

Originally Processed With FOIA(s):
2003-0259-F

FOIA Number:
2003-0259-F

FOIA MARKER

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

Record Group/Collection: George H.W. Bush Presidential Records
Collection/Office of Origin: Public Liaison, White House Office of
Series: Jeavons, Kathy, Files
Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 06272
Folder ID Number: 06272-043

Folder Title:
David Duke

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
G	0	0	0	0

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

November 7, 1991

MEMORANDUM FOR OPINION LEADERS

FROM:

BOBBIE KILBERG ^{BK}
DEPUTY ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT
FOR PUBLIC LIAISON

KATHY JEAVONS ^{VJ}
ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR FOR PUBLIC LIAISON

SUBJECT:

President Bush's recent speech in Madrid and
comments on David Duke

Enclosed please find the following:

- 1) President Bush's October 30 speech at the opening of the Middle East Peace Conference in Madrid;
- 2) President Bush's November 6 statement repudiating again David Duke's candidacy for Governor of Louisiana.

For your information, the President will be holding a roundtable discussion with a group of American Jewish leaders in New York City on November 12 to discuss the peace process.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Madrid, Spain)

For Immediate Release

October 30, 1991

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AT OPENING SESSION OF THE
MIDDLE EAST PEACE CONFERENCE

Salon de las Columnas
Royal Palace
Madrid, Spain

10:38 A.M. (L)

THE PRESIDENT: Prime Minister Gonzalez, and President Gorbachev, Excellencies. Let me begin by thanking the government of Spain for hosting this historic gathering. With short notice, the Spanish people and their leaders stepped forward to make available this magnificent setting. Let us hope that this conference of Madrid will mark the beginning of a new chapter in the history of the Middle East.

I also want to express at the outset my pleasure at the presence of our fellow co-sponsor, President Gorbachev. At a time of momentous challenges at home, President Gorbachev and his senior associates have demonstrated their intent to engage the Soviet Union as a force for positive change in the Middle East. This sends a powerful signal to all those who long for peace.

We come to Madrid on a mission of hope -- to begin work on a just, lasting and comprehensive settlement to the conflict in the Middle East. We come here to seek peace for a part of the world that in the long memory of man has known far too much hatred, anguish and war. I can think of no endeavor more worthy -- or more necessary.

Our objective must be clear and straightforward. It is not simply to end the state of war in the Middle East and replace it with a state of nonbelligerency. This is not enough; this would not last. Rather, we seek peace, real peace. And by real peace I mean treaties. Security. Diplomatic relations. Economic relations. Trade. Investment. Cultural Exchange. Even tourism.

What we seek is a Middle East where vast resources are no longer devoted to armaments. A Middle East where young people no longer have to dedicate and, all too often, give their lives to combat. A Middle East no longer victimized by fear and terror. A Middle East where normal men and women lead normal lives.

Let no one mistake the magnitude of this challenge. The struggle we seek to end has a long and painful history. Every life lost -- every outrage, every act of violence -- is etched deep in the hearts and history of the people of this region. There is a history that weighs heavily against hope. And yet, history need not be man's master.

MORE

I expect that some will say that what I am suggesting is impossible. But think back. Who back in 1945 would have thought that France and Germany, bitter rivals for nearly a century, would become allies in the aftermath of World War II? And who two years ago would have predicted that the Berlin Wall would come down? And who in the early 1960s would have believed that the Cold War would come to a peaceful end, replaced by cooperation -- exemplified by the fact that the United States and the Soviet Union are here today -- not as rivals, but as partners, as Prime Minister Gonzalez pointed out.

No, peace in the Middle East need not be a dream. Peace is possible. The Egyptian-Israeli Peace Treaty is striking proof that former adversaries can make and sustain peace. And moreover, parties in the Middle East have respected agreements, not only in the Sinai, but on the Golan Heights as well.

The fact that we are all gathered here today for the first time attests to a new potential for peace. Each of us has taken an important step toward real peace by meeting here in Madrid. All the formulas on paper, all the pious declarations in the world won't bring peace if there is no practical mechanism for moving ahead.

Peace will only come as the result of direct negotiations, compromise, give-and-take. Peace cannot be imposed from the outside by the United States or anyone else. While we will continue to do everything possible to help the parties overcome obstacles, peace must come from within.

We come here to Madrid as realists. We do not expect peace to be negotiated in a day, or a week, or a month, or even a year. It will take time; indeed, it should take time -- time for parties so long at war to learn to talk to one another, to listen to one another. Time to heal old wounds and build trust. In this quest, time need not be the enemy of progress.

What we envision is a process of direct negotiations proceeding along two tracks, one between Israel and the Arab states; the other between Israel and the Palestinians. Negotiations are to be conducted on the basis of U.N. Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338.

The real work will not happen here in the plenary session, but in direct bilateral negotiations. This conference cannot impose a settlement on the participants or veto agreements; and just as important, the conference can only be reconvened with the consent of every participant. Progress is in the hands of the parties who must live with the consequences.

Soon after the bilateral talks commence, parties will convene as well to organize multilateral negotiations. These will focus on issues that cross national boundaries and are common to the region: arms control, water, refugee concerns, economic development. Progress in these fora is not intended as a substitute for what must be decided in the bilateral talks; to the contrary, progress in the multilateral issues can help create an atmosphere in which long-standing bilateral disputes can more easily be settled.

For Israel and the Palestinians, a framework already exists for diplomacy. Negotiations will be conducted in phases, beginning with talks on interim self-government arrangements. We aim to reach agreement within one year. And once agreed, interim self-government arrangements will last for five years; beginning the third year, negotiations will commence on permanent status.

No one can say with any precision what the end result will be; in our view, something must be developed, something acceptable to Israel, the Palestinians and Jordan, that gives the Palestinian people meaningful control over their own lives and fate and provides for the acceptance and security of Israel.

We can all appreciate that both Israelis and Palestinians are worried about compromise, worried about compromising even the smallest point for fear it becomes a precedent for what really matters. But no one should avoid compromise on interim arrangements for a simple reason: nothing agreed to now will prejudice permanent status negotiations. To the contrary, these subsequent negotiations will be determined on their own merits.

Peace cannot depend upon promises alone. Real peace -- lasting peace -- must be based upon security for all states and peoples, including Israel. For too long the Israeli people have lived in fear, surrounded by an unaccepting Arab world. Now is the ideal moment for the Arab world to demonstrate that attitudes have changed, that the Arab world is willing to live in peace with Israel and make allowances for Israel's reasonable security needs.

We know that peace must also be based on fairness. In the absence of fairness, there will be no legitimacy -- no stability. This applies above all to the Palestinian people, many of whom have known turmoil and frustration above all else. Israel now has an opportunity to demonstrate that it is willing to enter into a new relationship with its Palestinian neighbors; one predicated upon mutual respect and cooperation.

Throughout the Middle East, we seek a stable and enduring settlement. We've not defined what this means; indeed, I make these points with no map showing where the final borders are to be drawn. Nevertheless, we believe territorial compromise is essential for peace. Boundaries should reflect the quality of both security and political arrangements. The United States is prepared to accept whatever the parties themselves find acceptable. What we seek, as I said on March 6, is a solution said on March 6, that meets the twin tests of fairness and security.

I know -- I expect we all know -- that these negotiations will not be easy. I know, too, that these negotiations will not be smooth. There will be disagreement and criticism, setbacks -- who knows -- possibly interruptions. Negotiation and compromise are always painful. Success will escape us if we focus solely upon what is being given up.

We must fix our vision on what real peace would bring. Peace, after all, means not just avoiding war and the costs of preparing for it. The Middle East is blessed with great resources: physical, financial and, yes, above all, human. New opportunities are within reach -- if we only have the vision to embrace them.

To succeed, we must recognize that peace is in the interest of all parties -- war, absolute advantage of none. The alternative to peace in the Middle East is a future of violence and waste and tragedy. In any future war lurks the danger of weapons of mass destruction. As we learned in the Gulf war, modern arsenals make it possible to attack urban areas -- to put the lives of innocent men, women and children at risk, to transform city streets, schools and children's playgrounds into battlefields.

Today, we can decide to take a different path to the future -- to avoid conflict. I call upon all parties to avoid unilateral acts, be they words or deeds, that would invite retaliation or, worse yet, prejudice or even threaten this process itself. I call upon all parties to consider taking measures that will bolster mutual confidence and trust -- steps that signal a sincere commitment to reconciliation.

I want to say something about the role of the United States of America. We played an active role in making this conference possible; both the Secretary of State, Jim Baker, and I will play an active role in helping the process succeed. Toward this end, we've provided written assurances to Israel, to Syria, to Jordan, Lebanon and the Palestinians. In the spirit of openness and honesty, we will brief all parties on the assurances that we have provided to the other. We're prepared to extend guarantees, provide technology and support, if that is what peace requires. And we will call upon our friends and allies in Europe and in Asia to join with us in providing resources so that peace and prosperity go hand in hand.

Outsiders can assist, but in the end, it is up to the peoples and governments of the Middle East to shape the future of the Middle East. It is their opportunity and it is their responsibility to do all that they can to take advantage of this gathering, this historic gathering, and what it symbolizes and what it promises.

No one should assume that the opportunity before us to make peace will remain if we fail to seize the moment. Ironically, this is an opportunity born of war -- the destruction of past wars, the fear of future wars. The time has come to put an end to war -- the time has come to choose peace.

Speaking for the American people, I want to reaffirm that the United States is prepared to facilitate the search for peace, to be a catalyst, as we've been in the past and as we've been very recently. We seek only one thing, and this we seek not for ourselves, but for the peoples of the area and particularly the children: that this and future generations of the Middle East may know the meaning and blessing of peace.

We have seen too many generations of children whose haunted eyes show only fear -- too many funerals for their brothers and sisters, the mothers and fathers who died too soon -- too much hatred, too little love. And if we cannot summon the courage to lay down the past for ourselves, let us resolve to do it for the children.

May God bless and guide the work of this conference, and may this conference set us on the path of peace. Thank you. (Applause.)

END

10:55 A.M. (L)

PRESS CONFERENCE BY THE PRESIDENT BEFORE
DEPARTURE TO ROME, ITALY AND THE HAGUE, THE NETHERLANDS

6:49 A.M. EST
November 6, 1991

Q Are you going to urge voters in Louisiana to vote against David Duke?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, strongly. We had a great victory in Mississippi yesterday. And Kirk Fordice won a good clean race on fundamental issues. And it is truly unfortunate that the state next door in Louisiana -- and they vote next week for governor -- do not have the choice between two good men. We differ with Senator Wofford, but I think the Pennsylvanians had a choice between two decent, good men. And I've got to be careful because I do not want to tell the voters of Louisiana how to cast their ballots next week. That is a right that we all cherish; it's a personal right. And so they've got to make their own decisions.

But when someone asserts that the Holocaust never took place, then I don't believe that person ever deserves one iota of public trust. And when someone has so recently endorsed Nazism, it is inconceivable that such a person can legitimately aspire to leadership -- in a leadership role in a free society. And when someone has a long record, an ugly record, of racism and of bigotry, that record simply cannot be erased by the glib rhetoric of a political campaign.

So I believe that David Duke is an insincere charlatan. I believe he is attempting to hoodwink the voters of Louisiana, and I believe that he should be rejected for what he is and what he stands for.

Kathy J

AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
440 FIRST STREET, N.W., SUITE 600
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001
FAX NUMBER (202) 347-4916
FOREIGN POLICY ISSUES

FAX NUMBER: _____

TO: Bobbie Kilberg

FROM: HOWARD KOUR

DATE: 12/20

TIME: _____

NUMBER OF PAGES (INCLUDING COVER PAGE): 3

IF COPY IS UNCLEAR OR IF THERE ARE ANY QUESTIONS, PLEASE CALL
(202) 639-5306 FOR FURTHER ASSISTANCE. THANK YOU.

Thursday

DECEMBER 19, 1991

The Detroit News

Section B

OBITUARIES 7E

Metro

Jewish leaders ask state to remove Duke from ballot

By Tarak Hamada
THE DETROIT NEWS

Industrialist Max Fisher Wednesday likened former Nazi sympathizer David Duke to Hitler and, with three other Metro Detroit Jewish leaders, called for the removal of Duke's name from Michigan's Republican presidential primary ballot.

"He stirs up bigotry and hate," Fisher said. "He's anti-black, anti-minority and anti-Jewish. And he's a smooth talker — just like Hitler."

In a letter to Secretary of State Richard Austin, businessmen Fisher, Paul Borman, David Himmelfarb and Ed Levy Jr. expressed "profound disappointment" with Austin's decision to put Duke's name on the ballot.

He is "an extremist who appeals to the most base fears in people," they said. "We would hope... there is some way that this decision can be reconsidered."

Fisher, a Republican, told "The Detroit News" he opposes Duke's placement on the GOP ballot because the party has repudiated him. President Bush and the Republican National Committee denounced Duke during his attempt to be elected governor of Louisiana in November. He lost.

Ballot: Jewish leaders ask state officials to remove Duke

From page 1B

A potential presidential candidate. "There's no escaping the fact that he will show up on several state ballots."

But Fisher said that Duke is merely a "fringe" candidate who only appeals to voters in Louisiana.

"The media paid too much attention to him," he said.

David Duke's spokesman, Marc Ellis, said from his New Orleans office that the Jewish leaders are trying to deny Michigan voters the chance to express their feelings about Duke and his message.

"These four gentlemen need to realize what they are talking about is denying the entire voting population of Michigan the right to choose,

Ellis said. "The overwhelming majority of Jewish Americans are people who have the rights of the individual uppermost in their minds. This is a civil liberties question."

Ellis denied Fisher's charge that Duke is anti-Semitic.

Although Ellis conceded that Duke in the late 1960s and early 1970s "put on one of those (Nazi) costumes and paraded with them," he added that Duke has never been a member of the American Nazi Party.

"How many of us haven't changed in the last 20 years?" Ellis asked. "I wouldn't be here if he were anti-Semitic."

But Fisher said he doesn't believe Duke's claims that he no longer supports the anti-Semitic Nazi ideology. "A leopard doesn't change his spots," Fisher said.

Ellis said Fisher is wrong to argue Duke isn't a Republican.

Duke, a former Ku Klux Klan leader, supports the party's conservative stands on welfare and affirmative action, Ellis said.

The complaint from the Jewish leaders came a day after the Michigan Republican Party's leadership asked Austin to require Duke, but not primary candidates President Bush or Pat Buchanan, to earn a place on the Republican ballot by collecting the required 9,529 signatures from registered voters support-

ing his candidacy.

"Duke cannot name one Republican elected or party official anywhere in America who supports his candidacy," said Michigan Republican State Chairman Dave Doyle.

During his run for the Louisiana governorship, Duke got some support in Michigan. A total of 255 Michigan residents contributed nearly \$12,000 to his campaign.

Austin will consider the party's request, said Thomas.

As far as Duke is concerned, "the secretary of state has put him on the ballot," Ellis said.

If Austin requires Duke to file the petitions, "we'll cross that bridge when we come to it," he said.

Please see **Ballot, 6B**

DEC 20 '91 14:19

File: David Duce

MAX M. FISHER
FISHER BUILDING
TWENTY SEVENTH FLOOR
DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48202

December 17, 1991

The Honorable Richard Austin
Secretary of State
Lansing, Michigan 48909

Dear Mr. Austin:

We write to express our profound disappointment in your decision to certify David Duke as a candidate in Michigan's primary election.

Our election laws require you to certify only those individuals recognized by the national media as legitimate candidates. We believe the media only has recognized Mr. Duke for what he is -- an extremist who appeals to the most base fears in people.

Mr. Duke's national media attention is based on his linkage to powerful symbols of hatred and violence -- the Nazi Party and the Klu Klux Klan. To equate such notoriety with a legitimate presidential candidacy undermines our election law and gives unwarranted credibility to extremist hate mongers who always will be on the fringes of our democratic society.

We would hope that on further reflection there is some way that this decision can be reconsidered.

Sincerely,

Paul Borman
Paul Borman

Max M. Fisher
Max M. Fisher

David Hermelin
David Hermelin

Ed Levy, Jr.
Ed Levy, Jr.

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

November 6, 1991

PRESS CONFERENCE BY THE PRESIDENT
BEFORE DEPARTURE TO ROME, ITALY AND THE HAGUE, THE NETHERLANDS

The South Lawn

6:49 A.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, everybody. I've got a little statement here, and then I'll be glad to take a few questions on this chilly morning.

First, I am just delighted about the Gates nomination. And I want to commend the Senate for approving him to be the Director of Central Intelligence. He is a good man, and he has outstanding credentials. And he served the country well; he's been at my right hand on all the big decisions we've had to make about war and peace. And I know he is going to be at CIA an outstanding Director, serving with distinction.

I think yesterday's vote brings a certain high degree of professionalism, dedicated leadership to an agency that will be undergoing significant change in the world in the years ahead. And, in my view, the Senate did the right thing. The agency could not be in more capable hands.

There are four other votes that deserve comment. Yesterday, the voters of Pennsylvania selected Senator Wofford to be the Senator. And Dick Thornburgh, who served the country as Attorney General, ran a strong campaign, a dignified campaign. He and Ginny have worked long and hard for the State of Pennsylvania and for our country. They're wonderful people, and I know it must hurt to lose, having been there myself, but I know that Dick has a brilliant career ahead of him.

We're very pleased -- there was a lot of good news for the Republicans. We elected a governor in Mississippi -- the first Republican governor in this century -- a good man, Kirk Fordice. He has pointed the way to change in the South. We believe more and more Republicans will be elected in Southern elections, so that is very good. Similarly, in the State of New Jersey -- it was a blowout. We had a huge swing to Republicans in both the House and the Senate. And in Virginia, right here across the river, the Republicans picked up eight seats in the Senate and now constitute a very, very strong voice in that state's political authority. Both of these elections bode well for Republican ideas and values.

Let me comment on the trip. NATO and the American presence in Europe have helped keep the peace for over 40 years, and now I am going to be meeting with the NATO leaders in Rome to talk about the challenges of security in the post-Cold War world, and the opportunity for partnership with former adversaries. I view this as a very important part of the responsibilities of the President working for peace around the world.

At The Hague, that is more economic because we'll be talking about our growing cooperation in helping the democratic transformations in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, and the ways of expanding free and fair trade all around the world -- something that is going to generate a lot of new business opportunities for American farmers particularly, but manufacturers and service industries as well. For example, just to put this in perspective, we

MORE

will do more than \$200 billion worth of trade this year with the EC nations, and every billion dollars worth of manufactured exports means 20,000 jobs here in the United States.

The best thing for American agriculture, incidentally, is to have a successful conclusion to the GATT talks, to the Uruguay Round. The American farmer can compete with anybody, but he's got to have free and fair access to the markets of Europe, and that is a lot of what we'll be talking about when we meet with the EC leaders in The Hague.

On the domestic scene, I hate going away with Congress still in session. Heaven knows what will happen, but there is a chance now to pass a growth package, which I've been advocating for about two years now, while the American people are demanding action. Haven't seen anything coming out of Congress yet that I can accept, but I am not going to give up on that. Fortunately, we're very serious about getting this economy growing, and we do have strong support, I think, on both sides now for some sensible ideas on growth.

I might say that listening to some, I will just respond this way: We've learned the awful price of isolationism -- back on what I'm trying to do abroad here -- and we've learned that protectionism and trade isolation hastened the worst economic depression in modern history. So we're going to be proving that we learned those lessons well and we are going to be, at the same time -- we've got two days more of legislative action this week here, and I want to see them move forward on this unemployment compensation, doing it in a way where the tiny percent that we desperately want to help get helped, but we don't burden the 95 percent or whatever it is that are paying taxes. I don't want to do this by breaking the budget agreement in terms of getting the checks to the people whose benefits have run out. So we've got to get going on that one as well.

That is about it. There are some other subjects, but I'm glad to take a few questions.

Q Mr. President, there is a feeling that it's panic time at the White House and that you can't -- it's panic time, that you have cancelled your Asian tour because you are afraid of the voters, the people getting more and more resentful of your foreign travels and having no real solution to the problems of joblessness and so forth. What is your response?

THE PRESIDENT: My response is, that's crazy. I'll be honest with you -- I had thought when this trip was scheduled for the end of November that definitely the Congress would be out of session. The Congress had announced a target date -- I think it was for November 4th or November 2nd. We've passed that date. It's not surprising. But, nevertheless, that was the date that was announced at the time this trip was set. But I think it is prudent -- to use an overworked word -- to be around here when the Congress is still in session, and especially when you get down to that year-end crunch where a lot of crazy things can happen.

So I didn't want to take a chance. This trip has been postponed, not cancelled. It does have some very important aspects, particularly the Japanese leg, because it affects jobs for America. But that is the reason, Helen.

But I can understand the political charges. It was a political day yesterday and we did very, very well, so tomorrow they'll have another political charge.

Q Well, Mr. President, why shouldn't people think that you are running scared when the number of people who say they'll

vote for you for reelection has dropped precipitously, when you've cancelled the trip now and your man in Pennsylvania lost badly? Why shouldn't people think that you're running scared?

THE PRESIDENT: Because our man in Mississippi won big. New Jersey won tremendous. Blew them away in Virginia. And so please just don't look at part of the glass -- the part that is only less than half-full. I am depressed over the Thornburgh race because he's such a good man, but you look at the overall record and what I stand for and what our party stands for -- had a very good day, thank you. But, look, we're in the political season; these guys are going to be making all these charges. I've told you I don't live and die by the polls, thus I will refrain from pointing out that we're not doing too bad in those polls. What matters is the people that are hurting. And let's try to solve the problems for the American people.

But we'll get these charges. I mean, anything you do in this job, I've learned, you take on a little water, get a few hits. If things are going well, why, you know, people are smiling and cheering and when they're not, you've got to redouble your efforts to help people. So I don't worry about the criticism, and I've told you before, I do not live and die by these polls that go up and down. Having said that, I've seen these head-on-heads, and I feel pretty good about it. But that is -- I don't want to start crowing about something when the election is a year away. I'll be facing a tough fight. All these people that are candidates are tough, and nobody is going to be taking anything for granted.

Q You campaigned very vigorously, though, for your man in Pennsylvania -- Thornburgh -- and it wasn't even close. I mean, he lost -- for a guy who went in with more than a 40-point lead, he lost by something like 10 percentage points. Did you know -- did your advisors see that coming yesterday before you cancelled your trip? When did you cancel your trip, and also what are the voters --

THE PRESIDENT: The trip had nothing to do with the election in Pennsylvania. Please, Rita.

Q Okay. Did you decide to cancel your trip before yesterday?

THE PRESIDENT: I talked about it because I've been worried -- I talked to Bob Michel on the trip to California and I said are you definitely going to adjourn on the 22nd? And he told me -- I hope I'm not talking out of school -- "Well, I talked to the Speaker and he hopes to be out on the 22nd, but for the first time he indicated we might not be out on the 22nd." This from the Congress that said they were going to be adjourned on November 2nd or November 4th. And I simply think at the end of a congressional session, it is important to be there. All kinds of crazy things can happen with this crowd that controls the Senate and House, and I'd like to be there to protect the American taxpayer and to help the American worker. So it was in that time frame that I got to thinking, hey, we'd better -- but it had nothing to do with the Pennsylvania election, nor the great victories in New Jersey, in Mississippi and in Virginia.

Q Mr. President, when you saw what the issues were in Pennsylvania, what do you think the voters there were saying about Washington, about the status quo?

THE PRESIDENT: I just take Senator Wofford at his word, that there is a message here for the administration and a message here for the United States Congress. And I think people -- when the economy is slow, people are concerned. They're hurting out there; they're concerned about their livelihood. He got a big hand for

saying he wants to help on those whose benefits have run out. So do I. We've got proposals up there. We could have had those checks in the mail literally weeks ago. But I must protect -- try to protect the taxpayers in this country who don't need another tax increase. A lot of the message in all these elections, I think, had to do with taxes.

But I accept Senator Wofford -- he ran a good campaign -- accept his explanation that there is a message for the White House -- and then I notice he said for the Congress, a Congress that is controlled in both houses by the Democratic Party. So, listen, as far as I'm concerned, we'll go the extra mile and we'll try even harder. But I will try to do it the way I was elected to do it.

Q Mr. President, one of the potent issues for Senator Wofford was health care. What message do you take from that development in Pennsylvania?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I listen to the message from all these people -- governors, senators, legislatures -- and one of the loud messages was don't raise taxes. One of the messages in Pennsylvania, try to help people with health care. So you've got to balance these two. And we are working, as you know, on the health care issue. And stay tuned because when we get prepared, why, we will be coming forth with something I think is constructive. But you cannot listen to just part of the message. You've got to listen to the whole message. And most of the American people at the state level and the gubernatorial level are saying, hey, please don't hit us again on taxes, please don't raise our taxes for whatever cause. The best evidence of that one -- check it out -- is New Jersey, where they just blew the Democrats away.

Q Are you going to urge voters in Louisiana to vote against David Duke?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, strongly. We had a great victory in Mississippi yesterday. And Kirk Fordice won a good clean race on fundamental issues. And it is truly unfortunate that the state next door in Louisiana -- and they vote next week for governor -- do not have the choice between two good men. We differ with Senator Wofford, but I think the Pennsylvanians had a choice between two decent, good men. And I've got to be careful because I do not want to tell the voters of Louisiana how to cast their ballots next week. That is a right that we all cherish; it's a personal right. And so they've got to make their own decisions.

But when someone asserts that the Holocaust never took place, then I don't believe that person ever deserves one iota of public trust. And when someone has so recently endorsed Nazism, it is inconceivable that such a person can legitimately aspire to leadership -- in a leadership role in a free society. And when someone has a long record, an ugly record, of racism and of bigotry, that record simply cannot be erased by the glib rhetoric of a political campaign.

So I believe that David Duke is an insincere charlatan. I believe he is attempting to hoodwink the voters of Louisiana, and I believe that he should be rejected for what he is and what he stands for.

Q Mr. President, the economy, sir, has been reported as rather weak in retail sales and consumer confidence. Are you concerned that consumers are not responding to the interest rate cuts that the Federal Reserve has put through and that the economy isn't coming back, that maybe it's sliding into recession?

THE PRESIDENT: No, I'm not worried about it sliding into recession. I am worried about consumer confidence because I

think when you look at historically low interest rates, a lot of people will suddenly wake up and say this is a good time to buy a home, a good time to buy a car. But I worry about it; of course, I do. I worry about it when people are hurting or think that they're hurting, or worried about the future -- you know, this right-track, wrong-track argument. Yes, I worry about that. But I think we've got good programs, if the Congress would move, that would help -- not solve it all, but would help. And I've put forward initiatives for growth that I keep talking about, have been in the State of the Union messages, will continue to talk about until we get action that doesn't hurt the economy.

There is kind of a panic, kind of a frenzy amongst some legislators who don't want to get home because they heard the message yesterday loud and clear from the voters. And that message -- the frenzy has to do with well, we'd better do something, we'd better look busy, we'd better accomplish something. But the something -- they'd better be careful what it is because the American people do not want to have a higher tax burden. And many of these proposals would do just that, and they also don't want to pay higher interest rates. You notice when some of the proposals were floated last week, long-term rates shot right through the roof because the market was saying wait a minute, we don't want to bust this budget agreement. That is the only safety the taxpayer has, and we don't want to see ourselves get into some spiral of inflation again.

So it's not an easy problem, but do I worry about it when people lack confidence? Of course, I do, and I want to try to find ways to help because people are hurting. But some of it is -- I think you put your finger on it -- there ought to be, in my view, given the economic place where we stand now, more confidence. I'm not trying to say everything is rosy, but I am saying interest rates are down. There is a good chance to do something now in the way of housing or on cars or on whatever that we haven't had before. And so I think it will come around, but, of course, I worry about it.

Q Are you going to offer any kind of --

Q What about a peace dividend? Why not use the peace dividend -- the reduction in the military budget?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we're reducing the military budget, and all I want to do is be sure that it is reduced in a way that can get -- where I can go to the American people, my foremost responsibility in my mind, and say I can guarantee you that the national security is where it should be. Reckless cuts, no. Cuts, yes, and Dick Cheney is working with the Congress on this, and I think we'll have a good program and I think it will be at lower levels of spending. We've already made some substantial cuts in it. So, yes, I don't think anything should be exempt, Helen.

Q Are you going to come up with your own package for growth, tying things together -- something new?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think I already have a good growth package, but I am prepared to work with Congress to come up with something new. The trouble is, when both houses of Congress are controlled by people who look at these issues differently, it is difficult to get the people's business done. The people do not want to bust the budget agreement -- in other words, have more government spending. They do not want higher taxes, and yet they are interested in health care and in a growth package and all of that. So it is a delicate situation, but we will continue to work with it. I talked to the leaders before leaving here, and let's hope something can get done.

Q -- the Democrat's tee shirt about all your foreign travel?

THE PRESIDENT: I haven't got one yet. Haven't got one yet. I don't worry about that.

Q How about the term limit vote, sir?

THE PRESIDENT: Mixed reviews on that. Yes, they lost in Washington and won, I gather, in Texas and some other places. So I haven't really analyzed it yet. I'm for it.

Okay, thank you all.

Q You're for term limits?

THE PRESIDENT: You got it, Helen.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END

7:10 A.M. EST



File: David Duke

- OFFICERS OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION
- National Chairman
MELVIN SALBERG
- National Director
ABRAHAM H. FOXMAN
- Chairman, National Executive Committee
DAVID H. STRASSLER
- Associate National Director
JUSTIN I. FINGER
- Executive Associate National Director
PETER T. WILLNER
- Honorary Chairmen
KENNETH J. BALLIN
SEYMOUR GRUBBER
MAXWELL E. GREENBERG
BUSTON M. JOSEPH
BUSTON S. LEVINSON
- Honorary Vice Chairmen
LEONARD L. ABESS
DOROTHY BINSTOCK
RUDY BOSCHWITZ
EDGAR M. BRONFMAN
MAXWELL DANE
MAX FISHER
BRUCE L. HOCHMAN
CERI M. JOSEPH
MAX M. KAMPELMAN
SAM KANE
PHILIP M. KLUTZNICK
PHILIP KLUFF
SAMUEL H. MILLER
BERNARD D. MINTZ
MILTON MOLLEN
BERNARD NATH
ROBERT E. NATHAN
ANITA PERLMAN
THEODORE H. SILBERT
SIDNEY B. YATES
- Vice-Chairmen
SYDNEY JARROW
NAT KAMENY
LUCILLE S. KANTOR
REYING SHAPIRO
JOEL SPRAYBERG
WILLIAM VEPEIN
- Vice-Chairman
National Executive Committee
ROBERT G. SUGARMAN
- Honorary Chairman, National Executive Committee
DAVID A. ROSE
RONALD B. SOBEL
- Honorary Treasurers
CHARLES GOLDRING
BENJAMIN GREENBERG
MOE KUDLER
- Treasurer
ROBERT H. NAFTALY
- Assistant Treasurer
MICHAEL SCHULTZ
- Secretary
MICHAEL NACHMAN
- Assistant Secretary
MEYER EISENBERG
- President, B'nai B'rith
KENT E. SCHINER
- Executive Vice President
SIDNEY CLEARFIELD
- President, B'nai B'rith Women
HARRIET HORWITZ
- Executive Director
ELAINE BINDER
- DIVISION DIRECTORS
- Civil Rights
JEFFREY P. SHENSKY
- Community Service
ANN TOLUB
- Development
SHeldon FLINGELMAN
- Finance and Administration
BOBBE ARSEFELD
- Intergroup Relations
CHARNEY V. BRONBERG
- International Affairs
KENNETH JACOBSON
- Leadership
Assistant to the National Director
MARVIN S. RAPAPORT
- Media and Marketing
MAX EDELMAN
- Washington Representative
JESS H. HORDES
- General Counsel
ARNOLD FORSTER

November 6, 1991

The President
The White House
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

Congratulations. In a few well-chosen words this morning, you said exactly what had to be said on David Duke.

Sincerely,

Abraham H. Foxman
National Director

Let's hope it works!
A.F.

ATT: National Desk / Political

NEWS FROM THE Committee



The American Jewish
Committee

Institute of Human Relations
165 East 56 Street
New York, New York 10022
212 751-4000

Morton Yarmon
Director of Public Relations

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

The American Jewish Committee protects the rights and freedoms of Jews the world over; combats bigotry and anti-Semitism and promotes human rights for all; works for the security of Israel and deepened understanding between Americans and Israelis; advocates public policy positions rooted in American democratic values and the perspectives of the Jewish heritage; and enhances the creative vitality of the Jewish people. Founded in 1906, it is the pioneer human-relations agency in the U.S.

AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE DOCUMENTS DAVID DUKE'S NAZI PAST & PRESENT

NEW YORK, Dec. 3...."Many people believe that David Duke will run in the Republican primaries for President. He will have nothing to lose, and everything to gain. He will be able to spread his message, attract supporters, increase his computerized mailing list. He might even become eligible for federal matching funds. Duke would not expect to win. But he would expect to bring his issues into the fray....This time around, the media need to do their homework on David Duke."

David Duke's Nazi affiliations and beliefs, both past and present, are detailed in a new American Jewish Committee publication titled "David Duke: A Nazi in Politics," written by Kenneth S. Stern, AJC program specialist on anti-Semitism and extremism. The 19-page publication disputes Duke's public claim that he is no longer the same man he was when he was Grand Wizard of the Knights of the Ku Klux Klan back in the 1970's.

Mr. Stern traces Duke's Nazi affiliations and pronouncements over twenty years. He cites literally hundreds of examples of Duke's Nazi beliefs, many quoted from Duke's own newspapers. And he cites scores of Nazi, anti-Semitic, Hitler-worshipping, and racist books that Duke has sold over the years, from his days as a young Nazi at Louisiana State University, up to 1989, when he was caught selling Mein Kampf from his Louisiana legislative office.

"The David Duke of the 1980's may have shed his Klan costume in favor of three-piece suits," writes Mr. Stern, "but his message was the same.

"David Duke is a Nazi. Ask him about Nazism on television, he says he is against totalitarianism of any kind. But ask him privately, his eyes light up. 'Eichmann got a raw deal,' he says. Ask Duke about the Holocaust on television, he says that there were atrocities on all sides. Ask him privately, he says that 'there were no extermination camps,' that Auschwitz was a 'rubber factory' that Jews who 'control Hollywood made

camps, that Auschwitz was a 'rubber factory,' that Jews who 'control Hollywood made up a colossal hoax....Through cosmetic surgery, three-piece suits, a sophisticated understanding of the media and use of sugar coded code words that combine racial and economic fears, Duke has made himself into a national figure."

NOTE TO EDITOR: For a review copy of "David Duke: A Nazi in Politics," write to David Saltman, American Jewish Committee, 165 East 56th Street, NY, NY 10022.

Alfred H. Moses, President and Chair, Board of Governors • Mimi Alperin, Chair, National Executive Council

Bruce M. Ramer, Chair, Board of Trustees • Robert S. Jacobs, Chair, Executive Committee

David A. Harris, Executive Vice President

Washington Office, 2027 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington DC 20036 • Israel Office, P.O. Box 1538, Jerusalem 91410

CSAE 1707

Even after having been narrowly elected State Representative of Louisiana, David Duke continued working toward his neo-Nazi goals. Mr. Stern cites the investigative work conducted by Republican State Committeewoman Elizabeth Rickey, who followed Duke to Nazi meetings and purchased Nazi books directly from Duke's legislative office.

Although his first year as a legislator was unsuccessful in terms of passing legislation, he was able, according to the Louisiana Coalition, to succeed in "shifting the house agenda to legislation which targets blacks."

In his 1989 race for the U.S. Senate, Duke won 44 percent of the total vote and 60 percent of the white vote. Most recently in November 1991, he lost in his bid for Governor of Louisiana, but still garnered 39 percent of the total vote and 55 percent of the white vote.

"The troubling thing was that voters did not reject him because he was a Nazi," says Mr. Stern, "but because having a Nazi governor would not be good for business."

Mr. Stern further expresses concern that tax-exempt, non-profit organizations that exist to combat anti-Semitism and bigotry, such as AJC, are unable to help educate voters and the media about the real David Duke and his agenda should he run for President. IRS codes and Federal election laws prohibit these non-profit, tax-exempt groups' involvement in political campaigns. Mr. Stern advocates changes in these laws.

Although it is highly improbable that David Duke will become President, Mr. Stern says he will most likely run for and win a seat in the U.S. House of Representatives in the Fall of 1992.

"Between now and then, both political parties must develop a more sophisticated approach to Duke and other potential Dukes around. Leaders must say clearly that hatred and bigotry will not be tolerated. David Duke has a political future and the leaders must plan for it and speak out about it now, not just after the fact. Leadership against bigotry is essential."

Mr. Stern concludes: "That hundreds of thousands of people think of David Duke as a hero and savior should stir us to action....As we approach the year 2000, what are we as a society going to do about the personal hurt, economic disruption, and potential political upheaval fueled by issues of race and bigotry? David Duke has thought this through and has an answer. Our government, our political parties, our schools, our clergy

and we as human beings must have an answer as well."

91-960-218

AJRZ, POL, BTS, BPOL