

Originally Processed With FOIA(s):

S

FOIA Number:

S

# FOIA MARKER

**This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the George Bush Presidential Library Staff.**

---

**Record Group/Collection:** George H.W. Bush Presidential Records  
**Collection/Office of Origin:** Speechwriting, White House Office of  
**Series:** Speech File Backup Files  
**Subseries:** Chron File, 1989-1993

---

**OA/ID Number:** 13771  
**Folder ID Number:** 13771-006

---

**Folder Title:**  
U.N. Address 9/23/91 [OA 8328] [6]

---

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
<b>G</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>

---

Colby Mann  
CEA  
Room 325  
x 3375

Decd avg annual real gdp growth  
1981-1989 3.1%

USSR 1.9  
EE 1.1  
China 9.0  
U.S. 0.4

1989 Real GNP (B terms)

USSR 2664  
EE 651  
China 427  
U.S. 130

Comment real gdp annual (real China)  
 $.69(1.9) + .17(1.1) + .03(0.4) + .11(9.0) = 2.5$

exchanging China  
 $.77(1.9) + .19(1.1) + 0.04(0.4) = 1.5$

Source: CIA, Handbook of Economic Statistics 1990  
 CPAS 90-10001 Sept. 1990  
 Table 7, 9.

Table 25. Emissions trading activity to 1985

Activity	Estimated number of internal transactions	Estimated number of external transactions	Estimated cost savings (millions)
Netting	5 000 to 12 000	none	\$500 to 12 000
Offsets	1 800	200	unknown
Bubbles			
Federally approved	40	2	\$300
State approved	89	0	\$135
Banking	small	small	small

Source: Hahn, R.W. (1989), "Economic Prescriptions for Environmental Problems", Journal of Economic Perspectives, vol.3, no.2.

atomic age. It is providing sound advice and guidance for the management of the many new atomic projects underway in its member states.

The Agency is making substantial contributions on an international basis in such fields as education and training and technical assistance. It is making great strides in spreading the knowledge of the many uses of the radioisotopes in the fields of medicine, agriculture and industry. In addition, the Agency has a paramount role in the development of the necessary health and safety standards.

This Agency is an organization that has no secrets; an organization devoted to the sharing of effort, research and information; one in which the major powers can lay aside political differences to work for the common good.

In broad outline, I can see the Agency fulfilling the basic purposes of its historic charter and thereby contributing to world peace. I can see it as a unique forum where technical skills and resources are pooled for the benefit of mankind.

The United States is gratified and encouraged at what has been done in three short years. My country will continue to support this organization and I wish for it continued progress and success.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

NOTE: The opening words "Mr. President" referred to Gueorgui Nadjakov, chairman of the Bulgarian delegation. The conference was held in Vienna, September 20-October 1, 1960.

### 302 ¶ Address Before the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations, New York City.

*September 22, 1960*

*Mr. President, Mr. Secretary General, members of the General Assembly, and guests:*

The people of the United States join me in saluting those countries which, at this session of the General Assembly, are represented here for the first time. With the admission of new members, mainly from the giant continent of Africa, almost 100 nations will be joined in a common effort to construct permanent peace, with justice, in a sorely troubled world.

The drive of self-determination and of rising human aspirations is creating a new world of independent nations in Africa, even as it is producing a new world of both ferment and of promise in all developing areas. An awakening humanity in these regions demands as never before that we make a renewed attack on poverty, illiteracy, and disease.

Side by side with these startling changes, technology is also in revolution. It has brought forth terrifying weapons of destruction, which for the future of civilization, must be brought under control through a workable system of disarmament. And it has also opened up a new world of outer space—a celestial world filled with both bewildering problems and dazzling promise.

This is, indeed, a moment for honest appraisal and historic decision.

We can strive to master these problems for narrow national advantage or we can begin at once to undertake a period of constructive action which will subordinate selfish interest to the general well-being of the international community.

The choice is truly a momentous one.

Today, I come before you because our human commonwealth is once again in a state of anxiety and turmoil. Urgent issues confront us.

## II.

The first proposition I place before you is that only through the United Nations Organization and its truly democratic processes can humanity make real and universal progress toward the goal of peace with justice. Therefore, I believe that to support the United Nations Organization and its properly constituted mechanisms and its selected officers is the road of greatest promise in peaceful progress. To attempt to hinder or stultify the United Nations or to deprecate its importance is to contribute to world unrest and, indeed, to incite the crises that from time to time so disturb all men. The United States stands squarely and unequivocally in support of the United Nations and those acting under its mandate in the interest of peace.

Nowhere is the challenge to the international community and to peace and orderly progress more evident than in Africa, rich in human and natural resources and bright with promise. Recent events there have brought into being what is, in effect, a vast continent of newly independent nations.

Outside interference with these newly emerging nations, all eager to

undertake the tasks of modernization, has created a serious challenge to the authority of the United Nations.

That authority has grown steadily during the 15 years since the United Nations pledged, in the words of its own Charter, "to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustments or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace."

And during those years, the United Nations successfully supported Iran's efforts to obtain the withdrawal of foreign military forces; played a significant role in preserving the independence of Greece, rallied world resistance to aggression against the Republic of Korea; helped to settle the Suez crisis; countered the threat to Lebanon's integrity; and most recently, has taken on an even more important task.

In response to the call of the Republic of the Congo, the United Nations under its outstanding Secretary General, has recently mounted a large-scale effort to provide that new Republic with help. That effort has been flagrantly attacked by a few nations which wish to prolong strife in the Congo for their own purposes. The criticism directed by these nations against the Secretary General, who has honorably and effectively fulfilled the mandate which he received from the United Nations, is nothing less than a direct attack upon the United Nations itself. In my opinion, he, the Secretary General, has earned the support and gratitude of every peace loving nation.

The people of the Congo are entitled to build up their country in peace and freedom. Intervention by other nations in their internal affairs would deny them that right and create a focus of conflict in the heart of Africa.

The issue thus posed in the Congo could well arise elsewhere in Africa.

The resolution of this issue will determine whether the United Nations is able to protect not only the new nations of Africa, but also other countries against outside pressures.

It is the smaller nations that have the greatest stake in the effective functioning of the United Nations.

If the United Nations system is successfully subverted in Africa, the world will be on its way back to the traditional exercise of power politics, in which small countries will be used as pawns by aggressive major powers. Any nation, seduced by glittering promises into becoming a catspaw for an imperialistic power, thereby undermines the United Na-

tions and places in jeopardy the independence of itself and all others.

It is imperative that the international community protect the newly emerging nations of Africa from outside pressures that threaten their independence and their sovereign rights.

To this end, I propose a program which contains five major elements:

*First:* A pledge by all countries represented at this Assembly to respect the African peoples' right to choose their own way of life and to determine for themselves the course they choose to follow. And this pledge would involve three specific commitments:

To refrain from intervening in these new nations' internal affairs—by subversion, force, propaganda, or any other means.

To refrain from generating disputes between the states of this area or from encouraging them to wasteful and dangerous competition in armaments.

And to refrain from any action to intensify or exploit present unsettled conditions in the Congo—by sending arms or forces into that troubled area, or by inciting its leaders and peoples to violence against each other.

These actions my country—and many others—are now avoiding. I hope this Assembly will call upon all its members to do likewise, and that each speaker who follows me to this platform will solemnly pledge his country to honor this call.

*Second:* The United Nations should be prepared to help the African countries maintain their security without wasteful and dangerous competition in armaments.

United Nations experts are being asked to train the Congo's security forces. If the Secretary General should find it useful to undertake increased activity in order to meet requests of this nature elsewhere, my country would be glad to join other Member States in making essential contributions to such United Nations activity.

More importantly I hope that the African states will use existing or establish new regional machinery in order to avert an arms race in this area. In so doing, they would help to spare their continent the ravages which the excesses of chauvinism have elsewhere inflicted in the past. If, through concerted effort, these nations can choke off competition in armaments, they can give the whole world a welcome lesson in international relations.

The speed and success of the United Nations in dispatching substantial forces to the Congo should give these states assurance that they can rely

others.  
the newly  
their inde-  
elements:  
to respect  
determine  
dige would  
ffairs—by  
his area or  
etition in  
t unsettled  
t troubled  
ach other.  
oiding. I  
, and that  
pledge his  
e African  
is compe-  
's security  
ertake in-  
-here, my  
; essential  
visting or  
ce in this  
e ravages  
past. If,  
in arma-  
-national  
bstantial  
can rely

on the United Nations to organize an effective response if their security is threatened. This should reduce any pressures on them to raise larger forces than are required to maintain internal security. Thus they would help to free their resources for more constructive purposes.

*Third:* We should all support the United Nations response to emergency needs in the Republic of the Congo which the Secretary General has shown such skill in organizing. I hope that states represented here will pledge substantial resources to this international program, and agree that it should be the preferred means of meeting the Congo's emergency needs. The United States supports the establishment of a United Nations fund for the Congo. We are prepared to join other countries by contributing substantially for immediate emergency needs to the \$100 million program that the Secretary General is proposing.

*Fourth:* The United Nations should help newly developing African countries to shape their long-term modernization programs. To this end:

The United Nations Special Fund and Expanded Technical Assistance Program should be increased so that in combination they can reach their annual \$100 million goal in 1961. The Special Fund's functions should be expanded so that it can assist countries in planning economic development.

The United Nations Operational and Executive Personnel program for making available trained administrators to newly developing countries should be expanded and placed on a permanent basis. The United States is prepared to join other countries in contributing increased funds for this program, and for the Special Fund, and for the United Nations Technical Assistance Program.

The World Bank and International Monetary Fund should be encouraged increasingly to provide counsel to the developing countries of Africa through missions and resident advisers. We should also look forward to appropriate and timely financial assistance from these two multilateral financial sources as the emerging countries qualify for their aid.

Of course, many forms of aid will be needed: both public and private, and on a bilateral and multilateral basis. For this assistance to be most effective it must be related to the basic problems and changing needs of the African countries themselves.

*Fifth:* As the final element of this program, I propose an all-out United Nations effort to help African countries launch such educational activities as they may wish to undertake.

It is not enough that loud speakers in the public square exhort people to freedom. It is also essential that the people should be furnished with the mental tools to preserve and develop their freedom.

The United States is ready to contribute to an expanded program of educational assistance to Africa by the family of United Nations organizations, carried out as the Secretary General may deem appropriate, and according to the ideas of the African nations themselves.

One of the first purposes of this assistance, after consultation and approval by the governments involved, might be to establish, staff and maintain—until these governments or private agencies could take over—Institutes for Health Education, for Vocational Training, for Public Administration and Statistics, and perhaps other purposes.

Each institute could be appropriately located and specifically dedicated to training the young men and women of that vast region, who are now called upon to assume the incredibly complex and important responsibilities inherent in an explosive emergence into nationhood.

If the African States should wish to send large numbers of their citizens for training abroad under this program, my country would be glad to set up a special commission to cooperate with the United Nations in arranging to accommodate many more of these students in our institutions of learning.

These then are the five ingredients of the Program I propose for Africa:  
Non-interference in the African countries' internal affairs;

Help in assuring their security without wasteful and dangerous competition in armaments;

Emergency aid to the Congo;

International assistance in shaping long-term African development programs;

United Nations aid for education.

### III.

Such a program could go far to assure the African countries the clear chance at the freedom, domestic tranquility and progress they deserve.

The changes which are occurring in Africa are also evident elsewhere. Indeed, Africa is but one part of the new world of change and progress which is emerging in all the developing areas.

We must carry forward and intensify our programs of assistance for the economic and social development in freedom of other areas, partic-

ularly in Latin America, Asia, and the Middle East.

Beyond this, we must never forget that there are hundreds of millions of people, particularly in the less developed parts of the world, suffering from hunger and malnutrition, even though a number of countries, my own included, are producing food in surplus. This paradox should not be allowed to continue.

The United States is already carrying out substantial programs to make its surpluses available to countries of greatest need. My country is also ready to join with other members of the United Nations in devising a workable scheme to provide food to member states through the United Nations system, relying on the advice and assistance of the Food and Agriculture Organization.

I hope this Assembly will seriously consider a specific program for carrying forward the promising Food for Peace Program.

IV.

In the developing areas, we must seek to promote peaceful change, as well as to assist economic and social progress. To do this—to assist peaceful change—the international community must be able to manifest its presence in emergencies through United Nations observers or forces.

I should like to see member countries take positive action on the suggestions in the Secretary General's report looking to the creation of a qualified staff within the Secretariat to assist him in meeting future needs for United Nations forces.

To regularize the United Nations emergency force potential, I proposed in 1958 creation of stand-by arrangements for United Nations forces. Some progress has been made since that time. Much remains to be done.

The Secretary General has now suggested that members should maintain a readiness to meet possible future requests from the United Nations for contributions to such forces. All countries represented here should respond to this need, by earmarking national contingents which could take part in United Nations forces in case of need.

The time to do it is now—at this Assembly.

I assure countries which now receive assistance from the United States that we favor use of that assistance to help them maintain such contingents in the state of readiness suggested by the Secretary General. To assist the Secretary General's efforts, the United States is prepared to earmark also substantial air and sea transport facilities on a stand-by basis,

to help move contingents requested by the United Nations in any future emergency.

Over the long run, further progress toward increasing the United Nations' ability to respond to future needs is surely possible. The prospects for such progress, however, will remain just that—prospects—unless we move now to exploit the immediate possibilities for practical action suggested by the Secretary General.

## v.

Another problem confronting us involves outer space.

The emergence of this new world poses a vital issue: will outer space be preserved for peaceful use and developed for the benefit of all mankind? Or will it become another focus for the arms race—and thus an area of dangerous and sterile competition?

The choice is urgent. And it is ours to make.

The nations of the world have recently united in declaring the continent of Antarctica “off limits” to military preparations. We could extend this principle to an even more important sphere. National vested interests have not yet been developed in space or in celestial bodies. Barriers to agreement are now lower than they will ever be again.

The opportunity may be fleeting. Before many years have passed, the point of no return may have passed.

Let us remind ourselves that we had a chance in 1946 to ensure that atomic energy be devoted exclusively to peaceful purposes. That chance was missed when the Soviet Union turned down the comprehensive plan submitted by the United States for placing atomic energy under international control.

We must not lose the chance we still have to control the future of outer space.

I propose that:

1. We agree that celestial bodies are not subject to national appropriation by any claims of sovereignty.
2. We agree that the nations of the world shall not engage in warlike activities on these bodies.
3. We agree, subject to appropriate verification, that no nation will put into orbit or station in outer space weapons of mass destruction. All launchings of space craft should be verified in advance by the United Nations.

4. We press forward with a program of international cooperation for constructive peaceful uses of outer space under the United Nations. Better weather forecasting, improved world-wide communications, and more effective exploration not only of outer space but of our own earth—these are but a few of the benefits of such cooperation.

Agreement on these proposals would enable future generations to find peaceful and scientific progress, not another fearful dimension to the arms race, as they explore the universe.

VI.

But armaments must also be controlled here on earth, if civilization is to be assured of survival. These efforts must extend both to conventional and non-conventional armaments.

My country has made specific proposals to this end during the past year. New United States proposals were put forward on June 27, with the hope that they could serve as the basis for negotiations to achieve general disarmament. The United States still supports these proposals.

The communist nations' walk-out at Geneva, when they learned that we were about to submit these proposals, brought negotiations to an abrupt halt. Their unexplained action does not, however, reduce the urgent need for arms control.

My country believes that negotiations can—and should—soon be resumed.

Our aim is to reach agreement on all the various measures that will bring general and complete disarmament. Any honest appraisal, however, must recognize that this is an immense task. It will take time.

We should not have to wait until we have agreed on all the detailed measures to reach this goal before we begin to move toward disarmament. Specific and promising steps to this end were suggested in our June 27 proposals.

If negotiations can be resumed, it may be possible to deal particularly with two pressing dangers—that of war by miscalculation and that of mounting nuclear weapons stockpiles.

The advent of missiles, with ever shorter reaction times, makes measures to curtail the danger of war by miscalculation increasingly necessary. States must be able quickly to assure each other that they are not preparing aggressive moves—particularly in international crises, when each side takes steps to improve its own defenses, which actions might be mis-

interpreted by the other. Such misinterpretation in the absence of machinery to verify that neither was preparing to attack the other, could lead to a war which no one had intended or wanted.

Today the danger of war by miscalculation could be reduced, in times of crisis, by the intervention, when requested by any nation seeking to prove its own peaceful intention, of an appropriate United Nations surveillance body. The question of methods can be left to the experts.

Thus the vital issue is not a matter of technical feasibility but the political willingness of individual countries to submit to inspection. The United States has taken the lead in this field.

Today, I solemnly declare, on behalf of the United States, that we are prepared to submit to any international inspection, provided only that it is effective and truly reciprocal. This step we will take willingly as an earnest of our determination to uphold the preamble of the United Nations Charter which says its purpose is "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind . . ."

The United States wants the Soviet Union and all the nations of the world to know enough about United States defense preparations to be assured that United States forces exist only for deterrence and defense—not for surprise attack. I hope the Soviet Union will similarly wish to assure the United States and other nations of the nonaggressive character of its security preparations.

There is a more basic point: in an age of rapidly developing technology, secrecy is not only an anachronism—it is downright dangerous. To seek to maintain a society in which a military move can be taken in complete secrecy, while professing a desire to reduce the risk of war through arms control, is a contradiction.

A second danger which ought to be dealt with in early negotiations is posed by the growth and prospective spread of nuclear weapons stockpiles.

To reverse this trend, I propose that the nations producing nuclear weapons immediately convene experts to design a system for terminating, under verification procedures, all production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes.

That termination would take effect as soon as the agreed inspection system has been installed and is operating effectively, while progress in other disarmament fields is also being sought.

The United States is prepared, in the event of a termination of pro-

duction, to join the USSR in transferring substantial quantities of fissionable materials to international stockpiles. The United Nations Disarmament Commission has already heard the proposal of Ambassador Lodge, to set aside not pounds, as was proposed by the United States in 1954, but tons of fissionable materials for peaceful purposes. Additional transfers would be made as progress in other aspects of disarmament is accomplished.

If the USSR will agree to a cessation of production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes, some production facilities could be closed without delay. The United States would be willing to match the USSR in shutting down major plants producing fissionable materials, one by one, under international inspection and verification.

The proposed working group of experts could also consider how to verify the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, which is part of the third stage of our proposed disarmament program of June 27. There is as yet no known means of demonstrably accomplishing this; we would hope that the experts could develop such a system.

United States officials are willing to meet immediately with representatives of other countries for a preliminary exchange of views on these proposals.

Some who have followed closely the many fruitless disarmament talks since the war tend to become cynical—to assume that the task is hopeless. This is not the position of the United States.

Men everywhere want to disarm. They want their wealth and labor to be spent not for war, but for food, for clothing, for shelter, for medicines, for schools.

Time and again, the American people have voiced this yearning—to join with men of good will everywhere in building a better world. We always stand ready to consider any feasible proposal to this end. And as I have said so many times, the United States is always ready to negotiate with any country which in integrity and sincerity shows itself ready to talk about any of these problems. We ask only this—that such a program not give military advantage to any nation and that it permit men to inspect the disarmament of other nations.

A disarmament program which was not inspected and guaranteed would increase, not reduce, the risk of war.

The international control of atomic energy and general and complete disarmament can no more be accomplished by rhetoric than can the

economic development of newly independent countries. Both of these immense tasks facing mankind call for serious, painstaking, costly, laborious and non-propaganda approaches.

## VII.

I have specifically avoided in this address mention of several immediate problems that are troubling the United States and other nations. My failure to do so does not mean in any sense that they are not of great concern both to the United States and to the entire international community.

For example, accumulating evidence of threatening encroachments to the freedom of the people of West Berlin continues to disturb us deeply.

Another instance, though, of special concern to the United States, the shooting down of an American aircraft last July first over international waters, the apparent killing of four of its crew members and the imprisonment of two others on trumped-up spy charges, is a shocking affront to the right of all nations to peaceful passage on and over the high seas. By its veto in the Security Council the Soviet Union prevented a full investigation of the facts of the case. But these facts still demand to be heard as a proper matter for the consideration of an impartial tribunal.

The particular problems I have just mentioned are not merely isolated instances of disagreements among a few nations. They are central to the issue of peace itself, and illustrative of the continuous and interdependent nature of our respective national concerns. They must be confronted with the earnestness and seriousness which their settlement demands.

## VIII.

The basic fact today of all change in the domain of international affairs is the need to forge the bonds and build the structure of a true world community.

The United Nations is available to mankind to help it create just such a community. It has accomplished what no nation singly, or any limited group of nations, could have accomplished. It has become the forum of all peoples, and the structure about which they can center their joint endeavors to create a better future for our world.

We must guard jealously against those who in alternating moods look upon the United Nations as an instrument for use or abuse. The United

Nations was not conceived as an Olympian organ to amplify the propaganda tunes of individual nations.

The generating force behind a successful United Nations must be the noble idea that a true international community can build a peace with justice if only people will work together patiently in an atmosphere of open trust.

In urging progress toward a world community, I cite the American concept of the destiny of a progressive society. Here in this land, in what was once a wilderness we have generated a society and a civilization drawn from many sources. Yet out of the mixture of many peoples and faiths we have developed unity in freedom—a unity designed to protect the rights of each individual while enhancing the freedom and well-being of all.

This concept of unity in freedom, drawn from the diversity of many racial strains and cultures, we would like to see made a reality for all mankind. This concept should apply within every nation as it does among nations. We believe that the right of every man to participate through his or her vote in self-government is as precious as the right of each nation here represented to vote its own convictions in this Assembly. I should like to see a universal plebiscite in which every individual in the world would be given the opportunity freely and secretly to answer this question: Do you want this right? Opposed to the idea of two hostile, embittered worlds in perpetual conflict, we envisage a single world community, as yet unrealized but advancing steadily toward fulfillment through our plans, our efforts, and our collective ideas.

Thus we see as our goal, not a super-state above nations, but a world community embracing them all, rooted in law and justice and enhancing the potentialities and common purposes of all peoples.

As we enter the decade of the 1960's, let us launch a renewed effort to strengthen this international community; to forge new bonds between its members in undertaking new ventures on behalf of all mankind.

As we take up this task, let us not delude ourselves that the absence of war alone is a sufficient basis for a peaceful world. I repeat, we must also build a world of justice under law, and we must overcome poverty, illiteracy, and disease.

We of the United States will join with you in making a mounting effort to build the structure of true peace—a peace in which all peoples may progress constantly to higher levels of human achievement. The means

are at hand. We have but to use them with a wisdom and energy worthy of our cause.

I commend this great task to your hearts, to your minds, and to your willing hands. Let us go forward together, leaving none behind.

Thank you, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:12 a.m. His opening words "Mr. President, Mr. Secretary General" referred to Frederick

H. Boland, Permanent Representative to the United Nations for Ireland, and Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld.

### 303 ¶ Remarks at a Luncheon for Latin American Delegates to the U.N. General Assembly, New York City. *September 22, 1960*

THIS IS the time, I think, to re-affirm some of our convictions and our beliefs that are important to all of us. I have, someone told me today, 2 days less than 4 months still to serve in my present office, and possibly this is the last time I shall have an opportunity to tell you, as representatives of your several governments, something of my affection for the people of Latin America with whom I have worked, and the affection of my government for these governments, all of which have served and worked so closely with us.

I tried to tell you this morning something of the importance that we of America attach to the functioning and indeed the existence of the United Nations, and the possibility it has for furthering the aspirations of men. But I want to tell you in somewhat more intimate fashion how deeply I believe in the Organization of American States, organized within the limits prescribed by the charter of the United Nations.

Gentlemen, our nations are bound together not merely by inescapable ties of geography. We are strong, and we are worthwhile only because we are bound together by things of the spirit. The dedication we have to imperishable values, of human dignity and liberty, and the sovereignty of our respective nations—these are the things that are worthwhile.

But because we do believe in these values and have these same dedications, we must devote ourselves as a unit to the production of that kind of atmosphere, that kind of situation in the world that will let us progress, with the help of the God in which we all believe, toward a better life, not merely for such people as sit around this table, but for the lowliest peon,

man Harris during the hearings on this legislation that the Board would take up its responsibilities to keep the system financially sound.

I also indicated to the Congress my hope that we might soon have some recommendations designed to remedy the financial situation of these systems. Accordingly I would like you to undertake immediately a review of the situation and to develop recommenda-

tions which I can consider for presentation to the Congress.

Sincerely,  
JOHN F. KENNEDY

[Honorable Howard W. Habermeyer, Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, 44 Rush Street, Chicago 11, Illinois]

NOTE: For the President's statement upon signing S. 2395, see Item 384.

In his letter the President referred to U.S. Representative Oren Harris from Arkansas, Chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

### 386 Statement by the President Upon Signing Bill Relating to the Office of Emergency Planning. *September 22, 1961*

I HAVE TODAY approved H.R. 8406, a bill "To Change the Name of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization to Office of Emergency Planning."

Effective August 1, I assigned to the Secretary of Defense major Federal responsibilities for civil defense. The remaining responsibilities can more accurately be described as emergency planning functions, for they deal with responsibilities for investigation, advice, coordination, and policy

formulation in connection with our preparedness effort.

These functions of the Office of Emergency Planning may be of critical importance to our very survival. The national security requires that there be soundly conceived and well-tested plans for every emergency.

NOTE: As enacted, H.R. 8406 is Public Law 87-296 (75 Stat. 630). See also Item 295.

The statement was released at Hyannis, Mass.

### 387 Address in New York City Before the General Assembly of the United Nations. *September 25, 1961*

*Mr. President, honored delegates, ladies and gentlemen:*

We meet in an hour of grief and challenge. Dag Hammarskjold is dead. But the United Nations lives. His tragedy is deep in our hearts, but the task for which he died is at the top of our agenda. A noble servant of peace is gone. But the quest for peace lies before us.

The problem is not the death of one man—the problem is the life of this organization. It will either grow to meet the

challenges of our age, or it will be gone with the wind, without influence, without force, without respect. Were we to let it die, to enfeeble its vigor, to cripple its powers, we would condemn our future.

For in the development of this organization rests the only true alternative to war—and war appeals no longer as a rational alternative. Unconditional war can no longer lead to unconditional victory. It can no longer serve to settle disputes. It can no longer concern the great powers

alone. For a nuclear disaster, spread by wind and water and fear, could well engulf the great and the small, the rich and the poor, the committed and the uncommitted alike. Mankind must put an end to war—or war will put an end to mankind.

So let us here resolve that Dag Hammarskjöld did not live, or die, in vain. Let us call a truce to terror. Let us invoke the blessings of peace. And, as we build an international capacity to keep peace, let us join in dismantling the national capacity to wage war.

## II.

This will require new strength and new roles for the United Nations. For disarmament without checks is but a shadow—and a community without law is but a shell. Already the United Nations has become both the measure and the vehicle of man's most generous impulses. Already it has provided—in the Middle East, in Asia, in Africa this year in the Congo—a means of holding man's violence within bounds.

But the great question which confronted this body in 1945 is still before us: whether man's cherished hopes for progress and peace are to be destroyed by terror and disruption, whether the "foul winds of war" can be tamed in time to free the cooling winds of reason, and whether the pledges of our Charter are to be fulfilled or defied—pledges to secure peace, progress, human rights and world law.

In this Hall, there are not three forces, but two. One is composed of those who are trying to build the kind of world described in Articles I and II of the Charter. The other, seeking a far different world, would undermine this organization in the process.

Today of all days our dedication to the Charter must be maintained. It must be

strengthened first of all by the selection of an outstanding civil servant to carry forward the responsibilities of the Secretary General—a man endowed with both the wisdom and the power to make meaningful the moral force of the world community. The late Secretary General nurtured and sharpened the United Nations' obligation to act. But he did not invent it. It was there in the Charter. It is still there in the Charter.

However difficult it may be to fill Mr. Hammarskjöld's place, it can better be filled by one man rather than by three. Even the three horses of the Troika did not have three drivers, all going in different directions. They had only one—and so must the United Nations executive. To install a triumvirate, or any panel, or any rotating authority, in the United Nations administrative offices would replace order with anarchy, action with paralysis, confidence with confusion.

The Secretary General, in a very real sense, is the servant of the General Assembly. Diminish his authority and you diminish the authority of the only body where all nations, regardless of power, are equal and sovereign. Until all the powerful are just, the weak will be secure only in the strength of this Assembly.

Effective and independent executive action is not the same question as balanced representation. In view of the enormous change in membership in this body since its founding, the American delegation will join in any effort for the prompt review and revision of the composition of United Nations bodies.

But to give this organization three drivers—to permit each great power to decide its own case, would entrench the Cold War in the headquarters of peace. Whatever advantages such a plan may hold out to my own country, as one of the great powers, we

reject it. For we far prefer world law, in the age of self-determination, to world war, in the age of mass extermination.

III.

Today, every inhabitant of this planet must contemplate the day when this planet may no longer be habitable. Every man, woman and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident or miscalculation or by madness. The weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us.

Men no longer debate whether armaments are a symptom or a cause of tension. The mere existence of modern weapons—ten million times more powerful than any that the world has ever seen, and only minutes away from any target on earth—is a source of horror, and discord and distrust. Men no longer maintain that disarmament must await the settlement of all disputes—for disarmament must be a part of any permanent settlement. And men may no longer pretend that the quest for disarmament is a sign of weakness—for in a spiraling arms race, a nation's security may well be shrinking even as its arms increase.

For 15 years this organization has sought the reduction and destruction of arms. Now that goal is no longer a dream—it is a practical matter of life or death. The risks inherent in disarmament pale in comparison to the risks inherent in an unlimited arms race.

It is in this spirit that the recent Belgrade Conference—recognizing that this is no longer a Soviet problem or an American problem, but a human problem—endorsed a program of “general, complete and strictly an internationally controlled disarmament.”

It is in this same spirit that we in the United States have labored this year, with a new urgency, and with a new, now statutory agency fully endorsed by the Congress, to find an approach to disarmament which would be so far-reaching yet realistic, so mutually balanced and beneficial, that it could be accepted by every nation. And it is in this spirit that we have presented with the agreement of the Soviet Union—under the label both nations now accept of “general and complete disarmament”—a new statement of newly-agreed principles for negotiation.

But we are well aware that all issues of principle are not settled, and that principles alone are not enough. It is therefore our intention to challenge the Soviet Union, not to an arms race, but to a peace race—to advance together step by step, stage by stage, until general and complete disarmament has been achieved. We invite them now to go beyond agreement in principle to reach agreement on actual plans.

The program to be presented to this assembly—for general and complete disarmament under effective international control—moves to bridge the gap between those who insist on a gradual approach and those who talk only of the final and total achievement. It would create machinery to keep the peace as it destroys the machinery of war. It would proceed through balanced and safeguarded stages designed to give no state a military advantage over another. It would place the final responsibility for verification and control where it belongs, not with the big powers alone, not with one's adversary or one's self, but in an international organization within the framework of the United Nations. It would assure that indispensable condition of disarmament—true inspection—and apply it in

stages proportionate to the stage of disarmament. It would cover delivery systems as well as weapons. It would ultimately halt their production as well as their testing, their transfer as well as their possession. It would achieve, under the eyes of an international disarmament organization, a steady reduction in force, both nuclear and conventional, until it has abolished all armies and all weapons except those needed for internal order and a new United Nations Peace Force. And it starts that process now, today, even as the talks begin.

In short, general and complete disarmament must no longer be a slogan, used to resist the first steps. It is no longer to be a goal without means of achieving it, without means of verifying its progress, without means of keeping the peace. It is now a realistic plan, and a test—a test of those only willing to talk and a test of those willing to act.

Such a plan would not bring a world free from conflict and greed—but it would bring a world free from the terrors of mass destruction. It would not usher in the era of the super state—but it would usher in an era in which no state could annihilate or be annihilated by another.

In 1945, this Nation proposed the Baruch Plan to internationalize the atom before other nations even possessed the bomb or demilitarized their troops. We proposed with our allies the Disarmament Plan of 1951 while still at war in Korea. And we make our proposals today, while building up our defenses over Berlin, not because we are inconsistent or insincere or intimidated, but because we know the rights of free men will prevail—because while we are compelled against our will to rearm, we look confidently beyond Berlin to the kind of disarmed world we all prefer.

I therefore propose, on the basis of this Plan, that disarmament negotiations resume promptly, and continue without interruption until an entire program for general and complete disarmament has not only been agreed but has been actually achieved.

#### IV.

The logical place to begin is a treaty assuring the end of nuclear tests of all kinds, in every environment, under workable controls. The United States and the United Kingdom have proposed such a treaty that is both reasonable, effective and ready for signature. We are still prepared to sign that treaty today.

We also proposed a mutual ban on atmospheric testing, without inspection or controls, in order to save the human race from the poison of radioactive fallout. We regret that that offer has not been accepted.

For 15 years we have sought to make the atom an instrument of peaceful growth rather than of war. But for 15 years our concessions have been matched by obstruction, our patience by intransigence. And the pleas of mankind for peace have met with disregard.

Finally, as the explosions of others beclouded the skies, my country was left with no alternative but to act in the interests of its own and the free world's security. We cannot endanger that security by refraining from testing while others improve their arsenals. Nor can we endanger it by another long, uninspected ban on testing. For three years we accepted those risks in our open society while seeking agreement on inspection. But this year, while we were negotiating in good faith in Geneva, others were secretly preparing new experiments in destruction.

Our tests are not polluting the atmosphere. Our deterrent weapons are guarded against accidental explosion or use. Our doctors and scientists stand ready to help any nation measure and meet the hazards to health which inevitably result from the tests in the atmosphere.

But to halt the spread of these terrible weapons, to halt the contamination of the air, to halt the spiralling nuclear arms race, we remain ready to seek new avenues of agreement, our new Disarmament Program thus includes the following proposals:

—First, signing the test-ban treaty by all nations. This can be done now. Test ban negotiations need not and should not await general disarmament.

—Second, stopping the production of fissionable materials for use in weapons, and preventing their transfer to any nation now lacking in nuclear weapons.

—Third, prohibiting the transfer of control over nuclear weapons to states that do not own them.

—Fourth, keeping nuclear weapons from seeding new battlegrounds in outer space.

—Fifth, gradually destroying existing nuclear weapons and converting their materials to peaceful uses; and

—Finally, halting the unlimited testing and production of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles, and gradually destroying them as well.

## v.

To destroy arms, however, is not enough. We must create even as we destroy—creating worldwide law and law enforcement as we outlaw worldwide war and weapons. In the world we seek, the United Nations Emergency Forces which have been hastily assembled, uncertainly supplied, and inadequately financed, will never be enough.

Therefore, the United States recommends

that all member nations earmark special peace-keeping units in their armed forces—to be on call of the United Nations, to be specially trained and quickly available, and with advance provision for financial and logistic support.

In addition, the American delegation will suggest a series of steps to improve the United Nations' machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes—for on-the-spot fact-finding, mediation and adjudication—for extending the rule of international law. For peace is not solely a matter of military or technical problems—it is primarily a problem of politics and people. And unless man can match his strides in weaponry and technology with equal strides in social and political development, our great strength, like that of the dinosaur, will become incapable of proper control—and like the dinosaur vanish from the earth.

## vi.

As we extend the rule of law on earth, so must we also extend it to man's new domain—outer space.

All of us salute the brave cosmonauts of the Soviet Union. The new horizons of outer space must not be driven by the old bitter concepts of imperialism and sovereign claims. The cold reaches of the universe must not become the new arena of an even colder war.

To this end, we shall urge proposals extending the United Nations Charter to the limits of man's exploration in the universe, reserving outer space for peaceful use, prohibiting weapons of mass destruction in space or on celestial bodies, and opening the mysteries and benefits of space to every nation. We shall propose further cooperative efforts between all nations in weather prediction and eventually in weather control.

We shall propose, finally, a global system of communications satellites linking the whole world in telegraph and telephone and radio and television. The day need not be far away when such a system will televise the proceedings of this body to every corner of the world for the benefit of peace.

## VII.

But the mysteries of outer space must not divert our eyes or our energies from the harsh realities that face our fellow men. Political sovereignty is but a mockery without the means of meeting poverty and illiteracy and disease. Self-determination is but a slogan if the future holds no hope.

That is why my Nation, which has freely shared its capital and its technology to help others help themselves, now proposes officially designating this decade of the 1960's as the United Nations Decade of Development. Under the framework of that Resolution, the United Nations' existing efforts in promoting economic growth can be expanded and coordinated. Regional surveys and training institutes can now pool the talents of many. New research, technical assistance and pilot projects can unlock the wealth of less developed lands and untapped waters. And development can become a cooperative and not a competitive enterprise—to enable all nations, however diverse in their systems and beliefs, to become in fact as well as in law free and equal nations.

## VIII.

My Country favors a world of free and equal states. We agree with those who say that colonialism is a key issue in this Assembly. But let the full facts of that issue be discussed in full.

On the one hand is the fact that, since the close of World War II, a worldwide declaration of independence has transformed nearly 1 billion people and 9 million square miles into 42 free and independent states. Less than 2 percent of the world's population now lives in "dependent" territories.

I do not ignore the remaining problems of traditional colonialism which still confront this body. Those problems will be solved, with patience, good will, and determination. Within the limits of our responsibility in such matters, my Country intends to be a participant and not merely an observer, in the peaceful, expeditious movement of nations from the status of colonies to the partnership of equals. That continuing tide of self-determination, which runs so strong, has our sympathy and our support.

But colonialism in its harshest forms is not only the exploitation of new nations by old, of dark skins by light, or the subjugation of the poor by the rich. My Nation was once a colony, and we know what colonialism means; the exploitation and subjugation of the weak by the powerful, of the many by the few, of the governed who have given no consent to be governed, whatever their continent, their class, or their color.

And that is why there is no ignoring the fact that the tide of self-determination has not reached the Communist empire where a population far larger than that officially termed "dependent" lives under governments installed by foreign troops instead of free institutions—under a system which knows only one party and one belief—which suppresses free debate, and free elections, and free newspapers, and free books and free trade unions—and which builds a wall to keep truth a stranger and its own citizens prisoners. Let us debate colonialism in full—and apply the principle of free choice

and the practice of free plebiscites in every corner of the globe.

ix.

Finally, as President of the United States, I consider it my duty to report to this Assembly on two threats to the peace which are not on your crowded agenda, but which causes us, and most of you, the deepest concern.

The first threat on which I wish to report is widely misunderstood: the smoldering coals of war in Southeast Asia. South Viet-Nam is already under attack—sometimes by a single assassin, sometimes by a band of guerrillas, recently by full battalions. The peaceful borders of Burma, Cambodia, and India have been repeatedly violated. And the peaceful people of Laos are in danger of losing the independence they gained not so long ago.

No one can call these "wars of liberation." For these are free countries living under their own governments. Nor are these aggressions any less real because men are knifed in their homes and not shot in the fields of battle.

The very simple question confronting the world community is whether measures can be devised to protect the small and the weak from such tactics. For if they are successful in Laos and South Viet-Nam, the gates will be opened wide.

The United States seeks for itself no base, no territory, no special position in this area of any kind. We support a truly neutral and independent Laos, its people free from outside interference, living at peace with themselves and with their neighbors, assured that their territory will not be used for attacks on others, and under a government comparable (as Mr. Khrushchev and I agreed at Vienna) to Cambodia and Burma.

624

But now the negotiations over Laos are reaching a crucial stage. The cease-fire is at best precarious. The rainy season is coming to an end. Laotian territory is being used to infiltrate South Viet-Nam. The world community must recognize—and all those who are involved—that this potent threat to Laotian peace and freedom is indivisible from all other threats to their own.

Secondly, I wish to report to you on the crisis over Germany and Berlin. This is not the time or the place for immoderate tones, but the world community is entitled to know the very simple issues as we see them. If there is a crisis it is because an existing peace is under threat, because an existing island of free people is under pressure, because solemn agreements are being treated with indifference. Established international rights are being threatened with unilateral usurpation. Peaceful circulation has been interrupted by barbed wire and concrete blocks.

One recalls the order of the Czar in Pushkin's "Boris Godunov": "Take steps at this very hour that our frontiers be fenced in by barriers. . . . That not a single soul pass o'er the border, that not a hare be able to run or a crow to fly."

It is absurd to allege that we are threatening a war merely to prevent the Soviet Union and East Germany from signing a so-called "treaty" of peace. The Western Allies are not concerned with any paper arrangement the Soviets may wish to make with a regime of their own creation, on territory occupied by their own troops and governed by their own agents. No such action can affect either our rights or our responsibilities.

If there is a dangerous crisis in Berlin—and there is—it is because of threats against the vital interests and the deep commitments of the Western Powers, and the free-

dom of West Berlin. We cannot yield these interests. We cannot fail these commitments. We cannot surrender the freedom of these people for whom we are responsible. A "peace treaty" which carried with it the provisions which destroy the peace would be a fraud. A "free city" which was not genuinely free would suffocate freedom and would be an infamy.

For a city or a people to be truly free, they must have the secure right, without economic, political or police pressure, to make their own choice and to live their own lives. And as I have said before, if anyone doubts the extent to which our presence is desired by the people of West Berlin, we are ready to have that question submitted to a free vote in all Berlin and, if possible, among all the German people.

The elementary fact about this crisis is that it is unnecessary. The elementary tools for a peaceful settlement are to be found in the charter. Under its law, agreements are to be kept, unless changed by all those who made them. Established rights are to be respected. The political disposition of peoples should rest upon their own wishes, freely expressed in plebiscites or free elections. If there are legal problems, they can be solved by legal means. If there is a threat of force, it must be rejected. If there is desire for change, it must be a subject for negotiation and if there is negotiation, it must be rooted in mutual respect and concern for the rights of others.

The Western Powers have calmly resolved to defend, by whatever means are forced upon them, their obligations and their access to the free citizens of West Berlin and the self-determination of those citizens. This generation learned from bitter experience that either brandishing or yielding to threats can only lead to war. But firmness and reason can lead to the kind of peaceful

solution in which my country profoundly believes.

We are committed to no rigid formula. We see no perfect solution. We recognize that troops and tanks can, for a time, keep a nation divided against its will, however unwise that policy may seem to us. But we believe a peaceful agreement is possible which protects the freedom of West Berlin and allied presence and access, while recognizing the historic and legitimate interests of others in assuring European security.

The possibilities of negotiation are now being explored; it is too early to report what the prospects may be. For our part, we would be glad to report at the appropriate time that a solution has been found. For there is no need for a crisis over Berlin, threatening the peace—and if those who created this crisis desire peace, there will be peace and freedom in Berlin.

x.

The events and decisions of the next ten months may well decide the fate of man for the next ten thousand years. There will be no avoiding those events. There will be no appeal from these decisions. And we in this hall shall be remembered either as part of the generation that turned this planet into a flaming funeral pyre or the generation that met its vow "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war." *(UN charter)*

In the endeavor to meet that vow, I pledge you every effort this Nation possesses. I pledge you that we shall neither commit nor provoke aggression, that we shall neither flee nor invoke the threat of force, that we shall never negotiate out of fear, we shall never fear to negotiate.

Terror is not a new weapon. Throughout history it has been used by those who could not prevail, either by persuasion or

example. But inevitably they fail, either because men are not afraid to die for a life worth living, or because the terrorists themselves came to realize that free men cannot be frightened by threats, and that aggression would meet its own response. And it is in the light of that history that every nation today should know, be he friend or foe, that the United States has both the will and the weapons to join free men in standing up to their responsibilities.

But I come here today to look across this world of threats to a world of peace. In that search we cannot expect any final triumph—for new problems will always arise. We cannot expect that all nations will adopt like systems—for conformity is the jailor of freedom, and the enemy of growth. Nor can we expect to reach our goal by contrivance, by fiat or even by the wishes of all.

But however close we sometimes seem

to that dark and final abyss, let no man of peace and freedom despair. For he does not stand alone. If we all can persevere, if we can in every land and office look beyond our own shores and ambitions, then surely the age will dawn in which the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved.

Ladies and gentlemen of this Assembly, the decision is ours. Never have the nations of the world had so much to lose, or so much to gain. Together we shall save our planet, or together we shall perish in its flames. Save it we can—and save it we must—and then shall we earn the eternal thanks of mankind and, as peacemakers, the eternal blessing of God.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:30 a.m. His opening words "Mr. President" referred to Mongi Slim, President of the General Assembly and U.N. Representative from Tunisia.

### 388 Remarks in New York City Upon Signing Bill Establishing the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

*September 26, 1961*

WITH THE SIGNING of H.R. 9118, there is created the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. This act symbolizes the importance the United States places on arms control and disarmament in its foreign policy.

The creation for the first time by act of Congress of a special organization to deal with arms control and disarmament matters emphasizes the high priority that attaches to our efforts in this direction.

Our ultimate goal, as the act points out, is a world free from war and free from the dangers and burdens of armaments in which the use of force is subordinated to the rule of law and in which international adjust-

ments to a changing world are achieved peacefully. It is a complex and difficult task to reconcile through negotiation the many security interests of all nations to achieve disarmament, but the establishment of this agency will provide new and better tools for this effort.

I am pleased and heartened by the bipartisan support this bill enjoyed in the Congress. The leaders of both political parties gave encouragement and assistance. The new agency brings renewed hope for agreement and progress in the critical battle for the survival of mankind.

I want to express my thanks to the Members of the Congress, particularly who are

the House would  
 assistance to im-  
 cal and child care  
 incidence of mental

prejudice, supersti-  
 since the dawn of  
 ng about the men-  
 entered a new era  
 and enlightenment.  
 of an exciting and  
 is a tribute to the  
 thousands of dedi-  
 onal persons, and

the lives of millions  
 ized to a very large  
 ts of the delegates  
 Conference. The  
 ge from the attic of  
 on the school play-  
 d adult will move  
 institutional ward  
 kshop.  
 r evidence of Amer-  
 and humanitarian

#### JOHN F. KENNEDY

Special Assistant to the  
 tion, the White House  
 [ation]

ference on Mental Re-  
 ember 19 and 20 at  
 a.

upon signing the bills  
 1 447.

g the situation this  
 I will confer at the  
 ll with white civic  
 ve us information  
 h the city has taken  
 olish the confidence

of everyone that law and order in Birming-  
 ham will be maintained.

In addition, I have today appointed Gen.  
 Kenneth Royall and Col. Earl Blaik as  
 a committee to represent me personally in  
 helping the city to work as a unit in over-  
 coming the fears and suspicions which now  
 exist. They will go to Birmingham in the  
 next few days to start on this work of great  
 importance.

In the meantime the Federal Bureau of  
 Investigation, as well as the local authorities,  
 is making massive efforts to bring to justice  
 the persons responsible for the bombing on

Sunday and previous incidents.

I urge everyone to cooperate with them in  
 this effort and that all citizens of Birming-  
 ham and Alabama will give these processes  
 of law enforcement a full opportunity to  
 work. I urge all citizens in these next days  
 to conduct themselves with restraint and  
 responsibility.

NOTE: For the President's initial statement on the  
 bombing, see Item 360. For his statement following  
 a conference with Mayor Albert Boutwell and other  
 Birmingham civic leaders on September 23, see Item  
 372.

### 366 Address Before the 18th General Assembly of the United Nations. September 20, 1963

*Mr. President—as one who has taken some  
 interest in the election of Presidents, I want  
 to congratulate you on your election to this  
 high office—Mr. Secretary General, dele-  
 gates to the United Nations, ladies and  
 gentlemen:*

We meet again in the quest for peace.

Twenty-four months ago, when I last had  
 the honor of addressing this body, the  
 shadow of fear lay darkly across the world.  
 The freedom of West Berlin was in imme-  
 diate peril. Agreement on a neutral Laos  
 seemed remote. The mandate of the United  
 Nations in the Congo was under fire. The  
 financial outlook for this organization was  
 in doubt. Dag Hammarskjold was dead.  
 The doctrine of troika was being pressed in  
 his place, and atmospheric nuclear tests had  
 been resumed by the Soviet Union.

Those were anxious days for mankind—  
 and some men wondered aloud whether this  
 organization could survive. But the 16th  
 and 17th General Assemblies achieved not  
 only survival but progress. Rising to its  
 responsibility, the United Nations helped  
 reduce the tensions and helped to hold back  
 the darkness.

Today the clouds have lifted a little so that  
 new rays of hope can break through. The

pressures on West Berlin appear to be tem-  
 porarily eased. Political unity in the Congo  
 has been largely restored. A neutral coal-  
 ition in Laos, while still in difficulty, is at  
 least in being. The integrity of the United  
 Nations Secretariat has been reaffirmed. A  
 United Nations Decade of Development is  
 under way. And, for the first time in 17  
 years of effort, a specific step has been taken  
 to limit the nuclear arms race.

I refer, of course, to the treaty to ban  
 nuclear tests in the atmosphere, outer space,  
 and under water—concluded by the Soviet  
 Union, the United Kingdom, and the United  
 States—and already signed by nearly 100  
 countries. It has been hailed by people the  
 world over who are thankful to be free from  
 the fears of nuclear fallout, and I am con-  
 fident that on next Tuesday at 10:30 o'clock  
 in the morning it will receive the overwhelm-  
 ing endorsement of the Senate of the United  
 States.

The world has not escaped from the dark-  
 ness. The long shadows of conflict and  
 crisis envelop us still. But we meet today  
 in an atmosphere of rising hope, and at a  
 moment of comparative calm. My presence  
 here today is not a sign of crisis, but of  
 confidence. I am not here to report on a

new threat to the peace or new signs of war. I have come to salute the United Nations and to show the support of the American people for your daily deliberations.

For the value of this body's work is not dependent on the existence of emergencies—nor can the winning of peace consist only of dramatic victories. Peace is a daily, a weekly, a monthly process, gradually changing opinions, slowly eroding old barriers, quietly building new structures. And however undramatic the pursuit of peace, that pursuit must go on.

Today we may have reached a pause in the cold war—but that is not a lasting peace. A test ban treaty is a milestone—but it is not the millennium. We have not been released from our obligations—we have been given an opportunity. And if we fail to make the most of this moment and this momentum—if we convert our new-found hopes and understandings into new walls and weapons of hostility—if this pause in the cold war merely leads to its renewal and not to its end—then the indictment of posterity will rightly point its finger at us all. But if we can stretch this pause into a period of cooperation—if both sides can now gain new confidence and experience in concrete collaborations for peace—if we can now be as bold and farsighted in the control of deadly weapons as we have been in their creation—then surely this first small step can be the start of a long and fruitful journey.

The task of building the peace lies with the leaders of every nation, large and small. For the great powers have no monopoly on conflict or ambition. The cold war is not the only expression of tension in this world—and the nuclear race is not the only arms race. Even little wars are dangerous in a nuclear world. The long labor of peace is an undertaking for every nation—and in this effort none of us can remain unaligned. To this goal none can be uncommitted.

The reduction of global tension must not be an excuse for the narrow pursuit of self-interest. If the Soviet Union and the United States, with all of their global interests and

clashing commitments of ideology, and with nuclear weapons still aimed at each other today, can find areas of common interest and agreement, then surely other nations can do the same—nations caught in regional conflicts, in racial issues, or in the death throes of old colonialism. Chronic disputes which divert precious resources from the needs of the people or drain the energies of both sides serve the interests of no one—and the badge of responsibility in the modern world is a willingness to seek peaceful solutions.

It is never too early to try; and it's never too late to talk; and it's high time that many disputes on the agenda of this Assembly were taken off the debating schedule and placed on the negotiating table.

The fact remains that the United States, as a major nuclear power, does have a special responsibility in the world. It is, in fact, a threefold responsibility—a responsibility to our own citizens; a responsibility to the people of the whole world who are affected by our decisions; and to the next generation of humanity. We believe the Soviet Union also has these special responsibilities—and that those responsibilities require our two nations to concentrate less on our differences and more on the means of resolving them peacefully. For too long both of us have increased our military budgets, our nuclear stockpiles, and our capacity to destroy all life on this hemisphere—human, animal, vegetable—without any corresponding increase in our security.

Our conflicts, to be sure, are real. Our concepts of the world are different. No service is performed by failing to make clear our disagreements. A central difference is the belief of the American people in self-determination for all people.

We believe that the people of Germany and Berlin must be free to reunite their capital and their country.

We believe that the people of Cuba must be free to secure the fruits of the revolution that have been betrayed from within and exploited from without.

In short, we believe that all the world—in

Eastern Europe as well as Western, in Southern Africa as well as Northern, in old nations as well as new—that people must be free to choose their own future, without discrimination or dictation, without coercion or subversion.

These are the basic differences between the Soviet Union and the United States, and they cannot be concealed. So long as they exist, they set limits to agreement, and they forbid the relaxation of our vigilance. Our defense around the world will be maintained for the protection of freedom—and our determination to safeguard that freedom will measure up to any threat or challenge.

But I would say to the leaders of the Soviet Union, and to their people, that if either of our countries is to be fully secure, we need a much better weapon than the H-bomb—a weapon better than ballistic missiles or nuclear submarines—and that better weapon is peaceful cooperation.

We have, in recent years, agreed on a limited test ban treaty, on an emergency communications link between our capitals, on a statement of principles for disarmament, on an increase in cultural exchange, on cooperation in outer space, on the peaceful exploration of the Antarctic, and on tempering last year's crisis over Cuba.

I believe, therefore, that the Soviet Union and the United States, together with their allies, can achieve further agreements—agreements which spring from our mutual interest in avoiding mutual destruction.

There can be no doubt about the agenda of further steps. We must continue to seek agreements on measures which prevent war by accident or miscalculation. We must continue to seek agreement on safeguards against surprise attack, including observation posts at key points. We must continue to seek agreement on further measures to curb the nuclear arms race, by controlling the transfer of nuclear weapons, converting fissionable materials to peaceful purposes, and banning underground testing, with adequate inspection and enforcement. We must continue to seek agreement on a freer flow

of information and people from East to West and West to East.

We must continue to seek agreement, encouraged by yesterday's affirmative response to this proposal by the Soviet Foreign Minister, on an arrangement to keep weapons of mass destruction out of outer space. Let us get our negotiators back to the negotiating table to work out a practicable arrangement to this end.

In these and other ways, let us move up the steep and difficult path toward comprehensive disarmament, securing mutual confidence through mutual verification, and building the institutions of peace as we dismantle the engines of war. We must not let failure to agree on all points delay agreements where agreement is possible. And we must not put forward proposals for propaganda purposes.

Finally, in a field where the United States and the Soviet Union have a special capacity—in the field of space—there is room for new cooperation, for further joint efforts in the regulation and exploration of space. I include among these possibilities a joint expedition to the moon. Space offers no problems of sovereignty; by resolution of this Assembly, the members of the United Nations have foresworn any claim to territorial rights in outer space or on celestial bodies, and declared that international law and the United Nations Charter will apply. Why, therefore, should man's first flight to the moon be a matter of national competition? Why should the United States and the Soviet Union, in preparing for such expeditions, become involved in immense duplications of research, construction, and expenditure? Surely we should explore whether the scientists and astronauts of our two countries—indeed of all the world—cannot work together in the conquest of space, sending some day in this decade to the moon not the representatives of a single nation, but the representatives of all of our countries.

All these and other new steps toward peaceful cooperation may be possible. Most of them will require on our part full con-

sultation with our allies—for their interests are as much involved as our own, and we will not make an agreement at their expense. Most of them will require long and careful negotiation. And most of them will require a new approach to the cold war—a desire not to “bury” one’s adversary, but to compete in a host of peaceful arenas, in ideas, in production, and ultimately in service to all mankind.

The contest will continue—the contest between those who see a monolithic world and those who believe in diversity—but it should be a contest in leadership and responsibility instead of destruction, a contest in achievement instead of intimidation. Speaking for the United States of America, I welcome such a contest. For we believe that truth is stronger than error—and that freedom is more enduring than coercion. And in the contest for a better life, all the world can be a winner.

The effort to improve the conditions of man, however, is not a task for the few. It is the task of all nations—acting alone, acting in groups, acting in the United Nations, for plague and pestilence, and plunder and pollution, the hazards of nature, and the hunger of children are the foes of every nation. The earth, the sea, and the air are the concern of every nation. And science, technology, and education can be the ally of every nation.

Never before has man had such capacity to control his own environment, to end thirst and hunger, to conquer poverty and disease, to banish illiteracy and massive human misery. We have the power to make this the best generation of mankind in the history of the world—or to make it the last.

The United States since the close of the war has sent over \$100 billion worth of assistance to nations seeking economic viability. And 2 years ago this week we formed a Peace Corps to help interested nations meet the demand for trained manpower. Other industrialized nations whose economies were rebuilt not so long ago with some help from us are now in turn recognizing their respon-

sibility to the less developed nations.

The provision of development assistance by individual nations must go on. But the United Nations also must play a larger role in helping bring to all men the fruits of modern science and industry. A United Nations conference on this subject held earlier this year at Geneva opened new vistas for the developing countries. Next year a United Nations Conference on Trade will consider the needs of these nations for new markets. And more than four-fifths of the entire United Nations system can be found today mobilizing the weapons of science and technology for the United Nations’ Decade of Development.

But more can be done.

—A world center for health communications under the World Health Organization could warn of epidemics and the adverse effects of certain drugs as well as transmit the results of new experiments and new discoveries.

—Regional research centers could advance our common medical knowledge and train new scientists and doctors for new nations.

—A global system of satellites could provide communication and weather information for all corners of the earth.

—A worldwide program of conservation could protect the forest and wild game preserves now in danger of extinction for all time, improve the marine harvest of food from our oceans, and prevent the contamination of air and water by industrial as well as nuclear pollution.

—And, finally, a worldwide program of farm productivity and food distribution, similar to our country’s “Food for Peace” program, could now give every child the food he needs.

But man does not live by bread alone—and the members of this organization are committed by the Charter to promote and respect human rights. Those rights are not respected when a Buddhist priest is driven from his pagoda, when a synagogue is shut down, when a Protestant church cannot open a mission, when a Cardinal is forced into

hiding, or when a crowded church service is bombed. The United States of America is opposed to discrimination and persecution on grounds of race and religion anywhere in the world, including our own Nation. We are working to right the wrongs of our own country.

Through legislation and administrative action, through moral and legal commitment, this Government has launched a determined effort to rid our Nation of discrimination which has existed far too long—in education, in housing, in transportation, in employment, in the civil service, in recreation, and in places of public accommodation. And therefore, in this or any other forum, we do not hesitate to condemn racial or religious injustice, whether committed or permitted by friend or foe.

I know that some of you have experienced discrimination in this country. But I ask you to believe me when I tell you that this is not the wish of most Americans—that we share your regret and resentment—and that we intend to end such practices for all time to come, not only for our visitors, but for our own citizens as well.

I hope that not only our Nation but all other multiracial societies will meet these standards of fairness and justice. We are opposed to apartheid and all forms of human oppression. We do not advocate the rights of black Africans in order to drive out white Africans. Our concern is the right of all men to equal protection under the law—and since human rights are indivisible, this body cannot stand aside when those rights are abused and neglected by any member state.

New efforts are needed if this Assembly's Declaration of Human Rights, now 15 years old, is to have full meaning. And new means should be found for promoting the free expression and trade of ideas—through travel and communication, and through increased exchanges of people, and books, and broadcasts. For as the world renounces the competition of weapons, competition in ideas must flourish—and that competition must be as full and as fair as possible.

The United States delegation will be prepared to suggest to the United Nations initiatives in the pursuit of all the goals. For this is an organization for peace—and peace cannot come without work and without progress.

The peacekeeping record of the United Nations has been a proud one, though its tasks are always formidable. We are fortunate to have the skills of our distinguished Secretary General and the brave efforts of those who have been serving the cause of peace in the Congo, in the Middle East, in Korea and Kashmir, in West New Guinea and Malaysia. But what the United Nations has done in the past is less important than the tasks for the future. We cannot take its peacekeeping machinery for granted. That machinery must be soundly financed—which it cannot be if some members are allowed to prevent it from meeting its obligations by failing to meet their own. The United Nations must be supported by all those who exercise their franchise here. And its operations must be backed to the end.

Too often a project is undertaken in the excitement of a crisis and then it begins to lose its appeal as the problems drag on and the bills pile up. But we must have the steadfastness to see every enterprise through.

It is, for example, most important not to jeopardize the extraordinary United Nations gains in the Congo. The nation which sought this organization's help only 3 years ago has now asked the United Nations' presence to remain a little longer. I believe this Assembly should do what is necessary to preserve the gains already made and to protect the new nation in its struggle for progress. Let us complete what we have started. For "No man who puts his hand to the plow and looks back," as the Scriptures tell us, "No man who puts his hand to the plow and looks back is fit for the Kingdom of God."

I also hope that the recent initiative of several members in preparing standby peace forces for United Nations call will encourage similar commitments by others. This Na-

tion remains ready to provide logistic and other material support.

Policing, moreover, is not enough without provision for pacific settlement. We should increase the resort to special missions of fact-finding and conciliation, make greater use of the International Court of Justice, and accelerate the work of the International Law Commission.

The United Nations cannot survive as a static organization. Its obligations are increasing as well as its size. Its Charter must be changed as well as its customs. The authors of that Charter did not intend that it be frozen in perpetuity. The science of weapons and war has made us all, far more than 18 years ago in San Francisco, one world and one human race, with one common destiny. In such a world, absolute sovereignty no longer assures us of absolute security. The conventions of peace must pull abreast and then ahead of the inventions of war. The United Nations, building on its successes and learning from its failures, must be developed into a genuine world security system.

But peace does not rest in charters and covenants alone. It lies in the hearts and minds of all people. And if it is cast out there, then no act, no pact, no treaty, no organization can hope to preserve it without

the support and the wholehearted commitment of all people. So let us not rest all our hopes on parchment and on paper; let us strive to build peace, a desire for peace, a willingness to work for peace, in the hearts and minds of all of our people. I believe that we can. I believe the problems of human destiny are not beyond the reach of human beings.

Two years ago I told this body that the United States had proposed, and was willing to sign, a limited test ban treaty. Today that treaty has been signed. It will not put an end to war. It will not remove basic conflicts. It will not secure freedom for all. But it can be a lever, and Archimedes, in explaining the principles of the lever, was said to have declared to his friends: "Give me a place where I can stand—and I shall move the world."

My fellow inhabitants of this planet: Let us take our stand here in this Assembly of nations. And let us see if we, in our own time, can move the world to a just and lasting peace.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11 a.m. In his opening words he referred to Dr. Carlos Sosa Rodriguez of Venezuela, newly elected President of the General Assembly, and to U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations.

Echors  
"learned"  
hand"  
May 21, 1944

### 367 Remarks in New York City to Staff Members of the U.S. Delegation to the United Nations. *September 20, 1963*

NO ONE should have to listen to two speeches, or even give them in the same morning, so I will be very brief.

Mr. Bunche, Governor Stevenson: I want to express a very warm sense of appreciation which all of us feel to you for the work that you are doing. You wear two hats with distinction, being citizens of the United States and also members of an International Secretariat. The United Nations has been criticized, has been under attack, for a good many years, but as Mr. Frost has said about

not taking down a wall until you know why it is put up, if there wasn't a United Nations we would certainly have to invent one. Even in the comparatively brief time that I have been President of the United States, on four or five occasions I really think the United Nations has come between, if not war, the direct confrontation of major powers.

The United Nations has served as the buffer, but more than the buffer, as a means by which great and small powers can adjust their differences in a peaceful way. I hope

Address Before the 38th Session of the United Nations General Assembly in New York, New York  
September 26, 1983

Mr. Secretary-General, Mr. President, distinguished delegates, ladies and gentlemen of the world:

Thank you for granting me the honor of speaking today, on this first day of general debate in the 38th Session of the General Assembly. Once again I come before this body preoccupied with peace. Last year I stood in this chamber to address the Special Session on Disarmament. Well, I've come today to renew my nation's commitment to peace. And I have come to discuss how we can keep faith with the dreams that created this organization.

The United Nations was founded in the aftermath of World War II to protect future generations from the scourge of war, to promote political self-determination and global prosperity, and to strengthen the bonds of civility among nations. The founders sought to replace a world at war with a world of civilized order. They hoped that a world of relentless conflict would give way to a new era, one where freedom from violence prevailed.

Whatever challenges the world was bound to face, the founders intended this body to stand for certain values, even if they could not be enforced, and to condemn violence, even if it could not be stopped. This body was to speak with the voice of moral authority. That was to be its greatest power.

But the awful truth is that the use of violence for political gain has become more, not less, widespread in the last decade. Events of recent weeks have presented new, unwelcome evidence of brutal disregard for life and truth. They have offered unwanted testimony on how divided and dangerous our world is, how quick the recourse to violence. What has happened to the dreams of the U.N.'s founders? What has happened to the spirit which created the United Nations?

The answer is clear: Governments got in the way of the dreams of the people. Dreams became issues of East versus West.

*There are lots of quotes on this if you wanted to elaborate*

Hopes became political rhetoric. Progress became a search for power and domination. Somewhere the truth was lost that people don't make wars, governments do.

And today in Asia, Africa, Latin America, the Middle East, and the North Pacific, the weapons of war shatter the security of the peoples who live there, endanger the peace of neighbors, and create ever more arenas of confrontation between the great powers. During the past year alone, violent conflicts have occurred in the hills around Beirut, the deserts of Chad and the western Sahara, in the mountains of El Salvador, the streets of Suriname, the cities and countryside of Afghanistan, the borders of Kampuchea, and the battlefields of Iran and Iraq.

We cannot count on the instinct for survival to protect us against war. Despite all the wasted lives and hopes that war produces, it has remained a regular, if horribly costly, means by which nations have sought to settle their disputes or advance their goals. And the progress in weapons technology has far outstripped the progress toward peace. In modern times, a new, more terrifying element has entered into the calculations—nuclear weapons. A nuclear war cannot be won, and it must never be fought. I believe that if governments are determined to deter and prevent war, there will not be war.

Nothing is more in keeping with the spirit of the United Nations Charter than arms control. When I spoke before the Second Special Session on Disarmament, I affirmed the United States Government's commitment, and my personal commitment, to reduce nuclear arms and to negotiate in good faith toward that end. Today, I reaffirm those commitments.

The United States has already reduced the number of its nuclear weapons worldwide, and, while replacement of older weapons is unavoidable, we wish to negotiate arms reductions and to achieve significant, equitable, verifiable arms control agreements. And let me add, we must

General

rhetoric. Progress er and domination. as lost that people nents do.

ca, Latin America, North Pacific, the he security of the ndanger the peace ever more arenas the great powers. e, violent conflicts lls around Beirut, e western Sahara, dvador, the streets and countryside of s of Kampuchea, n and Iraq.

ie instinct for sur- st war. Despite all pes that war pro- regular, if horribly ations have sought or advance their weapons technol- e progress toward i new, more terri- d into the calcula-

A nuclear war must never be governments are prevent war, there

leeping with the ons Charter than poke before the Disarmament, I es Government's personal commit- ms and to negoti- hat end. Today, I s.

already reduced weapons world- ment of older e wish to negoti- o achieve signifi- e arms control add, we must

ensure that world security is not undermined by the further spread of nuclear weapons. Nuclear nonproliferation must not be the forgotten element of the world's arms control agenda.

At the time of my last visit here, I expressed hope that a whole class of weapons systems, the longer range INF—intermediate nuclear forces—could be banned from the face of the Earth. I believe that to relieve the deep concern of peoples in both Europe and Asia, the time was ripe, for the first time in history, to resolve a security threat exclusively through arms control. I still believe the elimination of these weapons—the zero option—is the best, fairest, most practical solution to the problem. Unfortunately, the Soviet Union declined to accept the total elimination of this class of weapons.

When I was here last, I hoped that the critical strategic arms reduction talks would focus, and urgently so, on those systems that carry the greatest risk of nuclear war—the fast-flying, accurate, intercontinental ballistic missiles which pose a first-strike potential. I also hoped the negotiations could reduce by one-half the number of strategic missiles on each side and reduce their warheads by one-third. Again, I was disappointed when the Soviets declined to consider such deep cuts, and refused as well to concentrate on these most dangerous, destabilizing weapons.

Well, despite the rebuffs, the United States has not abandoned and will not abandon the search for meaningful arms control agreements. Last June I proposed a new approach toward the START negotiations. We did not alter our objective of substantial reductions, but we recognized that there are a variety of ways to achieve this end. During the last round of Geneva talks, we presented a draft treaty which responded to a number of concerns raised by the Soviet Union. We will continue to build upon this initiative.

Similarly, in our negotiations on intermediate-range nuclear forces, when the Soviet leaders adamantly refused to consider the total elimination of these weapons, the United States made a new offer. We proposed, as an interim solution, some equal number on both sides between zero and

572. We recommended the lowest possible level. Once again, the Soviets refused an equitable solution and proposed instead what might be called a “half zero option”—zero for us and many hundreds of warheads for them. And that's where things stand today, but I still haven't given up hope that the Soviet Union will enter into serious negotiations.

We are determined to spare no effort to achieve a sound, equitable, and verifiable agreement. And for this reason, I have given new instructions to Ambassador Nitze in Geneva, telling him to put forward a package of steps designed to advance the negotiations as rapidly as possible. These initiatives build on the interim framework the United States advanced last March and address concerns that the Soviets have raised at the bargaining table in the past.

Specifically, first, the United States proposes a new initiative on global limits. If the Soviet Union agrees to reductions and limits on a global basis, the United States for its part will not offset the entire Soviet global missile deployment through U.S. deployments in Europe. We would, of course, retain the right to deploy missiles elsewhere.

Second, the United States is prepared to be more flexible on the content of the current talks. The United States will consider mutually acceptable ways to address the Soviet desire that an agreement should limit aircraft as well as missiles.

Third, the United States will address the mix of missiles that would result from reductions. In the context of reductions to equal levels, we are prepared to reduce the number of Pershing II ballistic missiles as well as ground-launched cruise missiles.

I have decided to put forward these important initiatives after full and extensive consultations with our allies, including personal correspondence I've had with the leaders of the NATO governments and Japan and frequent meetings of the NATO Special Consultative Group. I have also stayed in close touch with other concerned friends and allies. The door to an agreement is open. It is time for the Soviet Union to walk through it.

I want to make an unequivocal pledge to

those gathered today in this world arena. The United States seeks and will accept any equitable, verifiable agreement that stabilizes forces at lower levels than currently exist. We're ready to be flexible in our approach, indeed, willing to compromise. We cannot, however, especially in light of recent events, compromise on the necessity of effective verification.

Reactions to the Korean airliner tragedy are a timely reminder of just how different the Soviets' concept of truth and international cooperation is from that of the rest of the world. Evidence abounds that we cannot simply assume that agreements negotiated with the Soviet Union will be fulfilled. We negotiated the Helsinki Final Act, but the promised freedoms have not been provided, and those in the Soviet Union who sought to monitor their fulfillment languish in prison. We negotiated a biological weapons convention, but deadly yellow rain and other toxic agents fall on Hmong villages and Afghan encampments. We have negotiated arms agreements, but the high level of Soviet encoding hides the information needed for their verification. A newly discovered radar facility and a new ICBM raise serious concerns about Soviet compliance with agreements already negotiated.

Peace cannot be served by pseudo arms control. We need reliable, reciprocal reductions. I call upon the Soviet Union today to reduce the tensions it has heaped on the world in the past few weeks and to show a firm commitment to peace by coming to the bargaining table with a new understanding of its obligations. I urge it to match our flexibility. If the Soviets sit down at the bargaining table seeking genuine arms reductions, there will be arms reductions. The governments of the West and their people will not be diverted by misinformation and threats. The time has come for the Soviet Union to show proof that it wants arms control in reality, not just in rhetoric.

Meaningful arms control agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union would make our world less dangerous; so would a number of confidence-building steps we've already proposed to the Soviet Union.

Arms control requires a spirit beyond narrow national interests. This spirit is a

basic pillar on which the U.N. was founded. We seek a return to this spirit. A fundamental step would be a true nonalignment of the United Nations. This would signal a return to the true values of the charter, including the principle of universality. The members of the United Nations must be aligned on the side of justice rather than injustice, peace rather than aggression, human dignity rather than subjugation. Any other alignment is beneath the purpose of this great body and destructive of the harmony that it seeks. What harms the charter harms peace.

The founders of the U.N. expected that member nations would behave and vote as individuals, after they had weighed the merits of an issue—rather like a great, global town meeting. The emergence of blocs and the polarization of the U.N. undermine all that this organization initially valued.

We must remember that the nonaligned movement was founded to counter the development of blocs and to promote détente between them. Its founders spoke of the right of smaller countries not to become involved in others' disagreements. Since then, membership in the nonaligned movement has grown dramatically, but not all the new members have shared the founders' commitment of genuine nonalignment. Indeed, client governments of the Soviet Union, who have long since lost their independence, have flocked into the nonaligned movement, and, once inside, have worked against its true purpose. Pseudo nonalignment is no better than pseudo arms control.

The United States rejects as false and misleading the view of the world as divided between the empires of the East and West. We reject it on factual grounds. The United States does not head any bloc of subservient nations, nor do we desire to. What is called the West is a free alliance of governments, most of whom are democratic and all of whom greatly value their independence. What is called the East is an empire directed from the center which is Moscow.

The United States, today as in the past, is a champion of freedom and self-determination for all people. We welcome diversity; we support the right of all nations to define

e U.N. was founded. spirit. A fundamen-  
ne nonalignment of  
his would signal a  
ies of the charter,  
of universality. The  
l Nations must be  
justice rather than  
than aggression,  
in subjugation. Any  
with the purpose of  
ructive of the har-  
harms the charter

U.N. expected that  
ehave and vote as  
had weighed the  
er like a great,  
he emergence of  
n of the U.N. un-  
ganization initially

at the nonaligned  
o counter the de-  
o promote détente  
ers spoke of the  
s not to become  
reements. Since  
nonaligned move-  
cally, but not all  
hared the found-  
ne nonalignment.  
its of the Soviet  
e lost their inde-  
o the nonaligned  
de, have worked  
Pseudo nonalign-  
do arms control.  
as false and mis-  
world as divided  
o East and West.  
nds. The United  
oc of subservient  
o. What is called  
of governments,  
atic and all of  
independence.  
empire direct-  
Moscow.  
is in the past, is  
self-determina-  
come diversity;  
ations to define

and pursue their national goals. We respect their decisions and their sovereignty, asking only that they respect the decisions and sovereignty of others. Just look at the world over the last 30 years and then decide for yourself whether the United States or the Soviet Union has pursued an expansionist policy.

Today, the United States contributes to peace by supporting collective efforts by the international community. We give our unwavering support to the peacekeeping efforts of this body, as well as other multi-lateral peacekeeping efforts around the world. The U.N. has a proud history of promoting conciliation and helping keep the peace. Today, U.N. peacekeeping forces or observers are present in Cyprus and Kashmir, on the Golan Heights and in Lebanon.

In addition to our encouragement of international diplomacy, the United States recognizes its responsibilities to use its own influence for peace. From the days when Theodore Roosevelt mediated the Russo-Japanese War in 1905, we have a long and honorable tradition of mediating or damp-ing conflicts and promoting peaceful solutions. In Lebanon, we, along with France, Italy, and the United Kingdom, have worked for a cease-fire, for the withdrawal of all external forces, and for restoration of Lebanon's sovereignty and territorial integrity. In Chad we have joined others in supporting the recognized government in the face of external aggression. In Central America, as in southern Africa, we are seeking to discourage reliance upon force and to construct a framework for peaceful negotiations. We support a policy to disengage the major powers from Third World conflict.

The U.N. Charter gives an important role to regional organizations in the search for peace. The U.S. efforts in the cause of peace are only one expression of a spirit that also animates others in the world community. The Organization of American States was a pioneer in regional security efforts. In Central America, the members of the Contadora group are striving to lay a foundation for peaceful resolution of that region's problems. In East Asia, the Asian countries have built a framework for peaceful political and economic cooperation that has greatly strengthened the prospects for lasting peace

in their region. In Africa, organizations such as the Economic Community of West African States are being forged to provide practical structures in the struggle to realize Africa's potential.

From the beginning, our hope for the United Nations has been that it would reflect the international community at its best. The U.N. at its best can help us transcend fear and violence and can act as an enormous force for peace and prosperity. Working together, we can combat international lawlessness and promote human dignity. If the governments represented in this chamber want peace as genuinely as their peoples do, we shall find it. We can do so by reasserting the moral authority of the United Nations.

In recent weeks, the moral outrage of the world seems to have reawakened. Out of the billions of people who inhabit this planet, why, some might ask, should the death of several hundred shake the world so profoundly? Why should the death of a mother flying toward a reunion with her family or the death of a scholar heading toward new pursuits of knowledge matter so deeply? Why are nations who lost no citizens in the tragedy so angry?

The reason rests on our assumptions about civilized life and the search for peace. The confidence that allows a mother or a scholar to travel to Asia or Africa or Europe or anywhere else on this planet may be only a small victory in humanity's struggle for peace. Yet what is peace if not the sum of such small victories?

Each stride for peace and every small victory are important for the journey toward a larger and lasting peace. We have made progress. We've avoided another world war. We've seen an end to the traditional colonial era and the birth of a hundred newly sovereign nations. Even though development remains a formidable challenge, we've witnessed remarkable economic growth among the industrialized and the developing nations. The United Nations and its affiliates have made important contributions to the quality of life on this planet, such as directly saving countless lives through its refugee and emergency relief programs. These broad achievements, how-

ever, have been overshadowed by the problems that weigh so heavily upon us. The problems are old, but it is not too late to commit ourselves to a new beginning, a beginning fresh with the ideals of the U.N. Charter.

Today, at the beginning of this 38th Session, I solemnly pledge my nation to upholding the original ideals of the United Nations. Our goals are those that guide this very body. Our ends are the same as those of the U.N.'s founders, who sought to replace a world at war with one where the rule of law would prevail, where human rights were honored, where development would blossom, where conflict would give way to freedom from violence.

In 1956 President Dwight Eisenhower made an observation on weaponry and deterrence in a letter to a publisher. He wrote: "When we get to the point, as we one day will, that both sides know that in any outbreak of general hostilities, regardless of the element of surprise, destruction will be both reciprocal and complete, possibly we will have sense enough to meet at the conference table with the understanding that the era of armaments has ended and the human race must conform its actions to this truth or die." He went on to say, "... we have already come to a point where safety cannot be assumed by arms alone ... their usefulness becomes concentrated more and more in their characteristics as deterrents than in instruments with which to obtain victory. . . ."

Distinguished ladies and gentlemen, as we persevere in the search for a more secure world, we must do everything we can to let diplomacy triumph. Diplomacy, the most honorable of professions, can bring the most blessed of gifts, the gift of peace. If we succeed, the world will find an excitement and accomplishment in peace beyond that which could ever be imagined through violence and war.

I want to leave you today with a message I have often spoken about to the citizens of my own country, especially in times when I felt they were discouraged and unsure. I say it to you with as much hope and heart as I've said it to my own people. You have the right to dream great dreams. You have the right to seek a better world for your people. And all of us have the responsibility to work for that better world. And as caring, peaceful peoples, think what a powerful force for good we could be. Distinguished delegates, let us regain the dream the United Nations once dreamed.

Thank you.

*Note: The President spoke at 10:34 a.m. in the General Assembly Hall at the United Nations Headquarters Building. Upon arrival at the United Nations, the President met with Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar de la Guerra and then with Jorge Illueca, President of the 38th Session of the General Assembly, who introduced the President to the session.*

*Following his address, the President returned to the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel.*

## Remarks at a Reception Sponsored by the Women's Sports Foundation in New York, New York September 26, 1983

*The President.* I'm delighted to have this opportunity to be here with you today. I have just come from addressing the United Nations, and I have to tell you, with all due respect to them, I feel more at home here, because—[laughter]—

In addition to athletics in school, and when I was in school I started my career as

a radio sports announcer, and thought that my life was going to go on connected with sports. Now here I am, and maybe I'm going to get back to it.

*Ms. de Varona.* We hope so. We welcome you.

*The President.* Well, I'd be pleased to do it.

Address to the 39th Session of the United Nations General Assembly  
in New York, New York  
September 24, 1984

commitment to these week, starting already of state and govern-ly speaking tomorrow ably, and on Tuesday d International Mone- a number of other Washington.

omatic activity comple- plomatic efforts. The ontinue, through our ssador, Jeane Kirkpat- be firm in advancing ful in the advocacy of of life. We will at the ir in approaching the 'e expect nothing less pect nothing less of us. will continue to work to promote peace and , reconciliation among osperity, human rights. Our own commitment arter remain steadfast. ntages of having the r country is an advan- gives you a chance to he American people. n to your countries, I them our best wishes. ss in your upcoming gain, your joining us t thank you, and God

spoke at 7:09 p.m. at Hotel. The reception United States for heads sters, and heads of del- d Nations session. Fol- the President returned el.

Mr. President, Mr. Secretary-General, distinguished heads of state, Ministers, Representatives, and guests: First of all, I wish to congratulate President Lusaka on his election as President of the General Assembly. I wish you every success, Mr. President, in carrying out the responsibilities of this high international office.

It's an honor to be here, and I thank you for your gracious invitation. I would speak in support of the two great goals that led to the formation of this organization—the cause of peace and the cause of human dignity.

The responsibility of this assembly—the peaceful resolution of disputes between peoples and nations—can be discharged successfully only if we recognize the great common ground upon which we all stand: our fellowship as members of the human race, our oneness as inhabitants of this planet, our place as representatives of billions of our countrymen whose fondest hope remains the end to war and to the repression of the human spirit. These are the important central realities that bind us, that permit us to dream of a future without the antagonisms of the past. And just as shadows can be seen only where there is light, so, too, can we overcome what is wrong only if we remember how much is right. And we will resolve what divides us only if we remember how much more unites us.

This chamber has heard enough about the problems and dangers ahead. Today, let us dare to speak of a future that is bright and hopeful and can be ours only if we seek it. I believe that future is far nearer than most of us would dare to hope.

At the start of this decade, one scholar at the Hudson Institute noted that mankind also had undergone enormous changes for the better in the past two centuries—changes which aren't always readily noticed or written about.

"Up until 200 years ago, there were relatively few people in the world," he wrote.

"All human societies were poor. Disease and early death dominated most people's lives. People were ignorant, and largely at the mercy of the forces of nature."

"Now," he said, "we are somewhere near the middle of a process of economic development . . . At the end of that process, almost no one will live in a country as poor as the richest country of the past. There will be many more people . . . living long, healthy lives, with immense knowledge and more to learn than anybody has time for." They will be "able to cope with the forces of nature and almost indifferent to distance."

Well, we do live today, as the scholar suggested, in the middle of one of the most important and dramatic periods in human history—one in which all of us can serve as catalysts for an era of world peace and unimagined human freedom and dignity.

And today I would like to report to you, as distinguished and influential members of the world community, on what the United States has been attempting to do to help move the world closer to this era. On many fronts enormous progress has been made, and I think our efforts are complemented by the trend of history.

If we look closely enough, I believe we can see all the world moving toward a deeper appreciation of the value of human freedom in both its political and economic manifestations. This is partially motivated by a worldwide desire for economic growth and higher standards of living. And there's an increasing realization that economic freedom is a prelude to economic progress and growth and is intricately and inseparably linked to political freedom.

Everywhere, people and governments are beginning to recognize that the secret of a progressive new world is to take advantage of the creativity of the human spirit, to encourage innovation and individual enterprise, to reward hard work, and to reduce barriers to the free flow of trade and information.

Our opposition to economic restrictions and trade barriers is consistent with our view of economic freedom and human progress. We believe such barriers pose a particularly dangerous threat to the developing nations and their chance to share in world prosperity through expanded export markets. Tomorrow at the International Monetary Fund, I will address this question more fully, including America's desire for more open trading markets throughout the world.

This desire to cut down trade barriers and our open advocacy of freedom as the engine of human progress are two of the most important ways the United States and the American people hope to assist in bringing about a world where prosperity is commonplace, conflict an aberration, and human dignity and freedom a way of life.

Let me place these steps more in context by briefly outlining the major goals of American foreign policy and then exploring with you the practical ways we're attempting to further freedom and prevent war. By that I mean, first, how we have moved to strengthen ties with old allies and new friends; second, what we're doing to help avoid the regional conflicts that could contain the seeds of world conflagration; and third, the status of our efforts with the Soviet Union to reduce the level of arms.

Let me begin with a word about the objectives of American foreign policy, which have been consistent since the postwar era, and which fueled the formation of the United Nations and were incorporated into the U.N. Charter itself.

The U.N. Charter states two overriding goals: "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind," and "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small."

The founders of the United Nations understood full well the relationship between these two goals. And I want you to know that the Government of the United States will continue to view this concern for human rights as the moral center of our foreign policy. We can never look at any-

one's freedom as a bargaining chip in world politics. Our hope is for a time when all the people of the world can enjoy the blessings of personal liberty. But I would like also to emphasize that our concern for protecting human rights is part of our concern for protecting the peace.

The answer is for all nations to fulfill the obligations they freely assumed under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It states: "The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections." The Declaration also includes these rights: "to form and to join trade unions," "to own property alone as well as in association with others," "to leave any country including his own and return to his country," and to enjoy "freedom of opinion and expression." Perhaps the most graphic example of the relationship between human rights and peace is the right of peace groups to exist and to promote their views. In fact, the treatment of peace groups may be a litmus test of government's true desire for peace.

In addition to emphasizing this tie between the advocacy of human rights and the prevention of war, the United States has taken important steps, as I mentioned earlier, to prevent world conflict. The starting point and cornerstone of our foreign policy is our alliance and partnership with our fellow democracies. For 35 years, the North Atlantic alliance has guaranteed the peace in Europe. In both Europe and Asia, our alliances have been the vehicle for a great reconciliation among nations that had fought bitter wars in decades and centuries past. And here in the Western Hemisphere, north and south are being lifted on the tide of freedom and are joined in a common effort to foster peaceful economic development.

We're proud of our association with all those countries that share our commitment to freedom, human rights, the rule of law, and international peace. Indeed, the bulwark of security that the democratic alliance provides is essential and remains essential to the maintenance of world peace. Every alliance involves burdens and obligations, but these are far less than the risks

and sacrifices that will result if the peaceloving nations were divided and neglectful of their common security.

The people of the United States will remain faithful to their commitments. But the United States is also faithful to its alliances and friendships with scores of nations in the developed and developing worlds with differing political systems, cultures, and traditions. The development of ties between the United States and China, a significant global event of the last dozen years, shows our willingness to improve relations with countries ideologically very different from ours.

We're ready to be the friend of any country that is a friend to us and a friend of peace. And we respect genuine nonalignment. Our own nation was born in revolution. We helped promote the process of decolonization that brought about the independence of so many members of this body. And we're proud of that history.

We're proud, too, of our role in the formation of the United Nations and our support of this body over the years. And let me again emphasize our unwavering commitment to a central principle of the United Nations system—the principle of universality, both here and in the United Nations technical agencies around the world. If universality is ignored, if nations are expelled illegally, then the U.N. itself cannot be expected to succeed.

The United States welcomes diversity and peaceful competition. We do not fear the trends of history. We are not ideologically rigid. We do have principles, and we will stand by them, but we will also seek the friendship and good will of all, both old friends and new.

We've always sought to lend a hand to help others—from our relief efforts in Europe after World War I to the Marshall plan and massive foreign assistance programs after World War II. Since 1946 the United States has provided over \$115 billion in economic aid to developing countries, and today provides about one-third of the nearly \$90 billion in financial resources, public and private, that flows to the developing world. And the U.S. imports about one-third of the manufactured exports of the developing world.

But any economic progress as well as any movement in the direction of greater understanding between the nations of the world are, of course, endangered by the prospect of conflict at both the global and regional level. In a few minutes, I will turn to the menace of conflict on a worldwide scale and discuss the status of negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union. But permit me first to address the critical problem of regional conflicts, for history displays tragic evidence that it is these conflicts which can set off the sparks leading to worldwide conflagration.

In a glass display case across the hall from the Oval Office at the White House there is a gold medal, the Nobel Peace Prize won by Theodore Roosevelt for his contribution in mediating the Russo-Japanese War in 1905. It was the first such prize won by an American, and it's part of a tradition of which the American people are very proud—a tradition that is being continued today in many regions of the globe.

We're engaged, for example, in diplomacy to resolve conflicts in southern Africa, working with the frontline states and our partners in the contact group. Mozambique and South Africa have reached an historic accord on nonaggression and cooperation. South Africa and Angola have agreed on a disengagement of forces from Angola, and the groundwork has been laid for the independence of Namibia, with virtually all aspects of Security Council Resolution 435 agreed upon.

Let me add that the United States considers it a moral imperative that South Africa's racial policies evolve peacefully but decisively toward a system compatible with basic norms of justice, liberty, and human dignity. I'm pleased that American companies in South Africa, by providing equal employment opportunities, are contributing to the economic advancement of the black population. But clearly, much more must be done.

In Central America, the United States has lent support to a diplomatic process to restore regional peace and security. We have committed substantial resources to promote economic development and social progress.

The growing success of democracy in El

Salvador is the best proof that the key to peace lies in a political solution. Free elections brought into office a government dedicated to democracy, reform, economic progress, and regional peace. Regrettably, there are forces in the region eager to thwart democratic change, but these forces are now on the defensive. The tide is turning in the direction of freedom. We call upon Nicaragua, in particular, to abandon its policies of subversion and militarism and to carry out the promises it made to the Organization of American States to establish democracy at home.

The Middle East has known more than its share of tragedy and conflict for decades, and the United States has been actively involved in peace diplomacy for just as long. We consider ourselves a full partner in the quest for peace. The record of the 11 years since the October war shows that much can be achieved through negotiations; it also shows that the road is long and hard.

Two years ago, I proposed a fresh start toward a negotiated solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict. My initiative of September 1st, 1982, contains a set of positions that can serve as a basis for a just and lasting peace. That initiative remains a realistic and workable approach, and I am committed to it as firmly as on the day I announced it. And the foundation stone of this effort remains Security Council Resolution 242, which in turn was incorporated in all its parts in the Camp David accords.

The tragedy of Lebanon has not ended. Only last week, a despicable act of barbarism by some who are unfit to associate with humankind reminded us once again that Lebanon continues to suffer. In 1983 we helped Israel and Lebanon reach an agreement that, if implemented, could have led to the full withdrawal of Israeli forces in the context of the withdrawal of all foreign forces. This agreement was blocked, and the long agony of the Lebanese continues. Thousands of people are still kept from their homes by continued violence and are refugees in their own country. The once flourishing economy of Lebanon is near collapse. All of Lebanon's friends should work together to help end this nightmare.

In the Gulf, the United States has supported a series of Security Council resolu-

tions that call for an end to the war between Iran and Iraq that has meant so much death and destruction and put the world's economic well-being at risk. Our hope is that hostilities will soon end, leaving each side with its political and territorial integrity intact, so that both may devote their energies to addressing the needs of their people and a return to relationships with other states.

The lesson of experience is that negotiations work. The peace treaty between Israel and Egypt brought about the peaceful return of the Sinai, clearly showing that the negotiating process brings results when the parties commit themselves to it. The time is bound to come when the same wisdom and courage will be applied with success to reach peace between Israel and all of its Arab neighbors in a manner that assures security for all in the region, the recognition of Israel, and a solution to the Palestinian problem.

In every part of the world, the United States is similarly engaged in peace diplomacy as an active player or a strong supporter.

In Southeast Asia, we have backed the efforts of ASEAN to mobilize international support for a peaceful resolution of the Cambodian problem, which must include the withdrawal of Vietnamese forces and the election of a representative government. ASEAN's success in promoting economic and political development has made a major contribution to the peace and stability of the region.

In Afghanistan, the dedicated efforts of the Secretary-General and his representatives to find a diplomatic settlement have our strong support. I assure you that the United States will continue to do everything possible to find a negotiated outcome which provides the Afghan people with the right to determine their own destiny, allows the Afghan refugees to return to their own country in dignity, and protects the legitimate security interests of all neighboring countries.

On the divided and tense Korean Peninsula, we have strongly backed the confidence-building measures proposed by the Republic of Korea and by the U.N. Com-

mand at Panmunjom. These are an important first step toward peaceful reunification in the long term.

We take heart from progress by others in lessening the tensions, notably the efforts by the Federal Republic to reduce barriers between the two German States.

And the United States strongly supports the Secretary-General's efforts to assist the Cypriot parties in achieving a peaceful and reunited Cyprus.

The United States has been and will always be a friend of peaceful solutions. This is no less true with respect to my country's relations with the Soviet Union.

When I appeared before you last year, I noted that we cannot count on the instinct for survival alone to protect us against war. Deterrence is necessary but not sufficient. America has repaired its strength. We have invigorated our alliances and friendships. We are ready for constructive negotiations with the Soviet Union.

We recognize that there is no sane alternative to negotiations on arms control and other issues between our two nations which have the capacity to destroy civilization as we know it. I believe this is a view shared by virtually every country in the world and by the Soviet Union itself. And I want to speak to you today on what the United States and the Soviet Union can accomplish together in the coming years and the concrete steps that we need to take.

You know, as I stand here and look out from this podium, there in front of me I can see the seat of the Representative from the Soviet Union. And not far from that seat, just over to the side, is the seat of the Representative from the United States. In this historic assembly hall, it's clear there's not a great distance between us. Outside this room, while there will still be clear differences, there's every reason why we should do all that is possible to shorten that distance. And that's why we're here. Isn't that what this organization is all about?

Last January 16th, I set out three objectives for U.S.-Soviet relations that can provide an agenda for our work over the months ahead.

First, I said, we need to find ways to reduce—and eventually to eliminate—the threat and use of force in solving interna-

tional disputes. Our concern over the potential for nuclear war cannot deflect us from the terrible human tragedies occurring every day in the regional conflicts I just discussed. Together, we have a particular responsibility to contribute to political solutions to these problems, rather than to exacerbate them through the provision of even more weapons.

I propose that our two countries agree to embark on periodic consultations at policy level about regional problems. We will be prepared, if the Soviets agree, to make senior experts available at regular intervals for indepth exchanges of views. I've asked Secretary Shultz to explore this with Foreign Minister Gromyko. Spheres of influence are a thing of the past; differences between American and Soviet interests are not. The objectives of this political dialog will be to help avoid miscalculation, reduce the potential risk of U.S.-Soviet confrontation, and help the people in areas of conflict to find peaceful solutions.

The United States and the Soviet Union have achieved agreements of historic importance on some regional issues. The Austrian State Treaty and the Berlin accords are notable and lasting examples. Let us resolve to achieve similar agreements in the future.

Our second task must be to find ways to reduce the vast stockpiles of armaments in the world. I am committed to redoubling our negotiating efforts to achieve real results: in Geneva, a complete ban on chemical weapons; in Vienna, real reductions to lower and equal levels in Soviet and American, Warsaw Pact and NATO conventional forces; in Stockholm, concrete practical measures to enhance mutual confidence, to reduce the risk of war, and to reaffirm commitments concerning nonuse of force; in the field of nuclear testing, improvements in verification essential to ensure compliance with the threshold test ban and peaceful nuclear explosions agreements; and in the field of nonproliferation, close cooperation to strengthen the international institutions and practices aimed at halting the spread of nuclear weapons, together with redoubled efforts to meet the legitimate expectations of all nations that the Soviet

Union and the United States will substantially reduce their own nuclear arsenals.

We and the Soviets have agreed to upgrade our hotline communications facility, and our discussions of nuclear nonproliferation in recent years have been useful to both sides. We think there are other possibilities for improving communications in this area that deserve serious exploration.

I believe the proposal of the Soviet Union for opening U.S.-Soviet talks in Vienna provided an important opportunity to advance these objectives. We've been prepared to discuss a wide range of issues of concern to both sides, such as the relationship between defensive and offensive forces and what has been called the militarization of space. During the talks, we would consider what measures of restraint both sides might take while negotiations proceed. However, any agreement must logically depend upon our ability to get the competition in offensive arms under control and to achieve genuine stability at substantially lower levels of nuclear arms.

Our approach in all these areas will be designed to take into account concerns the Soviet Union has voiced. It will attempt to provide a basis for an historic breakthrough in arms control. I'm disappointed that we were not able to open our meeting in Vienna earlier this month on the date originally proposed by the Soviet Union. I hope we can begin these talks by the end of the year or shortly thereafter.

The third task I set in January was to establish a better working relationship between the Soviet Union and the United States, one marked by greater cooperation and understanding. We've made some modest progress. We have reached agreements to improve our hotline, extend our 10-year economic agreement, enhance consular cooperation, and explore coordination of search and rescue efforts at sea.

We've also offered to increase significantly the amount of U.S. grain for purchase by the Soviets and to provide the Soviets a direct fishing allocation off U.S. coasts. But there's much more we could do together. I feel particularly strongly about breaking down the barriers between the peoples of the United States and the Soviet Union; and

between our political, military, and other leaders.

Now, all of these steps that I've mentioned—and especially the arms control negotiations—are extremely important to a step-by-step process toward peace. But let me also say that we need to extend the arms control process to build a bigger umbrella under which it can operate—a road map, if you will, showing where, during the next 20 years or so, these individual efforts can lead. This can greatly assist step-by-step negotiations and enable us to avoid having all our hopes or expectations ride on any single set or series of negotiations. If progress is temporarily halted at one set of talks, this newly established framework for arms control could help us take up the slack at other negotiations.

Today, to the great end of lifting the dread of nuclear war from the peoples of the Earth, I invite the leaders of the world to join in a new beginning. We need a fresh approach to reducing international tensions. History demonstrates beyond controversy that just as the arms competition has its root in political suspicions and anxieties, so it can be channeled in more stabilizing directions and eventually be eliminated if those political suspicions and anxieties are addressed as well.

Toward this end, I will suggest to the Soviet Union that we institutionalize regular ministerial or cabinet-level meetings between our two countries on the whole agenda of issues before us, including the problem of needless obstacles to understanding. To take but one idea for discussion: In such talks, we could consider the exchange of outlines of 5-year military plans for weapons development and our schedules of intended procurement. We would also welcome the exchange of observers at military exercises and locations. And I propose that we find a way for Soviet experts to come to the United States nuclear test site, and for ours to go to theirs, to measure directly the yields of tests of nuclear weapons. We should work toward having such arrangements in place by next spring. I hope that the Soviet Union will cooperate in this undertaking and reciprocate in a

manner that will enable the two countries to establish the basis for verification for effective limits on underground nuclear testing.

I believe such talks could work rapidly toward developing a new climate of policy understanding, one that is essential if crises are to be avoided and real arms control is to be negotiated. Of course, summit meetings have a useful role to play. But they need to be carefully prepared, and the benefit here is that meetings at the ministerial level would provide the kind of progress that is the best preparation for higher level talks between ourselves and the Soviet leaders.

How much progress we will make and at what pace, I cannot say. But we have a moral obligation to try and try again.

Some may dismiss such proposals and my own optimism as simplistic American idealism, and they will point to the burdens of the modern world and to history. Well, yes, if we sit down and catalog year by year, generation by generation, the famines, the plagues, the wars, the invasions mankind has endured, the list will grow so long and the assault on humanity so terrific that it seems too much for the human spirit to bear.

But isn't this narrow and shortsighted and not at all how we think of history? Yes, the deeds of infamy or injustice are all recorded, but what shines out from the pages of history is the daring of the dreamers and the deeds of the builders and the doers. These things make up the stories we tell and pass on to our children. They comprise the most enduring and striking fact about human history—that through the heart-break and tragedy man has always dared to perceive the outline of human progress, the steady growth in not just the material well-being, but the spiritual insight of mankind.

"There have been tyrants and murderers, and for a time they can seem invincible. But in the end, they always fail [fall].<sup>1</sup> Think on it . . . always. All through history, the way of truth and love has always won." That was the belief and the vision of Mahatma Gandhi. He described that, and it remains today a vision that is good and true. "All is gift," is said to have been the fa-

<sup>1</sup> White House correction.

vorite expression of another great spiritualist, a Spanish soldier who gave up the ways of war for that of love and peace. And if we're to make realities of the two great goals of the United Nations Charter—the dreams of peace and human dignity—we must take to heart these words of Ignatius Loyola; we must pause long enough to contemplate the gifts received from Him who made us: the gift of life, the gift of this world, the gift of each other—and the gift of the present.

It is this present, this time that now we must seize. I leave you with a reflection from Mahatma Gandhi, spoken with those in mind who said that the disputes and conflicts of the modern world are too great to overcome. It was spoken shortly after Gandhi's quest for independence had taken him to Britain.

"I am not conscious of a single experience throughout my 3 months' stay in England and Europe," he said, "that made me feel that after all East is East and West is West. On the contrary, I have been convinced more than ever that human nature is much the same, no matter under what clime it flourishes, and that if you approached people with trust and affection, you would have ten-fold trust and thousand-fold affection returned to you."

For the sake of a peaceful world, a world where human dignity and freedom is respected and enshrined, let us approach each other with ten-fold trust and thousand-fold affection. A new future awaits us. The time is here, the moment is now.

One of the Founding Fathers of our nation, Thomas Paine, spoke words that apply to all of us gathered here today. They apply directly to all sitting here in this room. He said, "We have it in our power to begin the world over again."

Thank you. God bless you.

*Note: The President spoke at 10:31 a.m. in the General Assembly Hall of the United Nations Headquarters Building. He was introduced by Paul Lusaka, President of the 39th Session of the General Assembly.*

*Upon arrival at the United Nations, the President was greeted by Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar de la Guerra.*

And may I presume to suggest a toast to the Secretary General and what he has accomplished and what he is doing for all of us.

*the North Delegate's Lounge at the United Nations in response to a toast by Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar de la Guerra.*

*Note: The President spoke at 2:45 p.m. in*

Address to the 40th Session of the United Nations General Assembly in New York, New York  
October 24, 1985

*Many echoes of JFK's '61 + '63 addresses to the UN*

Mr. President, Mr. Secretary General, honored guests, and distinguished delegates, thank you for the honor of permitting me to speak on this anniversary for the United Nations. Forty years ago, the world awoke daring to believe hatred's unyielding grip had finally been broken, daring to believe the torch of peace would be protected in liberty's firm grasp. Forty years ago, the world yearned to dream again innocent dreams, to believe in ideals with innocent trust. Dreams of trust are worthy, but in these 40 years too many dreams have been shattered, too many promises have been broken, too many lives have been lost. The painful truth is that the use of violence to take, to exercise, and to preserve power remains a persistent reality in much of the world.

its failure to deal with real security issues, the total inversion of morality in the infamous Zionism-is-racism resolution, the politicization of too many agencies, the misuse of too many resources. The U.N. is a political institution, and politics requires compromise. We recognize that, but let us remember from those first days, one guiding star was supposed to light our path toward the U.N. vision of peace and progress—a star of freedom.

The vision of the U.N. Charter—to spare succeeding generations this scourge of war—remains real. It still stirs our soul and warms our hearts, but it also demands of us a realism that is rockhard, clear-eyed, steady, and sure—a realism that understands the nations of the United Nations are not united. I come before you this morning preoccupied with peace, with ensuring that the differences between some of us not be permitted to degenerate into open conflict, and I come offering for my own country a new commitment, a fresh start.

What kind of people will we be 40 years from today? May we answer: free people, worthy of freedom and firm in the conviction that freedom is not the sole prerogative of a chosen few, but the universal right of all God's children. This is the universal declaration of human rights set forth in 1948, and this is the affirming flame the United States has held high to a watching world. We champion freedom not only because it is practical and beneficial but because it is morally right and just. Free people whose governments rest upon the consent of the governed do not wage war on their neighbors. Free people blessed by economic opportunity and protected by laws that respect the dignity of the individual are not driven toward the domination of others.

On this U.N. anniversary, we acknowledge its successes: the decisive action during the Korean war, negotiation of the nonproliferation treaty, strong support for decolonization, and the laudable achievements by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Nor must we close our eyes to this organization's disappointments:

We readily acknowledge that the United States is far from perfect. Yet we have endeavored earnestly to carry out our responsibilities to the charter these past 40 years, and we take national pride in our contributions to peace. We take pride in 40 years of helping avert a new world war and pride in our alliances that protect and preserve us and our friends from aggression. We take pride in the Camp David agreements and

our efforts for peace in the Middle East, rooted in resolutions 242 and 338; in supporting Pakistan, target of outside intimidation; in assisting El Salvador's struggle to carry forward its democratic revolution; in answering the appeal of our Caribbean friends in Grenada; in seeing Grenada's Representative here today voting the will of its own people; and we take pride in our proposals to reduce the weapons of war. We submit this history as evidence of our sincerity of purpose. But today it is more important to speak to you about what my country proposes to do in these closing years of the 20th century to bring about a safer, a more peaceful, a more civilized world.

Let us begin with candor, with words that rest on plain and simple facts. The differences between America and the Soviet Union are deep and abiding. The United States is a democratic nation. Here the people rule. We build no walls to keep them in, nor organize any system of police to keep them mute. We occupy no country. The only land abroad we occupy is beneath the graves where our heroes rest. What is called the West is a voluntary association of free nations, all of whom fiercely value their independence and their sovereignty. And as deeply as we cherish our beliefs, we do not seek to compel others to share them.

When we enjoy these vast freedoms as we do, it's difficult for us to understand the restrictions of dictatorships which seek to control each institution and every facet of people's lives—the expression of their beliefs, their movements, and their contacts with the outside world. It's difficult for us to understand the ideological premise that force is an acceptable way to expand a political system. We Americans do not accept that any government has the right to command and order the lives of its people, that any nation has an historic right to use force to export its ideology. This belief, regarding the nature of man and the limitations of government, is at the core of our deep and abiding differences with the Soviet Union, differences that put us into natural conflict and competition with one another.

Now, we would welcome enthusiastically a true competition of ideas; welcome a competition of economic strength and sci-

entific and artistic creativity; and, yes, welcome a competition for the good will of the world's people. But we cannot accommodate ourselves to the use of force and subversion to consolidate and expand the reach of totalitarianism. When Mr. Gorbachev and I meet in Geneva next month, I look to a fresh start in the relationship of our two nations. We can and should meet in the spirit that we can deal with our differences peacefully. And that is what we expect.

The only way to resolve differences is to understand them. We must have candid and complete discussions of where dangers exist and where peace is being disrupted. Make no mistake, our policy of open and vigorous competition rests on a realistic view of the world. And therefore, at Geneva we must review the reasons for the current level of mistrust. For example, in 1972 the international community negotiated in good faith a ban on biological and toxin weapons; in 1975 we negotiated the Helsinki accords on human rights and freedoms; and during the decade just past, the United States and the Soviet Union negotiated several agreements on strategic weapons. And yet we feel it will be necessary at Geneva to discuss with the Soviet Union what we believe are violations of a number of the provisions in all of these agreements. Indeed, this is why it is important that we have this opportunity to air our differences through face-to-face meetings, to let frank talk substitute for anger and tension.

The United States has never sought treaties merely to paper over differences. We continue to believe that a nuclear war is one that cannot be won and must never be fought. And that is why we have sought for nearly 10 years—still seek and will discuss in Geneva—radical, equitable, verifiable reductions in these vast arsenals of offensive nuclear weapons. At the beginning of the latest round of the ongoing negotiations in Geneva, the Soviet Union presented a specific proposal involving numerical values. We are studying the Soviet counterproposal carefully. I believe that within their proposal there are seeds which we should nurture, and in the coming weeks we will seek to establish a genuine process of give and take. The United States is also seeking to discuss

with the Soviet Union in Geneva the vital relationship between offensive and defensive systems, including the possibility of moving toward a more stable and secure world in which defenses play a growing role.

The ballistic missile is the most awesome, threatening, and destructive weapon in the history of man. Thus, I welcome the interest of the new Soviet leadership in the reduction of offensive strategic forces. Ultimately, we must remove this menace, once and for all, from the face of the Earth. Until that day, the United States seeks to escape the prison of mutual terror by research and testing that could, in time, enable us to neutralize the threat of these ballistic missiles and, ultimately, render them obsolete.

How is Moscow threatened if the capitals of other nations are protected? We do not ask that the Soviet leaders, whose country has suffered so much from war, to leave their people defenseless against foreign attack. Why then do they insist that we remain undefended? Who is threatened if Western research and Soviet research, that is itself well-advanced, should develop a nonnuclear system which would threaten not human beings but only ballistic missiles? Surely, the world will sleep more secure when these missiles have been rendered useless, militarily and politically; when the sword of Damocles that has hung over our planet for too many decades is lifted by Western and Russian scientists working to shield their citizens and one day shut down space as an avenue of weapons of mass destruction. If we're destined by history to compete, militarily, to keep the peace, then let us compete in systems that defend our societies rather than weapons which can destroy us both and much of God's creation along with us.

Some 18 years ago, then-Premier Aleksei Kosygin was asked about a moratorium on the development of an antimissile defense system. The official news agency, TASS, reported that he replied with these words: "I believe the defensive systems, which prevent attack, are not the cause of the arms race, but constitute a factor preventing the death of people. Maybe an antimissile system is more expensive than an offensive system, but it is designed not to kill people,

but to preserve human lives." Preserving lives—no peace is more fundamental than that. Great obstacles lie ahead, but they should not deter us. Peace is God's commandment. Peace is the holy shadow cast by men treading on the path of virtue.

But just as we all know what peace is, we certainly know what peace is not. Peace based on repression cannot be true peace and is secure only when individuals are free to direct their own governments. Peace based on partition cannot be true peace. Put simply: Nothing can justify the continuing and permanent division of the European Continent. Walls of partition and distrust must give way to greater communication for an open world. Before leaving for Geneva, I shall make new proposals to achieve this goal. Peace based on mutual fear cannot be true peace, because staking our future on a precarious balance of terror is not good enough. The world needs a balance of safety. And finally, a peace based on averting our eyes from trouble cannot be true peace. The consequences of conflict are every bit as tragic when the destruction is contained within one country.

Real peace is what we seek, and that is why today the United States is presenting an initiative that addresses what will be a central issue in Geneva—the issue of regional conflicts in Africa, Asia, and Central America. Our own position is clear: As the oldest nation of the New World, as the first anticolonial power, the United States rejoiced when decolonization gave birth to so many new nations after World War II. We have always supported the right of the people of each nation to define their own destiny. We have given \$300 billion since 1945 to help people of other countries, and we've tried to help friendly governments defend against aggression, subversion, and terror.

We have noted with great interest similar expressions of peaceful intent by leaders of the Soviet Union. I am not here to challenge the good faith of what they say. But isn't it important for us to weigh the record as well? In Afghanistan, there are 118,000 Soviet troops prosecuting war against the Afghan people. In Cambodia, 140,000 Soviet-backed Vietnamese soldiers wage a

war of occupation. In Ethiopia, 1,700 Soviet advisers are involved in military planning and support operations along with 2,500 Cuban combat troops. In Angola, 1,200 Soviet military advisers involved in planning and supervising combat operations along with 35,000 Cuban troops. In Nicaragua, some 8,000 Soviet-bloc and Cuban personnel, including about 3,500 military and secret police personnel.

All of these conflicts—some of them underway for a decade—originate in local disputes, but they share a common characteristic: They are the consequence of an ideology imposed from without, dividing nations and creating regimes that are, almost from the day they take power, at war with their own people. And in each case, Marxism-Leninism's war with the people becomes war with their neighbors. These wars are exacting a staggering human toll and threaten to spill across national boundaries and trigger dangerous confrontations. Where is it more appropriate than right here at the United Nations to call attention to article II of our charter, which instructs members to refrain "from the use or threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state. . . ." During the past decade, these wars played a large role in building suspicions and tensions in my country over the purpose of Soviet policy. This gives us an extra reason to address them seriously today.

Last year, I proposed from this podium that the United States and Soviet Union hold discussions on some of these issues, and we have done so. But I believe these problems need more than talk. For that reason, we are proposing and are fully committed to support a regional peace process that seeks progress on three levels.

First, we believe the starting point must be a process of negotiation among the warring parties in each country I've mentioned, which in the case of Afghanistan includes the Soviet Union. The form of these talks may and should vary, but negotiations and an improvement of internal political conditions are essential to achieving an end to violence, the withdrawal of foreign troops, and national reconciliation.

There is a second level. Once negotia-

tions take hold and the parties directly involved are making real progress, representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union should sit down together. It is not for us to impose any solutions in this separate set of talks; such solutions would not last. But the issue we should address is how best to support the ongoing talks among the warring parties. In some cases, it might well be appropriate to consider guarantees for any agreements already reached. But in every case, the primary task is to promote this goal: verified elimination of the foreign military presence and restraint on the flow of outside arms.

And finally, if these first two steps are successful, we could move on to the third: welcoming each country back into the world economy so its citizens can share in the dynamic growth that other developing countries, countries that are at peace, enjoy. Despite past differences with these regimes, the United States would respond generously to their democratic reconciliation with their own people, their respect for human rights, and their return to the family of free nations. Of course, until such time as these negotiations result in definitive progress, America's support for struggling democratic resistance forces must not and shall not cease.

This plan is bold; it is realistic. It is not a substitute for existing peacemaking efforts; it complements them. We're not trying to solve every conflict in every region of the globe, and we recognize that each conflict has its own character. Naturally, other regional problems will require different approaches. But we believe that the recurrent pattern of conflict that we see in these five cases ought to be broken as soon as possible. We must begin somewhere, so let us begin where there is great need and great hope. This will be a clear step forward to help people choose their future more freely. Moreover, this is an extraordinary opportunity for the Soviet side to make a contribution to regional peace which, in turn, can promote future dialog and negotiations on other critical issues.

With hard work and imagination, there is no limit to what, working together, our nations can achieve. Gaining a peaceful reso-

ies directly in-  
ress, represent-  
and the Soviet  
er. It is not for  
n this separate  
ould not last.  
ess is how best  
ks among the  
s, it might well  
s, it might well  
guarantees for  
ched. But in  
is to promote  
of the foreign  
it on the flow

two steps are  
to the third:  
ack into the  
can share in  
er developing  
peace, enjoy.  
hese regimes,  
id generously  
on with their  
uman rights,  
y of free na-  
ime as these  
ve progress,  
ge democratic  
id shall not

c. It is not a  
king efforts;  
ot trying to  
egion of the  
ach conflict  
y, other re-  
liferent ap-  
ie recurrent  
n these five  
as possible.  
let us begin  
great hope.  
rd to help  
ore freely.  
ry opportu-  
a contribu-  
1 turn, can  
tations on

*Bush has  
used  
this*

lution of these conflicts will open whole new vistas of peace and progress—the discovery that the promise of the future lies not in measures of military defense or the control of weapons, but in the expansion of individual freedom and human rights. Only when the human spirit can worship, create, and build, only when people are given a personal stake in determining their own destiny and benefiting from their own risks, do societies become prosperous, progressive, dynamic, and free.

We need only open our eyes to the economic evidence all around us. Nations that deny their people opportunity—in Eastern Europe, Indochina, southern Africa, and Latin America—without exception, are dropping further behind in the race for the future. But where we see enlightened leaders who understand that economic freedom and personal incentive are key to development, we see economies striding forward. Singapore, Taiwan, and South Korea, India, Botswana, and China—these are among the current and emerging success stories because they have the courage to give economic incentives a chance.

Let us all heed the simple eloquence in Andrei Sakharov's Nobel Peace Prize message: "International trust, mutual understanding, disarmament and international security are inconceivable without an open society with freedom of information, freedom of conscience, the right to publish and the right to travel and choose the country in which one wishes to live." At the core, this is an eternal truth; freedom works. That is the promise of the open world and awaits only our collective grasp. Forty years ago, hope came alive again for a world that hungered for hope. I believe fervently that hope is still alive.

The United States has spoken with candor and conviction today, but that does not lessen these strong feelings held by every American. It's in the nature of Americans to hate war and its destructiveness. We would rather wage our struggle to rebuild and renew, not to tear down. We would rather fight against hunger, disease, and catastrophe. We would rather engage our adversaries in the battle of ideals and ideas for the future. These principles emerge from the innate openness and good character of our

people and from our long struggle and sacrifice for our liberties and the liberties of others. Americans always yearn for peace. They have a passion for life. They carry in their hearts a deep capacity for reconciliation.

Last year at this General Assembly, I indicated there was every reason for the United States and the Soviet Union to shorten the distance between us. In Geneva, the first meeting between our heads of government in more than 6 years, Mr. Gorbachev and I will have that opportunity. So, yes, let us go to Geneva with both sides committed to dialog. Let both sides go committed to a world with fewer nuclear weapons, and some day with none. Let both sides go committed to walk together on a safer path into the 21st century and to lay the foundation for enduring peace. It is time, indeed, to do more than just talk of a better world. It is time to act. And we will act when nations cease to try to impose their ways upon others. And we will act when they realize that we, for whom the achievement of freedom has come dear, will do what we must to preserve it from assault.

America is committed to the world because so much of the world is inside America. After all, only a few miles from this very room is our Statue of Liberty, past which life began anew for millions, where the peoples from nearly every country in this hall joined to build these United States. The blood of each nation courses through the American vein and feeds the spirit that compels us to involve ourselves in the fate of this good Earth. It is the same spirit that warms our heart in concern to help ease the desperate hunger that grips proud people on the African Continent. It is the internationalist spirit that came together last month when our neighbor Mexico was struck suddenly by an earthquake. Even as the Mexican nation moved vigorously into action, there were heartwarming offers by other nations offering to help and glimpses of people working together, without concern for national self-interest or gain.

And if there was any meaning to salvage out of that tragedy, it was found one day in a huge mound of rubble that was once the Juarez Hospital in Mexico City. A week

after that terrible event, and as another day of despair unfolded, a team of workers heard a faint sound coming from somewhere in the heart of the crushed concrete. Hoping beyond hope, they quickly burrowed toward it. And as the late afternoon light faded, and racing against time, they found what they had heard, and the first of three baby girls, newborn infants, emerged to the safety of the rescue team. And let me tell you the scene through the eyes of one who was there. "Everyone was so quiet when they lowered that little baby down in a basket covered with blankets. The baby didn't make a sound either. But the minute they put her in the Red Cross ambulance, everybody just got up and cheered." Well, amidst all that hopelessness and debris came a timely and timeless lesson for us all. We witnessed the miracle of life.

It is on this that I believe our nations can make a renewed commitment. The miracle of life is given by One greater than ourselves, but once given, each life is ours to

nurture and preserve, to foster, not only for today's world but for a better one to come. There is no purpose more noble than for us to sustain and celebrate life in a turbulent world, and that is what we must do now. We have no higher duty, no greater cause as humans. Life and the preservation of freedom to live it in dignity is what we are on this Earth to do. Everything we work to achieve must seek that end so that some day our prime ministers, our premiers, our presidents, and our general secretaries will talk not of war and peace, but only of peace. We've had 40 years to begin. Let us not waste one more moment to give back to the world all that we can in return for this miracle of life.

Thank you all. God bless you all.

*Note: The President spoke at 10:08 a.m. in the General Assembly Hall at the United Nations. Upon his arrival at the United Nations, the President was greeted by Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar de la Guerra.*

### Informal Exchange With Reporters Prior to a Meeting With Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze in New York, New York October 24, 1985

*Q.* Mr. President, why were you so tough in outlining Soviet misdeeds today?

*The President.* You haven't been around for previous photo ops, but I've made it a rule today not to take any questions.

*Q.* Mr. Shevardnadze, what did you think of the President's speech, sir?

*The Foreign Minister.* Well, I've outlined it in my speech today.

*Q.* It sounded like you didn't like it.

*Q.* Are you going to talk to Mr. Shevardnadze about your plan for settling regional conflicts in this meeting?

*The President.* No answers, Sam [Sam Donaldson, ABC News].

*Q.* Mr. President, [Nicaraguan President] Ortega says that your speech flew in the face of peace.

*The President.* Never have I regretted so much that I'm not giving an answer as on

that one.

*Q.* Is there any questions you will answer?

*Q.* Mr. Shevardnadze, what, sir, do you think of the President's plan for settling regional conflicts?

*The Foreign Minister.* That's what we shall be discussing.

*Q.* In this meeting here?

*Q.* Does it make arms control—

*The Foreign Minister.* I don't think we shall be able to discuss it today because of the shortage of time—all of it today.

*Q.* But does it have some positive aspects?

*The Foreign Minister.* If there were no positive seeds, we would not have met at all.

*Q.* Do you think it makes arms control less important, Mr. Shevardnadze?

## Proclamation 5530—Ethnic American Day, 1986 September 20, 1986

*By the President of the United States  
of America*

### *A Proclamation*

Americans are a unique people, a colorful tapestry of traditions and cultures woven into one vibrant society. The motto graven on our coins—*E Pluribus Unum*—reflects the rich diversity from which America draws its strength and vitality.

Since the founding of our Republic more than 200 years ago, millions of immigrants have made the journey of freedom to our shores. America has drawn the stoutest hearts from every corner of the globe, from every Nation on earth. Some came to escape the chains of religious persecution, others to flee the bonds of political oppression, and still others came seeking a land of opportunity, the chance to begin life anew. Some of the most recent have scaled walls and crawled under barbed wire and through mine fields, while others risked their lives in makeshift boats on perilous seas.

No matter how they came, today they are all Americans who take pride in the traditions of their ancestral homeland while at the same time dedicating themselves wholeheartedly to the principles for which our Nation stands. They now are taking their full and rightful place in America's social and political life. Their contributions are legion in every area of endeavor: science, the arts, medicine, business, govern-

ment, sports, religion, and the media. The efforts of ethnic Americans in bolstering the values of faith, freedom, family, work, and country have served to strengthen the fabric of our national life and have made America a culturally richer and more vibrant land in which to live.

The Congress, by Public Law 99-206, has designated September 21, 1986, as "Ethnic American Day" 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 September 21, 1986, as Ethnic American Day. I call upon the people of the United States to acknowledge and advance mutual understanding and friendship among all Americans regardless of their ethnicity.*

*In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twentieth day of September, 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

*[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 2:47 p.m., September 23, 1986]*

*Note: The proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on September 22.*

## Address to the 41st Session of the United Nations General Assembly in New York, New York September 22, 1986

Mr. President, Mr. Secretary-General, honored guests, and distinguished delegates, a short walk from this chamber is the delegates Meditation Room, a refuge from a world deafened by the noise of strife and violence. "We want to bring back the idea

of worship," Dag Hammarskjöld once said about this room, "devotion to something which is greater and higher than we are ourselves." Well, it's just such devotion that gave birth to the United Nations—devotion to the dream of world peace and freedom,

of human rights and democratic self-determination, of a time when, in those ancient words, ". . . and they shall beat their swords into plowshares . . . nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore."

The United States remains committed to the United Nations. For over 40 years this organization has provided an international forum for harmonizing conflicting national interests and has made a significant contribution in such fields as peacekeeping, humanitarian assistance, and eradicating disease. And yet no one knows better than those in this chamber how the noble ideals embodied in the charter have often remained unfulfilled. This organization itself faces a critical hour—that is usually stated as a fiscal crisis. But we can turn this crisis into an opportunity. The important reforms proposed by a group of experts can be a first step toward restoring the organization's status and effectiveness. The issue, ultimately, is not one of cash but of credibility. If all the members of this universal organization decide to seize the moment and turn the rhetoric of reform into reality, the future of the U.N. will be secure. And you have my word for it: My country, which has always given the U.N. generous support, will continue to play a leading role in the effort to achieve its noble purposes.

When I came before you last year, an important moment in the pursuit of those purposes had not yet occurred. The leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States were to meet in Geneva. These discussions have now been held. For over 15 hours Soviet and American delegations met; for about 5 hours General Secretary Gorbachev and I talked, alone. Our talks were frank. The talks were also productive—in a larger sense than even the documents that were agreed. Mr. Gorbachev was blunt, and so was I. We came to realize again the truth of the statement: Nations do not mistrust each other because they are armed; they are armed because they mistrust each other. And I did not hesitate to tell Mr. Gorbachev our view of the source of that mistrust: the Soviet Union's record of seeking to impose its ideology and rule on others. So, we acknowledged the deep and abiding differences between our systems of government,

our views of history and the future of mankind. But despite these differences, we resolved to work together for real reductions in nuclear arms, as well as progress in other areas.

Delegates to the 41st General Assembly of the United Nations: Today I want to report to you on what has transpired since the summit, notably the important letter I sent July 25th to Mr. Gorbachev. In that letter, I dealt with the important issues of reducing nuclear arms, agreeing on strategic defenses, and limiting nuclear testing. In addition to those issues, which concern the military aspects of Soviet-American relations, I would also like to address other essential steps toward peace: the resolution of political conflicts, the strengthening of the international economy, and the protection of human rights. Before I do this, however, let me, in the tradition of candor established at Geneva, tell you that a pall has been cast over our relations with the Soviet Union. I refer here to a particularly disturbing example of Soviet transgressions against human rights.

Recently, after the arrest of a Soviet national and U.N. employee accused of espionage in the United States, an American correspondent in Moscow was made the subject of fabricated accusations and trumped-up charges. He was arrested and jailed in a callous disregard of due process and numerous human rights conventions. In effect, he was taken as a hostage—even threatened with the death penalty. Both individuals have now been remanded to their respective Ambassadors. But this is only an interim step agreed to by the United States for humanitarian reasons. It does not change the facts of the case: Gennadi Zakharov is an accused spy who should stand trial; Nicholas Daniloff is an innocent hostage who should be released. The Soviet Union bears the responsibility for the consequences of its action. Misusing the United Nations for purposes of espionage does a grave disservice to this organization. And the world expects better. It expects contributions to the cause of peace that only the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union can make.

It is for this reason that I wrote last

he future of man-  
differences, we re-  
or real reductions  
progress in other

General Assembly.  
Today I want to  
s, transpired since  
important letter I  
orbachev. In that  
important issues of  
agreeing on strate-  
g, nuclear testing,  
s, which concern  
viet-American re-  
to address other  
ce: the resolution  
strengthening of  
v, and the protec-  
re I do this, how-  
tion of candor has  
ou that a pall has  
ns with the Soviet  
rticularly disturbs  
gressions against

st of a Soviet na-  
accused of espio-  
an American cor-  
as made the sub-  
ons and trumped-  
ed and jailed in a  
rocess and numer-  
ions. In effect, he  
even threatened  
Both individuals  
d to their respec-  
s is only an inter-  
United States for  
does not change  
inadi Zakharov is  
stand trial; Nich-  
ent hostage who  
viet Union bears  
consequences of  
nited Nations for  
s a grave disserv-  
nd the world ex-  
ntributions to the  
he leaders of the  
oviet Union can

nat I wrote last

summer to Mr. Gorbachev with new arms control proposals. Before discussing the proposals, let us be clear about which weapons are the most dangerous and threatening to peace. The threat does not come from defensive systems, which are a shield against attack, but from offensive weapons—ballistic missiles that hurtle through space and can wreak mass destruction on the surface of the Earth, especially the Soviet Union's heavy, accurate ICBM's, with multiple warheads, which have no counterparts in size or number in any other country. And that is why the United States has long urged radical, equitable, verifiable reductions in these offensive systems. Note that I said "reduction," for this is the real purpose of arms control—not just to codify the levels of today's arsenals, not just to channel their further expansion, but to reduce them in ways that will reduce the danger of war. Indeed, the United States believes the prospect of a future without such weapons of mass destruction must be the ultimate goal of arms control.

I am pleased to say that the Soviet Union has now embraced our idea of radical reductions in offensive systems. At the Geneva summit last November, we agreed to intensify work in this area. Since then the Soviets have made detailed proposals which, while not acceptable to us, appear to represent a serious effort. So, we continue to seek a 50-percent reduction of American and Soviet arsenals, with the central focus on the reduction of ballistic missile warheads. If the Soviet Union wants only a lesser reduction, however, we are prepared to consider it—but as an interim measure. In other provisions as well, we have sought to take account of Soviet concerns. So, there has been movement. Similarly, in the area of intermediate-range nuclear forces, the United States seeks the total elimination of such missiles on a global basis. Again, if the Soviet Union insists on pursuing such a goal in stages, we are prepared to conclude an interim agreement without delay.

All this gives me hope. I can tell you the exchanges between our two sides this summer could well have marked the beginning of a serious, productive negotiation on arms reduction. The ice of the negotiating stalemate could break if both sides intensify

their effort in the new round of Geneva talks and if we keep the promises we made to each other last November. For too long a time, however, the Soviet response has been to downplay the need for offensive reductions. When the United States began work on technology to make offensive nuclear weapons someday obsolete, the Soviets tried to make that the main issue—as if the main danger to strategic stability was a defense against missiles that is still on the drawing boards, rather than the menacing ballistic missiles themselves that already exist in excessive numbers.

Still, the United States recognizes that both the offensive and defensive sides of the strategic equation must be addressed. And we have gone far to meet Soviet concerns expressed about the potential offensive use of strategic defensive systems. I have offered firm and concrete assurances that our SDI could never be used to deploy weapons in space that can cause mass destruction on Earth. I have pointed out that the radical reduction we seek now in offensive arsenals would be additional insurance that SDI cannot be used to support a first-strike strategy. And our preference from the beginning has been to move forward cooperatively with the Soviets on strategic defenses so that neither side will feel threatened and both can benefit from the strategic revolution that SDI represents.

The United States continues to respect the antiballistic missile treaty—in spite of clear evidence the Soviets are violating it. We have told the Soviets that if we can both agree on radical reductions in strategic offensive weapons, we are prepared right now to sign an agreement with them on research, development, testing, and deployment of strategic defenses based on the following:

First, both sides would agree to confine themselves through 1991 to research, development, and testing—which is permitted by the ABM treaty—to determine whether advanced systems of strategic defense are technically feasible.

Second, a new treaty signed now would provide that if, after 1991, either side should decide to deploy such a system, that side would be obliged to offer a plan for

sharing the benefits of strategic defense and for eliminating offensive ballistic missiles. And this plan would be negotiated over a 2-year period.

Third, if the two sides can't agree after 2 years of negotiation, either side would be free to deploy an advanced strategic defensive system after giving 6 months notice to the other.

As the United States has repeatedly made clear, we are moving toward a future of greater reliance upon strategic defense. The United States remains prepared to talk about how—under what ground rules and process—we and the Soviet Union can do this cooperatively. Such strategic defenses, coupled with radical reductions in offensive forces, would represent a safer balance and would give future statesmen the opportunity to move beyond it—to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons from the face of the Earth.

In addition to our proposals on offensive reductions and strategic defense, we have suggested new steps in another area: nuclear testing. Just as eliminating all nuclear weapons is our long-term goal, so, too, is a total ban on nuclear testing. But both must be approached with practical steps, for the reality is that for now we still must rely on these weapons for the deterrence of war. Thus, the safety and reliability of our deterrent are themselves critical to peace. The United States is proud of its record of nuclear safety and intends to maintain it. Nevertheless, we are, as I said, ready now to take two important steps toward limiting nuclear testing. First, we are ready to move forward on ratification of the threshold test ban treaty and the treaty on peaceful nuclear explosions, once agreement is reached on improved verification procedures. We have proposed new ideas to make this possible. Second, upon ratification of those treaties, and in association with a program to reduce and ultimately eliminate all nuclear weapons, we're prepared to discuss ways to implement a step-by-step, parallel program of limiting and ultimately ending nuclear testing.

These are steps we could take in the near future to show the world that we are moving forward. And I, therefore, call upon the Soviet Union to join us in practical, at-

tainable progress in limiting nuclear testing. Just a few days ago, I received a reply from General Secretary Gorbachev to my letter of July 25th. And for the moment, let me say simply that we are giving it serious and careful consideration.

As we move toward our goal of eliminating nuclear weapons, it is vital that we also address important imbalances of other kinds of weapons. And this is why the United States has proposed a comprehensive global ban on all chemical weapons and why we and our allies have tried hard to break the stalemate in the conventional force negotiations in Vienna. And in the Stockholm Conference a major advance has been achieved—a concrete, new set of military confidence-building measures which includes inspections.

But we must remember from the experience of the 1970's that progress in arms control cannot be divorced from regional political developments. As I said at the beginning, political tensions cause the military competition, not the other way around. But while the United States and the Soviet Union disagree over the root causes of political tension, we do agree that regional conflicts could escalate into global confrontation. Last year from this rostrum, I presented a formula for peace which would, apply to five critical regional conflicts that are potential flashpoints for wider conflict. I pointed out how difficult it is for the United States to accept Soviet assurances of peaceful intent when 126,000 Soviet troops prosecute a vicious war against the Afghan people; when 140,000 Soviet-backed Vietnamese soldiers wage war on the people of Cambodia; when 1,700 Soviet advisers and 2,500 Cuban combat troops are involved in military planning and operations in Ethiopia; when 1,300 Soviet military advisers and 36,000 Cuban troops direct and participate in combat operations to prop up an unpopular, repressive regime in Angola; when hundreds of millions of dollars in Soviet arms and Soviet-bloc advisers help a dictatorial regime in Nicaragua try to subvert and betray a popular revolution.

The danger inherent in these conflicts must be recognized. Marxist-Leninist regimes tend to wage war as readily against

ing nuclear testing.  
ived a reply from  
hev to my letter  
moment, let me  
ing it serious and

goal of eliminat-  
vital that we also  
ces of other kinds  
why the United  
prehensive global  
ons and why we  
hard to break the  
onal force negotia-  
e Stockholm Con-  
ance has been  
w set of military  
sures which in-

from the experi-  
progress in arms  
ed from regional  
I said at the be-  
cause the military  
way around. But  
and the Soviet  
not causes of polit-  
that regional con-  
global confronta-  
ostrum, I present-  
hich would apply  
licts that are po-  
conflict. I point-  
s for the United  
urances of peace-  
oviet troops pros-  
inst the Afghan  
viet-backed Viet-  
on the people of  
viet advisers and  
os are involved in  
erations in Ethio-  
itary advisers and  
t and participate  
op up an unpop-  
n Angola; when  
dollars in Soviet  
sers help a dicta-  
a try to subvert  
tion.

on these conflicts  
xist-Leninist re-  
is readily against

their neighbors as they routinely do against their own people. In fact, the internal and external wars often become indistinguishable. In Afghanistan, for example, the puppet regime has announced its intention to relocate tens of thousands of people from border areas. Can anyone doubt this will be done in classic Communist style—by force? Many will die to make it easier for the Soviets and their satellite troops to intimidate Pakistan. It is just such transgressions that make the risk of confrontation with democratic nations so acute.

So, once again, I propose a three-point peace process for the resolution of regional conflicts: First, talks between the warring parties themselves, without which an end to violence and national reconciliation are impossible; second, discussions between the United States and Soviet Union—not to impose solutions but to support peace talks and eventually eliminate the supply of arms and the proxy troops from abroad; and third, if the talks are successful, joint efforts to welcome each country back into the world economy and the community of nations that respect human rights.

In addition to regional disputes, the grave threat of terrorism also jeopardizes the hopes for peace. No cause, no grievance, can justify it. Terrorism is heinous and intolerable. It is the crime of cowards—cowards who prey on the innocent, the defenseless, and the helpless. With its allies and other nations, the United States has taken steps to counter terrorism directly, particularly state-sponsored terrorism. Last April the United States demonstrated that it will defend its interests and act against terrorist aggression. And let me assure all of you today, especially let me assure any potential sponsors of terrorism, that the American people are of one mind on this issue. Like other civilized peoples of the world, we have reached our limit. Attacks against our citizens or our interests will not go unanswered. We will also do all in our power to help other law-abiding nations threatened by terrorist attacks. To that end, the United States believes that the understandings reached by the seven industrial democracies at the Tokyo summit last May made a good start toward international accord in the war on terrorism. We recommend to

the General Assembly consideration of the Tokyo resolutions.

Moving to the economic realm—how ironic it is that some continue to espouse such ideas as a “new international economic order” based on state control when the world is learning, as never before, that the freedom of the individual, not the power of the state, is the key to economic dynamism and growth. Nations have turned away from centralized management and government controls and toward the incentives and rewards of the free market. They have invited their citizens to develop their talents and abilities to the fullest and, in the process, to provide jobs, to create wealth, to build social stability and foster faith in the future for all. The economic summits of the industrial democracies have paid tribute to these principles, as has the historic U.N. Special Session on Africa in May. We applaud the African nations’ call for reform, leading to greater reliance on their private sectors for economic growth. We believe that overcoming hunger and economic stagnation requires policies that encourage Africans’ own productivity and initiatives. Such a policy framework will make it easier for the rest of the world, including the United States, to help. The laws of economic incentives do not discriminate between developed and developing countries. They apply to all equally.

Much of the recent recovery in the world economy can be directly attributed to this growth of economic freedom. And it is this trend that offers such hope for the future. And yet this new hope faces a grave threat: the menace of trade barriers. History shows the imposition of such barriers invites retaliation, which in turn sparks the very sort of trade wars that plunged the world in the 1930’s deeper into depression and economic misery. Truly, protectionism is destructionism. That is why the United States seeks the assistance of all countries represented here in the General Assembly in protecting the practice of free and fair trade. We applaud the success of the meeting of GATT trade ministers last week in Uruguay, where agreement was reached to launch a new round of multilateral trade negotiations covering a wide range of topics important to

economic growth. With over 90 other countries of the GATT, the United States is working to maintain the free flow of international trade.

In addition to resistance to protectionism, the United States is also seeking to stimulate world economic growth in other ways. Our Treasury bill interest rate is now just over 5 percent, the lowest it has been in 9 years—which provides enormous relief to debtor countries. America's new tax structure will open the way for greater prosperity at home, which will contribute to greater prosperity abroad. And finally, the United States is working with other countries to minimize currency swings, to promote stability in the monetary market, to establish predictability as a basis for prosperity.

But the United States believes the greatest contribution we can make to world prosperity is the continued advocacy of the magic of the marketplace—the truth, the simple and proven truth, that economic development is an outgrowth of economic freedom just as economic freedom is the inseparable twin of political freedom and democratic government. And it is here that we come to our final category: human rights, the indispensable element for peace, freedom, and prosperity. I note that Mr. Gorbachev has used in recent speeches the same categories I have used here today: the military, the political, and the economic; except that he titled his fourth category: humanitarian.

Well, the difference is revealing. The United States believes that respect for the individual, for the dignity of the human person—those rights outlined in the U.N.'s Universal Declaration of Human Rights—does not belong in the realm of charity or humanitarian causes. Respect for human rights is not social work; it is not merely an act of compassion. It is the first obligation of government and the source of its legitimacy. It also is the foundation stone in any structure of world peace. All through history, it has been the dictatorships and the tyrannies that have surrendered first to the cult of militarism and the pursuit of war. Countries based on the consent of the governed, countries that recognize the unalienable rights of the individual, do not make war on each other. Peace is more

than just an absence of war. True peace is justice, true peace is freedom, and true peace dictates the recognition of human rights.

Commitments were made more than 10 years ago in Helsinki concerning these rights and their recognition. We need only look to the East today to see how sadly unfulfilled those commitments are. The persecution of scientists, religious leaders, peace activists, political dissenters, and other prisoners of conscience continues unabated behind the Iron Curtain. You know, one section of the Helsinki accords even speaks to "improvement of working conditions of journalists." So, it is clear that progress in the human rights area must keep pace with progress in other areas. A failure on this score will hinder further movement in East-West relations. These, then, are the areas of concern and of opportunity that the United States sees in the quest for peace and freedom, the twin objectives of the U.N. Charter.

Last year I pointed out in my address to the General Assembly the differences between the United States and the Soviet Union are deep and abiding. But I also called for a fresh start in relations between our two nations, a fresh start that could benefit our own people and the people of every nation. Since that time, the United States has taken action and put forth new proposals that could lead our two countries and the entire world in a direction we all have long sought to go. Now more than ever, it is the responsibility of the Soviet Union to take action and demonstrate that they, too, are continuing the dialog for peace. As I've said, I believe that we can be hopeful about the world and the prospects for freedom. We only need look around us to see the new technologies that may someday spare future generations the nightmare of nuclear terror, of the growing ranks of democratic activists and freedom fighters, or the increasing movement toward free market economies, or the extent of worldwide concern about the rights of the individual in the face of brute, state power.

In the past, when I have noted such trends—when I've called for a forward strategy for freedom and predicated the ul-

war. True peace is freedom, and true cognition of human

made more than 10 concerning these ion. We need only to see how sadly nents are. The per-religious leaders, d dissenters, and nce continues una-curtain. You know, sinki accords even of working condi-, it is clear that rights area must s in other areas. A will hinder further t relations. These, concern and of oppor- States sees in the edom, the twin ob-ter.

it in my address to he differences be-es and the Soviet biding. But I also n relations between h start that could and the people of t time, the United and put forth new l our two countries a direction we all o. Now more than bility of the Soviet d demonstrate that ng the dialog for ievie that we can be l and the prospects eed look around us gies that may some-tions the nightmare growing ranks of freedom fighters, ment toward free ie extent of world- rights of the indi-ute, state power. have noted such ed for a forward l predicated the ul-

timate triumph of democratic rule over totalitarianism—some have accused me of telling people what they want to hear, of urging them not to engage the day but to escape it. Yet, to hope is to believe in humanity and in its future. Hope remains the highest reality, the age-old power. Hope is at the root of all the great ideas and causes that have bettered the lot of humankind across the centuries. History teaches us to hope, for it teaches us about man and about the irrepressible human spirit.

A Nobel laureate in literature, a great figure of the American South, William Faulkner, once said that the last sound heard on Earth would be that of the two remaining humans arguing over where to go in the spaceship they had built. In his speech to the Nobel committee in 1950, Faulkner spoke of the nuclear age, of the general and universal physical fear it had engendered, a fear of destruction that had become almost unbearable. But he said, "I decline to accept the end of man. I believe that man will not merely endure, he will prevail. He is immortal . . . because he has

a soul, a spirit capable of compassion and sacrifice and endurance." Faulkner spoke of "the old verities and truths of the heart"—of the courage, honor, pride, compassion, pity, sacrifice, and, yes, that hope which is the glory of our past. And all of these things we find today in our present; we must use them to build our future.

And it's why today we can lift up our spirits and our hearts. It is why we resolve that with God's help the cause of humanity will not merely endure but prevail; that someday all the world—every nation, every people, every person—will know the blessings of peace and see the light of freedom.

Thank you, and God bless you.

*Note: The President spoke at 11 a.m. in the General Assembly Hall at the United Nations in New York. He was introduced by Humayun Rasheed Chowdhury, President of the 41st Session of the General Assembly. Upon his arrival at the United Nations, he was greeted by Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar de la Guerra. Following the President's address, he returned to Washington, DC.*

## Statement on the Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe September 22, 1986

Today in Stockholm, the United States and 34 other governments adopted an accord that will, if faithfully implemented, reduce the risk of war in Europe, where there is the greatest concentration of military forces of the East and the West. I welcome this positive outcome at the CDE Conference. It will contribute to greater security in Europe and to improved East-West relations. This accord also sends messages that should be welcomed by people throughout the world. It demonstrates that East and West, with seriousness of purpose and hard work, can establish common ground on which to build a more secure future. It also demonstrates that the nations of the West, around whose proposals the Stockholm accord was built, constitute a

powerful force for peace.

The set of militarily significant and verifiable measures adopted by the Stockholm CDE Conference marks a substantial advance over those in the Helsinki Final Act. These measures will make military activities more predictable and inhibit opportunities for political intimidation. In particular, the Stockholm accord commits the 35 nations to notify one another of military activities above certain levels, to invite observers, to forecast activities a year in advance, and to allow inspectors to verify compliance with those commitments. This is the first East-West accord in which the Soviet Union has agreed to inspection of military activities on its territory. Although these inspection provisions are very different from those we

## Address to the 42d Session of the United Nations General Assembly in New York, New York

September 21, 1987

Mr. President, Mr. Secretary-General, Ambassador Reed, honored guests, and distinguished delegates: Let me first welcome the Secretary-General back from his pilgrimage for peace in the Middle East. Hundreds of thousands have already fallen in the bloody conflict between Iran and Iraq. All men and women of good will pray that the carnage can soon be stopped, and we pray that the Secretary-General proves to be not only a pilgrim but also the architect of a lasting peace between those two nations. Mr. Secretary-General, the United States supports you, and may God guide you in your labors ahead.

Like the Secretary-General, all of us here today are on a kind of pilgrimage. We come from every continent, every race, and most religions to this great hall of hope, where in the name of peace we practice diplomacy. Now, diplomacy, of course, is a subtle and nuanced craft, so much so that it's said that when one of the most wily diplomats of the 19th century passed away other diplomats asked, on reports of his death, "What do you suppose the old fox meant by that?"

But true statesmanship requires not merely skill but something greater, something we call vision—a grasp of the present and of the possibilities of the future. I've come here today to map out for you my own vision of the world's future, one, I believe, that in its essential elements is shared by all Americans. And I hope those who see things differently will not mind if I say that we in the United States believe that the place to look first for shape of the future is not in continental masses and sealanes, although geography is, obviously, of great importance. Neither is it in national reserves of blood and iron or, on the other hand, of money and industrial capacity, although military and economic strength are also, of course, crucial. We begin with something that is far simpler and yet far more profound: the human heart.

All over the world today, the yearnings of the human heart are redirecting the course

of international affairs, putting the lie to the myth of materialism and historical determinism. We have only to open our eyes to see the simple aspirations of ordinary people writ large on the record of our times.

Last year in the Philippines, ordinary people rekindled the spirit of democracy and restored the electoral process. Some said they had performed a miracle, and if so, a similar miracle—a transition to democracy—is taking place in the Republic of Korea. Haiti, too, is making a transition. Some despair when these new, young democracies face conflicts or challenges, but growing pains are normal in democracies. The United States had them, as has every other democracy on Earth.

In Latin America, too, one can hear the voices of freedom echo from the peaks and across the plains. It is the song of ordinary people marching, not in uniforms and not in military file but, rather, one by one, in simple, everyday working clothes, marching to the polls. Ten years ago only a third of the people of Latin America and the Caribbean lived in democracies or in countries that were turning to democracy; today over 90 percent do.

But this worldwide movement to democracy is not the only way in which simple, ordinary people are leading us in this room—we who are said to be the makers of history—leading us into the future. Around the world, new businesses, new economic growth, new technologies are emerging from the workshops of ordinary people with extraordinary dreams.

Here in the United States, entrepreneurial energy—reinvigorated when we cut taxes and regulations—has fueled the current economic expansion. According to scholars at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, three-quarters of the more than 13½ million new jobs that we have created in this country since the beginning of our expansion came from businesses with fewer than 100 employees, businesses started by ordinary people who dared to take a

## Assembly

chance. And many of our new high technologies were first developed in the garages of fledgling entrepreneurs. Yet America is not the only, or perhaps even the best, example of the dynamism and dreams that the freeing of markets set free.

In India and China, freer markets for farmers have led to an explosion in production. In Africa, governments are rethinking their policies, and where they are allowing greater economic freedom to farmers, crop production has improved. Meanwhile, in the newly industrialized countries of the Pacific rim, free markets in services and manufacturing as well as agriculture have led to a soaring of growth and standards of living. The ASEAN nations, Japan, Korea, and Taiwan have created the true economic miracle of the last two decades, and in each of them, much of the magic came from ordinary people who succeeded as entrepreneurs.

In Latin America, this same lesson of free markets, greater opportunity, and growth is being studied and acted on. President Sarney of Brazil spoke for many others when he said that "private initiative is the engine of economic development. In Brazil we have learned that every time the state's penetration in the economy increases, our liberty decreases." Yes, policies that release to flight ordinary people's dreams are spreading around the world. From Colombia to Turkey to Indonesia, governments are cutting taxes, reviewing their regulations, and opening opportunities for initiative.

There has been much talk in the halls of this building about the right to development. But more and more the evidence is clear that development is not itself a right. It is the product of rights: the right to own property; the right to buy and sell freely; the right to contract; the right to be free of excessive taxation and regulation, of burdensome government. There have been studies that determined that countries with low tax rates have greater growth than those with high rates.

We're all familiar with the phenomenon of the underground economy. The scholar Hernando de Soto and his colleagues have examined the situation of one country, Peru, and described an economy of the

poor that bypasses crushing taxation and stifling regulation. This informal economy, as the researchers call it, is the principal supplier of many goods and services and often the only ladder for upward mobility. In the capital city, it accounts for almost all public transportation and most street markets. And the researchers concluded that, thanks to the informal economy, "the poor can work, travel, and have a roof over their heads." They might have added that, by becoming underground entrepreneurs themselves or by working for them, the poor have become less poor and the nation itself richer.

Those who advocate statist solutions to development should take note: The free market is the other path to development and the one true path. And unlike many other paths, it leads somewhere. It works. So, this is where I believe we can find the map to the world's future: in the hearts of ordinary people, in their hopes for themselves and their children, in their prayers as they lay themselves and their families to rest each night. These simple people are the giants of the Earth, the true builders of the world and shapers of the centuries to come. And if indeed they triumph, as I believe they will, we will at last know a world of peace and freedom, opportunity and hope, and, yes, of democracy—a world in which the spirit of mankind at last conquers the old, familiar enemies of famine, disease, tyranny, and war.

This is my vision—America's vision. I recognize that some governments represented in this hall have other ideas. Some do not believe in democracy or in political, economic, or religious freedom. Some believe in dictatorship, whether by one man, one party, one class, one race, or one vanguard. To those governments I would only say that the price of oppression is clear. Your economies will fall farther and farther behind. Your people will become more restless. Isn't it better to listen to the people's hopes now rather than their curses later?

And yet despite our differences, there is one common hope that brought us all to make this common pilgrimage: the hope that mankind will one day beat its swords into plowshares, the hope of peace. In no

place on Earth today is peace more in need of friends than the Middle East. Its people's yearning for peace is growing. The United States will continue to be an active partner in the efforts of the parties to come together to settle their differences and build a just and lasting peace.

And this month marks the beginning of the eighth year of the Iran-Iraq war. Two months ago, the Security Council adopted a mandatory resolution demanding a ceasefire, withdrawal, and negotiations to end the war. The United States fully supports implementation of Resolution 598, as we support the Secretary-General's recent mission. We welcomed Iraq's acceptance of that resolution and remain disappointed at Iran's unwillingness to accept it. In that regard, I know that the President of Iran will be addressing you tomorrow. I take this opportunity to call upon him clearly and unequivocally to state whether Iran accepts 598 or not. If the answer is positive, it would be a welcome step and major breakthrough. If it is negative, the Council has no choice but rapidly to adopt enforcement measures.

For 40 years the United States has made it clear, its vital interest in the security of the Persian Gulf and the countries that border it. The oil reserves there are of strategic importance to the economies of the free world. We're committed to maintaining the free flow of this oil and to preventing the domination of the region by any hostile power. We do not seek confrontation or trouble with Iran or anyone else. Our object is—or, objective is now, and has been at every stage, finding a means to end the war with no victor and no vanquished. The increase in our naval presence in the Gulf does not favor one side or the other. It is a response to heightened tensions and followed consultations with our friends in the region. When the tension diminishes, so will our presence.

The United States is gratified by many recent diplomatic developments: the unanimous adoption of Resolution 598, the Arab League's statement at its recent meeting in Tunis, and the Secretary-General's visit. Yet problems remain.

The Soviet Union helped in drafting and reaching an agreement on Resolution 598,

but outside the Security Council, the Soviets have acted differently. They called for removal of our Navy from the Gulf, where it has been for 40 years. They made the false accusation that somehow the United States, rather than the war itself, is the source of tension in the Gulf. Well, such statements are not helpful. They divert attention from the challenge facing us all: a just end to the war. The United States hopes the Soviets will join the other members of the Security Council in vigorously seeking an end to a conflict that never should have begun, should have ended long ago, and has become one of the great tragedies of the postwar era.

Elsewhere in the region, we see the continuing Soviet occupation of Afghanistan. After nearly 8 years, a million casualties, nearly 4 million others driven into exile, and more intense fighting than ever, it's time for the Soviet Union to leave. The Afghan people must have the right to determine their own future free of foreign coercion. There is no excuse for prolonging a brutal war or propping up a regime whose days are clearly numbered. That regime offers political proposals that pretend compromise, but really would ensure the perpetuation of the regime's power. Those proposals have failed the only significant test: They have been rejected by the Afghan people. Every day the resistance grows in strength. It is an indispensable party in the quest for a negotiated solution.

The world community must continue to insist on genuine self-determination, prompt and full Soviet withdrawal, and the return of the refugees to their homes in safety and honor. The attempt may be made to pressure a few countries to change their vote this year, but this body, I know, will vote overwhelmingly, as every year before, for Afghan independence and freedom. We have noted General Secretary Gorbachev's statement of readiness to withdraw. In April I asked the Soviet Union to set a date this year when this withdrawal would begin. I repeat that request now in this forum for peace. I pledge that, once the Soviet Union shows convincingly that it's ready for a genuine political settlement, the United States is ready to be helpful.

ouncil, the Sovi-  
They called for  
the Gulf, where  
They made the  
how the United  
ar, itself, is the  
Gulf. Well, such  
They divert at-  
facing us all: a  
United States  
the other mem-  
il in vigorously  
lict that never  
ave ended long  
the great trage-

we see the con-  
of Afghanistan.  
illion casualties,  
iven into exile,  
than ever, it's  
to leave. The  
the right to de-  
free of foreign  
e for prolonging  
up a regime  
numbered. That  
posals that pre-  
ly would ensure  
regime's power.  
the only signifi-  
rejected by the  
the resistance  
n indispensable  
otiated solution.  
ust continue to  
f-determination,  
drawal, and the  
their homes in  
tempt may be  
ntries to change  
s body, I know,  
as every year  
lence and free-  
neral Secretary  
adness to with-  
Soviet Union to  
this withdrawal  
request now in  
dge that, once  
nvincingly that  
ical settlement,  
to be helpful.

Let me add one final note on this matter. Pakistan, in the face of enormous pressure and intimidation, has given sanctuary to Afghan refugees. We salute the courage of Pakistan and the Pakistani people. They deserve strong support from all of us.

Another regional conflict, we all know, is taking place in Central America, in Nicaragua. To the Sandinista delegation here today I say: Your people know the true nature of your regime. They have seen their liberties suppressed. They have seen the promises of 1979 go unfulfilled. They have seen their real wages and personal income fall by half—yes, half—since 1979, while your party elite live lives of privilege and luxury. This is why, despite a billion dollars in Soviet-bloc aid last year alone, despite the largest and best equipped army in Central America, you face a popular revolution at home. It is why the democratic resistance is able to operate freely deep in your heartland. But this revolution should come as no surprise to you; it is only the revolution you promised the people and that you then betrayed.

The goal of United States policy toward Nicaragua is simple. It is the goal of the Nicaraguan people and the freedom fighters, as well. It is democracy—real, free, pluralistic, constitutional democracy. Understand this: We will not, and the world community will not, accept phony democratization designed to mask the perpetuation of dictatorship. In this 200th year of our own Constitution, we know that real democracy depends on the safeguards of an institutional structure that prevents a concentration of power. It is that which makes rights secure. The temporary relaxation of controls, which can later be tightened, is not democratization.

And, again, to the Sandinistas, I say: We continue to hope that Nicaragua will become part of the genuine democratic transformation that we have seen throughout Central America in this decade. We applaud the principles embodied in the Guatemala agreement, which links the security of the Central American democracies to democratic reform in Nicaragua. Now is the time for you to shut down the military machine that threatens your neighbors and assaults your own people. You must end your

stranglehold on internal political activity. You must hold free and fair national elections. The media must be truly free, not censored or intimidated or crippled by indirect measures, like the denial of newsprint or threats against journalists or their families. Exiles must be allowed to return to minister, to live, to work, and to organize politically. Then, when persecution of religion has ended and the jails no longer contain political prisoners, national reconciliation and democracy will be possible. Unless this happens, democratization will be a fraud. And until it happens, we will press for true democracy by supporting those fighting for it.

Freedom in Nicaragua or Angola or Afghanistan or Cambodia or Eastern Europe or South Africa or anyplace else on the globe is not just an internal matter. Some time ago the Czech dissident writer Vaclav Havel warned the world that "respect for human rights is the fundamental condition and the sole genuine guarantee of true peace." And Andrei Sakharov in his Nobel lecture said: "I am convinced that international confidence, mutual understanding, disarmament, and international security are inconceivable without an open society with freedom of information, freedom of conscience, the right to publish, and the right to travel and choose the country in which one wishes to live." Freedom serves peace; the quest for peace must serve the cause of freedom. Patient diplomacy can contribute to a world in which both can flourish.

We're heartened by new prospects for improvement in East-West and particularly U.S.-Soviet relations. Last week Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze visited Washington for talks with me and with the Secretary of State, Shultz. We discussed the full range of issues, including my longstanding efforts to achieve, for the first time, deep reductions in U.S. and Soviet nuclear arms. It was 6 years ago, for example, that I proposed the zero-option for U.S. and Soviet longer range, intermediate-range nuclear missiles. I'm pleased that we have now agreed in principle to a truly historic treaty that will eliminate an entire class of U.S. and Soviet nuclear weapons. We also agreed to intensify our diplomatic efforts in all

RR  
used  
same  
exact  
quote  
in 1985  
UN  
address

areas of mutual interest. Toward that end, Secretary Shultz and the Foreign Minister will meet again a month from now in Moscow, and I will meet again with General Secretary Gorbachev later this fall.

We continue to have our differences and probably always will. But that puts a special responsibility on us to find ways—realistic ways—to bring greater stability to our competition and to show the world a constructive example of the value of communication and of the possibility of peaceful solutions to political problems. And here let me add that we seek, through our Strategic Defense Initiative, to find a way to keep peace through relying on defense, not offense, for deterrence and for eventually rendering ballistic missiles obsolete. SDI has greatly enhanced the prospects for real arms reduction. It is a crucial part of our efforts to ensure a safer world and a more stable strategic balance.

We will continue to pursue the goal of arms reduction, particularly the goal that the General Secretary and I agreed upon: a 50-percent reduction in our respective strategic nuclear arms. We will continue to press the Soviets for more constructive conduct in the settling of regional conflicts. We look to the Soviets to honor the Helsinki accords. We look for greater freedom for the Soviet peoples within their country, more people-to-people exchanges with our country, and Soviet recognition in practice of the right of freedom of movement.

We look forward to a time when things we now regard as sources of friction and even danger can become examples of cooperation between ourselves and the Soviet Union. For instance, I have proposed a collaboration to reduce the barriers between East and West in Berlin and, more broadly, in Europe as a whole. Let us work together for a Europe in which force of the threat—or, force, whether in the form of walls or of guns, is no longer an obstacle to free choice by individuals and whole nations. I have also called for more openness in the flow of information from the Soviet Union about its military forces, policies, and programs so that our negotiations about arms reductions can proceed with greater confidence.

We hear much about changes in the Soviet Union. We're intensely interested in

these changes. We hear the word *glasnost*, which is translated as "openness" in English. "Openness" is a broad term. It means the free, unfettered flow of information, ideas, and people. It means political and intellectual liberty in all its dimensions. We hope, for the sake of the peoples of the U.S.S.R., that such changes will come. And we hope, for the sake of peace, that it will include a foreign policy that respects the freedom and independence of other peoples.

No place should be better suited for discussions of peace than this hall. The first Secretary-General, Trygve Lie, said of the United Nations: "With the danger of fire, and in the absence of an organized fire department, it is only common sense for the neighbors to join in setting up their own fire brigades." Joining together to drown the flames of war—this, together with a Universal Declaration of Human Rights, was the founding ideal of the United Nations. It is our continuing challenge to ensure that the U.N. lives up to these hopes. As the Secretary-General noted some time ago, the risk of anarchy in the world has increased, because the fundamental rules of the U.N. Charter have been violated. The General Assembly has repeatedly acknowledged this with regard to the occupation of Afghanistan. The charter has a concrete practical meaning today, because it touches on all the dimensions of human aspiration that I mentioned earlier—the yearning for democracy and freedom, for global peace, and for prosperity.

This is why we must protect the Universal Declaration of Human Rights from being debased as it was through the infamous "Zionism is Racism" resolution. We cannot permit attempts to control the media and promote censorship under the ruse of a so-called "New World Information Order." We must work against efforts to introduce contentious and nonrelevant issues into the work of the specialized and technical agencies, where we seek progress on urgent problems—from terrorism to drug trafficking to nuclear proliferation—which threaten us all. Such efforts corrupt the charter and weaken this organization.

There have been important administra-

word *glasnost*, "openness" in English term. It means freedom of information, news, political and social dimensions. We hope the peoples of the world will come. And we hope, that it will be that respects the interests of other people.

is suited for disapproval. The first time Lie, said of the danger of fire, organized fire demonstrators sense for the group their own safety rather to drown together with a human Rights, was United Nations. It is to ensure that our hopes. As the time ago, the world has increased, the rules of the U.N. stand. The General Assembly acknowledged this situation of Afghanistan concrete practical touches on all the aspiration that I am fighting for democracy, peace, and for

protect the Universal rights from being the infamous "Zionism." We cannot let the media and the abuse of a so-called "Order." We will introduce controversial issues into the technical agencies on urgent drug trafficking—which threaten the charter of the United Nations. I am fighting for democracy, peace, and for

and budget reforms. They have helped. The United States is committed to restoring its contribution as reforms progress. But there is still much to do. The United Nations was built on great dreams and great ideals. Sometimes it has strayed. It is time for it to come home. It was Dag Hammarskjöld who said: "The end of all political effort must be the well-being of the individual in a life of safety and freedom." Well, should this not be our credo in the years ahead?

I have spoken today of a vision and the obstacles to its realization. More than a century ago a young Frenchman, Alexis de Tocqueville, visited America. After that visit he predicted that the two great powers of the future world would be, on one hand, the United States, which would be built, as he said, "by the plowshare," and, on the other, Russia, which would go forward, again, as he said, "by the sword." Yet need it be so? Cannot swords be turned to plowshares? Can we and all nations not live in peace? In our obsession with antagonisms of the moment, we often forget how much unites all the members of humanity. Perhaps we need some outside, universal threat to make us recognize this common bond. I occasionally think how quickly our differences worldwide would vanish if we were facing an alien threat from outside this world. And yet, I ask you, is not an alien force already among us? What could be more alien to the universal aspirations of

our peoples than war and the threat of war?

Two centuries ago, in a hall much smaller than this one, in Philadelphia, Americans met to draft a Constitution. In the course of their debates, one of them said that the new government, if it was to rise high, must be built on the broadest base: the will and consent of the people. And so it was, and so it has been.

My message today is that the dreams of ordinary people reach to astonishing heights. If we diplomatic pilgrims are to achieve equal altitudes, we must build all we do on the full breadth of humanity's will and consent and the full expanse of the human heart. Thank you, and God bless you all.

*Note: President Reagan spoke at 11:02 a.m. in the General Assembly Hall. In his opening remarks, he referred to United Nations President Peter Florin, Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar de la Guerra, and Under Secretary-General for Political and General Assembly Affairs Joseph V. Reed, Jr. Following his address, President Reagan met with the Secretary-General in the Indonesian Lounge. He then went to the U.S. Mission for a meeting with allied Foreign Ministers and bilateral meetings with Prime Minister Mohammed Khan Junejo of Pakistan, Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone of Japan, and President Vinicio Cerezo Arévalo of Guatemala. Following the meetings, he returned to Washington, DC.*

### Statement by Assistant to the President for Press Relations Fitzwater on the United States Air Strike in the Persian Gulf September 21, 1987

United States Forces took defensive action in the Persian Gulf Monday evening, when an Iranian landing craft was discovered laying mines in international waters 50 miles northeast of Bahrain. We have previously communicated with the Iranian Gov-

ernment the way in which we would respond to such provocative acts which present an immediate risk to United States ships and to all ships. United States Forces acted in a defensive manner and in accordance with existing rules of engagement.

## Informal Exchange With Reporters on the Presidential Candidates Debate September 26, 1988

*Q.* Mr. President, who won the debate last night? Who won the debate?

*The President.* I think the Vice President was excellent. I think that he was the only one who was really stating facts and truth.

*Q.* He didn't know which missiles and—how come he didn't know what programs to cut from the defense budget?

*The President.* I didn't hear what you—

*Q.* He didn't know about the defense budget.

*The President.* What?

*Q.* He was mixed up on the defense budget.

*Mr. Fitzwater.* Must mean Dukakis, huh?

*The President.* You mean Dukakis? What?

*Q.* George Bush, on what weapons he would cut from the defense budget.

*Mr. Fitzwater.* Something weapon—I don't know. I don't know what she's saying—something about the defense

budget, but it's hard to tell. I think we'd better go.

*The President.* I think the simplest statement about the defense budget and who is to blame for what is happening is the fact that over a 5-year period the Congress cut \$125 billion from the budgets I've presented, but added \$250 billion to the non-defense spending.

*Q.* How did Dukakis do?

*The President.* What?

*Q.* How did Dukakis do in the debate?

*The President.* He didn't thrill me.

*Note: The exchange began at 9:07 a.m. at the South Portico of the White House, prior to the President's departure for New York City. Vice President George Bush and Gov. Michael Dukakis participated in the first Presidential candidates debate on September 25.*

## Address to the 43d Session of the United Nations General Assembly in New York, New York September 26, 1988

Mr. President, Mr. General Secretary [Secretary-General], distinguished delegates: Half a world away from this place of peace, the firing, the killing, the bloodshed in two merciless conflicts have, for the first time in recent memory, diminished. After adding terrible new names to the rollcall of human horror—names such as Halabja, Maidan Shahr, and Spin Buldak—there is today hope of peace in the Persian Gulf and Afghanistan. So, too, in the highlands and coastal cities of southern Africa—places of civil war, places of occupation by foreign troops—talk of peace is heard, peace for the tortured nation of Angola.

Sixty-five hundred miles east, in the Southeast Asian country of Cambodia, there is hope now of a settlement—the removal

of Vietnam's occupying forces. And finally, in this hemisphere, where only 12 years ago one-third of the people of Latin America lived under democratic rule, some 90 percent do so today; and especially in Central America, nations such as El Salvador, once threatened by the anarchy of the death squad and the specter of totalitarian rule, now know the hope of self-government and the prospect of economic growth.

And another change, Mr. Secretary-General, a change that, if it endures, may go down as one of the signal accomplishments of our history, a change that is a cause for shaking of the head in wonder, is also upon us—a change going to the source of postwar tensions and to the once seemingly impossible dream of ending the twin threats of our

time: totalitarianism and thermonuclear world war.

For the first time, the differences between East and West—fundamental differences over important moral questions dealing with the worth of the individual and whether governments shall control people or people control governments—for the first time, these differences have shown signs of easing, easing to the point where there are not just troop withdrawals from places like Afghanistan but also talk in the East of reform and greater freedom of press, of assembly, and of religion.

Yes, fundamental differences remain. But should talk of reform become more than that, should it become reality, there is the prospect of not only a new era in Soviet-American relations but a new age of world peace. For such reform can bring peace, history teaches. And my country has always believed that where the rights of the individual and the people are enshrined, war is a distant prospect. For it is not people who make war; only governments do that.

I stand at this podium, then, in a moment of hope—hope not just for the peoples of the United States or the Soviet Union but for all the peoples of the world—and hope, too, for the dream of peace among nations, the dream that began the United Nations.

Precisely because of these changes, today the United Nations has the opportunity to live and breathe and work as never before. Already, you, Mr. Secretary-General, through your persistence, patience, and unyielding will, have shown, in working toward peace in Afghanistan and the Persian Gulf, how valuable the United Nations can be. And we salute you for these accomplishments.

In Geneva at this very hour, there are numerous negotiations underway—multilateral negotiations at the Conference on Disarmament as well as bilateral negotiations on a range of issues between the Soviets and ourselves. And these negotiations, some of them under U.N. auspices, involve a broad arms control agenda—strategic offensive weapons and space, nuclear testing and chemical warfare—whose urgency we have witnessed anew in recent days. And, Mr. Secretary-General, the negotiators are busy. And over the last few years, they've been

engaged in more than an academic exercise. There is movement. The logjam is broken. Only recently, when the United States and the Soviet Union signed the INF agreement, an entire class of U.S. and Soviet nuclear missiles was eliminated for the first time in history. Progress continues on negotiations to reduce, in massive number, strategic weapons with effective verification. And talks will begin soon on conventional reductions in Europe.

Much of the reason for all of this goes back, I believe, to Geneva itself, to the small chateau along the lake where I and the General Secretary of the Soviet Union had the first of several fireside chats, exchanges characterized by frankness, but friendliness, too. I said at the first meeting in Geneva that this was a unique encounter between two people who had the power to start world war III or to begin a new age of peace among nations. And I also said peace conferences, arms negotiations, proposals for treaties could make sense only if they were part of a wider context, a context that sought to explore and resolve the deeper, underlying differences between us. I said to Mr. Gorbachev then, as I've said to you before: Nations do not mistrust each other because they're armed; they're armed because they mistrust each other.

And in that place, by that peaceful lake in neutral Switzerland, Mr. Gorbachev and I did begin a new relationship based not just on engagement over the single issue of arms control but on a broader agenda about our deeper differences—an agenda of human rights, regional conflicts, and bilateral exchanges between our peoples. Even on the arms control issue itself, we agreed to go beyond the past, to seek not just treaties that permit building weapons to higher levels but revolutionary agreements that actually reduced and even eliminated a whole class of nuclear weapons.

What was begun that morning in Geneva has shown results—in the INF treaty; in my recent visit to Moscow; in my opportunity to meet there with Soviet citizens and dissidents and speak of human rights, and to speak, too, in the Lenin Hills of Moscow to the young people of the Soviet Union about the wonder and splendor of human free-

academic exer-  
The logjam is  
when the United  
signed the INF  
ss of U.S. and  
s eliminated for  
ogress continues  
ce, in massive  
s with effective  
begin soon on  
Europe.

all of this goes  
a itself, to the  
ke where I and  
he Soviet Union  
eside chats, ex-  
frankness, but  
the first meeting  
unique encounter  
ad the power to  
gin a new age of  
I also said peace  
ations, proposals  
se only if they  
xt, a context that  
olve the deeper,  
veen us. I said to  
I've said to you  
trust each other  
ey're armed be-  
her.

at peaceful lake  
. Gorbachev and  
nship based on  
he single issue of  
der agenda about  
—an agenda of  
licts, and bilater-  
peoples. Even on  
lf, we agreed to  
not just treaties  
apons to higher  
reements that ac-  
minated a whole

orning in Geneva  
NF treaty; in my  
my opportunity  
citizens and dissi-  
n rights, and to  
ills of Moscow to  
viet Union about  
of human free-

dom. The results of that morning in Geneva are seen in peace conferences now underway around the world on regional conflicts and in the work of the U.N. here in New York as well as in Geneva.

But, Mr. Secretary-General, history teaches caution. Indeed, that very building in Geneva where important negotiations have taken place—the Geneva accords on Afghanistan, the Iran-Iraq negotiations, for example—we see it today as stonelike testimony to a failed dream of peace in another time. The Palais des Nations was the headquarters of the League of Nations, an institution that was to symbolize an end to all war. And yet today—that institution and its noble purpose ended with the Second World War; ended because the chance for peace was not seized in the 1930's by the nations of the world; ended because humanity didn't find the courage to isolate the aggressors, to reject schemes of government that serve the state, not the people.

We are here today, Mr. Secretary-General, determined that no such fate shall befall the United Nations. We are determined that the U.N. should succeed and serve the cause of peace for humankind. So, Mr. Secretary-General, we realize that, even in this time of hope, the chance of failure is real. But this knowledge does not discourage us; it spurs us on. For the stakes are high. Do we falter and fail now and bring down upon ourselves the just anger of future generations? Or do we continue the work of the founders of this institution and see to it that, at last, freedom is enshrined and humanity knows war no longer and that this place, this floor, shall be truly "the world's last battlefield?" We are determined it shall be so. So, we turn now to the agenda of peace.

Let us begin by addressing a concern that was much on my mind when I met with Mr. Gorbachev in the Kremlin, as well as on the minds of Soviet citizens that I met in Moscow. It is also an issue that I know is of immediate importance to the delegates of this Assembly, who this fall commemorate the 40th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. That declaration says plainly what those who seek peace can forget only at the greatest peril: that peace rests on one foundation—observing "the in-

alienable rights of all members of the human family." In a century where human rights have been denied by totalitarian governments on a scale never before seen in history, with so many millions deliberately starved or eliminated as a matter of state policy—a history, it has been said, of blood, stupidity, and barbed wire—few can wonder why peace has proved so elusive.

Now, let us understand: If we would have peace, we must acknowledge the elementary rights of our fellow human beings. In our own land and in other lands, if we would have peace, the trampling of the human spirit must cease. Human rights is not for some, some of the time. Human rights, as the universal declaration of this Assembly adopted in 1948 proclaims, is "for all people and all nations," and for all time.

This regard for human rights as the foundation of peace is at the heart of the U.N. Those who starve in Ethiopia, those who die among the Kurds, those who face racial injustice in South Africa, those who still cannot write or speak freely in the Soviet Union, those who cannot worship in the Ukraine, those who struggle for life and freedom on boats in the South China Sea, those who cannot publish or assemble in Managua—all of this is more than just an agenda item on your calendar. It must be a first concern, an issue above others. For when human rights concerns are not paramount at the United Nations, when the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is not honored in these halls and meeting rooms, then the very credibility of this organization is at stake, the very purpose of its existence in question.

That is why when human rights progress is made, the United Nations grows stronger—and the United States is glad of it. Following a 2-year effort led by the United States, for example, the U.N. Human Rights Commission took a major step toward ending the double standards and cynicism that had characterized too much of its past. For years, Cuba, a blatant violator of its citizens' human rights, has escaped U.N. censure or even scrutiny. This year, Cuba has responded to pressure generated by the Human Rights Commission by accepting an investigation into its human rights abuses.

Fidel Castro has already begun to free some political prisoners, improve prison conditions, and tolerate the existence of a small, independent national human rights group.

More must be done. The United Nations must be relentless and unyielding in seeking change in Cuba and elsewhere. And we must also see to it that the Universal Declaration itself should not be debased with episodes like the "zionism is racism" resolution. Respect for human rights is the first and fundamental mission of this body, the most elementary obligation of its members. Indeed, wherever one turns in the world today, there is new awareness, a growing passion for human rights. The people of the world grow united; new groups, new coalitions form—coalitions that monitor government, that work against discrimination, that fight religious or political repression, unlawful imprisonment, torture, or execution. As those I spoke to at Spaso House said to me last June, such movements make a difference.

Turning now to regional conflicts, we feel again the uplift of hope. In the Gulf war between Iran and Iraq, one of the bloodiest conflicts since World War II, we have a cease-fire. The resolution and the firmness of the allied nations in keeping the Persian Gulf open to international shipping not only upheld the rule of law, it helped prevent further spread of the conflict and laid the basis for peace. So, too, the Security Council's decisive resolution in July a year ago has become the blueprint for a peaceful Gulf. Let this war—a war in which there has been no victor or vanquished, only victims—let this war end now. Let both Iran and Iraq cooperate with the Secretary-General and the Security Council in implementing Resolution 598. Let peace come.

Moving on to a second region: When I first addressed the U.N. General Assembly in 1983, world attention was focused on the brutal invasion and illegal occupation of Afghanistan. After nearly 9 long years of war, the courage and determination of the Afghan people and the Afghan freedom fighters have held sway, and today an end to the occupation is in sight. On April 14, the U.S.S.R. signed the Geneva accords, which were negotiated under U.N. auspices by Pakistan and the Kabul regime. We en-

courage the Soviet Union to complete its troop withdrawal at the earliest possible date so that the Afghan people can freely determine their future without further outside interference.

In southern Africa, too, years of patient diplomacy and support for those in Angola who seek self-determination are having their effect. We look forward to an accord between the Governments of Angola, Cuba, and South Africa that will bring about a complete withdrawal of all foreign troops, primarily Cuban, from Angola. We look forward as well to full implementation of U.N. Security Council Resolution 435 and our longstanding goal of independence for Namibia. We continue to support a growing consensus among African leaders who also believe there can be no end to conflict in the region until there is national reconciliation within Angola.

Mr. Secretary-General, there are new hopes for Cambodia, a nation whose freedom and independence we seek just as avidly as we sought the freedom and independence of Afghanistan. We urge the rapid removal of all Vietnamese troops and a settlement that will prevent the return of the Khmer Rouge to power, permitting instead the establishment of a genuinely representative government—a government that will, at last, respect fully the rights of the people of Cambodia and end the hideous suffering they have so bravely and needlessly borne.

In other critical areas, we applaud the Secretary-General's efforts to structure a referendum on the western Sahara. And in the Mediterranean, direct talks between Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities hold much promise for accord in that divided island nation. And finally, we look to a peaceful solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict. So, too, the unnatural division of Europe remains a critical obstacle to Soviet-American relations.

In most of these areas, then, we see progress, and again, we're glad of it. Only a few years ago, all of these and other conflicts were burning dangerously out of control. Indeed, the invasion of Afghanistan and the apparent will among democratic and peace-loving nations to deter such

events seemed to cause a climate where aggression by nations large and small was epidemic, a climate the world has not seen since the 1930's. Only this time, larger war was avoided, avoided because the free and peaceful nations of the world recovered their strength of purpose and will. And now the United Nations is providing valuable assistance in helping this epidemic to recede.

And because we're resolved to keep it so, I would be remiss in my duty if I did not now take note here of the one exception to progress in regional conflicts. I refer here to the continuing deterioration of human rights in Nicaragua and the refusal of the tiny elite now ruling that nation to honor promises of democracy made to their own people and to the international community.

This elite, in calling itself revolutionary, seeks no real revolution; the use of the term is subterfuge, deception for hiding the oldest, most corrupt vice of all: man's age-old will to power, his lust to control the lives and steal the freedom of others. And that's why, as President, I will continue to urge the Congress and the American public to stand behind those who resist this attempt to impose a totalitarian regime on the people of Nicaragua, that the United States will continue to stand with those who are threatened by this regime's aggression against its neighbors in Central America.

Today I also call on the Soviet Union to show in Central America the same spirit of constructive realism it has shown in other regional conflicts—to assist in bringing conflict in Central America to a close by halting the flow of billions of dollars worth of arms and ammunition to the Sandinista regime, a regime whose goals of regional domination, while ultimately doomed, can continue to cause great suffering to the people of that area and risk to Soviet-American relations unless action is taken now.

Moving now to the arms reduction agenda, I have mentioned already the importance of the INF treaty and the momentum developed in the START negotiations. The draft START treaty is a lengthy document, filled with bracketed language designating sections of disagreement between the two sides. But through this summer in Geneva, those brackets have diminished. There is every reason to believe this process

can continue. I can tell this Assembly that it is highly doubtful such a treaty can be accomplished in a few months, but I can tell you a year from now is a possibility—more than a possibility. But we have no deadline. No agreement is better than a bad agreement. The United States remains hopeful, and we acknowledge the spirit of cooperation shown by the Soviet Union in these negotiations. We also look for that spirit to be applied to our concerns about compliance with existing agreements.

So, too, our discussions on nuclear testing and defense and space have been useful. But let me here stress to this General Assembly that much of the momentum in nuclear arms control negotiations is due to technological progress itself, especially in the potential for space-based defensive systems. I believe that the United States determination to research and develop and, when ready, deploy such defensive systems—systems targeted to destroy missiles, not people—accounts for a large share of the progress made in recent years in Geneva.

With such systems, for the first time, in case of accidental launch or the act of a madman somewhere, major powers will not be faced with the single option of massive retaliation but will instead have the chance of a saner choice: to shield against an attack instead of avenging it. So, too, as defensive systems grow in effectiveness, they reduce the threat and the value of greater and greater offensive arsenals. Only recently, briefings I have received in the Oval Office indicate that progress toward such systems may be even more rapid and less costly than we had at first thought. Today the United States reaffirms its commitment to its Strategic Defense Initiative and our offer to share the benefits of strategic defenses with others.

And yet, even as diplomatic and technological progress holds out the hope of at last diminishing the awful cloud of nuclear terror we've lived under in the postwar era, even at this moment another ominous terror is loose once again in the world, a terror we thought the world had put behind, a terror that looms at us now from the long-buried past, from ghostly, scarring

trenches and the haunting, wan faces of millions dead in one of the most inhumane conflicts of all time: poison gas, chemical warfare. Mr. Secretary-General, distinguished delegates, the terror of it! The horror of it! We condemn it. The use of chemical weapons in the Iran-Iraq war, beyond its tragic human toll, jeopardizes the moral and legal strictures that have held those weapons in check since World War I.

Let this tragedy spark reaffirmation of the Geneva protocol outlawing the use of chemical weapons. I call upon the signatories to that protocol, as well as other concerned states, to convene a conference to consider actions that we can take together to reverse the serious erosion of this treaty. And we urge all nations to cooperate in negotiating a verifiable, truly global ban on chemical weapons at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. It is incumbent upon all civilized nations to ban, once and for all, and on a verifiable and global basis, the use of chemical and gas warfare.

Finally, Mr. Secretary-General, we must redouble our efforts to stop further proliferation of nuclear weapons in the world. Likewise, proliferation in other high-technology weapons, such as ballistic missiles, is reaching global proportions, exacerbating regional rivalries in ways that can have global implications. The number of potential suppliers is growing at an alarming rate, and more must be done to halt the spread of these weapons. This was a matter of discussion last week between Secretary Shultz and Foreign Minister Shevardnadze. Talks between American and Soviet experts begin on this today. And we hope to see a multilateral effort to avoid having areas of tension like the Middle East become even more deadly battlegrounds than they already are.

But in most of these areas, we see not only progress but also the potential for an increasingly vital role for multilateral efforts and institutions like this United Nations. That is why, now more than ever, the United Nations must continue to increase its effectiveness through budget and program reform. The U.N. already is enacting sweeping measures affecting personnel reductions, budgeting by consensus, and the

establishment of program priorities. These actions are extremely important. The progress on reforms has allowed me to release funds withheld under congressional restrictions. I expect the reform program will continue and that further funds will be released in our new fiscal year.

And let me say here, we congratulate the United Nations on the work it has done in three areas of special concern. First, our struggle against the scourge of terrorism and state-sponsored terrorism must continue. And we must also end the scourge of hostage taking. Second, the work of the World Health Organization in coordinating and advancing research on AIDS is vital. All international efforts in this area must be redoubled. The AIDS crisis is a grave one. We must move as one to meet it.

And so, too, is the drug crisis. We're moving now toward a new anti-drug-trafficking convention. This important treaty will be completed in December. I am confident other strong U.N. drug control programs will also follow. The American people are profoundly concerned and deeply angered. We will not tolerate the drug traffickers. We mean to make war on them, and we believe this is one war the United Nations can endorse and participate in.

Yes, the United Nations is a better place than it was 8 years ago, and so, too, is the world. But the real issue of reform in the United Nations is not limited just to fiscal and administrative improvements but also to a higher sort of reform, an intellectual and philosophical reform, a reform of old views about the relationship between the individual and the state.

Few developments, for example, have been more encouraging to the United States than the special session this body held on Africa 2½ years ago, a session in which the United Nations joined as one in a call for free-market incentives and a lessening of state controls to spur economic development. At one of the first international assemblies of my Presidency, in Cancún, Mexico, I said history demonstrates that, time and again, in place after place, economic growth and human progress make their greatest strides in countries that en-

priorities. These are the most important. The program allowed me to re-examine congressional reform program. The program's per-funds will be available.

I congratulate the work it has done in the past. First, our concern of terrorism and crime must continue. The scourge of the work of the in coordinating AIDS is vital. All this area must be met is a grave one. Meet it.

Drug crisis. We're now in an anti-drug-traffic important treaty number. I am configuring control program. The American people are concerned and not tolerate the to make war on is one war the and participate

is a better place and so, too, is the of reform in the ted just to fiscal ements but also, an intellectual a reform of old up between the

example, have to the United session this body ago, a session in oined as one in a ves and a lessen-economic devel-irst international ncy, in Cancún, onstrates that, after place, eco- progress make ountries that en-

courage economic freedom; that individual farmers, laborers, owners, traders, and managers are the heart and soul of development. Trust them, because where they're allowed to create and build, where they're given a personal stake in deciding economic policies and benefiting from their success, then societies become more dynamic, prosperous, progressive, and free. We believe in freedom. We know it works.

And this, Mr. Secretary-General and distinguished delegates, is the immutable lesson of the postwar era: that freedom works—even more, that freedom and peace work together. Every year that passes, everywhere in the world, this lesson is taking hold, from the People's Republic of China to Cameroon, from Bolivia to Botswana, and, yes, in the citadel of Marxism-Leninism itself. No, my country did not invent this synergy of peace and freedom, but believe me, we impose no restrictions on the free export of our more than two centuries of experience with it. Free people blessed by economic opportunity and protected by laws that respect the dignity of the individual are not driven toward war or the domination of others. Here, then, is the way to world peace.

And yet we Americans champion freedom not only because it's practical and beneficial but because it is also just, morally right. And here, Mr. Secretary-General, I hope you'll permit me to note that I have addressed this assemblage more than any of my predecessors and that this will be the last occasion I do so. So I hope, too, I may be permitted now some closing reflections.

The world is currently witnessing another celebration of international cooperation. At the Olympics we see nations joining together in the competition of sports, and we see young people who know precious little of the resentments of their elders coming together as one. One of our young athletes from a home of modest means said that she drew the strength for her achievement from another source of wealth. "We were rich as a family," she said, about the love she was given and the values she was taught. Mr. Secretary-General, I dare to hope that, in the sentiment of that young athlete, we see a sign of the rediscovery of old and tested values: values such as family,

the first and most important unit of society, where all values and learning begin—an institution to be cherished and protected; values, too, such as work, community, freedom, and faith. For it's here we find the deeper rationale for the cause of human rights and world peace.

And our own experience on this continent—the American experience—though brief, has had one unmistakable encounter, an insistence on the preservation of one sacred truth. It is a truth that our first President, our Founding Father, passed on in the first farewell address made to the American people. It is a truth that I hope now you'll permit me to mention in these remarks of farewell, a truth embodied in our Declaration of Independence: that the case for inalienable rights, that the idea of human dignity, that the notion of conscience above compulsion can be made only in the context of higher law, only in the context of what one of the founders of this organization, Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld, has called devotion to something which is greater and higher than we are ourselves. This is the endless cycle, the final truth to which humankind seems always to return: that religion and morality, that faith in something higher, are prerequisites for freedom and that justice and peace within ourselves is the first step toward justice and peace in the world and for the ages.

Yes, this is a place of great debate and grave discussions. And yet I cannot help but note here that one of our Founding Fathers, the most worldly of men, an internationalist, Benjamin Franklin, interrupted the proceedings of our own Constitutional Convention to make much the same point. And I cannot help but think this morning of other beginnings, of where and when I first read those words: "And they shall beat their swords into plowshares . . ." and "your young men shall see visions and your old men shall dream dreams . . ." This morning, my thoughts go to her who gave me many things in life, but her most important gift was the knowledge of happiness and solace to be gained in prayer. It's the greatest help I've had in my Presidency, and I recall here Lincoln's words when he said only the most foolish of men would think he could con-

*again, Bush used this in his acceptance speech*

front the duties of the office I now hold without turning to someone stronger, a power above all others.

I think then of her and others like her in that small town in Illinois, gentle people who possessed something that those who hold positions of power sometimes forget to prize. No one of them could ever have imagined the boy from the banks of the Rock River would come to this moment and have this opportunity. But had they been told it would happen, I think they would have been a bit disappointed if I'd not spoken here for what they knew so well: that when we grow weary of the world and its troubles, when our faith in humanity falters, it is then that we must seek comfort and refreshment of spirit in a deeper source of wisdom, one greater than ourselves.

And so, if future generations do say of us that in our time peace came closer, that we did bring about new seasons of truth and justice, it will be cause for pride. But it shall be a cause of greater pride, still, if it is also said that we were wise enough to know the deliberations of great leaders and great bodies are but overture, that the truly majestic music—the music of freedom, of justice, and peace—is the music made in forgetting self and seeking in silence the will of Him who made us.

Thank you for your hospitality over the years. I bid you now farewell, and God bless you.

*Note: The President spoke at 11:04 a.m. in the General Assembly Hall at the United Nations.*

### Appointment of William J. Burns as a Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs *September 26, 1988*

The President today announced the appointment of William J. Burns as Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs and Senior Director for Near East and South Asian Affairs.

Mr. Burns, a career Foreign Service officer, has served on the National Security Council staff since 1986. His previous assignments include special assistant to the Deputy Secretary of State, staff assistant to

the Assistant Secretary of State for Near East and South Asian Affairs, and political officer at the U.S. Embassy in Amman, Jordan.

Mr. Burns graduated from LaSalle College and holds a doctorate in international relations from Oxford University. He was born April 4, 1956, in Fort Bragg, NC. Mr. Burns is married and resides in Washington, DC.

### Statement by Assistant to the President for Press Relations Fitzwater on Protection of United States-Flagged Shipping in the Persian Gulf *September 26, 1988*

After reviewing the current cease-fire in the Persian Gulf, which has been in effect since August 20, and consulting with allies and friends in the region, the President has decided to modify our present method of providing protection to U.S.-flagged ship-

ping in the Gulf. The modification entails a change from a tight escort procedure to an "accompany" regime. In an accompany regime, U.S. forces will be positioned such that they can take appropriate action if U.S.-flagged ships are directly threatened.

gressman from western Massachusetts. What big shoes to fill, but he will do it.

Thank you all very much, and may I take this opportunity to make a nonpartisan comment. Bill and I and Paul Cellucci and others rode in from the airport, and I must say I was deeply touched and moved by the warm response and welcome from the people that lined the streets coming in from the airport. I was deeply touched, and it gives me one hell of a sendoff for what's going to be a great Memorial Day weekend. Thank you all very, very much.

*Note: The President spoke at 1:22 p.m. in the Harborview Ballroom at the Boston World Trade Center. In his remarks, he referred to Secretary of Commerce Robert A. Mosbacher. These remarks were not received in time for inclusion in last week's issue.*

**Statement on Signing the Niobrara Scenic River Designation Act of 1991**  
May 24, 1991

Today I have signed into law S. 248, the "Niobrara Scenic River Designation Act of 1991." This action will, among other things, designate three segments of the Niobrara River and one segment of the Missouri River in Nebraska and South Dakota as "instant" components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System without the benefit of a formal study.

The Niobrara River is an outstanding river resource, and the national significance of the resource is not in question. Approval of this bill will preserve and protect the resources of the Niobrara for future generations and will provide for a worthy addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

However, I am extremely disappointed that the Congress has acted to designate these segments for Wild and Scenic River status without the benefit of a study under section 5(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. This study is not just a matter of blind process; rather, such a study would have given the Congress all the information needed to determine the most appropriate method of protecting the valuable resources along the Niobrara. Such a study is especially important when the lands along the des-

ignated segments are predominantly privately owned. Where private property interests are at stake, a formal study should be an absolute requirement before Federal action is taken that may infringe such rights.

I believe that to protect the integrity and viability of the National Park System, completion of feasibility studies should be a prerequisite for establishment of any new unit of the National Park System. Any component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System that is administered by the National Park Service becomes a unit of the National Park System. I urge the Congress to adhere to the requirement for such studies in the future.

George Bush

The White House,  
May 24, 1991.

*Note: S. 248, approved May 24, was assigned Public Law No. 102-50. This statement was not received in time for inclusion in last week's issue.*

**Remarks at the Yale University Commencement Ceremony in New Haven, Connecticut**

May 27, 1991

Thank you very, very much. President Schmidt and members of the faculty, and the Yale community, fellows of the Yale Corporation, and especially with congratulations to my fellow honorands, it is an honor to be here today. Mayor Daniels, it's nice to be back in the city. And most importantly, to the graduating students: Congratulate each and every one of you. May I single out Yale's band. They've cleaned up for today, and they've never been better under Mr. Tom Duffy. Thank you, sir. And thank you for the warm welcome. *Si res prehensio en cano est non oves sic vacio.* That means, if you're holding up the sign, you can't throw eggs. [Laughter]

I remember my own commencement. Like so many of my classmates, I'd come Yale fresh from war, ready to make up "lost time." I remember our impatience and our optimism. And we sensed upcoming adventure. I imagine it's the same today

for all of you. It's almost as if life is about to begin, that is, if the commencement speech ever ends. [Laughter]

Twenty-nine years ago, President Kennedy stood right here, and my dad was honored with him. And he said, "I have the best of all worlds: a Yale degree and a Harvard education." [Laughter] He had it wrong. I've got the best of all worlds: a Yale education and a Yale degree.

My day was no different. There's an excitement in the air, and Barbara and I spent a good part of our senior year thinking about, literally, becoming farmers. We talked about life on the land and rising early and working hard and raising a crop and a family. And we looked into the finances of running a farm. In the end, we decided against the whole idea. We realized that when it came to pigs and chickens and cattle or corn, we didn't know the first thing about farming.

So, of course, there was only one alternative: I went west and became an oilman. [Laughter] The days after—the day—the very day after the ceremony like this one, I relished the familiar surroundings of this beautiful old campus for the dust and grit and searing heat of the Lone Star State.

Odessa, Texas, became my world. And yet far beyond 37 Hillhouse Avenue where Barbara and I lived, or the Flatlands of West Texas, change rocked the whole world in ways that would affect us all for more than 40 years. On June 20th, 1948—my graduation day—the United Nations sent out its first peacekeeping force—49 men from the United States and 6 other nations—to bring the promise of peace to the Middle East. And on that day, the Soviet Union tried to clamp down on the free sectors of Berlin—the Berlin Blockade had begun. And on that day, Congress, after an all-night session, passed a bill to help the nations of war-torn Europe. That package would become known, as we all know, as the Marshall Plan.

Today's world—your world—is every bit as astonishing. Back in my day, opportunity knocked. And yours—your pager beeps.

We have seen in 2 short years the end of a long era of cold war and conflict. The Iron Curtain collapsed—it's gone, the wall is down. And with it the myth of an ideology called communism. On the barren ground

that once separated East and West, the democratic idea sprouted anew.

As a nation, we can take great pride in this triumph. It vindicates more than 40 years of American vigilance—a lesson learned on the battlefields of Europe and the seas of the South Pacific—that this nation could no longer pursue a policy of "splendid isolation."

The democratic renaissance in Central and Eastern Europe, the blossoming of democracy here in the Americas, the emerging consensus on the African Continent that democracy is the road to development, none of this would have taken place if America had turned inward, away from the challenges of a new world. So today, as we seek to promote freedom and democracy and human rights, as we seek to strengthen stability within the international community, an America confident enough to engage the world remains our best hope for peace, security, and shared prosperity.

Look in every corner of the globe and you will find that the American example has consequences. When we reach out, we offer more than cars or grain or MTV. We exemplify an ideal, an ideal that conquers circumstance and suspicion, that conquers despots and empowers people. Some argue that a nation as moral and just as ours should not taint itself by dealing with nations less moral, less just. But this counsel offers up self-righteousness draped in a false morality. You do not reform a world by ignoring it.

East Asia is a case in point. Today, this dynamic region plays an important role in the world economy. As it has grown more prosperous, it has also grown more free. Driven forward by the engine of economic growth and trade, especially with the U.S., South Korea and Taiwan have shed their once authoritarian rule in favor of democracy and freer trade.

This same approach guides our policy towards the People's Republic of China, home to fully one-fifth of the world's people. China easily can affect the stability of the Asian-Pacific region and, therefore, affect the entire world's peace and prosperity. The Chinese play a central role in working to resolve the conflict in Cambodia and relax tensions on the Korean Peninsula.

China has a voice now in the multinational organizations. And its votes in the United Nations Security Council against Iraq's brutal aggression helped us forge the broad coalition that brought us victory in the Gulf. And so, when we find opportunities to cooperate with China, we will explore them. When problems arise with China's behavior, we will take appropriate action.

After the tragedy of Tiananmen, the United States was the first nation to condemn the use of violence against the peacefully demonstrating people of Beijing. We were the first to guarantee the rights of Chinese students studying on campuses across the country, including here at Yale. The United States was the first nation to impose sanctions, and we are now the last, alone among the Western democracies, to keep those original sanctions in place. At every high-level meeting with the Chinese Government, U.S. officials reiterate our position on human rights violations.

Unfair trade is also high on our agenda. Just last month, we cited China under the trade rules of a special 301 for pirating U.S. copyrights and patents. And for the sake of national security, we will ban technologies and equipment to any Chinese company found to violate rules outlawing transfer of missile technologies.

We will continue to advance our interests and ideals: for free and fair trade, for broader democratization, for respect for human rights throughout China. Let me be clear: As a member of the United Nations, China is bound by the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights. We will hold China to the obligations that it has freely accepted.

And finally, we continue urging China to exercise restraint in its weapons exports. Our recent experience with Iraq proves how dangerous the deadly trade can be. And very soon, I will announce significant new steps that we can take to control arms exports to the entire Middle East. Every nation must play a part in this effort. That's why we urge the Chinese Government to abide by the letter and spirit of international agreements on missile technology controls, and to do what 141 other nations have already done: sign the nuclear nonproliferation treaty.

And this is one way that the United States can be a catalyst for positive change. This

week, I will employ another by proposing formally that MFN trade status continue for China. This policy has generated considerable controversy. Some critics have said revoke MFN—or endanger it with sweeping conditions—to censure China, cut our ties and isolate it. We are told this is a principled policy, a moral thing to do. This advice is not new. It's not wise. It is not in the best interests of our country, the United States. And in the end, in spite of noble and best intentions, it is not moral.

First, MFN is [not] special. It is not a favor. It is the ordinary basis of trade worldwide. Second, MFN is a means to bring the influence of the outside world to bear on China. Critics who attack MFN today act as if the point is to punish China, as if hurting China's economy will somehow help the cause of privatization and human rights.

The real point is to pursue a policy that has the best chance of changing Chinese behavior. If we withdrew MFN or imposed conditions that would make trade impossible, we would punish South China, in particular, Guangdong Province, the very region where free market reform and the challenge to central authority are the strongest. Right now, there's an estimated two million Chinese who are working and proving that privatization can work—all in South China. Withdraw MFN and their jobs would be in jeopardy. In addition, endangering MFN would deal a body blow to Hong Kong, the bastion of freedom and free trade in the Far East.

But the most compelling reason to renew MFN and remain engaged in China is not economic, it's not strategic, but moral. It is right to export the ideals of freedom and democracy to China. It is right to encourage Chinese students to come to the United States and for talented American students to go to China. It is wrong to isolate China if we hope to influence China.

For two decades after the Communists seized power in 1949, the Western world followed a policy of isolation toward China. This period proved to be among the most brutal episodes in Chinese history, a nightmare of anguish and death and suffering that will scar the soul of China for decades to come.

So, it comes down to the strength of our belief in the power of the democratic idea. If we pursue a policy that cultivates contacts with the Chinese people, promotes commerce to our benefit, we can help create a climate for democratic change.

No nation on Earth has discovered a way to import the world's goods and services while stopping foreign ideas at the border. Just as the democratic idea has transformed nations on every continent, so, too, change will inevitably come to China.

This nation's foreign policy has always been more than simply an expression of American interests; it's an extension of American ideals. This moral dimension of American policy requires us to remain active, engaged in the world. Many times, that means trying to chart a moral course through a world of lesser evils. That's the real world, not black and white. Very few moral absolutes. Enormous potential for error and embarrassment. But all are part of the risks that we willingly take to advance the American ideal.

Many times in the past 40 years, people have encouraged us to adopt a policy of righteous isolationism, but we remained engaged. We cannot advance principles if we curl up into a defensive ball. We cannot transform a world if we hide from its unpleasant realities. We can advance our cherished ideals only by extending our hand, showing our best sides, sticking patiently to our values, even if we risk rejection.

Look at the way American encouragement and the American example—the power of the American example—is paying off in Taiwan and Korea. We will have no leverage. We will not be able to advance our cause or resist repression if we pull back and declare that China is simply too impure a place for us. We want to promote positive change in the world through the force of our example, not simply profess our purity. We want to advance the cause of freedom, not just snub nations that aren't yet wholly free.

Let me close today with some modest pieces of advice. First, understand that you often will confront moral ambiguity. There will come times when you will have difficulty distinguishing between good guys and bad guys. When these situations arise, identify your principles and stick by them. Stick

by them even when people jeer, when people urge you to find a quick and easy out. If you remain patient and true to yourself, you can't go wrong. Second, remember that the corner of the world that matters most is one right here at home, the one you share with friends and family. And finally, your destiny and the currents of history will most likely intersect more than once. You will have ample opportunity to make your mark. And take care to make it count.

To all the graduates of the class of '91 who now join me as proud alumni of this great university, congratulations, good luck to you, and may God bless the United States of America.

*Note: The President spoke at 11:55 a.m. in the Yale University Quadrangle.*

### The President's News Conference in Kennebunkport, Maine

May 28, 1991

#### President's Health

*Q.* Mr. President, could we get your reaction—

*Q.* How about the water at the White House? Do you want to talk about that now?

*The President.* The water at the White House?

*Q.* Yes.

*The President.* What about it?

*Q.* They're apparently checking it.

*Q.* It's being checked to see if this is the thyroid problem.

*Q.* They're saying that possibly you and Mrs. Bush and the dog, having gotten these autoimmune problems, that perhaps it's something to do with the water.

*The President.* Maybe the air. I don't know—

*Q.* You didn't know about it?

*The President.* No.

*Q.* Did you know it was being checked?

*The President.* Not checked. I just heard something on the television. I could hardly believe it.

The odds against two people in the family having—the doctor told me, the thyroid

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

January 29, 1991

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT  
ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

The U.S. Capitol  
Washington, D.C.

9:09 P.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. President, and Mr. Speaker, and members of the United States Congress. I come to this House of the people to speak to you and all Americans, certain that we stand at a defining hour. Halfway around the world, we are engaged in a great struggle in the skies and on the seas and sands. We know why we're there. We are Americans -- part of something larger than ourselves. For two centuries, we've done the hard work of freedom. And tonight, we lead the world in facing down a threat to decency and humanity.

What is at stake is more than one small country; it is a big idea: a new world order, where diverse nations are drawn together in common cause to achieve the universal aspirations of mankind -- peace and security, freedom, and the rule of law. Such is a world worthy of our struggle and worthy of our children's future. (Applause.)

The community of nations has resolutely gathered to condemn and repel lawless aggression. Saddam Hussein's unprovoked invasion -- his ruthless, systematic rape of a peaceful neighbor -- violated everything the community of nations holds dear. The world has said this aggression would not stand -- and it will not stand. (Applause.)

Together, we have resisted the trap of appeasement, cynicism, and isolation that gives temptation to tyrants. The world has answered Saddam's invasion with 12 United Nations resolutions, starting with a demand for Iraq's immediate and unconditional withdrawal and backed up by forces from 28 countries of six continents. With few exceptions, the world now stands as one.

The end of the Cold War has been a victory for all humanity. A year and a half ago, in Germany, I said that our goal was a Europe whole and free. Tonight, Germany is united. Europe has become whole and free -- and America's leadership was instrumental in making it possible. (Applause.)

Our relationship to the Soviet Union is important, not only to us, but to the world. That relationship has helped to shape these and other historic changes. But like many other nations, we have been deeply concerned by the violence in the Baltics, and we have communicated that concern to the Soviet leadership.

The principle that has guided us is simple: Our objective is to help the Baltic peoples achieve their aspirations, not to punish the Soviet Union. (Applause.) In our recent discussions with the Soviet leadership, we have been given representations which, if fulfilled, would result in the withdrawal of some Soviet forces, a reopening of dialogue with the Republics, and a move away from violence.

We will watch carefully as the situation develops. And we will maintain our contact with the Soviet leadership to encourage

continued commitment to democratization and reform. (Applause.) If it is possible, I want to continue to build a lasting basis for U.S.-Soviet cooperation, for a more peaceful future for all mankind.

The triumph of democratic ideas in Eastern Europe and Latin America, and the continuing struggle for freedom elsewhere all around the world all confirm the wisdom of our nation's founders.

Tonight, we work to achieve another victory -- a victory over tyranny and savage aggression.

We in this Union enter the last decade of the 20th century thankful for our blessings, steadfast in our purpose, aware of our difficulties, and responsive to our duties at home and around the world.

For two centuries, America has served the world as an inspiring example of freedom and democracy. For generations, America has led the struggle to preserve and extend the blessings of liberty. And today, in a rapidly changing world, American leadership is indispensable. Americans know that leadership brings burdens and sacrifices. But we also know why the hopes of humanity turn to us. We are Americans: we have a unique responsibility to do the hard work of freedom. And when we do, freedom works. (Applause.)

The conviction and courage we see in the Persian Gulf today is simply the American character in action. The indomitable spirit that is contributing to this victory for world peace and justice is the same spirit that gives us the power and the potential to meet our toughest challenges at home.

We are resolute and resourceful. If we can selflessly confront evil for the sake of good in a land so far away, then surely we can make this land all that it should be. If anyone tells you that America's best days are behind her, they're looking the wrong way. (Applause.)

Tonight, I come before this House and the American people with an appeal for renewal. This is not merely a call for new government initiatives; it is a call for new initiative in government, in our communities, and from every American -- to prepare for the next American century.

America has always led by example. So who among us will set this example? Which of our citizens will lead us in this next American century? Everyone who steps forward today -- to get one addict off drugs, to convince one troubled teenager not to give up on life, to comfort one AIDS patient, to help one hungry child.

We have within our reach the promise of a renewed America. We can find meaning and reward by serving some purpose higher than ourselves -- a shining purpose, the illumination of a thousand points of light. And it is expressed by all who know the irresistible force of a child's hand, of a friend who stands by you and stays there -- a volunteer's generous gesture, an idea that is simply right.

The problems before us may be different, but the key to solving them remains the same. It is the individual -- the individual who steps forward. And the state of our Union is the union of each of us, one to the other -- the sum of our friendships, marriages, families, and communities.

We all have something to give. So if you know how to read, find someone who can't. If you've got a hammer, find a nail. If you're not hungry, not lonely, not in trouble, seek out someone who is. Join the community of conscience. Do the hard work of freedom. And that will define the state of our Union. (Applause.)

Since the birth of our nation, "We the people" has been the source of our strength. What government can do alone is limited -- but the potential of the American people knows no limits.

We are a nation of rock-solid realism and clear-eyed idealism. We are Americans. We are the nation that believes in the future. We are the nation that can shape the future. And we've begun to do just that -- by strengthening the power and choice of individuals and families.

Together, these last two years, we've put dollars for child care directly in the hands of parents instead of bureaucracies. (Applause.) Unshackled the potential of Americans with disabilities. (Applause.) Applied the creativity of the marketplace in the service of the environment, for clean air; and made home ownership possible for more Americans. (Applause.)

The strength of a democracy is not in bureaucracy. It is in the people and their communities. In everything we do, let us unleash the potential of our most precious resource -- our citizens, our citizens themselves. We must return to families, communities, counties, cities, states, and institutions of every kind the power to chart their own destiny, and the freedom and opportunity provided by strong economic growth. And that's what America is all about. (Applause.)

I know tonight in some regions of our country, people are in genuine economic distress. And I hear them.

Earlier this month, Kathy Blackwell, of Massachusetts, wrote me about what can happen when the economy slows down, saying, "My heart is aching, and I think that you should know your people out here are hurting badly."

I understand. And I'm not unrealistic about the future. But there are reasons to be optimistic about our economy.

First, we don't have to fight double-digit inflation. Second, most industries won't have to make big cuts in production because they don't have big inventories piled up. And third, our exports are running solid and strong. In fact, American businesses are exporting at a record rate.

So let's put these times in perspective. Together, since 1981, we've created almost 20 million jobs, cut inflation in half, and cut interest rates in half.

And, yes, the largest peacetime economic expansion in history has been temporarily interrupted. But our economy is still over twice as large as our closest competitor.

We will get this recession behind us and return to growth soon. (Applause.) We will get on our way to a new record of expansion and achieve the competitive strength that will carry us into the next American century.

We should focus our efforts today on encouraging economic growth, investing in the future, and giving power and opportunity to the individual. (Applause.)

We must begin with control of federal spending. (Applause.) That's why I'm submitting a budget that holds the growth in spending to less than the rate of inflation. And that's why, amid all the sound and fury of last year's budget debate, we put into law new, enforceable spending caps -- so that future spending debates will mean a battle of ideas, not a bidding war. (Applause.)

Though controversial, the budget agreement finally put the federal government on a pay-as-you-go plan and cut the growth of debt by nearly \$500 billion. And that frees funds for saving and job-creating investment.

Now, let's do more. My budget again includes tax-free family savings accounts; penalty-free withdrawals from IRAs for first-time home buyers -- (applause) -- and to increase jobs and

growth, a reduced tax for long-term capital gains. (Applause.)

I know there are differences among us -- (laughter) -- about the impact and the effects of a capital gains incentive. So tonight, I'm asking the congressional leaders and the Federal Reserve to cooperate with us in a study, led by Chairman Alan Greenspan, to sort out our technical differences so that we can avoid a return to unproductive partisan bickering. (Applause.)

But just as our efforts will bring economic growth now and in the future, they must also be matched by long-term investments for the next American century.

That requires a forward-looking plan of action -- and that's exactly what we will be sending to the Congress. We've prepared a detailed series of proposals that include:

A budget that promotes investment in America's future -- in children, education, infrastructure, space, and high technology;

legislation to achieve excellence in education -- building on the partnership forged with the 50 governors at the Education Summit, enabling parents to choose their children's schools and helping to make America number one in math and science; -- (applause) --

a blueprint for a new national highway system -- a critical investment in our transportation infrastructure; -- (applause) --

a research and development agenda that includes record levels of federal investment, and a permanent tax credit to strengthen private R&D and to create jobs; -- (applause) --

a comprehensive national energy strategy that calls for energy conservation and efficiency, increased development, and greater use of alternative fuels; -- (applause) --

a banking reform plan to bring America's financial system into the 21st century so that our banks remain safe and secure and can continue to make job-creating loans for our factories, our businesses and home-buyers.

You know, I do think there has been too much pessimism. Sound banks should be making sound loans now -- and interest rates should be lower, now. (Applause.)

In addition to these proposals, we must recognize that our economic strength depends on being competitive in world markets. We must continue to expand American exports. A successful Uruguay Round of world trade negotiations will create more real jobs and more real growth for all nations. You and I know that if the playing field is level, America's workers and farmers can out-work, out-produce anyone, anytime, anywhere. (Applause.)

And with a Mexican Free Trade Agreement and our Enterprise for the Americas Initiative, we can help our partners strengthen their economies and move toward a free trade zone throughout this entire hemisphere. (Applause.)

The budget also includes a plan of action right here at home to put more power and opportunity in the hands of the individual. And that means new incentives to create jobs in our inner cities, by encouraging investment through enterprise zones. It also means tenant control and ownership of public housing. Freedom and the power to choose should not be the privilege of wealth. They are the birthright of every American. (Applause.)

Civil rights are also crucial to protecting equal opportunity. (Applause.) Every one of us has a responsibility to speak out against racism, bigotry, and hate. (Applause.) We will continue our vigorous enforcement of existing statutes, and I will

MORE

once again press the Congress to strengthen the laws against employment discrimination without resorting to the use of unfair preferences. (Applause.)

We're determined to protect another fundamental civil right -- freedom from crime and the fear that stalks our cities. The Attorney General will soon convene a crime summit of our nation's law enforcement officials. And to help us support them, we need tough crime control legislation, and we need it now. (Applause.)

And as we fight crime, we will fully implement our national strategy for combatting drug abuse. Recent data show that we are making progress, but much remains to be done. We will not rest until the day of the dealer is over, forever. (Applause.)

Good health care is every American's right and every American's responsibility. And so we are proposing an aggressive program of new prevention initiatives -- for infants, for children, for adults, and for the elderly -- to promote a healthier America and to help keep costs from spiralling. (Applause.)

It's time to give people more choice in government, by reviving the ideal of the citizen politician who comes not to stay, but to serve. And one of the reasons that there is so much support across this country for term limitations is that the American people are increasingly concerned about big-money influence in politics. So we must look beyond the next election, to the next generation. And the time has come to put the national interest above the special interest -- and totally eliminate political action committees. (Applause.)

And that would truly put more competition in elections, and more power in the hands of individuals. And where power cannot be put directly in the hands of the individual, it should be moved closer to the people -- away from Washington.

The federal government too often treats government programs as if they are of Washington, by Washington, and for Washington. Once established, federal programs seem to become immortal.

It's time for a more dynamic program life cycle: Some programs should increase. Some should decrease. Some should be terminated. And some should be consolidated and turned over to the states. (Applause.)

My budget includes a list of programs for potential turnover totalling more than \$20 billion. Working with Congress and the governors, I propose we select at least \$15 billion in such programs and turn them over to the states in a single consolidated grant -- fully funded -- for flexible management by the states. (Applause.)

The value -- the value of this turnover approach is straightforward. It allows the federal government to reduce overhead. It allows states to manage more flexibly and more efficiently. It moves power and decision-making closer to the people. And it reinforces a theme of this administration: appreciation and encouragement of the innovative powers of "States as Laboratories."

This nation was founded by leaders who understood that power belongs in the hands of people. And they planned for the future. And so must we -- here and all around the world.

As Americans, we know that there are times when we must step forward and accept our responsibility to lead the world away from the dark chaos of dictators, toward the brighter promise of a better day.

Almost 50 years ago we began a long struggle against aggressive totalitarianism. Now we face another defining hour for

America and the world.

There is no one more devoted, more committed to the hard work of freedom, than every soldier and sailor, every Marine, airman, and Coastguardsman -- every man and woman now serving in the Persian Gulf. (Applause.) Oh, how they deserve -- (applause) -- and what a fitting tribute to them.

You see -- what a wonderful, fitting tribute to them. Each of them has volunteered -- volunteered to provide for this nation's defense -- and now they bravely struggle, to earn for America, for the world, and for future generations, a just and lasting peace.

Our commitment to them must be equal to their commitment to their country. They are truly America's finest. (Applause.)

The war in the Gulf is not a war we wanted. We worked hard to avoid war. For more than five months we, along with the Arab League, the European Community, the United Nations, tried every diplomatic avenue. U.N. Secretary General Perez de Cuellar; Presidents Gorbachev, Mitterrand, Ozal, Mubarak, and Bendjedid; Kings Fahd and Hassan; Prime Ministers Major and Andreotti -- just to name a few -- all worked for a solution. But time and again, Saddam Hussein flatly rejected the path of diplomacy and peace.

The world well knows how this conflict began and when: It began on August 2nd, when Saddam invaded and sacked a small, defenseless neighbor. And I am certain of how it will end. So that peace can prevail, we will prevail. (Applause.) Thank you.

Tonight, I am pleased to report that we are on course. Iraq's capacity to sustain war is being destroyed. Our investment, our training, our planning -- all are paying off. Time will not be Saddam's salvation.

Our purpose in the Persian Gulf remains constant: to drive Iraq out of Kuwait, to restore Kuwait's legitimate government, and to ensure the stability and security of this critical region.

Let me make clear what I mean by the region's stability and security. We do not seek the destruction of Iraq, its culture, or its people. Rather, we seek an Iraq that uses its great resources, not to destroy, not to serve the ambitions of a tyrant, but to build a better life for itself and its neighbors. We seek a Persian Gulf where conflict is no longer the rule, where the strong are neither tempted nor able to intimidate the weak.

Most Americans know instinctively why we are in the Gulf. They know we had to stop Saddam now, not later. They know that this brutal dictator will do anything; will use any weapon; will commit any outrage, no matter how many innocents suffer.

They know we must make sure that control of the world's oil resources does not fall into his hands, only to finance further aggression. They know that we need to build a new, enduring peace -- based not on arms races and confrontation, but on shared principles and the rule of law.

And we all realize that our responsibility to be the catalyst for peace in the region does not end with the successful conclusion of this war.

Democracy brings the undeniable value of thoughtful dissent -- and we've heard some dissenting voices here at home -- some, a handful, reckless -- most responsible. But the fact that all voices have the right to speak out is one of the reasons we've been united in purpose and principle for 200 years. (Applause.)

Our progress in this great struggle is the result of years of vigilance and a steadfast commitment to a strong defense. Now, with remarkable technological advances like the Patriot missile

we can defend against ballistic missile attacks aimed at innocent civilians.

Looking forward, I have directed that the SDI program be refocused on providing protection from limited ballistic missile strikes -- whatever their source. (Applause.) Let us pursue an SDI program that can deal with any future threat to the United States, to our forces overseas, and to our friends and allies.

The quality of American technology, thanks to the American worker, has enabled us to successfully deal with difficult military conditions and help minimize precious loss of life. We have given our men and women the very best. And they deserve it. (Applause.)

We all have a special place in our hearts for the families of our men and women serving in the Gulf. They are represented here tonight by Mrs. Norman Schwarzkopf. (Applause.) We are all very grateful to General Schwarzkopf and to all those serving with him. And I might also recognize one who came with Mrs. Schwarzkopf -- Alma Powell, the wife of the distinguished Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. (Applause.) And to the families, let me say our forces in the Gulf will not stay there one day longer than is necessary to complete their mission. (Applause.)

The courage and success of the RAF pilots, of the Kuwaiti, Saudi, French, the Canadians, the Italians, the pilots of Qatar and Bahrain -- all are proof that for the first time since World War II, the international community is united. The leadership of the United Nations, once only a hoped-for ideal, is now confirming its founders' vision. (Applause.)

I am heartened that we are not being asked to bear alone the financial burdens of this struggle. Last year, our friends and allies provided the bulk of the economic costs of Desert Shield. And now, having received commitments of over \$40 billion for the first three months of 1991, I am confident they will do no less as we move through Desert Storm. (Applause.)

But the world has to wonder what the dictator of Iraq is thinking. If he thinks that by targeting innocent civilians in Israel and Saudi Arabia, that he will gain advantage, he is dead wrong. (Applause.) If he thinks that he will advance his cause through tragic and despicable environmental terrorism, he is dead wrong. (Applause.) And if he thinks that by abusing the coalition prisoners of war he will benefit, he is dead wrong. (Applause.)

We will succeed in the Gulf. And when we do, the world community will have sent an enduring warning to any dictator or despot, present or future, who contemplates outlaw aggression.

The world can, therefore, seize this opportunity to fulfill the long-held promise of a new world order, where brutality will go unrewarded and aggression will meet collective resistance.

Yes, the United States bears a major share of leadership in this effort. Among the nations of the world, only the United States of America has both the moral standing and the means to back it up. We're the only nation on this Earth that could assemble the forces of peace. This is the burden of leadership and the strength that has made America the beacon of freedom in a searching world.

This nation has never found glory in war. Our people have never wanted to abandon the blessings of home and work for distant lands and deadly conflict. If we fight in anger, it is only because we have to fight at all. And all of us yearn for a world where we will never have to fight again.

Each of us will measure within ourselves the value of this great struggle. Any cost in lives -- any cost -- is beyond our power to measure. But the cost of closing our eyes to aggression is beyond mankind's power to imagine.

MORE

This we do know: Our cause is just. Our cause is moral. Our cause is right. (Applause.)

Let future generations understand the burden and the blessings of freedom. Let them say we stood where duty required us to stand.

Let them know that, together, we affirmed America and the world as a community of conscience.

The winds of change are with us now. The forces of freedom are together, united. We move toward the next century more confident than ever that we have the will at home and abroad to do what must be done, the hard work of freedom.

May God bless the United States of America. Thank you very, very much. (Applause.)

END

9:57 P.M. EST