

The Reykjavik Summit: A Warming Diplomacy Ushers in a New Hope in the Cold War

Hannah Yahraus
Historical Paper
Junior Division

The Cold War was a time of fear and distrust between the United States and the Soviet Union. It began immediately after World War II ended, continued through Ronald Reagan's presidency in the 1980s, and reached a peak when both the Soviet Union and the United States had developed nuclear arsenals large enough to destroy both themselves and the world. It was at this juncture that the two leaders, Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev, decided that a nuclear war could not be won and must never be fought. The Reykjavik summit, the starting point for great diplomacy, was an important milestone in the nuclear arms race. The nature of the summit, forthcoming, collaborative, and perceptive, set it apart from previous negotiations. The summit made clear what each leader held most dear, a nuclear free world, and ultimately led to the Intermediate Nuclear Forces treaty and Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty I of 1991.

The 1980s was an era in which many feared a nuclear war between the superpowers of the world. It was said that Reagan began his own Cold War in promising to rearm the U.S. in order to face the Soviets. Subsequently, the Soviets tried to match the U.S. in nuclear weapons. It was during this period that the arms race accelerated (Schweid "Reagan" 5). Even through this hostile relationship and arms race, Reagan sought a time to meet and talk with Mikhail Gorbachev, to begin to understand each other's motives and move forward in peace (Friedman 48, 50).

Leading up to the point where the two superpowers would meet, Reagan and Gorbachev corresponded throughout 1985. This communication eventually resulted in the Geneva summit. In all of these letters, they expressed their desire for a warmer relationship between the two countries and an end to the nuclear arms race. Both leaders mentioned the need to come together and converse with each other for the good of both countries (Gorbachev, "Document 6 Letter"; Reagan, A Life).

The Geneva summit, held in November 1985, was considered a success in that it brought the two leaders closer to an understanding of each other's views. They agreed that a nuclear war could not be won. Gorbachev wanted a signed agreement that neither country would launch a nuclear war. Reagan disagreed, however. If the Soviets were to attack Europe, the U.S. would not be able to come to Europe's aid. Wanting to offer a concession, Gorbachev said that the Soviet Union did not intend to stay in Afghanistan. At the end of these discussions, although Gorbachev agreed that Reagan "was a man to do business with," he also questioned Reagan's enthusiasm in wanting to resolve the arms race (Lee 6). Nevertheless, after this summit, each leader invited the other to his own capital for another meeting (McCauley 79-80).

After the Geneva summit the two leaders exchanged many letters, displaying immense diplomatic effort (Mandelbaum 215). Gorbachev had written a letter to Reagan on September 15, 1985 and wondered if "the U.S. leadership [was] at all prepared and really willing to seek agreements which would lead to the termination of the arms race and to genuine disarmament" (Gorbachev, "Document 6, Gorbachev Letter"). However, following the time in Geneva, he expressed confidence in Reagan by stating, "I am convinced that we shall be able to find solutions, and I am prepared to discuss with you in a substantive way all possible approaches to them and identify such steps as would make it possible - after prompt follow-up by appropriate government agencies - to make my visit to the United States a really productive and fruitful one" (Gorbachev, "Document 1"). It was then that the plan of having a quick pre-summit meeting was born. "That is why an idea has come to my mind to suggest to you, Mr. President, that, in the very near future and setting aside all other matters, we have a quick one-on-one meeting, let us say in Iceland or in London, maybe just for one day, to engage in a strictly confidential, private

and frank discussion” (Gorbachev, “Document 1”). These statements demonstrated the extent to which Gorbachev wanted to reach an agreement with Reagan (Anderson; Kapur 2039).

As suggested by Gorbachev, Reykjavik, Iceland was selected as the meeting site, and October 11-12, 1986 were the chosen dates. Though Iceland was not a direct ally of either country, it was allied with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Gorbachev’s eagerness showed his willingness to resolve the arms talks (Friedman 50; McCauley 77, 80). Since Reykjavik was originally planned as a pre-summit meeting, Reagan only had a few notes prepared. He appeared flustered and confused. When Reagan dropped the few note cards he had, Gorbachev avoided the awkwardness by inviting their Foreign Ministers, George Shultz from the U.S. and E.A. Shevardnadze from the Soviet Union, to join them. George Schultz, Reagan’s Secretary of State, saved the day by mentioning to Gorbachev that his proposals were appropriate. The talks then progressed (Cannon 225). Gorbachev stated in his autobiography that “the American President had little to say on the arguments I presented” (Gorbachev, Memoirs 416). Some felt that because Reagan was poorly prepared, a failure was inevitable (“A More” 20).

Even though Reagan appeared ill prepared, the two leaders still discussed important issues such as arms control and the need to reduce many types of arms. Reagan and Gorbachev agreed to reduce strategic weapons. Reagan mentioned that eliminating nuclear arsenals was of the utmost importance. At one point Reagan asked, “Do we have in mind - and I think it would be very good - that by the end of the two five-year periods all nuclear explosive devices would be eliminated, including bombs, battlefield systems, cruise missiles, submarine weapons, intermediate-range systems and so on?” Gorbachev responded, “We could say that, list all those weapons” (“Document 16”). The proposals kept building and the prospect of reducing arms

increased. The leaders discussed in depth two ten-year periods to reduce arms and eventually eliminate all weapons. Gorbachev agreed to accept cuts in giant land-based missiles, proposals unheard of and remarkable. Reagan even proposed to end the arms race and to cease the hostilities between the two countries (Ratnesar 82; McCauley 81).

While the conversation was civil, with neither man losing his temper, many disagreements remained. Reagan obstinately guarded his Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), which had earned the nickname 'Star Wars.' This was to be a system deployed into space for defensive purposes "against ballistic missiles" ("Reagan Denies"). Reagan likened it to the gas mask. He had promised the American people to make SDI a reality (Mandelbaum 217). On August 7, 1986 he had said: "SDI is no bargaining chip. It is the path to a safer and more secure future. And the research is not and never has been negotiable" ("Reagan Denies"). His goals for SDI could even be traced to November of 1985, before the Geneva summit. He believed it meant "too much to the world and to the cause of peace if it should be possible to have an effective defensive system" ("Reagan Plucks"). The Soviets' objective, however, was to kill off SDI to prevent it from interfering with their offensive ballistic missiles. SDI would thereby put the Soviets at a disadvantage. Gorbachev, fearful to be "call[ed] a fool and irresponsible leader" could not agree to allow Reagan to proceed with SDI ("Document 16"). Neither would budge. Reagan even offered a ten-year delay of the project although he would not confine SDI to the laboratory. Gorbachev adamantly demanded its total abandonment to achieve the ultimate goal of nuclear disarmament (Gelb, "Neither" 1; Ali 2).

The controversy over SDI may have led to the end of the Reykjavik summit. While Reagan stubbornly pursued putting SDI into motion, Gorbachev stated "what we are talking about is seeing to it that SDI testing takes place only in the laboratory. We cannot go along with

allowing it to come out in the atmosphere or into space. That is unacceptable to us. It is a question of principle” (“Document 16”). Reagan replied, “You’re destroying all my bridges to continuation of my SDI program. I cannot go along with restrictions on the plan as you demand.” Gorbachev addressed Reagan, again trying to convince him to sign an agreement: “If I understand you, Mr. President, you are now addressing me in a trusting manner, as a man who occupies in his own country a position equal to yours. Therefore, I say to you frankly and in the same trusting manner: if we sign a package containing major concessions... you will become without exaggeration, a great President” (“Document 16”). The meeting then wound down to final pleas. Before they left, Gorbachev spoke to Reagan, “I’m ready to go right back into the house and sign a comprehensive document on all the issues agreed if you drop your plans to militarize space.” Reagan replied, “I am really sorry” (Gorbachev, Memoirs 419).

The impasse troubled many observers and analysts around the world. Francois Heisbourg, an advisor to the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs was “not happy that the Americans and the Russians did not reach an agreement.” (“Disappointment” 12). Politicians across the globe expressed disappointment that Reykjavik ended the way it did. Another lamented that what counted was not European missiles, but superpower arsenals. He reflected regret in the shifting focus of the talks from arms control to SDI. Senator Sam Nunn of Georgia concurred saying “It seemed Reagan had shifted his goal of arms control to preserving SDI” (Broder 20). Political commentators urged both Reagan and Gorbachev not to let SDI get in the way of historic arms control agreements (“Disappointment” 12). Most felt that SDI had been the cause of the end of the Reykjavik talks (Lewis 9; Hoagland 6; Gelb “Neither”). Led Aspin, a United States Representative, commented that Reagan “turned down the deal of the century... walked away,” (“Aspin”) referring to Reagan’s unwillingness to compromise on his Star Wars

initiative. Aspin believed if the two leaders had come to an agreement, it could have been greater than anything they might forge later in subsequent negotiations (“Aspin”).

Despite the negative views of some on the outcome, others, including Reagan and Gorbachev and some analysts, were optimistic (Adelman 11). Pundits were relieved the meeting had not resulted in frustration that could have closed the door permanently for talks. British Minister of State Timothy Renton considered the meeting as “one step more along the laborious road to arms control. It brought to the surface important matters...” (Schultz). Schultz was very positive. He felt that it was “important to recognize how effectively and constructively and hard the President worked, and how much he achieved potentially” (Schultz). He wrote later in his life that “what startled people was not what was said, because both Reagan and Gorbachev had said that before, but the fact was here were two leaders in an operational setting, talking about timetables. All of a sudden this vision had reality to it that changed the scene drastically, and that really did grab people’s attention” (Cannon 258). Reagan was very optimistic, believing the U.S. and the Soviet Union were closer than ever to an arms agreement (“News”). Gorbachev agreed that a totally new situation had emerged after Reykjavik and that a ban on nuclear arms was within reach. He also confirmed that the Soviets would continue and that all the proposals made at Reykjavik “would be on the table” (Toth).

Because the door had not been closed, a way was left open for new efforts. Another meeting in February 1988 in Moscow led to the Intermediate Nuclear Forces treaty which then led to a reduction of 859 U.S. missiles and 1836 Soviet ones. The INF treaty was the first between the two nations to provide for the destruction of nuclear weapons. Nuclear warheads were also reduced by two-thirds. At the signing of the INF treaty in Washington, a certain familiarity existed between Reagan and Gorbachev. The Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty I

(START I) of 1991 also came from the newly forged relationship between the United States and Soviet Union. The START I accord, coming a few years later, included reductions from both sides, and was an accomplishment of its own. This relationship had begun to develop in Geneva and progressed even more in Reykjavik, the defining moment in the negotiations (Gelb, “Neither”; Goodby; Hoffman 265; Gorbachev, Memoirs 81).

The opened doors, the discernable perspectives, and the amicable positions taken at Reykjavik all led to new agreements between the Soviets and the U.S. which brought about the end of the nuclear arms race between the two superpowers. This momentary diplomatic event forced the two leaders to acknowledge their differences and negotiate. The nature of the summit was mutual and understanding, giving them an opportunity to debate and compromise on their positions. Though ultimately they did not reach an agreement at Reykjavik, the meeting was a significant turning point in the Cold War. If the meeting at Reykjavik had resulted in the withdrawal of either side from discussions, or if it had convinced the world that the U.S. and Soviet Union simply could not work together, the end of the Cold War may not have arrived. Reagan and Gorbachev embodied two great leaders who came to the realization that a nuclear war could not be won and must never be fought. Then, they set in motion the necessary diplomatic steps to ensure that such a war would never come about, paving the way for a renewed hope and the end of the Cold War.

Works Cited

Primary Sources

Books

Gorbachev, Mikhail Sergeyevich. Memoirs-Mikhail Gorbachev. New York: Doubleday Press, 1995.

Mikhail Gorbachev's autobiography offered a new point of view on the summit and how Gorbachev dealt with it. It also gave his opinions on what should have happened. He felt he had offered everything he could to Reagan, but Reagan did not realize this.

Reagan, Ronald. A Life in Letters. New York: Free Press, 2003.

I found numerous letters in this book, but none of them were to Gorbachev during the time period I focused on. It helped me gain a bit more context on Reagan's focus. He wrote a letter to Rudolph Hines, a pen pal of the President, about how relations were going between the U.S. and the Soviet Union, and included several references to his personal life.

Letters

Gorbachev, Mikhail Sergeyevich. "Document 1. Letter to President Ronald Reagan. 15 Sept. 1986." The Reykjavik File. National Security Archive. 21 Feb. 2011.

<<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB203/index.htm>>

In this letter, Gorbachev asked Reagan to have a pre-summit meeting. He suggested London or Iceland as the meeting place. He expressed doubts about Reagan's enthusiasm. He also asked him to set aside his plans and try to come to an agreement.

Gorbachev, Mikhail Sergeyevich. "Document 6. Letter to President Ronald Reagan. 24 March. 1985." The Reykjavik File. National Security Archive. 23 Feb. 2011.

<<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB172/index.htm>>

I found this letter from Gorbachev that was sent before the Geneva Summit on the National Security Archives. It spoke of some of the same issues that were discussed at Reykjavik.

Gorbachev, Mikhail Sergeyevich. "Document 6. Gorbachev Letter to Reagan. 24 March 1985."

The Reykjavik File. National Security Archive. 24 Feb. 2011.

<<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB172/index.htm>>

Gorbachev replied to Reagan. He focused upon the need to improve relations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

Reagan, Ronald. "Document 2. Letter to Mikhail Gorbachev. 11 March 1985." To the Geneva

Summit Perestroika and the Transformation of U.S.-Soviet Relations. National Security

Archive. 22 Feb. 2011. <<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/>

[NSAEBB172/index.htm](http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB172/index.htm)>

Reagan sent a letter to Gorbachev, asking what could be done to improve relations.

Gorbachev replied in other letters.

Newspaper Articles

Ali, Mohsin. "U. S., USSR Maneuver To Break Reykjavik Ice." The Blade. 19 Oct. 1986: 2.

Ali spoke in detail about the negotiations. He explained what he believed went wrong and what others believed. He mentioned Reagan refused to confine SDI in the laboratory, yet he kept the door open for more talks to follow.

"Aspin Says a Great Arms Deal Was Lost." The Milwaukee Journal. 12 Oct. 1986: 6

Many opinions were expressed in this article. Some said that the meeting had been a failure and the President should have been able to reach an agreement.

Barrett, Graham. "Reykjavik and Realities." The Age. 8 Oct. 1986: 11.

Written before Reykjavik, Barrett discussed the current state of the looming arms race. He also brought up SDI, one of the most important topics discussed at Reykjavik.

“Both Sides Losers at Summit Meeting.” Milwaukee Sentinel. 13 Oct. 1986: 12.

I found this article useful in further understanding how President Reagan and George Schultz felt about the Strategic Defense Initiative. Schultz knew of its importance, and Reagan felt it too great a prospect to abandon.

Broder, David S. “Reagan’s Belief in SDI Is Unshakable.” St. Petersburg Times. 14 Oct. 1986: 20.

Reagan’s very controversial Space Defense Initiative is found to be the cause of the failure at Reykjavik in this article. I also learned of another point of view on SDI and Reagan’s motives.

“Disappointment Is Expressed in World Capitals Over Iceland Talks, but Also Hope.” The New York Times. 13 Oct. 1986: 12.

The views of leaders around the world were mentioned here. I learned of the many reactions to the summit, and on whether the summit was a failure.

Gelb, Leslie H. “Neither Leader Would Yield on ‘Shield Issue’.” Pittsburgh Post-Gazette. 13 Oct. 1986: 1.

This article described the stubbornness of both sides and their unwillingness to budge on the SDI issue. It also mentioned the disappointment expressed by both leaders.

Gelb, Leslie H. “The Road to Disagreement.” St. Petersburg Times. 14 Oct. 1986: 21.

Contradicting another article in this same paper that stated there was no success, this article mentioned several breakthroughs. Gelb also spoke of the sacrifices neither side was willing to make.

Hoagland, Jim. "Impasse Brings a New Uncertainty." The Milwaukee Journal. 13 Oct. 1986: 6.

Hoagland quoted several politicians in this article. Many were negative toward Reagan's final decision to end the summit without reaching an agreement.

Hoffman, David. "Reagan Masks Flaws in Upbeat Claims for Summit." Milwaukee Journal. 9 Nov. 1986: 2.

Hoffman described Reagan's extreme optimism on the summit he broke away from. He also explained his enthusiasm in resolving the arms race.

Lee, Gary. "Iceland Talks are Gamble for Soviets." The Washington Post. 1 Oct. 1986: 6.

Lee mentioned the Soviet's broken commitment to change the state of the arms race. He also mentioned the Soviets' willingness to compromise.

Lewis, Anthony. "Reykjavik Changed the World's Expectations for Arms Control." Pittsburgh Post-Gazette. 17 Oct. 1986: 9.

Lewis offered his perspective on the Reykjavik summit. He said that the summit gave new hope in the negotiations between Reagan and Gorbachev. Lewis felt a lesson could be learned from the failure of Reykjavik. He also thought that SDI had ended Reykjavik and all deals that could have come out of it.

"A More Dangerous World." St. Petersburg Times. 14 Oct. 1986: 20.

Featuring a different viewpoint than the bright outlook some others felt, this article spoke of U.S. and Soviet relations as being worse off than before Reykjavik. It called the summit a failure, rather than a success, and added another perspective to my research.

"News Summary." The New York Times. 14 Oct. 1986.

This was not an article, but a summary that listed what had happened during the year. Reykjavik was mentioned as an important event.

Prail, Frank J. "Schultz Briefs NATO Allies on Talks." The New York Times. 14 Oct. 1986.

A simple overview of the many things George Schultz had to say about Reykjavik, I enjoyed reading his opinions and feelings. Schultz was very disappointed at the outcome and had hoped that the final decisions would be better.

"Reagan Denies He Plans to Delay 'Star Wars'." Schenectady Gazette. 7 Aug. 1986: 1.

Reagan did not want to delay SDI because it was of the utmost importance. I used this article to understand Reagan's reasons for SDI to exist.

"Reagan Plucks Line From Movie to Promote Star Wars Defense." Lakeland Ledger. 30 Mar. 1985: 7A.

Offering insight on Reagan's plans for SDI, I used this article to understand why Reagan was so stubborn on keeping SDI alive during the Reykjavik summit.

"Reagan Won't Give Up On 'Star Wars'." Ellensburg Daily Record. 7 Nov. 1986: 10.

I also used this article to understand SDI. Reagan felt it had great importance to the world. Therefore, he would not give it up.

Safire, William. "The Debate Takes Shape." St. Petersburg Times. 14 Oct 1986: 21.

Safire speaks of the problems SDI is causing in this article. However, he seemed to be siding with the President in that he felt President Reagan had made the right choice.

Schweid, Barry. "Questions Reagan Took With Him to Reykjavik Meeting." 10 Oct. 1986: 1.

Written before the meeting at Reykjavik took place, this article spoke about what questions they wanted answered at the "good old-fashioned get-together." Some of these included what to do with Daniloff, a spy who had caused tension between the U.S. and the Soviet Union when he was caught by the KGB.

Schweid, Barry. "Reagan and Gorbachev Stake a Lot on Upcoming Reykjavik Summit."

Southeast Missourian. 7 Oct. 1986: 5.

This article was written several days before the summit. It described how important some felt the summit would be, and how they believed it would turn out.

Schultz, George. "Excerpts From Comments by Schultz at the News Conference in Reykjavik."

The New York Times. 13 Oct. 1986.

George Schultz expressed deep disappointment in Reykjavik. He knew that something great had slipped through the fingers of two great leaders of the world, and he felt regretful about the outcome.

"Star Wars Dispute Torpedoes Meeting." Pittsburgh Post- Gazette. 13 Oct 1986:1.

Another article speaking of the impact of SDI, this one gave another overview of what each side expected, and how the summit ended. Reagan refused to compromise further, thus ending the meeting.

Toth, Robert C. "The Reykjavik Summit the One That Got Away." The Ludington Daily News.

10 Oct 1986.

Referring to the summit as a failure, but describing exactly what went on, I found this article very useful to understand how each of the leaders saw their relationship.

"Wins, Losses Tough to Tally in Review of Summit." The Milwaukee Journal. 19 Oct. 1986:

18J.

Instead of a journalist writing this article, readers submitted their opinions on the outcome of the summit. It was nice to read the public's opinion of the conclusion at Reykjavik.

Other Primary Documents

“Document 15: U.S. Memorandum of Conversation, Reagan-Gorbachev, Final Meeting, 12 October 1986, 3:25 p.m. - 4:30 p.m. and 5:30 p.m. - 6:50.” The Reykjavik File. 12 Oct. 1986. The National Security Archive. George Washington University. 22 Feb. <<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB203/index.htm>>

I compared the Russian transcript with this U.S. one. The differences were minimal, and the concepts remained the same.

“Document 16: Russian transcript of Reagan-Gorbachev Summit in Reykjavik, 11 October 1986.” The Reykjavik File. 12 Oct. 1986. The National Security Archive. George Washington University. 22 Feb. <<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB203/index.htm>>

I found this document, a Russian transcript of the meeting, very useful. I quoted several people and found new information here.

United States. House of Representatives, Defense Policy Panel of the Committee on Armed Services. Process and Implications of the Iceland Summit. Washington, D.C. 1986.

This document was a discussion of arms control and the summit. Many representatives were present, and all had different views. This great primary source showed how different government officials felt about the outcome of the summit.

Scholarly Journals

Adelman, Kenneth L. “The Road from Reykjavik.” World Affairs 149 (1986): 11-12.

This was an address made by Kenneth Adelman, the director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, before the United Nations. He explained what the U.S. wanted

to achieve at Reykjavik, and that was to lay the groundwork and to narrow differences between the two countries.

Kapur, Harish. "Reykjavik Summit." Economic and Political Weekly 21 (1986): 2039.

Kapur talked of the many reactions in the United States and Europe. He mentioned how some in the United States felt that Gorbachev had the upper-hand at the summit. He also pointed out several European opinions. One of these was an agreement to eliminate missiles in Europe, but not in the Soviet Union which would give the Soviet Union an advantage.

Mandelbaum, Michael, and Strobe Talbott. "Reykjavik and Beyond." Foreign Affairs 65 (1986): 215-235.

Mandelbaum and Strobe wrote about how before Reykjavik both leaders displayed efforts to reach a point where the two leaders could talk and negotiate. However, things did not go as planned and the pre-summit meeting turned into a summit.

Schlesinger, James. "Reykjavik and Revelations: A Turn of the Tide?" Foreign Affairs 65 (1986): 426- 446.

The author of this article praised Reagan and the United States. He also mentioned several points of political disagreement before Reykjavik occurred. His opinion of the summit was that it reduced hopes for arms control between the U.S. and Soviet Union.

Secondary Sources

Books

Cannon, Lou. Ronald Reagan. New York: Public Affairs, 2001.

Cannon, a reporter who followed Reagan much of his life, wrote much on the Reykjavik summit and Reagan's reactions. He also mentioned the positive effects it had on treaties

and on Reagan's relationship with Gorbachev. This book also included a draft of a letter sent to Gorbachev.

Friedman, Norman. The Cold War. London: Andre Deutsch, 2009.

This book had many examples of wartime propaganda and good explanations of the time period between the beginning and the end of the Cold War. It briefly mentioned Reykjavik, but it described the eventual warming of the Soviets' relationship with the U.S.

Gaddis, John Lewis. The Cold War: A New History. New York: The Penguin Press, 2005.

An in depth perspective on the Cold War, I was not able to read this whole book. However, it gave a great synopsis on the Reykjavik summit. It was much briefer than other books, but was very simple in explaining the summit. It was suggested by a professor I consulted, Jeffrey Brooks.

Hoffman, David E. The Dead Hand. New York: Double Day, 2009.

I enjoyed this book very much. Written in a novel format, it was a story-like read. However, it had a huge amount of information on the summit and the relationship between Reagan and Gorbachev. It emphasized Reagan's stubbornness in not letting go of SDI.

McCauley, Martin. Gorbachev. London: Longman, 1998.

This was a simple biography of Gorbachev and listed several quotes of his in reference to the summit. For example, Gorbachev expressed his optimistic view for future talks. It also had a helpful section on the Geneva summit, which was another meeting between Reagan and Gorbachev.

Ratnesar, Romesh. Tear Down This Wall. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2009.

I found this to be a useful source to clarify the information I had previously found. I also used it to add detail to the earlier notes I had taken, such as an extended quote.

Schaller, Michael. Ronald Reagan. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

A short biography on Reagan, I read this book for context on Reagan's mindset and plans during his presidency.

Treisman, Daniel. The Return. New York: Free Press, 2011.

A lengthy book, I could not read all of The Return. I did read several pages on what occurred after the Reykjavik summit and what resulted from the initiative that both leaders took.

Venezia, Mike. Ronald Reagan. New York: Children's Press, 2008.

This was a short biography of President Reagan, talking about his early life, acting career, and Presidency. I used it early in my research to understand the kind of person Reagan was and his motives during his Presidency.

Interview

Anderson, Richard. Email interview. 4 April 2011.

I interviewed Professor Anderson, a political science professor at the University of California and Los Angeles, to learn his opinion on the situation between Reagan and Gorbachev. He stated several times that Gorbachev was the one who took the most initiative in dealing with the talks between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

Websites

Goodby, Ambassador James E. "Looking Back: The 1986 Reykjavik Summit." September, 2006.

<www.armscontrol.org/act/2006_09/lookingback>

U.S. Ambassador James Goodby wrote this article on the Arms Control Association website. I gained an overview of the Reykjavik summit. This website stated important points and conclusions that were very helpful, such as the possible explanations on how the summit ended. It also gave insight on what happened during the summit. Mentioning the specific dream to end the threat of nuclear war, it had an optimistic perspective on the summit.

Sokov, Dr. Nikolai. "Reykjavik Summit: The Legacy and a Lesson for the Future." Issue Brief.

December 2007. NTI by the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies. <www.nti.org/e_research/e3_95.html>

I gained a clear overview of the summit from reading this website. It mentioned basic points and insights on the summit, such as the ice broken between the two leaders at Reykjavik.