President Reagan

Current
Policy
No. 765

A Mission for Peace

United States Department of State
Bureau of Public Affairs
Washington, D.C.

Following is President Reagan's address to the nation, Washington, D.C., November 14, 1985.

In 36 hours I will be leaving for Geneva for the first meeting between an American President and a Soviet leader in 6 years. I know that you and the people of the world are looking forward to that meeting with great interest, so tonight I want to share with you my hopes and tell you why I'm going to Geneva.

My mission, stated simply, is a mission for peace. It is to engage the new Soviet leader in what I hope will be a dialogue for peace that endures beyond my presidency. It is to sit down across from Mr. Gorbachev and try to map out, together, a basis for peaceful discourse even though our disagreements on fundamentals will not change.

It is my fervent hope that the two of us can begin a process which our successors and our peoples can continue—facing our differences frankly and openly and beginning to narrow and resolve them; communicating effectively so that our actions and intentions are not misunderstood; and eliminating the barriers between us and cooperating wherever possible for the greater good of all.

This meeting can be a historic opportunity to set a steady, more constructive course to the 21st century. The history of American-Soviet relations, however, does not augur well for euphoria. Eight of my predecessors—each in his own way, in his own time—sought to achieve a more stable and peaceful relationship with the Soviet Union. None fully succeeded. So, I don't underestimate the difficulty of the task ahead. But these sad chapters do not relieve me of the obligation to try to make this a safer, better world. For our children, our grandchildren, for all mankind, I intend to make the effort. And with your prayers and God's help, I hope to succeed.

Success at the summit, however, should not be measured by any short-term agreements that may be signed. Only the passage of time will tell us whether we constructed a durable bridge to a safer world.

Building a Foundation for Lasting Peace

This, then, is why I go to Geneva—to build a foundation for lasting peace. When we speak of peace, we should not mean just the absence of war. True peace rests on the pillars of individual freedom, human rights, national self-determination, and respect for the rule of law. Building a safer future requires that we address candidly all the issues which divide us and not just focus on one or two issues, important as they may be. When we meet in Geneva, our agenda will seek not just to avoid war but to strengthen peace, prevent confrontation, and remove the sources of tension. We should seek to reduce the suspicions and mistrust that have led us to acquire mountains of strategic weapons.

Since the dawn of the nuclear age, every American President has sought to limit and end the dangerous competition in nuclear arms. I have no higher priority than to finally realize that dream. I've said before, I will say again, a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought.

We've gone the extra mile in arms control, but our offers have not always been welcome. In 1977 and again in 1982, the United States proposed to the Soviet Union deep reciprocal cuts in strategic forces. These offers were rejected out-of-hand. In 1981, we proposed the complete elimination of a whole category of intermediate-range nuclear forces. Three years later, we proposed a treaty for a global ban on chemical weapons. In 1983, the Soviet Union got up and walked out of the Geneva nuclear arms control negotiations altogether. They did this in protest because we and our European allies had begun to deploy nuclear weapons as a counter to Soviet SS-20s aimed at our European and other allies.

I'm pleased now, however, with the interest expressed in reducing offensive weapons by the new Soviet leadership.

Let me repeat tonight what I announced last week. The United States is prepared to reduce comparable nuclear systems by 50%. We seek reductions that will result in a stable balance between us with no first-strike capability—and verified full compliance.

If we both reduce the weapons of war, there would be no losers, only winners. And the whole world would benefit if we could both abandon these weapons altogether and move to nonnuclear defensive systems that threaten no one.

But nuclear arms control is not of itself a final answer. I told four Soviet political commentators 2 weeks ago that nations do not distrust each other because they're armed; they arm themselves because they distrust each other. The use of force, subversion, and terror has made the world a more dangerous place, and thus, today, there's no peace in Afghanistan; no peace in Cambodia; no peace in Angola, Ethiopia, or Nicaragua.

These wars have claimed hundreds of thousands of lives and threaten to spill over national frontiers. That's why in my address to the United Nations, I proposed a way to end these conflicts: a regional peace plan that calls for negotiations among the warring parties, withdrawal of all foreign troops, democratic reconciliation, and economic assistance.

Four times in my lifetime, our soldiers have been sent overseas to fight in foreign lands. Their remains can be found from Flanders Field to the islands of the Pacific. Not once were those young men sent abroad in the cause of conquest. Not once did they come home claiming a single square inch of some other country as a trophy of war.

American Commitment to Freedom and Democracy

A great danger in the past, however, has been the failure by our enemies to remember that while we Americans detest war, we love freedom and stand ready to sacrifice for it. We love freedom not only because it's practical and beneficial but because it is morally right and just.

In advancing freedom, we Americans carry a special burden—a belief in the dignity of man in the sight of the God who gave birth to this country. This is central to our being.

A century and a half ago, Thomas Jefferson told the world: "... the mass of mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs. . . ." Freedom is America's core. We must never deny it or forsake it. Should the day come when we Americans remain silent in the face of armed aggression, then the cause of America—the cause of freedom—will have been lost, and the great heart of this country will have been broken. This affirmation of freedom is not only our duty as Americans, it's essential for success at Geneva.

Freedom and democracy are the best guarantors of peace. History has shown that democratic nations do not start wars. The rights of the individual and the rule of law are as fundamental to peace as arms control. A government which does not respect its citizens' rights and its international commitments to protect those rights is not likely to respect its other international undertakings.

And that's why we must and will speak in Geneva on behalf of those who cannot speak for themselves. We are not trying to impose our beliefs on others. We have a right to expect, however, that great states will live up to their international obligations.

The Need for Increased People-to-People Contact

Despite our deep and abiding differences, we can and must prevent our international competition from spilling over into violence. We can find as yet undiscovered avenues where American and Soviet citizens can cooperate fruitfully for the benefit of mankind. And this, too, is why I'm going to Geneva.

Enduring peace requires openness, honest communications, and opportunities for our peoples to get to know one another directly. The United States has always stood for openness. Thirty years ago in Geneva, President Eisenhower, preparing for his first meeting with the then Soviet leader, made his "open skies" proposal and an offer of new educational and cultural exchanges with the Soviet Union. He recognized that removing the barriers between people is at the heart of our relationship. He said:

> Restrictions on communications of all kinds, including radio and travel, existing in extreme form in some places, have operated as causes of mutual distrust. In America, the fervent belief in freedom of thought, of expression, and of movement is a vital part of our heritage.

Well, I have hopes that we can lessen the distrust between us, reduce the levels of secrecy, and bring forth a more "open world." Imagine how much good we could accomplish, how the cause of peace would be served, if more individuals and families from our respective countries could come to know each other in a personal way.

For example, if Soviet youth could attend American schools and universities, they could learn firsthand what spirit of freedom rules our land and that we do not wish the Soviet people any harm. If American youth could do likewise, they could talk about their interests and values and hopes for the future with their Soviet friends. They would get firsthand knowledge of life in the U.S.S.R., but most important, they would learn that we're all God's children with much in common.

Imagine if people in our nation could see the Bolshoi Ballet again, while Soviet citizens could see American plays and hear groups like the Beach Boys. And how about Soviet children watching Sesame Street?

We've had educational and cultural exchanges for 25 years and are now close to completing a new agreement. But I feel the time is ripe for us to take bold new steps to open the way for our peoples to participate in an unprecedented way in the building of peace.

Why shouldn't I propose to Mr. Gorbachev at Geneva that we exchange many more of our citizens from fraternal, religious, educational, and cultural groups? Why not suggest the exchange of thousands of undergraduates each year and even of younger students who would live with a host family and attend schools or summer camps? We could look to increased scholarship programs; improve language studies; conduct courses in history, culture, and other subjects; develop new sister cities; establish libraries and cultural centers; and, yes, increase athletic competition. People of both our nations love sports. If we must compete, let it be on the playing fields and not the battlefields.

In science and technology we could launch new joint space ventures and establish joint medical research projects. In communications, we'd like to see more appearances in the other's mass media by representatives of both our countries. If Soviet spokesmen are free to appear on American television, to be published and read in the American press, shouldn't the Soviet people have the same right to see, hear, and read what we Americans have to say?

Such proposals will not bridge our differences, but people-to-people contacts can build genuine constituencies for peace in both countries. After all, people don't start wars, governments do.

Conclusion

Let me summarize, then, the vision and hopes that we carry with us to Geneva.

We go with an appreciation, born of experience, of the deep differences between us—between our values, our systems, our beliefs. But we also carry with us the determination not to permit those differences to erupt into confrontation or conflict. We do not threaten the Soviet people and never will.

We go without illusion but with hope—hope that progress can be made on our entire agenda. We believe that progress can be made in resolving the regional conflicts now burning on three continents—including our own hemisphere. The regional plan we proposed at the United Nations will be raised again at Geneva.

We're proposing the broadest people-to-people exchanges in the history of American-Soviet relations, exchanges in sports and culture, in the media, education, and the arts. Such exchanges can build in our societies thousands of coalitions for cooperation and peace.

Governments can only do so much: once they get the ball rolling, they should step out of the way and let people get together to share, enjoy, help, listen, and learn from each other, especially young people.

Finally, we go to Geneva with the sober realization that nuclear weapons pose the greatest threat in human history to the survival of the human race—that the arms race must be stopped. We go determined to search out and discover common ground—where we can agree to begin the reduction, looking to the eventual elimination, of nuclear weapons from the face of the earth.

It is not an impossible dream that we can begin to reduce nuclear arsenals, reduce the risk of war, and build a solid foundation for peace. It is not an impossible dream that our children and grandchildren can some day travel freely back and forth between America and the Soviet Union; visit each other's homes; work and study together; enjoy and discuss plays, music, television; and root for teams when they compete.

These, then, are the indispensable elements of a true peace: the steady expansion of human rights for all the world's peoples; support for resolving conflicts in Asia, Africa, and Latin America that carry the seeds of a wider war; a broadening of people-to-people exchanges that can diminish the distrust and suspicion that separate our two peoples; and the steady reduction of these awesome nuclear arsenals until they no longer threaten the world we both must inhabit. This is our agenda for Geneva; this is our policy; this is our plan for peace.

We have cooperated in the past. In both World Wars, Americans and Russians fought on separate fronts against a common enemy. Near the city of Murmansk, sons of our own nation are buried, heroes who died of wounds sustained on the treacherous North Atlantic and North Sea convoys that carried to Russia the indispensable tools of survival and victory. While it would be naive to think a single summit can establish a permanent peace, this conference can begin a dialogue for peace. So we look to the future with optimism, and we go to Geneva with confidence.

Both Nancy and I are grateful for the chance you've given us to serve this nation and the trust you've placed in us. I know how deep the hope of peace is in her heart, as it is in the heart of every American and Russian mother.

I received a letter and picture from one such mother in Louisiana recently. She wrote:

> Mr. President, how could anyone be more blessed than I? These children you see are mine, granted to me by the Lord for a short time. When you go to Geneva, please remember these faces, remember the faces of my children—of Jonathan, my son, and of my twins, Lara and Jessica. Their future depends on your actions. I will pray for guidance for you and the Soviet leaders.

Her words, "my children," read like a cry of love. And I could only think how that cry has echoed down through the centuries, a cry for all the children of the world, for peace, for love of fellowman. Here is the central truth of our time—of any time—a truth to which I've tried to bear witness in this office.

When I first accepted the nomination of my party, I asked you, the American people, to join with me in prayer for our nation and the world. Six days ago in the Cabinet Room, religious leaders—Ukrainian and Greek Orthodox bishops, Catholic Church representatives including a Lithuanian bishop, Protestant pastors, a Mormon elder, and Jewish rabbis—made me a similar request.

Well, tonight I'm honoring that request. I am asking you, my fellow Americans, to pray for God's grace and His guidance for all of us at Geneva, so that the cause of true peace among men will be advanced and all of humanity thereby served. ■

Published by the United States Department of State • Bureau of Public Affairs
Office of Public Communication • Editorial Division • Washington, D.C. • November 1985
Editor: Colleen Sussman • This material is in the public domain and may be reproduced without permission; citation of this source is appreciated.

Bureau of Public Affairs
United States Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20520

Official Business

If address is incorrect
please indicate change.
Do not cover or destroy
this address label. Mail
change of address to:
PA/OAP, Rm. 5815A ►

Postage and Fees Paid
Department of State
STA-501

(Dolan)
November 4, 1985
7:30 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: TO THE NATION -- GENEVA SUMMIT

In 48 hours, I will be leaving for Geneva to meet with Mr. Gorbachev, the leader of the Soviet Union. Few events attract as much attention as summit conferences and I felt it my duty to report directly to you tonight on this meeting and its significance.

Now, I don't think it's any mystery why most of us regard summit conferences as a good idea. The danger of thermonuclear warfare and the havoc it would wreak are, as President Kennedy put it, a modern sword of Damocles dangling over the head of each of us. The awful reality of these weapons is actually a kind of terrible crescendo to the steady, dehumanizing progress of modern warfare in this century. To a few people here in this office recently, I recalled a hotly debated issue in my own college years -- which by the way also took place in this century -- when some of us strenuously argued that in the advent of another world war no civilized person and certainly no American would ever obey an order to attack purely civilian targets. Humanity, we were certain, would never come to that. Well, World War II and 34 million civilian casualties later we were all sadly, tragically wiser. At least today we can say we have fewer illusions: we know if a World War III breaks out the destruction will be vast and devastating with perhaps 90 percent civilian casualties.

Believe me, the office I now occupy leads to serious reflection on all this. Whenever I travel, for example, I am followed by a military aide who carries with him a small black attache case -- "the football" is its nickname. It is a grim reminder of the narrow line our world walks every day because it contains the codes necessary for retaliation to a nuclear attack on the United States.

And this office provides another sobering, even sadder perspective on our world. The 23 million lives lost since the end of World War II in conventional and regional conflicts are stark evidence that a strictly nuclear conflict is far from the only danger we face. In recent years, America has had her share of fallen sons; Korea, Vietnam, other military engagements including terrorist attacks have been part of this terrible cost. And many times at this desk I have had to discharge the most difficult duty I have as President: to try and find words of comfort for grieving mothers and fathers. I don't have to tell you how regularly I fail at that; because there are no such words. It's one reason why earlier this year when I visited those places in Europe that had seen so much suffering during World War II, I said a voice could be heard there, a voice from our century and from every century, the same voice I have heard in such sorrow here in this room, the voice of humanity crying out in anguish but in hope for peace -- and for an end to war.

This is why I go to Geneva. For peace. And in hope -- the hope of never having to face that awful option of nuclear retaliation and of never again having to speak from this office

to grief-stricken loved ones. The hope too of seeking to work with the Soviet Union to reduce and eventually eliminate the danger of nuclear destruction, to relax those regional tensions that can lead to wider conflict, to enhance respect for human rights and to expand the peace process itself by involving more directly the citizens of both our nations. And on this latter point I want to mention in a few moments the specific new proposals I have in mind.

There is another reason I go to Geneva. It has to do, like the threat of nuclear war, with a danger unique to this century. Part of our heritage as Americans is our Founding Fathers' warning about history's most terrible but, somehow most easily forgotten lesson; that the abuse of government power has always posed the most serious and enduring threat to the freedom of man.

In the twentieth century, with the development of science and technology and the rise of modern ideology, we have seen a quantum leap in the nature of this danger and the birth of the gravest threat to freedom ever known -- the police state, the totalitarian society.

Now I don't think I have to elaborate on the human suffering totalitarian government has caused in our time. Hitler's concentration camps or Stalin's forced famines, the Third Reich or the Gulag Archipelago. The advent of totalitarian ideology -- an ideology that justifies any crime or affront to the individual done in the name of the state -- has sparked the worst assaults in history on the human spirit. On this point, my own views have been plainly stated many times. Only as recently as a few weeks

ago at the United Nations, I spoke of some specific instances of unacceptable Soviet conduct: the invasion of Afghanistan that has cost between 750,000 and one million lives not to mention nearly six million refugees, Soviet intervention in the African nations of Angola and Ethiopia, Soviet attempts to establish a totalitarian regime in Nicaragua. This tragic, unhappy list goes on.

I need not elaborate on this now except to say that in forthrightly opposing such action we Americans have a grave responsibility and bear a special burden. A belief in the dignity of the individual and in his or her worth in the sight of God gave birth to this country; it is central to our being. "Our whole experiment is based on the capacity of the people for self-government," said James Madison. And Thomas Jefferson said; "The mass of men were not born to wear saddles on their backs," and again: "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty as well." This is our past, it is a part of us, we must never deny nor forsake it. If the day ever comes when the leaders of this Nation remain silent in the face of foreign aggression or stop speaking out about the repression of human rights then truly the cause of America -- the cause of freedom -- has been lost, and the great heart of this country has been broken. We Americans know we can never rest as a people nor say our work as a Nation is done until each man, woman and child on earth knows the blessings of liberty.

And this is the second reason I go to Geneva. For freedom. To speak for the right of every people and every nation to choose

their future. I go to Geneva for the right of human beings everywhere to determine their own destiny, to live in the dignity God intended for each of his children.

But let me stress here that not only do I believe this candor and realism on behalf of freedom is our responsibility as Americans, I also think it is essential for success in Geneva. Because if history has shown there is any key to dealing successfully with the Soviets it is this: the Soviets must realize that their counterparts take them seriously and that we harbor no illusions about their ultimate goals and intentions. The Soviet mind is not the mirror image of the American or the Western mind and it is both wrong and arrogant to assume that it is. The Soviets have a very different view of the world than we do; they believe a great struggle is already underway in the world and true peace can only be attained with the triumph of communist power. The Soviets sincerely believe that the march of history is embodied in the Soviet state, and so, to them, the mere existence of the democracies is seen as an obstacle to the ultimate triumph of history and that state. So, from the Soviet perspective, even if the democracies do nothing overt against their interests, just our survival, our mere existence, is considered by them an act of aggression.

And that is why the Soviets tend to misinterpret well-intentioned public statements obscuring the nature of this struggle or minimizing the crucial moral distinction between totalitarianism and democracy. And that is why any sudden shifts in our realistic and long-held views about the Soviets tends to

disrupt the negotiating process. In the past, when such shifts or such statements have been made, the Soviets have either regarded them as a ruse and reacted with distrust, or looked on them as hopelessly naive and attempted to exploit the pathetic illusions of their counterparts. In both cases, the peace process and the business of serious negotiations have suffered.

So I must be blunt with you tonight; while I go to Geneva for peace and for freedom, I also go to Geneva without illusions. Let us be clear: the fact of this summit conference does not mean the Soviets have forsaken their long-term goals and objectives. Let us never forget, as President Eisenhower put it in his farewell address to the American people; "we face a hostile ideology -- global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose and insidious in method."

I do not mention this, however, to sound unduly pessimistic or to paint a heedlessly discouraging picture. Far to the contrary, my mood about this meeting is one of cautious optimism. While it would be foolhardy to think one summit conference can establish a permanent peace, this conference can, I believe, help begin a permanent process toward peace.

But that is why realism is so essential. For only by leaving our illusions behind and dealing realistically with the Soviets do we have any chance at all for meaningful progress in Geneva.

This is the way to progress; as Winston Churchill said after a long experience of negotiating with the Soviets, "The Soviets will try every door in the home, enter all rooms which are not

locked and when they come to a house that is barred, if they are unsuccessful in breaking through it, they will withdraw and invite you to dine genially that same evening."

Our goals next week in Geneva then must be both peace and freedom as well as an end to illusion. But because we can neither permit civilization to perish in a nuclear holocaust nor freedom to wither under the steady and rentless assault of totalitarianism, how do we confront this dilemma in Geneva and elsewhere? If nuclear war is an impossible option and so too is a world under totalitarian rule, how then are we to steer between them? What course are we to chart and what cause is their for hope?

My fellow Americans, I believe there is great cause for hope -- hope that peace and freedom will not only survive but triumph, and perhaps even sooner than any of us had even dared to imagine only a few years ago. I also think it possible that history will record a great paradox about our century: that while it gave birth to the awful menaces of nuclear weapons and totalitarian government and saw so much bloodshed and heartache it was also the century that in its closing decades fostered the greatest movement in human memory towards free institutions and democratic self-rule, the greatest flowering of mankind's age old aspiration for freedom and human dignity.

Consider, for a moment, that at the start of the twentieth century there were only a handful of democracies in the entire world while today there are more than 50 with one-third of the world's population living in freedom. Here in our own hemisphere

there is dramatic evidence of this change: more than 90 percent of the people in Latin America are now living under governments that are either democratic or headed in that direction, a dramatic reversal from only a few years ago.

Even the communist world is far from immune to this worldwide movement. In an astonishing turnaround from only a few years ago, China, for example, has adopted sweeping economic reforms. Eastern European nations are seeking higher standards of living through free-market techniques. Although for the moment Polish Solidarity has been suppressed we know the hunger of the Polish people for freedom can never be completely stilled.

So we see even in the communist world, the great longing for personal freedom and democratic self-rule, the realization that economic progress is directly tied to the operation of a free market, surfacing again and again. That's because Karl Marx was in one sense right: the demand for economic well-being in this century has brought the masses into conflict with the old political order; only he was wrong about where this conflict would occur. It is the democracies that are vibrant and growing -- bringing to their people higher and higher standards of living even as freedom grows and deepens while the communist world has economies that stagnate, technology that lags and people who are restless and unhappy with their lives.

In the Soviet Union too, economic difficulties have led to reappraisal and reexamination. Mr. Gorbachev himself has spoken to this issue and I intend to engage him further on this matter when we meet. Without being overly optimistic we should

recognize that it has happened before in history: a small ruling elite -- when it meets firm resistance to foreign adventurism -- begins to ponder how to lend more legitimacy to its government by allowing the people more of voice in their own destiny.

Now, don't get me wrong; I hardly think we've reached this situation, not by a long shot. But, my fellow Americans, I do believe that there is a historic trend towards more openness and democracy in the world and that even in communist countries the momentum is building. But because, unlike the Soviets, we believe that history has no unalterable laws, we must do all in our power to accelerate this trend. Let us start by understanding the important factors that have contributed to this movement.

To begin with, the health and vigor of the American economy -- with 15 million new jobs -- has been restored; and this in turn had led to a reinvigoration of the world economy, a new appreciation by many nations for the pragmatic benefits of freedom.

Second, our efforts to restore America's military might has brought with it a new appreciation by the rest of the world for American power, resolve and confidence.

Third, this item I am about to discuss is actually related to our defense buildup but because I believe it is so vital to the peace process I wanted to treat it separately. As most of you know, the United States and the Soviet Union have for many years used massive nuclear arsenals to hold each other hostage in a kind of mutual nuclear terror -- one side threatening massive

retaliation against the other. This has been known as mutual assured destruction; M-A-D or M.A.D. as the arms control experts call it. I think you will agree there has never been a more apt acronym. As perhaps most of you also know, the United States is now embarked on research and development of new strategic defense system -- an intricate but workable series of defenses that could provide a survival shield in outer space against incoming nuclear missiles. We believe this system could be ready for deployment at the end of this decade or the early part of the 1990's.

Now we have embarked on this program for a single reason: to end the madness of M.A.D., the insanity of mutual nuclear terror. Think what the advent of this new space shield -- a defensive system that would kill weapons not people -- could mean to our lives and the lives of our children. For the first time much of the dread of the postwar period would be lifted because we would have some means as a people to protect ourselves from a nuclear attack launched either by design or by mistake.

Fourth, we must continue with a foreign policy that offers a wide range of peace initiatives even as it speaks out vigorously for freedom. Yes, we have been candid about the difference between the Soviets and ourselves and we have been willing to use our military power when our vital interests were threatened. And I think we can be pleased with the results: for the first time in many years not a single square inch of real estate has been lost to communist aggression, in fact, Grenada has been rescued from such a fate and in at least four other countries freedom fighters are now opposing the rule of totalitarian leaders. But

in addition to these firm foreign policy steps, we have also set in motion a wide series of diplomatic initiatives, perhaps the greatest number of such proposals in our history. They cover a range of areas: strategic nuclear weapons, intermediate nuclear weapons, chemical weapons, mutual troop reductions in Europe. The list goes on.

It is in this last area, the business of negotiation between the Soviet Union and the United States that this Geneva meeting takes on a special importance. Too often in the past, the whole burden of Soviet and American relations has rested on one or two arms talks or even arms proposals. And while arms control is essential it can not be the only area of discussion. That is why I believe this summit conference can move the peace process substantially forward. After careful consultation with our allies, Secretary Shultz flew to Moscow last week and established with the Soviets a four-fold agenda. So, we will be discussing in Geneva arms control but also human rights; we will be talking with them about bilateral matters such as trade, scientific and cultural exchanges but also regional conflicts such as those in Afghanistan, Angola, Ethiopia and Nicaragua.

I think this represents a breakthrough. And I am determined to continue in this direction in Geneva by offering the Soviets a series of proposals that make up in their entirety a unique and even revolutionary approach. With this series of "Open World" proposals, I want to invite the Soviet Union to participate more fully in the effort to reduce secrecy and distrust between nations and construct a more open and constructive relationship.

First, in my United Nations speech of last year I mentioned a proposal for a series of "Umbrella talks" between the Soviets and ourselves on a wide-ranging number of issues. I will once again offer this proposal, suggesting not only regular summit meetings of the two heads of state but meetings at the cabinet and ministerial level as well.

Second, in the area of arms control I want to formally take up the issue of our strategic defense initiative. But rather than bargaining away this essential system or spending our time in Geneva bickering over who is building what and which side is destabilizing the other; I am going to extend to the Soviets an invitation to share in the fruits of our research for the deployment of this space shield.

Third, I will be proposing a wide series of people-to-people exchanges. Unlike the exchanges of the past, however, which were limited to a tiny number on both sides, I will be suggesting to Mr. Gorbachev that we exchange on a yearly basis thousands of our citizens from different community, fraternal and cultural groups; students, religious organizations and so forth.

This series of people-to-people exchanges can I believe do much to bring the people of both our nations together. In this area we are going to suggest for example the exchange of at least 5,000 undergraduates each year for two semesters of study as well a youth exchange involving at least 5,000 secondary school age youngsters who would live with a host family and attend schools or summer camps. We also look to increase scholarship programs, to improve language studies, to develop and expand sister city

relationships, to establish cultural centers and libraries and to increase bi-national athletic exchanges and sporting competitions.

In the areas of science, space and technology we would also seek to inaugurate more joint space flights and establish joint medical research projects and institutes in each of our countries. In the communications area, in particular, we would like to see a far more extensive contact including more appearances by representatives of both our countries in the other's mass media. I've noted that Mr. Gorbachev has shown a lively appreciation for America's free press tradition; I can assure you I will be preaching the virtues of some Soviet movements in this direction as well and will ask again, as I did several years ago in a speech to the British Parliament, for an opportunity to address the Soviet people.

Now I do not think these proposals will by themselves solve the world's problems or end our differences; but I do believe more people-to-people contact between our nations can help build constituencies for peace and freedom in both our nations.

To summarize then; I will be going to Geneva for peace and for freedom; without illusions; to put forward a whole series of "Open World" proposals that can lead to less distrust and suspicion in the international climate.

I also think the conversations Mr. Gorbachev and I will here together can help alleviate whatever suspicions and misunderstandings now exist between our two sides. You can be sure the Soviet Union knows the United States is not an aggressor

and will never strike first against a foreign adversary. As Prime Minister Mulroney of Canada put it recently when he was told the United States was an imperialist Nation -- and I'm using the Prime Minister's words -- "What the hell do you mean 'imperialist nation?'. We have a 4,000 mile border with them and for 172 years there hasn't been a shot fired in anger."

But the great danger in the past has been the failure by our adversaries to remember that while the American people love peace, they also love freedom and are always ready to sacrifice for it. That is why I will be stressing to Mr. Gorbachev that the only way war can ever break out between our two countries is through this sort of miscalculation. My first meeting with Mr. Gorbachev, by the way, will be taking place on the anniversary of the Gettysburg address; so you can be certain I will remind him that the American people are as determined as ever that "government by the people for the people and of the people shall not perish from the earth."

In conclusion, my fellow Americans, while this summit conference marks the culmination of much of our effort in the foreign policy area it is also, in another way, a milestone in a personal journey. That quotation from James Madison I mentioned earlier was from a speech that marked my entry into political life, a speech given more than two decades ago.
It was a time when many of us anticipated the troubles and difficulties of the years ahead and wondered if America would meet that challenge. She has, of course; and, as I said during the campaign last year, this is not the work of any one man or

party. The accomplishment is yours; the credit belongs to you the American people.

Both Nancy and I are proud and grateful for the chance you have given us to serve this Nation and the trust you have placed in us. And I think you can understand why on the eve of our departure for Geneva my thoughts turn not only to you but to her as well: not just for all the support and love she has given me over the years but also because I know how deep the hope of peace is in her heart, as it is in the heart of every American mother.

You know recently Nancy and I saw together a moving new film, the story of Eleni, a woman caught in the Greek civil war at the end of World War II, a mother who because she smuggled her children out to safety in America was tried, tortured and shot by the Greek communists.

It is also the story of her son, Nicholas Gage, who grew up to become an investigative reporter with the New York Times and who secretly vowed to return to Greece someday to take vengeance on the man who had sent his mother to her death. But at the dramatic end of the story, Nick Gage finds he cannot extract the vengeance he has promised himself. Mr. Gage writes it would have relieved the pain that had filled him for so many years but it would also have broken the one bridge still connecting him to his mother and the part of him most like her. As he tells it: "her final cry, before the bullets of the firing squad tore into her, was not a curse on her killers but an invocation of what she died for, a declaration of love: 'my children.'"

How that cry has echoed down through the centuries, a cry for the children of the world, for peace, for love of fellowmen.

Here then is what Geneva is really about; the hope of heeding such words, spoken so often in so many different places -- in a desert journey to a promised land, or by a carpenter beside the Sea of Galilee -- words calling all men to be brothers and all nations to be one.

Here is the central truth of our time, of any time; a truth to which I have tried to bear witness in this office. When I first accepted the nomination of my party for the presidency I asked the American people to join with me in prayer for our Nation and for the world. I want to remind you again that in the simple prayers of people like yourselves there is far more power than in the hands of all the great statesmen or armies of the world.

And so, as Thanksgiving approaches, I want to ask each of you to join me again in thanking God for all his blessings to this Nation and ask him to help and guide us as we meet next week in Geneva that the cause of peace and freedom will be served and all of humanity ennobled.

God bless you and good night.

(Dolan)
November 4, 1985
7:30 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: TO THE NATION -- GENEVA SUMMIT

In 48 hours, I will be leaving for Geneva to meet with Mr. Gorbachev, the leader of the Soviet Union. Few events attract as much attention as summit conferences and I felt it my duty to report directly to you tonight on this meeting and its significance.

Now, I don't think it's any mystery why most of us regard summit conferences as a good idea. The danger of thermonuclear warfare and the havoc it would wreak are, as President Kennedy put it, a modern sword of Damocles dangling over the head of each of us. The awful reality of these weapons is actually a kind of terrible crescendo to the steady, dehumanizing progress of modern warfare in this century. To a few people here in this office recently, I recalled a hotly debated issue in my own college years -- which by the way also took place in this century -- when some of us strenuously argued that in the advent of another world war no civilized person and certainly no American would ever obey an order to attack purely civilian targets. Humanity, we were certain, would never come to that. Well, World War II and 34 million civilian casualties later we were all sadly, tragically wiser. At least today we can say we have fewer illusions: we know if a World War III breaks out the destruction will be vast and devastating with perhaps 90 percent civilian casualties.

Believe me, the office I now occupy leads to serious reflection on all this. Whenever I travel, for example, I am followed by a military aide who carries with him a small black attache case -- "the football" is its nickname. It is a grim reminder of the narrow line our world walks every day because it contains the codes necessary for retaliation to a nuclear attack on the United States.

And this office provides another sobering, even sadder perspective on our world. The 23 million lives lost since the end of World War II in conventional and regional conflicts are stark evidence that a strictly nuclear conflict is far from the only danger we face. In recent years, America has had her share of fallen sons; Korea, Vietnam, other military engagements including terrorist attacks have been part of this terrible cost. And many times at this desk I have had to discharge the most difficult duty I have as President: to try and find words of comfort for grieving mothers and fathers. I don't have to tell you how regularly I fail at that; because there are no such words. It's one reason why earlier this year when I visited those places in Europe that had seen so much suffering during World War II, I said a voice could be heard there, a voice from our century and from every century, the same voice I have heard in such sorrow here in this room, the voice of humanity crying out in anguish but in hope for peace -- and for an end to war.

This is why I go to Geneva. For peace. And in hope -- the hope of never having to face that awful option of nuclear retaliation and of never again having to speak from this office

to grief-stricken loved ones. The hope too of seeking to work with the Soviet Union to reduce and eventually eliminate the danger of nuclear destruction, to relax those regional tensions that can lead to wider conflict, to enhance respect for human rights and to expand the peace process itself by involving more directly the citizens of both our nations. And on this latter point I want to mention in a few moments the specific new proposals I have in mind.

There is another reason I go to Geneva. It has to do, like the threat of nuclear war, with a danger unique to this century. Part of our heritage as Americans is our Founding Fathers' warning about history's most terrible but, somehow most easily forgotten lesson; that the abuse of government power has always posed the most serious and enduring threat to the freedom of man.

In the twentieth century, with the development of science and technology and the rise of modern ideology, we have seen a quantum leap in the nature of this danger and the birth of the gravest threat to freedom ever known -- the police state, the totalitarian society.

Now I don't think I have to elaborate on the human suffering totalitarian government has caused in our time. Hitler's concentration camps or Stalin's forced famines, the Third Reich or the Gulag Archipelago. The advent of totalitarian ideology -- an ideology that justifies any crime or affront to the individual done in the name of the state -- has sparked the worst assaults in history on the human spirit. On this point, my own views have been plainly stated many times. Only as recently as a few weeks

ago at the United Nations, I spoke of some specific instances of unacceptable Soviet conduct: the invasion of Afghanistan that has cost between 750,000 and one million lives not to mention nearly six million refugees, Soviet intervention in the African nations of Angola and Ethiopia, Soviet attempts to establish a totalitarian regime in Nicaragua. This tragic, unhappy list goes on.

I need not elaborate on this now except to say that in forthrightly opposing such action we Americans have a grave responsibility and bear a special burden. A belief in the dignity of the individual and in his or her worth in the sight of God gave birth to this country; it is central to our being. "Our whole experiment is based on the capacity of the people for self-government," said James Madison. And Thomas Jefferson said; "The mass of men were not born to wear saddles on their backs," and again: "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty as well." This is our past, it is a part of us, we must never deny nor forsake it. If the day ever comes when the leaders of this Nation remain silent in the face of foreign aggression or stop speaking out about the repression of human rights then truly the cause of America -- the cause of freedom -- has been lost, and the great heart of this country has been broken. We Americans know we can never rest as a people nor say our work as a Nation is done until each man, woman and child on earth knows the blessings of liberty.

And this is the second reason I go to Geneva. For freedom. To speak for the right of every people and every nation to choose

their future. I go to Geneva for the right of human beings everywhere to determine their own destiny, to live in the dignity God intended for each of his children.

But let me stress here that not only do I believe this candor and realism on behalf of freedom is our responsibility as Americans, I also think it is essential for success in Geneva. Because if history has shown there is any key to dealing successfully with the Soviets it is this: the Soviets must realize that their counterparts take them seriously and that we harbor no illusions about their ultimate goals and intentions. The Soviet mind is not the mirror image of the American or the Western mind and it is both wrong and arrogant to assume that it is. The Soviets have a very different view of the world than we do; they believe a great struggle is already underway in the world and true peace can only be attained with the triumph of communist power. The Soviets sincerely believe that the march of history is embodied in the Soviet state, and so, to them, the mere existence of the democracies is seen as an obstacle to the ultimate triumph of history and that state. So, from the Soviet perspective, even if the democracies do nothing overt against their interests, just our survival, our mere existence, is considered by them an act of aggression.

And that is why the Soviets tend to misinterpret well-intentioned public statements obscuring the nature of this struggle or minimizing the crucial moral distinction between totalitarianism and democracy. And that is why any sudden shifts in our realistic and long-held views about the Soviets tends to

disrupt the negotiating process. In the past, when such shifts or such statements have been made, the Soviets have either regarded them as a ruse and reacted with distrust, or looked on them as hopelessly naive and attempted to exploit the pathetic illusions of their counterparts. In both cases, the peace process and the business of serious negotiations have suffered.

So I must be blunt with you tonight; while I go to Geneva for peace and for freedom, I also go to Geneva without illusions. Let us be clear: the fact of this summit conference does not mean the Soviets have forsaken their long-term goals and objectives. Let us never forget, as President Eisenhower put it in his farewell address to the American people; "we face a hostile ideology -- global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose and insidious in method."

I do not mention this, however, to sound unduly pessimistic or to paint a heedlessly discouraging picture. Far to the contrary, my mood about this meeting is one of cautious optimism. While it would be foolhardy to think one summit conference can establish a permanent peace, this conference can, I believe, help begin a permanent process toward peace.

But that is why realism is so essential. For only by leaving our illusions behind and dealing realistically with the Soviets do we have any chance at all for meaningful progress in Geneva.

This is the way to progress; as Winston Churchill said after a long experience of negotiating with the Soviets, "The Soviets will try every door in the home, enter all rooms which are not

locked and when they come to a house that is barred, if they are unsuccessful in breaking through it, they will withdraw and invite you to dine genially that same evening."

Our goals next week in Geneva then must be both peace and freedom as well as an end to illusion. But because we can neither permit civilization to perish in a nuclear holocaust nor freedom to wither under the steady and rentless assault of totalitarianism, how do we confront this dilemma in Geneva and elsewhere? If nuclear war is an impossible option and so too is a world under totalitarian rule, how then are we to steer between them? What course are we to chart and what cause is their for hope?

My fellow Americans, I believe there is great cause for hope -- hope that peace and freedom will not only survive but triumph, and perhaps even sooner than any of us had even dared to imagine only a few years ago. I also think it possible that history will record a great paradox about our century: that while it gave birth to the awful menaces of nuclear weapons and totalitarian government and saw so much bloodshed and heartache it was also the century that in its closing decades fostered the greatest movement in human memory towards free institutions and democratic self-rule, the greatest flowering of mankind's age old aspiration for freedom and human dignity.

Consider, for a moment, that at the start of the twentieth century there were only a handful of democracies in the entire world while today there are more than 50 with one-third of the world's population living in freedom. Here in our own hemisphere

there is dramatic evidence of this change: more than 90 percent of the people in Latin America are now living under governments that are either democratic or headed in that direction, a dramatic reversal from only a few years ago.

Even the communist world is far from immune to this worldwide movement. In an astonishing turnaround from only a few years ago, China, for example, has adopted sweeping economic reforms. Eastern European nations are seeking higher standards of living through free-market techniques. Although for the moment Polish Solidarity has been suppressed we know the hunger of the Polish people for freedom can never be completely stilled.

So we see even in the communist world, the great longing for personal freedom and democratic self-rule, the realization that economic progress is directly tied to the operation of a free market, surfacing again and again. That's because Karl Marx was in one sense right: the demand for economic well-being in this century has brought the masses into conflict with the old political order; only he was wrong about where this conflict would occur. It is the democracies that are vibrant and growing -- bringing to their people higher and higher standards of living even as freedom grows and deepens while the communist world has economies that stagnate, technology that lags and people who are restless and unhappy with their lives.

In the Soviet Union too, economic difficulties have led to reappraisal and reexamination. Mr. Gorbachev himself has spoken to this issue and I intend to engage him further on this matter when we meet. Without being overly optimistic we should

recognize that it has happened before in history: a small ruling elite -- when it meets firm resistance to foreign adventurism -- begins to ponder how to lend more legitimacy to its government by allowing the people more of voice in their own destiny.

Now, don't get me wrong; I hardly think we've reached this situation, not by a long shot. But, my fellow Americans, I do believe that there is a historic trend towards more openness and democracy in the world and that even in communist countries the momentum is building. But because, unlike the Soviets, we believe that history has no unalterable laws, we must do all in our power to accelerate this trend. Let us start by understanding the important factors that have contributed to this movement.

To begin with, the health and vigor of the American economy -- with 15 million new jobs -- has been restored; and this in turn had led to a reinvigoration of the world economy, a new appreciation by many nations for the pragmatic benefits of freedom.

Second, our efforts to restore America's military might has brought with it a new appreciation by the rest of the world for American power, resolve and confidence.

Third, this item I am about to discuss is actually related to our defense buildup but because I believe it is so vital to the peace process I wanted to treat it separately. As most of you know, the United States and the Soviet Union have for many years used massive nuclear arsenals to hold each other hostage in a kind of mutual nuclear terror -- one side threatening massive

retaliation against the other. This has been known as mutual assured destruction; M-A-D or M.A.D. as the arms control experts call it. I think you will agree there has never been a more apt acronym. As perhaps most of you also know, the United States is now embarked on research and development of new strategic defense system -- an intricate but workable series of defenses that could provide a survival shield in outer space against incoming nuclear missiles. We believe this system could be ready for deployment at the end of this decade or the early part of the 1990's.

Now we have embarked on this program for a single reason: to end the madness of M.A.D., the insanity of mutual nuclear terror. Think what the advent of this new space shield -- a defensive system that would kill weapons not people -- could mean to our lives and the lives of our children. For the first time much of the dread of the postwar period would be lifted because we would have some means as a people to protect ourselves from a nuclear attack launched either by design or by mistake.

Fourth, we must continue with a foreign policy that offers a wide range of peace initiatives even as it speaks out vigorously for freedom. Yes, we have been candid about the difference between the Soviets and ourselves and we have been willing to use our military power when our vital interests were threatened. And I think we can be pleased with the results: for the first time in many years not a single square inch of real estate has been lost to communist aggression, in fact, Grenada has been rescued from such a fate and in at least four other countries freedom fighters are now opposing the rule of totalitarian leaders. But

in addition to these firm foreign policy steps, we have also set in motion a wide series of diplomatic initiatives, perhaps the greatest number of such proposals in our history. They cover a range of areas: strategic nuclear weapons, intermediate nuclear weapons, chemical weapons, mutual troop reductions in Europe. The list goes on.

It is in this last area, the business of negotiation between the Soviet Union and the United States that this Geneva meeting takes on a special importance. Too often in the past, the whole burden of Soviet and American relations has rested on one or two arms talks or even arms proposals. And while arms control is essential it can not be the only area of discussion. That is why I believe this summit conference can move the peace process substantially forward. After careful consultation with our allies, Secretary Shultz flew to Moscow last week and established with the Soviets a four-fold agenda. So, we will be discussing in Geneva arms control but also human rights; we will be talking with them about bilateral matters such as trade, scientific and cultural exchanges but also regional conflicts such as those in Afghanistan, Angola, Ethiopia and Nicaragua.

I think this represents a breakthrough. And I am determined to continue in this direction in Geneva by offering the Soviets a series of proposals that make up in their entirety a unique and even revolutionary approach. With this series of "Open World" proposals, I want to invite the Soviet Union to participate more fully in the effort to reduce secrecy and distrust between nations and construct a more open and constructive relationship.

First, in my United Nations speech of last year I mentioned a proposal for a series of "Umbrella talks" between the Soviets and ourselves on a wide-ranging number of issues. I will once again offer this proposal, suggesting not only regular summit meetings of the two heads of state but meetings at the cabinet and ministerial level as well.

Second, in the area of arms control I want to formally take up the issue of our strategic defense initiative. But rather than bargaining away this essential system or spending our time in Geneva bickering over who is building what and which side is destabilizing the other; I am going to extend to the Soviets an invitation to share in the fruits of our research for the deployment of this space shield.

Third, I will be proposing a wide series of people-to-people exchanges. Unlike the exchanges of the past, however, which were limited to a tiny number on both sides, I will be suggesting to Mr. Gorbachev that we exchange on a yearly basis thousands of our citizens from different community, fraternal and cultural groups; students, religious organizations and so forth.

This series of people-to-people exchanges can I believe do much to bring the people of both our nations together. In this area we are going to suggest for example the exchange of at least 5,000 undergraduates each year for two semesters of study as well a youth exchange involving at least 5,000 secondary school age youngsters who would live with a host family and attend schools or summer camps. We also look to increase scholarship programs, to improve language studies, to develop and expand sister city

relationships, to establish cultural centers and libraries and to increase bi-national athletic exchanges and sporting competitions.

In the areas of science, space and technology we would also seek to inaugurate more joint space flights and establish joint medical research projects and institutes in each of our countries. In the communications area, in particular, we would like to see a far more extensive contact including more appearances by representatives of both our countries in the other's mass media. I've noted that Mr. Gorbachev has shown a lively appreciation for America's free press tradition; I can assure you I will be preaching the virtues of some Soviet movements in this direction as well and will ask again, as I did several years ago in a speech to the British Parliament, for an opportunity to address the Soviet people.

Now I do not think these proposals will by themselves solve the world's problems or end our differences; but I do believe more people-to-people contact between our nations can help build constituencies for peace and freedom in both our nations.

To summarize then; I will be going to Geneva for peace and for freedom; without illusions; to put forward a whole series of "Open World" proposals that can lead to less distrust and suspicion in the international climate.

I also think the conversations Mr. Gorbachev and I will here together can help alleviate whatever suspicions and misunderstandings now exist between our two sides. You can be sure the Soviet Union knows the United States is not an aggressor

and will never strike first against a foreign adversary. As Prime Minister Mulroney of Canada put it recently when he was told the United States was an imperialist Nation -- and I'm using the Prime Minister's words -- "What the hell do you mean 'imperialist nation?'. We have a 4,000 mile border with them and for 172 years there hasn't been a shot fired in anger."

But the great danger in the past has been the failure by our adversaries to remember that while the American people love peace, they also love freedom and are always ready to sacrifice for it. That is why I will be stressing to Mr. Gorbachev that the only way war can ever break out between our two countries is through this sort of miscalculation. My first meeting with Mr. Gorbachev, by the way, will be taking place on the anniversary of the Gettysburg address; so you can be certain I will remind him that the American people are as determined as ever that "government by the people for the people and of the people shall not perish from the earth."

In conclusion, my fellow Americans, while this summit conference marks the culmination of much of our effort in the foreign policy area it is also, in another way, a milestone in a personal journey. That quotation from James Madison I mentioned earlier was from a speech that marked my entry into political life, a speech given more than two decades ago.
It was a time when many of us anticipated the troubles and difficulties of the years ahead and wondered if America would meet that challenge. She has, of course; and, as I said during the campaign last year, this is not the work of any one man or

party. The accomplishment is yours; the credit belongs to you the American people.

Both Nancy and I are proud and grateful for the chance you have given us to serve this Nation and the trust you have placed in us. And I think you can understand why on the eve of our departure for Geneva my thoughts turn not only to you but to her as well: not just for all the support and love she has given me over the years but also because I know how deep the hope of peace is in her heart, as it is in the heart of every American mother.

You know recently Nancy and I saw together a moving new film, the story of Eleni, a woman caught in the Greek civil war at the end of World War II, a mother who because she smuggled her children out to safety in America was tried, tortured and shot by the Greek communists.

It is also the story of her son, Nicholas Gage, who grew up to become an investigative reporter with the New York Times and who secretly vowed to return to Greece someday to take vengeance on the man who had sent his mother to her death. But at the dramatic end of the story, Nick Gage finds he cannot extract the vengeance he has promised himself. Mr. Gage writes it would have relieved the pain that had filled him for so many years but it would also have broken the one bridge still connecting him to his mother and the part of him most like her. As he tells it: "her final cry, before the bullets of the firing squad tore into her, was not a curse on her killers but an invocation of what she died for, a declaration of love: 'my children.'"

How that cry has echoed down through the centuries, a cry for the children of the world, for peace, for love of fellowmen.

Here then is what Geneva is really about; the hope of heeding such words, spoken so often in so many different places -- in a desert journey to a promised land, or by a carpenter beside the Sea of Galilee -- words calling all men to be brothers and all nations to be one.

Here is the central truth of our time, of any time; a truth to which I have tried to bear witness in this office. When I first accepted the nomination of my party for the presidency I asked the American people to join with me in prayer for our Nation and for the world. I want to remind you again that in the simple prayers of people like yourselves there is far more power than in the hands of all the great statesmen or armies of the world.

And so, as Thanksgiving approaches, I want to ask each of you to join me again in thanking God for all his blessings to this Nation and ask him to help and guide us as we meet next week in Geneva that the cause of peace and freedom will be served and all of humanity ennobled.

God bless you and good night.

PSL 41

(Dolan)
November 4, 1985
4:00 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: TO THE NATION -- GENEVA SUMMIT

¶ In 48 hours, I will be leaving for Geneva to meet with Mr. Gorbachev, the leader of the Soviet Union. ~~Very~~ few events attract as much attention as summit conferences and I felt it ~~was~~ my duty to report directly to you tonight on this meeting and its significance.

¶ Now, I don't think it's any mystery why most of us regard summit conferences as a good idea. The danger of thermonuclear warfare and the havoc it would wreak are, as President Kennedy put it, a modern sword of Damocles dangling over the head of each of us. The awful reality of these weapons is actually a kind of terrible crescendo to the steady, dehumanizing progress of modern warfare in this century. To a few people here in this office recently, I recalled a hotly debated issue in my own college years -- which by the way also took place in this century -- when some of us strenuously argued that in the advent of another world war, no civilized person and certainly no American would ever obey an order to attack purely civilian targets. Humanity, we were certain, would never come to that. Well, World War II and 34 million civilian casualties later we were all sadly, tragically wiser. At least today we can say we have fewer illusions: we know if a World War III breaks out the destruction will be vast and devastating with perhaps 90 percent civilian casualties.

Believe me, the office I now occupy leads to serious reflection on all this. Whenever I travel, for example, I am followed by a military aide who carries with him a small black attache case -- "the football" is its nickname. It is a grim reminder of the narrow line our world walks every day, because it contains the codes necessary for retaliation to a nuclear attack on the United States.

And this office provides another sobering, even sadder perspective on our world, ~~one I will talk about to Mr. Gorbachev in a few days, one I want to mention to you now~~. The 23 million lives lost since the end of World War II in conventional and regional ~~conflicts~~ conflict are stark evidence that a strictly nuclear conflict is far from the only danger we face. In recent years, America has had her share of fallen sons; Korea, Vietnam, other military engagements including terrorist attacks, have been part of this terrible cost. And many times at this desk I have had to discharge the most difficult duty I have as President: to try and find words of comfort for grieving mothers and fathers. I don't have to tell you how regularly I fail at that; because there are no such words. It's one reason why earlier this year when I visited those places in Europe that had seen so much suffering during World War II, I said a voice could be heard there, a voice from our century and from every century, the same voice I have heard in such sorrow here in this room, the voice of humanity crying out in anguish but in hope for peace -- and for an end to war.

¶ This is why I go to Geneva. For peace. And in hope -- the hope of never having to face that awful option of nuclear retaliation; the hope of never again having to speak from this office to grief-stricken loved ones, ~~the hope that~~ someday our Nation and the Soviet Union and all the people of the world will learn to heed the age-old cry of mankind for peace among all nations.

Insert A

¶ There is another reason I go to Geneva. It has to do, like the threat of nuclear war, with a danger unique to this century. Part of our heritage as Americans is our Founding Fathers' warning about history's most terrible but, somehow, most easily forgotten lesson; that the abuse of government power has always posed the most serious and enduring threat to the freedom of man.

¶ In the twentieth century, with the development of science and technology and the rise of modern ideology, we have seen a quantum leap in the nature of this danger and the birth of the gravest threat to freedom ever known -- the police state, the totalitarian society.

Now I don't think I have to elaborate on the human suffering ~~and the loss of life~~ totalitarian government has caused in our time. Hitler's concentration camps or Stalin's ~~purges~~ Forced Famines, the Third Reich or the Gulag Archipelago, the advent of totalitarian ideology -- an ideology ~~which~~ justifies any crime ~~or affront~~ of a kind to the individual done in the name of the state -- has sparked the worst assaults in history on the human spirit. On this point, my own views have been plainly stated many times ~~in the past~~; only as recently as a few weeks ago at the United Nations, I spoke of some specific

instances of unacceptable Soviet conduct: the invasion of Afghanistan, ~~one~~ that has cost between 750,000 and one million lives not to mention nearly six million refugees, Soviet intervention in the African nations of Angola and Ethiopia, Soviet attempts to establish a totalitarian regime in Nicaragua ~~and undermine democracy in this hemisphere,~~ this tragic, unhappy list goes on.

I need not elaborate on this now except to say that in forthrightly opposing such action we Americans have a grave responsibility and bear a special burden. A belief in the dignity of the individual and in his or her worth in the sight of God gave birth to this country; it is central to our being. "Our whole experiment is based on the capacity of the people for self-government," said James Madison. And Thomas Jefferson said more directly: "The mass of men were not born to wear saddles on their backs," and again: "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty as well." This is our past, it is a part of us, we must never deny nor forsake it. If the day ever comes when the leaders of this Nation remain silent in the face of foreign aggression or stop speaking out about the repression of human rights then truly the cause of America -- the cause of freedom -- has been lost, and the great heart of this country has been broken. We Americans know we can never rest as a people nor say our work as a Nation is done until each man, woman and child on earth knows the blessings of liberty.

And this is the second reason I go to Geneva. For freedom. To speak for the right of every people and every nation to choose

their future. I go to Geneva for the right of human beings everywhere to determine their own destiny, to live in the dignity God intended for each of his children.

But let me stress here that not only do I believe this candor and realism on behalf of freedom is our responsibility as Americans, I also think it is essential for success in Geneva. Because if history has shown there is any key to dealing successfully with the Soviets it is this: the Soviets must realize that their counterparts take them seriously and that, above all, we harbor no illusions about their ultimate goals and intentions. The Soviet mind is not the mirror image of the American or the Western mind and it is both wrong and arrogant to assume that it is. The Soviets have a very different view of the world than we do; they believe a great struggle is already underway in the world and true peace can only be attained with the triumph of communist power. The Soviets sincerely believe that the march of history is embodied in the Soviet state, and so, to them, the mere existence of the democracies is seen as an obstacle to the ultimate triumph of history and that state. So, from the Soviet perspective, even if the democracies do nothing overt against their interests, just our survival, our mere existence, is considered by them an act of aggression.

And that is why the Soviets tend to misinterpret well-intentioned public statements obscuring the nature of this struggle or minimizing the crucial moral distinction between totalitarianism and democracy. And that is why any sudden shifts in our realistic and long-held views about the Soviets tends to

disrupt the negotiating process. In the past, when such shifts or such statements have been made, the Soviets have either regarded them as a ruse and reacted with distrust, or looked on them as hopelessly naive and attempted to exploit the pathetic illusions of their counterparts. In both cases, the peace process and the business of serious negotiations suffered ~~serious setbacks~~.

So I must be blunt with you tonight; while I go to Geneva for peace and for freedom, I also go to Geneva without illusions. Let us be clear: the fact of this summit conference does not mean the Soviets have forsaken their long-term goals and objectives. Let us never forget, as President Eisenhower put it in his farewell address to the American people; "we face a hostile ideology -- global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose and insidious in method."

I do not mention this, however, to sound unduly pessimistic or to paint a heedlessly discouraging picture. Far to the contrary, my mood about this meeting is one of cautious optimism ~~and~~ while it would be foolhardy to think one summit conference can establish a permanent peace, this conference can, I believe, help begin a permanent process toward peace.

But that is why realism is so essential. For only by leaving our illusions behind and dealing realistically with the Soviets do we have any chance at all for meaningful progress in Geneva. The Soviets understand firmness of mind and will; and I can assure you that the American delegation will lack neither next week in Geneva.

This is the way to progress; as Winston Churchill said after a long experience of negotiating with the Soviets, "The Soviets will try every door in the home, enter all rooms which are not locked and when they come to a house that is barred, if they are unsuccessful in breaking through it, they will withdraw and invite you to dine genially that same evening."

So, because we can neither permit civilization to perish in a nuclear holocaust nor freedom to wither under the steady and rentless assault of totalitarianism, our goals next week in Geneva must be both peace and freedom as well as an end to illusion.

But if nuclear war is an impossible option and so too is a world under totalitarian rule, how then are we to steer between them? How do we confront this dilemma in Geneva and elsewhere? What course are we to chart and what cause is their for hope?

My fellow Americans, I believe there is great cause for hope -- hope that peace and freedom will not only survive but triumph, and perhaps even sooner than any of us had even dared to imagine only a few years ago. I also think it possible that history will record a great paradox about our century: that while it gave birth to the awful menaces of nuclear weapons and totalitarian government and saw so much bloodshed and heartache it was also the century that in its closing decades fostered the greatest movement in human memory towards free institutions and democratic self-rule, the greatest flowering of mankind's age old aspiration for freedom and human dignity.

Consider, for a moment, that at the start of the twentieth century there were only a handful of democracies in the entire world while today there are more than 50 with one-third of the world's population living in freedom. Here in our own hemisphere there is dramatic evidence of this change: more than 90 percent of the people in Latin America are now living under governments that are either democratic or headed in that direction, a dramatic reversal from only a few years ago.

Even the communist world is far from immune to this worldwide movement. In an astonishing turnaround from only a few years ago, China, for example, has adopted sweeping economic reforms. ~~And~~ Eastern European nations are seeking higher standards of living through ~~some~~ free-market techniques, ~~and~~ although for the moment Polish Solidarity has been suppressed we know the hunger of the Polish people for freedom can never be completely stilled.

So we see even in the communist world, the great longing for personal freedom and democratic self-rule, the realization that economic progress is directly tied to the operation of a free market, surfacing again and again. That's because Karl Marx was in one sense right: the demand for economic well-being in this century has brought the masses into conflict with the old political order; only he was wrong about where this conflict would occur. It is the democracies that are vibrant and growing -- bringing to their people higher and higher standards of living even as freedom grows and deepens while the communist

world has economies that stagnate, technology that lags and people who are restless and unhappy with their lives.

In the Soviet Union too, economic difficulties have led to reappraisal and reexamination. Mr. Gorbachev himself has spoken to this issue and I intend to engage him further on this matter when we meet. Without being overly optimistic we should recognize that it has happened before in history: a small ruling elite -- when it meets firm resistance to foreign adventurism -- begins to ponder how to lend more legitimacy to its government by allowing the people more of voice in their own destiny.

And think what this would mean for the prospects of arms control and peace; consider what a process of democratization within the Soviet Union might contribute. Public involvement in the peace initiatives would grow as it has in the West and the enormous Soviet military budget -- nearly 15 percent of the gross national product -- would suddenly be subjected to public scrutiny as it is here in the West. And one of the central difficulties in negotiating arms control agreements -- the problem of verification -- could be dramatically eased. Above all, the suspicion and distrust which is endemic to closed political systems, and which so poisons the mutual pursuit of peace by the Soviet Union and the United States, would be greatly alleviated.

Now, don't get me wrong; I hardly think we've reached this situation, not by a long shot. But, my fellow Americans, I do believe that there is a historic trend towards more openness and democracy in the world and that even in communist countries the

momentum is building ~~in this direction~~. But because, unlike the Soviets, we believe that history has no unalterable laws, we must do all in our power to accelerate this trend. Let us start by understanding the important factors that have contributed to this movement.

To begin with, the health and vigor of the American economy -- with 15 million new jobs -- has been restored; and this in turn had led to a reinvigoration of the world economy, ~~a lessening of international tension and~~ a new appreciation by many nations for the pragmatics of freedom. Many more people and ~~governments~~ understand today that freedom is fruitful, that freedom works. And that ~~is~~ why it is especially important to keep our economy vigorous and expanding by moving here at home on initiatives like deficit reduction and tax reform.

Second, our efforts to restore America's military might has brought with it a new appreciation by the rest of the world for American power, resolve and confidence. But this job is not yet completed. Since the postwar period the American people have sacrificed enormously to provide for the defense of the free world; let us not at the very moment when that willingness to sacrifice is beginning to pay dividends relax our vigilance or vigor.

Third, this item I am about to discuss is actually related to our defense buildup but because I believe it is so vital to the peace process I wanted to treat it separately. As most of you know, the United States and the Soviet Union have for many years used massive nuclear arsenals to hold each other hostage in

a kind of mutual nuclear terror -- one side threatening massive retaliation against the other. This has been known as mutual assured destruction; M-A-D or M.A.D. as the arms control experts call it. I think you will agree there has never been a more apt acronym. As perhaps most of you also know, the United States is now embarked on research and development of new strategic defense system -- an intricate but ~~very~~ workable series of defenses that could provide a shield in outer space against incoming nuclear missiles. We believe this system could be ~~[illegible]~~ at the end of this decade or the early part of the 1990's.

Now we have embarked on this program for a single reason: to end the madness of MAD, the insanity of mutual nuclear terror. Think what the advent of this new space shield -- a defensive system that would kill weapons not people -- could mean to our lives and the lives of our children. For the first time much of the dread of the postwar period would be lifted because we would have some means as a people to protect ourselves from a nuclear attack launched either by design or by mistake.

Now I must tell you when I made the decision to go ahead with this program several years ago, I heard much well-intended advice urging me to either delay or not to take this course at all. But some decisions in any Presidency must be made alone; and it was so in this case. But I think we are already seeing evidence this was the correct course to choose; at first, many derided this proposal as unworkable calling it "star wars"; but as research efforts have continued the system has become increasingly feasible and this negative mood has altered.

The Soviets of course have been working on their own defensive system; much less capable than ours but nonetheless one in which they have moved from the research stage to the deployment stage. They have already, for example, installed a huge new radar system and computer network that would be the brains of any such system, a clear violation of the terms of the A.B.M. Treaty signed by our two countries in 1972. But because they are aware of our technological advantage, the Soviets are deeply frightened by our resolve to move ahead with our space shield; they have launched a massive propaganda offensive designed to convince the world our defensive system is "destabilizing" even as they move vigorously ahead with their own.

So that is why I believe moving forward with our strategic defense initiative and making sure this system is not given up or negotiated away in Geneva is a third important step towards peace and freedom.

Fourth, we must continue with a foreign policy that offers a wide range of peace initiatives even as it speaks out vigorously for freedom. Yes, we have been candid about the difference between the Soviets and ourselves and we have been willing to use our military power when our vital interests were threatened. And I think we can be pleased with the results: for the first time in many years not a single square inch of real estate has been lost to communist aggression; in fact, Grenada has been rescued from such a fate and in at least four other countries freedom fighters are now opposing the rule of totalitarian leaders. But

in addition to these firm foreign policy steps, we have also set in motion a wide series of diplomatic initiatives, perhaps the greatest number of such proposals in our history. They cover a range of areas: strategic nuclear weapons, intermediate nuclear weapons, chemical weapons, mutual troop reductions in Europe, and the list goes on.

And it is in this last area, the business of negotiation between the Soviet Union and the United States that this Geneva meeting takes on a special importance. Too often in the past, the whole burden of Soviet and American relations has rested on one or two arms talks or even arms proposals. And while arms control is absolutely essential it can not be the only area of discussion, between the United States and the Soviet Union. That is why I believe this summit conference can move the peace process substantially forward. After careful consultation with our allies, Secretary Shultz flew to Moscow last week and established with the Soviets a four-fold agenda, for discussion. So, we will be discussing in Geneva arms control but also human rights; we will be talking with them about bilateral matters such as trade, scientific and cultural exchanges but also regional conflicts such as those in Afghanistan, Angola, and the other places I have mentioned and Nicaragua, Ethiopia.

I think this represents a breakthrough. And I am determined to continue in this direction in Geneva by offering the Soviets a series of proposals that while not new when taken individually do make up in their entirety a unique and even revolutionary approach. With this series of "Open World" proposals, I want to

invite the Soviet Union to participate more fully in the effort to reduce secrecy and distrust between nations and construct a more open and constructive relationship.

First, in my United Nations speech of last year I mentioned a proposal for a series of "Umbrella talks" between the Soviets and ourselves on a wide-ranging number of issues. I will once again offer this proposal, suggesting not only regular summit meetings of the two heads of state but meetings at the cabinet and ministerial level as well.

Second, in the area of arms control ~~we will be discussing a wide series of proposals. In addition to these,~~ I want to formally take up the issue of our strategic defense initiative. But rather than bargaining away this essential system or spending our time in Geneva bickering over who is building what and which side is destabilizing the most; I am going to extend to the Soviets an invitation to share in the fruits of our research and deployment of this space shield.

Third, I will be proposing a wide series of people-to-people exchanges. Unlike the exchanges of the past, however, which were limited to a tiny few on both sides, I will be suggesting to Mr. Gorbachev that we exchange on a yearly basis thousands of our citizens from different community, fraternal and cultural groups; students, religious organizations and so forth.

And fourth and finally, I've noted that Mr. Gorbachev has shown a lively appreciation for America's free press tradition; I can assure you I will be preaching the virtues of some Soviet movement in this direction as well and will ask again, as I did

several years ago in a speech to the British Parliament, for an opportunity to address the Soviet people.

Now I do not think progress on any of these proposals will necessarily be immediate. But I do believe the very fact that such proposals are on the table and under discussion is an event of considerable significance.

To summarize then; I will be going to Geneva for peace and for freedom; without illusions; to put forward a whole series of "Open World" proposals that can ~~help~~ lead to a more open and less distrustful international climate.

I also think the conversations Mr. Gorbachev and I will here together can help alleviate whatever suspicions and misunderstandings now exist between our two sides. You can be sure the Soviet Union knows the United States is not an aggressor and will never strike first against a foreign adversary. As Prime Minister Mulroney of Canada put it recently when he was told the United States was an imperialist Nation -- and I'm using the Prime Minister's words -- "What the hell do you mean 'imperialist nation?'. We have a 3,000 mile border with them and for 172 years there hasn't been a shot fired in anger."

But the great danger in the past has been the failure by our adversaries to remember that while the American people love peace they also love freedom and are always ready to sacrifice for it. That is why I will be stressing to Mr. Gorbachev that the only way war can ever break out between our two countries is through such a grave miscalculation on the part of the Soviets. My first meeting with Mr. Gorbachev, by the way, will be taking place on

the anniversary of the Gettysburg address; so you can be certain I will remind him that the American people are as determined as ever that "government by the people for the people and of the people shall not perish from the earth."

In conclusion, my fellow Americans, while this summit conference marks the culmination of much of our effort in the foreign policy area it is also, in another way, a milestone in a ~~long~~ personal journey. That quotation from James Madison I mentioned earlier was from a speech that marked my ~~first~~ entry into political life, a speech given more than two decades ago. It was a time when many of us anticipated the troubles and difficulties of the years ahead and wondered if America would meet that challenge. She has, of course, and, as I said during the campaign last year, this is not the work of any one man or party, the accomplishment is yours; the credit belong to the American people.

Both Nancy and I are proud and grateful for the chance you have given us to serve this Nation and the trust you have placed in us. And I think you can understand why on the eve of our departure for Geneva my thoughts turn not only to you but her as well: not just for all the support and love she has given me over the years but also because I know how deep the hope of peace is in her heart as it is in the heart of every American mother.

You know recently Nancy and I saw together a moving new film, the story of Eleni, a woman caught in the Greek civil war at the end of World War II, a mother who because she smuggled her

children out to safety in America was tried, tortured and shot by the Greek communists.

It is also the story of her son, Nicholas Gage, who grew up to become an investigative reporter with the New York Times and who secretly vowed to return to Greece someday to take vengeance on the man who had sent his mother to her death. But at the end of the story Nick Gage finds he cannot extract the vengeance he has promised himself. Mr Gage writes it would have relieved the pain that had filled him for so many years but it would also have broken the one bridge still connecting him to his mother and the part of him most like her. As he tells it: "her final cry, before the bullets of the firing squad tore into her, was not a curse on her killers but an invocation of what she died for, a declaration of love: 'my children.'"

How that cry echoes down through the centuries, a cry for the children of the world, for peace, for love of a fellowman.

Here then is what Geneva is really about; the hope of heeding such words, spoken so often in so many different places -- in a desert journey to a promised land, or by a carpenter at the Sea of Galilee -- words calling all men to be brothers and all nations to be one.

Here is the central truth of our time, of any time; a truth to which I have tried to bear witness in this office. When I first accepted the nomination of my party for the presidency I asked the American people to join with me in prayer for our Nation and for the world. I want to remind you again that in the simple prayers of people like ourselves there is far more power

than in the hands of all the great statesmen or armies of the world.

And so, as Thanksgiving approaches, I want to ask each of you to join me again in thanking God for all his blessings to this Nation and ask him to help and guide us so that next week in Geneva the cause of peace and freedom will be served and all of human life ennobled.

God bless you and good night.

But the hope too of seeking to work with the Soviet Union to reduce and eventually eliminate the danger of nuclear destruction, to relax those regional tensions that can lead to wider conflict, to enhance respect for human rights in every nation and to expand the peace process itself by involving more directly the citizens of both our nations. And on this latter point I want to mention in a few moments the specific new proposals I have in mind.

This series of people-to-people exchanges can I believe do much to bring the people of both our nations together. In this area we are going to suggest for example the exchange of at least 5,000 undergraduates each year for two semesters of study as well a youth exchange involving at least 5,000 secondary school age youngsters who would live with a host family and attend schools or summer camps. We also look to increase scholarship programs, to improve language studies, to develop and expand sister city relationships, to establish cultural centers and libraries and to increase bi-national athletic exchanges and sporting competitions.

In the areas of science, space and technology we would also seek to inaugurate more joint space flights and establish joint medical research projects and institutes in each of our countries. In the communications area, in particular, we would like to see a far more extensive contact including more appearances by representatives of both our countries in the other's mass media. I've noted that Mr. Gorbachev has shown a

lively appreciation for America's free press tradition; I can assure you I will be preaching the virtues of some Soviet movements in this direction as well and will ask again, as I did several years ago in a speech to the British Parliament, for an opportunity to address the Soviet people.

Now I do not think these proposals will by themselves solve the world's problems or end our differences; but I do believe more people-to-people contact between our nations can help build constituencies for peace and freedom in both our nations.

(Dolan)
November 4, 1985
4:00 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: TO THE NATION -- GENEVA SUMMIT

In 48 hours, I will be leaving for Geneva to meet with Mr. Gorbachev, the leader of the Soviet Union. Very few events attract as much attention as summit conferences and I felt it was my duty to report directly to you tonight on this meeting and its significance.

Now, I don't think it's any mystery why most of us regard summit conferences as a good idea. The danger of thermonuclear warfare and the havoc it would wreak are, as President Kennedy put it, a modern sword of Damocles dangling over the head of each of us. The awful reality of these weapons is actually a kind of terrible cresendo to the steady, dehumanizing progress of modern warfare in this century. To a few people here in this office recently, I recalled a hotly debated issue in my own college years -- which by the way also took place in this century -- when some of us strenuously argued that in the advent of another world war no civilized person and certainly no American would ever obey an order to attack purely civilian targets. Humanity, we were certain, would never come to that. Well, World War II and 34 million civilian casualties later we were all sadly, tragically wiser. At least today we can say we have fewer illusions: we know if a World War III breaks out the destruction will be vast and devastating with perhaps 90 percent civilian casualties.

Believe me, the office I now occupy leads to serious reflection on all this. Whenever I travel, for example, I am followed by a military aide who carries with him a small black attache case -- "the football" is its nickname. It is a grim reminder of the narrow line our world walks every day because it contains the codes necessary for retaliation to a nuclear attack on the United States.

And this office provides another sobering, even sadder perspective on our world, one I will talk about to Mr. Gorbachev in a few days, one I want to mention to you now. The 23 million lives lost since the end of World War II in conventional and regional conflicts are stark evidence that a strictly nuclear conflict is far from the only danger we face. In recent years, America has had her share of fallen sons; Korea, Vietnam, other military engagements including terrorist attacks have been part of this terrible cost. And many times at this desk I have had to discharge the most difficult duty I have as President: to try and find words of comfort for grieving mothers and fathers. I don't have to tell you how regularly I fail at that; because there are no such words. It's one reason why earlier this year when I visited those places in Europe that had seen so much suffering during World War II, I said a voice could be heard there, a voice from our century and from every century, the same voice I have heard in such sorrow here in this room, the voice of humanity crying out in anguish but in hope for peace -- and for an end to war.

This is why I go to Geneva. For peace. And in hope -- the hope of never having to face that awful option of nuclear retaliation; the hope of never again having to speak from this office to grief-stricken loved ones, the hope that someday our Nation and the Soviet Union and all the people of the world will learn to heed the age-old cry of mankind for peace among all nations.

There is another reason I go to Geneva. It has to do, like the threat of nuclear war, with a danger unique to this century. Part of our heritage as Americans is our Founding Fathers' warning about history's most terrible but, somehow, most easily forgotten lesson; that the abuse of government power has always posed the most serious and enduring threat to the freedom of man.

In the twentieth century, with the development of science and technology and the rise of modern ideology, we have seen a quantum leap in the nature of this danger and the birth of the gravest threat to freedom ever known -- the police state, the totalitarian society.

Now I don't think I have to elaborate on the human suffering and the loss of life totalitarian government has caused in our time. Hitler's concentration camps or Stalin's purges, the Third Reich or the Gulag Archipalog, the advent of totalitarian ideology -- an ideology which justifies any crime or affront to the individual done in the name of the state -- has sparked the worse assaults in history on the human spirit. On this point, my own views have been plainly stated many times in the past; only as recently as a few weeks ago, I spoke of some specific

instances of unacceptable Soviet conduct: the invasion of Afghanistan, one that has cost between 750,000 and one million lives not to mention nearly six million refugees, Soviet intervention in the African nations of Angola and Ethiopia, Soviet attempts to establish a totalitarian regime in Nicaragua and undermine democracy in this hemisphere -- this tragic, unhappy list goes on.

I need not elaborate on this now except to say that in forthrightly opposing such action we Americans have a grave responsibility and bear a special burden. A belief in the dignity of the individual and in his or her worth in the sight of God gave birth to this country; it is central to our being. "Our whole experiment is based on the capacity of the people for self-government," said James Madison. And Thomas Jefferson said more directly: "The mass of men were not born to wear saddles on their backs," and again: "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty as well." This is our past, it is a part of us, we must never deny nor forsake it. If the day ever comes when the leaders of this Nation remain silent in the face of foreign aggression or stop speaking out about the repression of human rights then truly the cause of America -- the cause of freedom -- has been lost, and the great heart of this country has been broken. We Americans know we can never rest as a people nor say our work as a Nation is done until each man, woman and child on earth knows the blessings of liberty.

And this is the second reason I go to Geneva. For freedom. To speak for the right of every people and every nation to choose

their future. I go to Geneva for the right of human beings everywhere to determine their own destiny, to live in the dignity God intended for each of his children.

But let me stress here that not only do I believe this candor and realism on behalf of freedom is our responsibility as Americans, I also think it is essential for success in Geneva. Because if history has shown there is any key to dealing successfully with the Soviets it is this: the Soviets must realize that their counterparts take them seriously and that, above all, we harbor no illusions about their ultimate goals and intentions. The Soviet mind is not the mirror image of the American or the Western mind and it is both wrong and arrogant to assume that it is. The Soviets have a very different view of the world than we do; they believe a great struggle is already underway in the world and true peace can only be attained with the triumph of communist power. The Soviets sincerely believe then that the march of history is embodied in the Soviet state, and so, to them, the mere existence of the democracies is seen as an obstacle to the ultimate triumph of history and that state. So, from the Soviet perspective, even if the democracies do nothing overt against their interests, just our survival, our mere existence, is considered by them an act of aggression.

And that is why the Soviets tend to misinterpret well-intentioned public statements obscuring the nature of this struggle or minimizing the crucial moral distinction between totalitarianism and democracy. And that is why any sudden shifts in our realistic and long-held views about the Soviets tends to

disrupt the negotiating process. In the past, when such shifts or such statements have been made, the Soviets have either regarded them as a ruse and reacted with distrust or looked on them as hopelessly naive and attempted to exploit the pathetic illusions of their counterparts. In both cases, the peace process and the business of serious negotiations suffered serious setbacks.

So I must be blunt with you tonight; while I go to Geneva for peace and for freedom, I also go to Geneva without illusions. Let us be clear: the fact of this summit conference does not mean the Soviets have forsaken their long-term goals and objectives. Let us never forget, as President Eisenhower put it in his farewell address to the American people; "we face a hostile ideology -- global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose and insidious in method."

I do not mention this, however, to sound unduly pessimistic or to paint a heedlessly discouraging picture. Far to the contrary, my mood about this meeting is one of cautious optimism; and while it would be foolhardy to think one summit conference can establish a permanent peace, this conference can, I believe, help begin a permanent process towards peace.

But that is why realism is so essential. For only by leaving our illusions behind and dealing realistically with the Soviets do we have any chance at all for meaningful progress in Geneva. The Soviets understand firmness of mind and will; and I can assure you that the American delegation will lack neither next week in Geneva.

This is the way to progress; as Winston Churchill said after a long experience of negotiating with the Soviets, "The Soviets will try every door in the home, enter all rooms which are not locked and when they come to a house that is barred, if they are unsuccessful in breaking through it, they will withdraw and invite you to dine genially that same evening."

So, because we can neither permit civilization to perish in a nuclear holocaust nor freedom to wither under the steady and rentless assault of totalitarianism, our goals next week in Geneva must be both peace and freedom as well as an end to illusion.

But if nuclear war is an impossible option and so too is a world under totalitarian rule, how then are we to steer between them? How do we confront this dilemma in Geneva and elsewhere? What course are we to chart and what cause is their for hope?

My fellow Americans, I believe there is great cause for hope -- hope that peace and freedom will not only survive but triumph, and perhaps even sooner than any of us had even dared to imagine only a few years ago. I also think it possible that history will record a great paradox about our century: that while it gave birth to the awful menaces of nuclear weapons and totalitarian government and saw so much bloodshed and heartache it was also the century that in its closing decades fostered the greatest movement in human memory towards free institutions and democratic self-rule, the greatest flowering of mankind's age old aspiration for freedom and human dignity.

Consider, for a moment, that at the start of the twentieth century there were only a handful of democracies in the entire world while today there are more than 50 with one-third of the world's population living in freedom. Here in our own hemisphere there is dramatic evidence of this change: more than 90 percent of the people in Latin America are now living under governments that are either democratic or headed in that direction, a dramatic reversal from only a few years ago.

Even the communist world is far from immune to this worldwide movement. In an astonishing turnaround from only a few years ago, China, for example, has adopted sweeping economic reforms. And Eastern European nations are seeking higher standards of living through some free-market techniques; and although for the moment Polish Solidarity has been suppressed we know the hunger of the Polish people for freedom can never be completely stilled.

So we see even in the communist world, the great longing for personal freedom and democratic self-rule, the realization that economic progress is directly tied to the operation of a free market, surfacing again and again. That's because Karl Marx was in one sense right: the demand for economic well-being in this century has brought the masses into conflict with the old political order; only he was wrong about where this conflict would occur. It is the democracies that are vibrant and growing -- bringing to their people higher and higher standards of living even as freedom grows and deepens while the communist

world has economies that stagnate, technology that lags and people who are restless and unhappy with their lives.

In the Soviet Union too, economic difficulties have led to reappraisal and reexamination. Mr. Gorbachev himself has spoken to this issue and I intend to engage him further on this matter when we meet. Without being overly optimistic we should recognize that it has happened before in history: a small ruling elite -- when it meets firm resistance to foreign adventurism -- begins to ponder how to lend more legitimacy to its government by allowing the people more of voice in their own destiny.

And think what this would mean for the prospects of arms control and peace; consider what a process of democratization within the Soviet Union might contribute. Public involvement in the peace initiatives would grow as it has in the West and the enormous Soviet military budget -- nearly 15 percent of the gross national product -- would suddenly be subjected to public scrutiny as it is here in the West. And one of the central difficulties in negotiating arms control agreements -- the problem of verification -- could be dramatically eased. Above all, the suspicion and distrust which is endemic to closed political systems, and which so poisons the mutual pursuit of peace by the Soviet Union and the United States, would be greatly alleviated.

Now, don't get me wrong; I hardly think we've reached this situation, not by a long shot. But, my fellow Americans, I do believe that there is a historic trend towards more openness and democracy in the world and that even in communist countries the

momentum is building in this direction. But because, unlike the Soviets, we believe that history has no unalterable laws, we must do all in our power to accelerate this trend. Let us start by understanding the important factors that have contributed to this movement.

To begin with, the health and vigor of the American economy -- with 15 million new jobs -- has been restored; and this in turn had led to a reinvigoration of the world economy, a lessening of international tension and a new appreciation by many nations for the pragmatics of freedom. Many more people and governments understand today that freedom is fruitful, that freedom works. And that is why it is especially important to keep our economy vigorous and expanding by moving here at home on initiatives like deficit reduction and tax reform.

Second, our efforts to restore America's military might has brought with it a new appreciation by the rest of the world for American power, resolve and confidence. But this job is not yet completed. Since the postwar period the American people have sacrificed enormously to provide for the defense of the free world; let us not at the very moment when that willingness to sacrifice is beginning to pay dividends relax our vigilance or vigor.

Third, this item I am about to discuss is actually related to our defense buildup but because I believe it is so vital to the peace process I wanted to treat it separately. As most of you know, the United States and the Soviet Union have for many years used massive nuclear arsenals to hold each other hostage in

a kind of mutual nuclear terror -- one side threatening massive retaliation against the other. This has been known as mutual assured destruction; M-A-D or M.A.D. as the arms control experts call it. I think you will agree there has never been a more apt acronym. As perhaps most of you also know, the United States is now embarked on research and development of new strategic defense system -- an intricate but very workable series of defenses that could provide a shield in outer space against incoming nuclear missiles. We believe this system could be partly deployed at the end of this decade or the early part of the 1990's.

Now we have embarked on this program for a single reason: to end the madness of MAD, the insanity of mutual nuclear terror. Think what the advent of this new space shield -- a defensive system that would kill weapons not people -- could mean to our lives and the lives of our children. For the first time much of the dread of the postwar period would be lifted because we would have some means as a people to protect ourselves from a nuclear attack launched either by design or by mistake.

Now I must tell you when I made the decision to go ahead with this program several years ago, I heard much well-intended advice urging me to either delay or not to take this course at all. But some decisions in any Presidency must be made alone; and it was so in this case. But I think we are already seeing evidence this was the correct course to choose; at first, many derided this proposal as unworkable calling it "star wars"; but as research efforts have continued the system has become increasingly feasible and this negative mood has altered.

The Soviets of course have been working on their own defensive system; much less capable than ours but nonetheless one in which they have moved from the research stage to the deployment stage. They have already, for example, installed a huge new radar system and computer network that would be the brains of any such system, a clear violation of the terms of the A.B.M. Treaty signed by our two countries in 1972. But because they are aware of our technological advantage, the Soviets are deeply frightened by our resolve to move ahead with our space shield; they have launched a massive propaganda offensive designed to convince the world our defensive system is "destabilizing" even as they move vigorously ahead with their own.

So that is why I believe moving forward with our strategic defense initiative and making sure this system is not given up or negotiated away in Geneva is a third important step towards peace and freedom.

Fourth, we must continue with a foreign policy that offers a wide range of peace initiatives even as it speaks out vigorously for freedom. Yes, we have been candid about the difference between the Soviets and ourselves and we have been willing to use our military power when our vital interests were threatened. And I think we can be pleased with the results: for the first time in many years not a single square inch of real estate has been lost to communist aggression, in fact, Grenada has been rescued from such a fate and in at least four other countries freedom fighters are now opposing the rule of totalitarian leaders. But

in addition to these firm foreign policy steps, we have also set in motion a wide series of diplomatic initiatives, perhaps the greatest number of such proposals in our history. They cover a range of areas: strategic nuclear weapons, intermediate nuclear weapons, chemical weapons, mutual troop reductions in Europe, and the list goes on.

And it is in this last area, the business of negotiation between the Soviet Union and the United States that this Geneva meeting takes on a special importance. Too often in the past, the whole burden of Soviet and American relations has rested on one or two arms talks or even arms proposals. And while arms control is absolutely essential it can not be the only area of discussion between the United States and the Soviet Union. That is why I believe this summit conference can move the peace process substantially forward. After careful consultation with our allies, Secretary Shultz flew to Moscow last week and established with the Soviets a four-fold agenda for discussion. So, we will be discussing in Geneva arms control but also human rights; we will be talking with them about bilateral matters such as trade, scientific and cultural exchanges but also regional disputes such as those in Afghanistan, Angola and the other places I have mentioned.

I think this represents a breakthrough. And I am determined to continue in this direction in Geneva by offering the Soviets a series of proposals that while not new when taken individually do make up in their entirety a unique and even revolutionary approach. With this series of "Open World" proposals, I want to

invite the Soviet Union to participate more fully in the effort to reduce secrecy and distrust between nations and construct a more open and constructive relationship.

First, in my United Nations speech of last year I mentioned a proposal for a series of "Umbrella talks" between the Soviets and ourselves on a wide-ranging number of issues. I will once again offer this proposal, suggesting not only regular meetings of the two heads of state but meetings at the cabinet and ministerial level as well.

Second, in the area of arms control we will be discussing a wide series of proposals. In addition to these, I want to formally take up the issue of our strategic defense initiative. But rather than bargaining away this essential system or spending our time in Geneva bickering over who is building what and which side is destabilizing the most; I am going to extend to the Soviets an invitation to share in the fruits of our research and deployment of this space shield.

Third, I will be proposing a wide series of people-to-people exchanges. Unlike the exchanges of the past, however, which were limited to a tiny few on both sides, I will be suggesting to Mr. Gorbachev that we exchange on a yearly basis thousands of our citizens from different community, fraternal and cultural groups; students, religious organizations and so forth.

And fourth and finally, I've noted that Mr. Gorbachev has shown a lively appreciation for America's free press tradition; I can assure you I will be preaching the virtues of some Soviet movement in this direction as well and will ask again, as I did

several years ago in a speech to the British Parliament, for an opportunity to address the Soviet people.

Now I do not think progress on any of these proposals will necessarily be immediate. But I do believe the very fact that such proposals are on the table and under discussion is an event of considerable significance.

To summarize then; I will be going to Geneva for peace and for freedom; without illusions; to put forward a whole series of "Open World" proposals that can help lead to a more open and less distrustful international climate.

I also think the conversations Mr. Gorbachev and I will here together can help alleviate whatever suspicions and misunderstandings now exist between our two sides. You can be sure the Soviet Union knows the United States is not an aggressor and will never strike first against a foreign adversary. As Prime Minister Mulroney of Canada put it recently when he was told the United States was an imperialist Nation -- and I'm using the Prime Minister's words -- "What the hell do you mean 'imperialist nation?'. We have a 5,000 mile border with them and for 172 years there hasn't been a shot fired in anger."

But the great danger in the past has been the failure by our adversaries to remember that while the American people love peace they also love freedom and are always ready to sacrifice for it. That is why I will be stressing to Mr. Gorbachev that the only way war can ever break out between our two countries is through such a grave miscalculation on the part of the Soviets. My first meeting with Mr. Gorbachev, by the way, will be taking place on

the anniversary of the Gettysburg address; so you can be certain I will remind him that the American people are as determined as ever that "government by the people for the people and of the people shall not perish from the earth."

In conclusion, my fellow Americans, while this summit conference marks the culmination of much of our effort in the foreign policy area it is also, in another way, a milestone in a long personal journey. That quotation from James Madison I mentioned earlier was from a speech that marked my first entry into political life, a speech given more than two decades ago. It was a time when many of us anticipated the troubles and difficulties of the years ahead and wondered if America would meet that challenge. She has, of course, and, as I said during the campaign last year, this is not the work of any one man or party the accomplishment is yours; the credit belong to the American people.

Both Nancy and I are proud and grateful for the chance you have given us to serve this Nation and the trust you have placed in us. And I think you can understand why on the eve of our departure for Geneva my thoughts turn not only to you but her as well: not just for all the support and love she has given me over the years but also because I know how deep the hope of peace is in her heart as it is in the heart of every American mother.

You know recently Nancy and I saw together a moving new film, the story of Eleni, a woman caught in the Greek civil war at the end of World War II, a mother who because she smuggled her

children out to safety in America was tried, tortured and shot by the Greek communists.

It is also the story of her son, Nicholas Gage, who grew up to become an investigative reporter with the New York Times and who secretly vowed to return to Greece someday to take vengeance on the man who had sent his mother to her death. But at the end of the story Nick Gage finds he cannot extract the vengeance he has promised himself. Mr Gage writes it would have relieved the pain that had filled him for so many years but it would also have broken the one bridge still connecting him to his mother and the part of him most like her. As he tells it: "her final cry, before the bullets of the firing squad tore into her, was not a curse on her killers but an invocation of what she died for, a declaration of love: 'my children.'"

How that cry echoes down through the centuries, a cry for the children of the world, for peace, for love of a fellowman.

Here then is what Geneva is really about; the hope of heeding such words, spoken so often in so many different places -- in a desert journey to promised land or by a carpenter at the Sea of Galilee -- words calling all men to be brothers and all nations to be one.

Here is the central truth of our time, of any time; a truth to which I have tried to bear witness in this office. When I first accepted the nomination of my party for the presidency I asked the American people to join with me in prayer for our Nation and for the world. I want to remind you again that in the simple prayers of people like ourselves there is far more power

than in the hands of all the great statesmen or armies of the world.

And so, as Thanksgiving approaches, I want to ask each of you to join me again in thanking God for all his blessings to this Nation and ask him to help and guide us so that next week in Geneva the cause of peace and freedom will be served and all of human life ennobled.

God bless you and good night.