

NEW YORK TIMES
7 October 1986

The Speech By Reagan On Iceland

Following are excerpts from President Reagan's speech in Washington yesterday, as recorded by The New York Times through the facilities of ABC Radio:

Knowing of your interest in this matter, I wanted to use this opportunity to offer a perspective, the American perspective if you will, on the meetings between Mr. Gorbachev and me later this week in Reykjavik, Iceland.

Groundwork is essential. And from the beginning, we've tried to make this a hallmark of Administration policy. We've tried to take a prudent and a realistic and above all deliberate approach toward Soviet-American relations.

Instead of rushing unprepared into negotiations with the Soviets, the Administration took the time in its earliest days to make clear the essential elements of American foreign policy.

Our commitment to the twin goals of world peace and world freedom, our willingness to be realistic and candid about the Soviets, to publicly define the crucial moral distinctions between totalitarianism and democracy and assist those who are struggling for their own self-determination.

'Prevent War and Keep the Peace'

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

Iceland is not intended to be a signing ceremony or a media event but a pre-summit planning session, a chance to make preparations for the serious work Mr. Gorbachev and I will have to do when he visits the United States.

Iceland is a base camp before the summit.

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

In short, doing more about arms control meant talking about more than arms control. So I proposed in my 1984 U.N. address what I call umbrella talks — negotiations with a broad-based agenda. The summit process has reflected this approach and includes a broad-based agenda.

We've stressed, in addition to arms reduction, three other agenda items:

- ¶ Respect for human rights.
- ¶ Resolving regional conflicts.
- ¶ And improving bilateral contacts between the Soviets and ourselves.

Daniloff and Orlov

As you know, after a Soviet spy at the U.N. was arrested, the Soviets retaliated by arresting an American journalist, Nicholas Daniloff, on trumped-up charges. It was an act that held hostage not only an innocent American journalist but the future of Soviet-American relations. The United States took action in response to the Soviet use of the U.N. for intelligence activities by ordering the expulsion of 25 Soviet personnel known to be involved in such activities.

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

It's worth noting here that we agreed to exchange the Soviet spy in question for the noted Russian human rights leader Yuri Orlov and his wife. Mr. Orlov's service to humanity, the record of his sufferings, makes him a hero for our time.

Yet it is also worth noting he was persecuted simply because he led an effort to get the Soviet Government to live up to the human rights agreements it signed at Helsinki in 1975.

Rights and Regional Conflicts

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

So, too, there is the issue of regional conflicts. It would be simply unthinkable for world leaders to meet in splendid isolation even as the people of Afghanistan, Central America, Africa and Southeast Asia undergo terrible sufferings as a result of Soviet invasion or military intervention.

Finally, there is the issue of broader contacts between the Soviet and American peoples, especially young people.

I think you can understand, then, when Mr. Gorbachev extended his invitation to a pre-summit discussion, I accepted. With such grave and complex matters, there's no such thing as too much preparation.

So, I hope that in explaining all this I've done something to dispel some of the inaccurate speculation and false hopes raised about the Iceland talks.

I expect these talks to be useful and successful, but only as preparation for future summit conferences. Our view is that we will proceed as we have from the start — step by step, cautiously, prudently and realistically.

And by the way, I hope this last point, about our realism, helps to answer some of the domestic criticisms recently of the summit process. Actually, I've got to confess that hearing suggestions that I'm getting soft on Communism is for me a new, and perhaps the word titillating is proper for that experience.