

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Chumachenko, Katherine: Files
Folder Title: Moscow Summit 1988 (2)
Box: OA 18287

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

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

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

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

Intro

In 1970's, US-Sov reltns deterioration →
HR perf ↓, invasion of Afgh.

When Pres Reag came in, he
expressed deep commitment to long
state of relations.

But not as some were recommending →
unilat disarmament, nuclear freeze,
questioning own faith in freedom.

Rather reject of idea that nucl
war & totalit - 2 grt threats of 20th
- inevit.

Public candor about basic moral
differences, ~~reaffirm~~ atten to own
defense capab's, greater cooper w/
allies, commit to freedom.

+ Reag's
aimed at
recognizing
& resolving
fundam
differences.

dedic to democ,
Lo: be hold -) aid to freedom fighters,
resulted in major AS:

Marx predicted polit order would
conflict w/ ec order. Not w/ but
East

Sov need to A bes of fundam
ee problems; hat' to tensions,
cost of arms, world attn.

Summit 4th mtg btw R & G

4 part agenda intertwined.

Arms Control / #R / Reg / Bilat

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 8, 1988

MEMORANDUM FOR ADMINISTRATION SPOKESPERSONS

FROM: MARION C. BLAKEY ^{MCB}
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

SUBJECT: Talking Points on the Moscow Summit

Attached for your information and use are White House Talking Points on the results and accomplishments of the Moscow Summit.

If you have any questions concerning this material, please feel free to contact the White House Office of Public Affairs at (202) 456-7170.

Thanks very much.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE MOSCOW SUMMIT

"Quite possibly, we're beginning to break down the barriers of the postwar era. Quite possibly, we are entering an era in history, a time of lasting change in the Soviet Union.... Imagine, the President of the United States and the General Secretary of the Soviet Union walking together in Red Square, talking about a growing personal friendship and meeting together average citizens, realizing how much our people have in common."

--- President Reagan
June 3, 1988

The Moscow Summit of May 29-June 2 was the fourth meeting between President Reagan and Soviet General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev. The President reported further progress in building a solid and lasting foundation for peace -- and the shared hope of the two leaders that this progress may transcend changes in U.S. and Soviet relations in the future.

Progress was achieved in key areas of the President's four-part agenda in addressing U.S.- Soviet relations: arms reduction, human rights, regional conflicts, and bilateral relations.

President Reagan remains fully aware of the fundamental differences which separate the U.S. and the Soviet Union. The President said:

"(L)et us remember the strategy that we have adopted is one that provides for setbacks along the way as well as progress. Let us embrace honest change when it occurs, but let us also be wary. Let us stay strong. And let us be confident, too."

Arms Reduction

- o President Reagan and Mr. Gorbachev ~~exchanged the instruments of ratification of the historic INF Treaty,~~ which will eliminate an entire class of U.S. and Soviet intermediate-range nuclear force missiles. The INF Treaty is the first arms control treaty to be approved by the U.S. Senate and put into effect in 16 years.

- For the first time ever, the levels of nuclear arms will actually be reduced, rather than having caps placed on their growth. These missiles will not simply be moved elsewhere or put in storage -- they will be eliminated.
- With the INF Treaty's stringent verification measures, for the first time in a U.S.- Soviet arms control agreement, each side will send onsite inspection teams to verify the data provided by the other side.
- The President and Mr. Gorbachev made further progress toward an equitable and effectively verifiable START agreement, which would reduce strategic nuclear arms by 50 percent. Included in this category are the most dangerous and destabilizing of nuclear weapons -- large, intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) with multiple warheads.
- Progress on START included the vital area of verification. The two sides prepared joint draft texts of an inspection protocol, a conversion or elimination protocol, and a memorandum of understanding on data; all of which are integral parts of the START Treaty. These documents build on the verification provisions of the INF Treaty, extending and elaborating on them as necessary to meet the more demanding requirements of START.

Human Rights

- Few would have suggested only a decade ago that a U.S. president would meet with Soviet human rights activists inside Moscow itself, or be able to speak to Soviet college students at Moscow State University about freedom. Yet these exchanges took place. President Reagan said:

"Seeds of greater freedom and greater trust were sown. And I just have to believe -- in ways we may not even be able to guess -- those seeds will take root and grow."
- The U.S.- Soviet dialogue on human rights has come a long way in recent years. The Soviet record is gradually improving. Soviet citizens still lack generally accepted international civil and political rights. The Soviet system remains, in its essential structure, as it was. But significant changes may be taking place. The issue now is whether these changes will deepen and become institutionalized and permanent.

Regional Conflicts

- o The ~~withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, when~~ completed, will represent an historic step -- one President Reagan and Mr. Gorbachev agreed could serve as a precedent for resolution of other regional conflicts. The President said he expected Soviet troops would leave within the time agreed at Geneva and expressed continued support for Pakistan.
- o The President welcomed ~~Vietnam's~~ ~~commitment to remove some of its troops from Cambodia,~~ but he stressed that a solution there will require removal of all Vietnamese troops. The two leaders discussed new prospects for an early target date for ~~removal of Cuban and all foreign troops from Angola.~~
- o The President emphasized U.S. concerns about Central America, calling on Mr. Gorbachev to stop the vast supply of Soviet weaponry to the communist Sandinistas in Nicaragua and to the communist guerillas in neighboring countries. The President once again pressed for Soviet support for enforcement of United Nations Security Council Resolution 598 in order to end the Iran-Iraq war, and for our Middle East peace initiative.

Bilateral Issues

- o President Reagan is pleased that Mr. Gorbachev agreed to take an important step toward ~~expanding people-to-people exchanges,~~ not just making occasional, symbolic gestures that involve a few carefully selected groups. The goal is an ongoing series of widespread exchanges involving a cross-section of citizens from both societies. The two leaders ~~agreed to an annual exchange of hundreds of high school students --~~ far larger numbers than in the past.
- o The President and Mr. Gorbachev ~~expanded and improved an earlier cultural agreement and agreed to a plan to negotiate establishment of cultural and information centers in both Washington and Moscow.~~ Also signed were a number of ~~other~~ cooperation agreements, including a new comprehensive ~~fisheries~~ agreement, an agreement on ~~transportation science and technology,~~ and two agreements concerning Coast Guard search and rescue and radio navigation.

"I pray the hand of the Lord will be on the Soviet people, the people whose faces Nancy and I saw everywhere we went. Believe me, there was one thing about those faces we will never forget. They were the faces of hope, the hope of a new era in human history and hopefully an era of peace and freedom for all."

--- President Reagan
June 3, 1988

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 13, 1988

MEMORANDUM FOR ADMINISTRATION SPOKESMEN

FROM: MARION C. BLAKEY ^{MCS}
Special Assistant to the President and
Director of Public Affairs

SUBJECT: Talking Points on the Moscow Summit

Attached for your information and use is a set of White House Talking Points on the Moscow Summit.

If you have any questions concerning this material, please feel free to contact the White House Office of Public Affairs at (202) 456-7170.

WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

THE MOSCOW SUMMIT

President Reagan and Soviet General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev will meet in Moscow from May 29-June 2. At this meeting, the fourth between the two leaders, the President will seek to consolidate progress in all aspects of the U.S.- Soviet relationship and prepare the way for further progress. His goal remains a brighter future and a safer world for all people. The Summit is an important event, though only one of a growing number of contacts between our two countries.

During his two terms in office, President Reagan has reshaped the U.S.- Soviet relationship to address a four-part agenda:

- o HUMAN RIGHTS
- o REGIONAL CONFLICTS
- o BILATERAL ISSUES
- o ARMS REDUCTION

This agenda rests on the President's policy of peace through strength, realism, and dialogue. It provides for continued progress in building a solid and lasting foundation for peace, not merely a misleading and temporary improvement in atmosphere.

A Realistic, Consistent, and Comprehensive Policy

President Reagan's policy toward the Soviet Union has been successful because it has been realistic, consistent, and comprehensive. With strengthened ties among our allies, this policy has already made U.S.- Soviet relations more stable and has improved prospects for peace.

- o The President is fully aware of the differences which separate the United States and the Soviet Union. Fundamentally opposed political, social, and economic systems limit possibilities of cooperation and interaction.
- o In spite of progress, the promise of Soviet rhetoric remains far from the reality of Soviet behavior.

In Moscow, President Reagan will continue to urge Mr. Gorbachev to adopt ways more compatible with the free exchange of people, ideas, and information. Although governments can do a great deal, the strongest bonds between nations will grow only from the interchange of people free to express their own ideas.

WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

HUMAN RIGHTS

The basic differences between the U.S. and Soviet systems are graphically illustrated in the ways we approach human rights. Respect for human rights is as important to peace as is arms control. President Reagan believes governments which honor their citizens' human rights are more likely to abide by international agreements and truly respect other nations. A country that represses its population sows mistrust abroad.

President Reagan continues to insist that the Soviet Union take concrete steps toward the freer flow of information, people, and ideas as set out in the 1975 Helsinki Final Act. This covenant specifies the fundamental individual liberties enumerated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and calls upon each government to respect these rights.

The U.S.- Soviet dialogue on human rights has come a long way over the past few years. By sitting down and discussing subjects they earlier had refused even to acknowledge, the Soviets show that they are changing both their attitude and approach on human rights.

The Soviet Union's record on human rights has improved somewhat, especially since the end of 1986 -- but Soviet citizens still lack generally accepted international safeguards on human rights.

Progress

- o More than 300 political prisoners have been released from labor camps.
- o Jews in the Soviet Union and long-time refuseniks have been allowed to emigrate in greater numbers over the past year, and larger numbers of new applicants have received exit permits.
- o Many cases of divided families and spouses have been satisfactorily resolved.
- o Arrests under an arbitrary law that was mostly used against dissidents -- whose only crime was to express critical views -- have virtually stopped.

WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

Repressive Policies Persist

- o Emigration is still restricted and the number of people allowed to emigrate, especially Soviet Jews, remains far below demand. An estimated 10,000 applications by Soviet Jews for emigration are yet to be resolved.
- o Members of unregistered religious sects are still heavily persecuted.
- o Peaceful demonstrations by national minorities, refuseniks, free-press advocates, and others continue to be broken up by police.
- o Unofficial publications -- invariably those that reflect unauthorized political views -- are denied the right to register as official publications.
- o An unknown number of prisoners of conscience and religious dissenters remain interned in Soviet prisons, labor camps and psychiatric institutions. Continued forced commitment of prisoners of conscience and religious dissenters to psychiatric hospitals, and other forms of punishment, is a fundamental breach of human rights.

Ongoing Dialogue

- o Round table seminars on human rights between U.S. and Soviet officials and experts from the private sector began in March 1988.
- o The Reagan Administration will continue to urge the Soviet Union to make changes in laws and practices in order to institutionalize human rights reform. Unless changes are institutionalized, there is a danger of backsliding, or a return to a much more repressive environment.

WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

REGIONAL CONFLICTS

Regional conflicts cause suffering, can dangerously escalate, and threaten international peace. Soviet conduct contributes to many of these conflicts and is itself a source of tension. Improvement in these areas is important for improvement in overall U.S.- Soviet relations.

The Soviet Union, or its surrogates, continue to encourage or maintain repressive Marxist/Leninist regimes in Afghanistan, Cambodia, Angola, Ethiopia and Nicaragua.

President Reagan has consistently made it clear to Moscow that failure to move forward on key regional problems will affect the climate of U.S.- Soviet relations, including the prospects for further arms reductions.

Afghanistan

- o The goal of the Reagan Administration remains a genuinely independent, non-aligned Afghanistan. The key to resolving the Afghan conflict remains Soviet fulfillment of their commitment to withdraw rapidly and completely their forces and allow self-determination for all the Afghan people.
- o The Soviet Union has agreed to begin withdrawal of all troops from Afghanistan on May 15. The withdrawal is to be completed within one year. The United States stands ready to play a constructive role. It is hoped that Soviet readiness to reach a solution in Afghanistan will open the way to cooperation on other regional conflicts.

Persian Gulf

- o The U.S. is deeply concerned about Soviet behavior in the Persian Gulf. After cooperating with us last July to pass U.N. Security Council Resolution 598 calling for an end to the Gulf War, Soviet policy has become uncooperative and a cover for Iranian belligerence.
- o It is long past due for Moscow to prove its good intentions in the Gulf by moving with the U.S. in the U.N. Security Council toward an enforcement resolution in response to Iran's refusal to accept Resolution 598. Soviet reluctance to do so injures their claim that they desire the U.N. Security Council to play a major role in settling regional conflicts.

WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

Arab-Israeli Peace Process

- o The U.S. is determined to pursue peace between Israel and the Arab states. We are prepared to explore different avenues for facilitating bilateral and direct negotiations, including the possibility of a properly structured international conference.
- o The Soviet Union is not taking the necessary steps to help advance the prospects for peace in the region. Such steps would include:
 - Adopting a more realistic approach to an international conference, one which facilitates bilateral negotiations rather than supplants them;
 - Establishing diplomatic relations with Israel; and
 - Using their influence to stop efforts by the Syrians and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to block the U.S. initiative.

Central America

- o The Soviet Union continues to provide \$650 million a year in military assistance to Nicaragua, even as the Sandinistas and the Democratic Resistance pursue peace under the Guatemala Agreement and despite the cutoff of U.S. military assistance to the freedom fighters.
- o Soviet assistance stiffens Sandinista reluctance to take steps toward democratization and real compromise with the Democratic Resistance, and increases Sandinista military power to the point of posing a threat to Nicaragua's neighboring democracies.
- o Moscow should halt the flow of arms through Cuba and Nicaragua to the guerrillas in El Salvador.

Cambodia

- o A political settlement in Cambodia depends on prompt withdrawal of Vietnamese troops. Afghanistan provides an example of what Vietnam should do. The U.S. seeks to have the Soviet Union, a provider of arms and aid to Hanoi, make constructive efforts to facilitate Vietnamese withdrawal.

WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

Angola

- o The Soviets continue to pour in massive quantities of arms to Angola, which supports the Cuban expeditionary force. The U.S. calls for a political, negotiated solution based on Cuban troop withdrawal, independence for Namibia under U.N. Security Council Resolution 435, and reconciliation between the Angolan regime and the UNITA freedom fighters.

Ethiopia

- o Moscow continues to support a repressive regime in Ethiopia with substantial military and other assistance. The Soviet Union should press the regime to abandon its expulsion of foreign relief workers in northern Ethiopia, where at least two million people face starvation because the Ethiopian government has made its war needs a higher priority than the survival of innocent civilians.

Korea

- o The Soviet Union should use its influence so that North Korean leader Kim Il-song will take the steps necessary to reduce tension on the Korean peninsula and to assure an uninterrupted 1988 summer Olympic Games.

WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

BILATERAL ISSUES

President Reagan believes strongly that prospects for peace are enhanced by measures that help open up the Soviet system and lower artificial barriers to interaction between our peoples. The U.S. favors a broad array of educational, cultural, scientific, commercial, and people-to-people contacts which promote this objective.

The President favors bilateral exchanges that promote mutual understanding and mutual benefit. However, we must be alert for Soviet efforts to obtain high technology that would enhance their military capability.

Educational and Cultural Exchanges

- o An agreement was signed at the Geneva Summit in 1985, reinstating touring exhibits and other educational and cultural exchanges between the U.S. and U.S.S.R. Over the past two years, there has been a great expansion of such exchanges.
- o Under the President's Exchange Initiative, the U.S. has encouraged a series of people-to-people activities, including school exchanges, citizens' public meetings, and joint television broadcasts.
- o The U.S. is seeking agreement for a new three-year cultural exchange program which will redress several inequities in the conduct of cultural exchanges. The U.S. is particularly interested in a significant expansion of U.S.- Soviet youth exchanges, especially those involving high school and undergraduate college students.
- o The U.S. encourages expanded media exchange activities based on reciprocity. Soviet spokesmen, for example, appear regularly on U.S. television and have free access to our media. U.S. spokesmen should have the same opportunities to explain American policies to the people of the Soviet Union.

Science and Technology

- o The U.S. favors mutually beneficial bilateral exchanges in matters of basic science where there is no risk of transferring sensitive technology.

WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

- o The U.S. recently signed a protocol of understanding with the Soviet Union on civilian nuclear reactor safety. Both governments will work under this program to make their civilian nuclear power programs as safe as possible.
- o In the area of basic sciences, the two sides are actively discussing an agreement covering U.S.- proposed joint programs in geology, chemistry, mathematics, theoretical physics, life sciences, arctic studies, engineering sciences, and science policy.
- o The U.S. is insisting that this agreement provide American access to the best Soviet scientists, contain provisions for the protection of intellectual property rights, and not be used as a way of achieving Soviet access to militarily useful technology.
- o Two new U.S.- Soviet agreements have recently been concluded -- one on maritime search and rescue assistance, the other on radio navigation. These agreements provide increased protection for the ships and planes of both countries.
- o The U.S., U.S.S.R., Japan, and the European Community, under the sponsorship of the International Atomic Energy Agency, began work in April on a conceptual design for a fusion test reactor. This work has long-term prospects for creating a new source of safe and efficient energy to meet the world's ever-increasing power needs.

Trade and Other Economic Issues

- o Increased bilateral trade can be of benefit to both countries. However, national security and human rights concerns constitute two major boundaries to the potential for expanding trade with the Soviet Union.
- o President Reagan and Mr. Gorbachev have expressed strong support for expansion of mutually beneficial trade relations. Their trade ministers met in April and agreed on concrete steps for trade expansion which will lead to improvements in market access for U.S. companies.
- o The two countries have agreed to discuss the future of the U.S.- Soviet long-term grain agreement.
- o Now that the Soviet Union has ceased commercial whaling in accordance with the moratorium agreed to by the International Whaling Commission, the U.S. looks forward with renewed interest to a comprehensive fisheries agreement with the Soviet Union.

WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

- o For national security reasons, the U.S. will continue to restrict strategic trade with the Soviet Union. All U.S.-Soviet trade must comply fully with U.S. and multilateral (COCOM) regulations.
- o The 1974 Jackson-Vanik Amendment continues to guide U.S. policy. This amendment ties Most Favored Nation trade status and government-backed credits to Soviet emigration policies. No changes are under consideration regarding U.S. policies on export controls or the relationship between human rights and trade.
- o Under Mr. Gorbachev, the U.S.S.R. has begun a drive for greater autonomy for economic and trade enterprises, using economic modernization and greater participation in the international economic system to aid that process.
- o The U.S. opposes Soviet membership or participation in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and in other international economic institutions because the Soviet economic system is not compatible with free world economies.

Campaign of Disinformation

- o Soviet media continue to publish lies about U.S. actions as part of a widespread campaign of disinformation. Lurid stories have alleged, for example, that the U.S. created the AIDS virus in a germ warfare laboratory, and that unscrupulous American businessmen are obtaining children in Central America to sell their body organs for transplant operations.
- o We have strongly objected to this disinformation campaign. It undermines efforts to improve communications and build better understanding between our two countries. The Soviet press, unlike ours, is controlled by the government. We are encouraged that some aspects of this campaign have recently diminished, and we hope it will continue.

Embassy Espionage

- o The U.S. uncovered a massive Soviet espionage program directed against our Embassy and personnel in Moscow. The President has decided that we will not occupy the new Embassy office building until it is safe and secure, and that the U.S.S.R. will not be allowed to occupy its new chancery in Washington until a simultaneous move is possible. Our first priority is to make our Moscow Embassy safe and secure. Extensive renovations are underway.

WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

ARMS REDUCTION

Arms reduction negotiations are not an end in themselves, but a central element in President Reagan's strategy to ensure the future security of the U.S. and its allies. The President seeks to enhance strategic stability at lower levels of military forces and thus reduce the risk of war. Arms reductions should establish a foundation of mutual restraint and responsibility and help us build a safer world for all people.

After six years of negotiation and discussion, during which President Reagan held firm in the face of extreme Soviet political pressure, the United States and the Soviet Union signed the INF Treaty last December. This historic agreement eliminates an entire class of U.S. and Soviet intermediate-range nuclear force (INF) missiles.

The INF agreement is a step toward a more secure peace, but only a first step. In the continuing effort to achieve a safer world, the Reagan Administration, with support from our allies, has engaged the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact states on a wide range of arms reduction issues.

Among arms reduction issues to be discussed at the Summit, the two leaders will emphasize strategic nuclear arms. Defense and space, conventional forces, chemical weapons, and nuclear testing will also be addressed.

Strategic Nuclear Arms (START)

- o President Reagan places the highest priority on efforts to reach an equitable and effectively verifiable agreement with the Soviets for a 50 percent reduction in strategic nuclear arms (START).
- o Deep reductions do not, in and of themselves, guarantee enhanced stability or reduce the risk of war. Some weapons are more dangerous and destabilizing than others because they are better suited for first-strike missions. The key, therefore, to reducing the risk of war is to ensure that strategic reductions result in force structures that reduce incentives to strike first.
- o For this reason, since the beginning of the START talks in 1982, the President has insisted on negotiating sublimits (specific limits on particular weapons within the overall reductions) on the most threatening categories of strategic weapons -- especially large, intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) with multiple warheads; the weapons most suitable for a first-strike.

WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

- o At the 1985 Geneva Summit, Soviet General Secretary Gorbachev agreed in principle to a 50 percent reduction of strategic nuclear arms. At Iceland in 1986, the two leaders reached major new areas of agreement on the nature of a strategic reduction regime. However, Soviet insistence on linking strategic arms reductions to measures that would cripple the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) prevented an agreement.
- o On May 8, 1987, the U.S. presented a draft treaty at the START negotiations in Geneva. The U.S. draft treaty reflects the basic areas of agreement reached by President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev in Iceland and provides for roughly 50 percent reductions in strategic offensive nuclear arsenals to equal levels for both sides.
- o At the December 1987 Washington Summit, both sides agreed to a sublimit of 4,900 ballistic missile warheads within a total of 6,000 nuclear warheads. This was a very important step because it meets a longstanding Reagan Administration requirement for strict limits on these systems.
- o At Ministerial meetings this year, the two sides have agreed to press forward on treaty verification, which is fundamental to successful conclusion of a treaty. Negotiators are currently working to complete joint draft verification protocols and the Memorandum of Understanding on data.
- o President Reagan believes a START agreement could be reached this year, but only if the Soviet Union drops its insistence that we accept measures which would kill or cripple the SDI program.
 - The President has made it clear that because of the importance of SDI to the future security of the U.S. and our allies, the program must move forward.
- o In the process of negotiating a START agreement, President Reagan, above all, remains firm in his position that no agreement is better than a bad agreement. He will refuse to sign a START agreement, or any other agreement, unless it is in the best security interests of the United States and our allies.

WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

Defense and Space

- o At the Defense and Space talks, the U.S. has endeavored to discuss with the Soviet Union how, should effective strategic defenses prove feasible, the U.S. and U.S.S.R. could jointly manage a stable transition to a deterrence based increasingly on defenses rather than on the threat of retaliation by offensive nuclear weapons.
- o At the Washington Summit, President Reagan and Mr. Gorbachev agreed to instruct their negotiators "to work out an agreement that would commit the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. to observe the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, as signed in 1972, while conducting their research, development, and testing as required, which are permitted by the Treaty, and not to withdraw from the Treaty for a specified period of time."
- o In March 1988, the two sides agreed to work on a joint draft text of a separate Defense and Space agreement, based on the agreement reached at the Washington Summit. The Soviet Union has only recently begun to carry out their agreement to do this.
- o In an effort to reach agreement with the Soviet Union on Defense and Space, the U.S. has made a number of constructive proposals, including a proposed predictability package providing for exchange of data and other measures to enhance confidence in the nature, pace, and scope of the strategic defense activities undertaken by each side. It is important to note that the U.S.S.R. has long been actively engaged in its own strategic defense programs.
- o Many differences continue to separate the two sides, however, including Soviet efforts to place restrictions on the SDI program. The U.S. has made it clear that it will not accept any restrictions on SDI beyond those actually agreed to in the ABM treaty.

Conventional Forces and Chemical Weapons

- o At their Iceland meeting in June 1987, NATO foreign ministers set as a priority the effort to redress the serious imbalances in conventional forces and chemical weapons favoring the Warsaw Pact.

WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

- o Western security has long been threatened by Warsaw Pact conventional superiority -- based primarily on massive, forward-deployed, offensively configured Soviet armored forces in Eastern Europe and in western U.S.S.R. The conventional imbalance derives not only from Eastern numerical superiority in key categories of combat capability, but also from geographic and other non-quantitative advantages.
- o Today, as a result of the unilateral restraint exercised by the U.S. and the intensive Soviet chemical weapons modernization program, there is a serious East-West imbalance in these weapons. The Soviet Union possesses a formidable, modern arsenal including what is by far the world's largest chemical weapons stockpile, while the U.S. capability -- largely unusable and dating, in part, from the 1940s and 1950s -- has lost much of its deterrent value against first use of chemical weapons.
- o The Reagan Administration is addressing these concerns by seeking U.S. and NATO force improvements; pursuing the East-West Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions (MBFR) negotiations in Vienna seeking Warsaw Pact agreement on a mandate for new conventional stability negotiations covering, for the first time, the entire area from the Atlantic Ocean to the Ural Mountains; and by pursuing an effective, verifiable, and global ban on chemical weapons.
- o The United States and the Soviet Union have both agreed to work with their respective allies to move forward with dispatch in the Vienna talks on the mandate for new conventional stability negotiations.
- o The U.S. decision to begin restoring our chemical deterrent by producing binary chemical munitions has clearly spurred the Soviet Union to negotiate seriously on chemical weapons. Substantial progress has been made on U.S.- Soviet bilateral chemical weapons data exchange. Both sides have recognized the goal of a global ban, but serious difficulties remain, especially in the vital area of verification.

Nuclear Testing

- o President Reagan is committed to seeking effective and verifiable agreements with the Soviet Union on nuclear testing limitations which could strengthen security for all nations.

WHITE HOUSE TALKING POINTS

- In September 1987, Secretary of State Shultz and Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze issued a statement agreeing to begin full-scale stage-by-stage negotiations on nuclear testing before December 1, 1987. The first round of these negotiations was held in Geneva from November 9-20, 1987.
- As a first step in these negotiations, the two sides will agree upon effective verification measures which will make it possible for the U.S. Senate to ratify the U.S.- Soviet Threshold Test Ban Treaty of 1974 and the Peaceful Explosions Treaty of 1976. These treaties would limit underground explosions for military and peaceful purposes, respectively, to 150 kilotons. Negotiators are currently working on draft texts of verification protocols for these treaties.
- At the Washington Summit, the two sides also agreed to design and conduct a Joint Verification Experiment (JVE) to facilitate agreement on verification provisions for these treaties. The JVE will be conducted this summer at our Nevada test site and at the Semipacatinsk test site in the Soviet Union.

Office of the Press Secretary
(Helsinki, Finland)

For Immediate Release

May 27, 1987

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO THE PAASIKIVI SOCIETY
AND
THE LEAGUE OF FINNISH-AMERICAN SOCIETIES

Finlandia Hall
Helsinki, Finland

3:05 P.M. (L)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you all very much. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Prime Minister, and ladies and gentlemen, let me begin by saying thank you to our hosts, the Finnish government, the Paasikivi Society, and the League of Finnish-American Societies. It's a particular honor for me to come here today. This year -- the "Year of Friendship," as Congress has proclaimed it, between the United States and Finland -- this year marks the 350th anniversary of the arrival of the first Finns in America and the establishment of a small Scandinavian colony near what is today Wilmington, Delaware. An ancient people in a new world -- and that is the story, not only of those Finns, but of all the peoples who braved the seas, to settle in and build my country, a land of freedom for a nation of immigrants.

Yes, they founded a new world, but as they crossed the oceans, the mountains, and the prairies, those who made America carried the old world in their hearts -- the old customs, the family ties, and, most of all, the belief in God, a belief that gave them the moral compass and ethical foundation by which they explored an uncharted frontier and constructed a government and nation of, by, and for the people.

And so, although we Americans became a new people, we also remain an ancient one, for we're guided by ancient and universal values -- values that Prime Minister Holkeri spoke of in Los Angeles this February when, after recalling Finland's internationally recognized position of neutrality, he added that Finland is "tied to Western values of freedom, democracy, and human rights."

And let me add here that for America, those ties are also the bonds of our friendship. America respects Finland's neutrality. We support Finland's independence. We honor Finland's courageous history. We value the creative statesmanship that has been Finland's gift to world peace. And in this soaring hall -- which is the great architect Alvar Aalto's statement of hope for Finland's future -- we reaffirm our hope and faith that the friendship between our nations will be unending.

We're gathered here today in this hall because it was here, almost 13 years ago, that the 35 nations of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe signed the Helsinki Final Act -- a document that embodies the same ethical and moral principles and the same hope for a future of peace that Finns and so many other European immigrants gave America. The Final Act is a singular statement of hope. Its "three baskets" touch on almost every aspect of East-West relations, and taken together form a kind of map through the wilderness of mutual hostility to open fields of peace and to a common home of trust among all of our sovereign nations -- neutrals, non-aligned, and Alliance members alike. The Final Act sets new standards of conduct for our nations and provided the mechanisms by which to apply those standards.

MORE

Yes, the Final Act goes beyond arms control -- once the focus of international dialogue. It reflects a truth that I have so often noted -- nations do not distrust each other because they are armed; they are armed because they distrust each other. The Final Act grapples with the full range of our underlying differences and deals with East-West relations as an interrelated whole. It reflects the belief of all our countries that human rights are less likely to be abused when a nation's security is less in doubt; that economic relations can contribute to security, but depend on the trust and confidence that come from increasing ties between our peoples, increasing openness, and increasing freedom; and that there is no true international security without respect for human rights.

I can hardly improve on the words President Koivisto used in this hall two years ago when he recalled that, "security is more than the protection of borders and social structures. It is emphasized in the Final Act that individual persons who live in the participating states have to feel in their own lives security which is based on respect for fundamental human rights and basic freedoms."

And beyond establishing these integrated standards, the Final Act establishes a process for progress. It sets up a review procedure to measure performance against standards. And -- despite the doubts of the critics -- for the past 13 years, the signatory states have mustered the political will to keep on working and making progress.

Let me say that it adds -- it seems particularly appropriate to me that the Final Act is associated so closely with this city and this country. More than any other diplomatic document, the Final Act speaks to the yearning that Finland's longtime President, Urho Kekkonen, spoke of more than a quarter century ago when he said, in his words, "It's the fervent hope of the Finnish people that barriers be lowered all over Europe and that progress be made along the road of European unity." And he added that this was, as he put it, "for the good of Europe, and thus of humanity as a whole." Well, those were visionary words. That vision inspired and shaped the drafting of the Final Act and continues to guide us today.

Has the Final Act and what we call the Helsinki process worked or not? Many say it hasn't, but I believe it has.

In the security field, I would point to the most recent fruit of the process -- the Stockholm Document of confidence- and security-building measures in Europe. This agreement lays down the rules by which our 35 states notify each other of upcoming military activities in Europe; provides detailed information on these activities in advance; and lets the others know their plans for very large military activities one or two years in advance and agrees not to hold such maneuvers unless this notice is given; invites observers to their larger military activities; and permits on-site inspections to make sure the agreement is honored.

I am happy to note that since our representatives shook hands to seal this agreement a year and a half ago, all 35 states have, by and large, honored both the letter and the spirit of the Stockholm Document. The Western and neutral and non-aligned states have set a strong example in providing full information about their military activities. In April, Finland held its first military activity subject to the Stockholm notification requirements and voluntarily invited observers to it. The Soviet Union and its allies also have a generally good record of implementation, though less forthcoming than the West. Ten on-site inspections have been conducted so far, and more and more states are exercising their right to make such inspections. I can't help but believe that making inspections a matter of routine business will improve openness and enhance confidence.

Nor was Stockholm the end of the process. In Vienna, all 35 signatory states are considering how to strengthen the confidence-

and security-building measures, in the context of a balanced outcome at the CSCE follow-up meeting that includes significant progress on human rights.

In the economic field, as in the security field, I believe there has been progress, but of a different kind. Issues and negotiations regarding security are not simple, but military technology makes arms and armies resemble each other enough so that common measures can be confidently applied. Economic relations, by contrast, are bedeviled by differences in our systems. Perhaps increases in nonstrategic trade can contribute to better relations between East and West, but it's difficult to relate the state-run economies of the East to the essentially free-market economies of the West. Perhaps some of the changes underway in the state-run economies will equip them better to deal with our businessmen and open new arenas for cooperation. But our work on these issues over the years has already made us understand that differences in systems are serious obstacles to expansion of economic ties, and since understanding of unpleasant realities is part of wisdom, that, too, is progress.

The changes taking place in the Eastern countries of the continent go beyond changes in their economic systems and greater openness in their military activities -- changes have also begun to occur in the field of human rights, as was called for in the Final Act. The rest of us would like to see the changes that are being announced actually registered in the law and practice of our Eastern partners and in the documents under negotiation in the Vienna follow-up to the Helsinki Conference.

Much has been said about the human rights and humanitarian provisions in the Final Act and the failure of the Eastern bloc to honor them. Yet, for all the bleak winds that have swept the plains of justice since that signing day in 1975, the Accords have taken root in the conscience of humanity and grown in moral and, increasingly, in diplomatic authority. I believe that this is no accident. It reflects an increasing realization that the agenda of East-West relations must be comprehensive -- that security and human rights must be advanced together, or cannot truly be secured at all. But it also shows that the provisions in the Final Act reflect standards that are truly universal in their scope. The Accords embody a fundamental truth, a truth that gathers strength with each passing season, and that will not be denied -- the truth that, like the first Finnish settlers in America, all our ancient peoples find themselves today in a new world and that, as those early settlers discovered, the greatest creative and moral force in this new world, the greatest hope for survival and success, for peace and happiness, is human freedom.

Yes, freedom -- the right to speak, to print, the right to worship, to travel, to assemble -- the belief -- the right to be different, the right, as the American philosopher, Henry David Thoreau, wrote, "to step to the music of a different drummer." This is freedom as most Europeans and Americans understand it, and freedom as it is embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and, yes, in the Helsinki Accords. And far more than the locomotive or the automobile, the airplane or the rocket, more than radio, television or the computer -- this concept of liberty is the most distinct, peculiar, and powerful invention of the civilization we all share.

Indeed, without this freedom there would have been no mechanical inventions, for inventions are eccentricities. The men and women who create them are visionaries, just like artists and writers. They see what others fail to see and trust their insights when others don't. The same freedom that permits literature and the arts to flourish, the same freedom that allows one to attend church, synagogue, or mosque without apprehension, that same freedom from oppression and supervision is the freedom that has given us, the peoples of Western Europe and North America, our dynamism, our

economic growth, and our inventiveness. Together with Japan and Australia, and many others, we have lived in this state of freedom, this House of Democracy, since the end of the Second World War. The House of Democracy is a house whose doors are open to all. Because of it, because of the liberty and popular rule we've shared, today we also share a prosperity more widely distributed and extensive, a political order more tolerant and humane than has ever before been known on Earth.

To see not simply the immediate but the historic importance of this, we should remember how far many of our nations have traveled -- and how desolate the future of freedom and democracy once seemed.

For much of this century, the totalitarian temptation, in one form or another, has beckoned to mankind, also promising freedom -- but of a different kind than the one we celebrate today. This concept of liberty is as the Czechoslovak writer, Milan Kundera, has put it, "the age-old dream of a world where everybody would live in harmony, united by a single common will and faith, without secrets from one another" -- the freedom of imposed perfection.

Fifty, forty, even as recently as thirty years ago, the contest between this utopian concept of freedom on one hand and the democratic concept of freedom on the other seemed a close one. Promises of a perfect world lured many Western thinkers and millions of others besides. And many believed in the confident prediction of history's inevitable triumph.

Well, few do today. Just as democratic freedom has proven itself incredibly fertile -- fertile not merely in a material sense, but also in the abundance it has brought forth in the human spirit -- so, too, utopianism has proven brutal and barren.

Albert Camus once predicted that, in his words, "when revolution in the name of power and of history becomes a murderous and immoderate mechanism, a new rebellion is consecrated in the name of moderation of life." Isn't this exactly what we see happening across the mountains and plains of Europe and even beyond the Urals today? In Western Europe, support for utopian ideologies -- including support among intellectuals -- has all but collapsed, while in the nondemocratic countries, leaders grapple with the internal contradictions of their system and some ask how they can make that system better and more productive.

In a sense, the front line in the competition of ideas that has played in Europe and America for more than 70 years has shifted East. Once it was the democracies that doubted their own view of freedom and wondered whether utopian systems might not be better. Today, the doubt is on the other side.

In just two days, I will meet in Moscow with General Secretary Gorbachev. It will be our fourth set of face-to-face talks since 1985. The General Secretary and I have developed a broad agenda for U.S.-Soviet relations -- an agenda that is linked directly to the agenda of the Final Act.

Yes, as does the Final Act, we will discuss security issues. We will pursue progress in arms reduction negotiations across the board and continue our exchanges on regional issues.

Yes, we will also discuss economic issues, although, as in the Helsinki process, we have seen in recent years how much the differences in our systems inhibit expanded ties and how difficult it is to divorce economic relations from human rights and other elements of that relationship.

And, yes, as our countries did at Helsinki, we will take up other bilateral areas, as well -- including scientific, cultural, and people-to-people exchanges, where we've been hard at work

identifying new ways to cooperate. In this area, in particular, I believe we'll see some good results before the week is over.

And like the Final Act, our agenda now includes human rights as an integral component. We have developed our dialogue and put in place new mechanisms for discussion. The General Secretary has spoken often and forthrightly on the problems confronting the Soviet Union. In his campaign to address these shortcomings, he talks of "glasnost" and "perestroika" -- openness and restructuring, words that to our ears have a particularly welcome sound. And since he began his campaign, things have happened that all of us applaud.

The list includes the release from labor camps or exile of people like Andrei Sakharov, Irina Ratushinskaya, Anatoly Koryagin, Josef Begun, and many other prisoners of conscience; the publication of books like Dr. Zhivago and Children of the Arbat; the distribution of movies like "Repentance," that are critical of aspects of the Soviet past and present; allowing higher levels of emigration; greater toleration of dissent; General Secretary Gorbachev's recent statements on religious toleration; the beginning of Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan.

All this is new and good. But at the same time, there is another list, defined not by us but by the standards of the Helsinki Final Act and the sovereign choice of all participants, including the Soviet Union, to subscribe to it. We need look no further through the Final Act to see where Soviet practice does not -- or does not yet -- measure up to Soviet commitment.

Thirteen years after the Final Act was signed, it's difficult to understand why cases of divided families and blocked marriages should remain on the East-West agenda; or why Soviet citizens who wish to exercise their right to emigrate should be subject to artificial quotas and arbitrary rulings. And what are we to think of the continued suppression of those who wish to practice their religious beliefs? Over three hundred men and women whom the world sees as political prisoners have been released. There remains no reason why the Soviet Union cannot release all people still in jail for expression of political or religious belief, or for organizing to monitor the Helsinki Act.

The Soviets talk about a "common European home," and define it largely in terms of geography. But what is it that cements the structure of clear purpose that all our nations pledged themselves to build by their signature of the Final Act? What is it but the belief in the inalienable rights and dignity of every single human being? What is it but a commitment to true pluralist democracy? What is it but a dedication to the universally understood democratic concept of liberty that evolved from the genius of European civilization? This body of values -- this is what marks, or should mark, the common European home.

Mr. Gorbachev has spoken of, in his words, "the artificiality and temporariness of the bloc-to-bloc confrontation and the archaic nature of the 'iron curtain.'" Well, I join him in this belief and welcome every sign that the Soviets and their allies are ready, not only to embrace, but to put into practice the values that unify, and, indeed, define contemporary Western European civilization and its grateful American offspring.

Some 30 years ago, another period of relative openness, the Italian socialist, Pietro Nenni, long a friend of the Soviet Union, warned that it was wrong to think that the relaxation could be permanent in, as he said, "the absence of any system of judicial guarantees." And he added that only democracy and liberty could prevent reversal of the progress underway.

There are a number of steps, which, if taken, would help ensure the deepening and institutionalization of promising reforms. First, the Soviet leaders could agree to tear down the Berlin Wall

and all barriers between Eastern and Western Europe. They could join us in making Berlin itself an all-European center of communications, meetings, and travel.

They could also give legal and practical protection to free expression and worship. Let me interject here that at one time Moscow was known as the City of the Forty Forties, because there were 1,600 belfries in the churches of the city. The world welcomes the return of some churches to worship after many years. But there are still relatively few functioning churches and almost no bells. Mr. Gorbachev recently said, as he put it, "Believers are Soviet people, workers, patriots, and they have the full right to express their conviction with dignity." Well, I applaud Mr. Gorbachev's statement. What a magnificent demonstration of goodwill it would be for the Soviet leadership for church bells to ring out again, not only in Moscow but throughout the Soviet Union.

But beyond these particular steps, there's a deeper question. How can the countries of the East not only grant but guarantee the protection of rights?

The thought and practice of centuries has pointed the way. As the French constitutional philosopher, Montesquieu, wrote more than 200 years ago, "There is no liberty if the judiciary power be not separated" from the other powers of government. And like the complete independence of the judiciary, popular control over those who make the laws provides a vital, practical guarantee of human rights. So does the secret ballot. So does the freedom of citizens to associate and act for political purposes or for free collective bargaining.

I know that for the Eastern countries such steps are difficult, and some may say it's unrealistic to call for them. Some said in 1975 that the standards set forth in the Final Act were unrealistic; that the comprehensive agenda it embodied was unrealistic. Some said, earlier in this decade, that calling for global elimination of an entire class of U.S. and Soviet intermediate-range nuclear missiles was unrealistic; that calling for 50-percent reductions in U.S. and Soviet strategic offensive arms was unrealistic; that the Soviets would never withdraw from Afghanistan. Well, is it realistic to pretend that rights are truly protected when there are no effective safeguards against arbitrary rule? Is it realistic, when the Soviet leadership itself is calling for glasnost and democratization, to say that judicial guarantees, or the independence of the judiciary, or popular control over those who draft the laws, or freedom to associate for political purposes are unrealistic? And finally, is it realistic to say that peace is truly secure when political systems are less than open?

We believe that realism is on our side when we say that peace and freedom can only be achieved together, but that they can indeed be achieved together if we're prepared to drive toward that goal. So did the leaders who met in this room to sign the Final Act. They were visionaries of the most practical kind. In shaping our policy toward the Soviet Union, in preparing for my meetings with the General Secretary, I have taken their vision -- a shared vision, subscribed to by East, West, and the proud neutral and nonaligned countries of this continent -- as my guide. I believe the standard that the framers of the Final Act set -- including the concept of liberty it embodies -- is a standard for all of us. We can do no less than uphold it and try to see it turn, as the Soviets say, into "life itself."

We in the West will remain firm in our values; strong and vigilant in defense of our interests; ready to negotiate honestly for results of mutual and universal benefit. One lesson we drew again from the events leading up to the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces Treaty was that, in the world as it is today, peace truly does depend on Western strength and resolve. It is a lesson we will continue to heed.

But we're also prepared to work with the Soviets and their allies whenever they're ready to work with us. By strength we do not mean diktat, that is, an imposed settlement; we mean confident negotiation. The road ahead may be long -- but not as long as our countries had before them 44 years ago when Finland's great President J.K. Paasikivi, told a nation that had shown the world uncommon courage in a harrowing time: "A path rises up from the slope from the floor of the valley. At times the ascent is gradual, at other times steeper. But all the time one comes closer and closer to free, open spaces, above which God's ever brighter sky can be seen. The way up will be difficult, but every step will take us closer to open vistas."

I believe that in Moscow, Mr. Gorbachev and I can take another step toward a brighter future and a safer world. And I believe that, for the sake of all our ancient peoples, this new world must be a place both of democratic freedom and of peace. It must be a world in which the spirit of the Helsinki Final Act guides all our countries like a great beacon of hope to all mankind for ages to come.

Thank you and God bless you. And bear with me now --
Onnea ja memestysta koko suomen kansalle. (Applause.) Thank you.
Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END

3:37 P.M. (L)

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary
(London, England)

For Immediate Release

June 3, 1988

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO THE ROYAL INSTITUTE OF
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

The Great Hall
Guildhall
London, England

June 3, 1988

12:10 P.M. (L)

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you all very much. My Lord Mayor, Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, my lords, aldermen, sheriffs, ladies and gentlemen, I wonder if you can imagine what it is for an American to stand in this place. Back in the States, we're terribly proud of anything more than a few hundred years old; some even see my election to the presidency as America's attempt to show our European cousins that we too have a regard for antiquity. (Laughter.)

Guildhall has been here since the 15th century and while it is comforting at my age to be near anything that much older than myself -- (laughter) -- the venerable age of this institution is hardly all that impresses. Who can come here and not think upon the moments these walls have seen -- the many times that people of this city and nation have gathered here in national crisis or national triumph. In the darkest hours of the last world war -- when the tense drama of Edward R. Murrow's opening -- "This is London" was enough to impress on millions of Americans the mettle of the British people -- how many times in those days did proceedings continue here, a testimony to the cause of civilization for which you stood. From the Marne to El Alamein, to Arnhem, to the Falklands, you have in this century so often remained steadfast for what is right -- and against what is wrong. You are a brave people and this land truly is, as your majestic, moving hymn proclaims, a "land of hope and glory." And it's why Nancy and I -- in the closing days of this historic trip -- are glad to be in England once again. After a long journey, we feel among friends, and with all our hearts we thank you for having us here.

Such feelings are, of course, especially appropriate to this occasion; I have come from Moscow to report to you, for truly the relationship between the United States and Great Britain has been critical to NATO's success and the cause of freedom.

This hardly means that we've always had a perfect understanding. When I first visited Mrs. Thatcher at the British Embassy in 1981, she mischevously reminded me that the huge portrait dominating the grand staircase was none other than that of George III -- though she did graciously concede that today most of her countrymen would agree with Jefferson that a little rebellion now and then is a good thing. (Laughter.)

So there has always been, as there should be among friends, an element of fun about our differences. But let me assure you, it is how much we have in common and the depth of our friendship that truly matters. I have often mentioned this in the States, but I have never had an opportunity to tell a British audience how during my first visit here 40 years ago I was, like most Americans, anxious to see some of the sights and those 400-year-old inns I had been told

MORE

abound in this country.

Well, a driver took me and a couple of other people to an old inn, a pub really -- and what in America we would call a "mom and pop place." This quite elderly lady was waiting on us, and finally, hearing us talk to one another, she said, "You're Americans, aren't you?" And we said we were. "Oh," she said, "there were a lot of your chaps stationed down the road during the war." And she added, "They used to come in here of an evening, and they'd have a songfest. They called me Mom, and they called the old man Pop." And then her mood changed and she said, "It was Christmas Eve. And, you know, we were all alone and feeling a bit down. And, suddenly, they burst through the door, and they had presents for me and Pop." And by this time she wasn't looking at us anymore. She was looking off into the distance, into memory, and there were tears in her eyes. And then she said, "Big strapping lads they was, from a place called Ioway." (Laughter.)

From a place called Ioway. And Oregon, California, Texas, New Jersey, Georgia. Here with other young men from Lancaster, Hampshire, Glasgow, and Dorset -- all of them caught up in the terrible paradoxes of that time -- that young men must wage war to end war, and die for freedom so that freedom itself might live.

And it is those same two causes for which they fought and died -- the cause of peace, the cause of freedom for all humanity -- that still brings us, British and American, together.

For these causes, the people of Great Britain, the United States, and other allied nations have, for 44 years, made enormous sacrifices to keep our alliance strong and our military ready. For them, we embarked in this decade on a new post-war strategy, a forward strategy of freedom, a strategy of public candor about the moral and fundamental differences between statism and democracy, but also a strategy of vigorous diplomatic engagement. A policy that rejects both the inevitability of war or the permanence of totalitarian rule, a policy based on realism that seeks not just treaties for treaties' sake, but the recognition and resolution of fundamental differences with our adversaries.

The pursuit of this policy has just now taken me to Moscow and, let me say, I believe this policy is bearing fruit. Quite possibly, we're beginning to take down the barriers of the post-war era, quite possibly, we are entering a new era in history, a time of lasting change in the Soviet Union. We will have to see. But if so, it's because of the steadfastness of the allies -- the democracies -- for more than 40 years, and especially in this decade.

The history of our time will undoubtedly include a footnote about how, during this decade and the last, the voices of retreat and hopelessness reached a crescendo in the West -- insisting the only way to peace was unilateral disarmament, proposing nuclear freezes, opposing deployment of counterbalancing weapons such as intermediate-range missiles or the more recent concept of strategic defense systems.

These same voices ridiculed the notion of going beyond arms control -- the hope of doing something more than merely establishing artificial limits within which arms build-ups could continue all but unabated. Arms reduction would never work, they said, and when the Soviets left the negotiating table in Geneva for 15 months, they proclaimed disaster.

And yet it was our double-zero option, much maligned when first proposed, that provided the basis for the INF Treaty, the first treaty ever that did not just control offensive weapons, but reduced them and, yes, actually eliminated an entire class of U.S. and Soviet nuclear missiles.

This treaty, last month's development in Afghanistan, the

changes we see in the Soviet Union -- these are momentous events. Not conclusive. But momentous.

And that's why, although history will duly note that we too heard voices of denial and doubt, it is those who spoke with hope and strength who will be best remembered. And here I want to say that through all the troubles of the last decade, one such firm, eloquent voice, a voice that proclaimed proudly the cause of the Western Alliance and human freedom, has been heard. A voice that never sacrificed its anticommunist credentials or its realistic appraisal of change in the Soviet Union, but because it came from the longest-serving leader in the Alliance, it did become one of the first to suggest that we could "do business" with Mr. Gorbachev.

So let me discharge my first official duty here today. Prime Minister, the achievements of the Moscow summit as well as the Geneva and Washington summits say much about your valor and strength and, by virtue of the office you hold, that of the British people. So let me say, simply: At this hour in history, Prime Minister, the entire world salutes you and your gallant people and gallant nation.

And while your leadership and the vision of the British people have been an inspiration, not just to my own people but to all of those who love freedom and yearn for peace, I know you join me in a deep sense of gratitude toward the leaders and peoples of all the democratic allies. Whether deploying crucial weapons of deterrence, standing fast in the Persian Gulf, combating terrorism and aggression by outlaw regimes, or helping freedom fighters around the globe, rarely in history has any alliance of free nations acted with such firmness and dispatch, and on so many fronts.

In a process reaching back as far as the founding of NATO and the Common Market, the House of Western Europe, together with the United States, Canada, Japan, and others -- this House of Democracy -- engaged in an active diplomacy while sparking a startling growth of democratic institutions and free markets all across the globe -- in short, an expansion of the frontiers of freedom and a lessening of the chances of war.

So it is within this context that I report now on events in Moscow. On Wednesday, at 08:20 Greenwich time, Mr. Gorbachev and I exchanged the instruments of ratification of the INF Treaty. So, too, we made tangible progress toward the START treaty on strategic weapons. Such a treaty, with all its implications, is, I believe, now within our grasp.

But part of the realism and candor we were determined to bring to negotiations with the Soviets meant refusing to put all the weight of these negotiations and our bilateral relationship on the single issue of arms control. As I never tire of saying, nations do not distrust each other because they are armed, they are armed because they distrust each other. So equally important items on the agenda dealt with critical issues, like regional conflicts, human rights, and bilateral exchanges.

With regard to regional conflicts, here, too, we are now in the third week of the pullout of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. The importance of this step should not be underestimated. Our third area of discussion was bilateral contacts between our peoples. An expanding program of student exchanges and the opening of cultural centers -- progress toward a broader understanding of each other.

And finally, on the issue of human rights -- granting people the right to speak, write, travel, and worship freely -- there are signs of greater individual freedom.

Now originally I was going to give you just an accounting on these items. But, you know, on my first day in Moscow, Mr. Gorbachev used a Russian saying: "Better to see something once than to hear about it a hundred times." So if I might go beyond our

four-part agenda today and offer just a moment or two of personal reflection on the country I saw for the first time.

In all aspects of Soviet life, the talk is of progress toward democratic reform. In the economy, in political institutions, in religious, social, and artistic life. It is called glasnost -- openness. It is perestroika -- restructuring. Mr. Gorbachev and I discussed his upcoming party conference where many of these reforms will be debated and, perhaps, adopted. Such things as official accountability, limitations on length of service in office, an independent judiciary, revisions of the criminal law, and lowering taxes on cooperatives. In short, giving individuals more freedom to run their own affairs, to control their own destinies.

To those of us familiar with the post-war era, all of this is cause for shaking the head in wonder. Imagine, the President of the United States and the General Secretary of the Soviet Union walking together in Red Square, talking about a growing personal friendship and meeting, together, average citizens, realizing how much our people have in common.

It was a special moment in a week of special moments. My personal impression of Mr. Gorbachev is that he is a serious man seeking serious reform. I pray that the hand of the Lord will be on the Soviet people -- the people whose faces Nancy and I saw everywhere we went. Believe me, there was one thing about those faces that we will never forget -- they were the faces of hope, the hope of a new era in human history, and, hopefully, an era of peace and freedom for all.

And yet, while the Moscow summit showed great promise and the response of the Soviet people was heartening, let me interject here a note of caution and, I hope, prudence. It has never been disputes between the free peoples and the peoples of the Soviet Union that have been at the heart of post-war tensions and conflicts. No, disputes among governments over the pursuit of statism and expansionism have been the central point in our difficulties.

Now that the allies are strong and expansionism is receding around the world and in the Soviet Union, there is hope. And we look to this trend to continue. We must do all we can to assist it. And this means openly acknowledging positive change, and crediting it.

But let us also remember the strategy that we have adopted is one that provides for setbacks along the way as well as progress. Let us embrace honest change when it occurs; but let us also be wary. Let us stay strong.

And let us be confident, too. Prime Minister, perhaps you remember that upon accepting your gracious invitation to address the members of the Parliament in 1982, I suggested then that the world could well be at a turning point when the two great threats to life in this century -- nuclear war and totalitarian rule -- might now be overcome. In an accounting of what might lie ahead for the Western Alliance, I suggested that the hard evidence of the totalitarian experiment was now in and that this evidence had led to an uprising of the intellect and will, one that reaffirmed the dignity of the individual in the face of the modern state.

I suggested, too, that in a way Marx was right when he said the political order would come into conflict with the economic order -- only he was wrong in predicting which part of the world this would occur in. For the crisis came not in the capitalist West but in the communist East. Noting the economic difficulties reaching the critical stage in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, I said that at other times in history the ruling elites had faced such situations and, when they encountered resolve and determination from free nations, decided to loosen their grip. It was then I suggested that the tides of history were running in the cause of liberty, but only

if we, as free men and women, joined together in a worldwide movement toward democracy, a crusade for freedom, a crusade that would be not so much a struggle of armed might -- not so much a test of bombs and rockets as a test of faith and will.

Well, that crusade for freedom, that crusade for peace is well underway. We have found the will. We have held fast to the faith. And, whatever happens, whatever triumphs or disappointments ahead, we must keep to this strategy of strength and candor -- this strategy of hope -- hope in the eventual triumph of freedom.

But as we move forward, let us not fail to note the lessons we've learned along the way in developing our strategy. We have learned the first objective of the adversaries of freedom is to make free nations question their own faith in freedom, to make us think that adhering to our principles and speaking out against human rights abuses or foreign aggression is somehow an act of belligerence. Well, over the long run, such inhibitions make free peoples silent and ultimately half-hearted about their cause. This is the first and most important defeat free nations can ever suffer. For when free peoples cease telling the truth about and to their adversaries, they cease telling the truth to themselves. In matters of state, unless the truth be spoken, it ceases to exist.

It is in this sense that the best indicator of how much we care about freedom is what we say about freedom; it is in this sense, that words truly are actions. And there is one added and quite extraordinary benefit to this sort of realism and public candor. This is also the best way to avoid war or conflict. Too often in the past, the adversaries of freedom forgot the reserves of strength and resolve among free peoples, too often they interpreted conciliatory words as weakness, and too often they miscalculated and underestimated the willingness of free men and women to resist to the end. Words of freedom remind them otherwise.

This is the lesson we've learned and the lesson of the last war and, yes, the lesson of Munich. But it is also the lesson taught us by Sir Winston, by London in the Blitz, by the enduring pride and faith of the British people.

Just a few years ago, Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth and I stood at the Normandy beaches to commemorate the selflessness that comes from such pride and faith. It is well we recall the lessons of our Alliance. And, I wonder if you might permit be to recall one other this morning.

Operation MARKET GARDEN, it was called, three months after OVERLORD and the rescue of Europe began. A plan to suddenly drop British and American airborne divisions on the Netherlands and open up a drive into the heart of Germany. A battalion of British paratroopers was given the great task of seizing the bridge deep in enemy territory at Arnhem. For a terrible 10 days they held out.

Some years ago, a reunion of those magnificent veterans -- British, Americans, and others of our allies -- was held in New York City. From the dispatch by The New York Times reporter Maurice Carroll, there was this paragraph: "'Look at him,' said Henri Knap, an Amsterdam newspaperman who headed a Dutch underground's intelligence operation in Arnhem. He gestured toward General John Frost, a bluff Briton who had committed the battalion that held the bridge. 'Look at him -- still with that black moustache. If you put him at the end of a bridge even today and said 'keep it,' he'd keep it.'"

The story mentioned the wife of Cornelius Ryan, the American writer who immortalized MARKET GARDEN in his book, "A Bridge Too Far," who told the reporter that just as Mr. Ryan was finishing his book -- writing the final paragraphs about General Frost's valiant stand at Arnhem and about how in his eyes his men would always be undefeated -- her husband burst into tears. That was quite

unlike him; and Mrs. Ryan, alarmed, rushed to him. The writer could only look up and say of General Frost: "Honestly, what that man went through."

A few days ago, seated there in Spaso House with Soviet dissidents, I had that same thought, and asked myself: What won't men suffer for freedom?

The dispatch about the Arnhem veteran concluded with this quote from General Frost about his visits to that bridge. "We've been going back ever since. Every year we have a -- what's the word -- reunion. Now, there's a word." He turned to his wife, 'Dear, what's the word for going to Arnhem?' 'Reunion,' she said. 'No,' he said, 'there's a special word.' She pondered, 'Pilgrimage,' she said. 'Yes, pilgrimage,'" General Frost said.

As those veterans of Arnhem view their time, so too we must view ours; ours is also a pilgrimage, a pilgrimage toward those things we honor and love: human dignity, the hope of freedom for all peoples and for all nations. And I've always cherished the belief that all of history is such a pilgrimage and that our Maker, while never denying us free will, does over time guide us with a wise and provident hand, giving direction to history and slowly bringing good from evil -- leading us ever so slowly but ever so relentlessly and lovingly to a moment when the will of man and God are as one again.

I cherish, too, the hope that what we have done together throughout this decade and in Moscow this week has helped bring mankind along the road of that pilgrimage. If this be so, prayerful recognition of what we are about as a civilization and a people has played its part. I mean, of course, the great civilized ideas that comprise so much of your heritage: the development of law embodied by your constitutional tradition, the idea of restraint on centralized power and individual rights as established in your Magna Carta, the idea of representative government as embodied by the mother of all parliaments.

But we go beyond even this. Your own Evelyn Waugh who reminded us that "civilization -- and by this I do not mean talking cinemas and tinned food nor even surgery and hygienic houses but the whole moral and artistic organization of Europe -- has not in itself the power of survival." It came into being, he said, through the Judeo-Christian tradition and "without it has no significance or power to command allegiance. It is no longer possible," he wrote, "to accept the benefits of civilization and at the same time deny the supernatural basis on which it rests."

And so, it is first things we must consider. And here it is a story, one last story, that can remind us best of what we're about.

It's a story that a few years ago came in the guise of that art form for which I have an understandable affection -- the cinema.

It's a story about the 1920 Olympics and two British athletes: Harold Abrahams, a young Jew, whose victory -- as his immigrant Arab-Italian coach put it -- was a triumph for all those who have come from distant lands and found freedom and refuge here in England and Eric Liddell, a young Scotsman, who would not sacrifice religious conviction for fame. In one unforgettable scene, Eric Liddell reads the words of Isaiah.

"He Giveth power to the faint, and to them that have no might, he increased their strength, but they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength. They shall mount up with wings as eagles. They shall run and not be weary."

Here then is our formula for completing our crusade for freedom. Here is the strength of our civilization and our belief in

the rights of humanity. Our faith is in a higher law. Yes, we believe in prayer and its power. And like the founding fathers of both our lands, we hold that humanity was meant, not to be dishonored by the all-powerful state, but to live in the image and likeness of Him who made us.

More than five decades ago, an American President told his generation that they had a rendezvous with destiny; at almost the same moment, a Prime Minister asked the British people for their finest hour. This rendezvous, this finest hour, is still upon us. Let us seek to do His will in all things, to stand for freedom, to speak for humanity.

"Come, my friends," as it was said of old by Tennyson, "it is not too late to seek a newer world." Thank you. (Applause.)

END

12:41 P.M. (L)