JP/typo — In ink
Rod Bunt — In pencil (RB)
Bob/Ty — In pencil

April 30, 1985

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: TO EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT
STRASBOURG, FRANCE
WEDNESDAY, MAY 8

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. It is an honor to be with you on this day.

We mark today the anniversary of the liberation of Europe from tyrants who had seized this continent and plunged it into a terrible war. Forty years ago today, the guns were stilled and peace began -- a peace that has become the longest of this century.

On this day 40 years ago, they swarmed onto the boulevards of Paris, rallied under the Arc de Triomphe, and sang the "Marseillaise" in the free and open air. In Rome, the sound of church bells filled St. Peter's square and echoed through the city. On this day 40 years ago, Winston Churchill walked [out] onto a balcony in Whitehall and said to the people of Britain, "this is your victory" -- and the crowd yelled back, in an unforgettable moment of love and gratitude, "No, it is yours." Londoners tore the blackout curtains from their windows, and put floodlights on the great symbols of English history. And for the first time in six years Big Ben, Buckingham Palace, and St. Paul's Cathedral were illuminated against the sky.

Across the ocean, a half million New Yorkers flooded Times Square and laughed and posed for the cameras. In Washington, our new president, Harry Truman, called reporters into his office and said, "the flags of freedom fly all over Europe."

On that day 40 years ago, I was at my post at the Army Air Corps installation in Culver City, California. Passing a radio I heard the words, "ladies and gentlemen, the war in Europe is over," I felt a chill, as if a gust of cold wind had just swept past, and -- even though, for America there was still a war on the Pacific Front -- I realized: I will never forget this moment.

This day can't help but be emotional, for in it we feel the long tug of memory; we are reminded of shared joy and shared pain. A few weeks ago in California an old soldier, with tears in his eyes said, "It was such a different world then. It's almost impossible to describe it to someone who wasn't there but, when they finally turned the lights on in the cities again, it was like being reborn."

If it is hard to communicate the happiness of those days, it is even harder to remember Europe's agony.

So much of it lay in ruins. Whole cities had been destroyed. Children played in the rubble and begged for food.

By this day 40 years ago, 40 million lay dead, and the survivors composed a continent of victims. And to this day, we wonder: how did this happen? How did civilization take such a terrible turn? After all the books and the documentaries, after all the histories, and studies, we still wonder: How?

Hannah Arendt spoke of "the banality of evil" -- the banality of the little men who did the terrible deeds. We know they were totalitarians who used the state, which they had

elevated to the level of "God," to inflict war on peaceful nations and genocide on innocent peoples.

We know of the existence of evil in the human heart, and we know that in Nazi Germany that evil was institutionalized -- given power and direction by the state and those who did its bidding. And we also know that early attempts to placate the totalitarians did not save us from war. In fact, they guaranteed it. There are lessons to be learned in this and never forgotten.

But there is a lesson too in another thing we saw in those days: perhaps we can call it "the commonness of virtue." The common men and women who somehow dug greatness from within their souls-- the people who sang to the children during the blitz, who joined the resistance and said 'No' to tyranny, the people who hid the Jews and the dissidents, the people who became, for a moment, the repositories of all the courage of the West -- from a child named Anne Frank to a hero named Raoul Wallenberg.

They give us heart forever. The glow of their memories lit Europe in her darkest days.

Who can forget the hard days after the war? We can't help but look back and think: life was so vivid then. There was the sense of purpose, the joy of shared effort, and, later, the incredible joy of our triumph. Those were the days when the West rolled up its sleeves and repaired the damage that had been done, the days when Europe rose in glory from the ruins.

Old enemies were reconciled with the European family. Together, America and Europe created and put into place the Marshall Plan to rebuild from the rubble. Together we created

the Atlantic Alliance, which proceeded not from transient interests of state but from shared ideals. Together we created the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, a defense system aimed at seeing that the kind of tyrants who had tormented Europe would never torment her again. NATO was a triumph of organization and effort, but it was also something new, very different. For NATO derived its strength directly from the moral values of the people it represented, from their high ideals, their love of liberty, their commitment to peace.

But perhaps the greatest triumph of all was not in the realm of a sound defense or material achievement. No, the greatest triumph of Europe after the war is that in spite of all the chaos, poverty, sickness, and misfortune that plagued this continent, the people of Europe resisted the call of new tyrants and the lure of their seductive ideologies. Europe did not become the breeding ground for new extremist philosophies. Europe resisted the totalitarian temptation. The people of Europe embraced democracy, the dream the fascists could not kill. They chose freedom.

Today we celebrate the leaders who led the way-- Churchill and Monnet, Adenauer and Schuman, de Gasperi and Spaak, Truman and Marshall. And we celebrate, too, the free political parties that contributed their share to greatness: the Liberals and the Christian Democrats, the Social Democrats and Labour and the Conservatives. Together they tugged at the same oar, and the great and mighty ship of Europe moved on.

If any doubt their success, let them look at you. In this room are they who fought on opposite sides 40 years ago, and their sons and daughters. Now you govern together and lead Europe democratically. You buried animosity and hatred in the rubble. There is no greater testament to reconciliation and to the peaceful unity of Europe than the men and women in this room.

In the decades after the war, Europe knew great growth and power, amazing vitality in every area of life, from fine arts to fashion, from manufacturing to science to the world of ideas. Europe was robust and alive, and none of this was an accident. It was the natural result of freedom, the natural fruit of the democratic ideal. We in America looked at Europe and called her what she was: an Economic Miracle.

And we could hardly be surprised. When we Americans think about our European heritage we tend to think of your cultural influences, and the rich ethnic heritage you gave us. But the industrial revolution that transformed the American economy came from Europe. [The financing of the railroads we used to settle the West came from Europe.] The guiding intellectual lights of our democratic system -- Locke and Montesquieu, Hume and Adam Smith -- came from Europe. And the geniuses who ushered in the modern industrial-technological age came from--well, I think you know, but two examples will suffice. Alexander Graham Bell, whose great invention maddened every American parent whose child insists on phoning his European pen pal rather than writing to him--was a Scotsman. And Guglielmo Marconi, who invented the radio--thereby providing a living for a young man from Dixon, the Italian,

Illinois, who later went into politics-- I guess I should explain that's me -- so blame Marconi. Marconi, as you know, was born in Italy.

RB

Robert Schuman's proposal for

Tomorrow will mark the 35th anniversary of the European Coal and Steel Community, the first block in the creation of a united Europe. The purpose was to tie French and German -- and European -- industrial production so tightly together that war between them "becomes not merely unthinkable but materially impossible." Those are ~~the~~ Schuman's words ~~of Robert Schuman;~~ the Coal and Steel Community was the child of his genius. And if he were here today I believe he would say: We have only just begun!

I am here to tell you America remains, as she was 40 years ago, dedicated to the unity of Europe. We continue to see a strong and unified Europe not as a rival but as an even stronger partner. Indeed, John F. Kennedy, in his ringing "Declaration of Interdependence" in the freedom bell city of Philadelphia 23 years ago, explicitly positioned this objective among the key tenets of post-war American policy, which foresaw the New World and the Old as twin pillars of a larger democratic community. We Americans still see European unity as a vital force in that historic process. We favor the expansion of the European Community; we welcome the entrance of Spain and Portugal into that Community, for their presence makes for a stronger Europe, and a stronger Europe is a stronger West.

made this a

Yet despite Europe's Economic Miracle which brought so much prosperity to so many, despite the visionary ideas of John Kennedy and the European leaders who preceded him, despite the

So many

enlargement of democracy's frontiers within the European community itself, I am told that a more doubting mood is upon Europe today. I hear words like "Europessimism" and "Europaralysis," that Europe seems to have lost the sense of confidence that dominated that postwar era. If there is something of a "lost" quality these days, is it connected to the fact that some, in the past few years, have begun to question the ideals and philosophies that have guided the West for centuries? That some have even come to question the moral and intellectual worth of the West?

I wish to speak, in part, to that questioning today. And there is no better place to do it than Strasbourg -- where Goethe studied, where Pasteur taught, where Hugo first knew inspiration. This has been a lucky city for questioning and finding valid answers. It is also a city for which some of us feel a very sweet affection. You know that our statue of Liberty was a gift from France, and its sculptor, F.A. Bartholdi, was a son of France. I don't know if you have ever studied the face of the Statue, but immigrants entering New York Harbor used to strain to see it, as if it would tell them something about their new world. It is a strong, kind face; it is the face of Bartholdi's mother, a woman of Alsace. And so, among the many things we Americans thank you for, we thank you for her.

The Statue of Liberty - made in Europe, erected in America - helps remind us not only of the past ties but present realities.

It is to those realities we must look in order to dispel whatever doubts may exist about the course of history and the

place of free men and women within it. We live in a complex, dangerous, divided world, yet a world which can provide all of the good things we require, spiritual and material, if we but have the confidence and courage to face history's challenge.

Some of the doubts about the West are directly connected to the performance of the West's economies, others relate to our relationship with the Soviet Union and others relate to our resolve to meet international commitments to support the democratic way of life.

We in the West have much to be thankful for -- peace, prosperity and freedom. If we are to preserve these for our children, and for theirs, today's leaders must demonstrate the same resolve and sense of vision which inspired Churchill, Adenauer, DeGasperi and DeGaulle. Their challenge was to rebuild a democratic Europe under the shadow of Soviet power. Our task, in some ways even more daunting, is to keep the peace with an evermore powerful Soviet Union, to introduce greater stability in our relationship with it, and to coexist in a world in which our values can prosper.

The leaders and people of postwar Europe had learned the lessons of their history from the failures of their predecessors. They learned that aggression feeds on appeasement and that weakness itself can be provocative. We, for our part, can learn from the success of our predecessors. We know that both conflict and aggression can be deterred, that democratic nations are capable of the resolve, the sacrifices and the consistency of policy needed to sustain such deterrence.

From the creation of NATO in 1949 through the early 1970's, Soviet power was effectively deterred and Soviet ambitions effectively limited. The strength of Western economies, the vitality of our societies, the wisdom of our diplomacy, all contributed to such restraint; but certainly the decisive factor must have been the countervailing power -- ultimately, military, and above all, nuclear power -- which the West was capable of bringing to bear in the defense of its interests.

It was in the early 1970's that the United States lost that superiority over the Soviet Union in strategic nuclear weapons which had characterized the postwar era. In Europe, the effect of this loss was not quickly perceptible. But seen globally, Soviet conduct changed markedly and dangerously. First in Angola in 1975, then, when the West failed to respond, in Ethiopia, in South Yemen, in Kampuchea and ultimately in Afghanistan, the Soviet Union began courting more risks, and expanding its influence through the indirect and direct application of ~~Soviet~~ military power. Today, we see similar Soviet efforts to profit from and stimulate regional conflicts in Central America.

The ineffectual Western response to Soviet adventurism of the late 1970's had many roots, not least in the crisis of self-confidence within the American body politic wrought by the Vietnam experience. But just as Soviet decision-making in the earlier postwar era had taken place against the background of overwhelming American strategic power, so the decisions of the late 1970's were taken in Moscow, as in Washington and throughout

Europe, against the background of growing Soviet and stagnating Western nuclear strength.

One might draw the conclusion from these events that the West should reassert that nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union upon which our security and our strategy rested through the postwar era. That is not my view. We cannot and should not seek to build our peace and freedom perpetually upon the basis of expanding nuclear arsenals.

In the short run, we have no alternative but to compete with the Soviet Union in this field, not in the pursuit of superiority, but merely of balance. It is thus essential that the United States maintain a modern and survivable nuclear capability [in each leg of the strategic triad -- sea, land and air based.] It is similarly important that France and Britain maintain and modernize their independent strategic capabilities.

The Soviet Union, however, has not been content to sustain, either through arms control or unilateral choice, a stable nuclear balance. It has chosen, instead, to build nuclear forces clearly designed to [strike first, and thus to] disarm their adversary. The Soviet Union is now moving toward deployment of new mobile MIRVed missiles which have these capabilities, plus the ability to avoid detection, monitoring, or arms control verification. In doing this, the Soviet Union is undermining stability and the basis for mutual deterrence.

One can imagine several possible responses to the continued Soviet build-up of nuclear forces. On the one hand, we can ask the Soviet Union to reduce its offensive systems and to deal,

RB

through arms control measures, with the particular problems posed by its MIRV'd mobile ICBM. We shall press that case in Geneva. Thus far, however, we have heard nothing new from the other side.

A second possibility would be for the West to step up our current modernization effort to keep up with constantly accelerating Soviet deployments, not to regain superiority, but merely to keep up with Soviet deployments. But is this really an acceptable alternative? Even if this course could be sustained by the West, it would produce a less stable strategic balance than the one we have today. We need a better guarantee of peace than that.

Fortunately, there is a third possiblity, in the long-term. That is to offset the continued Soviet offensive build-up in destabilizing weapons by developing defenses against these weapons. In 1983 I launched a new research program -- the Strategic Defense Initiative.

The state of modern technology may soon make possible for the first time the ability to use non-nuclear systems to defeat ballistic missiles. It will take time. The Soviets themselves have long recognized the value of defensive systems and have invested heavily in them. Indeed, they have spent as much on defensive systems as they have on offensive systems for more than 20 years.

As we proceed with this research program, we will remain within existing treaty constraints. We will also consult in the closest possible fashion with our Allies. And when the time for decisions on the possible production and deployment of such

systems comes, we must and will discuss and negotiate these issues with the Soviet Union. We, for our part, have no intention of unilateral deployment.

Both for the short and long term I am confident that the West can maintain effective military deterrence. But surely we can aspire to more than maintaining a state of highly armed truce in international politics.

During the 1970's we went to great lengths to restrain unilaterally our strategic weapons programs out of the conviction that the Soviet Union would adhere to certain rules in its conduct -- rules such as neither side seeking to gain unilateral advantage at the expense of the other. Those efforts of the early 1970's resulted in some improvements in Europe, the Berlin Quadripartite Agreement being the best example. But the hopes for a broader and lasting moderation of the East-West competition foundered in Angola, Ethiopia, Afghanistan, and Nicaragua.

The question before us today is whether we have learned from those mistakes and consequently can undertake a serious new relationship with the Soviet Union based upon stable military deterrence and the reduction of tensions in other areas. I believe we can. I believe we have learned that successful cooperation with the Soviet Union must be accompanied by successful competition in areas -- particularly Third World areas -- where the Soviets are not yet prepared to act with restraint. I believe we have learned the importance of conducting our trade with the Soviet Union within the broader framework of our security interests, avoiding decisive dependence upon Soviet energy sources,

curtailing preferential credit arrangements, and bringing our regulations in restraint of strategic trade in military relevant goods and technologies up to date.

These are the reflexions which have molded our policy toward the Soviet Union. That policy embodies the following basic elements:

-- While we maintain a stable deterrence to preserve the peace, the United States will make a steady, sustained effort to reduce tensions and solve problems in its relations with the Soviet Union.

-- The United States is prepared to conclude fair, equitable, ~~reciprocal,~~ verifiable agreements for arms reduction, above all with regard to offensive nuclear weapons.

-- The United States seeks no unilateral advantages, and of course can accept none on the Soviet side.

-- The United States will insist upon compliance with past agreements both for their own sake and to strengthen confidence in the possibility of future accords.

-- The United States will proceed in full consultation with its allies, recognizing that our fates are intertwined and we must act in unity.

-- The United States does not seek to ~~undermine or change the Soviet system nor to~~ impinge upon the security of the Soviet Union. At the same time it will resist attempts by the Soviet Union to use or threaten force against others, or to impose it's system on others by force.

Ultimately, I hope the leaders of the Soviet Union will come to understand that they have nothing to gain from attempts to achieve military superiority or to spread their dominance by force, but have much to gain from joining the West in mutual arms reduction and expanding cooperation.

I have directed the Secretary of State to engage with the Soviet Union on an extended agenda of problem solving.

Yet even as we embark upon new efforts to sustain a productive dialogue with the Soviet Union, we are reminded of the obstacles imposed by our so fundamentally different concepts of humanity, of human rights, of the value of a human life. [The murder of Major Nicholson by a Soviet soldier in East Germany, and the Soviet Union's refusal to accept responsibility for this act is only the latest reminder.]

If we are to succeed in reducing East-West tensions, we must find means to ensure against the thoughtless and arbitrary use of lethal force in the future--whether against individuals like Major Nichlson, or against ~~whole~~ groups, such as the passengers on a jumbo jet.

(As a step toward this end, first, ~~Therefore,~~ I propose that the United States and the Soviet Union take three bold practical steps:

First, that the United States and the Soviet Union make a regular practice of exchanging observers at military exercises and locations. We now follow this practice with many other nations, to the equal benefit of all parties. Greater familiarity does not automatically betoken greater confidence and cooperation, but a necessary step toward that objective.

Second, as I believe it is desirable for the two leaders of America and the Soviet Union to meet and tackle problems, I am

also convinced that the military leaders of our nations could benefit from this type of contact. One of the most durable and successful ventures in US-Soviet relations has been the annual meetings of our two navies. These reviews have let our naval professionals gain an appreciation of each other's concerns and develop a pattern of solving problems. I therefore proposed that we institute regular, high-level contacts between the military leaders of our two countries, to develop better understanding and to prevent potential tragedies from occuring.

Third, I urge that the Conference on Disarmament in Europe act promptly and agree on the concrete confidence-building measures proposed by the NATO countries. The United States is prepared to ~~agree to new~~ discuss commitments on non-use of force in the context of Soviet agreement to concrete confidence-building measures ~~which would significantly improve upon existing arrangements for advance notification and observation of military activities in Europe.~~

These proposals are not cure-alls for our current problems, and will not compensate for the deaths which have occured. But as terrible as past events have been, it would be more tragic if we were to make no attempt to prevent even larger tragedies from occuring through lack of contact and communication.

We have much to do -- and we must do it together. ~~The road to peace does not run through Munich.~~ We must remain unified in the face of attempts to divide us and strong in spite of attempts to weaken us. And we must remember that our unity and strength are not a mere impulse of like-minded allies, but the natural result of our shared love for liberty.

Surely we have no illusions that convergence of the two systems is likely. We are in for an extended period of competition of ideas. It is up to us in the West to answer whether or not we can make available the resources, ideas, examples and assistance programs to compete with the Soviet Union in the Third World. We have much in our favor, not least the experience of those states which have tried Marxism and are looking for an alternative.

We do not aspire to impose our system on anyone, nor do we have pat answers for all the world's ills. But our ideals of freedom and democracy, our economic systems have proven their ability to meet the needs of our people. Our adversaries reward the enforced sacrifice of their people with economic stagnation, the corrupt hand of state and party bureacracy, which ultimately satisfies neither material nor spiritual needs.

I want to reaffirm to the people of Europe the constancy of the American purpose. We were at your side through two great wars; we have been at your side through 40 years of a sometimes painful peace. We are at your side today because, like you, we have not veered from the ideals of the West -- the ideals of freedom, liberty, and peace. Let no one -- no one -- doubt our purpose.

The United States is committed not only to the security of Europe--we are committed to the recreation of a larger and more genuinely European Europe. The United States is committed not only to a partnership with Europe-- the United States is committed to an end to the artificial division of Europe.

Jack - Rest of my comments

62

JP

We do not ~~seek to destabilize or undermine any government, nor do we~~ deny any nation's legitimate interest in security. We share the basic aspirations of all of the peoples of Europe -- freedom, prosperity and peace. When families are divided, and people are not allowed to maintain normal human and cultural contacts, this creates international tension. Only in a system in which all feel secure, and sovereign, can there be a lasting and secure peace.

RB

For this reason we support and will encourage ~~all~~ peaceful movement toward the social, humanitarian, and democratic ideals shared in Europe. The ~~question~~ issue is not one of state boundaries, but of insuring the right of all nations to conduct ~~these~~ their affairs as their peoples desire. The problem of a divided Europe, like others, must be solved by peaceful means. Let us rededicate ourselves to the full implementation of the Helsinki Final Act in all its aspects.

All of us in this room want to preserve and protect our own democratic liberties -- but don't we also have a responsibility to encourage democracy throughout the world? Only in such an atmosphere can man peacefully resolve his differences through the ballot, through a free press, free speech and free political parties and the right to redress injustice.

??

As we seek to encourage democracy, we must remember that each country must struggle for democracy within its own culture; emerging democracies have special problems and require special help. Those nations whose democratic institutions are newly emerged and whose confidence in the process is not yet deeply

JACK: You left the first two ~~four~~ sentences out. which I think you should

See p 22

painstaking. It is passed on with pride from generation to generation. It is the work not only of leaders but of ordinary people. The cathedral evolves as it is created, with each generation adding its own vision -- but the initial spark of vision remains constant, and the faith that drives the vision persists. The results may be slow to see, but our children and their children will trace in the air the emerging arches and spires and know the faith and dedication and love that produced them. My friends, Europe is the Cathedral, and it is illuminated still.

And if you doubt your will, and your spirit, and your strength to stand for something, think of those people 40 years go -- who wept in the rubble, who laughed in the streets, who paraded across Europe, who cheered Churchill with love and devotion, and who sang the "Marseillaise" down the boulevards. Spirit like that does not disappear; it cannot perish; it will not go away. There's too much left unsung within it.

Thank you, all of you, for your graciousness on this great day. Thank you, and God bless you all.

NSC/McF Approved
April 29, 1985
1700 hrs

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: TO EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT
STRASBOURG, FRANCE
WEDNESDAY, MAY 8, 1985

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. It is an honor to be with you on this day.

We mark today the anniversary of the liberation of Europe from tyrants who had seized this continent and plunged it into a terrible war. Forty years ago today, the guns were stilled and peace began -- a peace that has ~~endured to~~ become the longest of this century.

On this day 40 years ago, they swarmed onto the boulevards of Paris, rallied under the Arc de Triomphe, and sang the "Marseillaise" in the free and open air. In Rome, the sound of church bells filled St. Peter's square and echoed through the city. On this day 40 years ago, Winston Churchill walked out onto a balcony in Whitehall and said to the people of Britain, "this is your victory" -- and the crowd yelled back, "no, it is yours," in an unforgettable moment of love and gratitude. Londoners tore the blackout curtains from their windows, and put floodlights on the great symbols of English history. And for the first time in six years Big Ben, Buckingham Palace, and St.

Paul's Cathedral were illuminated against the sky.

Across the ocean, a half million New Yorkers flooded Times Square and, being Americans, laughed and posed for the cameras. In Washington, our new president, Harry Truman, called reporters into his office and said, "the flags of freedom fly all over Europe."

On day 40 years ago, I was at my post at the Army Air Corps installation in Culver City, California. And as I passed a radio I heard the words, "ladies and gentlemen, the war in Europe is over," and like so many people that day I felt a chill, as if a gust of cold wind had just swept past, and-even though, for America there was still a war on the Pacific Front- I realized: I will never forget this moment.

This day can't help but be emotional, for in it we feel the long tug of memory; we are reminded of shared joy and shared pain and the terrible poignance of life. A few weeks ago in California an old soldier touched on this. With tears in his eyes he said, "it was such a different world then. It's almost impossible to describe it to someone who wasn't there but, when they finally turned the lights on in the cities again, it was like being reborn."

If it is hard to communicate the happiness of those days, it is even harder to remember Europe's agony.

So much of it lay in ruins. Whole cities had been destroyed. Children played in the rubble and begged for food.

By this day 40 years ago, 40 million lay dead, and the survivors composed a continent of victims. And to this day, we wonder: how did this happen? How did civilization take such a terrible turn? After all the books and the documentaries, after all the histories, and studies, we still wonder: how?

Hannah Arendt spoke of "the banality of evil" -- the banality of the little men who did the terrible deeds. We know what they were: totalitarians who used the state, which they had elevated to the level of "God," to inflict war on peaceful nations and genocide on innocent peoples.

We know of the existence of evil in the human heart, and we know that in Nazi Germany that evil was institutionalized -- given power and direction by the state, by a corrupt regime and those who did its bidding. And we know, we learned, that early attempts to placate the totalitarians did not save us from war. In fact, they guaranteed it. There are lessons to be learned in this and never forgotten.

But there is a lesson too in another thing we saw in those days: perhaps we can call it "the commonness of virtue." The common men and women who somehow dug greatness from within their souls-- the people who sang to the children during the blitz, who joined the resistance and said 'No' to tyranny, the people who hid the Jews and the dissidents, the people who became, for a moment, the repositories of all the courage of the West -- from a child named Anne Frank to a hero named Raoul Wallenberg.

These names shine. They give us heart forever. And the glow — from their beings, the glow of their memories, lit Europe in her darkest days.

Who can forget the days after the war? They were hard days, yes, but we can't help but look back and think: life was so vivid then. There was the sense of purpose, the joy of shared effort, and, later, the incredible joy of our triumph. Those were the days when the West rolled up its sleeves and repaired the damage that had been done. Those were the days when Europe rose in glory from the ruins.

Old enemies were reconciled with the European family. Together, America and Europe created and put into place the Marshall Plan to rebuild from the rubble. Together we created

the Atlantic Alliance, an alliance which proceeded not from transient interests of state but from shared ideals. Together we created the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, a defense system aimed at seeing that the kind of tyrants who had tormented Europe would never torment her again. NATO was a triumph of organization and effort, but it was also something new, very different. For NATO derived its strength directly from the moral values of the people it represented. It was infused with their high ideals, their love of liberty, their commitment to peace.

But perhaps the greatest triumph of all was not in the realm of a sound defense or material achievement. No, the greatest triumph of Europe after the war is that in spite of all the chaos, poverty, sickness, and misfortune that plagued this continent --in spite of all that, the people of Europe resisted the call of new tyrants and the lure of their seductive ideologies. Europe did not become the breeding ground for new extremist philosophies. Europe resisted the totalitarian temptation. Instead, the people of Europe embraced democracy, the strongest dream, the dream the fascists could not kill. They chose freedom.

Today we celebrate the leaders who led the way-- Churchill and Monnet, Adenauer and Schuman, de Gasperi and Spaak, Truman and Marshall. And we celebrate, too, the free political parties

that contributed their share to greatness: the Liberals and the Christian Democrats, the Social Democrats and Labour and the Conservatives. Together they tugged at the same oar, and the great and mighty ship of Europe moved on.

If any doubt their success, let them look at you. In this room are they who fought on opposite sides 40 years ago, and their sons and daughters. Now you govern together and lead Europe democratically. You buried animosity and hatred in the rubble. There is no greater testament to reconciliation and to the peaceful unity of Europe than the men and women in this room.

In the decades after the war, Europe knew great growth and power. You enjoyed amazing vitality in every area of life, from fine arts to fashion, from manufacturing to science to the world of ideas. Europe was robust and alive, and none of this was an accident. It was the natural result of freedom, the natural fruit of the democratic ideal. We in America looked at Europe and called her what she was: an Economic Miracle.

And we could hardly be surprised. When we Americans think about our European heritage we tend to think of your cultural influences, and the rich ethnic heritage you gave us. But the industrial revolution that transformed the American economy came from Europe. The financing of the railroads we used to settle

the West came from Europe. The guiding intellectual lights of our democratic system--Locke and Montesquieu, Hume and Adam Smith--came from Europe. And the geniuses who ushered in the modern industrial-technological age came from--well, I think you know, but two examples will suffice. Alexander Graham Bell, whose great invention maddened every American parent whose child insists on phoning his European pen pal rather than writing to him--was a Scotsman. And Guglielmo Marconi, who invented the radio--thereby providing a living for a young man from Dixon, Illinois, who later went into politics-- I guess I should explain that's me--now you know it's Marconi's fault--Marconi was born, as you know in Italy.

Tomorrow will mark the 35th anniversary of of the European Coal and Steel Community, the first block in the creation of a united Europe. The purpose was to tie French and German -- and European- industrial production so tightly together that war between them "becomes not merely unthinkable but materially impossible." Those are the words of Robert Schuman; the Coal and Steel Community was the child of his genius. And if he were here today I believe he would say: We have only just begun!

I am here to tell you America remains, as she was 40 years ago, dedicated to the unity of Europe. We continue to see a strong and unified Europe not as a rival but as an even stronger

partner. Indeed, John F. Kennedy, in his ringing "Declaration of Interdependence" in the freedom bell city of Philadelphia 23 years ago, explicitly positioned this objective among the key tenets of post-war American policy, a policy which foresaw the New World and the Old as twin pillars of a larger democratic community. We Americans still see European unity as a vital force in that historic process. We favor the expansion of the European Community; we welcome the entrance of Spain and Portugal into that Community, for their presence makes for a stronger Europe, and a stronger Europe is a stronger West.

Yet despite Europe's Economic Miracle which brought so much prosperity to so many, despite the visionary ideas of John Kennedy and the European leaders who preceded him, despite the enlargement of democracy's frontiers within the European community itself, I am told that a more doubting mood is upon Europe today. I hear words like "Europessimism" and "Europaralysis." I am told that Europe seems to have lost the sense of confidence that dominated that postwar era. I cannot believe this is so--but if there is something of a "lost" quality these days, I suspect it is connected to the fact that some, in the past few years, have begun to question the ideals and philosophies that have guided the West for centuries. Some have even come to question the moral and intellectual worth of the West.

I wish to speak, in part, to that questioning today. And there is no better place to do it than Strasbourg--where Goethe studied, where Pasteur taught, where Hugo first knew inspiration. This has been a lucky city for questioning and finding valid answers. It is also a city for which some of us feel a very sweet affection. You know that our statue of Liberty was a gift from France, and its sculptor, F.A. Bartholdi, was a son of France. I don't know if you have ever studied the face of the Statue, but immigrants entering New York Harbor used to strain to see it, as if it would tell them something about their new world. It is a strong, kind face; it is the face of Bartholdi's mother; and she was a woman of Alsace. And so, among the many things we Americans thank you for, we thank you for her.

The Statue of Liberty - made in Europe, erected in America - helps remind us not only of the past ties but present realities. It is to those realities we must look in order to dispel whatever doubts may exist about the course of history and the place of free men and women within it. The fact of the matter is, we live in a complex, dangerous, divided world, yet a world which can provide all of the good things we require, spiritual and material, if we but have the confidence and courage to face history's challenge.

Some of the doubts about the West are directly connected to the performance of the West's economies, others relate to our relationship with the USSR and others relate to our resolve to meet international commitments to support the democratic way of life.

We in the West have much to be thankful for -- peace, prosperity and freedom. If we are to preserve these for our children, and for theirs, today's leaders must demonstrate the same resolve and sense of vision which inspired Churchill, Adenauer, DeGasperi and DeGaulle. Their challenge was to rebuild a democratic Europe under the shadow of Soviet power. Our task, in some ways even more daunting, is to keep the peace with an evermore powerful Soviet Union, to introduce greater stability in our relationship with it, and to coexist in a world in which our values can prosper.

The leaders and people of postwar Europe had learned the lessons of their history from the failures of their predecessors. They learned that aggression feeds on appeasement and that weakness itself can be provocative. We, for our part, can learn from the success of our predecessors. We know that both conflict and aggression can be deterred, that that democratic nations are capable of the resolve, the sacrifices and the consistency of policy needed to sustain such deterrence.

From the creation of NATO in 1949 through the early 1970's, Soviet power was effectively deterred and Soviet ambitions effectively limited. The strength of Western economies, the vitality of our societies, the wisdom of our diplomacy, all contributed to such restraint; but certainly the decisive factor must have been the countervailing power -- ultimately, military, and above all, nuclear power -- which the West was capable of bringing to bear in the defense of its interests.

It was in the early 1970's that the United States lost that superiority over the Soviet Union in strategic nuclear weapons which had characterized the postwar era. In Europe, the effect of this loss was not quickly perceptible. But seen globally, Soviet conduct changed markedly and dangerously. First in Angola in 1975, then, when the West failed to respond, in Ethiopia, in South Yemen, in Kampuchea and ultimately in Afghanistan, the Soviet Union began courting more risks, and expanding its influence through the indirect and direct application of Soviet military power. Today, we see similar Soviet efforts to profit from and stimulate regional conflicts in Central America.

The ineffectual Western response to Soviet adventurism of the late 1970's had many roots, not least in the crisis of self-confidence within the American body politic wrought by the

Vietnam experience. But just as Soviet decision-making in the earlier postwar era had taken place against the background of overwhelming American strategic power, so the decisions of the late 1970's were taken in Moscow, as in Washington and throughout Europe, against the background of growing Soviet and stagnating Western nuclear strength.

One might draw the conclusion from these events that the West should reassert that nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union upon which our security and our strategy rested through the postwar era. That is not my view. I am certain that we cannot and should not seek to build our peace and freedom perpetually upon the basis of expanding nuclear arsenals.

In the short run, we have no alternative but to compete with the Soviet Union in this field, not in the pursuit of superiority, but merely of balance. It is thus essential that the United States maintain a modern and survivable nuclear capability in each leg of the strategic triad -- sea, land and air based. It is similarly important that France and Britain maintain and modernize their strategic capabilities. In all these countries, our publics appreciate the need for nuclear deterrence, and will support its sustenance.

The Soviet Union, however, has not been content to sustain,

either through arms control or unilateral choice, a stable nuclear balance. It has chosen, instead, to build nuclear forces clearly designed to preempt their opponent in the event of conflict, to strike first, and thus to disarm their adversary. The Soviet Union is now moving toward deployment of new mobile MIRVed missiles which have these capabilities, plus the ability to avoid detection, monitoring, or arms control verification. In taking these various steps, the Soviet Union is undermining stability and the basis for mutual deterrence.

One can imagine several possible responses to the continued Soviet build-up of nuclear forces. On the one hand, we can ask the Soviet Union to reduce its offensive systems and to deal, through arms control measures, with the particular problems posed by its MIRV'd mobile ICBM. We shall surely press that case in Geneva. Thus far, however, notwithstanding our own imaginative and flexible ideas in those talks, we have heard nothing new from the other side.

A second possibility would be for the West to keep bulding offensive systems, and in fact to step up our current modernization effort to keep up with constantly accelerating Soviet deployments. I am not speaking here of regaining superiority, but merely of keeping up with the relentless growth of Soviet deployments. But is this really an acceptable

alternative? It seems to me that it is likely to be both politically uncertain over the long term, and also militarily questionable. Even if this course could be sustained by the West, it would produce a less stable strategic balance than the one we have today. We need a better guarantee of peace than that.

Fortunately, there is a third possiblity, in the long-term. That is to offset the continued Soviet offensive build-up in destabilizing weapons by developing defenses against these weapons. It is to investigate this possibility that in 1983 I launched a new research program -- the Strategic Defense Initiative.

The state of modern technology may soon make possible for the first time the ability to use non-nuclear systems to defeat ballistic missiles. It will take time, and will be for my successors to reach decisions with our Allies as to the desirability and feasibility of deployment. It is essential now, however, that a prudent research program be sustained. The Soviets themselves have long recognized the value of defensive systems and have invested heavily in them. Indeed, they have spent as much on defensive systems as they have on offensive systems for more than 20 years.

As we proceed with this research program, we will remain within existing treaty constraints. We will also consult in the closest possible fashion with our Allies. And when the time for decisions on the possible production and deployment of such systems comes, we must and will discuss and negotiate these issues with the Soviet Union. We, for our part, have no intention of unilateral deployment.

Both for the short and long term I am confident that the West can maintain effective military deterrence. This is the fundamental requirement in East-West relations. But surely we can aspire to more than maintaining a state of highly armed truce in international politics.

We in the U.S. have thought so. During the 1970's we went to great lengths to restrain unilaterally our strategic weapons programs out of the conviction that the Soviet Union would adhere to certain rules in its conduct--rules such as neither side seeking to gain unilateral advantage at the expense of the other. Those efforts of the early 1970's resulted in some improvements in Europe, the Berlin Quadripartite Agreement being the best example. But the hopes for a broader and lasting moderation of the East-West competition foundered in Angola, Ethiopia, Afghanistan, and Nicaragua.

The question before us today is whether we have learned from those mistakes and can undertake a serious relationship with the Soviet Union based upon stable military deterrence and the reduction of tensions in other areas. I believe we can. I believe we have learned that successful cooperation with the Soviet Union must be accompanied by successful competition in areas-- particularly Third World areas--where the Soviets are not yet prepared to act with restraint. I believe we have learned the importance of conducting our trade with the Soviet Union within the broader framework of our security interests, avoiding decisive dependence upon Soviet energy sources, curtailing preferential credit arrangements, and bringing our regulations in restraint of strategic trade in military relevant goods and technologies up to date.

These are the reflexions which have molded our policy toward the Soviet Union. That policy embodies the following basic elements:

--While we maintain a stable deterrence to preserve the peace, the United States will make a steady, sustained effort to reduce tensions and solve problems in its relations with the Soviet Union.

--The United States is prepared to conclude fair, reciprocal, verifiable agreements for arms reduction, above all with regard

to offensive nuclear weapons.

--The United States seeks no unilateral advantages, and of course can accept none on the Soviet side.

--The United States will insist upon compliance with past agreements both for their own sake and to strengthen confidence in the possibility of future accords.

--The United States will proceed in full consultation with its allies, recognizing that our fates are intertwined and we must act in unity.

--The United States does not seek to undermine or change the Soviet system—nor to impinge upon the security of the Soviet Union. At the same time it will resist attempts by the Soviet Union to use or threaten force against others, or to impose it's system on others by force.

Ultimately, I hope the leaders of the Soviet Union will come to understand that they have nothing to gain from attempts to achieve military superiority or to spread their dominance by force, but have much to gain from joining the West in mutual arms reduction and expanding cooperation.

It is in this belief that I have directed the Secretary of State to engage with the Soviet Union on an extended agenda of problem solving.

Yet even as we embark upon new efforts to sustain a productive dialogue with the Soviet Union, we are reminded of the obstacles imposed by our so fundamentally different concepts of humanity, of human rights, of the value of a human life. The murder of Major Nicholson by a Soviet soldier in East Germany, and the Soviet Union's refusal to accept responsibility for this act is only the latest reminder.

If we are to succeed in reducing East-West tensions, we must find means to ensure against the thoughtless and arbitrary use of lethal force in the future--whether against individuals like Major Nichlson, or against whole groups, such as the passengers on a jumbo jet.

Therefore, I propose that the United States and the Soviet Union take three bold practical steps:

First, I propose that the United States and the Soviet Union make a regular practice of exchanging observers at military exercises and locations. We now follow this practice with many other nations, to the equal benefit of all parties.

Second, as I believe it is desirable for the two leaders of America and the Soviet Union to meet and tackle problems, I am also convinced that the military leaders of our nations could

benefit from this type of contact. One of the most durable and successful ventures in US-Soviet relations has been the annual meetings of our two navies. These reviews have let our naval professionals gain an appreciation of each other's concerns and develop a pattern of solving problems. I therefore proposed that we institute regular, high-level contacts between the military leaders of our two countries, to develop better understanding and to prevent potential tragedies from occuring.

As a third step, I urge that the Conference on Disarmament in Europe act promptly and conclude agreement on the concrete confidence-building measures proposed by the NATO countries. As I have said previously, the US is prepared to agree to new commitments on non-use of force in the context of Soviet agreement to concrete confidence-building measures.

These proposals are certainly not cure-alls for our current problems, and will not in themselves compensate for the deaths which have occured. But as terrible as past events have been, it would be more tragic if we were to make no attempt to prevent even larger tragedies from occuring through lack of contact and communication.

We have much to do -- and we must do it together. We must remember anew that the road to peace does not run through Munich.

We must remain unified in the face of attempts to divide us. We must remain strong in spite of attempts to weaken us. And we must remember that our unity and our strength are not a mere impulse of like-minded allies, not a mere geopolitical calculation. Our unity is the natural result of our shared love for liberty.

Surely we have no illusions that convergence of the two systems is likely. It is not, now or for the foreseeable future. We are in for an extended period of competition. In that competion of ideas it is up to us in the West to step up to the question of whether or not we can make available the resources, ideas, examples and assistance programs to compete with the Soviet Union in the Third World. We have much in our favor, not least the experience of many of those states which have tried Marxism and are looking for our help in shaping an alternative.

I am sure we will be up to the task. For the reality is that we do not aspire to impose our system on anyone, nor do we profess to have pat answers for all the world's ills. But our ideals of freedom and democracy stir hearts everywhere. Our economic systems have proven their ability to meet the needs of our people, while our adversaries have rewarded the enforced sacrifice of their people with economic stagnation, the dead and corrupt hand of state and party bureacracy, and ultimately an

inability to satisfy either material or spiritual needs.

I am here today to reaffirm to the people of Europe the constancy of the American purpose. We were at your side through two great wars; we have been at your side through 40 years of a sometimes painful peace; and we are at your side today. It is not mere sentiment that dictates this, though sentiment we feel. We are here because, like you, we have not veered from the ideals of the West -- the ideals of freedom, liberty, and peace. Let no one -- no one -- doubt our purpose.

The United States is committed not only to the security of Europe--we are committed to the recreation of a larger and more genuinely European Europe. The United States is committed not only to a partnership with Europe-- the United States is committed to an end to the artificial division of Europe.

Let me make it clear here that we do not seek to destabilize or undermine any government, nor do we deny any nation's legitimate interest in security. But we do assert that we share the basic aspirations of all of the peoples of Europe--freedom, prosperity and peace. When families are divided, and people are not allowed to maintain normal human and cultural contacts, this creates international tension. Only in a system in which all feel secure, and sovereign, can there be a lasting and secure

peace.

For this reason we support and will encourage all movement toward the social, humanitarian, and democratic ideals shared in Europe. The question is not one of state boundaries, but of insuring the right of all nations to conduct these affairs as their peoples desire. The problem of a divided Europe, like others, must be solved by peaceful means. Let us rededicate ourselves to pressing for the full implementation of the Helsinki Final Act in all its aspects.

All of us in this room want to preserve and protect our own democratic liberties -- but don't we also have a responsibility to encourage democracy throughout the world? Only in an atmosphere of democracy can man peacefully resolve his differences through the ballot, through a free press, through free speech and free political parties and the right to redress injustice.

More and more of the countries of the world are turning to democracy--turning each day, turning at great price, turning with great effort. In the past 10 years alone _____countries that did not know political freedom, for whatever reason, have become democratic. As we seek to encourage democracy, we must remember that each country must struggle for democracy within its own

culture; emerging democracies have special problems and require special help. Those nations whose democratic institutions are newly emerged and whose confidence in the process is not yet deeply rooted need our help. They should have an established community of their peers, other democratic countries to whom they can turn for support or just advice.

In my address to the British Parliament in 1982. I spoke of the need for democratic governments to come together and spread the democratic word throughout the world. Soon after, the Council of Europe brought together delegates from four continents, and I congratulate these European Members of Parliament for what is now known as the "Strasbourg Initiative."

I would hope that this initiative could be continued, gathering not only Europe's own, but all the emerging democracies to craft a sense of common purpose to help move the world forward to social justice, human dignity, economic growth and political democracy. In the three years since my speech at Westminster, we in our country have engaged in a broad bipartisan effort to strengthen and promote democratic ideals and institutions. Following a pattern first started in democratic West Germany, two years ago, the United States Congress approved the National Endowment for Democracy. This organization subsequently established institutes of labor, business, and political parties

dedicated to programs of cooperation with democratic forces around the world. I can report to you that the Endowment is off to a fine start. I would encourage other European democracies to create similar organizations to foster democracy.

The force of the democratic ideal does not stop short because there are arbitrary borders, some with barbed wires and control towers. Here in Western Europe, you have created a Europe for yourselves in which there is a free flow of people, of information, of goods and of culture. It is the natural bent of all Europeans to move freely in all directions, sharing and partaking of each other's ideas and culture. It is my hope, our hope, that in the 21st century-- which is only 15 years away-- all Europeans, from Moscow to Lisbon can travel without a passport and the free flow of people and ideas will include the other half of Europe. It is my fervent wish that in the next century there will once again be one, free Europe.

I do not believe those who say the people of Europe today are paralyzed and pessimistic. And I would say to those who think this: Europe, beloved Europe, you are greater than you know. You are the treasury of centuries of Western thought and Western culture, you are the father of Western ideals and the mother of Western faith.

Europe, you have been the power and the glory of the West, and you are a moral success. In fact, in the horrors after World War II, when you rejected totalitarianism, when you rejected the lure of new "Superman," and a "New Communist Man," you proved that you were -- and are -- a moral triumph.

You in the West are a Europe without illusions, a Europe firmly grounded in the ideals and traditions that made her greatness, a Europe unbound and unfettered by a bankrupt ideology. You are, today, a New Europe on the brink of a new century -- a democratic community with much to be proud of.

We have much to do. The work ahead is not unlike the building of great cathedral. The work is slow, complicated, and painstaking. It is passed on with pride from generation to generation. It is the work not only of leaders but of ordinary people. The cathedral evolves as it is created, with each generation adding its own vision -- but the initial spark of vision remains constant, and the faith that drives the vision persists. The results may be slow to see, but our children and their children will trace in the air the emerging arches and spires and know the faith and dedication and love that produced them. My friends, Europe is the Cathedral, and it is illuminated still.

And if you doubt your will, and your spirit, and your strength to stand for something, think of those people 40 years ago -- who wept in the rubble, who laughed in the streets, who paraded across Europe, who cheered Churchill with love and devotion, and who sang the "Marseillaise" down the boulevards. May I tell you: spirit like that does not disappear; it cannot perish; it will not go away. There's too much left unsung within it.

Thank you, all of you for your graciousness on this great day. Thank you, and God bless you all.