

# Ronald Reagan Presidential Library

## Digital Library Collections

---

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

---

**Collection:**  
Green, Max: Files, 1985-1988  
**Folder Title:**  
Press Releases  
**Box:** 21

---

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Inventories, visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

Contact a reference archivist at: **reagan.library@nara.gov**

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/research-support/citation-guide>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

# REQUEST FOR MULTIPLE MAILING

August 28, 1986

(Date)

I. TO: White House Administrative Office, Room 1, OEOB

FROM: Linas Kojelis Ext. 6573

Description of Request: *(Attach text of letter, copy of mailing list, sample of enclosure(s) etc.)*

Please duplicate attached press releases (2) and buck slip and send out to DFP "A" list.

Any questions, please call Matt Zachari x6270

The purpose of this mailing is to inform supporters of the President's policies on defense of recent administration actions.

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_ Disapproved: \_\_\_\_\_

(Cost Estimate: \_\_\_\_\_)

II. TO: Biff Henley, Room 80

FROM: White House Administrative Office

Attached mailing has been approved and is to be entered into Name/List Service if appropriate

III. TO: Maureen Hudson, Room 60

FROM: Records Management

☐ List \_\_\_\_\_ is being transmitted for attached request

☐ Attached does not qualify for Name/List Service

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

July 29, 1986

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT  
AT DROP-BY BRIEFING  
FOR WASHINGTON INTERNS

Room 450  
Old Executive Office Building

2:19 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Well, thank you all very much, and welcome to the White House Complex.

I'm delighted to have this chance to speak with you today. I know most of you are interns who have come to Washington to observe this government of ours firsthand. For many of you it may be an eye-opening experience -- was for me. (Laughter.)

I want to talk today about a serious subject -- one of those serious subjects that can often seem dry and academic, but which can be so important to all of our lives. In the swirl of issues and events that is Washington, there remains one overriding purpose, the purpose toward which everything else we do in this town is -- or should be -- aimed.

I guess I would define it this way: Creating a peaceful and safe world in which we can all securely enjoy the rights and freedoms that have been given to us by God.

Being free and prosperous in a world at peace -- that's our ultimate goal. That is, as you might say, the business at hand here in Washington. Toward that end, few issues cut deeper than our relations with the Soviet Union. There are many issues on the U.S.-Soviet agenda: Arms reduction; human rights; Soviet involvement in regional conflicts around the world; and possibilities for bilateral cooperation. All of these are important. But today, I want to share with you some of the latest developments in our ongoing efforts to negotiate radical reductions in nuclear arms with the Soviet Union.

When I spoke in Glassboro a little over a month ago, speaking to a high school graduation there, I said there were encouraging signs at the negotiating table. I spoke of a possible moment of opportunity in our relations with the Soviet Union. The Soviets have put forward proposals on a range of issues from nuclear power plant safety to conventional force reductions to nuclear arms reductions. And as I said at Glassboro, while we cannot accept all these proposals as they stand, we feel the Soviets have begun to make a serious effort.

In that speech, I stressed my own commitment to move the process forward -- to pursue every opportunity to seek real and verifiable reductions in nuclear weapons.

I have now sent a letter to General Secretary Gorbachev that underlines my determination to keep the momentum going.

Now, unfortunately I cannot satisfy what I know must be your curiosity about the specifics of the letter. In the past we've criticized the Soviets for making their proposals public because serious exchanges usually take place in private. Negotiations are sensitive plants that can wither up and die in the glare of publicity.

But even though I can't get specific about these negotiations, I can tell you of my renewed hopes for their success. I am hopeful that we have reached a stage where misunderstanding or suspicion in themselves will no longer keep us from our goal. Each side has a candid, realistic view of the other's positions and intentions. This candor has assisted the negotiating process and, I believe, if the Soviets sincerely want equitable and verifiable nuclear arms reductions, there will be such nuclear arms reductions.

While I can't discuss the specific proposals in my letter, I can say that they are responsive to Soviet concerns. They seek out areas of convergence, they address the ultimate goal of eliminating all nuclear weapons while identifying practical steps that can move us in that direction.

I also agreed to the Soviets' suggestion of a work plan involving a series of preparatory meetings that could lead to a productive summit later this year.

Let me add that our program for the reduction of nuclear weapons rests on two pillars. The first is good faith negotiations with the Soviet Union toward arms reductions, and, as I said, I think we are seeing the first cautious steps in this direction from the other side.

The second pillar is our Strategic Defense Initiative, research on which has advanced more rapidly than the projections of even a few years ago. We won't bargain away SDI because it is a promising area of technology that could release the world from the threat of nuclear ballistic missiles. We must continue our SDI program on schedule. What we seek is a transition to a world in which deterrence no longer depends solely on the threat of mutual annihilation.

You know, this came into being -- it was called the MADD policy, because that's MADD -- you know, everything in Washington become initials. Well, MADD spells what it is -- it's really mad, but it was mutual assured destruction, and the idea being that there would be peace between us as long as each one of us knew that the other fellow could retaliate if we shot first and blow us up, too. And since we never intended to shoot first, that meant that we'd have to take the first one and then hope we had enough left that they would think twice before there would be a first one.

Well, the offensive and defensive parts of the equation now are clearly related, and both are part of our discussion with the Soviet Union. So I must emphasize -- to the extent that some members of Congress slow down or undercut SDI, they undercut hopes for progress in arms reductions.

We do not seek the Strategic Defense Initiative to enable us to be safe from their weapons while we still have our offensive weapons to shoot at them -- not in any way. We look at the Strategic Defense Initiative -- if our research develops that there is such a practical system, then we look at that as the means of getting everybody in the world including ourselves to get rid of their nuclear missiles.

And we're doing our share. We've responded constructively. We've made clear our serious desire for a better relationship with the Soviet Union. But now the ball is in the Soviet court. As I said in Glassboro, if both sides genuinely want progress, then this could represent a turning point in the effort to make ours a safer and more peaceful world.

Our arms reduction negotiations with the Soviet Union will not succeed overnight. They'll certainly be a long, arduous process. For the first time, however, we're not only pointed in the right direction -- toward reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons -- we have begun to move, both sides, down that road.

As I look out on you from a little more than seven decades plus of experience, believe me, I reflect on how important that road is. I have seen four wars in my lifetime. I know the heartbreak, the human suffering that war causes; each generation seeks for succeeding generations to end -- an end to war, a time of peace and freedom. This dream is mine today. And I can only hope that, years hence, you'll be able to say to the generation succeeding your own that you were witness to one of the birthdates of this dream, this dream of freedom and of peace.

I'm finished with the serious part, but I do just want to tell you a little something. I know you must wonder sometimes -- sounds so lofty -- a summit conference -- what happens when the General Secretary of the other great superpower and the President of this one get together in a room by themselves and talk to each other. Well, you might be interested to know that the General Secretary has a good sense of humor. (Laughter.) I've been collecting jokes (laughter) that I know are told by the Russian people among themselves, which kind of shows a little cynicism about government. We're aware of that in our own country. (Laughter.) So, I told him one of those jokes and I got a big laugh. (Laughter.)

I told him the joke about the American and the Russian who were arguing about how much freedom they had. And the American finally said to the Russian, "Look," he said, "I can walk into the Oval Office. I can pound the President's desk and I can say, 'Mr. President, I don't like the way you're running our country.'" And the Russian said, "I can do that." And the American said, "You can?" He says, "I can go into the Kremlin. I can walk into the General Secretary's office. I can pound the desk and say, 'Mr. General Secretary, I don't like the way President Reagan's running his country.'" (Laughter.)

Well, listen, thank you all and I hope this has been and is being a valuable experience for all of you -- to see behind the front and where the wheels are going around. Sometimes, I know, it looks a little unwashed -- (laughter) -- but all in all, as Churchill once said about democracy, with all its faults, it's better than any other system anyone else has ever devised. But it depends on all of us and all of you. It can't work without the people.

I have another hobby. I've been reading a lot of constitutions of other nations, including the Soviet -- and amazed at how many things I found in the Soviet Constitution that are similar to things in ours -- like freedom of speech and things. Of course, they don't allow that, but it's there. (Laughter.) And then I thought well, what -- and then the difference came to me -- the difference is so simple that you can almost miss it and yet it explains the entire situation between all our countries. Theirs all say, their constitutions, that the government permits the people the following privileges, rights and so forth. Ours says: We the people will allow the government to do the following things and it can't do anything other than what we have specifically given it the right to do. And as long as we keep that kind of a system in this country, we will be a super power.

Thank you all very much. God bless you. (Applause.)

END

2:30 P.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE  
Office of the Press Secretary

---

For Immediate Release

April 21, 1987

The President today announced his intention to award the Presidential Medal of Freedom, the highest civilian award of our Government, at a luncheon to be held at the White House on June 23, 1987. The following individuals will be given this prestigious award by the President.

Ambassador Anne Armstrong, for her contributions as a diplomatic representative for the United States.

Mr. Justin W. Dart, Sr., (posthumous), for his contributions in the fields of business and public service.

Mr. Danny Kaye (posthumous), actor, for his contributions in the fields of the arts and entertainment and other significant public endeavors.

General Lyman Lemnitzer, for his contributions of outstanding military service to his country.

Mr. John McCone, for his contributions in the fields of public service and national interests of the United States as former Director of CIA.

Dr. Frederick Patterson, founder of the United Negro College Fund, for his contributions in the fields of education and public service.

Mr. Nathan Perlmutter, for his contributions in the field of public service.

Mr. Mstislav Rostropovich, maestro, for his contributions in the fields of the arts and entertainment.

Dr. William B. Walsh, founder of Project HOPE, for his contributions in the fields of medicine and humanitarianism.

Mr. Meredith Willson (posthumous), composer, for his contributions in the fields of entertainment and music.

# # #

January 20, 1987

PERSONAL STATEMENT OF  
PATRICK J. BUCHANAN  
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT AND DIRECTOR OF COMMUNICATIONS

The purpose of this statement is to end speculation that I intend to announce my candidacy for the Republican nomination. I do not.

Many conservatives have urged me to enter the race. They argue that our ideas and issues are not being given, and will not be given, the clarity of voice their merit deserves. Others -- some of the oldest friends I have in politics -- have said pointedly, that a Buchanan Campaign would be the Pickett's Charge of the American Right, that its only certain and predictable consequence would be to "mortally wound" the campaign of Congressman Jack Kemp whose service to the cause has earned him an unimpeded shot at the nomination.

Having explored this matter for several weeks, I reluctantly yield to the argument that a Buchanan candidacy, launched in the near future, would fractionate -- and embitter -- not unite, the leadership and rank-and-file of the conservative cause.

While a run-up to the presidential primaries, and the primaries themselves, are the best forum in American life from which to address national issues, there are other forums, where the equal access rule does not apply.



THE WHITE HOUSE  
Office of the Press Secretary

---

For Immediate Release

June 1, 1987

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT  
DURING  
SIGNING CEREMONY DECLARING  
GEORGE C. MARSHALL MONTH

The East Room

3:07 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much and welcome to the White House. I'd like to thank you for being here. It's a pleasant coincidence that George C. Marshall Month, which we will proclaim today, coincides with the upcoming summit -- economic summit. I'm certain that General Marshall would approve of my taking advantage of this opportunity to speak with you also about some of our expectations, our goals, for that important gathering.

First and foremost, today we gather to honor George C. Marshall, a gallant soldier, a visionary statesman, and an American who set a standard of honor and accomplishment for all who have followed.

George Marshall is the only professional soldier ever to win the Nobel Prize for Peace. It was a fitting tribute. Even in time of war, Marshall was a champion of peace. During his tenure as Chief of Staff of the United States Army, a war -- the greatest conflagration in human history -- was won. And that victory was not a triumph of conquerors in a struggle for power and domination, but a desperate fight of free peoples for the preservation of the humane values and democratic institutions they held dear.

What made the Second World War different from all those that had preceded it was that Western civilization, by its outcome, was left in the hands of leaders like George Marshall -- individuals dedicated to ideals which were not forgotten after the enemy was vanquished.

It's difficult in this time of plenty to imagine the destitution, devastation, and hopelessness that pervaded Europe after the close of the Second World War. The conflict had taken the lives of millions of Europeans, many of them the young leaders who are the greatest asset of any society.

Resources used to fuel the war machines were gone. Great destruction had been brought upon the face of Europe. Germany lay in almost total ruin. Throughout the rest of the continent, cities and factories were in disrepair, the whole economic infrastructure had been devastated. The monumental job of rebuilding seemed overwhelming.

It was at this time of despair when, under the leadership of wise and decent individuals like George C. Marshall, by then secretary of state, our country stepped forward with a program Winston Churchill referred to as the "most unsordid act in history."

Forty years ago June 5th, Secretary of State George Marshall gave the commencement address at Harvard University. In it, he laid out a proposal for the reconstruction of Europe, the foundation for what has been the most remarkable period of peace and prosperity in the history of that continent.

MORE

In today's money, the Marshall Plan was a commitment of extraordinary proportions, about \$60 billion. And with that, industry, large and small, was provided capital; harbors, canals, roads, electric systems were rebuilt; and the production lines began to roll as Europe went back to work.

The Marshall Plan was an investment America made in its friends and in the future. If it had simply been a gift of resources, it would likely have been a colossal failure. The success of this greatest of undertakings, the rebuilding of a battle-scarred continent, can be traced to goals that are easily distinguished from the mere transfer of money.

First, it was designed to generate hope where there was none. George Marshall, as a soldier, well understood the role of motivation. "It is the spirit which we bring to the fight that decides the issue," he once wrote. "It is morale that wins the victory."

George Marshall's speech was viewed by many Europeans as a lifeline thrown to them at a time when they were foundering. It gave them reason to work, to build, to invest. And in short order, purpose replaced aimlessness. Enterprise replaced inertia.

The second and most important goal of the Marshall Plan was to provide incentives for Europeans to find common ground, to bring down the political barriers which stifle economic activity and growth. Our leadership helped officials overcome local interest groups and work with other governments to beat back the pressures for protectionism and isolation, to free the flow of commerce, materials, and resources across international frontiers, to integrate transport and power systems, and to develop economic and political ties that would serve as an engine for progress.

The Marshall Plan led to the creation of institutions that today are pillars of the free world's economy -- the European Economic Community, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the OECD. -- and created the environment where the World Bank and the IMF could function. The Marshall Plan was an act of generosity, but it was not a give-away program. Instead, it was the beginning of a process of cooperation and enterprise that has carried the peoples of the Western democracies to new heights.

But there was one most important achievement, too much overlooked. A reading of history reveals that in past wars, the peace settlement laid the foundation for the next war. Hatreds and enmity remained. And today, we have known 40 or more years of peace, and one-time enemies are the closest of friends and allies as a result of the Marshall Plan.

With us today is an individual who, at President Truman's direction, took a central role in polling the leadership, gathering the ideas, and putting together a comprehensive overview of foreign policy strategy. This effort was the genesis of the Marshall Plan. His dedication, creativity, and resourcefulness were of great service to his president and his country at that pivotal moment. And Clark Clifford, we are proud to have you with us today. (Applause.)

Now, in a few days, I will leave for the economic summit in Venice. It will be the 13th time the seven major industrial democracies have so met, and the seventh time I've been privileged to represent the United States. While our country is still looked to for leadership, the free world is now undeniably a partnership among democracies, to a large degree because of initiatives we set in motion four decades ago.

Today, free world efforts -- economic, political, and security -- depend on genuine cooperation. Self-determination, as we've recognized since the time of Woodrow Wilson, is consistent with

the interaction of free peoples. We sought it and, brother, we've got it.

The governments of Western Europe, North America, and Japan face the future together, and meetings like the economic summit build unity and sense of purpose. And that unity is increasingly important. The velocity of economic change reshaping our world is making greater demands on our governments, individually and collectively. This change flows naturally from the open economic system we've established in the West. Our peoples and countries are now operating in a global market. Instantaneous communications, multinational corporations, the flow of international investment, widespread computer technology, and the integration of financial markets are facts of life.

The progress of mankind, however, remains dependent on political as well as economic and technological momentum. Today, we face challenges comparable to those that confronted struggling democracies four decades ago. We sought to achieve prosperity; now we seek to preserve it and ensure that our standard of living continues to improve. Nothing can be taken for granted.

We must be active and vigorous to be successful. And we must work together. And that is what freedom is all about. And that's why we call the portion of the planet on which we live the free world. People here are not told what we must do. We talk things over and decide what to do for ourselves.

There's a story about an American and a Russian. As is often the case, the American was bragging about how in the United States everyone was free to speak. Well, the Russian replied, "In Russia we're just as free to speak; the difference is in your country you're free after you speak." (Laughter.)

The greatest challenge for those of us who live in freedom is to recognize the ties of common interest that bind us, to prove wrong those cynics who would suggest that free enterprise and democracy lead to short-sighted policies and undisciplined self-interest.

Today -- and we can't say this too often -- it is in the common interest of all of us, in every free land, to work against parochialism and protectionism, to keep markets open and commerce flowing. By definition, protecting domestic producers from competition erodes national competitiveness, slows down economic activity, and raises prices. It also threatens the stability of the entire free world trading system.

Some countries, which have taken full advantage of America's past openness, must realize that times have changed. Today, any country selling heavily in the United States, whose markets are not substantially open to American goods, risks a backlash from the American people. No country that closes its own markets, or unfairly subsidizes its exports, can expect the markets of its trading partners to remain open. This point will be driven home in Venice. It was the central theme of our agreement at last year's Tokyo summit to launch the Uruguay trade round.

While the vibrancy of the U.S. economy has contributed enormously to the world expansion, preserving a growing world economy is the business of every member of the world trading community. It is the special responsibility of the larger economic powers. It will be made clear, especially to our friends in Japan and the Federal Republic of Germany, that growth-oriented domestic policies are needed to bolster the world trading system upon which they depend.

We and our allies must always fulfill our agreements concerning exchange rate stability. Economic policy decisions made last year in Tokyo, and at this year's meetings of Group of Seven finance ministers in Paris and in Washington, cannot be ignored or

forgotten. The commitments made at these meetings need to be translated into action.

Talks continue to flow about the necessity of a coordinated attack on market-distorting agricultural policies, policies which are found in almost every Western country. The time to act is fast approaching.

One concern shared by the industrialized powers is what to do about the Third World countries which are not developing, not progressing; countries that, if something doesn't happen, will be left behind.

Japan has made admirable strides in this direction by offering to share some of its wealth -- some of its trade surplus -- with lesser-developed nations. I hope that during the course of this summit, Japan will clarify what form this aid will take. I also hope that other countries will consider following Japan's good example.

However, as I noted about our -- the European example of four decades ago, the transfer of cash alone is not the solution. If tax rates are too high, if markets are not free, if government is big, corrupt, or abusive, a country cannot expect to attract the expertise and private investment needed to advance, nor will its own people have the incentives needed to push their economy forward.

After the war, German industry was little more than a shell. If Ludwig Erhard and Konrad Adenauer, courageous democratic post-war leaders of that country, had not dramatically, in one fell swoop, eliminated most of the intrusive controls on the West German economy in 1948, Marshall Plan aid might not have had the miraculous impact that it did. If we're serious about changing the plight of less fortunate nations, we must, at the very least, be candid with them about these economic realities -- open their eyes to the secret of Germany's restoration and the secret of the amazing growth taking place on the Pacific Rim. That secret is a Marshall Plan of ideas. It is simply that freedom of enterprise, competition, and the profit motive work. They work so well that the United States now must maneuver with economically powerful competitors, friendly competitors.

And, yes, let us admit the recognizable friction among the great democracies about trade and economic policy. Our heated debates and maneuverings -- and the fact they're front-page news -- are a healthy sign. First, during economic movement, close friends disagree, but no one should lose sight of the impressive strides taking place. Second, the attention paid to complex economic issues, which decades ago were subject matter only for specialists, suggests the wide degree of consensus our nations have reached on the vital issues of war and peace, human rights, and democracy.

Today, the unity of the West on security issues is something which George Marshall and his contemporaries would look on with a deep and abiding pride. Marshall led America through war and out of isolationism. Like protectionism, isolationism is a tempting illusion. Four decades of European peace and the greatest economic expansion in history stand as evidence that isolationism and protectionism are not the way. We must work with like-minded friends to direct the course of history, or history will be determined by others who do not share our values, and we will not escape the consequences of the decisions they make.

Nowhere is this burden heavier than in the Middle East, a region that has been plagued with turmoil and death. If we retreat from the challenge, if we sail to a distance and wait passively on the sidelines, forces hostile to the free world will eventually have their way.

Two weeks ago, we lost 37 of our sons in the Persian Gulf. They were the pride and joy of their families, fine young men

MORE



who volunteered to wear the uniform and serve their country. We have none better than these. They died while guarding a chokepoint of freedom, deterring aggression, and reaffirming America's willingness to protect its vital interests.

Yet, the American people are aware that it is not our interests alone that are being protected. The dependence of our allies on the flow of oil from that area is no secret. During the upcoming summit in Venice, we will be discussing the common security interests shared by the Western democracies in the Persian Gulf. The future belongs to the brave. Free men should not cower before such challenges, and they should not expect to stand alone.

And we are working together in a number of critical areas. Our friends and allies have been cooperating ever more closely to combat the scourge of terrorism. Democracies are peculiarly vulnerable to this form of international criminality, and, at the upcoming Venice summit, we will give renewed impetus to the momentum which has developed in the past year.

The Western Alliance, with courage and unity of purpose, has time and again thwarted threats to our prosperity and security. During the last decade, as American military spending declined, the Soviets raced ahead to gain a strategic advantage, deploying a new generation of intermediate-range missiles aimed at our European allies. This hostile maneuver -- part of a long-term strategy to separate Europe from the United States -- was countered by a united Alliance. Pershing and cruise missiles were deployed in Western Europe, even amidst the noise and clamor of sometimes violent opposition and an intensely hostile Soviet propaganda campaign.

Let no one forget, six years ago we offered to refrain from deploying our intermediate-range missiles, if the Soviets would agree to dismantle their own. It was called the "zero option." The other side refused. At that time, a vocal minority in Western countries, including the United States, suggested if we moved forward with deployment of our Pershing and cruise missiles, all hope of arms control agreements would be lost.

The pessimists, however, have been proven wrong, and western resolve is paying off. In recent months, we've witnessed considerable progress in our talks with the Soviet government. The Kremlin now, in principle, accepts the "zero option" formula in Europe and our negotiators are busy seeing if the details can be worked out. In short, we may be on the edge of an historic reduction of the number of nuclear weapons threatening mankind. If this great first step is taken, if nuclear arms reduction is achieved, it will be due to the strength and determination of allied leaders across Western Europe who refused to accept the Soviet nuclear domination of Europe.

European leaders, and indeed most Europeans, have come to understand that peace comes only through strength. Strength and realism are the watchwords for real progress in dealing with our Soviet adversaries. As we view changes which seem to be happening in the Soviet Union with cautious optimism, let it be remembered that, four decades ago, the Kremlin rejected Soviet participation in the Marshall Plan.

If the current Soviet leadership seeks another path, if they reject the closed, isolated, and belligerent policies they inherited, if they wish their country to be a part of the free world economy, we welcome the change. Let there be no mistake: The Soviet government is subject to the same rules as any other. Any government which is part of our deals with the West's major economic institutions, must do so with good faith, open books, and the open government on which both depend. Economic transactions are not maneuvers for political gain or international leverage; such destructive tactics are not tolerated. Countries which are part of the system are expected to do their best to strengthen the process

MORE

and institutions, or be condemned to economic isolation.

The Soviet Union must also understand that the price of entry into the community of prosperous and productive nations is not just an economic price. There is a political price or even greater significance: respect for and support for the values of freedom that are, in the end, the true engines of material prosperity.

Time will tell if the signs emanating from the Soviet Union reflect real change or illusion. The decisions made by the Soviet leaders themselves will determine if relations will bloom or wither. Any agreement to reduce nuclear weapons, for example, must be followed by reductions in conventional forces. We are looking closely for signs that tangible changes have been made in that country's respect for human rights; and that does not mean just letting out a few of the better-known dissidents. We are waiting for signs of an end to their aggression in Afghanistan.

This year is also the 40th anniversary of the Truman Doctrine, which fully recognized the need for economic assistance, but underscored the necessity of providing those under attack the weapons needed to defend themselves. On March 12, 1947, President Truman addressed a joint session of Congress and spelled out America's commitment. "It must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures. I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way."

Nineteen forty-seven was a volatile political year for our country. I was a Democrat back then. President Truman was under attack from both sides of his own party, and the opposition controlled both houses of Congress -- and believe me, I know how frustrating that can be.

Even amidst the deep political divisions so evident in 1947, the Marshall Plan and Truman Doctrine were approved by Congress. In the end, it was our ability to overcome our own domestic political discord, and forge a bipartisan approach that made the difference. Greece and Turkey were saved. Western Europe was put on the path to recovery. Human freedom was given a chance. Democracy has its weaknesses, but its strengths will prevail.

I leave for Europe with confidence. This generation of free men and women, too, will work together and succeed. We will pass on to our children a world as filled with hope and opportunity as the one we were handed. We owe this to those who went before us, to George C. Marshall and others who shaped the world we live in.

With this said, I will sign the order proclaiming George C. Marshall Month.

Thank you and God bless you.

END

3:32 P.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE  
Office of the Press Secretary

---

For Immediate Release

June 1, 1987

GEORGE C. MARSHALL MONTH, JUNE 1987

- - - - -

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A PROCLAMATION

Forty years ago this June 5, Secretary of State George Catlett Marshall, Jr., in a commencement address at Harvard University, proposed a plan for the reconstruction of war-shattered Europe. It is truly fitting that we commemorate the 40th anniversary of what became known as the Marshall Plan, because it was the foundation for the most remarkable period of peace and prosperity in history. Highly symbolic of American commitment to peace and freedom in Europe, the Plan most appropriately bore George Marshall's name. As Chief of Staff of the Army during World War II, he had been instrumental in the liberation of Europe; after peace had come, he worked with equal vigor as Secretary of State to see Europe restored to a new level of strength and vitality.

The Marshall Plan is a proud monument in the history of our Nation, because it derives from our large and generous spirit and our commitment to the principles of interdependence, self-determination, and openness to positive cooperation. The plan succeeded beyond greatest expectations and remains an inspiration today because it demonstrates what is possible when nations lay aside differences to meet a common challenge.

We also take this opportunity to honor George C. Marshall for his lifetime of devotion to the United States of America. He led the Army during our greatest test of arms, served as Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense, and became the first professional soldier to receive the Nobel Peace Prize. He will be remembered forever as the epitome of the citizen soldier.

The Congress, by Senate Joint Resolution 70, has designated the month of June as "George C. Marshall Month" and authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this event.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, RONALD REAGAN, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim June 1987 as George C. Marshall Month. I urge all Americans to join in observance of this month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this first day of June, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and eighty-seven, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and eleventh.

RONALD REAGAN

# # #



THE WHITE HOUSE  
Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

October 6, 1986

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT  
IN DROPBY MEETING OF THE  
EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE COMMISSION

October 6, 1986

Room 450 OEOB

2:15 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. Well, thank you, and I'm delighted we could meet today. First, this is a chance to say to all of you -- hello to all of you, and compliment you on the work that you've been doing on defense and peace related issues. And second, knowing of your interest in this matter, I wanted to use this opportunity to offer a perspective -- the American perspective if you will -- on the meetings between Mr. Gorbachev and me later this week in Reykjavik, Iceland.

By the way, since we Americans have developed a reputation for being uncomplicated, straightforward and not especially long-winded, I want you to know that I'll be trying to practice these national traits -- especially the last one -- in my remarks to you today.

I can't resist. I used to -- I've wore out a story that expressed the -- (laughter) -- that expressed the importance of brevity in a speech. It was told to me by a minister -- Bill Alexander -- used to do the invocation for the Republican National Conventions. And he heard me speak once. And after he'd heard me speak, he told me about his first experience as a preacher. And I've always thought there was a connection.

He said that he had worked for weeks on that first sermon. He'd been invited to preach at a little country church out in Oklahoma, and he went there well-prepared, and stood up in the pulpit for an evening service, and looked out at one lone little fellow sitting out there among all the empty pews. So he went down, and he said, "My friend, you seem to be the only member of the congregation that showed up, and I'm just a young preacher getting started. What do you think? Should I go through with it?" And the fellow says, "Well, I don't know about that sort of thing, I'm a little old cowpoke out here in Oklahoma. But I do know this -- if I loaded up a truckload of hay, took it out in the prairie and only one cow showed up, I'd feed her. (Laughter.)

Well, Bill took that as a cue. (Laughter.) And he said -- and hour and a half later, he said amen. And he went down, and he said, "My friend, you seem to have stuck with me. I'm just a young preacher getting started. What do you think?"

"Well," he says, "like I told you, I don't know about that sort of thing, but I do know this -- if I loaded up a truckload of hay and took it out in the prairie and only one cow showed up, I sure as hell wouldn't give her the whole load." (Laughter and applause.)

But recently, as you know, there's been some speculation that the United States and the Soviet Union are about to sign

MORE



important new arms control agreements. Now, this sort of talk isn't all that unexpected; whenever leaders of countries are about to meet, there are always those who predict landmark treaties and historical breakthroughs.

Yet, when I see such speculation, I can't help but think of the first administrative post that I held. And I hope you'll forgive me for reminiscing here, but as a union president, I spent a good deal of time at the bargaining table and learned one valuable lesson -- now, that it's the initial phase of the negotiating process, laying the groundwork, setting the agenda, establishing areas of agreement as well as disagreement -- that pays off in the future.

Now, if that's true of labor and management negotiations here, you can imagine how relevant it is to Soviet-American bargaining sessions; after all, we both have a little more separating us than, say, General Motors and U.A.W. So, groundwork is essential.

And from the beginning we have tried to make this a hallmark of administration policy; we've tried to take a prudent, and a realistic and, above all, deliberate approach toward Soviet-American relations. Instead of rushing unprepared into negotiations with the Soviets, the administration took the time in its earliest days to make clear the essential elements of American foreign policy -- our commitment to the twin goals of world peace and world freedom, our willingness to be realistic and candid about the Soviets, to publicly define the crucial, moral distinctions between totalitarianism and democracy and to actively assist those who are struggling for their own self-determination.

Yet, at the same time we also made plain another of our essential objectives -- our determination to seek ways of working with the Soviets to prevent war and to keep the peace. In pursuing this objective, we adopted a step-by-step approach towards Soviet-American negotiations, gradually expanding and intensifying the areas of both bilateral and multilateral discussion. And, as we've seen, eventually summit meetings themselves became a critical part of that effort.

Now, this willingness to make painstaking preparations was what I believe made last year's talks in Geneva a success. Each side had a good idea of what to expect; there was an agenda; Mr. Gorbachev and I could be candid with each other. In short, we had something to work with, something to build on.

And we must continue in this spirit. And that's why Iceland is not intended to be a signing ceremony or a media event but a pre-summit planning session, a chance to make preparations for the serious work Mr. Gorbachev and I will have to do when he visits the United States. Iceland is a base camp before the summit.

And yet, while our emphasis will be on planning and preparation, not treaty papers or publicity, part of the emphasis in Iceland will be on the broad-based agenda that we've agreed to -- discussion not only of critical arms reduction proposals, but equally important questions such as Soviet human rights violations, military intervention by the Soviets and their proxies in regional conflicts.

On this point of the summit agenda let me add another point of background. A few years ago in a speech to the United Nations, I said that I shared the sense of urgency many felt about arms control issues. But I also suggested placing the entire burden of Soviet-American relations on arms control negotiations could be dangerous and counterproductive. I noted that problems in arms negotiations should not be permitted to thwart or imperil the entire Soviet-American relationship and, similarly, that sometimes, negotiations in other areas could assist in speeding up arms control process.

In short, doing more about arms control meant talking about more than arms control. So I proposed in my 1984 U.N. address what I called "umbrella talks," negotiations with a broad-based agenda.

The summit process has reflected this approach and includes a broad-based agenda. We've stressed in addition to arms reduction three other agenda items -- respect for human rights, resolving regional conflicts, and improving bilateral contacts between the Soviets and ourselves.

Now, that first area, human rights, takes on, in view of the recent Danilooff incident, a particular reference -- or relevance, I should say. As you know, after a Soviet spy at the U.N. was arrested the Soviets retaliated by arresting an American journalist, Nicholas Danilooff, on trumped up charges. It was an act that held hostage not only an innocent American journalist, but the future of Soviet-American relations.

The United States took action in response to the Soviet use of the U.N. for intelligence activities by ordering the expulsion of 25 Soviet personnel known to be involved in such activities.

That the arrest of a single spy could lead to such risk-taking by the Soviets again underscores the differences between our two systems. It was an extremely grave step, but one that could hardly surprise us; after all, human rights violations in the Soviet bloc remain unceasing because they're institutionalized and sanctioned by the state ideology.

It's worth noting here that we agreed to exchange the Soviet spy in question for the noted Russian human rights leader, Yuri Orlov, and his wife. Mr. Orlov's service to humanity -- the record of his sufferings -- makes him a hero for our time. Yet, it is also worth noting he was persecuted simply because he led an effort to get the Soviet government to live up to the human rights agreements it signed at Helsinki in 1975.

When the Soviet state's ideology makes it a crime to advocate living up to international commitments, the rest of the world has to take notice. And this point, as well as the entire range of Soviet human rights abuses must be addressed at future summits.

So, too, there is the issue of regional conflicts. It would be simply unthinkable for world leaders to meet in splendid isolation even as the people of Afghanistan, Central America, Africa and Southeast Asia undergo terrible sufferings as a result of Soviet invasion or military intervention. Again, our proposals for resolving regional conflicts remain a critical agenda item. And on this point, you may have read last week that the Soviet Foreign Minister acknowledged that Afghanistan has to be discussed in Reykjavik. I wish we saw any evidence that the Soviets had made a decision to get out.

They need to see that the only solution that can last is one providing self-determination for the Afghan people and a rapid, complete withdrawal of Soviet forces. Short of that, the freedom fighters will struggle on, and let me promise you, they'll have the support they need from people around the world. (Applause.)

Finally, there is the issue of broader contacts between the Soviet and American peoples, especially young people. We all welcome the commitment made last year in Geneva to increase contacts, notably in the cultural exchange area. This was the result of careful pre-summit planning, and it's our hope that our work in Iceland will speed up implementation of these programs and lay the groundwork for future progress at future summits.

These then are the difficult matters on our summit agenda: arms reduction, human rights, regional conflicts, people-to-people contacts. I think you can understand, then, when Mr. Gorbachev extended his invitation to a pre-summit discussion, I accepted. With such grave and complex matters, there's no such thing as too much preparation. So I hope that in explaining all this, I've done something to dispel some of the inaccurate speculation and false hopes raised about the Iceland talks. I expect these talks to be useful and successful, but only as preparation for future summit conferences. Our view is that we will proceed as we have from the start -- step-by-step -- cautiously, prudently, and realistically.

And by the way, I hope this last point about our realism helps to answer some of the domestic criticisms recently of the summit process.

Actually, I've got to confess that hearing suggestions that I'm getting soft on communism is for me a new -- and perhaps the word titillating -- (laughter) -- is proper for that experience.

But, seriously, I would ask those of my old supporters who may have voiced doubts to simply consider three facts that I think may make the current summit process very different from that of previous decades.

First, the United States has made it plain we enter these negotiations without illusions, and that we will continue to be candid about the Soviet Union, the moral implications of its ideology, the grave danger of its geopolitical intentions.

Second, part of this candid approach includes restatement of what I said in my 1982 speech at Westminster Palace in Great Britain -- that the ultimate goal of American foreign policy is not just the prevention of war, but the extension of freedom -- (applause) -- to see that every nation, every people, every person someday enjoys the blessings of liberty.

And finally I would ask that some note be taken of the historical tides. America is no longer under seige -- far from it. Our economic and military power is resurgent, the Western democracies are revitalized, and all across the world nations are turning to democratic ideas and the principles of the free market. In all of this, the United States continues to play its historical role and assist those who struggle for world freedom.

And we believe the summit process can be useful in preventing war as we move toward a world of expanding personal freedom and growing respect for human rights. We believe the summit agenda reflects the helpful changes that have occurred in the world. We are discussing not just arms control, for example, but arms reduction, as well as human rights and regional conflicts.

Progress toward our twin goals of peace and freedom then will not be easy. As I mentioned in my Saturday radio talk, we seek the support of all Americans. We need your help, and we also need, as I said, some careful preparation.

And that is why we agreed to the talks in Iceland and will look forward to meeting Mr. Gorbachev there. And, come to think of it, it's also why I have to get back across the street to my homework and my briefing books.

You know, I have taken to collecting stories that I can tell that show the cynicism of some of the people in the totalitarian states for their government. Stories that I can confirm are actually told by those people to each other. So I'm going to share the last one with you, and then it's back to work.

Evening, or darkness in the Soviet Union. A citizen walking along the street. A soldier yells, "Halt." He starts to run, the soldier shoots him. Another citizen says, "Why did you do that?" And the soldier says, "Curfew." "But," he said, "it isn't curfew time yet." He said, "I know. He's a friend of mine. I know where he lives. He couldn't have made it." (Laughter and applause.)

You know something? In the summit meetings I tell some of those stories to the other side. (Laughter.)

Thank you all very much. God bless you. (Applause.)

END

2:33 P.M. EDT

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

---

For Immediate Release

NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER, 1987

- - - - -

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A PROCLAMATION

In 1952 the Congress of the United States, resuming a tradition observed by the Continental Congress from 1776 to 1783 and followed intermittently thereafter, adopted a resolution calling on the President to set aside and proclaim a suitable day each year as a National Day of Prayer. At the time the resolution was adopted, Americans were dying on the battlefield in Korea. More than 125,000 of our young men had been killed or wounded in that conflict, the third major war in which our troops were involved in a century barely half over.

Members of Congress who spoke for the resolution made clear that they felt the Nation continued to face the very same challenges that preoccupied our Founders: the survival of freedom in a world frequently hostile to human ideals and the struggle for faith in an age that openly doubted or vehemently denied the existence of the Almighty. One Senator remarked that "it would be timely and appropriate for the people of our Nation to join in this service of prayer in the spirit of the founding fathers who believed that God governs in the affairs of men and who based their Declaration of Independence upon a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence."

Human nature is such that times of distress, grief, and war -- or their recent memory -- impel us to acknowledgements we are often too proud to make, or too prone to forget, in periods of peace and prosperity. During the Civil War Lincoln said that he was driven to his knees in prayer because he was convinced that he had nowhere else to go. During World War II, an unknown soldier in a trench in Tunisia left behind a scrap of paper with the verses:

Stay with me, God. The night is dark,  
The night is cold: my little spark  
Of courage dies. The night is long;  
Be with me, God, and make me strong.

America has lived through many a cold, dark night, when the cupped hands of prayer were our only shield against the extinction of courage. Though that flame has flickered from time to time, it burns brightest when we are willing, as we ought to be now, to turn our faces and our hearts to God not only at moments of personal danger and civil strife, but in the full flower of the liberty, peace, and abundance that He has showered upon us.

Indeed, the true meaning of our entire history as a Nation can scarcely be glimpsed without some notion of the importance of prayer, our Declaration of Dependence on God's favor on this unfinished enterprise we call America. Our land today is more diverse than ever, our citizens come from nearly every nation on Earth, and the variety of religious traditions



that have found welcome here has never been greater. On our National Day of Prayer, then, we join together as people of many faiths to petition God to show us His mercy and His love, to heal our weariness and uphold our hope, that we might live ever mindful of His justice and thankful for His blessing.

By joint resolution of the Congress approved April 17, 1952, the recognition of a particular day set aside each year as a National Day of Prayer has become a cherished national tradition.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, RONALD REAGAN, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim May 7, 1987, as a National Day of Prayer. I call upon the citizens of this great Nation to gather together on that day in homes and places of worship to pray, each after his or her own manner, for unity of the hearts of all mankind.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-second day of December, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and eighty-six, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and eleventh.

RONALD REAGAN

# # # # #