Originally Processed With FOIA(s): S

FOIA Number: S

FOIA MARKER

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

Record Group/Collection: George H.W. Bush Presidential Records
Collection/Office of Origin: Speechwriting, White House Office of
Series: Speech File Backup Files
Subseries: Alpha File, 1987-1991

OA/ID Number: 13845
Folder ID Number: 13845-012

Folder Title:
Quote File, 1989-1990 [2]

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
G	26	23	3	2

Photo Copy Preservation

Robert J. Samuelson

4/3/89

A Frivolous Decade?

Don't buy all the instant history. The 1980s were far more complex than that.

The 1980s have hardly ended, but they've already been judged in numerous television and print retrospectives. We were self-indulgent and often greedy. We ignored public responsibilities. Government deficits ballooned. Ronald Reagan blessed our selfishness and indifference. America descended, Japan ascended. The Cold War may be over, but so is America's reign as the dominant world power. Great events occurred abroad. At home, we had too much fun. ABC News called it "The My Decade."

I find much of this instant analysis misleading and a bit offensive. Oh, many of the facts and trends are indisputable. What's offensive is the air of strong moral disapproval: the sense that we will deservedly suffer tomorrow for yesterday's pleasures. Sometimes the verdict is delivered openly. More often, it's implied through the images—Donald Trump is a favorite—chosen to represent the decade. We were unconcerned about our future and uncaring of our poor. It was a frivolous time. As I saw it, the 1980s were far more complicated.

We didn't shirk all our public responsibilities. We beat double-digit inflation. That was a megaproblem, which, had it persisted, would have constantly undermined our economy and self-confidence. It wasn't easy. For a while, double-digit unemployment replaced double-digit inflation. But we were rewarded (if it was that) with the second longest economic expansion in U.S. history. Since 1980, employment has risen by 18 million.

The prevailing view of the 1980s identifies our lifestyles as the basic national problem. We are too materialistic. The decade merely illuminated our excesses. Well, if that's the problem, we're doomed. Our national psyche won't change. Even in the early 1800s, Tocqueville noted the "feverish [with which] the Americans pursue their own welfare." The typical American "clutches everything . . . but soon loosens his grasp to pursue fresh gratifications."

Be reassured then that selfishness is not the main story line of the 1980s. What was unsettling about the decade is that truths that Americans took to be permanent turned out to be fleeting. We had assumed that our technology and management would be forever superior. That was a simplistic conceit. As the world economy expanded, other nations were bound to excel. But our miscalculation does not reflect a defective national character. Nor does it mean that the United States has become an economic lightweight. Factory output has jumped 30 percent since 1980. This is not exactly "deindustrialization."

Stigmatizing the 1980s subtly erases the decade's complexities. One oft-told, but false, tale pictures the middle class as slowly vanishing. Society is supposedly dividing into two huge pools of haves and have-nots. Among other things, the young can't afford new homes. So what has actually happened? In 1983, 69.7 percent of married couples between 30 and 34 owned homes, report urbanologists James Hughes and George Sternlieb in American Demographics magazine. By 1988, this share had declined negligibly to 68.2 percent.

By reporting this, I don't mean to sugarcoat the facts. The middle class survived the 1980s, but the gap widened between the rich (who got richer) and the poor (who generally didn't). Low-skilled workers suffered relative wage losses in an economy characterized by more foreign competition and cost-conscious management. Such were the decade's complexities.

What moralizers believe is that we could have easily made it otherwise. Poverty persisted only because stingy Americans permitted it to persist. Perhaps. But the public mood, as I judge it, is more skeptical than stingy. People don't believe that greater public spending can mechanically induce more self-reliance or self-sufficiency. For what it's worth, most academic research is similarly skeptical.

Likewise, the budget deficits were not primarily the product of Ronald Reagan's stubbornness. On balance, he didn't cut taxes. Federal taxes in his last year (19 percent of the gross national product) were about the same as in Jimmy Carter's last year (19.4 percent). The impasse is deeper: Americans' appetite for government services exceeds their willingness to be taxed. Reagan is gone, yet the impasse remains. Even Michael Dukakis can't get his legislature to raise taxes to close a deficit.

The truth, of course, is that we are too close to the 1980s to know their full meaning. How well will we adapt to a global economy? Will a world without rigid East-West conflicts be more or less stable? What will be the long-run impact of budget deficits? The answers aren't obvious. Compared to the economy, for example, today's federal debt is only half what it was after World War II. And that didn't prevent postwar prosperity.

All the moralizing only subtracts from our understanding. Consider a recent report from People For the American Way—a self-styled citizens' lobby—that criticizes today's young for sliding toward "apathy and disengagement from the political process." A teacher's quote adorns the report's cover: "My kids are going to look at community involvement and say, 'Well, that's not going to buy me a Gucci shirt.' "

How ignorant. It implies that today's youth are uniquely self-absorbed and apolitical. Well, even in the 1960s, most students weren't activists, and the youth culture of that era was hugely self-absorbed. In World War II, many young Americans were homespun and apolitical in their aspirations, as historian John Morton Blum has noted. The Saturday Evening Post ran a series written by GIs on "What I Am Fighting For." One typical article began: "I am fighting for that big house with the bright green roof and the big front lawn."

The demands for instant history are not easily resisted. But the resulting clichéd conclusions should be treated with caution, if not scorn. Perhaps our preoccupations in the 1980s seemed mundane and frivolous. Sometimes they were. More often they were merely private. The decade's spirit was personal and inward-looking, because we were spared a social catastrophe (a major war or economic crisis) that would have otherwise commanded our attention. May we be so fortunate in the 1990s.

©1990, Newsweek, Inc.

Notable Quotables

from MediaWatch®

A bi-weekly compilation of the latest outrageous, sometimes humorous, quotes in the liberal media.

MEDIA RESEARCH CENTER®

111 S. Columbus St.
Alexandria, Va. 22314
(703) 683-9733

THE LINDA ELLERBEE AWARDS FOR DISTINGUISHED REPORTING

The Best *Notable Quotables* of 1989

December 25, 1989 (Vol. Two; No. 26)

The Media Research Center (MRC) asked a group of media observers to decide which quotes qualified for inclusion in this special year-end issue. For each of 14 award categories, the 16 judges were asked to rank the top two or three quotes from a list of three to ten provided by the MRC.

The award panelists were: **Gary Bauer**, President of the Family Research Council and former Reagan domestic policy adviser; **John Corry**, former *New York Times* television critic; **John Fund**, *Wall Street Journal* editorial writer; **Frank Gaffney**, Director of the Center for Security Policy and former Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Policy; **Vic Gold**, Washington author and journalist; **David Keene** and **Craig Shirley** of Keene-Shirley Associates; **Cliff Kincaid**, media columnist and radio talk show host; **Bill Kling**, News Director for the Free Congress Foundation and former *Chicago Tribune* national political correspondent; **Pat Korten**, former Director of Public Affairs for the Justice Department; **Avi Nelson**, Editorial Director for WEEI Radio in Boston; **Marvin Olasky**, journalism professor at the University of Texas; **Burton Yale Pines**, Senior Vice President of the Heritage Foundation; **Mike Rosen**, talk show host on KOA Radio in Denver; **William Rusher**, Claremont Institute Senior Fellow and former Publisher of *National Review*; **Ted J. Smith III**, Associate Professor of Mass Communication at Virginia Commonwealth University; **Dick Williams**, *Atlanta Journal* columnist. In addition, the Publisher and Editors of *Notable Quotables* completed the survey.

First under each award heading is the winner, followed in order by the next top vote getters. *Notable Quotables* thanks the judges for helping us determine the most outrageous and humorous utterances from the media over the past year.

Award for the Silliest Analysis

"'These boat people,' says the government of Hong Kong, 'they all want to go to America.' Well, I swear I don't know why, do you? I mean take Vietnam. Why would any Vietnamese come to America after what America did for Vietnam? Don't they remember My Lai, napalm, Sylvester Stallone? Clearly they have no more sense over there, than say, Mexicans who keep trying to get into this country even though this country stole large parts of their country from them in the first place." -- Linda Ellerbee, *CNN PrimeNews*, June 2.

Runners-Up:

"Sadly, many home remedies could damage a fetus instead of kill it." -- *Newsweek* Senior Editor Melinda Beck on self-performed abortions, July 17 issue.

"Well, am I a liberal, a conservative, or what? What...I believe in sunny summer mornings when the grass is sweet and the wind is green with possibilities. I believe in chili with no beans and iced tea all year round....I believe music is too important to be left to musicians, and that Ella Fitzgerald is the best American singer ever, and that Beethoven would have liked Chuck Berry....And so it goes." -- Linda Ellerbee in her first commentary on CNN, March 20.

"But certain times with George Bush there seems to be an irrelevancy, or he gets something wrong. We pointed out yesterday he referred to Benjamin Harrison dying of pneumonia after a chilly inauguration day, and of course it was William Tyler Harrison who died." -- NBC's John Cochran on William Henry Harrison, January 20.

"The (Afghan) army has controlled this beatifully rugged landscape with the help of women right from the revolution. It's the women of this country who have the most to lose if this Marxist revolution fails, if the government falls to the fundamentalist Muslim rebels. A woman's place in such a society would be back under the head to toe covering of the chaterra, cooking and bearing children." -- Reporter Steve Hurst on *CNN PrimeNews*, February 9.

The Good News Is Bad News Award

"Some analysts said that the country's now close to full employment, the point at which the available labor pool dries up. That's not the same as saying that everyone who wants a job has a job. But business correspondent Ray Brady reports the high employment rate is causing problems." -- *CBS Evening News* Anchor Charles Kuralt, March 10.

Runner-Up:

"The danger is that as the economy picks up, it could become too much of a good thing. Borrowing and buying by consumers could become excessive. Prices and interest rates could take off. The problem would again become how to avoid a hard landing." -- Irving R. Levine on *NBC Nightly News*, same night.

Which Way Is It? The Economy

"Good evening. A double dose of worrisome economic statistics tonight from the government: inflation, with its highest quarterly gain in two years; home building, sharply down. That left some economists alarmed." -- Dan Rather opening the April 18 *CBS Evening News*.

versus...

"This country's economic expansion has now entered its seventh year and the Joint Economic Committee of Congress says still more growth can be expected. It warned, however, that this growth could be threatened by huge budget deficits and renewed inflation. But, the inflation news today is reassuring." -- Tom Brokaw on *NBC Nightly News*, same night.

Runners-Up:

Economy expanding,
slightly stronger

-- *Washington Times*, June 23

GNP Figures Indicate a Slowdown

-- *Washington Post*, same day

Poverty Level Stabilizes at 31 Million -- *Washington Post*, October 19

Number of Nation's Poor Remains at 32 Million for a Second Year -- *New York Times*, same day

Per capita income up, but experts say poor get poorer -- *Chicago Tribune*, same day

Number of poor fell,
Census Bureau says -- *Washington Times*, same day

Economic expansion skips the poor -- *Boston Globe*, same day

New method to count poor
Census report makes 'em disappear -- New York *Daily News*, same day

Blame America First Award

"As rockets made in the U.S.A. keep falling here and flares to deflect those rockets keep burning small children, resentment towards the United States grows...For the Russians, Afghanistan may no longer be what Gorbachev called, 'a bleeding wound.' But for many here what is bleeding now is America's image." -- Reporter Bob Faw on the May 1 *CBS Evening News.*

Runners-Up:

"Latins do not believe the Soviets want any more bases in this hemisphere: Cuba is enough, they say. Their hope, as it has been for a long time, is that the U.S. will disband the Contras once and for all, and then, maybe, just maybe, there will be a chance for peace." -- Reporter Ed Rabel on *NBC Nightly News,* Oct. 28.

"The latest incident of alleged Contra violence in south central Nicaragua killed whatever chances there might have been for the 19 month old ceasefire agreement to be extended....The Sandinistas argue that they've given the Contras ample opportunity to meet their obligations under terms of the regional peace plan. Now they say the time has come for the rebels and the Bush Administration to do their part if there is to be peace in Nicaragua." -- Beginning and end of story on *CNN PrimeNews* by Ronnie Lovler, Nov. 1.

"Sandinista critics' direct predictions of totalitarianism have also failed to come true...Nicaragua today is neither a classless social democracy nor a communist dungeon. Opposition parties and media thrive, despite Sandinista harassment and their own incompetence....And a government socially committed to the needs of the poorest has seen its education and health projects plummet due to a lack of resources and the Contra war." -- *Christian Science Monitor* reporter J.D. Gannon, July 18.

Media Hero Award

"A testament to courage: the courage of some unabashed trade unionists and civil rights workers, Leftists and yes, American Communists, who fought for principles that we now take for granted." -- Endorsement of Carl Bernstein's book *Loyalties,* from Ted Koppel.

Runners-Up:

"Ralph Nader is a legend, perhaps the only universally recognized symbol of pure honesty and clean energy left in a culture that, after being shot through with greed, cynicism and weariness, is oddly proud of its hardened self. Two decades after he slew General Motors, Nader, the young dynamo who could not be bought, is a reminder of what we once hoped to be." -- *Washington Post Magazine* writer Marc Fisher, July 23.

"What does realistic mean with Mr. Gorbachev any more? We used to know what realism was in world affairs, but we have a Soviet leader as bold as we, I think, have ever seen, and a man who seems to be some kind of dreamer. He dreams new dreams. I think he's saying 'Match me in boldness and we'll create a new world.'" -- "CBS News consultant" Stephen Cohen on the *CBS Evening News,* October 24.

"He (George Mitchell) talks about the record of legislation the Senate Democrats are building, the substantive progress on issues from oil spills to rural development, which so often gets overlooked in the day-to-day political analysis of 'up or down, winner or loser.' His logic is crisp, unassailable, his manner far removed from the thrust and parry of contemporary politics. He is the soul of judiciousness, highminded in his concern for governance. But some in his party would like for a bit more of the street fighter." -- Reporter Robin Toner in *The New York Times,* October 17.

"For Gorbachev at the end of four years, it is the best of times, it is the worst of times. There was triumph at the Moscow summit, when cold warrior Ronald Reagan said the Evil Empire belonged to a time now past. Bittersweet triumph when the Soviet troops came home from Afghanistan. The Soviets did not win, but Gorbachev did. He had the courage to end Soviet involvement." -- CBS reporter Barry Petersen on the March 11 *Evening News.*

Which Way Is It? Foreign Affairs

"These days Cuba doesn't count for nearly as much in the Soviet military scheme of things....Much of the equipment...is old and obsolete. Although with its militia the Cuban armed forces are the largest in Latin America, this Soviet weaponry is years behind the times." -- ABC's Richard Threlkeld on *World News Tonight*, April 3.

versus...

"The Soviets have spent billions of dollars keeping Fidel Castro supplied....The equipment, the best the Soviet Union can supply....Fidel Castro still believes in the Mao adage that power comes from the barrel of a gun. And his island bristles with some of the most modern, such as these advanced MiG 23s." -- Reporter Barry Petersen on the *CBS Evening News*, same night.

Runners-Up:

Supposedly neutral tribunal stacked to favor Sandinistas

-- *Washington Times*, June 9

Managua Forms Election Panel Containing Opposition Members

-- *Washington Post*, same day

"U.S. officials in Moscow said today they have been unable to determine, after meetings with patients in Soviet mental hospitals, whether they are being held because of their political beliefs." – *NBC Nightly News* Anchor Connie Chung, March 11.

U.S. PSYCHIATRISTS FAULT SOVIET UNITS

Team Finds Inmates Are Still Held for Political Reasons

-- *New York Times*, next morning

Joe Isuzu Award

"Communism got to be a terrible word here in the United States, but our attitude toward it may have been unfair. Communism got in with a bad crowd when it was young and never had a fair chance...

The Communist ideas of creating a society in which everyone does his best for the good of everyone is appealing and fundamentally a more uplifting idea than capitalism. Communism's only real weakness seems to be that it doesn't work." – *60 Minutes* commentator Andy Rooney in *The New York Times*, June 26

Runners-Up:

"Indeed, most observers and politicians here agree that the election is just one part of a larger process involving squaring the revolutionary side of Nicaraguan society -- the meshing of the Sandinista party with the government and Army after 10 years of rule -- with a trend toward establishing a liberal democracy. That is a long process fraught with contradictions that an opposition victory could force to a conclusion too soon." -- Reporter J.D. Gannon in *The Christian Science Monitor*, October 26.

"The incident is now known throughout the country as 'Bloody Sunday' and marked a desperate moment in the leadership's attempts to win public confidence in its movement for democratic change." – *Washington Post* reporter David Remnick on Soviet troops killing peaceful protesters in Georgia, Oct. 12.

"Medical care was once for the priviledged few. Today it is available to every Cuban and it is free. Some of Cuba's health care is world class. In heart disease, for example, in brain surgery. Health and education are the revolution's great success stories." -- ABC's Peter Jennings on the April 3 *World News Tonight*.

Damn Those Conservatives Award

"I've known Barney Frank since I was in college. He's a man of surpassing integrity that I've never known to be questioned. I think he's a master politician, which people forget. He's also a magnificent Congressman, and above all, there is nothing in this episode that counters any of those other images, and I would expect him to survive this smear in good standing." – *Boston Globe* Washington Bureau reporter and columnist Tom Oliphant on *Inside Washington*, August 26.

Runners-Up:

"And if his moving speech today does not restore those decencies he so wistfully remembered today, then perhaps history will remember that at least he tried." – Reporter Jim Wooten on Jim Wright's resignation announcement, ABC's *World News Tonight*, May 31.

"You two fill the voids left by those who were casualities of an ethics war Republicans started." – NBC *Today* show co-host Bryant Gumbel to Rep. Richard Gephardt and Rep. William Gray, June 15.

"Politics didn't just turn ugly. It evolved from a nasty presidential campaign that featured the GOP's famous Willie Horton ad." -- Reporter Eric Engberg on the *CBS Evening News*, May 29.

Which Way Is It? American Politics

"Polls show that more than 70 percent of Americans support a woman's right to a legal abortion." – NBC reporter Jamie Gangel, on the April 9 *Nightly News.*

Most in US favor ban on majority of abortions, poll finds

– *Boston Globe* front page, March 31

Runners- Up:

47 Wright charges dropped

-- *USA Today*, April 18

Wright Violated Rules 69 Times, Ethics Panel Says

– *Los Angeles Times, same day*

SEX SCANDAL PERILS FRANK
Back home, constituents reconsider

-- *Washington Times*, August 31

For Now, Constituents Supporting Rep. Frank

– *Washington Post*, same day

Award For The Most Honest Confession

"I read *Mother Jones* carefully and look forward to every issue. After all, stories that started out in *Mother Jones* have wound up on *60 Minutes*." -- CBS *60 Minutes* correspondent Mike Wallace as quoted in subscription letter for the far-left magazine.

Runner-Up:

"I predict historians are going to be totally baffled by how the American people fell in love with this man (Ronald Reagan) and followed him the way we did." – CBS News White House reporter Lesley Stahl on NBC's *Later with Bob Costas*, January 11.

The Real Ronald Reagan Award

"In just seven weeks, the '80's will be behind us. It was a decade dominated, in politics and in style, by the Reagans....While the wealthy got most of the attention, those who needed it most were often ignored. More homeless, less spending on housing. The gap between the top and the bottom grew in the '80's....The AIDS crisis began in the '80's. Some say the decade's compassion gap made it worse." – *CBS This Morning* co-host Kathleen Sullivan, November 13.

Runners-Up:

"Largely as a result of the policies and priorities of the Reagan Administration, more people are becoming poor and staying poor in this country than at any time since World War II." -- *Today* co-host Bryant Gumbel, July 17.

The Reagan Legacy

A Swelling Medical Underclass in a Land of Plenty

"An unfortunate legacy of the Reagan revolution is a swelling medical underclass: alcoholics and drug addicts who deluge emergency rooms and fill prisons, AIDS babies and crack newborns in overwhelmed pediatric wards, homeless children with anemia, schizophrenics and other mental patients in shelters and jails and on the streets...While Ronald Reagan did not cause the medical underclass, his laissez-faire approach to social problems exacerbated the trend." – Abigail Trafford, Editor of *The Washington Post* "Health" section, in a January 24 article under headline above.

"But analysts will also recognize that Ronald Reagan presided over a meltdown of the federal government during the last eight years. Fundamental management was abandoned in favor of rhetoric and imagery. A cynical disregard for the art of government led to wide-scale abuse. Only now are we coming to realize the cost of Mr. Reagan's laissez-faire: the crisis in the savings and loan industry, the scandal in the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the deterioration of the nation's nuclear weapons facilities, the dangerous state of the air traffic control system -- not to mention the staggering deficit." – CBS News reporter Terence Smith, in a November 5 *New York Times* op-ed.

"After eight years of what many saw as the Reagan Administration's benign neglect of the poor and studied indifference to civil rights, a lot of those who lived through this week in Overtown (rioting in a section of Miami) seemed to think the best thing about George Bush is that he is not Ronald Reagan....There is an Overtown in every big city in America. Pockets of misery made even meaner and more desperate the past eight years." – Reporter Richard Threlkeld on ABC's *World News Tonight*, January 20.

The Real Jimmy Carter Award

"Perhaps the Democrat who best personifies this republic of virtue is former President Jimmy Carter. His reputation burnished by the elevated tone of his retirement, Carter would actually bring to the task energy, integrity and his legendary distaste for congressional business as usual. He could even boast a made-to-order campaign slogan: 'After the Wright stuff, why not the best?'" – *Time* Senior Writer and former Carter Administration official Margaret Carlson recommending a new House Speaker, June 5 issue.

Runners-Up:

"While Reagan peddles his time and talents to the highest bidder and Gerald Ford perfects his putt and Richard Nixon struggles to gain a toehold in history, Carter, like some jazzed superhero, circles the globe at 30,000 ft., seeking opportunities to Do Good." -- Stanley Cloud, *Time* Washington Bureau Chief, September 11 issue.

"The person we have chosen this week (as "Person of the Week") has continued his life with distinction, considerable grace, and with a very strong commitment to peace and justice...In the public's mind, the scales were never balanced. Carter's successes in foreign affairs, peace between Egypt and Israel, renewed respect for the United States in Latin America, have always been outweighed in the public mind by the hostage crisis." -- Peter Jennings on ABC's *World News Tonight*, May 12.

The No Agenda Here Award

"Atwater's fouling the civic atmosphere with vicious misinformation is bad enough; compounding that with the White House hypocrisy is too much. If Bush really wants to prove himself a political environmentalist in search of a kinder, gentler America, he should sack Atwater." -- *Time*'s Laurence Barrett in sidebar to a June 19 article on the "Foley memo."

Runners-Up:

"At the same time, Atwater -- who cut his political teeth as a protege of South Carolina's once segregationist Senator Strom Thurmond -- downplayed his role in devising the crypto-racist Willie Horton ads that helped Bush win the White House. 'That's in the past,' he insisted." -- *Time* reporters Jacob V. Lamar and Alessandra Stanley in the March 20 issue.

"Support Family Planning. In 1984 the Reagan Administration cut off U.S. aid to the two major international family-planning organizations...Unless the growth in the world population is slowed, it will be impossible to make serious progress on any environmental issue. The U.S. should immediately restore the aid it withdrew." -- *Time*'s recommendations on how to save the Earth, in the January 2 "Planet of the Year" issue.

"Propose deep mutual cuts in military forces and expenditures going well beyond those under consideration in START and conventional-arms talks."

"Offer most-favored-nation status, allowing the U.S.S.R. the same trading arrangements provided to most industrial nations, including Hungary."

"Relax technology-transfer regulations to allow sales of such items as personal computers and communications equipment that could spur autonomy." -- Policies recommended by *Time*, November 6.

"The documentary has held up as both true and sadly prophetic. While Congress restored some of the cuts made in those first Reagan budgets, in the years since, the poor and the working poor have borne the brunt of the cost of the Reagan Revolution. The hardest-hit programs have been welfare, housing and other anti-poverty measures. Even programs that were not cut have failed to keep up with inflation. Meanwhile, rich people got big tax breaks. And the middle class kept most of their subsidies intact. As a result, the Reagan years brought on a wider gap between rich and poor." -- Bill Moyers after PBS re-airing of 1982 *CBS Reports* "People Like Us," June 20.

Walter Mondale Award For Tax Hike Insistence

"We have this drug problem, we have an education problem in the country. All we keep doing is cutting the domestic budget because taxes aren't being asked for. When does it become necessary to start investing in our future by fixing these problems, and when you do decide it becomes necessary, won't it become necessary to raise taxes? And just isn't that a bald truth?" -- Lesley Stahl to OMB Director Richard Darman, July 23 *Face the Nation.*

Runners-Up:

"If we don't find some way to raise new revenues, that means taxes, we're going to continue this self-deception, we're going to continue to add to the national deficit, we're going to continue to cause this country to head toward an economic abyss." -- Sam Donaldson on *This Week*, September 24.

"Returning from his foreign travels, George Bush came home to domestic economic realities today. To the stubborn budget deficit that most economists say will never be seriously reduced without the new taxes to which the President remains opposed." – Reporter Mark Phillips on *CBS Evening News*, July 18.

"The borrow-and-spend policies that Ronald Reagan presided over have bequeathed to his chosen successor a downsized presidency devoid of the resources to address long neglected domestic problems. The Bush campaign strategists--with the candidate's active complicity--burdened the new President with an obdurate stance on taxes." -- Reporters Michael Duffy and Richard Hornik in *Time*, February 20.

Award For The Most Inane Comparison

"Thousands may have been gunned down in Beijing, but what about the millions of American kids whose lives are being ruined by an enormous failure of the country's educational system...We can and we should agonize about the dead students in Beijing, but we've got a much bigger problem here at home." -- John Chancellor's commentary on *NBC Nightly News*, June 20.

Runners-Up

"In a way, you might say that David Duke is the son of Willie Horton. Duke is more overt, of course, but he's really just pushing the same buttons and sending the same coded messages that the Horton ads did so effectively for the Bush campaign last year." -- Reporter Judd Rose on ABC's *Prime Time Live*, November 2.

"Will the military leaders there be embarrassed by this, will this be something like Kent State was for our military?" – CBS reporter Eric Engberg referring to China on *Nightwatch*, June 7.

"Like North, Castro has always portrayed foreign policy as an endless struggle between darkness and light, and the Fidels and Ollies of the world desperately need each other. 'Great Satans,' observes Hunter, (of the Center for Strategic and International Studies) 'always come in pairs.'" – *U.S. News & World Report* Senior Writer Steven Roberts, April 17.

Quote of the Year

"For the most part, the Nicaraguan Contras burned villages and murdered civilians. On behalf of their cause, Reagan sold out his oath of office and subverted the Constitution....

"Oliver North presented himself as the immortal boy in the heroic green uniform of Peter Pan. Although wishing to be seen as a humble patriot, the colonel's testimony showed him to be a treacherous and lying agent of the national security state, willing to do anything asked of him by a President to whom he granted the powers of an Oriental despot." – *Harper's* Editor Lewis Lapham narrating his PBS series *America's Century*, November 28.

– L. Brent Bozell III; Publisher
– Brent H. Baker; Tim Graham; Editors
– Jim Heiser, Gerard Scimeca, Stewart Verdery, Dorothy Warner; Media Analysts

Services of Mead Data Central

23 PAGES 794 LINES

11:02 A.M. STARTED 11:08 A.M. ENDED

```
EEEEE   N   N   DDDD
E       N   N   D   D
E       NN  N   D   D
EEE     N N N   D   D
E       N  NN   D   D
E       N   N   D   D
EEEEE   N   N   DDDD
```

SEND TO: BLESSEY, STEPHANIE
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OLD EXECUTIVE OFFICE BUILDING
17TH & PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW
WASHINGTON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA 20017

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Services of Mead Data Central

***** 05676 ********** PRINTOUT COMPLETED ****** APRIL 3, 11:08 A.M. *********

***** 05676 ********** PRINTOUT COMPLETED ****** APRIL 3, 11:08 A.M. *********

***** 05676 ********** PRINTOUT COMPLETED ****** APRIL 3, 11:08 A.M. *********

***** 05676 ********** PRINTOUT COMPLETED ****** APRIL 3, 11:08 A.M. *********

***** 05676 ********** PRINTOUT COMPLETED ****** APRIL 3, 11:08 A.M. *********

***** 05676 ********** PRINTOUT COMPLETED ****** APRIL 3, 11:08 A.M. *********

***** 05676 ********** PRINTOUT COMPLETED ****** APRIL 3, 11:08 A.M. *********

***** 05676 ********** PRINTOUT COMPLETED ****** APRIL 3, 11:08 A.M. *********

***** 05676 ********** PRINTOUT COMPLETED ****** APRIL 3, 11:08 A.M. *********

***** 05676 ********** PRINTOUT COMPLETED ****** APRIL 3, 11:08 A.M. *********

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Services of Mead Data Central

***** 04173 ********** BEGIN PRINTOUT ******** APRIL 3, 4:30 P.M. **********

***** 04173 ********** BEGIN PRINTOUT ******** APRIL 3, 4:30 P.M. **********

***** 04173 ********** BEGIN PRINTOUT ******** APRIL 3, 4:30 P.M. **********

***** 04173 ********** BEGIN PRINTOUT ******** APRIL 3, 4:30 P.M. **********

***** 04173 ********** BEGIN PRINTOUT ******** APRIL 3, 4:30 P.M. **********

***** 04173 ********** BEGIN PRINTOUT ******** APRIL 3, 4:30 P.M. **********

***** 04173 ********** BEGIN PRINTOUT ******** APRIL 3, 4:30 P.M. **********

***** 04173 ********** BEGIN PRINTOUT ******** APRIL 3, 4:30 P.M. **********

***** 04173 ********** BEGIN PRINTOUT ******** APRIL 3, 4:30 P.M. **********

***** 04173 ********** BEGIN PRINTOUT ******** APRIL 3, 4:30 P.M. **********

***** 04173 ********** BEGIN PRINTOUT ******** APRIL 3, 4:30 P.M. **********

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Services of Mead Data Central

PRINT CASE REQUESTED: APRIL 3, 1990 100G7P

2 DOCUMENTS PRINTED
19 PRINTED PAGES

SEND TO: DOOLY, PEGGY
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OLD EXECUTIVE OFFICE BUILDING
17TH & PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW
WASHINGTON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA 20017

**********04173**********

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Services of Mead Data Central

DATE: APRIL 3, 1990

CLIENT:
LIBRARY: GOVNWS
FILE: PRESDC

YOUR SEARCH REQUEST IS:
SOVIET UNION W/12 DEMOC!

NUMBER OF DOCUMENTS FOUND WITH YOUR REQUEST THROUGH:
LEVEL 1... 90

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Services of Mead Data Central

4TH DOCUMENT of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Public Papers of the Presidents

Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session at a Luncheon
Hosted by the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco, California

25 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 191

February 7, 1990

LENGTH: 7299 words

The President. Thank you, Dr. Fink. Modesty may not be his long suit, but I like the introduction. [Laughter] And very candidly, I like the pride he takes in his institution, and he gave me a good lecture up here as to how I should be supportive of these smaller and independent colleges. And it struck home to me, I'll tell you.

Governor Deukmejian, I'm glad to be with you, sir. And our Commonwealth Club president, Joseph Perrelli, thank you for your hospitality. And let me just single out our former Secretary of State, George Shultz. I'm honored to see him here and be with him.

I'm going to get in real trouble here, but another San Franciscan who has served his country at a very high level is now giving of his time to work with me on the prestigious Science Advisory Committee, and I'm talking about your own and my friend, David Packard. I'm delighted he's here.

And just two more. I'm pleased to see the mayor of San Francisco here -- Mayor [Art]Agnos -- delighted to see him. And of course, another who I read in the paper had re-retired, or was about to re-retire, and I'm talking to the former head of the World Bank, Tom Clausen, an old friend, who I'm delighted to see him here.

So, I feel encompassed by friends and delighted to be back for, I think it is, my seventh -- Joe, seventh? -- seventh appearance before this prestigious group. A few minutes ago, I asked a 49'er fan what he thought was the turning point in the Super Bowl. [Laughter] He said, the national anthem. [Laughter]

Of course not all the recent memories -- as Art knows -- in the Bay area have been pleasant ones. I'm sure you remember the last time I was here, after this city suffered tragedy. And I'm talking about a clutter of car wrecks and a flattened freeway and a terrible black cloud rising from the Marina district. And I know that some damage remains, and certainly some heartache and some hardship. But today I've sensed and felt something else: renewal. The people of the Bay area have stood up and dusted themselves off and are rebuilding because you came together. And San Francisco will be as beautiful and vital as ever. So, I think it's fair to say, from having been here for about 45 minutes, San Francisco is back, and we can understand that. [Laughter]

But I've come here today to California for another reason: to give you a no-nonsense -- you hardnosed business men and women that you are -- a straightforward and hopeful message about the national security of our country. Yesterday at Fort Irwin, I also thanked our men and women in uniform -- not just because they keep America safe and free. But I came to thank them because they help to make possible the wonderful changes that are sweeping the world. I

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Services of Mead Data Central

wish every man and woman here could have been with me as I talked to the young troops out there in the desert. It's very clear why every one of our Joint Chiefs keep telling me our services all have the finest, most dedicated young men and women to ever serve in the uniform of the United States.

And as the threats to our security change, so, too must our defense strategy. In 1986 defense expenditures consumed 6.3 percent of our gross national product. As you know, I just submitted my 1991 budget to Congress, which holds down defense spending for the fifth year in a row, down to just above 5 percent of gross national product. I'm submitting this budget at a time when the postwar world that we have known, the world that began in 1945, is changing before our very eyes. So, to understand then where we're going, let me first review where we've been and where I think we are today.

The free world's first generation of post-war leaders had the cautionary example of their predecessors. They remembered that the Great War, the war to end all wars, was followed by chaos and conflict. They remembered that visionary statesmen after the First World War had tried to limit large navies, even outlawed war itself. But soon these great hopes faded in the face of unchecked aggression, and no pact could prevent World War II.

So, by 1945 our leaders had acquired a realism, a realism born of bloody experience, a pragmatism born of a sober appraisal of the world as it was. And from Harry Truman to Ronald Reagan, our strength became the world's shielf; our ideals of freedom and democracy, the world's hope. We paid dearly for the defense of liberty with our national wealth and with many of our youngest and bravest.

And so, over the past 40 years, our leaders continued to provide for war even as they sought peace. It was during the Truman administration, in this very city, that men and women of great vision and high ideals came from around the world to create an assembly of nations. And so, it was in San Francisco, 45 years ago, that the United Nations was born. Then, as now, the United States strove to balance its role as peacekeeper with that of peacemaker. We helped create the United Nations and NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Organization]. And we encouraged Soviet change even as we thwarted Soviet expansion.

Those who crafted this new policy had a name for it. They called it containment and predicted that if we blocked the easy path of expansion, the Soviet Union would one day have to confront the contradictions of its inhumane, illogical system. The purpose of containment was not to defeat or humiliate the Soviets. The purpose was to preserve and extend liberty. The hope was someday to see, as George Kennan put it in 1947, "the gradual mellowing of Soviet power." It took nearly a half a century to vindicate this strategy, but we can now see the results: today the Cold War is in retreat. That is good news, for no sane man or woman is nostalgic for the Cold War.

We're inspired by this revolution of 1989, heartened, for example, to see a man of letters and conscience in Prague move from prison to the Presidential palace. We are heartened to see the Berlin Weall fall, setting off a shockwave that upended a tyrant in Romania. And we're grateful for something more. Now, because of our strength and that of our allies, now thanks to the march of freedom and democracy in Eastern Europe, and even in the Soviet Union itself, now the prospects for an enduring peace are greater than ever before. We can now envision a new destiny for the nations of the continent: that of a

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Services of Mead Data Central

Europe truly whole and free.

We are taking the first steps across a bridge begun by others long ago. And it's a bridge that can lead us from seemingly endless conflict to the promise of a lasting peace. But no matter how great the promise, we must be certain that the bridge is secure. As President, every morning I receive an intelligence briefing. And I receive the best information available to any world leader today. Yet the morning news is often overtaken by the news that very same evening. And the world is moving too fast to forecast with absolute certainty what will happen next. Our challenge is to manage this period of transition from the world of today to the world of tomorrow and safeguard the security of America in the process. When it comes to the security of this country, I would rather be called cautious than I would be called reckless. Our pursuit of this promising future must start with an understanding of today's realities.

Take, for example, our most recent proposal, warmly received by our allies and President Gorbachev. I proposed reducing the troop levels on both sides in central and eastern Europe to 195,000 troops. That balance, that balance encourages the less threatening future we envision, and it holds great promise. But right now, right now, the Soviets still have more than 560,000 men under arms in central Europe. On the issue of strategic weapons, we've made progress in the START [STRATEGIC ARMS REDUCTION TALKS] NEGOTIATIONS. AND AGAIN, I'D LIKE TO SALUTE GEORGE SHULTZ FOR HIS VERY IMPORTANT PART IN THIS. AND WE NOW HOPE TO SLASH DRAMATICALLY THE NUMBER OF STRATEGIC WEAPONS ON BOTH SIDES. IT IS THESE IMPORTANT REDUCTIONS THAT SECRETARY [OF STATE] BAKER IS SEEKING THIS VERY DAY IN MOSCOW. THAT'S THE FUTURE WE ENVISION, AND IT, TOO, HOLDS GREAT PROMISE. BUT LET US NOT FORGET THAT RIGHT NOW THE SOVIETS STILL HAVE MORE THAN 10,000 STRATEGIC WEAPONS. THEY ARE MODERNIZING THEM, THEY HAVE DEVELOPED TWO NEW MOBILE ICBM's, and their spending on strategic defense is comparable to their spending on strategic offensive forces.

The President of the United States is the Commander in Chief, bound by the Constitution to defend and protect the United States of America. Now, some would have me predicate the defense of our people on promising but as yet unfulfilled hopes for the future. I will not do that. I am determined to seek with the Soviets the collateral to implement a new peace. In international terms, collateral means soldiers discharged, tanks dismantled, nuclear missiles demolished, and chemical weapons banned from the face of the Earth. Some see our measured approach as endangering the process of change. I see our approach as essential to change, essential to the security of this nation, and as the only way to a lasting peace. We have shown that American resolve can help further Soviet reform. And we've shown that American strength is the catalyst for arms control. And we've shown that the idea called America can inspire change. And now we must not let impatience, born of euphoria, jeopardize all that we hope to achieve in the future.

First, as Americans have always believed, our foremost goal is to prevent another world war. To do so, we will still need to remain fully engaged. European security, stability, and freedom, so tied to our own, requires an American presence. Western Europeans all want us to stay there -- every single country -- want us to avoid pulling back into an uninvolved isolation. I have the feeling that when the dust settles, the new democracies of eastern Europe will feel exactly the same way. We must remain in Europe as long as we are needed and wanted. And the prospect of global peace, therefore, depends on an American forward presence.

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Services of Mead Data Central

Second, we will, of course, continue to reduce the likelihood of nuclear war. And that's why I will vigorously pursue the START talks with the Soviet Union. But arms control and strategic modernization are not competing strategies. Rather, they can work together to make the world a safer place. Just this morning, I went out and visited Lawrence Livermore Labs and met those visionary men and women who strive to make a nuclear strike on our country, whether from a nuclear superpower or some renegade nation or terrorist group, even more unlikely than it is today. And if the technology I have seen today proves feasible -- and it looks very promising -- no aggressor could be confident of the success of a ballistic missile attack. And that's what deterrence is all about.

And let's be clear: This purely defensive concept doesn't threaten a single person anywhere in the world, the life of a single person anywhere in the world. God forbid, if it ever had to be used, it would be used against missiles, not against people. When some complain of the cost of developing such technologies, they should first consider the cost of not doing all we can to deter conflict and protect the cities and the citizens of America. And that's why I will seek to persuade the Soviets, through our defense-in-space talks, that, in fact, greater reliance on strategic defenses will contribute to a safer world.

Now let me now tell you something about the strategy behind our 1991 defense budget. First, new threats are emerging beyond the traditional East-west antagonism of the last 45 years. These contingencies must loom larger in our defense planning. Remember the threats of Libyan and Iranian terrorism. And remember the liberation of Grenada and Panama. And remember the dedication of our American servicemen on duty in the Persian Gulf 2 years ago, safeguarding not only the flow of oil -- safeguarding the flow of oil to the industrial democracies -- but an action also welcomed by many small nations over there who were afraid that the Iran-Iraq war would adversely affect their own freedom.

And remember, too, that there are more than 15 countries in the world that will have developed ballistic missiles by the end of the decade -- 15 countries, many with chemical and biological capabilities. Nuclear weapons capabilities are proliferating, much to my regret and the regret of everybody here. And inevitably, high-tech weapons will fall into the hands of those whose hatred of America and contempt for civilized norms is well-known. We will continue to work hard to prevent this dangerous proliferation. But one thing is certain: We must be ready for its consequences. And we will be ready.

Then there are the narco-gangsters that concern us all, already a threat to our national health and spirit. Now they are taking on the pretensions of a geopolitical force -- whole new force to effect change -- and they must be dealt with as such by our military: in the air, on the land, and on the seas.

Clearly, in the future, we will need to be able to thwart aggression: repel a missile or protect a sealane or stop a drug lord. We will need forces adaptable to conditions everywhere. And we will need agility, readiness, sustainability. We will need speed and stealth. And we will need leadership.

In short, we must continue to deter both a global war and limited conflicts in new conditions. And for this reason, we doubly need to continue the modernization of our forces. I pray that it will not be my sad duty to commit American fighting men again into combat. But if I do, on my watch, the lives of American fighting men will not be shortchanged.

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Services of Mead Data Central

As I mentioned, just yesterday I visited the National Training Center at Fort Irwin, near Barstow, where our fighting forces prepare for action. It was at this very base that we trained many of our troops who fought with such distinction in Panama. And they were courageous. But being prepared is also the best way to ensure that wars are prevented. And after seeing our men and women again and talking with them, they are indeed up to the challenges of the future.

You know, I once read that Khrushchev once spoke to the Commonwealth Club for 3 hours. [Laughter] Perhaps he began this speech with these words: "Let me make just a few brief observations before taking your questions." [Laughter]

So, I will get to my final concern: how all this change in our defense budget affects us at home. Many speak of the peace dividend. Few discuss the short-term cost of peace. There will be costs as we cross the bridge to a better future -- for dislocated industries and workers, for communities -- painful personal adjustments to be made. But America has always been willing to pay the price of peace. I know that some of the bases tht have been proposed for cutbacks are in this area, just as many of them are in my home State of Texas. But let me state right here and now: there have been no politics in these proposals. Some talk about bases in Democratic districts here. Well, they're also in the same State as a great Republican Governor over here. I ask Congress to join me in a spirit of fairness. Longstanding critics of defense spending should not turn around and block the closing of a base in their home district. There's something just a little bit ironic about certain Members of Congress whose philosophy seems to be: make deep cuts, but be sure to cut in somebody else's State or somebody else's district. And we can't have that anymore. This is too important. I can't accept that. The taxpayers deserve better, and so do those affected by our decisions. So let me assure you: If a base closes, it doesn't close Federal concern and commitment.

You know civilians who are laid off will receive top priority for placement in other DOD [Department of Defense] positions. The Homeowner's Assistance Program will protect military and civilian personnel from falling real estate prices. And the Office of Economic Adjustment will work with communities to develop powerful new economic assets, new ways to use old bases. The Bible speaks of beating swords into plowshares. We're transforming military runways into municipal airports, and military bases into industrial parks and community colleges, and missile hangars into factories.

I don't know how the pruning hook business is going out there, but we may go back into that too, cast them into pruning hooks. You know, I know the American people will support these measures for a continued strong defense. My travels around this country tell me that. But to have the means to negotiate reductions and ensure peace, I will need the support, the cooperation, and consultation of Congress. We can now envision a time when the world is more secure than ever; when all the competitive instincts of modern man will be diverted to commerce, even to football.

You know, I started joking about the 49'ers winning the Super Bowl during the national anthem. But it's not how many passes Joe Montana completed, it's that he knew better than to rest on his laurels at the beginning of the fourth quarter. So, so should we. I will work with Congress to build a bridge to a more secure world. And if we work together, then peace itself will be the greatest dividend of all.

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Services of Mead Data Central

Thank you for inviting me to San Francisco. And God bless you all.

Strategic Defense Initiative

Q. Having reviewed SDI at Livermore Lab today, do you support moving ahead with the project?

The President. Yes, I do. And our budget calls for that. And again, I would remind the critics that it is defensive; that the science and technology from it will benefit not just this concept of a reasonably priced way of intercepting somebody else's missile, whether it's from a major power or from some renegade hand, but that the science will benefit, I believe, the environment. I believe it has enormous potential for other uses. I feel more strongly about that than when I went to Livermore.

Defense Spending

Q. Will the expected troop reductions bring about a savings that can be used to offset the increased cost in strategic arms?

The President. Yes, and I hope that there will not be a greatly increased cost in strategic arms. The Soviets have modernized. They've modernized their systems, and we have not yet. But I would hope that the resulting reductions in the strategic arms, which I am pledged to and which I will work for, will have beneficial effect on and will result in savings.

You see, I am convinced that if politics of international change are handled correctly and if things go more forward, we will eventually have far lower levels of spending. But I've spelled out for you here why I think that should be approached in a very prudent manner.

Trade and Competitiveness

Q. With the recent events in Eastern Europe, do you think we should now again prepare for a world economic struggle rather than be preparing unnecessarily for a military struggle?

The President. Well, I wouldn't necessarily shift priorities. I've told you the priority I place on defense. But when it comes to competitiveness of the United States, we should be struggling with that on the front burner right now. And I think we are. And that's one of the reasons I increased dramatically R&D spending in our budget. It's one of the inevitable byproducts of a better education system. It's why we're putting more emphasis on math and science. It's why I'm imposing on great scientists like David Packard and others to give us the advice on how we can become more competitive. It's why my trade negotiator, Carla Hills [U.S. Trade Representative], and our Secretary of Commerce [Robert A. Mosbacher]are doing their level best to convince people that if we are going to have free trade that has to be fair trade.

And so, this competition on the economic front is big. It's going to get even bigger, in my view. And we've got an enormous job to do -- not just the Federal Government. We can't do this. Many businesses have already moved into much more -- in the sense of quality product -- moved much more into the sense of automation and modernization. So, it is a national goal that we be more competitive, but it can't wait until we get our defense program in line. It's

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Services of Mead Data Central

right now. It's urgent.

And let me just throw in one, Joe, on the success of the Uruguay trade round, for those who are a little more technically oriented than some. The success of this Uruguay trade round is very, very important to our ability to enhance the rest of the world and ourselves by free trade. But we've got some big barriers out there. We've got some problems we have to overcome.

Budget Deficit

Q. Can you pledge that a certain amount of dollars from armament reduction be transferred as a reduction in the debt?

The President. No, I can't pledge that, but I am pledged to get the deficit down in accordance with the Gramm-Rudman targets. We will have that if we get our way with Congress, which doesn't exactly do things the way I want, I've found out.[Laughter] But if we get that done, I stated in my State of the Union Message that that should be an objective and to move right into it, the minute we are in balance, which would be in 3 years. Now, I expect there will be a lot of pressure on. You hear pressure today on what is referred to alluring as a "peace dividend." And it appeals to me. There are things that I'd love to be able to say: We can put a little more in this research, or we can help this homeless person a little more, or whatever it is. The pressures will be on, but I think that it would be a very good thing to do because as a grandparent of 12 I must confess, like a lot of people here, you feel that we are burdening the generations to come with a debt that does nothing but click off at the beginning of each year an enormously high and even higher rate of interest that we're pledged -- interest account that we're pledged to pay on the national debt. So, yes, as I said in the State of the Union, that's what I want to do.

Defense Policy

Q. If the Soviet Union and others in the Warsaw Pact substantially scale back their military commitment, doesn't the U.S. run the risk of moving in the opposite direction of the world? Are we prepared to stand alone?

The President. No, because I think as I mentioned to you earlier -- and this is the truth -- our allies want us involved. They don't want to see us decouple or delink from Europe. They see the changes and welcome them. All the allied leaders -- and I talk to the leaders of NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Organization] on a fairly regular basis -- they see and welcome the change, but they do not want to see the United States pull back into what would be perceived worldwide as some kind of a neo-isolationist decoupling.

And I am not suggesting that we can't save money; indeed, we will. If our proposal -- the proposal that I put forward -- is accepted by the Soviets and we negotiate out all the details and get a CFE, conventional force agreement, as we are proposing, I think we will see substantial savings that are made by the -- what do you call it? -- suddenly gone blank -- in terms of when you bring a guy back and he no longer is in the army. [Laughter] But it's not just transferring: it's a question of having fewer troops on both sides. And that will inevitably result in some savings.

So, we're aware that there's a chance to save, but it is not that we are going to be swimming against the tide with our European allies. And as I said

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Services of Mead Data Central

in the speech -- and I recognize his question -- didn't indicate the guy that asked the question was asleep, he probably wrote the question before the speech, I hope. [Laughter] But what I also said is that I hope and believe that many of the new fledgling democracies in Eastern Europe are going to welcome a stabilizing presence on the part of the United States. Now, some will say that's sacrificing. And I say, no, it is in our interest because we provide a certain stability that wouldn't be there if we, the United States, weren't there.

Conservation

Q. Do you see the freedom of the Communist country as a threat to the globe? That is, if they all want the comforts we have, will we use up the resources of our Earth at an even greater rate?

The President. No. I think there's an environmental awareness in the world today that is encouraging. I will readily concede there are some in what is known as the Third World -- I'm not thinking so much as the evolution of Eastern Europe into the arms of democracy -- but I think there's a feeling in some Third World countries: Don't you big guys from the United States who have raped, pillaged, and plundered the environment now come and tell us what we can't do. We understand that, but we've got to work with them and share our tremendously advanced technology, existing technology, as we work to find even greater technological breakthroughs to protect the environment.

But I don't think you're going to necessarily see that is because of the evolution of Iron Curtain countries into growing -- hopefully, growing democracies. I think there's an awareness now in Europe about the need to have sound international environmental practice based on science -- not on myth but on science.

German Reunification

Q. As Eastern Europe and the U.S.S.R. progress toward democracy, do you foresee any potential military alliances being formed that could threaten the free world, such as a united Germany and Japan?

The President. No, I don't. And I think everybody that's interested in foreign affairs, I'm sure, has an opinion one way or another as to what happens on the reunification of Germany. But I think that can be -- well, let me recite, just as background, the U.S. position, which is self-determination -- and this is the NATO position -- self-determination. And then when it comes to borders, I believe Helsinki says no alteration in borders without agreement of the parties. So, that gives you a rather stable framework.

Now, you can read every day about the rapidity of change and what might happen in terms of German reunification. But I think it can be managed in such a way that it will not be a threat to Western Europe or to what was termed in the question, I think, the free world. And when I hear both West German Foreign Minister Mr. Genscher and West German Chancellor Kohl talking about a Germany that remains tied into NATO in some way -- maybe not a NATO in exactly the same form it is -- but that's encouraging. That's encouraging.

Soviet Role in the Middle East

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Services of Mead Data Central

Q. In the past, smaller countries used to play the U.S. versus the U.S.S.R. to get military and economic aid. Now that relations have improved with the U.S.S.R., and if we can anticipate continued improvement, what are the chances of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. working together to solve some of the world's problems, such as the Middle East?

The President. Better, far better. And I think there's certain things that the Soviet Union could do that would facilitate their role as a catalyst for peace in the Middle East. One of them would be to assist more, through transportation -- direct flights -- for Soviet Jews wishing to leave the Soviet Union to go to Israel. I think that would send a sign that their interest in the Middle East is not just on the side of -- what heretofore has been the side of the more radical states in the area. So, they can do something like that. I'd like to see them normalize diplomatic relations with the State of Israel. I think that would be helpful. But I would think that as the Soviet Union evolves in a more democratic fashion that some of the concerns we've had in the past will be lessened.

So, I wouldn't say that at some point they wouldn't have a useful role. I've cited two areas where I think they can have a useful role in building credibility not just with the State of Israel but with other states as well. So, let's hope that they can do something.

Soviet Reforms

Q. How can we help Mr. Gorbachev in his quest for a unification of his country, in demonstration of his country?

The President. I think we can avoid doing dumb things. [Laughter] And that's my cautious approach. You know, he's facing some enormously difficult internal problems. And you may have noted that I have been -- hopefully on behalf of most the people in our country -- supporting perestroika. When for a few months into our Presidency -- mine -- why, people wondered: What does he really care? Does he understand these changes? Does he really mean it when he says, I support perestroika? I do, and glasnost, the openness concept, as well.

But in the last press conference or so -- a couple of them, maybe -- I referred to support for Gorbachev. And I have felt that he has handled some extraordinarily complicated internal problems, problems inside the Soviet Union, with a certain restraint and finesse that I think demonstrates a real commitment to peaceful change. The last thing I think any United States citizen needs to do when you have the Central Committee meeting is to try to fine-tune it from San Francisco or Washington as to how they ought to conduct themselves.[Laughter] So, I want to be very careful about picking winners and losers or saying how they ought to do things.

But I do think that, generally speaking, it is in our interest to support perestroika. And I will say again: I think Mr. Gorbachev has shown a considerable restraint. And frankly, the dealings that I've had with him here, and then on the sidelines when George [George Shultz, former Secretary of State] and President Reagan were dealing with him, is that he's a man who you can talk to; he's quite open in his negotiations. He damn sure will tell you if he doesn't agree with you. [Laughter] I mean, you're not under any doubt about that. [Laughter] But it's a new approach. I mean, it's very different than dealing with some of the previous Soviet leaders.

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Services of Mead Data Central

So, I'm not here to anoint or try to shape the deliberations of the Central Committee proceedings in the Soviet Union -- this very day, or that will commence again tomorrow, maybe. But I do think that there's an awful lot to be hopeful about there because I find we can talk quite openly. And I'm looking forward to a summit meeting. I don't know why all meetings have to be called summits.[Laughter] We tried to call the Malta meetings something else, and it lasted for about 2 days. [Laughter] And I mean it, because I think summit projects the idea that you have to have some massive breakthrough, or else you disappoint the rest of the world. And I've changed my thinking on this. I think maybe communications where you don't have to do that is better. And that's why I was on the phone with him the other day on a couple of matters. So, I'm optimistic about our dealings with him, but I cannot predict and nor can any of you, with any degree of accuracy, exactly what's going to happen inside the Soviet Union.

Chairman Gorbachev of the Soviet Union

Q. Please comment on Mikhail Gorbachev's nomination for the Nobel Peace Prize.

The President. I'd hate to say I wasn't aware of it, but I wasn't aware of it.[Laughter] And I don't follow those proceedings too closely. [Laughter] But I've told you I would salute the man for his adherence to peaceful change in Eastern Europe. I mean that, I think, is dramatic and, I think, worthy of a positive note. But far be it for me to try to influence the gurus that decide who wins a Nobel Prize. [Laughter]

War on Drugs

Q. As far as the issue of drug trafficking goes and the world drug problem, could you please address the issue of whether or not military forces will be used in a more direct way in the enforcement of international drug traffic?

The President. No, not in a more direct way. Military forces have been used over the years. The arrest power rests with the Coast Guard. The coastguardsmen can be aboard naval vessels. But we have an interdiction network that is manned and operated by our military. But what the question implies to me at least, of a quantum leap forward in terms of this -- I don't know.

One of the things I have felt is that sometimes the military says, Well, we can't undertake this mission or that because of readiness. It is my view that sometimes an exercise that results in the interdiction of aircraft coming into this country on an illegal mission is a good mission and should not be detracted from the readiness. So, I think that we're always looking at the mission of the military in this regard, but I don't want to give the military more arrest powers. I think we've got a very proper justice system in this country. I do think that they can be extraordinarily useful, and have been, in interdiction and in working with countries that want their cooperation.

Q. Are you prepared to use troops in the United States to enforce the laws against drug consumption, to cut down on the demand which entices the supply?

The President. Well, not to cut down on the demand. I don't think that's a function of the U.S. military. We have police powers in this country; they are properly defined; and that should not, in my view, be altered.

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Services of Mead Data Central

Q. There are many questions that ask why do you find it necessary --

The President. -- The demand -- let me be sure -- the demand side really relates also to education, to people: This is bad; you should not do this. We've condoned things in this country that we should have condemned long ago in terms of narcotics.

Drug Summit in Cartagena, Colombia

Q. There are several questions that have asked why do you find it necessary to physically go to Colombia?

The President. Well, let me explain that to you because I think it's on the minds of a lot of people. I went to a barbecue in Beeville, Texas -- [laughter] -- and there were 800 people there -- not quite this big a mob. And I thought, well, these people are doing this to welcome me back to south Texas. And I decided I would shake hands with everybody there. We politicians are all alike, you know -- go out there and shake hands. Art, you know how that is. [Laughter] So, out I went. And I think about 15 percent of them at that point said, Hey, you know, we're hoping you don't do this.

Let me explain it to you. In the first place, I am not going to do something stupid or macho. [Laughter] I love -- the guy they used to call timid is now "macho man" or something. [Laughter] It has nothing to do with that; it doesn't have anything to do with personal. It has a lot to do with the support for a courageous leader in Colombia.

And I believe, and I think this goes for those who have the responsibility of protecting any President of the United States, that the security of the President can be protected on this naval base, a place where the man has his own home that is cut off from the mainland except by one entrance.

And I don't want to send a signal on your behalf or my behalf that the United States says to this great President, Look, our President can't come there, even though we think the security can be guaranteed; and thus push him, perhaps inadvertently, to make a kind of deal that he has resisted making with these narco traffickers.

I talked to a foreign leader the other day from South America, and he agrees with this rationale. So, it isn't whimsical or a desire to be in harm's way. I think we've got good arrangements, and I think it is good sound antinarcotic policy to support President Barco [of Colombia], who is doing an awful lot to protect our kids from the scource of narcotics.

War on Drugs

Q. There are claims that the removal of General Ortega will improve our efforts at interdicting international drug trafficking. Do you agree with this?

The President. Yes, I do, because there's some symbolism there. And just as I think the extradition of Carlos Lehder and the Colombians' pursuit of the drug lord that was recently killed down there in battle in Colombia -- those things help, because if they see major participants, traffickers going about their life without threat, why, I just think it sends the wrong signal.

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Services of Mead Data Central

Mexico-U.S. Relations

Q. Since the Panama invasion, have our relations with Mexico improved?

The President. Yes. And I'll tell you one thing that was good. Our Secretary of the Treasury [Nicholas F. Brady] went down there -- I don't know whether you saw it on Sunday -- and signed with President Salinas, the very fine young President of Mexico, an agreement on Third World debt. I think that was a good sign.

Look, I think I know enough about this hemisphere to know that anytime a United States force is used in Central America, or wherever else in this hemisphere, there are going to be concerns built on a foundation of history that concern our friends and those who are less friendly to us in this hemisphere. But I've explained as best I can, through letter and by phone, to these leaders why we acted the way we did.

I will tell you that I am convinced not only is the relationship with Mexico good and is it strong, I see nothing but making it even better. And I'm going to work at that because Mexico -- we must not take for granted the fact that we have marvelously strong allies to our north and friends to our south. Sometimes, blessed as we are by our own geography, we forget that. And there could be an inclination to neglect our neighbors, and I don't want to do that. And I can't tell you that there has been no strains, but I think some of what you've been reading about South American reaction has been overstated. And I base that on some contact with the individual leaders in this hemisphere. But it's an exciting hemisphere. This hemisphere can be, in the next couple of years, totally democratic. We must not neglect it.

So, if somebody disagrees with me on Panama and South America or Central America, that just redoubles my desire to make it right, make them understand that the President of the United States is going to protect American life, make them understand that 92 percent of the people in Panama support what I did, make them understand that democracy now has a chance, and make them understand that we're going to assist that democracy. Once I do a better job of that, I think any last concerns about what happened there will be laid to rest.

General Noriega of Panama

Q. Why are we wasting time with Noriega when he cannot possibly receive a constitutionally fair trial without compromising national security? Why not send him to exile in a country willing to take him? [Laughter]

The President. Well, the line is not very long for one thing. And secondly -- [laughter] -- secondly, look, I would just disagree with the person writing the question that the given is he can't get a fair trial. Of course he can get a fair trial. And we've seen that over and over again in highly controversial cases. And so, our justice system that bends over backwards to be fair will, indeed, acquit itself well in this case.

Q. Is your administration --

The President. And should. The man's entitled to a fair trial.

U.S. Support of Foreign Governments

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Services of Mead Data Central

Q. Is your administration prepared to accept governments you dislike, even if they carry their public support, such as the Sandinistas in Nicaragua?

The President. Please define acceptance.[Laughter] I mean, my aspiration is to help and assist those countries in this hemisphere that want to walk down democracy's road -- freedom, democracy, the very changes that we see coming forward in Eastern Europe. Who would have thought we'd be talking about trying to assist Czechoslovakia a year ago? Or Romania? Or some of these other countries? So, I don't think we can dictate exactly what kind of system somebody else has. It's not our business, particularly if they have free and certifiably fair elections. But I think one's inclination is to help those who have the same reverence for democracy and freedom that we have.

Education Reform

Q. You stated in your State of the Union Address that you wish to improve education and to implement the goal of best by the year 2000. How do you plan to implement your goal of having our graduates be the best by the year 2000?

The President. Well, we have a sound program, what I call the Education Excellence Act, before the Congress today. It's complex legislation, but I want to see it passed. Probably get amended, probably get changed, but it challenges people to think anew. We've gotten the Governors together in a Governors conference that was more than just frill. What it did was get -- agree to set national goals. And in the speech the other night, I spelled out four of the national goals that the Governors have agreed should be national. And they themselves will get to work and redouble their efforts in their States and try to encourage the localities to implement the program that we've spelled out.

But let me be careful here, because it isn't the role of the Federal Government to do this alone. It can't do it. Seven percent of the educational spending in this country is Federal. And the rest, for very understandable and, I think, wonderful reasons, belong at the State and local level or private educational institution level.

And so, we can exhort; we can push for the kind of legislation; we can push for implementation of the national goals through the use of the bully pulpit in the White House. And then we've got to encourage the Governors and the local school boards and our teachers, when it comes to alternative certification and all of these things, to think anew. And we can do this. But we're trying to put some emphasis on things like math and science, so we can guarantee our ability to compete in the future. But the Federal Government isn't going to do it alone. It wouldn't be good, either, for the Federal Government to try to do it alone.

The First Lady

Q. President Bush, this is your last question. And before I ask the question, I wish to remind our audience to please remain seated until President Bush and Governor Deukmeijian have left the room. This is a summary of many different questions that I've received, President Bush, and that is: Where is Mrs. Bush, and how is she? [Laughter]

The President. I know you'll never believe this, but I'm getting a terrible inferiority complex. [Laughter] She's fine. And we both have something in

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Services of Mead Data Central

common now -- the vision thing -- because she has this eye problem. But she is doing very well. There is no hidden agenda to her health. And today she is down as one of the Thousand Points of Light, which she's been for a long time, helping on literacy in southern California. And I'll meet her tonight in Omaha. But she's doing just great, and thank you for asking about her.

Thank you very much.

Note: The President spoke at 12:35 p.m. in the Grand Ballroom at the San Francisco Hilton Hotel. He was introduced by Joseph Fink, president of Dominican College and quarterly chairman of the Commonwealth Club.

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Services of Mead Data Central

10TH DOCUMENT of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Public Papers of the Presidents

Remarks at the National Republican Congressional Committee Dinner Honoring Representative Robert H. Michel

25 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 1899

December 5, 1989

LENGTH: 1751 words

Thank you all. Please be seated. We may never get to eat. Thank you all. Thank you, Joe. And the great thing about having the speeches before dinner, they're normally shorter, and I will try to follow that pattern. But I want to first thank Joe Rodgers. What a job he did for the United States as our Ambassador in France. And also, he has always been in the front line of helping the solid, sound Republican causes. Joe, thank you for suiting up again.

I want to thank Guy Vander Jagt, the chairman, and his cochairman, Ed Rollins. I'm delighted to see members of my Cabinet here and, of course, so many members of the House leadership: Newt [Gingrich] and Mickey [Edwards] -- well, I'm going to get in trouble if I keep going, but many of them right up here and then out there in the audience. Let me thank the NRCC faithful -- that's you, putting up the money, hanging in there through good times and bad. And I'm delighted to see this wonderful turnout to support this worthwhile cause.

And then, finally, recognize the man of the night, our honoree, Bob Michel. He is our leader, and he's a longtime friend of mine. I served with him up on the Hill. I played baseball with him on the Republican baseball team. We had winning seasons in those days. [Laughter] And he knows the Congress inside out. He is our leader, as I say, a key player in working with this President. And it makes a difference; it makes a difference if you have a leader that you can pick up the phone and talk to and get advice from and then know that you'll also have support up there. And so, he is a keen ally, a strong player. And I'll tell you, we are going to hit the ground running when the Congress comes back next year. And I'll be counting on him in the future, as in the past.

You remember the big Presidential dinner they had last spring? I made the best-dressed list, but I would only want you to remember Bob Michel's sportcoat at that dinner. [Laughter] He is a shoe-in to make it. And here he is conservatively clad for this one.

I'm glad to be back here -- a little bit spaced out. I'm on Malta standard. But I want you to know that it is a pleasure. And I thought I'd say just a word or two, not to bore you with the details on the meeting but just a mention of the atmosphere, because I think the meetings did capture the imagination of a lot of the world.

I'll tell you that at NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Organization] I was very pleased with the reaction from the solid NATO partners we have. And whatever the weather in Malta, I can tell you the weather inside was relaxed. There were some moments when we would disagree on things, clearly; that's what those kinds of meetings are about, I guess. But I was able to talk in a straightforward manner with Mr. Gorbachev with no rancor. I think we did establish good lines

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Services of Mead Data Central

of communication, and I think in an era of rapid change -- and we certainly are living in that -- it is important that we have good lines of communication. I made clear to him that it was not our role as the United States and as a leader in the NATO alliance to seek to exploit the changes in the events taking place in Eastern Europe but really only to assist the forces of freedom and reform that are emerging there. And I was very up-front with him on the differences, particularly the differences in our own hemisphere.

We are going to be the first hemisphere that is truly, totally democratic. And our goal is to assist countries that are moving in democracy's way. And we find that we have some differences obviously with, certainly, past performance of the Soviets and, regrettably, I'm afraid, in the future. But we're going to keep on working this. I was upfront with him about the destabilizing flow of arms into the region from nations that are receiving Soviet support. And both of us, though, agreed that we do not have to sacrifice candor in order to build up a better relationship.

There is no question that progress was made at Malta. It wasn't a meeting where we were going there to cross the T's and dot the I's on some kind of an arms control agreement. But progress was made. I think, in a sense, we've got an agenda out there now, an agenda that, if we can fulfill it and follow through on it, will strengthen the peace and provide a solid base for future advances.

We agreed to accelerate the timetables for reducing arms. And that means we're going to have to do our part, not just the United States but our alliances. I want to see a conventional force reduction. We have it on the table. It's a good one. It calls for disproportionate reductions: fewer U.S. troops coming out than Soviet. But the Soviets, in principle, are agreed. Now we've got to move that forward because I believe that kind of an agreement will really enhance the peace.

We agreed to set the timeframe for a summit meeting here in the United States next June. The general agreement was out there, but we pinned it down until the last of June.

We agreed to move forward in trying to forge a closer economic relationship, in light of the positive changes that are taking place in Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union. We know it's a long way to go. They have not been blessed with the wonders of the free economic system we have. They don't know what free markets are and convertible currencies and all the things that we, obviously, take for granted in the United States. But as long as these changes, these democratic changes, keep moving inside the Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe, I think the United States ought to be out there trying to help not in some kind of a superior manner but trying to say, Look, here's what works. Let us get in there and try to assist if we possibly can.

And I might say when Mr. Shevardnadze[Soviet Foreign Minister] said -- before our meeting somebody said, "Do you want the United States to bail you out?" And to the man's credit, he said, "No, we don't want a bailout." That's good because we don't have any money anyway. [Laughter] So, I was delighted that he had that attitude.

No, but I look at Malta as a hopeful step in a new relationship. The first step in the next decade and the new world that is taking place each passing day -- it's got to be a new world of freedom. And make no mistake, the progress

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Services of Mead Data Central

that I think we set in motion there at Malta would not have been possible without the steadfast support of the American people and, certainly, the steadfast support of those leaders that we have up here on this stage tonight, those leaders in the Congress -- Jerry [Lewis] and Duncan Hunter and Bob and Mickey and Newt and Guy Vander Jagt. And I mean that.

When you go to a meeting of this nature, there's trepidation. People wonder whether you're going to -- you know, how it's going to come out. But if you know you have strong friends that will tell you exactly what they feel -- they who have been elected by their own constituencies -- it gives the President a great deal of confidence. And I am grateful, again, to our Republican leadership in the House of Representatives.

I'm pleased to share that report with all of you, especially given Bob Michel. This is one time I don't have to ask, Will it play in Peoria. I can say that his politics have been playing there a long time. And we are in close touch on this.

You know, what is it? Less than a month -- this is a little hard to focus on -- less than a month from now, we're going to begin a new decade, the last in this century. And I think all of us feel a natural inclination to look ahead, to think about the changes that a new century can bring. Barbara and I, we're heavy in the grandchild business these days, with 11 of them, and you can't help but see any one of them running around there that your focus doesn't shift to what kind of world are they going to be living in. And there's more than that natural impulse at work. Each day brings new change, from Warsaw, Budapest to Prague, Berlin -- new evidence that the love of freedom, freedom that sometimes you and sometimes I take for granted, is gathering force.

And so, I'm a lucky person to be President of our great country in these very exciting times, times that are exciting for every American, for people all over the world who cherish now the freedoms that we've enjoyed for years. And they're exciting times, I think, for our party. We feel that our values on these issues are triumphing; but they're values that we have stood for a long, long time, values that have kept America free and prosperious and at peace, values that help create the conditions for that new world of freedom that is unfolding before us.

I am convinced that the American people will continue to look to us, look to leaders like Bob Michel and his fellow Republicans in the House, to keep this country on course in these times of change. And let me say right now to all the loyal members of the NRCC: The 1990's will bring a new world. We've all seen the grim spectacle -- voices struggling to be heard, a minority trampled by unbridled power -- the decade's old fight against oppression. Yes, I'm talking about Republicans in the House of Representatives. The tide is turning, though. [Laughter]

The tide is turning. People didn't think freedom would come to Berlin. [Laughter] But change will come to Capitol Hill. And I'd like to think that here the days of one party rule are over. So, our message is getting -- [applause]. And I think our message, thanks to Bob and Newt and others, is getting through: the party with ideas, with experience, with the answers to the questions we face in the decade ahead. And there's no greater goal than the one that inspires everyone here tonight to build support in mainstream America into majority status in the House. And when that day comes, a proud day for every

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Services of Mead Data Central

Republican, from the House leadership right on down to the rank and file, we'll have the NRCC to thank for its tireless efforts.

It's been a great pleasure to be here tonight. I hate to leave before Bob Michel sings, but that's just one of the breaks, you know. [Laughter]

God bless you, and God bless the United States. Thank you very, very much.

Note: The President spoke at 7:04 p.m. in the Grand Ballroom of the J. W. Marriott Hotel. Following his remarks, the President and Mrs. Bush visited a Toys for Tots party in the hotel hosted by lobbyist Roy Pfautch.

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

DATE: 1/17/90

NOTE FOR: DAVID DEMAREST

The President has reviewed the attached, and it is forwarded to you for your:

information ✓

action ☐

copy speechwriters

[redacted]

Thank you.

James W. Cicconi
Assistant to the President
and Deputy to the Chief of Staff
(x-2702)

cc:

[redacted]

CAMP DAVID

[redacted]

Roger

read with interest
be sure speechwriters get the
factas in here and the
anecdotal stuff.

gb

1-15-90

[redacted]

[redacted]

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN

ADDRESS BY ROGER B. PORTER
BEFORE THE
UNITED STATES COUNCIL FOR INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS
New York, N.Y.
December 5, 1989

I. Introduction

I am honored to join with you in celebrating excellence. It was Plato who observed many centuries ago that what is honored in a country will be cultivated there. John Akers, throughout his career, has shown a commitment to excellence, a capacity for leadership, and a broader vision than merely short-term profitability. He has evidenced a vision for the long-term success of the enterprise he heads. At the same time, he has shown a willingness to attend to issues that are at the top of the nation's agenda.

The President has asked me to convey to John his special greetings and appreciation for John's service on the President's Education Policy Advisory Committee and on the Business Roundtable's task force on education.

II. Where We Have Been and What We Have Learned

The meeting of the U.S. and Soviet leaders in Malta this past weekend presents a fitting occasion to assess what we have learned and where we have been. The pace of change in recent

months has been truly dramatic. It reminds one of the refrain of the Angel Gabriel in the play, Green Pastures: "Everything nailed down seems to be coming loose."

I am also reminded of the scene from the movie, "Three Days of the Condor," in which a CIA analyst discovers a plot within the agency. He takes his discovery to an old OSS hand bound to a desk job in Langley and, after revealing the details, asks the old man, "You saw some action once, too, didn't you? Do you miss the action?" Slowly, the old man replies, emphasizing every work, "It is not the action I miss. It is the clarity." I suspect that the events of the last few weeks have caused some to long for a return to similar clarity. But the clock cannot be rewound. The changes we are witnessing are truly reshaping the face of a continent.

Even in this time of change, and perhaps because of it, certain lessons seem a bit clearer.

-- We have learned that the yearning for freedom and for democratic institutions is strong, even among peoples who have been denied them for many decades.

-- We have learned that efforts to centrally manage economies ultimately fail by misallocating resources.

-- We have learned that markets and market-oriented institutions do efficiently allocate resources and produce economic growth and prosperity.

-- The verdict of this century in country after country confirms the wisdom of both democratic political institutions and market-oriented economic arrangements.

In many respects, the post-World War II period has been one of the most remarkable in the history of the world. We have experienced no major world war for forty-five years, compared with two during the previous forty-five years. There have been regional conflicts to be sure, but since 1945 we have maintained a time of relative peace.

The post-World War II period has also been a time of unprecedented economic growth and of shared prosperity. When World War II ended, the worldwide average for life expectancy was just 46 years. Today, it is 62 years. Worldwide, infant mortality has been cut by more than half, from 155 per thousand births to 71 today. In the United States, only 53 percent of 25-29 year olds had completed high school in 1950, compared with 86 percent today. In short, in many measurable ways we are much better off than we were 45 years ago.

What accounts for this unprecedented growth and prosperity? Two have pulled us down the path of peace and prosperity. The first is the diffusion of technology and ideas associated with the transportation, communications, and technological revolutions. Consider what has happened in the U.S. during the decade of the 1980's alone:

-- The percentage of households with cable television went from 19 percent to 51 percent.

-- The percentage of households with VCRs went from 1 percent to 58 percent.

-- The number of personal computers in use went from 2 million to 38 million.

-- The percentage of elementary and secondary schools with microcomputers rose from 18 percent to 96 percent.

-- If you are not persuaded by these statistics, ask yourself how we survived only a few years ago without FAX machines.

The second engine has been an open and increasingly integrated international economy. World trade has expanded by

6.2 percent annually since 1950, compared with 4.1 percent for the world economy as a whole. During the 1980's, trade has been even bigger contributor to growth. Between 1981 and 1989, world trade expanded at a rate of 4.5 percent annually, compared with world output growth of 2.8 percent per year.

Despite these victories and this progress, there is deep and appropriate concern on the part of many Americans about our competitive position in the world. Our budget and trade deficits are troubling, both in their magnitude and in their persistence. To some it appears that U.S. firms and U.S. real estate are all being sold to foreigners.

Therefore, it is appropriate to turn our attention to the question of what will be the major challenges for us as a nation in the 1990's and what we must do.

III. Investing in the Future: A Longer-Term Vision

The first characteristic of a mature people and a mature society is the care it takes for its future. We have learned through much experience that productivity is tied to investment. We all instinctively know that no successful farmer consumes his seed corn. Current consumption is no substitute for carefully planned investments. This is true for individuals and

families, it is true for business organizations, and it is true for societies.

In practical terms this is reflected in our policies, practices, and patterns with respect to investments in three critical areas -- physical capital, research and development, and human capital.

Physical Capital. Central to securing adequate capital investment is a pattern of private saving and public borrowing that is conducive to lowering the cost of capital. We have known for a long time that our current levels of private saving are inadequate, particularly when combined with the levels of public borrowing that characterized the 1980's. This is a battle that we must wage on both the public borrowing and the private saving fronts.

It is a challenge that will require great patience and persistence. On the public borrowing front, we are making considerable progress in reducing the relative size of the budget deficit. Between 1985 and 1988, for example, the Federal deficit declined in relation to GNP from 4.9 percent to 3.0 percent. Indeed, if one considers the entire public sector, including state and local governments, the decline is even more dramatic -- from 3.3 percent to 2.0 percent between 1985 and 1988.

And we are not doing poorly when compared with other industrial countries. For the public sector as a whole, our 1988 deficit in relation to GNP is comparable to that of Germany (2.0 percent), Canada (2.6 percent), and France (1.4 percent); and far better than in Italy (10.6 percent). GNP.

The 1989 budget battle provides reason for encouragement. It was a landmark in the fight to reduce the budget deficit:

-- First, the President began the year by proposing a realistic budget that was not declared "dead on arrival." It served as the basis for successful budget agreement negotiations with the Congress.

-- Second, as the budget battle played out over the year, the political system shifted away from the discipline that had characterized it during its early period. In the end, there was the genuine threat and actual imposition of sequestration. I consider it significant that it was the willingness of the President to remain in and manage sequestration for an entire year if necessary that brought the political system (in this instance the Congress) back to the table and produced a Reconciliation Bill that included genuine spending reductions.

-- Third, among other things, the budget battles of 1989 demonstrated that we could put our fiscal house in order without resorting to higher taxes. The Gramm-Rudman target was met without increased taxes.

Research and Development. The second critical area in considering a longer-term vision for the future is research and development. A strong R&D effort is central to the success of an economy. This is why the administration has proposed making the R&D tax credit permanent. The other essential element of tax policy as far as R&D is concerned is stability. Stability with respect to federal tax policy permits private sector organizations to plan with greater confidence. Indeed, one of the most important things that government can do is provide a stable environment in which entrepreneurship can flourish.

The numbers indicate that, while the United States has improved its R&D effort over the last decade, we still have work to do. According to the National Science Foundation, our R&D effort increased as a share of GNP from 2.1 percent in 1977 to 2.6 percent in 1987. But other countries also increased their efforts. This left us only slightly behind both Japan (2.9 percent) and Germany (2.8 percent). If defense R&D is excluded, however, the gap widens: In 1987, the U.S. effort was 1.8 percent of GNP, compared with 2.8 percent for Japan and 2.6 percent for Germany.

There has been much discussion about what will happen to defense R&D in this new era of defense cut-backs. It is simply too early to forecast what will be in the administration's FY 1991 proposals. But it is highly unlikely that we will see increases in defense R&D spending. This will mean that we will need even greater R&D spending in other parts of the system.

While the government has an important role to play in basic research and development spending, it is crucial that U.S. businesses consider carefully their R&D spending patterns with respect to their implications for investments in the future. Often the trade-off is higher dividends today or greater R&D spending for tomorrow.

Human Capital. Investments in human capital are also important, and with the tightness of our labor force this will become even more important in the future. Throughout the decade of the eighties, our labor force has grown at an average annual rate of 1.7 percent, a substantial drop over the 2.5 percent average rate of the 1970's. Recent projections indicate that the growth rate will decline toward 1 percent a year during the 1990's. This, of course, is heavily dependent on what happens with respect to immigration, which has accounted for about one-fourth of all the population growth in the United States during this century. The point is that with the labor force growing

more modestly, it will be even more important that businesses effectively train their employees.

At the President's Education Summit Conference with Governors in Charlottesville, one governor related a conversation he had with the chairman of Toyota. During the course of their discussion the governor asked this business executive what percentage of his workers were illiterate. He replied, "By American standards none. By Japanese standards, fifteen percent."

Puzzled by this response the governor asked what he meant. The chairman replied, "All my workers can read and write, but fifteen percent of them are not yet fully able to program a computer."

This is the kind of world in which we must compete during the decade of the 1990's and beyond. It will require investments in our future, investments in physical capital, research and development, and human capital.

IV. Balancing Security and Dynamism

A second basic challenge for the United States as a nation in the 1990's will be striking a balance between security and dynamism. There is an underlying tension in the life of every

individual, every organization, and every society between the desire for security and stability and a recognition of the need for dynamism, adjustment, and change.

The more affluent a society becomes the more it has the luxury of satisfying the desires of its people for security. We have seen much of this in Western societies during this century with the wide array of measures designed to provide protection against the vicissitudes of life and to provide for health, welfare, employment security, and retirement. Many of these measures have become a part of our thinking about what a proper society should have. Is there anyone who wants to dispense with having an unemployment compensation system? The list of mandated benefits that some would add to the current array is a long one indeed. And there are legitimate arguments that one can make for each of these.

What I am arguing is that one must take care to look at the aggregate effect of these measures designed to achieve greater security. The reason for this is very simple. Much of America's success over the last two hundred years, I am convinced, comes from our capacity to innovate, to adapt, to reallocate resources, to change. We are by far the most mobile society in the world.

America has had a remarkable record of job creation during the 1980's, while employment in Europe has been relatively

stagnant. Between 1982 and 1988, total employment in America rose 15 percent. In France, the number of people employed actually fell by 150,000. German employment rose a modest 1.6 percent. Margaret Thatcher's economic miracle in England produced the best record in Europe -- 6.9 percent job growth over this period.

During the late 1980's, the duration of unemployment in the United States has fallen significantly below that of Europe. The pain of long-term unemployment is far less common here than in Europe. In 1987 in the United States, only 14 percent of the unemployed had been out of work more than 6 months, while only 8 percent had been out of work more than a year. By contrast, more than 60 percent of the United Kingdom's unemployed had not worked in 6 months and more than 40 percent had been out a full year. The situation in France was even worse, with nearly two-thirds of the unemployed out of work for more than 6 months and nearly half out of work for a year or longer.

The Europeans are aware of these comparisons, and they have much to do with Europe's commitment to complete its single internal market by 1992.

One of our greatest strengths is the flexibility with which we deploy our resources, human, financial, and otherwise. We

must preserve this adaptability and mobility if we are to have a truly dynamic economy.

Contrast the relative flexibility that exists in our labor market arrangements with the inflexibility that characterizes much of our education system.

Over time, America's education system has gravitated toward security and stability. We need a major restructuring to achieve greater dynamism through increased innovation, accountability, competition, and choice. As an active participant in the President's Education Summit last September in Charlottesville, I see some reason for encouragement on this front. There is a commitment to reform among governors all across the nation that can help produce the educational renaissance that is so desperately needed.

As one who has spent many hours in the classroom, I am convinced that the educational renaissance that is needed can happen. Four years ago, I had the privilege of visiting the largest private high school in Osaka, Japan. My morning began with an address to its 4,000 students. I spent the day sitting in classes and talking with the exchange students from the United States, Great Britain, Canada, and Australia. This is truly an impressive school. It was founded in 1945 in the ashes of the Second World War. In the past forty-five years it has produced

seven Olympic gold medal winners. They regularly win the all-Japanese gymnastic and tennis championships.

But it is not just their athletic prowess that impressed me. Fully 98 percent of their students graduate and go on to attend universities and colleges. Their academic accomplishments parallel their athletic achievements. At the end of the day, I met with the Headmaster and the Vice Headmaster and made many inquiries about where they recruited their students and teachers, what kind of entrance requirements did they have, and similar sorts of questions. But the great lesson for me came in response to my question to the Headmaster: "What is the key to your success?"

Without pausing or reflecting, he looked at me and said: "The key to our success is very simple. It can be summarized in a single word, expectations. At Seifu Gakuen we have a tradition of expectations. When students come here they know that they are expected to attend class every day. They are expected to have their homework completed. They are expected to master the material, however long it takes. Anything less is simply not acceptable.

The students were full of enthusiasm and commitment. They felt they were engaged in something that was important. They cared and so did their teachers and parents. It is that kind of

commitment and that kind of dynamism that can transform our schools.

V. Summary

As we prepare to respond to the challenges of the next decade, I believe that we would do well to recall the advice of Thomas Huxley, who visited America in 1876. He observed:

> I cannot say that I am in the slightest degree impressed by your bigness, or your material resources, as such. Size is not grandeur, and territory does not make a nation. The great issue, about which hangs true sublimity, and the terror of overhanging fate, is what are you going to do with all these things?

Perhaps never before in the history of the world has a nation seemed to have achieved so much. During this century we have championed democratic political institutions. We have also championed market-oriented approaches to managing economic activities.

Indeed, we have been the great torchbearers for democracy and free enterprise. Everywhere we turn the direction is towards these two goals. We do not face the prospect of a 1930's type of depression or of the double-digit inflation of the 1970's. We do not face hostile regimes abroad like Hitler's Germany or Stalin's Russia. We have peace and remarkable prosperity.

-- We are now in our 85th month of the longest peacetime expansion in our history.

-- Nearly 20.5 million new jobs have been created during the current economic expansion.

-- Unemployment levels have been sustained at levels not seen since the Vietnam war.

-- We are in the eighth straight year of keeping inflation under 5 percent.

But the challenge for us will be not to pause and not to rest on these successes. For during the coming decade we will discover how mature we are as a people. If we are to achieve productivity growth rates that will provide for our aspirations as a nation, we will need two things.

-- First, we will need to make reasoned investments in the future which will require both wisdom and a willingness to defer some current gratification.

-- Second, we will have to embrace dynamism and a willingness to adjust, to adapt, and to innovate. This will mean eschewing measures which hold forth the

promise of protection from foreign competition and the security of mandated benefits.

These are great challenges for a great people. How we rise to meet them will test our maturity as a nation. I am confident we have the leadership and will summon the commitment to successfully meet these challenges. Our children and those who will follow them deserve no less.

U.S., Extending Some Unusual Aid to Hungary, Provides Veteran Political-Campaign Advisers

By Robert S. Greenberger
Staff Reporter of The Wall Street Journal

BUDAPEST, Hungary—Not long ago, the three-story cement building in the Buda Hills was a training center for Communist Party bureaucrats. Today it's being used to tutor other Hungarians in techniques more associated with the Iowa caucuses and the New Hampshire primary.

Hungary last held elections before the advent of the television era. So U.S. political operative John Sasso, late of the Dukakis campaign, is teaching one batch of this country's first generation of post-Communist politicians how to handle the media by having them conduct mock television interviews.



John Sasso

An interviewer asks a dark-haired man with glasses in his mid-20s if he isn't a little too young to be running for parliament. The man looks straight into the camera and says: "Before I answer that, I want to thank the station for giving us the opportunity to be here. I want to thank my constituents for watching, and I hope to win your support." He adds that he is youthful but experienced.

Mr. Sasso is ecstatic. "That's terrific. He seemed to know that the camera is just a living room sitting there," he says.

Welcome to Eastern Europe 1990, where Stalinism is giving way to soundbites. Elections are coming to Hungary in March, and to many other nations in the region later this year.

The U.S. government wants to lend a hand. But instead of shipping over professors to lecture on Jeffersonian democracy, the government has sent Mr. Sasso and other seasoned political experts to teach nuts-and-bolts campaigning. This weekend workshop is sponsored by the Democratic wing of a tiny congressionally funded group, the National Endowment for Democracy. The challenge here is to teach modern campaign and communications skills in a country emerging from a political and media Ice Age.

"Whoever thought I'd be exporting Boston street politics to Budapest?" asks a wondering Mr. Sasso.

And that's the problem. Not long ago, these novice candidates were driven mainly by passionate anti-Communism. Now they have to learn to compete in elections. The U.S. consultants' strong suit is technique, not substance. Mr. Sasso, for instance, became famous for 15 minutes in the U.S. when he launched the "attack video" that knocked Sen. Joseph Biden (D., Del.) out of the 1988 presidential race by documenting plagiarism. Unleashing such lethal expertise here could be the equivalent of giving guns to children.

William Sweeney, a former deputy chairman of the Democratic National Committee, worries about the distorting effect U.S. technical skills could have here. He frets that he and his colleagues, with their feel for buzzwords and hot buttons, could add to the confusion in Hungary, where 50-odd political parties have proliferated in the past year. "We might be able to take parties that aren't in the ballpark and put them in the ballpark very quickly," he says.

Big Leagues

But putting parties in a winning position, whether or not they're ready for the big leagues, is what these weekend workshops are all about. That's why Francis O'Brien, who handled press relations in Geraldine Ferraro's ill-fated 1984 vice-presidential campaign, is addressing about 100 candidates from the Alliance of Young Democrats. Not long ago, most of those in the audience were student firebrands. Now they are preparing to run the country. The only reminders that the building they're in once housed Communist functionaries are two plate-sized, red tin stars, their points bent, drooping on a stairwell gate.

One legacy of that failed system is that Mr. O'Brien has to teach these candidates such bare-bones basics as how to press the flesh. He calls on rumpled Istvan Hegedus, who with his shoulder-length hair and wrinkled corduroys looks like a time-warped hippie, and tells him to pretend that Mr. O'Brien is "a very good-looking 16-year-old girl" that Mr. Hegedus would like to meet.

Mr. Hegedus asks what Mr. O'Brien is studying in school. Mr. O'Brien says economics. "Is it as boring as it was when I learned economics by Karl Marx?" begins the 32-year-old would-be parliamentarian. Soon they are chatting about the Young Democrats' program to revive the Hungarian economy.

Mr. O'Brien applauds the effort. He says Mr. Hegedus was polite, and tried to find common ground. The group has a good laugh.

Cultural Divide

But other campaign skills require both the consultants and the candidates to bridge a cultural divide. Meeting voters and canvassing neighborhoods don't come naturally on streets where Soviet tanks once rolled. Walking through a crowded Budapest subway station, Mr. Sweeney stops to observe a middle-aged man distributing campaign leaflets: "Look at that guy. He's passive. He's just standing there. He should be putting it in people's faces."

The consultants also are experiencing some culture shock. Most of the Young Democrats' candidates look like U.S.-style, left-wing radicals, but they talk like Reaganites. Underneath their shaggy locks, they are rabid anti-Communists and die-hard free-marketeers. A couple of months ago, three Young Democrats showed up in London to have their picture taken with Tory Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher.

All this is a bit confusing to Mr. Sasso, a Massachusetts Democrat who thought he knew what a liberal was. Mitchell Daniels, a former Reagan White House aide also teaching the Hungarians, gibes: "I think I'm just along to translate for Sasso in case they talk about free markets."

No Joke

One subject the consultants don't joke about here is the negative campaigning that sullied the 1988 U.S. presidential race. That, the Americans agree, is one U.S. product not fit for export.

But Hungarian politicians say they don't see much appetite for negative campaigning in this election. The whole democratic process is still so new, says Tibor Vidos, executive director of the Free Democrats, that Hungarian politicians can attract attention simply by airing catchy television commercials.

"But," adds Mr. Vidos, "i we'll probably be so bored that it probably will be time f using negative campaigning."

Social Security Tax Cut Would Be Tied To Budget Gap Under Sasser Proposal

By John E. Yang
Staff Reporter of The Wall Street Journal

WASHINGTON — Chairman James

billion over two years.

Under Sen. Sasser's plan, the lawmakers would have a target of cutting the

WARNING:
Parents of college gra
Your graduate may no longer be covered by your medical insurance
After graduation you may have to pay, if your new grad is hospitalized without insurance
Ask your insurance agent for
Golden Rule's
Short Term Major Medical
• $1,000,000 Protection • 1 to 6 months cove
•Very affordable. Fo
Mail To: Short Term Division
Golden Rule
Golden Rule Insurance Company
7440 Woodland Drive
Indianapolis, IN 46278-1719
(317) 297-4123
"A" Rated (Exce
—A.M.
Please send costs and full details on Short Term Major Medical.
Name _____
Address _____
City _____ State _____ Zip _____
Phone (___) _____
No cost or obligation. Not available in all states. An agent or broker may contact yo

United States Information Agency

Washington, D.C. 20547

Office of the Director

USIA

February 2, 1990

Dear Dan,

I appreciate you concern over the language service cuts. They really are a devastating blow and probably couldn't come at a worse time. I've attached a copy of my remarks about them.

On a happier note, congratulations on the State of the Union address. A terrific job.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,
Dick

3440

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN. FRIENDS. THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR BEING HERE.

THE VOICE OF AMERICA MEANS SO MUCH TO ALL OF US.

I KNOW EACH OF YOU SHARE WITH ME GREAT PRIDE IN THIS INSTITUTION. WHAT WE DO HAS OPENED DOORS IN THE MINDS OF MILLIONS OF PEOPLE - BRINGING THEM A WORLD OF INFORMATION AND IDEAS.

BECAUSE OF THAT, WHAT I HAVE TO SAY IS VERY DIFFICULT. THIS IS THE TOUGHEST AND SADDEST DAY OF MY PROFESSIONAL LIFE.

TODAY, JUST MONTHS AFTER OUR STUNNING SUCCESS IN BRINGING INFORMATION TO ALL OF CHINA, ONLY A FEW SHORT WEEKS SINCE THE EUROPEAN REVOLUTIONS, VOA WILL GO DARK IN SOME PARTS OF THE WORLD.

I AM HERE TO TELL YOU THAT WE ARE GOING TO ABOLISH DIRECT BROADCASTS IN SIX IMPORTANT LANGUAGES. IN SO DOING WE WILL ELIMINATE 57 JOBS IN THE LANGUAGE SERVICES. THESE AREN'T JUST "SLOTS", OR "POSITIONS", THEY ARE REAL JOBS HELD BY REAL PEOPLE. YOUR COLLEAGUES. MY COLLEAGUES.

THIS DECISION WILL INHIBIT OUR MISSION. IT WILL CRIPPLE OUR EFFECTIVENESS AT A TIME OF UNPRECEDENTED CHANGE - AND UNPRECEDENTED OPPORTUNITY - IN THE WORLD.

THE REAL TRAGEDY IS THAT OUR ROLE IN THE WORLD HAS NEVER BEEN MORE IMPORTANT THAN IT IS NOW. NOT SINCE THE END OF WW2, NOT SINCE THE CONQUEST OF FASCISM, HAS OUR TASK BEEN MORE INTELLECTUALLY COMPELLING OR NEEDED. YOU KNOW THIS IS TRUE. OUR AUDIENCE KNOWS THIS IS TRUE. YOU SEE THE RESULTS OF IT ALL THE TIME. YOU HEAR ABOUT IT EVERY DAY. NATAN SCHARANSKY SAID IT. ANDRE SAKHAROV SAID IT. SYUDIS IN LITHUANIA SAYS IT. SOLIDARITY SAYS IT. THOSE NAMELESS STUDENTS WHO SENT US BARBED WIRE SOUVENIRS FROM CZECHOSLOVAKIA, FROM ROMANIA, FROM HUNGARY, SAY IT .... THE VOICE OF AMERICA IS VITAL TO THE FUTURE OF THEIR LIVES.

YOU HELPED SHAPE THE REVOLUTION IN EASTERN EUROPE.

YOU LAID THE GROUNDWORK FOR THE CHANGES IN THE USSR.

YOU WERE A LIFELINE TO PEOPLE.

YOU FED THE INTELLECTUALLY HUNGRY.

YOU GAVE THEM FOOD FOR THE MIND.

AND WHAT YOU DID HELPED PULL THE RUG OUT FROM UNDER THE LAST GREAT EUROPEAN EMPIRE .... AND YOU DID IT BY TELLING THE TRUTH, THROUGH FAIR AND HONEST BROADCASTS.

AT THE VERY TIME THAT OTHER INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTERS ARE EXPANDING, WE WILL CONTRACT. WE WILL DO TO OURSELVES WHAT 30 YEARS OF SOVIET JAMMING WAS NEVER ABLE TO DO.

WE HAVE NO CHOICE IN THIS. BOB COONROD AND I, EVERY SENIOR MANAGER HERE, FRANKLY, HAS STRUGGLED FOR YEARS TO AVOID CUTS IN PROGRAMMING AND TO KEEP FROM CUTTING JOBS. IT SEEMS ALL WE DO THESE DAYS IS WORK ON THE BUDGET.

YOU KNOW WALT LAFLEUR, HEAD OF ENGINEERING. HE'S RESPONSIBLE FOR THIS VAST NETWORK OF RELAY STATIONS, TRANSMITTERS, ANTENNA FIELDS, OUR SATELLITE INTERCONNECT SYSTEM, AND KEEPING US ON THE AIR IN ALL THESE LANGUAGES EVERY DAY. HE SAID TO ME LAST WEEK, "WITH ALL I HAVE TO DO, I SPEND 60 PERCENT OF MY TIME TRYING TO FIND WAYS TO SQUEEZE MORE SAVINGS OUT OF WHAT I GET." THIS IS A PATHETIC SITUATION WE ARE IN.

OUR ASSIGNED REDUCTIONS FROM USIA ARE SO SEVERE WE HAVE NO CHOICE BUT TO CUT THE LANGUAGES AND JOBS I'VE INDICATED. MORE PIECE-MEAL SLICING WILL NOT WORK. WE'VE TRIED IT, IT'S STUPID, AND DEFEATING. IT WILL ONLY WEAKEN US FURTHER, ULTIMATELY TO A POINT WHERE OUR PROGRAMMING WILL FALL APART, ALONG WITH OUR CREDIBILITY.

IT IS IMPERATIVE THAT IF WE HAVE TO MAKE THESE CUTS, THEN WE MUST HAVE 37 SOLID LANGUAGE SERVICES, GOOD ONES, STRONG ONES, RATHER THAN 43 POOR ONES WITH NO AUDIENCE.

AMPUTATION OF AN ENTIRE LANGUAGE SERVICE IS TRAGIC, BUT IT IS A BETTER SOLUTION BY FAR THAN BIT-BY-BIT DISMEMBERMENT.

THIS BUDGET PROBLEM HAS CONSUMED US FOR THE FOUR YEARS I HAVE BEEN AT VOA. DURING THAT TIME I CUT $36 MILLION OUT OF OUR BUDGET. THERE HAS NEVER BEEN A CHOICE IN THE MATTER.

EVEN NOW WE NEED FOUR AND ONE HALF MILLION DOLLARS MORE FOR NEXT YEAR THAN WE HAD LAST YEAR JUST TO TAKE CARE OF INFLATION AND SALARY INCREASES. YET THE BUDGET REQUIRES WE OPERATE IN 1990 AT AN EVEN LOWER FUNDING LEVEL THAN WE HAD IN 1989.

PLUS, AS YOU MAY KNOW, A NEW LAW WILL REQUIRE THAT WE ESTABLISH A TIBETAN SERVICE, FOR WHICH WE DON'T HAVE THE FUNDS.

THIS ISN'T THE FAULT OF USIA. THIS IS A BIG AGENCY. THERE ARE MANY ELEMENTS COMPETING FOR FUNDS. THEY ALL BELIEVE THEY ARE WORTHWHILE. MANY USIA ELEMENTS ARE SUFFERING THE SAME DRACONIAN CUTS AS WE ARE. AND THE PROBLEM IS GOVERNMENT WIDE. I SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET EFFORTS BUT IT IS GOING TO HURT FOR A NUMBER OF YEARS.

PRESENTLY WE ARE WORKING WITH A BUDGET OF ABOUT $170 MILLION FOR SALARIES AND EXPENSES - ABOUT $7 MILLION LESS THAN WE ASKED FOR AND NEED TO FUND CURRENT OPERATIONS.

THIS TERRIBLE EVENT TODAY - THIS "RIF", WHICH IS WHAT IT IS - HAS BEEN COMING FOR A LONG TIME.

LET ME QUICKLY LIST FOR YOU WHAT CUTS WE HAVE TAKEN SINCE THE BEGINNING OF 1987:

WE HAVE CUT 113 LANGUAGE PROGRAM HOURS.

WE HAVE TAKEN 75 HOURS OF ENGLISH OFF THE AIR EVERY WEEK.

WE HAVE REDUCED AIRTIME IN 15 LANGUAGE SERVICES.

WE HAVE ELIMINATED OUR DIRECT BROADCASTS IN THAI AND PORTUGUESE TO PORTUGAL. A TERRIBLE BLOW.

WE SLICED MORE THAN 30 JOBS OUT OF THE NEWSROOM. WE CASHIERED FIVE CORRESPONDENT POSITIONS. WE CLOSED FOUR NEWS BUREAUS: ROME, MEXICO CITY, HONG KONG AND HOUSTON. WE ELIMINATED A TOTAL OF 222 REAL JOBS.

WE SLASHED ADVERTISING, PROMOTION, TWENTY PERCENT OF TRAVEL. JUST LAST SEPTEMBER WE REDUCED OUR ARABIC, OUR RUSSIAN, OUR SPANISH AND OUR POLISH BROADCASTS BY 42 HOURS A WEEK.

THE PRESSURE ON ALL OF US HAS BEEN ENORMOUS. NO MORE SO THAN ON YOU.

YOU HAVE CARRIED ON AT HALF STRENGTH, SOMETIMES AT ONE THIRD STRENGTH, WITH NO MONEY AND NO HELP, FUELED ONLY BY ENTHUSIASM AND SENSE OF PURPOSE AND DUTY. I AM GRATEFUL TO EVERY ONE OF YOU FOR YOUR SACRIFICES.

YOU REALLY ARE VETERANS OF THE CRUSADE FOR TRUTH. AND AS VETERANS YOU SHOULD ONLY BE HONORED, NOT DISMISSED. THAT IS WHY THIS TASK IS SO DIFFICULT FOR ME.

I HAVE SPOKEN PERSONALLY TO EACH OF THE AFFECTED LANGUAGE SERVICE CHIEFS THIS MORNING. BOTH UNIONS HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED AS WELL.

THE LANGUAGE CUTS WERE MADE ON A PRIORITY BASIS HAVING NOTHING TO DO WITH THEIR INTRINSIC MANAGEMENT VALUE OR THE VALUE OF THE PEOPLE IN THEM. A COUPLE OF THESE SERVICES ARE AMONG THE VERY BEST WE HAVE.

WE ARE GOING TO ABOLISH THE FOLLOWING:

LAO, GREEK, TURKISH, SLOVENE, UZBEK AND SWAHILI.

A WORD ABOUT EACH OF THEM:

LAOS REMAINS A CLOSED SOCIETY. MEDIA IS TIGHTLY CONTROLLED BY THE GOVERNMENT. WE ARE THE ONLY SOURCE OF NEWS FROM THE OUTSIDE WORLD.

THE LOSS OF SWAHILI TO 50 MILLION AFRICANS WILL MEAN THE LOSS OF AMERICA'S VOICE IN KENYA, ZAIRE, UGANDA, AND TANZANIA, CRITICALLY IMPORTANT PARTS OF EAST AND CENTRAL AFRICA. THREE YEARS AGO WE WERE FORCED TO CUT OUR WEEKEND NEWSCASTS THERE FOR LACK OF FUNDS. RADIO MOSCOW HAS SINCE INCREASED THEIR BROADCASTING IN SWAHILI.

THE LOSS OF SLOVENE WILL DENY REFORM FORCES IN SLOVENIA AN IMPORTANT WESTERN VOICE IN PERHAPS THE MOST CRITICAL YEAR FOR YUGOSLAVIA SINCE 1948.

ABOLITION OF GREEK AND TURKISH WILL KILL OFF AN IMPORTANT LINK TO AUDIENCES ALONG THE SOUTHERN FLANK OF NATO. WE ARE THE ONLY INTERNATIONAL RADIO IN TURKISH ON MEDIUM WAVE.

FINALLY, UZBEK. WE BROADCAST TO NOT ONLY THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN, BUT TO AUDIENCES IN AFGHANISTAN, AND SINKIANG PROVINCE, CHINA. THERE ARE 30 MILLION UZBEK SPEAKERS IN THE REPUBLIC ALONE. AND OUR CROSS-REPORTING OF EVENTS IN THE CAUCUSES AND BALTIC STATES IS OF TREMENDOUS IMPORTANCE TO UZBEKS IN AND OUT OF THE USSR.

YOU'VE NOTICED THAT IN DESCRIBING THE LANGUAGE SERVICES, I'VE GIVEN REASONS IN EACH CASE WHY THEY SHOULD BE RETAINED. THAT IS BECAUSE, BY ANY STANDARD, THEY SHOULD BE. THEY SHOULD BE ON THE AIR.

BOB COONROD AND I WENT THROUGH THIS WITH GENE KOPP LAST NIGHT. HE AGREES WITH EVERYTHING I'VE SAID. SO DOES STAN SILVERMAN, THE USIA COMPTROLLER. THEY THINK THESE LANGUAGES SHOULD REMAIN ON THE AIR, TOO. GENE KOPP RECOGNIZES THE IMPORTANCE OF WHAT WE DO. <u>BUT WE ARE OUT OF ALTERNATIVES</u>. UNLESS WE ARE HANDED A WINDFALL THESE LANGUAGES ARE DOOMED.

I WANT TO PAY TRIBUTE NOW TO THE PEOPLE WHO MAKE UP EACH OF THESE SERVICES, AND WHO HAVE BEEN SO IMPORTANT TO VOA.

EVERY ONE OF THEM - OUR 57 COLLEAGUES - HAS LOOKED ON HIS OR HER WORK NOT SIMPLY AS A JOB OR A CAREER BUT AS AN OPPORTUNITY TO SERVE THE PEOPLE OF THIS COUNTRY BY SERVING THE PEOPLE OF OTHER COUNTRIES.

IT IS A SAD DAY, AND A TERRIBLE IRONY, THAT YOU WHO LABORED HERE WHEN OUR WORK WAS POORLY UNDERSTOOD OR NOT APPRECIATED AT HOME WILL NOW BE FORCED TO LEAVE WHEN THE SEEDS OF WHAT YOU'VE SOWN ARE FLOURISHING -- AT A TIME WHEN YOUR EFFORTS ARE SO WIDELY RECOGNIZED BY THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

I AM GOING TO READ YOUR NAMES ALOUD OUT OF REGARD FOR THE CONTRIBUTIONS YOU HAVE MADE HERE.

(READS NAMES AND LENGTHS OF SERVICE)

I WANT TO SAY THIS ABOUT YOU.

YOU HELPED PEOPLE TO KNOW AND UNDERSTAND DEMOCRACY. YOU PROMPTED PEACE AND HUMAN DIGNITY. YOU MADE THE IDEALS AND ASPIRATIONS OF THIS COUNTRY COME ALIVE IN THE MINDS OF YOUR LISTENERS.

YOU IMPROVED THEIR LIVES.

YOU SHOULD BE PROUD OF WHAT YOU HAVE DONE. YOU HAVE OUR RESPECT.

YOU REALLY ARE "THE VOICES OF AMERICA."

AFTER WE END, WOULD THOSE WHOSE NAMES I'VE READ PLEASE COME DOWN HERE SO I CAN SPEAK TO YOU PERSONALLY.

JAN BRAMBILLA FROM PERSONNEL IS HERE AS IS BOB COONROD AND SID DAVIS. WE HAVE ALREADY BEGUN TAKING STEPS TO DO EVERYTHING POSSIBLE TO ASSIST YOU IN FINDING OTHER WORK. WE WILL DO IT AGGRESSIVELY. WE HAVE ALREADY BEEN IN CONTACT WITH RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY WHO ARE OFFERING SUPPORT. AND WE HAVE NOTIFIED THE BBC.

OF COURSE WE WILL OFFER SPECIAL HELP TO THOSE OF YOU WHO AREN'T CITIZENS, INCLUDING HOLDERS OF J-1 VISAS AND THEIR FAMILIES.

CAROL WEISS OF THE AGENCY'S REFERRAL AND COUNSELING SERVICE WILL BE AVAILABLE TO YOU FOR HELP .... AS WILL WE ALL.

THANK YOU.

Services of Mead Data Central

35TH STORY OF Level 2 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1990 Central News Agency

FEBRUARY 2, 1990, FRIDAY

LENGTH: 477 words

HEADLINE: CUBA AND PEKING SHUT OUT UNIVERSALLY DESIRED DEMOCRATIC VALUES: BAKER

DATELINE: WASHINGTON, FEB. 1

BODY:

U.S. SECRETARY OF STATE JAMES BAKER THURSDAY NAMED CASTRO'S CUBA AND THE CHINESE COMMUNIST REGIME AS EXAMPLES OF "GOVERNMENTS" THAT TRY TO SHUT OUT UNIVERSALLY DESIRED DEMOCRATIC VALUES.

HE SAID SUCH GOVERNMENTS "SERVE ONLY TO DELAY THEIR PEOPLES' PROGRESS."

REPORTING TO THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE ON THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION'S FOREIGN POLICY PRIORITIES, SECRETARY BAKER LISTED "PROMOTING DEMOCRATIC VALUES" AS THE FIRST OF FIVE FOREIGN POLICY CHALLEGES FACING THE UNITED STATES.

HE REFERRED TO RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN EAST EUROPE AND OTHER CONTINENTS, AND SAID THAT SUCH UNMISTAKABLE TRENDS TOWARD DEMOCRACY THROUGHOUT THE WORLD MAKE THE SETBACKS ALL THE MORE STARK.

THEN HE SAID, "GOVERNMENTS THAT TRY TO SHUT OUT UNIVERSALLY DESIRED DEMOCRATIC VALUES, SUCH AS CASTRO'C CUBA OR IN THE TRAGIC CASE OF (RED) CHINA -- SERVE ONLY TO DELAY THEIR PEOPLES' PROGRESS."

"WE WANT TO SEE ALL NATIONS FREELY AND OPENLY ADVANCE," ADDED SECRETARY BAKER.

THIS WAS THE FIRST TIME SINCE LAST JUNE THAT THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION MADE REFERENCE TO THE CRACKDOWN ON THE CHINESE MAINLAND IN COMPARISON WITH WORLD-WIDE PROGRESS TOWARD DEMOCRACY.

PRESIDENT BUSH, IN HIS STATE OF THE UNION SPEECH TO THE U.S. CONGRESS WEDNESDAY NIGHT, CALLED THE CHANGES IN EAST EUROPE LAST YEAR "THE REVOLUTION OF 89," AND "THE BEGINNING OF A NEW ERA IN THE WORLD'S AFFAIRS." HE NOTED THE CRUMBLING OF COMMUNISM AND SAID THAT "IN THE FAR EAST AND AFRICA, IT IS TIME FOR THE FULL FLOWERING OF FREE GOVERNMENTS AND FREE MARKETS THAT HAVE SERVED AS THE ENGINE OF PROGRESS."

BUT CONSPICUOUSLY ABSENT FROM BUSH'S SPEECH WAS ANY REFERENCE TO DEVELOPMENTS ON THE CHINESE MAINLAND.

IN HIS TESTIMONY BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE THURSDAY, SECRETARY BAKER ALSO LISTED FOSTERING MARKET FORCES, PROMOTING PEACE, PROTECTING THE WORLD COMMUNITY AGAINST TRANSNATIONAL DANGERS, AND STRENGTHENING ALLIANCES AND OTHER TIES AS THE FOREIGN POLICY CHALLENGES FOR THE UNITED STATES.

HE SAID THE URUGUAY ROUND OF GATT NEGOTIATIONS REMAINS THE HIGHEST PRIORITY FOR THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION. "WE ARE WORKING HARD WITH OUR TRADING PARTNERS -- FROM BOTH DEVELOPED AND DEVELOPING NATIONS -- TO COMPLETE A STRONG SET OF

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Services of Mead Data Central

(c) 1990 Central News Agency, FEBRUARY 2, 1990

AGREEMENTS IN DECEMBER 1990," SAID BAKER.

ON ASIAN REGIONAL AFFAIRS, BAKER SAID IT IS THE OBJECTIVE OF THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION TO BRING ABOUT A NEGOTIATED SETTLEMENT IN CAMBODIA THAT WILL VERIFY VIETNAMESE WITHDRAWAL, PREVENT THE RETURN TO POWER OF THE KHMER ROUGE AND PROVIDE GENUINE SELF-DETERMINATION FOR THE PEOPLE OF CAMBODIA.

HE CALLED U.S. SECURITY COMMITMENT TO THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA "ESSENTIAL TO PEACE AND STABILITY ON THE KOREAN PENINSULA." BUT HE ALSO SAID THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION IS "LOOKING FOR A STEADY, RECIPROCAL PROCESS TOWARD BETTER RELATIONS BOTH BETWEEN NORTH AND SOUTH KOREA, AND BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND NORTH KOREA."

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Remarks Delivered by
Secretary Cheney
at the Commissioning of
ABRAHAM LINCOLN (CVN72)

SACMON
DoD.

11 November 1989

Secretary Garrett

Honored guests

Officers and sailors of ABRAHAM LINCOLN and your families

The shipbuilders of Newport News

Fellow citizens.

Our flight today from Washington took us about forty minutes. But those forty minutes covered some 200 years of our history.

We began by passing over Arlington National Cemetery, a reminder for all of us -- especially on Veterans Day -- of the price paid for today's freedom. We flew over national monuments commemorating the battles of the Civil War. As we moved south, we passed the battlefields of First and Second Manassas, Chancellorsville, and flew near the site of the Wilderness campaign. As we came in, we could see where the Revolutionary War ended, a victory made possible by naval power.

The short distance from Washington to Newport News covers an enormous sweep of history. It also provides a reminder of what really matters in defense. What matters is people; the soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines who have volunteered to guarantee our security and defend our liberty. The reason for our presence here today is standing on the decks of ABRAHAM LINCOLN right now.

Today's event should be a celebration, as well as an opportunity to think about serious questions. Commissioning ABRAHAM LINCOLN gives us the chance to reflect upon the need for continued naval and military strength; it gives us the chance to think about President Lincoln's contribution and spirit, and because of the day, it gives us the chance to honor America's veterans. But all of our speeches can hardly add anything to the grandeur of the moment. This occasion speaks for itself.

Today is Veterans' Day. Commissioning a great carrier is proof to veterans that our nation will be capable of defending the ideas and values you fought for. The naming of this ship, ABRAHAM LINCOLN, confirms our adherence to the principles of liberty and equality that LINCOLN stood for and that our veterans have defended. And just look into the faces of these plankowners, whose average age is just about 19. Seeing this crew in action tells us, more than words can, that America's defense remains in capable hands.

So, many words have been and will be spoken about this great ship, about its enormous power and about its part in America's global military reach. But no words can be as important as ones I know all of us want to say: Sailors of ABRAHAM LINCOLN, thank you for your willingness to put on our nation's uniform, to spend months at sea in every part of the globe, and to place yourselves in harm's way for the sake of America's freedom.

The longer I serve as Secretary, the more convinced I become that the key to our military strength isn't technology. It's young people prepared to take on the duties and risks of military service.

And even in peacetime, those risks are brought home to me every day. The accidents of the last several weeks are a troubling reminder of the costs of readiness. Operational preparedness means we have to use the potent weapons of this ship in ways similar to the actual experience of war itself. Our people have to fly the planes, fire the weapons, repair the systems, and test every aspect of fleet operations in a manner that best prepares them for combat. As our sailors will tell you, readiness is both necessary and dangerous. We must seek the highest levels of safety to keep these dangers to a minimum. But all our people in uniform accept these risks, knowing that the greatest risk for them -- and for us -- comes when we are unprepared.

Just a little over a week ago, I spoke with the men of USS AMERICA at sea in the Mediterranean. Today, the AMERICA is secured in the pier right next to this one after months of dangerous operations in the Indian Ocean and the Med, and after having helped evacuate our embassy personnel from Beirut. Her crew performed magnificently and set the standard for fleet operations.

I have to wonder what a young man from the AMERICA might tell LINCOLN's crew before they go to sea. Surely he would mention missing his family. He would mention the hard work. He would no doubt gripe about one thing or another, at the same time he harbored enormous pride in his ship and its men. But he might also mention one important part of his experience in the Indian Ocean and the Med that we here at home often forget. "No matter what you read about peace breaking out in the world," the sailor from the AMERICA might say, "the world is still a very dangerous place."

This fifth Nimitz class carrier will join the other carrier battle groups in a world marked by many threats, but also by remarkable change. The changes are especially clear in the communist world where nations may be moving closer to the dream Abraham Lincoln spoke of over one hundred twenty-five years ago. It's a hope that is particularly relevant to this ship and to its mission, for his dream spells out the deepest reasons why America must remain strong and prepared.

On his trip from Illinois to Washington to take the oath of office in 1861, Lincoln made many stops along the way, accepting cheers of congratulations and speaking to enthusiastic crowds. But he waited until he arrived in Philadelphia to make his most significant remarks. Standing in Independence Hall, where he said "were collected together the wisdom, the patriotism, the devotion to principle, from which sprang the institutions under which we live," Lincoln explained what he thought to be the real meaning of the Declaration of Independence. He said its importance " rests not just on the separation of the colonies from Great Britain, but in the fact that the Declaration gives liberty <u>not alone</u> to the people of this country, <u>but</u> hope to the world for <u>all</u> future time."

The Declaration proclaimed that the rights of liberty and equality were universal. Even at the dawn of the Civil War, Lincoln wanted to make sure America understood that the horrible battles to come had meaning beyond the struggle between North and South.

Today the struggle for freedom around the world echoes Lincoln's dream. In the streets of East Berlin, Leipzig, Budapest, Moscow, and a host of other cities, citizens are demanding that the promise of liberty be realized.

Lincoln was telling us that in preserving the principles of liberty and equality at home, we were doing more than seeing to our self-interest. As the last best hope for liberty, America's obligation was from the beginning a global responsibility to the idea of natural rights. We can never be indifferent to the fate of people demanding that their rights be observed.

Of course, Lincoln's hope that the unalienable rights of the Declaration would some day be enjoyed in all nations means we first have to defend ourselves. But it also means more than that.

Our global military presence, the kind of presence that will be clearly demonstrated by this new carrier, is required if our obligation to the promise of universal natural rights is to be taken seriously.

Indeed, the very fact that we are seeing such things as opening boarders, elections, and freedom marches in the East has a lot to do with our own perseverance in a successful strategy. By building and sustaining strong alliances, maintaining a robust economy, and investing in appropriate military strength, the West has successfully weathered forty years of Cold War.

Now we are seeing--in very human terms--the fruits of our patience and unity. Today, after over forty years, the people of East Germany are embracing freedoms that have been commonplace to us and only dreams to them. One East German said he was going to West Berlin immediately to make sure that this freedom to travel was really not a dream. We are looking forward to a Europe that is whole and free. We've taken a step in that direction this week.

Nothing could please us more than to have the military threat from the Warsaw Pact and the Soviet Union go the way of the crumbling Berlin Wall. But in a period of such rapid change we must look to and preserve the Western alliance.

NATO is a rock in this sea of change. For forty years it has protected freedom and has set the standard for liberty to which so many in the East now aspire. Now, when NATO's example is fostering so much change, is hardly the time for us to reduce any of our commitments.

Despite these important and dramtic changes, there are many steps that must be taken, in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, before we can be certain that the military threat is reduced. History has taught us that the Kremlin is capable of rapid shifts in intentions.

All of us want Soviet reforms to take hold and succeed. But we have to remember that it took five years from keel laying to commissioning to bring us the ABRAHAM LINCOLN. Intentions can change overnight.

If we are to see reforms in the communist world succeed, we cannot do so by abandoning the strategy that has brought us this far. We must maintain the strength of NATO and our own military preparedness.

And we must also resist the concerted Soviet effort to reduce our naval capability through Naval Arms Control. Our need for naval forces transcends any East-West competition. Our global interests demand a global naval capability. ABRAHAM LINCOLN and the carrier GEORGE WASHINGTON, which we will commission in 1991, tell the world we are going to do just that.

To preserve the peace, we must engage our national power through a clear willingness to maintain, and if necessary, use appropriate levels of force. Peacetime engagement in defense of democracy means we are going to need the economic, political, and military tools to uphold our interests and those of our friends and allies.

On the military side of this problem, carrier forces are particularly suitable. Given their flexibility and mobility, carrier battle groups offer us unique capabilities to influence events far from our shores. They are a capability we must preserve.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN will serve this nation well into the next century. It's now capable of accepting our most advanced weapons. It can also handle any new weapons we expect to deploy. LINCOLN'S F-14 force will be replaced one day by the Advanced Tactical Fighter and the A-12 will replace the A-6. This carrier and its crew will be ready for the future.

* * * * *

We have asked and will continue to ask a great deal of the officers and men of ABRAHAM LINCOLN. Each one is here because they chose military over civilian life. None have illusions about the dangers of service. They've just decided they want to be in the thick of things.

For us, this means we have a special obligation. It's an obligation to make sure the crews' families are cared for, to make sure their training is appropriate and safe, and to make sure the American people know about, and appreciate their service.

There is another obligation, and it's one that forces us to remember President Lincoln. As we witness the extension of the rights and liberties Lincoln believed our republic stood for, we must be certain that we always keep in mind the reasons for ships such as this. The carrier LINCOLN stands as our most visible commitment to the belief that "in due time the weights should be lifted from the shoulders of all men and that all should have an equal chance."

Thank you all very much.

THE CONFESSIONS OF JEAN-JACQUES ROUSSEAU

Translated from the French.

With a preface by
EDMUND WILSON

VOLUME I



ALFRED · A · KNOPF
New York · 1923

heart most resembled my own. We were connected with two or three Englishmen of great wit and information, and, like ourselves, passionately fond of music. All these gentlemen had their wives, female friends, or mistresses: the latter were most of them women of talent, at whose apartments there were balls and concerts. There was but little play; a lively turn, talents, and the theatres rendered that amusement insipid. Play is the resource of none but men whose time hangs heavy on their hands. I had brought with me from Paris the prejudice of that city against Italian music; but I had also received from nature a sensibility and niceness of distinction which prejudice cannot withstand. I soon contracted that passion for Italian music with which it inspires all those who are capable of feeling its excellence. In listening to *barcarolles*, I found I had not yet known what singing was, and I soon became so fond of the opera that, tired of babbling, eating, and gaming in the boxes, when I wished to listen I frequently withdrew from the company to another part of the theatre. There, quite alone, shut up in my box, I abandoned myself, notwithstanding the length of the representation, to the pleasure of enjoying it at ease to the conclusion. One evening, at the Theatre of Saint Chrysostom, I fell into a more profound sleep than if I had been in my bed. The loud and brilliant airs did not disturb my repose. But who can explain the delicious sensations given me by the soft harmony of the angelic music by which I was charmed from sleep? What an awakening! what ravishment! what ecstasy, when at the same instant I opened my ears and eyes! My first idea was to believe I was in paradise. The ravishing air, which I still recollect and shall never forget, began with these words —

'Conservami la bella
Che si m'accende il cor.'

I was desirous of having it; I had and kept it for a time; but it was not the same thing upon paper as in my head. The notes were the same, but the thing was different. This divine composition can never be executed but in my mind in the same manner as it was on the evening when it awoke me from sleep.

A kind of music far superior, in my opinion, to that of operas, and which in all Italy has not its equal, nor perhaps in the whole world, is that of the *scuole*. The *scuole* are houses of charity, established for the education of young girls without fortune, to whom the Republic afterwards gives a portion either in marriage or for the cloister. Amongst talents cultivated in these young girls, music is in the first rank. Every Sunday at the church of each of the four *scuole*, during vespers, motets or anthems, with full choruses, accompanied by a great orchestra, and composed and directed by the best masters in Italy, are sung in the galleries by girls only, not one of whom is more than twenty years of age. I have not an idea of anything so voluptuous and affecting as this music: the richness of the art, the exquisite taste of the vocal parts, the excellence of the voices, the justness of the execution, everything in these delightful concerts concurs to produce an impression which certainly is not in exact accordance with the taste of the day, but from which I am of opinion no heart is secure. Carrio and I never failed being present at these vespers of the *Mendicanti*, and we were not alone. The church was always full of lovers of the art, and even the actors of the Opera came there to form their tastes after these excellent models. What vexed me was the accursed iron grate, which suffered nothing to escape but sounds, and concealed from me the angels of which they were worthy. I talked of nothing else. One day I spoke of it at Monsieur Le Blond's. 'If you are so desirous,' said he, 'to

see those little girls, it will be an easy matter to satisfy your wishes. I am one of the administrators of the house, I will give you a collation with them.' I did not let him rest until he had fulfilled his promise. In entering the saloon which contained those beauties I so much longed to see, I felt a trembling of love which I had never before experienced. Monsieur Le Blond presented to me, one after the other, these celebrated female singers, of whom the names and voices were all with which I was acquainted. 'Come, Sophia': she was horrid. 'Come, Cattina': she had but one eye. 'Come, Bettina': the smallpox had entirely disfigured her. Scarcely one of them was without some striking defect. He laughed cruelly at my surprise; however, two or three of them appeared tolerable; these never sang but in the choruses; I was almost in despair. During the collation, we endeavoured to attract their attention, and they soon became enlivened; ugliness does not exclude the graces, which I found they possessed. I said to myself, 'They cannot sing in this manner without intelligence and sensibility, they must have both'; in fine, my manner of seeing them changed to such a degree that I left the house almost in love with each of these ugly faces. I had had scarcely courage enough to return to their vespers; I had now gained reassurance. I still found their singing delightful; and their voices so much embellished their persons, that whilst they sang, in spite of my eyes, I obdurately continued to think them beautiful.]

Music in Italy is accompanied with so trifling an expense that it is not worth while for such as have a taste for it to deny themselves the pleasure it affords. I hired a harpsichord, and for half a crown I had at my apartment four or five symphonists, with whom I practised once a week in executing such airs as had given me most pleasure at the Opera. I also had some symphonies per-

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release February 3, 1989

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
AND SECRETARY OF COMMERCE ROBERT MOSBACHER
AT SWEARING-IN CEREMONY

Department of Commerce

10:40 A.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you for that warm welcome. This is a very special occasion for me because, as most -- I'd say please be seated, but -- (laughter) -- I don't think that would go over too well back there. What a wonderful, wonderful turnout for our new Secretary. But this is a special occasion. Bob Mosbacher and I have been friends for a quarter of a century, more; and I trust his advice, I respect what he's accomplished in business, and I know he will be a very valuable member of our economic team.

It's also an honor for me to participate in this swearing-in in a hall that's named after another dear friend of mine, Mac Baldrige. He was a tremendous Secretary of Commerce and I know he would have been so pleased to see that this Department, which meant so much to him, will be in such capable hands.

When what was then called the Department of Commerce and Labor, established back in 1903, Congressman Charles Cochran described what he believed were the ideal qualifications for the Secretary. He said, "Above everything, he should be a man of affairs, acquainted with the vast subject with which he must deal, vigilant, enterprising, resourceful, and possessed of the sagacity which distinguishes the American men of business from all others."

Well, ladies and gentlemen, those of you who know anything about Bob Mosbacher know that he fits that description to a tee. And he's a savvy international businessman, an entrepreneur who built his own extraordinarily successful business and kept it on solid footing even during tough economic times. He also is known as a world-class sailor, won international and national championships, and to use a sailing analogy, he will now take the helm at Commerce and help chart America's economic course into a new era of prosperity.

It's Bob's mission to foster, promote, and develop the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States; a mission that's easily stated, but not so easily executed. As Secretary, he will promote American exports aggressively, continue our support of R&D -- research and development -- operate an export control program balanced between safeguarding security and encouraging exports, responsibly manage our vast national fisheries resources, and play an important role in this administration's efforts to clean up the oceans and America's coastlines. I know that preserving and protecting the environment is a special concern of Secretary Mosbacher's. Bob will work with business to create innovative programs and achieve scientific breakthroughs in manufacturing, transportation, communications and other areas to guarantee that the United States maintains its leadership role in the world marketplace.

Both Bob and I are committed to making America more competitive than ever before. Our businesses can compete with anyone, anywhere in the world if we're given a fair chance. Our commitment to free and fair trade will enable us to ensure that our trading partners respect our right to compete in their marketplace,

while they compete fairly in ours.

Bob has a big job ahead of him. But whether it's trade, or tourism, or NOAA, or the Bureau of Standards, Minority Business Development, the Census -- any of the important areas of this Department -- I know that he has a great team behind him, willing to give 100 percent. And one of the reasons I wanted to come here to the Deparment is to express my confidence in those of you who have worked as careers for the federal government.

The growth of commerce, both nationally and internationally, is the key to guaranteeing that America's most productive and prosperous days are still ahead. As a fellow Texan said recently, Bob Mosbacher is the right man to do the job that has to be done. So I came over here to wish him well -- wish all of you well.

Mr. Secretary, congratulations, good luck and God bless you.

And now, Secretary Baker will do the honors. (Applause.)

(The Secretary is sworn in.) (Applause.)

SECRETARY MOSBACHER: Mr. President, Secretary Baker, if I may digress for a second, to wonderful, wonderful Americans who this country is so proud of and so lucky to have -- friends of over 30 years -- thank you, sir. And, of course, my family and, of course, all of us who are going to work together -- fellow employees of the Department of Commerce.

I look forward with great enthusiasm to addressing the challenges and opportunities the American people have in several vital, important walks of our national life.

Mr. President, on behalf of this Department of Commerce, we accept our mission. Of course, it's a mission -- and a major objective or ours at this Department is to promote our economic growth and competiveness. We must ensure that trade is a two-way street for American business by expanding overseas markets for top U.S. goods and services while ensuring fair competition through effective enforcement of our trade laws.

Another vitally important mission is to improve the beauty and quality of our oceans, shorelines, and estuaries. Our fine people in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration -- NOAA as it's known to all of you and now many of us -- are already working vigorously at cleaning up our oceans. But, of course, even though they're working on this, more work can and must be done because we have been blessed with abundance of beautiful natural resources, including our oceans, estuaries, our beaches, our shoreline, and we must do all in our power to preserve and protect these precious assets.

Third, as an old sailor, I know how vitally important it is to keep our weather forecasts accurate and our warnings early. You know, Mr. President, there are a lot of people in this country who view Willard Scott as our weatherman. (Laughter.) But we in this Department know that NOAA is the bureau that serves as the provider of the meteorlogical data to the nation's weathermen, and so we are really your weathermen.

We must also enforce our national capability to develop the best in modern technology. We must pursue policies that will speed commercialization of technology. Our new technology administration will be in the forefront of this effort. Our colleagues in economic affairs must continue their diligent efforts to measure efficiently and accurately the successes and failings of our diverse economy. In the same vein, we must ensure an accurate and fair census in 1990.

A challenge? Sure, and a tough one. But to do anything

less than to strive to succeed as never before would not be right.

Finally, let me say, Mr. President, we have -- you have given us -- and to me and to all of us here -- a special assignment that is near and dear to your heart. We know this. Specifically, we're going to strengthen the Minority Business Development Agency so that all Americans will have the fullest opportunity to participate and enjoy the great American dream. It's important and it must happen.

I'm humbled by the challenges that lie before us and confident that together we will offer our hands to help achieve our President's goals. As Reverend Parker said, if we work together, all is possible.

Again, my thanks to you, sir, to the family I love, and to all of you. Together we can do the job. God bless you. (Applause.)

END 10:52 A.M. EST

Services of Mead Data Central

4TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1989 The Washington Post

March 24, 1989, Friday, Final Edition

SECTION: EDITORIAL; PAGE A23

LENGTH: 976 words

KRAUTHAMMER 1 SIDE. 2/20→ 4/1

HEADLINE: Democracy Has Won

BYLINE: Charles Krauthammer

BODY:

In1928, excited by a recent discovery regarding the electron, physicist Max Born declared, somewhat prematurely, that "physics, as we know it, will be over in six months." It has occurred to me, excited as I am about Boris Yeltsin and the Soviet election campaign, that it may not be premature to say that political philosophy is over. Finished. Solved.

The perennial question that has preoccupied every political philosopher since Plato -- what is the best form of governance? has been answered. After a few millennia of trying every form of political system, we close this millennium with the sure knowledge that in liberal, pluralist, capitalist democracy we have found what we have been looking for.

And not just we. This decade has seen the rest of the world register its agreement that to be modern -- to be advanced and humane -- is to embrace such Western political values as pluralism, democracy and free markets. The verdict is in from Korea, Chile, the Philippines, much of Africa, Poland, Hungary, China. And now, mirabile dictu, the Soviet Union.

"The majority of developing countries," declares a leading Soviet Foreign Ministry official, "suffer not so much from capitalism as from lack of it." The Kremlin's ideology chief then declares that the Soviet Union needs to introduce three elements into its political life: democratization, pluralism and the rule of law. And now Yeltsin, as if to give these pronouncements life, is raising hell in his race for the new Congress of People's Deputies.

Of course, outside the West the practice of democracy is rare. But the triumph of the Western political idea is complete. Its rivals have been routed. Fascism was put to the sword 40 years ago. Communism was put to the test and has now expired, at 70, of massive complications. What models are left? Islamic fundamentalism? African socialism? Nasserism? The jig is up. Political theory, at least the part concerned with defining the good polity, is finished. The Western idea of governance has prevailed.

Yes, a few holdouts remain, mostly some Western eccentrics holed up in academia and the church, Marxism's last two sanctuaries. And yes, some details remain to be worked out: questions of written v. traditional bills of rights, presidential v. parliamentary systems, proportional representation v. constituency electoral systems. Someone has to figure out how mixed the economy should be and how to limit campaign contributions. We will always need the Kennedy School. But the basic question is definitively answered.

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Services of Mead Data Central

(c) 1989 The Washington Post, March 24, 1989

The end of ideology began when Western communists, intellectuals and other adolescents gave up their Marxist illusions in response to the successive Soviet betrayals of 1939, 1956, 1968 and in recent years, to Solzhenitsyn, Afghanistan and Poland. The next stage occurred when the newly decolonized states of the Third World, after initially identifying socialism as both their natural ally and their destiny, had second thoughts.

Then China renounced in all but name its Marxist and Maoist pretensions. That was Communism's Reformation. Now the denouement: in Moscow, the Vatican is losing its faith. I asked Natan Sharansky, whose specialty is understanding the Soviet mind (it kept him alive for nine years in the Gulag), what Gorbachev still believes of Marxism-Leninism. "He believes that socialism stands for a certain dignity among men," said Sharansky. "Beyond that, nothing."

The triumph of the Western idea was not at all anticipated a generation ago when the theory in vogue was convergence, the idea that West and East were moving inexorably toward each other. As market democracies became more centralized and hierarchical, they, like the command societies of the East, would evolve into that Leviathan, "the new industrial state." It has not happened.

Why not? Consider computers. In the days of Univac, it was assumed that computers would centralize control of information in the hands of government and other large organizations. Computers do that. But what was not anticipated was that they would also give individuals such enormous access to the world of information and such power to disseminate (e.g. desk-top publishing). Give an individual a computer, a copier, a phone and a fax and he becomes a movement. No revolution has ever given more power to the people.

Admittedly, it takes some hubris to say that Western democracy circa 1989 is history's answer to its political questions. It is easy to write triumphantly of Western democracy in this temporary historical lull, when the economy is growing, unemployment is low, social unrest is rare and our world is at peace. What about the next crisis?

Well, what about it. In the Depression, people could flee to Communism or Fascism or some alternative messianism. Assume a coming economic crisis. It will produce reformers and various stripes of "populist." But all within the democratic framework. There is no credible alternative ideology. There is no end to our social problems. But we have reached an end of sorts in our deepest political thinking.

This is not to say that liberal democracy is the system for every stage of history. If we were to discover a race of Neanderthals, we would not impose on them a two-party system. But for modern technological states, and emerging ones as well, there is no better system. And none is in sight. Perhaps in the next century, when technology has completely transformed society and perhaps our own biology, a new system will present itself. But I cannot imagine it. And I don't expect to live to see it.

Amid the breezy metaphors of his inaugural address, President Bush got it right. "For the first time in this century -- for the first time in perhaps all history," he said, "we don't have to talk late into the night about which form of government is better." We know.

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Services of Mead Data Central

(c) 1989 The Washington Post, March 24, 1989

Lights out.

TYPE: OPINION EDITORIAL

SUBJECT: U.S.S.R.; COMMUNISM; VOTING / ELECTIONS; POLITICAL POSITIONS / PHILOSOPHY

NAME: BORIS YELTSIN

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Services of Mead Data Central

3RD STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1989 Newsday, Inc.;
Newsday

March 26, 1989, Sunday, NASSAU AND CITY EDITION

SECTION: IDEAS; Pg. 06
Other Edition: Suffolk Pg. 8

LENGTH: 1240 words

HEADLINE: Is the White House Sideshow Finally Over?

BYLINE: By Hugh Sidey. Hugh Sidey is Washington contributing editor of Time magazine. This is adapted from a speech he gave at the Gannett Center for Media Studies at Columbia University.

KEYWORD: OPINION; RONALD REAGAN; MEDIA; PRESIDENT

BODY:

MORE THAN 50 years ago, as a young boy in a small town out in western Iowa, I remember coming home from my dad's print shop and that little weekly paper on many nights in which the dust storms came out of the west. There was drought, there was desperation all around me. And I can remember turning on the old cathedral-style radio and listening to the sportscaster in Des Moines, "Dutch" Reagan. He was the only happy man in Iowa.

I never forgot it. More than 50 years later, I went to the White House and there he was: He looked the same, talked the same, thought the same, ate the same, read the same. He was in the same suit. I would swear it. And on most days he was the only happy man in Washington.

So it boggles my mind to think back over this half century that that man, Ronald Reagan, could become president. I was in Moscow with him last spring and in Red Square. And there was "Dutch" Reagan, a man who had risen to power on his condemnation of the Soviet system, and he's hiking arm in arm with Mikhail Gorbachev, chucking babies, smiling, laughing, and over behind him the were moldering remains of Lenin, whom he condemned his entire career.

I remember back when I first went to the White House and Jim Hagerty was press secretary and Dwight Eisenhower was president. And I remember that there would be about 20 of us on a normal day, and we'd go up to Hagerty's desk and stand there. And more days than not, Hagerty would come down and say, "Boys, there's no story today," and we'd go off and have lunch, take a nap and forget it. There was no demand to be on the nightly news, there was no studio on the front lawn. Ike didn't seem compelled to have to appear on the evening rundown. I slowly watched that change over the years.

I remember the arrival of John Kennedy and the discovery of television and the power of it, those press conferences that he held in the afternoons over at the State Department, his understanding that every announcement from the government somehow reflected on him, and he began to gather in those lines. We no longer ran over to the Pentagon if a U-2 went down. We no longer went to the State Department for the Suez crisis, as we'd done in Eisenhower's time. We stayed at the White House, and the people began to come near.

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Services of Mead Data Central

(c) 1989 Newsday, March 26, 1989

And so the power grew, and our group grew bigger and bigger, more intense. And then Lyndon Johnson discovered that he wanted to have some say about every announcement that was made, and so virtually everyone of any consequence in that entire government came through the White House. We suddenly discovered that we were supposed to be instant experts on missiles, megatons, tax reform, pension reform, the Great Society, poverty. There was no way that any White House correspondent could absorb all of that.

Finally, perhaps sometime in the Carter era, it seems to me that on the daily beat, much of it anyway, we ceased to be involved in journalism. Covering the presidency, to an alarming degree, became reviewing a soap opera every day.

It was principally a matter of television. Out of that came a star system, principally for television reporters, but involving all of us. We shared that limelight, we traveled, it was glamorous. When we hit a city or a small country, it took them months to recover from that entourage.

There was Sander Vanocur, and old Bill Lawrence of ABC, and then of course their modern counterparts Tom Brokaw and Dan Rather covering the White House. And there was Sam Donaldson, who stands as the symbol for the kind of coverage we give the White House now.

I don't believe Sam Donaldson is in journalism exactly. He's a good reporter, he's a good journalist when he's away from the White House, thoughtful, all of those things. I like him. He's fun, he's interesting, he's bright. But when he gets on the White House stage - and maybe they're all affected that way, and certainly there are others who follow his lead - he is something else.

He found a partner finally in Ronald Reagan. The two came together, they used each other. Sam Donaldson was involved not so much in enlightenment or finding out what went on, he was involved in confronting the president.

Of course he will argue that he had to do that to penetrate the shell of Ronald Reagan. But Reagan was the consummate actor and all he wanted to do was stand up there and tell the country what he wanted to tell it.

But it seemed to me that that system became corrupted as it went on. Sam's principal interest was humiliating, harassing or otherwise showing the president to be a dummy. Not very hard, on some days, I might add.

They were each other's foils, in essence. It was a good partnership. So Sam came to work, and the other people too, and there were the helicopters and the Rose Garden and Buckingham Palace and Red Square. And almost always on the nightly news, you could come up with a confrontation or some kind of a sort of a minidrama that would get a few seconds. And Sam was a star and Reagan was a star, and so the world turns night after night.

I think out of that we began to worship the processes of government and governing, of presidency, more than what happened. We began to worry that there weren't enough press conferences. We wanted more press conferences, even though those press conferences became a sham, an East Room extravaganza, for which, all day, the president prepped on how to avoid answering questions.

Whereas we felt that presidents walled themselves away, it was also true that there were too many of us. We went from 20 reporters to 200 every day, from

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Services of Mead Data Central

(c) 1989 Newsday, March 26, 1989

news demanded once a day to every 15 minutes, to keep up with the recurring broadcasts.

I'm not sure that a president's first 100 days is exactly the yardstick we should use in judging him, but nevertheless it's a time of change. Well, what is the change? It is that the office of the presidency takes on the personal dimensions of the man. I could tell the day after Ronald Reagan took over the White House, by calling the switchboard, just from the manner that they answered.

It's a different White House now. That's George Bush's town down there. He's lived in it 21 years, six jobs. If you turned Ronald Reagan loose tonight with an automobile and told him to drive to the Capitol, he couldn't find his way.

George Bush knows Washington, the secret hideaways. His picture is on every delicatessen's wall because he'd been there.

If reporters ask him about tax reform, and he talks about it in detail, this may put us a to a test. How many 15-second bites are they going to have on the nightly news of Bush talking about his notions of free trade?

Now George Bush when he talks sometimes doesn't have his verbs and his objects in the right order, or leaves them out, so it's a little hard to follow him. But the confrontational sort of journalism we've had is going to diminish, I suspect. You've got different people, different personalities.

Above all, you have George Bush, who is going to talk about the issues in a substantive way. I suspect that we're going to have more press conferences of a different nature, more backgrounders, more little meetings. It's going to be different. I suspect if we want the news from the White House, we're going to have to go to the Pentagon and to the Hill and to the State Department. We're going to have to once again begin to cover the city and not just wait around for some kind of drama.

GRAPHIC: Newsday Color illustration by Gary Viskupic-Television picture of Sam Donaldson bashing the President, Ronald Reagan, with a baseball bat superimposed on a drawing of the White House

EXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

Dan
1/6

MARCH 9, 1990

MEMORANDUM FOR CHRISS WINSTON

FROM: DEB AMEND

RE: UNSOLICITED SPEECH QUOTE

Chriss, attached are a couple of pages from Mark Twain's "Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court." I'm sure you know the story, a guy from Connecticut gets time warped back to King Arthur's day. He talks about what democracy means -- its been one of my favorite passages for years -- and it occurs to me that it might be something to quote in a speech.

buried him at midnight at the crossroads with a stake through his back, and his master the baron or the bishop confiscated all his property and turned his widow and his orphans out of doors.

And here were these freemen assembled in the early morning to work on their lord the bishop's road three days each—gratis, every head of a family, and every son of a family, three days each, gratis, and a day or so added for their servants. Why, it was like reading about France and the French before the ever memorable and blessed Revolution, which swept a thousand years of such villainy away in one swift tidal wave of blood—one: a settlement of that hoary debt in the proportion of half a drop of blood for each hogshead of it that had been pressed by slow tortures out of that people in the weary stretch of ten centuries of wrong and shame and misery the like of which was not to be mated but in hell. There were two "Reigns of Terror," if we would but remember it and consider it; the one wrought murder in hot passion, the other in heartless cold blood; the one lasted mere months, the other had lasted a thousand years; the one inflicted death upon ten thousand persons, the other upon a hundred millions; but our shudders are all for the "horrors" of the minor Terror, the momentary Terror, so to speak, whereas what is the horror of swift death by the ax compared with life-long death from hunger, cold, insult, cruelty, and heart-break? What is swift death by lightning compared with death by slow fire at the stake? A city cemetery could contain the coffins filled by that brief Terror which we have all been so diligently taught to shiver at and mourn over, but all France could hardly contain the coffins filled by that older and real Terror—that unspeakably bitter and awful Terror which none of us has been taught to see in its vastness or pity as it deserves.

These poor ostensible freemen who were sharing their breakfast and their talk with me were as full of humble reverence for their king and Church and nobility as their worst enemy could desire. There was something pitifully ludicrous about it. I asked them if they supposed a nation of people ever existed, who, with a free vote in every man's hand, would elect that a single family and its descendants should reign over it forever, whether gifted or boobies, to the exclusion of all other families—including the voter's—and would also elect that a certain hundred families should be raised to dizzy summits of rank and clothed on with offensive transmissible glories and privileges to the exclusion of the rest of the nation's families—*including his own.*

They all looked unhit and said they didn't know, that they had never thought about it before, and it hadn't ever occurred to them that a nation could be so situated that every man *could* have a say in the government. I said I had seen one—and that it would last until it had an Established Church. Again they were all unhit—at first. But presently one man looked up and asked me to state that proposition again and state it slowly, so it could soak into his understanding. I did it, and after a little he had the idea, and he brought his fist down and said *he* didn't believe a nation where every man had a vote would voluntarily get down in the mud and dirt in any such way, and that to steal from a nation its will and preference must be a crime and the first of all crimes. I said to myself:

"This one's a man. If I were backed by enough of his sort, I would make a strike for the welfare of this country and try to prove myself its loyalest citizen by making a wholesome change in its system of government."

You see my kind of loyalty was loyalty to one's country, not to its institutions or its office-holders. The coun-

try is the real thing, the substantial thing, the eternal thing; it is the thing to watch over and care for and be loyal to; institutions are extraneous, they are its mere clothing, and clothing can wear out, become ragged, cease to be comfortable, cease to protect the body from winter, disease, and death. To be loyal to rags, to shout for rags, to worship rags, to die for rags—that is a loyalty of unreason, it is pure animal; it belongs to monarchy, was invented by monarchy; let monarchy keep it. I was from Connecticut, whose Constitution declares "that all political power is inherent in the people, and all free governments are founded on their authority and instituted for their benefit; and that they have *at all times* an undeniable and indefeasible right to *alter their form of government* in such a manner as they may think expedient."

Under that gospel, the citizen who thinks he sees that the commonwealth's political clothes are worn out, and yet holds his peace and does not agitate for a new suit, is disloyal; he is a traitor. That he may be the only one who thinks he sees this decay, does not excuse him; it is his duty to agitate anyway, and it is the duty of the others to vote him down if they do not see the matter as he does.

And now here I was, in a country where a right to say how the country should be governed was restricted to six persons in each thousand of its population. For the nine hundred and ninety-four to express dissatisfaction with the regnant system and propose to change it would have made the whole six shudder as one man, it would have been so disloyal, so dishonorable, such putrid black treason. So to speak, I was become a stockholder in a corporation where nine hundred and ninety-four of the members furnished all the money and did all the work, and the other six elected themselves a

permanent board of direction and took all the dividends. It seemed to me that what the nine hundred and ninety-four dupes needed was a new deal. The thing that would have best suited the circus side of my nature would have been to resign the Boss-ship and get up an insurrection and turn it into a revolution, but I knew that the Jack Cade or the Wat Tyler who tries such a thing without first educating his materials up to revolution grade is almost absolutely certain to get left. I had never been accustomed to getttng left, even if I do say it myself. Wherefore, the "deal" which had been for some time working into shape in my mind was of a quite different pattern from the Cade-Tyler sort.

So I did not talk blood and insurrection to that man there who sat munching black bread with that abused and mistaught herd of human sheep, but took him aside and talked matter of another sort to him. After I had finished, I got him to lend me a little ink from his veins, and with this and a sliver I wrote on a piece of bark—

Put him in the Man-factory—

and gave it to him, and said:

"Take it to the palace at Camelot and give it into the hands of Amyas le Poulet, whom I call Clarence, and he will understand."

"He is a priest, then," said the man, and some of the enthusiasm went out of his face.

"How—a priest? Didn't I tell you that no chattel of the Church, no bond-slave of pope or bishop can enter my Man-factory? Didn't I tell you that *you* couldn't enter unless your religion, whatever it might be, was your own free property?"

"Marry, it is so and for that I was glad; wherefore it liked me not, and bred in me a cold doubt, to hear of this priest being there."

1980 → called 411 for Bush Camp. HDQ. ##.

You know he is a member of the Trilateral Comm.

Delta

Preliminary Confirmation

Unitech

$203

Dulles

#1426, Apr 26 4:05 - 5:17 13A/

#1443 Sun Apr 29 12:15 - 1:19 5A/

or May 3rd — same: $203

May 6th

53 96 16

94 72 11

- 226 4

nism, will be identified with the deprivations the population has suffered. When Mandela speaks of nationalization, he is not caught in a time warp or simply parroting ANC positions. He is keeping faith with a constituency that sees South Africa's cruel migrant labor system as an economically useful tool developed in the mines.

That does not mean that the end result in South Africa has to be the economic wasteland that nationalization, poor management and wholesale theft by government have created in Zambia and other independent African nations to the north. South Africa has the resources and talent to be different.

Mining companies and other institutions that helped create the monster of apartheid have led the way over the past decade in trying to chart a future beyond apartheid. In freeing Mandela, de Klerk follows a trail blazed by Afrikaner and English-speaking businessmen who have sought out the ANC for dialogue.

To set the stage for successful negotiations, the government must stop enforcing economic disadvantage on blacks. In 1950, Afrikaner Prime Minister D. F. Malan proudly told the nation that policies that came to be known as apartheid would ensure "adequate wages, better and safer working conditions and old-age provision" for the white population. Malan kept his word to the whites. De Klerk now needs to make in good faith a similar pledge to black South Africans.

This should persuade Mandela and the ANC to rely on the shifting balance of forces in the South African political economy rather than on radical and destabilizing measures. Mandela needs to show how he will give content to his stated intention to avoid widespread disruption for the white minority as change comes.

The words and deeds of Mandela and de Klerk have lit the horizon of a new future for South Africa. They cannot say what the future will be, but they are asking the right question at this stage: What can it be? It should be a future beyond apartheid, a future of economic justice for both races

volume of prison correspondence, "Letters to Olga," and before that through much of his dramatic work: the effect on people's moral fiber of an immoral regime; the ways pressure makes them betray each other, the decay and the self-justifyings. Havel's plays against the intellectual, who can afford the luxury of keeping himself clean—doesn't he realize that it's a luxury even to care whether you're straight or corrupt, to feel that it matters to anyone, a luxury not available to a "brewery hick"? "Principles! Sure you hang on to your f--ing principles! You know damned more about him than we do about most presidents, then reading and seeing his plays means that we, too, can listen to Havel with at least a glimmer of understanding of the challenges he will face.

The writer is a member of the editorial page staff.

The result, however, is the same. It is to litter the arena of discussion with eggshells and mines, so that anyone who speaks loosely of a taboo subject risks being blown sky-high. CBS News is very big on the Four Freedoms, including freedom of speech. But the next time it mounts its high horse to battle the latest raid upon free speech by the yahoos of the right, I shall recall the fate of Andy Rooney and laugh. Not that laughing will be much fun.

Timothy E. Wirth

Hotter and Hotter in the Greenhouse

Photo Copy Preservation

Taking Exception

In its lead editorial of Feb. 7, The Post continues the media pattern of oversimplifying the state of scientific knowledge about global warming. A bewildering false debate persists about what we know and don't know about global warming.

The Post's editorial—"Getting Warmer?"—asserts that "true, the evidence of global warming so far is confused and inconclusive." The editorial goes on to praise the administration for "taking the implications of global warming seriously, as its predecessor did not" and for "fighting over the right questions." The editorial avers further that "no case exists yet for the kind of emergency action that would require disruptive and hugely expensive changes in the economy."

In my opinion, the case for strong action is clear, and the administration has not come close to taking this issue seriously enough. Claiming "scientific uncertainty," the administration has relegated the United States to the sidelines at international meetings about how we deal with this monumental problem.

Simply put, a handful of environmental naysayers have overwhelmed the chorus of scientific experts who are urging societies to take concrete steps to avoid climatic catastrophe. Most recently, half of this nation's Nobel Laureates, 64 recipients of the National Medal of Science and almost half of the members of the National Academy of Sciences have signed a declaration calling for an end to our complacency.

We were promised the "White House effect." What we've gotten from the administration is more like the whitewash effect.

Those who, like the administration, argue that not enough is known about the problem rely on scientific assertions that are shaky at best. The two most widely distributed critiques of global warming warnings have been "Scientific Perspectives on the Greenhouse Problem," issued by the George C. Marshall Institute, and an unpublished report by Dr. Richard Lindzen of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Surprisingly, the two documents questioning global warning science have never been peer reviewed, as is standard scientific practice. Both reports have been torn apart by the scientific community. The journal Science has published blistering critiques of these reports in recent issues—calling the Marshall report a "slim, unreferred report that many scientists have dismissed as biased and misleading [that] is said to be at least partly behind the White House's recent temporizing on climate change." Two senior White House officials are "impressed with the report. . . . We have a coherent policy in the federal government that is not inconsistent with the Marshall Institute report."

Indeed, these views are raised at every turn by individuals unable or unwilling to sort through the facts—including the media. Once again, these were the views presented by the administration at the recent meeting of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. The president's speech was yet another chapter in a long history of delay. We were promised the "White House effect" in 1988, and what we've gotten from the administration is more like the whitewash effect. To wit: "We acknowledge a broad spectrum of views on these issues . . . where politics and opinion have outpaced the science, we are accelerating our support of the technology to bridge that gap."

The science on this subject is clear. Scientists know that we live in a "greenhouse." Without the water vapor and other gases that exist in the atmosphere, the planet would be about 60 degrees cooler than it is today. We also know that the human species is rapidly increasing the concentrations of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. There can be no debate on this score; it can and has been measured.

There is broad consensus that the Earth will warm. I have not seen any peer-review scientific articles that assert that current greenhouse gas emissions rates will not cause global warming in the future. The question is not whether the Earth will warm but how much and how soon. And our top scientists are telling us that they fear a dramatic, unprecedented and perhaps catastrophic warming.

Clearly, we need to continue a strong program of research to answer these questions. But I would argue against The Post's view that no case exists yet for emergency action. We are gambling with the climatic underpinnings upon which all societies depend for survival.

We must develop a comprehensive national energy policy that makes reduction of greenhouse gases and air pollutants a national objective. Energy conservation, as The Post points out, must be the cornerstone of this effort in United States, where we use twice as much energy per unit of GNP as do our prime economic competitors. Why, then, has this administration proposed cuts for energy conservation programs in its recent budget?

Similarly, we should embark on an all-out program to develop nonpolluting sources of energy—whether it be new solar panels or a new, safe generation of nuclear power plants. Third, we need to find new uses for the cleanest burning of the fossil fuels—natural gas. Fourth, the rich and the poor nations must reach an agreement to protect and replant forests—our natural atmospheric filters.

Finally, the United States must reassert itself as the world's leader in the effort to halt the staggering pace of population growth.

Global environmental ills have replaced the Cold War as the greatest threats to international security, and we do nothing. We must change course.

The writer, a Democratic senator from Colorado and member of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, is the author of global warming legislation.

FINAL

"THE WINDS OF CHANGE"

INTERNATIONAL HOUSE OF CHICAGO

DELIVERED BY

MAX M. KAMPELMAN

University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

October 30, 1989

It has been ten months and ten days since I left government service with its different, exciting, and enriching challenges. It has been suggested that I use this occasion to stand back and evaluate the dramatic world changes I have had the privilege of observing and experiencing.

The object of our nation's diplomacy is to preserve our security and our values in a condition of peace. But this proud word, "peace", has historically run the risk of being distorted. There is the "peace" of the grave; the "peace" that reigns in a well-disciplined prison or gulag; the peace that may plant, with its terms, the seeds of a future war. Certainly those are not what our dreamers and philosophers have yearned for. It is peace with dignity that we seek. It is peace with liberty that is the indispensable ingredient for the evolution of Man from the species homo sapiens to the species "human being."

From the Desk of: MAX M. KAMPELMAN

Suite 800
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 639-7020

It occurred to me that this might interest you. Feel free to use excerpts from it.

MMK

Men and women seem capable of mobilizing their talents to unravel the mysteries of their physical environment. We have learned to fly through space like birds and move in deep waters like fish, but how to live and love on this small planet as brothers and sisters still eludes us. The immense challenge to our society is to find and develop the basis for lasting peace among the peoples of the world so that they might live in dignity. In this rapidly moving nuclear age, the significance of that goal cannot be overstated.

The fundamental fact is that the world is changing so fast and so dramatically that we can barely see its details let alone its scope. During my father's day, there was no income tax; no Federal Reserve; no vitamin tablets; no refrigerators; no transcontinental telephones; no plastics; no man-made fibers; no fluorescent lights; no Social Security; no unemployment insurance; no airmail; no airlines; no Xerox; no air-conditioning; no antibiotics; no frozen foods; no television; no transistors.

China → FAX....

During my lifetime, medical knowledge available to physicians has probably increased more than ten-fold. More than 80% of all scientists who ever lived are alive today. More than 100,000 scientific journals annually publish the

flood of new knowledge that pours out of the world's laboratories. The average life span is now nearly twice as great as it was when my grandparents were born. Advanced computers, new materials, new bio-technological processes are altering every phase of our lives, deaths, even reproduction.

These developments are stretching our minds and our grasp of reality to the outermost dimensions of our capacity to understand them. Moreover, as we look ahead, we must agree that we have only the minutest glimpse of what our universe really is. Our science is indeed a drop, our ignorance an ocean.

Economic, technological, and communication advances have made global interdependence a reality. Economic power and industrial capacity are ever more widely dispersed around the world. Our political and economic institutions are feeling the stress of these pressures as they try to digest their implications. We have yet to come to grips with a world in which the combined gross national product of Europe, for example, exceeds that of the United States; and the gross national product of Japan exceeds that of the Soviet Union; while the economies of South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore have moved, in the space of a generation, to international influence far beyond their relative size. And we

have yet to settle on an international legal and regulatory framework to cope with a world where economic interdependence blurs the origin of products, and where international financial flows in a single day (about $1 trillion) equal our government's annual budget.

We are brought up to believe that necessity is the mother of invention. I suggest the corollary is also true: invention is the mother of necessity. Technology and communication have made the world smaller. There is no escaping the fact that the sound of a whisper or a whimper in one part of the world can immediately be heard in all parts of the world; and, yet, the world body politic is not consistently keeping pace with those realities. There is resistance to change. It is as if a part of us is saying: "Not so fast. Stop the world. We want to get off. We are not ready. We are not prepared for this new world we are being dragged into." And this resistance is holding on tight and with a determined frenzy to the familiar, the tribal, the traditional. This phenomenon cannot be ignored as religion, nationalism, fanatacism, race and ethnicity make themselves increasingly felt.

But the inevitable tomorrow is appearing. Developments in science and technology are fundamentally altering our material lives; and our social and political relationships as well.

There are new dominant sounds and among those most clearly and loudly heard today are the sounds of freedom and democracy. When given the chance -- and sometimes when not -- people across the world are standing for liberty. The striving for human dignity is universal because it is an integral part of our human character. We see it in China, Burma, Korea, the Philippines, South Africa, Chile, Paraguay, the Soviet Union, Hungary, Poland -- different cultures, different parts of the world. A larger part of the world's population is today living in relative freedom than ever before in the history of the world.

Hannah Arendt, the distinguished and perceptive social scientist, reflected the significance of this human ingredient when she wrote in an 1958 epilogue to her Origins of Totalitarianism that the new voices from Eastern Europe

> "speaking so plainly and simply of freedom and truth, sounded like an ultimate affirmation that human nature is unchangeable, that Communism will be futile, that even in the absence of all teaching and in the presence of overwhelming indoctrination, a yearning for freedom and truth will rise out of man's heart and mind forever."

Within every age the drive for human dignity has been dominant, but the struggle is a continuing one. Change is inevitable, but we cannot predict its direction. It would be a

mistake to believe that the end point of mankind's ideological evolution has been reached. It would be narrow to assert that Western liberal democracy, desirable as it is, is the final form of human government. Our vigilance is required, for, as the saying goes, "the devil, too, evolves." Aristotle taught us that all forms of government, including democracy, are transitional and vulnerable to the corrosion of time, new problems, and missed opportunities. We are at risk if we remain smug and content about our present strengths and the weakness of our adversaries.

The trend toward freedom and democracy is prompted not only by a deep inner drive for human dignity, but by the growing realization that democracy seems to work best. Governments and societies everywhere are discovering that keeping pace requires openness to information, new ideas, and the freedom which enables ingenuity to germinate and flourish. A closed tightly-controlled society cannot compete in a world experiencing an information explosion that knows no national boundaries.

We are clearly in a time when no society can isolate itself or its people from new ideas and new information anymore than one can escape the winds whose currents affect us all. National boundaries can keep out vaccines, but those boundaries

cannot keep out germs or ideas or broadcasts. This suggests, among many other implications, the need to reappraise our traditional definitions of sovereignty. The Government of Bangladesh, for example, cannot prevent tragic floods without active cooperation from Nepal and India. Canada cannot protect itself from acid rain without collaborating with the United States. The Mediterranean is polluted by 18 different countries.

We learned in the classroom that sovereignty was once lodged in the emperor by divine authority. This personal concept evolved into a territorial one and with the emergence of the nation state in the 17th century, it became identified with a political entity. By the 19th century, "sovereignty," "statehood" and "nation" became intertwined. Today, we see further change under way.

We in the United States have lived with this ambiguity. Our Declaration of Independence places sovereignty in the people. Much of our early political theory looked at sovereignty as residing in our states. Yet, our nation, like others, is a sovereign nation. It is clear that the idea of divided and shared sovereignty, our American pattern, is now spreading within the international community. The requirements of our evolving technology are increasingly turning national

not impassible, permeable.

boundaries into patterns of lace through which flow ideas, money, people, crime, terrorism, ballistic missiles -- all of which know no national boundaries.

In response to these realities, nations are by agreement curtailing their sovereign powers over many of their own domestic and security affairs. Under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Helsinki Final Act, nations undertake to behave humanely toward their own citizens and recognize the rights of other states to evaluate that internal behavior. Observers and on-site inspectors are given the right to inspect military facilities and maneuvers under the guise of confidence-building measures or to verify agreements made. The Soviets are struggling and anguishing over how to adjust the doctrine of sovereignty to the Baltic republics and to other national groups crying for independent recognition.

One essential geo-political consequence of this new reality is that there can be no true security for any one country in isolation. Unilateral security for us will not come from either withdrawing from the world or attempting national impregnability. Instead, we must learn to accept in each of our countries a mutual responsibility for the peoples in other countries. The politics of persuasion and consent furthermore, must prevail over the politics of coercion and terror.

Let me here pause a moment on the word "terror" and the political movement "terrorism" which supports and perpetuates it. Logic and reason and humaneness and self-interest demonstrate the dire need for a concerted international effort to eradicate terrorism. It is today universally understood that no one can be safe from this dangerous and destabilizing phenomenon. Yet, there is no effective international action in place and, I reluctantly suspect, none in the offing. A recent illustrative outrage of the political opportunism and fear that stand in the way of coordinated anti-terrorism was the previous Greek government's brazen release of a suspected terrorist to Libya, rather than extraditing him to Italy where he was wanted for killing a two-year old child and wounding 34 people in an attack on a synagogue. The myopic statement of the Greek Minister of Justice that such an attack fell "within the domain of the struggle to regain the independence of . . . [a] homeland" demonstrates the deplorable way some so-called "civilized" states cooperate with and condone terrorism. Furthermore, the world has not even been able in its international institutions to agree upon a definition of "terrorism," rendering efforts to outlaw it spurious.

Yet the danger is a real and potentially increasing one. Nuclear weapons and the skills necessary to build them are no longer the exclusive possession of the superpowers. These,

along with ominous chemical and bacterialogical weapons, are today capable of being acquired by the irresponsible and the lawless. Senator Sam Nunn recently pointed out in an important speech, that our society is a society of vulnerable networks -- electricity grids, water systems, pipelines, telecommunication links. Modern society is seriously vulnerable to catastrophic disruption. I suggest that here we have an immediate test of the effectiveness of our evolving international community and of our developing bilateral relations with the Soviet Union.

In this world of increasing interdependence, the lessons for the United States and the Soviet Union -- the most important security relationship in the present era -- are evident. For nearly half a century, we have looked at international relations through the prism of our relations with one another. We cannot escape from one another. We are bound together in an equation that makes the security of each of us dependent on that of the other. The Soviet Union, we must remember, is today the only country which can militarily threaten our nation.

We are told by Soviet leaders that through the process of internal transformation that is demanded by the new technologies, they comprehend that repressive societies in our day cannot achieve inner stability or true security; that it is

in their best interest to permit a humanizing process to take place; and that their domestic requirements are their highest priority.

Without doubt, Soviet leadership faces the urgent need for drastic internal changes if the Soviet Union is to be a significant part of the 21st Century. The Soviet economy is working poorly, although it does provide adequate sustenance for itself and its fully-functioning military machine. Massive military power has provided the Soviets with a presence that reaches all parts of the world, but this military superpower cannot hide the fact that its economic and social weaknesses are deep. The Soviet's awesome internal police force has provided continuity to its system of governance, but a Russia which during Czarist days exported food cannot today feed its own people.

Productivity is low. "We pretend to work and they pretend to pay us" is what I recently heard in Moscow. It is estimated that a worker in the Soviet Union must work more than seven times as many hours as a Western European to earn enough money to buy a car. With absenteeism, corruption, and alcoholism, internal morale is bad. Their traditional family structure shows signs of crumbling, with divorce and abortion rates among the highest of any modern country, rising infant mortality, and

a drug problem brought back from Afghanistan. Contrary to trends elsewhere in the world, life expectancy in the Soviet Union is actually decreasing.

The new leaders of the Soviet Union are fully aware of its problems. One Soviet economist recently said: "There have been many books written on the transition from capitalism to socialism, but not one on the transition from socialism to capitalism." That leadership is also aware of our strengths, reflecting the vitality of our values and the healthy dynamism of our system.

President Gorbachev recently said:

> "We are now, as it were, going through the school of democracy afresh. We are learning that our political culture is still inadequate. Our standard of debate is inadequate; our ability to respect the point of view of even our friends and comrades -- even that is inadequate."

Reports indicate Mr. Gorbachev may now have second thoughts about his words, particularly as they apply to press freedoms. But we hear these and other Soviet words with hope that the deeds and reality will indeed follow the rhetoric. We hope the time is at hand when Soviet authorities, looking at the energy of the West, comprehend the systemic weakness that corrodes their society. We hope Soviet authorities will join us in making the commitment that our survival as a civilization depends on the

mutual realization that we must live under rules of responsible international behavior. We hope -- and there are encouraging signs to bolster that hope. But as yet, we, regrettably, cannot trust.

The problem is not the character and culture of the peoples who make up the Soviet Union. The Soviet peoples are proud and talented, with a rich history and culture. Its citizens desire peace and human dignity as much as any American. But it is the Government which sets policy and their system which causes us concerns.

But even as we cannot yet trust, or be certain we understand ultimate Soviet intentions behind their search for "breathing space", we have a responsibility to observe developments in the Soviet Union carefully and to do so with open eyes and an open mind. It will not be easy for many of us to change the prism of our accustomed spectacles for clearer viewing. It is difficult to believe what we appear to see. Our need, indeed, is to replace our microscope with a wide-angle lens. Change is inevitable and it is underway. We must not fear it. We must influence it.

When I began negotiating with the Soviet Union in 1980, under President Carter, human rights was beginning to be

injected as a major item of our country's international agenda. The Soviet Union insisted that the discussion of the subject was an improper interference in their internal affairs. When President Reagan asked me in 1985 to return to government service as head of our nuclear arms reduction negotiating team, an extraordinary change soon became apparent. Under the leadership of President Reagan and Secretary of State George Shultz, the United States enlarged upon what President Carter initiated and incorporated the concept of human rights as a necessary and ever-present ingredient in the totality of our relations with the Soviet Union.

The issue of human rights is today a fully-agreed agenda item in our discussions with the Soviet Union. It is discussed thoroughly, frankly and frequently -- and we see results. The results are not yet entirely to our satisfaction, but are, nevertheless, highly significant. There will be further positive results, going in tandem with other items on our agenda.

I do not denigrate the importance of arms control when I say that for arms control to be real and meaningful, it must be accompanied by resolution of the serious problems that cause nations to take up arms. Arms are but the symptoms of a

disease. The remaining items on the U.S./Soviet agenda of talks are designed to try to treat the disease as well as the symptoms, the source of tensions between our two countries.

Our ability to influence Soviet internal developments is likely to be limited, but we should not ignore the things we can do to encourage the evolution of Soviet policy in directions that are constructive and responsible. Our military strength is obviously indispensable. But so is our role as a world leader and as an example.

The United States is the Soviet Union's principal adversary. We are also its standard for comparison. We thus have a responsibility to make it clear to the leadership of the Soviet Union what we expect and require for increased trust. In essence, we urge them to develop stronger legal and structural restraints on their power, both internal and external. We must insist that they abjure the use or threat of force to extend and expand their system in our own hemisphere and elsewhere. We must persuade the Soviet Union to join us in a commitment to "rules of the game" for responsible international behavior. Ultimately, the only battlefield that is rational in this nuclear age is the battlefield of ideas.

Soviet leadership may well be coming to understand that it cannot exempt itself from the stubbornly growing insistence of

human beings for political systems that provide dignity for themselves and their families. The tremendous vitality of our democratic values is central to any agenda for the future. I have sometimes been asked why we risk allowing our concern about human rights to get in the way of negotiating arms control agreements or other security objectives. As the Nobel Laureate Andrei Sakharov has so often pointed out, however, the cause of human rights and peace is indivisible. It is worth remembering the words of John Stuart Mills, who, after studying theoretical socialism seriously and sympathetically more than a century ago, concluded that the contest he saw ahead between democracy and socialism would probably hinge on "which of the two systems is consistent with the greatest amount of human liberty and spontaneity."

In his 1975 Nobel Prize speech that he was not permitted to present in person, Dr. Andrei Sakharov, said:

> "I am convinced that international trust, mutual understanding, disarmament, and international security are inconceivable without an open society with freedom of information, freedom of conscience, the right to publish, and the right to travel and choose the country in which one wishes to live."

The United States interacts and negotiates with the Soviet Union in that context. We have faith in our principles as we

intensify our efforts, through our negotiations, to find a basis for understanding, security, stability, and peace with dignity.

To negotiate is risky. In the words of that outstanding American public servant, Hubert Humphrey, it is something like crossing a river while walking on slippery rocks. The possibility of disaster is on every side, but it is the way -- sometimes the only way -- to get across. The aim of our diplomacy and the supreme achievement of statesmanship is patiently, through negotiation, to pursue the peace with dignity we seek, always recognizing the threat to that peace, and always protecting our vital national interests and values. We should recall the message of Winston Churchill that diplomatic negotiations "are not a grace to be conferred but a convenience to be used."

The United States and the Soviet Union have begun a historic process. Given the nature of our adversary and the complex issues between us, coupled with the stresses of our own internal politics, even with the package of arms reduction agreements now in negotiation, we are still nearer the beginning than the end of that process. The process, furthermore, is likely to be a difficult and murky one. The fundamental nature of the Soviet system is the reality that they and we must still face. Their problems are real and overwhelming. Ethnic nationalism at times

appears to be tearing at the fiber of the Soviet empire as a tumultuous environment develops, with violence, demonstrations, curfews, and the recurring question: "How tolerant can Moscow afford to be?" Can the Soviet Union, with more than 100 nationalities and widely-disparate cultures living in 15 Republics, contain the demands for local sovereignty emanating from pent-up resentments and a long-desired opportunity to even things out?

Ken Adelman reminded us in his column a few weeks ago that the Marquis de Custine wrote 150 years ago: "Whenever the right of speech shall be restored to this muzzled people, the astonished world will hear so many disputes arise that it will believe the confusion of Babel again returned."

Jim Billington recently noted De Tocqueville's view that the most dangerous time of an authoritarian regime is when it is undergoing change or reform; and that the most dangerous time in the life of a religion -- and Communism is a secular religion -- is when it has lost its inner faith but retained its outer power. If the current national minority agitation should blend with social upheaval in the USSR, or escalate to the Ukraine or to Moslem Central Asia, there is always the danger that a militaristic xenophobic Russian nationalism could rise.

I note these problems, because just as the strains must not blind us to the changes, so should the changes not blind us to the difficulties that still remain. Yes, the changes are stunning -- Soviet troops out of Afghanistan; Solidarity in control of government in Poland; the prospect of Cuban troop withdrawal from Angola; Communist Party officials challenged and defeated in Soviet elections; the beginning of a multi-party system in Hungary; important Soviet proposals to reduce conventional and nuclear arms along lines proposed by the West.

But, of course, the basis for international skepticism also remains as we look at Cuba, Soviet bloc military assistance to Nicaragua, continued transfer of much of that supply to the rebels in El Salvador, the awesome Soviet military budget, the Soviet's recent missile sale to Libya of bomber aircraft capable of threatening and further destabilizing the Middle East. We could go on. That skepticism, furthermore, has deep roots. Europeans remember that it was Czar Nicholas I who remarked: "where the Russian flag has once been hoisted, it must never be lowered." Helmut Schmidt in his memoirs quotes a 19th Century Russian statesman that "Russia can feel completely secure only when Russian soldiers stand on both sides of her borders."

The great challenge to our diplomacy is how to adjust to an evolving Soviet Union in a rapidly-changing world without

endangering our security and our values. Our task is to effect a soft landing from the cold war. It is our responsibility to work toward that end. This requires a steady America, strong but confident, conscious of the reality of its own interest in a stable peaceful world.

Will we be able to play our part? Will we be sufficiently sensitive to the judgment of history and take heed lest future generations condemn us for having missed a decisive opportunity for peace with dignity? Will we be wise enough to know how to assist the historic developments now underway in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe? Will we be sufficiently alert and forthcoming to grab the opportunity presented to us? Are we adequately bold and imaginative to adjust our security interests to the new world we are entering? It is on the basis of these criteria that history will judge us.

Our task is to achieve the firm sense of purpose, readiness, steadiness, and strength that is indispensable for effective and timely foreign policy decision-making. Our political community must resist the temptation of partisan politics and institutional rivalry as we develop the consensus adequate to meet the challenge of de Tocqueville's criticism.

You will notice that I now introduce the word "consensus" as an indispendable ingredient for effective foreign policy in our democracy. Effective diplomacy in our world of today requires the realistic availability of power. But power today cannot be exercised effectively in our democracy without a broad consensus in support of the policy that power is designed to advance. Consensus -- not unanimity -- requires, given the limited nature of our political party system, broad agreement and understanding between the President and a bipartisan Congress. This in turn means that our policies require an identification with our country's values and aspirations. We are as a nation painfully coming to that realization. Neither the diplomat nor the politician in a democracy can afford to ignore the moral dimension of foreign policy. With the clearly devastating character of modern weapons, conventional and nuclear, no democracy can effectively pursue its diplomacy, where the availability of force is an indispensable ingredient, unless there is a broad consensus supported by a moral foundation behind the policy.

G.K. Chesteron summarized his studies of our country by declaring that the United States is a "nation with the soul of a church." This must be understood as we seek the basis for national consensus in foreign policy. We require moral justification for our actions.

Our country is today the oldest democracy in the world. Abraham Lincoln of your State of Illinois said that "America is the last great hope of mankind." It still is! Our political values and our character traits have helped us build the most dynamic and open society in recorded history, a source of inspiration to most of the world. It should be a source of inspiration for us as well. We cannot take it for granted. We must realize what the American dream means to us and to the world. In fulfilling our responsibility as citizens of this democracy, there is no room for aloof neutrality. The idea that somehow power is bad, that superpowers are worse, with one superpower more or less as bad as the other, is a nihilistic formula for defeat. There is an unmistakable difference between a prison yard and a meadow.

It is not arrogant for us to proclaim the virtues of our own system because it casts no credit on us. We are not the ones who created American democracy. We are merely its beneficiaries with an opportunity to strengthen it for succeeding generations. The future lies with liberty, human dignity, and democracy. The changes stimulated by modern technology may well assist us to move in that direction, if we permit our democratic values to provide the guidelines for the journey. When we are growing up, we are taught not to be afraid of the dark. I say to you that as our societies mature, we must not be afraid of the light and where it can take us.

Thank you

9811k

Theodore Roosevelt Association

BOX 720
OYSTER BAY
NEW YORK 11771

June 1, 1990

Dear Ms. Dooley:

I have been asked to send you information on the attempted assassination of (then former) President Theodore Roosevelt in 1912. Here is some material from a biography, and you will find the speech TR gave after the shooting in the little enclosed book.

When you have finished with the book, please have the book added to the research library of the White House.

Incidently, the speech ms. and glasses case with bullet holes are now on display with the shirt he was wearing at the Theodore Roosevelt Birthplace National Historic Site, New York City. The second undershirt TR was wearing is on display at Theodore Roosevelt National Park, Medora, North Dakota. Several bullet-pierced speech are owned privately.

The text in the book is a stenographic report of TR's remarks, and of course not the text of the undelivered speech.

If I can be of further help, call me at 516-922-1221.

Sincerely yours,

John A. Gable

John A. Gable, Ph.D.
Executive Director

from Joseph B. Bishop, Theodore Roosevelt and His Time, vol. 2

1912

When the campaign was at its height in October its progress was arrested and the whole country was shocked by the attempted assassination of Roosevelt while he was on a speaking tour in the West. As he was leaving his hotel in Milwaukee, on the evening of October 14, a half-crazed fanatic shot him as he stood in an automobile bowing to a cheering crowd. His assailant was only a few feet away when he fired the shot which under ordinary conditions would have been fatal. One of Roosevelt's secretaries, Elbert E. Martin, who had been a football player, immediately sprang upon the assailant and forced him to the ground. The crowd, thoroughly incensed, was crying out, "Lynch him, lynch him," but Roosevelt, who had not been thrown down by the shot, calmed the crowd by saying: "Don't hurt him! Bring him here. I want to look at him." When one of his secretaries suggested that Roosevelt be taken at once to a hospital, he said: "You get me to that speech; it may be the last I shall deliver, but I am going to deliver this one."

He rode at once to the hall where he was to speak, and on arriving there one of his companions exclaimed as soon as they came into a lighted room: "Look, Colonel, there's a hole in your overcoat!" Roosevelt looked down, saw the hole, and putting his hand inside his coat, withdrew it with blood upon it. Not at all dismayed, he said: "It looks as though I had been hit, but I don't think it is anything serious." Three physicians who were found in the audience examined the wound, said the bullet had penetrated his breast, that they could not tell how serious the injury was, but that in their opinion he should be taken at once to a hospital. He refused absolutely to permit this, saying: "I will make this speech, or die; one or the other," and strode to the platform. The great audience, in ignorance of the shooting, broke into prolonged cheering at his appearance, and when quiet was restored the presiding officer said: "I have something to tell you and I hope you will receive the news with calmness. Colonel Roosevelt has been

shot. He is wounded." A cry of astonishment and horror ran over the audience and great confusion followed. Roosevelt stepped to the front of the platform and produced instant calm by raising his hand and saying: "I am going to ask you to be very quiet and please to excuse me from making you a very long speech. I'll do the best I can, but you see there is a bullet in my body. But it is nothing. I'm not hurt badly."

He began at once upon his speech. On taking from the breast-pocket of his coat the folded manuscript of his speech he saw that it had a bullet hole completely through it, having first passed through a metal spectacle case which was also in his pocket, but this did not check him for a moment, though he said afterwards it did startle him a little. Showing it to the audience, he said: "It takes more than that to kill a Bull Moose!" Several times during his speech he seemed to be growing weak but when persons on the platform rose to help him, he said: "Let me alone. I'm all right." In the course of his speech he said that certain newspaper utterances were to blame for the attempt to assassinate him—that a weak-minded man had been influenced by them. He finished his speech and later in the evening was taken by special train to Chicago, arriving there at half past three the next morning. Looking from the car window and seeing an ambulance standing by the station, he said: "I'll not go to a hospital lying in that thing. I'll walk to it and I'll walk from it to the hospital. I'm no weakling to be crippled by a flesh wound."

On arriving at the hospital a thorough examination of his wound, with X-rays, was made and it was discovered that the bullet had entered his chest at the right of and below the right nipple and was embedded in a rib; it had touched no vital part. One of the examining surgeons said: "Colonel Roosevelt has a phenomenal development of the chest. It is largely due to the fact that he is a physical marvel that he was not dangerously wounded. He is one of the most powerful men I have ever seen laid on an

operating table. The bullet lodged in the massive muscles of the chest instead of penetrating the lung."

Mrs. Roosevelt, who was in New York at the time, received news of the shooting while at a theater and, accompanied by her two daughters, went at once to Chicago, where she took personal charge of the patient. Dr. Alexander Lambert, Roosevelt's family physician, also hastened to Chicago and after examining him said: "The folded manuscript and heavy steel spectacle case checked and deflected the bullet so that it passed up at such an angle that it went outside the ribs and in the muscles. If this deflection had not occurred and the bullet gone through the arch of the aorta or auricles of the heart, Colonel Roosevelt would not have lived 60 seconds."

In the official bulletin of October 15, the attending surgeons said: "We find him in a magnificent physical condition, due to his regular physical exercise, his habitual abstinence from tobacco and liquor."

Senator Beveridge, of Indiana, visited him in the hospital on the day of his arrival, October 15, and to him Roosevelt dictated the following message to his followers, which the Senator delivered to a large audience at Louisville, Kentucky, on October 17, 1912:

"It matters little about me, but it matters all about the cause we fight for. If one soldier who happens to carry the flag is stricken, another will take it from his hands and carry it on. One after another the standard bearers may be laid low, but the standard itself can never fail.

"You know that personally I did not want ever to be a candidate for office again. And you know that only the call that came to the men of the 60's made me answer it in our day as they did more nobly in their day. And now, as then, it is not important whether one leader lives or dies; it is important only that the cause shall live and win. Tell the people not to worry about me, for if I go down another will take my place. Always the cause is there, and it is the cause for which the people care, for it is the people's cause."

Describing his sensations at the time of the shooting, a few days later, Roosevelt said: "It was nothing, nothing. I felt a little pain, but it was not serious. When I stretched out my arms or reached for my manuscript it made me gasp a bit, but that was all. It was quite amusing when I reached for my manuscript to see that it had a hole in it from the bullet and there was a hole in my spectacle case too."

"Amusing, did you say, Colonel?" some one asked.

"Well, it was quite interesting," he replied. "It was difficult to keep my temper," he added, "when at the close of my speech a half dozen men scrambled upon the platform to shake hands with me. Didn't they know that it is impossible for a man who has just been shot to shake hands with genuine cordiality?"

The shooting had completely arrested the progress of the campaign, both Taft and Wilson sending messages of sympathy and refraining from public utterances while the ultimate effect of the attack was in doubt. Two days after reaching the hospital Roosevelt made a statement for publication in which he urged that the campaign be resumed without regard to his condition. In this he said:

"I cannot too strongly emphasize the fact upon which we Progressives insist, that the welfare of any one man in the fight wholly is immaterial compared to the great and fundamental issues involved in the triumph of the principles for which our cause stands. If I had been killed the fight would have gone on exactly the same. . . . So far as my opponents are concerned, whatever could with truth and propriety have been said against me and my cause before I was shot can with equal truth and equal propriety be said against me now, and it should be so said; and the things that cannot be said now are merely the things that ought not to have been said before. This is not a contest about any man; it is a contest concerning principles."

He remained in the hospital till October 21, when he went to his home in Oyster Bay. The man who shot him was a

fanatic, named John Schrank, who was shown by papers found on his person to be of unbalanced mind, and to have been following Roosevelt about the country for some time seeking a favorable opportunity to shoot him. In a sort of diary, among these papers, were entries in which Schrank said McKinley had appeared to him and told him that Roosevelt was his murderer. Another entry showed that some of the campaign talk against Roosevelt as a candidate for a third term had affected his crazy brain, for it read: "Any man looking for a third term ought to be shot." When he was arraigned in court in Milwaukee, on November 12, 1912, he showed very clearly that this was the case, for when asked how he would plead he replied: "Why, guilty. I did not mean to kill a citizen, Judge; I shot Theodore Roosevelt because he was a menace to the country. He should not have a third term. I did not want him to have one. I shot him as a warning that men must not try to have more than two terms as President." Could there be furnished stronger evidence than this that violent denunciation of public men, in the press and on the stump, incites assassination by inducing persons of unbalanced minds to attempt it in the crazy belief that they are thereby doing a public service? The assassinations of Lincoln, Garfield and McKinley were directly traceable to this source.

The court appointed a commission of five alienists to examine Schrank and report on his mental condition. They reported on November 22 that he was insane and he was committed to an asylum for the insane for an indefinite period.

Several letters that Roosevelt wrote at the time and subsequently contain exceedingly interesting observations upon the natural conduct of men in like situations:

November 15, 1912.

To the Rt. Hon. Sir Edward Grey, Foreign Office, London:

"I am a little amused, my dear fellow, at your saying that the account of the shooting stirred you with a curiosity to know whether, if the experience had been yours, you would

'have had the nerve to make the speech,' and whether your 'body would have proved as healthy.' I can answer both questions with absolute certainty. Your nerve would not have been affected in the least, you would have made the speech as a matter of course, and your body would have proved *more* healthy. You would have shown the absolute coolness and courage and lack of thought of self that your brother showed when mauled by the lions. Modern civilization is undoubtedly somewhat soft, and the average political orator or party leader, the average broker, or banker, or factory owner, at least when he is past middle age, is apt to be soft—I mean both mentally and physically—and such a man accepts being shot as a frightful and unheard-of calamity, and feels very sorry for himself and thinks only of himself and not of the work on which he is engaged or of his duty to others, or indeed of his real self-respect. But a good soldier or sailor, or for the matter of that even a civilian accustomed to hard and hazardous pursuits, a deep-sea fisherman, or railway-man, or cow-boy, or lumber-jack, or miner, would normally act as I acted without thinking anything about it. I believe half the men in my regiment at the least would have acted just as I acted. Think how many Bulgars during the last month have acted in just the same fashion and never even had their names mentioned in bulletins!

"Recently John Murray sent me 'The Life of Sir Harry Smith,' and I was reading his experiences in the Peninsula War, and his account of the many officers who continued to perform their duties with bullets in them, it being often many hours before a surgeon could attend to them. Why! even in our little San Juan fight there were thirteen men of my regiment who after being shot continued to fight. Now I wish to rank myself with such men as Harry Smith and his comrades in the Peninsula War, and with the men in my regiment, and I expect to be judged by their standards and not by the standards of that particular kind of money-maker whose soul has grown hard while his body has grown

soft; that is, who is morally ruthless to others and physically timid about himself.

"I doubt if any man has had a greater volume of obliquity poured upon him than I have had during the past nine months, and I have been assailed with an injustice so gross as to be fairly humorous. But there is a good deal in Emerson's law of compensation, and to offset this I have been praised in connection with the shooting with quite as extravagant a disregard of my deserts. The bullet passed through the manuscript of my speech and my iron spectacle case, and only went three or four inches into the chest, breaking a rib and lodging against it. I never saw my assailant, as it was dark and he was mixed with the dense crowd beside the automobile, and as I was standing unsteadily I half fell back for a second. As I stood up I coughed and at once put my hands to my lips to see if there was any blood. There was none, so that as the bullet was in the chest I felt the chances were twenty to one that it was not fatal.

"I would not have objected to the man's being killed at the very instant, but I did not deem it wise or proper that he should be killed before my eyes if I was going to recover, so I immediately stopped the men who had begun to worry him, and had him brought to me so that I might see if I recognized him; but I did not. There was then a perfectly obvious duty, which was to go on and make my speech. In the very unlikely event of the wound being mortal I wished to die with my boots on, so to speak. It has always seemed to me that the best way to die would be in doing something that ought to be done, whether leading a regiment or doing anything else. Moreover, I felt that under such circumstances it would be very difficult for people to disbelieve in my sincerity, and that therefore they would be apt to accept at the face value the speech I wished to make, and which represented my deepest and most earnest convictions. If, on the other hand, as I deemed overwhelmingly probable, the wound should turn out to be slight, it was still likely that I would have little further chance to speak during

the campaign, and therefore it behooved me to go on while I had the chance, and make a speech to which under the circumstances it was at least possible that the country would pay some heed. This is all there was to the incident."

December 16, 1912.

To J. St. Loe Strachey, Esq., Editor of the London Spectator: "Just one word about the madman who shot me. He was not really a madman at all; he was a man of the same disordered brain which most criminals, and a great many non-criminals, have. I very gravely question if he has a more unsound brain than Eugene Debs. He simply represents a different stratum of life and of temperament, which if not more violent is yet more accustomed to brutal physical expression. He had quite enough sense to avoid shooting me in any Southern State, where he would have been lynched, and he waited until he got into a State where there was no death penalty. I have not the slightest feeling against him; I have a very strong feeling against the people who, by their ceaseless and intemperate abuse, excited him to the action, and against the mushy people who would excuse him and all other criminals once the crime has been committed."

December 31, 1912.

To Sir Cecil Arthur Spring-Rice, British Legation, Stockholm: "I am as well as possible. I did not care a rap for being shot. It is a trade risk, which every prominent public man ought to accept as a matter of course. For eleven years I have been prepared any day to be shot; and if any one of the officers of my regiment had abandoned the battle merely because he received a wound that did nothing worse than break a rib, I should never have trusted that officer again. I would have expected him to keep on in the fight as long as he could stand; and what I expect lieutenants to do I expect *a fortiori,* a leader to do."

February 5, 1913.

To Dr. William Sturgis Bigelow, Boston: "I was getting into the barouche, having just left a lighted hotel, so

that I could not see the crowd distinctly. What I said when the man was caught was: 'Don't hurt him. Bring him here. I want to look at him.' After the bullet I had no real pain. The wound felt hot. When I began to speak my heart beat rapidly for some ten minutes, but aside from that about all the real trouble I had was that on account of my broken rib I had to breathe quick and short, so that I could not speak as loudly as usual, nor use long sentences without breathing. When I got to the railway car I shaved and took out the studs and buttons from my bloody shirt and put them in a clean shirt, as I thought I might be stiff next morning. This all tired me a little, and when I lay down in my bunk my heart was again beating fast enough, and my breath was short enough, to make me feel somewhat uncomfortable. But after a while I found I could turn, if I did it very carefully, to my unwounded side, and then I fell asleep."

February 17, 1913.

"By the way, I remember once or twice your speaking to me about why the bullet was not cut out. I never asked the surgeon, but through Dean Sumner, who had just been attended by Dr. Murphy and who questioned him about me, I found out the reason. Dr. Murphy said that the bullet had splintered the inside of the rib, and one or two of the splinters penetrated the pleura. My speech slightly aggravated the laceration, and they were afraid that if they took out the bullet immediately there might either be a collapse of the pleura or an infection of the pleura cavity; and inasmuch as there was no infection for the moment they thought it was better to leave well enough alone."

The bullet was never extracted and he carried it with him to his grave. Writing to his friend, Charles G. Washburn, of Worcester, Mass., on March 5, 1913, he said of it: "I do not mind it any more than if it were in my waistcoat pocket."

Roosevelt remained quietly at Oyster Bay until he recovered completely from his wound, taking no active part in the

campaign till a few days before election. On October 31, 1912, he addressed a great audience of 15,000 persons in Madison Square Garden in New York City, where he was received with unbounded enthusiasm and was seen to be in full health and vigor. In closing he repeated the passage from his Carnegie Hall speech of March 20, which I have quoted in Chapter XXII of this volume, and which he called his political creed, and added:

"Friends, what I said then I say now. Surely there never was a greater opportunity than ours. Surely there never was a fight better worth making than this. I believe we shall win, but win or lose I am glad beyond measure that I am one of the many who in this fight have stood ready to spend and be spent, pledged to fight while life lasts the great fight for righteousness and for brotherhood and for the welfare of mankind."

The result of the election demonstrated conclusively that Roosevelt had been, as his advocates claimed, the first choice of a majority of the Republican voters, for his popular vote was 4,119,507, while Taft's was 3,484,056. He received the electoral votes of six States, 88 in all, while Taft received those of only two States, Vermont and Utah, or 8 in all. In the six States that Roosevelt carried were such Republican strongholds as Pennsylvania, Michigan and Minnesota. In nearly all other normally Republican States his vote greatly exceeded that of Taft, who, although the regular nominee of his party, ran third in the contest, while Roosevelt, the nominee of a new party, ran second. No new party in the history of the country had ever before developed such remarkable strength; but time was to show very speedily that it was not a party strength at all, but simply Roosevelt strength—that he himself was the party, for without him as its candidate it dissolved almost as quickly as it had been formed. Four millions of people had voted for him because he was Roosevelt and they had absolute faith in him, but in doing so they had not consolidated themselves into a permanent political organization.

Freedom Remains the Touchstone

Carl Gershman

WITH THE stunning collapse of communism in Central Europe, it is appropriate to reconsider the goals of American foreign policy in a post-Cold War world. It is true, of course, that the communist regime in the Soviet Union remains in place, that in military terms Moscow is still a superpower, and that it continues to give military assistance to Afghanistan, Cuba, Angola, and other Third World client states. Nonetheless, the Soviet Union is exhausted economically and ideologically, and is in the throes of a profound systemic crisis. The challenge ahead is not to defend against its expansion but to manage its decline.

In this altered world, the policy of containment is clearly outdated. It does not respond to the immediate challenge of consolidating democratic systems in the liberated countries of Central Europe and facilitating their eventual integration into an expanded European Community. It is rapidly becoming obsolete in the Third World as well.

That said, however, it does not follow that the United States must define a new "central purpose" for its foreign policy. Containment itself was not the central purpose of U.S. policy but rather a response to a specific geopolitical situation in which the United States found itself challenged by a formidable military and ideological rival. The central purpose, as stated in the Truman Doctrine, was to "support free peoples" in defense of a "way of life" based upon "the will of the majority" and "distinguished by free institutions, representative government, free elections, guarantees of individual liberty, freedom of speech and religion, and freedom from political oppression." Support for this way of life against its totalitarian alternative was the purpose for which containment was designed. The attenuation of the totalitarian challenge does not invalidate this purpose, which was enunciated before the Cold War by Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt. It only raises the question of whether a policy of support for free institutions and for adherence to democratic political norms around the world can and should be sustained in the absence of a grave threat that necessitates U.S. action.

In answering that question, it may be helpful to recall that the consensus supporting the containment policy broke down as a result of the debate over U.S. involvement in Vietnam and was not reestablished during the following two decades. At issue was the policy of the United States toward noncommunist authoritarian governments threatened by communist attack or subversion. In effect, one side in this debate favored withdrawing the containment shield from such governments if they did not take meaningful steps to improve their human rights performance. The other side favored retaining the shield

Carl Gershman is president of the National Endowment for Democracy.

not only to resist communist expansion but also in the belief that authoritarian systems were less repressive and more open to democratic reform than the totalitarian alternative.

The debate sharpened in the 1970s when it appeared that the United States faced the bleak prospect of having to choose between these two options only. It came to a head in 1979 over the Nicaraguan revolution, but the bitter lesson that each side came away with from that experience—that authoritarianism is not a bulwark against communism, and that the overthrow of authoritarianism is not a guarantee of democracy—actually laid the foundation for a new policy fostering peaceful transitions to democracy. As the democratic wave of the 1980s in Latin America and elsewhere in the Third World gained momentum, and despite the bitter dispute over funding the armed resistance to the Sandinista government in Nicaragua, a new bipartisan consensus began to form around this pro-democracy policy. In March 1986, following the peaceful revolution in the Philippines, President Reagan enunciated the new consensus by committing the United States to the "democratic revolution" taking place in the world. The core of his message to Congress was that "The American people believe in human rights and oppose tyranny in whatever form, whether of the Left or the Right."

The collapse of communism has given this policy renewed support as Republicans and Democrats outdo each other in calls for assistance to the democratic revolution in Central Europe, and as the fear of another Vietnam—still a cautionary factor in any policy expressing global support for democracy—recedes. Nonetheless, strong reservations persist about the merits of such a policy. They are associated with no single political camp, but can be found among both conservatives and liberals, as well as among foreign policy "realists" who have always been skeptical of American universalism.

The reservations may be summarized as follows: Democratic globalism, or Wilsonian internationalism if you will, betrays an ethnocentric point of view that mistakenly assumes democracy is an appropriate system for everybody. It is not, and the desire to implant it where it does not exist reflects cultural arrogance, missionary zeal, and a dangerous tendency to impose abstract principles on political reality. Moreover, a policy of globalism implies unlimited commitments along the lines of President Kennedy's pledge to "pay any price" to support freedom. If commitments exceed power and resources, policy will become insolvent, as Walter Lippmann once wrote. On top of this, there is no compelling, tangible national interest that is served by such a policy. The United States should not go abroad, in the famous words of John Quincy Adams, "in search of monsters to destroy," but only in pursuit of clearly defined interests to protect.

THE RESPONSE to this line of argument begins with the democratic revolution which demonstrates that successful democratic systems, as well as the aspiration for democracy, now extend far beyond the industrial democracies of the West. The last months of 1989 alone saw not only communist dictatorships overthrown in Central Europe but the holding of transitional elections in Chile, Namibia, and Taiwan; the peaceful transfer of power following sharply contested elections in the two largest Third World democracies, India and Brazil; and the installation of a democratically-elected government in Panama (by U.S. troops, to be sure, but with the overwhelming approval of the Panamanian people). These dramatic events were the culmination of a period of unprecedented democratic gains that began in the 1970s with the democratic transitions in Greece, Spain, and Portugal, then spread across most of Central and South America and to a large part of Asia before it reached Central Europe. While the democratic movement in China was brutally suppressed, it probably did more than any single event to signal to the world that the democratic idea is truly universal and that there are young people continents and cultures away from the historic centers of dem-

ocratic life who are prepared to lay down their lives for freedom. The democratic movement in Burma (which was suppressed) demonstrated the same point.

No single factor accounts for this worldwide phenomenon. The technological and communications revolutions have made the attributes of modern democratic society accessible and discernible throughout the world, thereby introducing into non-Western societies expectations and aspirations for democracy not present before. Moreover, the decline of traditional forms of authority in modernizing societies, combined with the more recent collapse of Marxism, has left democratic consent as the only means of conferring legitimacy on governments. Developing countries are also discovering that democracy, while by no means a panacea, offers a way to limit and decentralize state power, to expose corruption, to reduce the potential for civil violence by integrating different economic and ethnic groups into the system, and to achieve economic growth. As the alternative to tyrannical force in the management of increasingly complex societies, democracy would have to be invented, as Peter Berger has written, if it did not already exist.

IF DEMOCRACY is developing indigenously within countries because it offers the best way to manage the affairs of society and to achieve national objectives, the issue for us to decide is whether we should assist and encourage this process, not whether we should seek to impose our system on others. We cannot force others to do what they are not prepared or willing to do for themselves; the American people would not support this approach in any event. But we can insist upon adherence to political norms and provide support and encouragement to those seeking to establish democratic systems. Such a policy is consistent with American values—pluralism as well as democracy—and it does not risk insolvency because it can be pursued with relatively limited resources.

In fact, the basic elements of such a policy are already in place, having been assembled in the course of more than a decade of attempts to find common ground between liberals and conservatives, and between the executive branch and Congress, on these questions. They include the integration of human rights issues into the fabric of U.S. policy through such mechanisms as the establishment of a Human Rights Bureau at the State Department; the annual preparation of "country reports" on human rights; the conditioning of economic and security assistance, trade benefits, and votes in international lending agencies on human rights performance; and the provision of funds under the Foreign Assistance Act for programs that encourage respect for human rights. They also include instructions to U.S. ambassadors to carry out this policy by maintaining close contacts with democratic groups and by encouraging wherever possible steps toward stable democratic transitions. (The results of this activist approach have already been evident in such countries as the Philippines, Chile, Paraguay, Poland, and Hungary.)

An additional element in this policy has been the establishment of the National Endowment for Democracy which enlists the involvement of private U.S. organizations—principally institutes associated with our two political parties, the AFL-CIO, and the Chamber of Commerce—in assisting the development of democratic political and social institutions abroad. Military force is also an element in the policy, though its use is circumscribed by criteria, set forth by Defense Secretary Weinberger in 1984 and now widely endorsed, that favor the commitment of U.S. forces only as a last resort and only with broad bipartisan backing. Significantly, the recent commitment of U.S. forces in Panama and the show of force in the Philippines during the coup attempt against the Aquino government were justified in terms of supporting democracy.

But does this policy serve a compelling, tangible national interest? Or is it, to borrow the phrase of one commentator, "a special

kind of international social work"? The events of the last months offer the most eloquent answer to this question, for it was the democratic revolution in Central Europe, more than any military or diplomatic factors, that brought the postwar era to a close and redrew the political map of the world. Despite all the attention devoted to disarmament over the last decades by governments and demonstrators alike, it was the success of the democratic struggles in the communist world that made meaningful disarmament a real possibility.

Beyond these immediate issues, the United States has a clear interest in the establishment of democratic governments abroad. Such governments are more likely than dictatorships to enjoy political stability and to establish peaceful relations with their neighbors. In addition, while governments that share our values may not agree with us on every issue, they are likely to be our friends and to desire a close mutual relationship. Just as important, we would be able to sustain such a close and collaborative relationship with *them*, something we have difficulty doing (given the nature of our polity and the importance we attach to democratic values) with countries that are not democratic. Moreover, given our position as the world's first and leading democracy, we have a unique opportunity to exercise leadership in supporting the progress of democracy, arguably the foremost political issue of our time. Our prestige and morale would inevitably suffer if we were to relinquish this responsibility.

Is the objective of supporting democracy sufficient to serve as a "central purpose" for the United States in its relations with the world? The question should answer itself, for this already *is* our central purpose and has been ever since our nation was founded on the basis of universal democratic principles. The moments when we strayed from these principles—during the Vietnam malaise, for example, when many Americans ceased to believe in our national purpose—have not been happy times for America. More recently, our national self-confidence and sense of purpose have been restored. The fact that this restoration coincided with the world democratic revolution may have been purely coincidental. More likely, however, these developments were mutually reinforcing; the former giving renewed impetus to the idea of freedom in the world, and the latter reminding us that our heritage does, indeed, have a universal meaning. That is a useful thing to recall as we set our course at the beginning of a new era.