

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: Chron File, 1989-1993

OA/ID Number: 13744
Folder ID Number: 13744-012

Folder Title:
National Religious Broadcasters Convention 1/28/91 [OA 8321] [5]

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
G	26	21	2	4

Steph B.

RELIGIOUS BROADCASTERS
SHERATON WASHINGTON HOTEL
MONDAY, JANUARY 29, 1990
2:00 P.M.

PRESIDENT ROSE, DIRECTOR COOK, DR. ROBERTSON --
AND I WANT TO SALUTE YOUR LEADERSHIP OF THE NRB.
LADIES AND GENTLEMEN. ((IT IS OFTEN SAID OF A GROUP OR
INDIVIDUAL THAT "HE HASN'T GOT A PRAYER." WELL, I AM
PLEASED TO BE WITH AN AUDIENCE ABOUT WHOM THAT WILL
NEVER BE SAID.)) // *applause*

THIS MARKS THE FOURTH TIME I HAVE HAD THE HONOR OF
ADDRESSING THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL
RELIGIOUS BROADCASTERS. AND ONCE AGAIN, IT IS A
DELIGHT TO BE BACK.

IN THE SPIRIT OF THE OCCASION, I WANT TO MAKE TWO
VOWS. FIRST, I'LL BE BRIEF. ((I KNOW THERE'S A
MENTION IN THE BIBLE ABOUT THE BURNING BUSH -- BUT I
ALSO KNOW THAT COMPARED TO MOST AROUND ME HERE, I'M NOT
THAT HOT A SPEAKER.)) // *applause*

THE SECOND PROMISE IS FOR THOSE OF YOU IN THE BACK
OF THE ROOM. I'LL TRY TO SPEAK UP. // ((PAT
ROBERTSON WARNED ME THAT THE AGNOSTICS IN THIS ROOM ARE
VERY BAD.)) // *applause*

LET ME BEGIN WITH SOME GOOD NEWS FOR MODERN MAN:
THERE IS NO DENYING THAT AMERICA IS A RELIGIOUS NATION.

//

SURE, DIFFERENCES EXIST OVER SECT AND THEOLOGY.
((I'M REMINDED OF WHAT THE FRENCH STATESMAN TALLEYRAND
ONCE SAID OF AMERICA: "I FOUND THERE A COUNTRY WITH
THIRTY-TWO RELIGIONS AND ONLY ONE SAUCE.")) // YET WE
KNOW WHAT UNITES US ECLIPSES WHAT DIVIDES US. FOR WE
BELIEVE THAT POLITICAL VALUES WITHOUT MORAL VALUES
CANNOT SUSTAIN A PEOPLE. // *applause*

THIS AFTERNOON, I'D LIKE TO TALK TO YOU ABOUT
THOSE MORAL VALUES. I SPEAK OF THE QUALITIES OF
TOLERANCE AND DECENCY, COURAGE AND RESPONSIBILITY, AND
OF COURSE, *dropped* FAITH. VALUES WHICH REMIND US THAT WHILE
GOD CAN LIVE WITHOUT MAN, MAN CANNOT LIVE WITHOUT GOD. *stressed*

// *applause*

TODAY, AMID POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC UPHEAVAL, THESE
VALUES HAVEN'T CHANGED. NOR WILL THEY BE MORE CRUCIAL
THAN IN THE 1990s.

NOW, YOU KNOW ME. I'M AN OPTIMIST. ((AFTER ALL,
LAST YEAR I HAD AN EXPERIENCE THAT RENEWED MY FAITH. I
WAS RUNNING OUT OF PRAYERS AND HAD ALMOST GIVEN UP
CB ~~HOPE~~ *HOPE*. THEN A MIRACLE OCCURRED. // I CAUGHT A FISH.))
// SO IT WON'T SURPRISE YOU THAT I'M CONVINCED WE CAN
-- AND WILL -- UPHOLD THE VALUES I'M REFERRING TO. FOR
AS AMERICANS, WE ALWAYS HAVE.

CONSIDER THAT FOR MORE THAN TWO CENTURIES, AMERICA
HAS ENDORSED THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE. BUT
IT HAS ALSO SHOWN HOW RELIGION AND GOVERNMENT CAN
CO-EXIST. // AND THAT -- TO PARAPHRASE OUR FOUNDING
DOCUMENT -- ALL MEN ARE ENDOWED NOT BY GOVERNMENT BUT
BY THEIR CREATOR WITH CERTAIN UNALIENABLE RIGHTS. *hit*

THESE RIGHTS INCLUDE THE FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION.
AND TO THINK, DREAM, AND WORSHIP AS WE PLEASE. EQUAL
PROTECTION UNDER THE LAW. AND THE RIGHT TO CHOOSE OUR
LEADERS AND OUR DESTINIES. THE INHERENT DIGNITY OF THE *hit*
INDIVIDUAL. // AND WE MUST MANIFEST THAT DIGNITY BY
THE POLICIES WE PURSUE.

FOR EXAMPLE, I BELIEVE THAT WE SHOULD HELP PARENTS OBTAIN THE BEST CHILD-CARE FOR THEIR KIDS. // SO WE HAVE SENT LEGISLATION TO CONGRESS TO MAKE GOOD THAT GOAL. I WANT TO ENSURE THAT PARENTS, NOT BUREAUCRATS, ARE THE ONES WHO DECIDE HOW TO CARE FOR THEIR CHILDREN. AND I WILL NOT SEE THE OPTION OF RELIGIOUS-BASED CHILD CARE RESTRICTED OR ELIMINATED. //

NEXT, THERE'S THE CONCERN OF EVERY CHILD: THE QUALITY AND DIVERSITY OF AMERICA'S SCHOOLS. // OUR PIONEERING LEGISLATION -- THE "EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE ACT OF 1989" -- WILL SPUR EXCELLENCE AND DEMAND ACCOUNTABILITY. FOR OUR KIDS SAKE, LET'S HELP AMERICAN EDUCATION MAKE THE GRADE. //

WE COME NEXT TO AN ISSUE ON WHICH AMERICANS CAN, ~~AND DO~~, DISAGREE. FOR MY PART, LET ME BE CLEAR. I SUPPORT THE SANCTITY OF LIFE. WE NEED POLICIES THAT ENCOURAGE ADOPTION, NOT ABORTION. //

applause - 5 -

FINALLY, I CONTINUE TO SUPPORT A BELIEF HELD BY
THE OVERWHELMING MAJORITY OF AMERICANS: THE RIGHT TO
VOLUNTARY SCHOOL PRAYER. SO I SUPPORT A CONSTITUTIONAL
AMENDMENT RESTORING VOLUNTARY PRAYER. WE NEED THE
FAITH OF OUR FATHERS BACK IN OUR SCHOOLS. // applause

AS WE STRUGGLE TO FIND ANSWERS TO OUR PRESSING
SOCIAL PROBLEMS, I WILL ENDORSE POLICIES THAT REFLECT
THE RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL -- A CONCEPT AS OLD AS THE
SCRIPTURES. RIGHTS WHICH FORM THE ESSENCE OF AMERICA.
AND THAT TO OTHER NATIONS, HAVE BECOME THE MESSAGE OF
AMERICA -- FOR OUR FREEDOMS HAVE BEEN CARRIED TO EVERY
CORNER OF THE EARTH. //

ONE YEAR AGO IN MY INAUGURAL ADDRESS, I SAID, "THE
DAY OF THE DICTATOR IS OVER." // AND INDEED, THE LAST
YEAR HAS BEEN A VICTORY FOR THE FREEDOMS WITH WHICH GOD
HAS BLESSED AMERICA. WE HAVE SEEN THE RIGHTS OF MAN
MOVE MOUNTAINS OR -- AS IN EAST BERLIN -- EVEN MOVE A
WALL. // applause

THINK OF CENTRAL AMERICA, WHERE MEN AND WOMEN --
FACING GREAT PERSONAL RISK -- WORK FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND
AGAINST TYRANNY OF ANY IDEOLOGY. AND LET ME ADD: I AM
ESPECIALLY PROUD OF OUR TROOPS IN PANAMA. ^{for a lot of reasons but} AMERICANS
SUPPORTED "OPERATION JUST CAUSE" ^{because} BECAUSE DEMOCRACY IS A
NOBLE CAUSE. // AND TO THE YOUNG SOLDIERS WHO SERVED
THIS COUNTRY, EVERY AMERICAN THANKS YOU. // THINK,
NEXT, OF SOUTH AFRICA AND THE PHILIPPINES, WHERE THE
VALUES OF CHURCH LEADERS HAVE BEEN A FORCE FOR
DEMOCRATIC CHANGE. // AND, YES, IN EASTERN EUROPE,
TOO. WHERE FOR CENTURIES FAITH HAS SUSTAINED THOSE
STRIVING FOR FREEDOM ^{amid} ADVERSITY.

apphause

should
apphause

← vice dropped

YOU KNOW, EIGHT YEARS AGO ONE OF THE LORD'S GREAT
AMBASSADORS, THE REVEREND BILLY GRAHAM, WENT TO EASTERN
EUROPE AND THE SOVIET UNION. AND UPON RETURNING SPOKE
OF A MOVEMENT THERE TOWARD MORE RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.
PERHAPS HE SAW IT BEFORE MANY OTHERS BECAUSE IT TAKES A
MAN OF GOD TO SENSE THE EARLY MOVEMENT OF THE HAND OF
GOD. // YET WHO COULD PREDICT THAT IN 1989,
FREEDOM'S TIDE WOULD ALSO BE ECONOMIC, POLITICAL, AND
INTELLECTUAL? OR THAT THE WALLS OF BAYONETS AND BARBED
WIRE -- THE WALLS OF TYRANNY -- WOULD COME TUMBLING
DOWN.

sign

← built up

LOOK, FIRST, AT EAST GERMANY -- WHERE IN 1982 --
LONG BEFORE LAST NOVEMBER'S MASS DEMONSTRATIONS --
MEMBERS OF LEIPZIG'S ST. NICHOLAS CHURCH BEGAN A WEEKLY
"PRAYER FOR PEACE." AT THE SERVICES, STUDENTS WERE
TAUGHT NON-VIOLENCE. AND STARTED THE CANDLE-LIGHT
VIGILS THAT WOULD ONE DAY ROUSE A CONTINENT. THE
POLICE CAME AND THREATENED THEM. BUT THE STUDENTS
VOWED TO STAY, AND DID. BECOMING A LIGHT UNTO THE
WORLD.

And ULTIMATELY, THAT LIGHT SPREAD TO DRESDEN AND EAST
BERLIN. AND AS IT SHONE, A WITTENBERG PASTOR SAID, "I
WOULD RATHER SEE 1,000 DROPS OF CANDLE WAX ON THE
MARKET PLACE THEN ONE DROP OF BLOOD." // AND THERE
WAS NO BLOOD. ONLY THE STIRRING SIGHT LAST OCTOBER OF
70,000 WORKERS IN THE STREETS AND SQUARES OF LEIPZIG.
WEAPONS? THEY CARRIED CANDLES. AND THEIR LIGHT WAS
LIKENED TO "A BLIZZARD OF FIREFLIES IN THE NIGHT." ASK
ANYONE THAT EVENING. THEY SOUGHT WHAT WE AMERICANS
ENJOY: FREE MARKETS, FREE ELECTIONS, AND THE EXERCISE
OF FREE WILL UNHAMPERED BY THE STATE.

THEY WERE PROPELLED BY MANY THINGS -- FAITH NOT THE LEAST OF THEM. AND AS THEY AND OTHERS MARCHED ACROSS EASTERN EUROPE, THE DAY OF THE DICTATOR DID END. THE DAY OF DEMOCRACY BEGAN.

LOOK AT BULGARIA. WHERE LAST MONTH THE STATE PRESS AGENCY CONCEDED: "PEOPLE [WERE] WISHING MERRY CHRISTMAS TO EACH OTHER MAYBE FOR THE FIRST TIME WITHOUT FEAR THEY WOULD BE ACCUSED OF BEING 'RELIGIOUS.'" // AND CZECHOSLOVAKIA. THERE, TOO, A VICTORY FOR THE RIGHTS OF MAN. FOR YEARS, POLICE CHASED CAROLERS FROM PRAGUE'S KING'S ROAD. THIS CHRISTMAS, CAROLS WARMED THE HEART OF THE CITY. THERE WAS WONDER IN THE AIR. // IN THE SOVIET UNION, LAST YEAR MOSCOW HOSTED THE FIRST NATIONWIDE GATHERING OF JEWS SINCE THE FALL OF THE CZAR. AND IN ROMANIA: STILL FURTHER VICTORIES. CHRISTMAS SONGS ON THE RADIO FOR THE FIRST TIME SINCE 1946. AND HEROES WHO SHOWED THAT YOU CAN'T LOCK PEOPLE BEHIND WALLS FOREVER -- WHEN MORAL CONVICTION UPLIFTS THEIR HEARTS. //

LET ME CLOSE, THEN, WITH THE STORY OF TWO SUCH
HEROES -- BOTH ROMANIAN. AND HOW THEIR EXAMPLE
ILLUMINED DECENCY, COURAGE, AND LOVE.

THE FIRST WAS A LUTHERAN MINISTER, LASZLO
[LAZ-LOW] TOKES [TO-KESH], WHO DARED TO SPEAK OF
FREEDOM. SO LAST NOVEMBER IN TIMISOARA
[TIMMY-SCHWA-RA], MASKED THUGS BROKE INTO THE SMALL
APARTMENT OF TOKES AND HIS PREGNANT WIFE. ^{RWB} THEY BEAT ^{HIM}
^{THEY} AND STABBED HIM. ^{AND} THE GOVERNMENT ALLOWED THEM NO FOOD.
// EVEN PARISHIONERS WERE NOT PERMITTED TO BRING
BREAD; FINALLY, THE POLICE ARRIVED TO DEPORT THE
PASTOR. BUT THE FLOCK PROTECTED HIM -- FORMING A HUMAN
CHAIN AROUND HIS APARTMENT. IN TIME, THE CHAIN GREW
ACROSS THE LAND. UNTIL -- AS WE CELEBRATED CHRISTMAS
-- ROMANIA'S QUEST FOR FREEDOM SUMMONED "LIGHTNESS
AGAINST THE DARK." //

TODAY, LASZLO TOKES MINISTERS TO EVER-LARGER
NUMBERS -- PREACHING HIS FAITH WITHOUT ^{BUT NOW PREACHING IT} FEAR. ^{ALL} AS
DOES GHEORGHE [GEORGE] CALCIU [CAL-CHEW] -- A ROMANIAN
ORTHODOX MINISTER. HIS STORY PROVES YOU CAN'T KILL AN
IDEA -- OR DESTROY THE HUMAN WILL. //

FATHER CALCIU [CAL-CHEW] HAS SPENT 21 OF HIS 64
report 1/3 of his entire life in jail
YEARS IN JAIL. IN FACT, HE FOUND GOD THERE WHILE
IMPRISONED FOR OPPOSING THE GOVERNMENT. RELEASED, HE
RISKED HIS FREEDOM BY PREACHING A SERIES OF LENTEN
SERMONS. AND FOR THAT HE WAS IMPRISONED AGAIN --
slowly TORTURED BEYOND BELIEF. // YET FATHER CALCIU HAD
FAITH. HE REFUSED TO BREAK -- AND WAS SENTENCED TO
DEATH. AND AS HE STOOD IN THE CORNER OF THE PRISON
YARD, PRAYING FOR HIS WIFE AND SON -- AWAITING DEATH --
IT WAS THEN SOMETHING REMARKABLE OCCURRED. //

HIS TWO EXECUTIONERS CALLED TO HIM. SURELY, HE
pause
THOUGHT, THIS WAS THE END. BUT INSTEAD THEY SAID,
"FATHER" -- THAT WAS THE FIRST TIME THEY CALLED HIM
THAT -- "WE HAVE DECIDED NOT TO KILL YOU." // THREE
WEEKS LATER, HE ASKED PERMISSION TO CELEBRATE THE
DIVINE LITURGY. AND WHILE MAKING PREPARATIONS, HEARD
THESE SAME TWO MEN APPROACH. HE TURNED AROUND, AND WAS
ASTONISHED. // HIS WOULD-BE EXECUTIONERS WERE ON THEIR
KNEES ON THE COLD CONCRETE OF THE CELL. //

standing ovation - 11 -

FATHER CALCIU IS WITH US TODAY. FATHER, IT'S AN HONOR TO SALUTE YOU. // I KNOW YOU'RE GLAD TO BE HERE. BUT I KNOW, TOO, YOU HOPE TO RETURN TO YOUR NATIVE LAND. AND IN THIS SEASON OF MIRACLES, WHO CAN DOUBT YOU WILL? // FOR TODAY, THE TIMES ARE ON THE SIDE OF PEACE. BECAUSE THE WORLD, INCREASINGLY, IS ON THE SIDE OF GOD. //

FOR MY OWN PART, I KNOW THAT THIS IS TRUE. FOR ALTHOUGH I'VE BEEN PRESIDENT FOR BARELY A YEAR, I BELIEVE -- WITH ALL MY HEART -- THAT ONE CANNOT BE AMERICA'S PRESIDENT WITHOUT A BELIEF IN GOD.

What the strength
your belief gives
to you.
R. Appleby

ANOTHER PRESIDENT, DWIGHT EISENHOWER -- BELOVED IKE -- ONCE SAID, "FREE GOVERNMENT IS THE POLITICAL EXPRESSION OF A DEEPLY-FELT RELIGIOUS FAITH." LET EACH OF US USE HIS FAITH TO EXPRESS THE NOBLEST VALUES OF AMERICA. SO THAT, TOGETHER, WE CAN SERVE THE INALIENABLE RIGHTS OF MAN.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR WORK, AND FOR YOUR KINDNESS.
GOD BLESS YOU. AND GOD BLESS OUR BELOVED LAND -- THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

*Don
Don
Don
Don
Don*

#

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

September 24, 1990

90 SEP 24 PM 5:34

INFORMATION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

THROUGH: CHRISS WINSTON *W*
FROM: CURT SMITH *CS*
SUBJECT: REMARKS AT PRESIDENT'S CLUB DINNER

I. SUMMARY

On Tuesday, September 25, 1990, at 7:57 P.M., you will address approximately 650 guests in the Regency Ballroom of the Omni Shoreham Hotel. Entering its tenth year, the RNC's President's Club includes members from around the country, each of whom has contributed at least \$1,000 to the Party. Among those attending this year's dinner will be dinner chairman Mike Harper, who will introduce you; Sen. Phil Gramm, Sen. Gordon Humphrey, General Scowcroft, Deputy Sec. Henson Moore, Tim Ryan, Larry Bathgate, Charlie Black, Wally Ganzi, Jeb and Columba Bush, Katie Boyd, and Jim Pierce.

II. DISCUSSION

The attached remarks (12 minutes, teleprompter) highlight the importance of a strong Republican showing in the upcoming mid-term elections. Within this framework, the remarks pay particular attention to the ongoing budget negotiations, the failure of the Congress to take necessary action with regard to the environment and crime, and the continued necessity of a sound defense.

Please note page two reference to the efforts of Lee Atwater. Mr. Atwater will be unable to attend the dinner.

*Let's try some definite jokes on p 1
top of 2*

*Budget language needs to be carefully
reviewed on Tuesday. to replace some of budget
If need money add some
"education" stuff.*

(Smith/Garmey)
September 24, 1990
4 P.M.
GOP1

90 SEP 24 P7:31

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: PRESIDENT'S DINNER
SHOREHAM HOTEL
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1990

OK Mike (Harper), thank you for that introduction -- and the wonderful job you've done as Dinner Chairman for tonight's dinner. Congratulations on tomorrow's birthday. // Senator Gramm and Senator Humphrey. Larry (Bathgate) -- I salute you, too, for all you're doing as Chairman of the Finance Committee. // It's also great to have Charlie Black here. And a personal friend of ^{twenty years} ~~twenty years~~, the National Chairman of the President's Club -- Wally Ganzi, and his lovely wife Reva. Katie Boyd. To Crystal Gale, Loretta Lynn, and Peggy Sue Wright -- who loved country before it was cool, it's always good to see you. // It's exciting to have several members of my family with us. Our son, Jeb, his wife, Columba, and our nephew, Jim Pierce. Above all, my thanks to each of you here tonight for your support of the Republican National Committee. // And for your support this fall in our critical races -- in the Senate, the House, and the State Houses. It's commitment and dedication like yours that will make such a difference in so many key races.

On Barbara's behalf, thank you for that generous reception. She made me promise not to be too windy. ((Maybe she's heard the report that our military has trained for those long hours of boredom in the Gulf by listening to tapes of my speeches.)) //

((I was listening to a country and western tape on the way here, and on came Randy Travis singing, "It's just a matter of

time." // What a relief to hear a song expressing confidence in my ultimate ability to catch a fish.)) // *dated*

((Actually, here's a scoop: I'm thinking of giving up fishing altogether. As somebody put it recently: The way my golf game's been going, I spend enough time around water just being out on the course.)) //

Seriously, I want to take a moment to salute a man who is in our thoughts this evening. He's a fighter // a winner // above all, he's our friend and inspiration, Lee Atwater. // Lee has been forced to keep a low profile. But he, himself, is a profile in courage. I join every Republican in extending prayers to Lee, his wife Sally, and his three daughters, Sarah, Ashley, and Sally T. // Here's to the grand young man of the Grand Old Party. //

Like you, Lee Atwater knows what this election is all about. It's about values and priorities. It's about keeping America strong. It's about one philosophy -- ours -- that wants to move ahead -- working, creating, dreaming. And another philosophy -- the Democrats' philosophy -- that is as timeworn as it is tired.

The Democrats' philosophy burdens people for the benefit of government. Our philosophy could not be more different. It uses government for the benefit of easing burdens on people. // Democrats believe in status-quo. Republicans believe in status-grow. Democrats embrace "More of the same." Republicans embrace the letters "GOP": Growth, opportunity, and prosperity.

//

For proof, let's look first at the budget. Why not? That's all Congress has been doing for nearly a year. // Some say there's not a dollar's worth of difference between our two parties. They're right. // There's half-a-trillion dollars' worth. // That's what our plan -- the Republican plan -- would have slashed from the Federal budget deficit over the next five years. //

All of you know the history of these budget negotiations. It's a very sad history. Nearly eight months ago, I proposed a budget for the coming fiscal year. That didn't wake up the Congress. So three months ago, I said that to cut the deficit, everything would be considered "on the table." That didn't wake up the Congress. // As a result, five days from now we face the prospect of drastic spending cuts that will scar America. Yet still Congress refuses to make real spending cuts and real budget reform. In short, to put our fiscal house in order. //

Sequestration isn't partisan fiction. It's real / it's approaching / and once here, it will cost jobs and harm our economy. It is senseless. It is also needless. So I call on Congress to oppose further tax hikes. And support growth-oriented tax incentives -- from expanded IRA's to Family Savings Accounts to, yes, a cut in the capital gains tax. // Together, let's do what we were elected to do: serve the American people. Not sometime. Not someplace. But here in Washington. Now. //

As the budget proves, Americans expect their leaders to act quickly -- and intelligently. Let me tell a story which shows

Check
this
with
Dan
&
Sam
—

what I mean. Happened up in Kennebunkport. ((I told John Sununu I'd like to deliver a speech called, "Keeping pace with rapidly-moving events." He said, "Do you really think an audience wants to hear what it's like to play 18 holes with you?" // I said, "Sure, I like to do things quickly // and you can ignore that rumor that I watch 60 Minutes in three-quarters of an hour.")) // OK

Americans do expect action. Yet let me note several other ways Congress has wavered -- thwarting growth, opportunity, and prosperity. //

It's been sixteen months, for instance, since our Administration's Comprehensive Crime Control proposals reached Capitol Hill. // Some feel we can soft-pedal the need to be hard on crime. Republicans disagree. We know that for anybody who kills a police officer, no legal penalty is too tough. // So our legislation proposes a workable death penalty -- a real death penalty -- for the killers of Federal law enforcement officers. And we urge all Governors to enact similar legislation for the killers of local police officers. // Soon, the House will begin debate on its version of the Crime Bill. I call on Congress to give cop-killers the kind of punishment they deserve.

Here's another issue where the Congress has delayed. The environment. Over a year ago (this is beginning to sound familiar), we proposed a landmark bill to rewrite the Clean Air Act. Legislation which says we can have a sound economy and a safe environment. Sound good? Apparently not to the Democrats. // Six months ago, we reached an agreement with the Senate

leadership -- and still no final action. To the Congress, I say: Republicans don't think we have to throw people out of work to protect our environment. Send me a Clean Air Act I can sign. //

((As you can see, clear differences abound between our parties. Sort of like the difference between the old and new "Air Force One." // The new plane is incredible. But, I want to take this chance to deny the rumor that I held budget meetings last week in the forward horseshoe pits.)) //

This fall, Republicans and Democrats will discuss our differences. Fairly, and honorably, as all Americans should. Yet, as we debate, let's remember one issue confronting us that unites us as a people. I refer to the Persian Gulf. //

Two weeks ago, I went before the Congress to talk about what we must do together to defend civilized values around the world. I spoke of how our objectives in the Middle East are clear: Iraq must withdraw from Kuwait, completely, immediately, and without condition. Kuwait's legitimate government must be restored. The security and stability of the Persian Gulf must be assured. And American citizens and others must be protected. //

Tonight, I say: Those goals are unchanged. We will stay in the Persian Gulf not a moment more, nor less, than necessary. We will stay just as long as it takes to complete our mission. //

To finish the job will require the support of our friends and allies. We have it. Think of the unprecedented United Nations' unity. And the aid -- economic or military -- from Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, the United Arab Emirates, Turkey; from

Germany, Japan, France, the United Kingdom, and many others. Think of our Arab allies who are sacrificing so much -- above all, Egypt. This isn't the U.S. against Iraq. It's Iraq against the world. We're not going it alone -- and believe me, we are going to see it through. //

We will continue to stand up to aggression -- and for those who believe that no Nation should mug another -- and get away with it. // ~~We will continue to put our armed forces where they are needed, when they are needed.~~ // Incidentally, if Saddam Hussein had any doubts about our staying power, the last few weeks should dispel them. Go to any city or town. Ask anyone you meet. Where does America stand? Their refrain can be heard from Bangor to Baghdad: America stands where it always has -- against aggression. //

We all remember a man who knew something about countering aggression. // His name was Dwight David Eisenhower, and this year we observe the centennial of his birth. What's more, we celebrate Ike's lessons that endure until today. //

Dwight Eisenhower showed how, at home, private enterprise can unleash growth, opportunity, and prosperity. And that abroad, America will never -- ever -- allow a tyrant to brutalize the family of Nations. // Something, I might add, that a certain dictator should recall as he goes to sleep each night. //

Today, America has never been more willing or able to follow Ike's lessons. Today, we will do what is right for America -- and for the world. // Thank you for this occasion. Let's have

a grand November 6. And God bless the greatest Nation on the face of this earth -- the United States of America.

#

VFW ADDRESS \ BALTIMORE, MARYLAND
MONDAY, AUGUST 20, 1990 \ 10 A.M.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, IT IS A PRIVILEGE TO JOIN
YOU. AND A DEEP PERSONAL PLEASURE TO RENEW OLD TIES
-- AND TO GREET NEW FRIENDS. // MY THANKS TO ALL OF
YOU -- BUT ESPECIALLY TO WALTER HOGAN, DOING A GREAT
JOB AS YOUR COMMANDER IN CHIEF. FOLLOWING THE LIKES OF
LARRY RIVERS ISN'T EASY -- BUT WALTER'S DONE THE VFW
PROUD. I ALSO KNOW WE'RE LOOKING FORWARD TO THE SAME
KIND OF STRONG LEADERSHIP FROM JAMES KIMERY. AND LET
ME OFFER MY THANKS AGAIN TO COOPER HOLT, A REAL LEGEND,
WHO HAS GIVEN SO MANY YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE VFW.
COOPER -- WE MISS YOU. //

NEXT, I WANT TO THANK MY VETERANS' SECRETARY AND
FELLOW VFW MEMBER ED DERWINSKI. // ED'S GOT SO MUCH
GOING ON -- BUT I'M ESPECIALLY HAPPY TO SEE THE WORK
HE'S DOING TO IMPROVE OUR VETERANS' HOSPITALS. HIS
DEPARTMENT IS INTENT ON SERVING YOU --MUCH AS YOU HAVE
SERVED AMERICA. // AND, LET US REMEMBER THOSE WHO
COULD NOT BE WITH US. OUR ADMINISTRATION WILL NOT
FORGET OUR POWS/MIAS STILL ALIVE OR WHO GAVE WHAT
LINCOLN TERMED "THAT LAST FULL MEASURE OF DEVOTION." //

m

LET ME ACKNOWLEDGE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, MICHAEL STONE, AND BALTIMORE MAYOR, KURT SCHMOKE. AND, YES, FINALLY, TODAY'S HONOREES. // BUD DUDLEY, AND MY UNITED NATIONS AMBASSADOR TOM PICKERING, WHO'S BEING HONORED THIS EVENING.

AS A VETERAN, I WANT TO SALUTE THE VFW ON ITS 91ST YEAR. AND TO NOTE HOW WE MEET AMID GREAT CHALLENGES -- FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC. FIRST, DOMESTIC. THE UNITED STATES SENATE WILL SOON CONSIDER THE NOMINATION OF OUR SUPERB CANDIDATE, DAVID SOUTER, AS SUPREME COURT JUSTICE. I CALL ON THE SENATE TO CONFIRM JUDGE SOUTER TO THE NATION'S HIGHEST COURT. //

((SECOND, ON THE FOREIGN SCENE, HERE'S A CHALLENGE WHICH ONLY SOMETHING LIKE THE MIDDLE EAST CAN PUT INTO PERSPECTIVE. WHEN AN AIDE BURST INTO MY OFFICE IN EARLY AUGUST AND SAID, "THERE'S A DICTATOR ON THE RAMPAGE," I REPLIED, "I THOUGHT THE YANKEES ALREADY SOLVED THE STEINBRENNER PROBLEM."))

THIS MORNING, I AM GRATEFUL TO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS A FAR GREATER AND MORE SERIOUS PROBLEM: THE CRISIS IN THE PERSIAN GULF. // A CRISIS THAT WILL REQUIRE AMERICAN PLANNING, PATIENCE, AND PERSONAL SACRIFICE. BUT A CRISIS THAT WE MUST AND WILL MEET IF WE'RE TO STOP AGGRESSION, HELP OUR FRIENDS, AND PROTECT OUR OWN INTEREST AND THE PEACE AND STABILITY OF COUNTRIES AROUND THE GLOBE. //

EIGHTEEN DAYS AGO, THESE BELIEFS PROMPTED ME TO TAKE ACTION IN THE MIDDLE EAST TO RESTORE THE SOVEREIGNTY OF KUWAIT AND DETER THOSE WHO THREATEN FRIENDLY COUNTRIES AND THE VITAL INTERESTS OF AMERICA. I ACTED KNOWING THAT OUR CAUSE WOULD NOT BE EASY --BUT THAT OUR CAUSE IS RIGHT. // AND THAT WHILE ONE SHOULD NOT UNDERESTIMATE THOSE WHO ENDANGER PEACE -- AN EVEN GREATER MISTAKE WOULD BE TO UNDERESTIMATE AMERICA'S COMMITMENT TO OUR FRIENDS WHEN OUR FRIENDS ARE IMPERILED. //

TODAY, THE OUTCOME IS NOT YET DECIDED. HARD CHOICES REMAIN. BUT OF THIS WE ARE CERTAIN. AMERICA WILL NOT BE DETERRED. // INSTEAD, WE WILL ACT TO SUPPORT THE COMMON CODE AND RULE OF LAW THAT PROMOTES COOPERATION INSTEAD OF CONFLICT. WE WILL PRESERVE OUR ECONOMIC VITALITY. // ABOVE ALL, WHEN SOME ASK: WHERE DOES AMERICA STAND? OUR ANSWER IS: AMERICA STANDS WHERE IT ALWAYS HAS -- AGAINST AGGRESSION -- AGAINST THOSE WHO WOULD USE FORCE TO REPLACE THE RULE OF LAW. // AND WE ARE PROUD THAT SO MANY FRIENDS AND ALLIES ARE STANDING SHOULDER TO SHOULDER WITH US. //

THROUGHOUT HISTORY, WE HAVE LEARNED THAT WE MUST
STAND UP TO EVIL. IT IS A TRUTH WHICH THE PAST
EIGHTEEN DAYS HAVE REAFFIRMED. ITS LESSONS SPEAK TO
AMERICA, AND TO THE WORLD. //

THE FIRST LESSON IS AS VIVID AS THE MEMORIES OF
NORMANDY, KHE SANH, AND PORK CHOP HILL. WE HAVE BEEN
REMINDING AGAIN THAT AGGRESSION MUST -- AND WILL --
BE CHECKED. // SO WE HAVE SENT U.S. FORCES TO THE
MIDDLE EAST -- RELUCTANTLY, BUT DECISIVELY. KNOWING,
AS TEDDY ROOSEVELT SAID, THAT AMERICA "MEANS MANY
THINGS. [AMONG THEM], EQUALITY OF RIGHTS AND,
THEREFORE, EQUALITY OF DUTY AND OF OBLIGATION." //

YET WE ARE NOT ACTING ALONE -- BUT IN CONCERT --
HELPING TO PROTECT OUR OWN NATIONAL SECURITY INTERESTS
AS WELL AS THOSE OF THE BROADER COMMUNITY OF NATIONS.
WHICH BRINGS ME TO A SECOND LESSON REAFFIRMED BY THE
PAST EIGHTEEN DAYS. BY ITSELF, AMERICA CAN DO MUCH.
TOGETHER, WITH ITS ALLIES AND FRIENDS, AMERICA CAN DO
MUCH MORE -- FOR PEACE AND FOR JUSTICE. //

THINK BACK TO WORLD WAR II, WHERE TOGETHER ALLIES
CONFRONTED A HORROR WHICH EMBODIED HELL ON EARTH. OR
KOREA, WHERE UNITED NATIONS FORCES OPPOSED
TOTALITARIANISM. TODAY, EVEN MORE, NATIONS -- MANY OF
THEM MOSLEM -- HAVE JOINED TO BECOME PROTECTORS OF
PEACE. //

OUR SAUDI FRIENDS, UNDER THE BRAVE LEADERSHIP OF
KING FAHD, ASKED FOR OUR HELP IN DEFENDING AGAINST
UNPROVOKED AGGRESSION. I SALUTE BAHRAIN, EGYPT,
FRANCE, ITALY, KATAR, KUWAIT, MOROCCO, OMAN, AND THE
UNITED ARAB EMIRATES FOR ALREADY SENDING FORCES IN
RESPONSE TO SAUDI ARABIA'S REQUEST. AND I SALUTE GREAT
BRITAIN FOR DISPATCHING TROOPS, FIGHTER PLANES, AND THE
DESTROYER HMS YORK TO THE PERSIAN GULF. // LOOK TO
OTHER NATIONS FROM AUSTRALIA, BANGLADESH, BELGIUM,
CANADA, AND GREECE TO THE NETHERLANDS, PAKISTAN, SPAIN,
SYRIA, TURKEY, AND WEST GERMANY. THE CAUSE OF HUMAN
DIGNITY IS INDEBTED TO THEM ALL. // THINK OF THE
SOVIET UNION -- WHOSE COOPERATION IN THE U.N. SHOWS HOW
FISTS ONCE CLENCHED IN ANIMOSITY CAN BECOME HANDS
JOINED IN PARTNERSHIP. //

A THIRD LESSON WAS ALSO REAFFIRMED BY THE LAST EIGHTEEN DAYS -- AS VETERANS, IT WON'T SURPRISE YOU: THE STEADFAST CHARACTER OF THE AMERICAN WILL. // LOOK TO THE SANDS OF SAUDI ARABIA AND THE WATERS OFFSHORE -- WHERE BRAVE AMERICANS ARE DOING THEIR DUTY. JUST AS YOU DID AT ANZIO, INCHON, AND HAMBURGER HILL. THINK OF THE MEN AND WOMEN ABOARD OUR PLANES AND SHIPS -- YOUNG, ALONE, AND SO VERY FAR FROM HOME. // THEY MAKE US PROUD, AND HUMBLE -- AND I SALUTE THE FINEST SOLDIERS, SAILORS, AIRMEN, AND MARINES ANY NATION COULD EVER HAVE. // MOREOVER, I PLEDGE TO YOU: WE WILL DO WHATEVER IT TAKES TO HELP THEM COMPLETE THEIR MISSION.

THIS MEANS REALIZING THE FOURTH LESSON REAFFIRMED BY THE PAST EIGHTEEN DAYS. ALTHOUGH THE SIZE OF AMERICA'S ARMED FORCES IN THE YEARS AHEAD WILL BE SMALLER BECAUSE THE THREAT TO OUR SECURITY IS CHANGING, FUTURE AMERICAN DEFENSE CAPACITY MUST BE EVEN MORE "A LEAN, MEAN FIGHTING MACHINE."// BY 1995, WE ESTIMATE THAT OUR SECURITY NEEDS CAN BE MET BY AN ACTIVE FORCE 25 PERCENT SMALLER THAN TODAY'S -- THE LOWEST LEVEL SINCE 1950. YET, WE MUST ENSURE THAT A REDUCTION OF NUMBERS DOES NOT MEAN A REDUCTION IN AMERICAN STRENGTH.

//

OPERATION DESERT SHIELD PROVES VIVIDLY THAT INSTEAD OF RELIVING PAST CONTINGENCIES, WE MUST PREPARE FOR THE CHALLENGES OF THE 1990S AND BEYOND. BY ENSURING THAT OUR TROOPS ARE READY, AND TRAINED, WE CAN EXERT OUR PRESENCE IN KEY AREAS -- AND RESPOND EFFECTIVELY TO CRISIS. THIS IS READINESS MEASURED IN DAYS AND HOURS, NOT WEEKS AND MONTHS. // OPERATION DESERT SHIELD HAS UNDERSCORED THE NEED TO BE ABLE TO GET OUR SOLDIERS WHERE THEY ARE NEEDED, WHEN THEY ARE NEEDED. THIS KIND OF RESPONSIVENESS WILL BE CRITICAL IN THE CRISES OF THE FUTURE.

LAST WEEK, THE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS, GENERAL COLIN POWELL, SPOKE TO THIS WHEN HE PRAISED "THE FINEST PEACETIME MILITARY IN THE HISTORY OF AMERICA." WE WILL BE SMALLER IN TROOP STRENGTH, AND RESTRUCTURED, BUT WE WILL REMAIN PURPOSEFUL, PROUD AND EFFECTIVE. // JUST LOOK AT THE LAST EIGHTEEN DAYS: DESERT SHIELD HAS BEEN A CLASSIC CASE OF AMERICA'S MILITARY AT ITS BEST.

I THINK, FOR INSTANCE, OF AIRMAN FIRST CLASS WADE WEST, HOME ON LEAVE TO BE MARRIED. ON AUGUST 7, HE WAS CALLED UP. WITHIN AN HOUR HE HAD THE CEREMONY PERFORMED, LEFT FOR THE MIDDLE EAST, AND IS STATIONED NOW IN SAUDI ARABIA. TALK ABOUT A GUY WHO GETS THINGS DONE. // BUT I WOULD LIKE TO APOLOGIZE TO THE BRIDE. //

ANOTHER EXAMPLE: SEVEN YEARS AGO, DIANA KROPTAVICH [CROP-TA-VICH] WORRIED AT HOME WHILE HER HUSBAND, WALTER, STEAMED OFF THE LEBANON COAST ON THE USS NEW JERSEY DEFENDING THE MARINES. TODAY, THEIR ROLES ARE REVERSED. RETIRED, WALTER IS AT HOME WITH THEIR 6-YEAR-OLD SON; DIANA SERVES ABOARD THE DESTROYER USS YELLOWSTONE. // HERE'S AN ARMY COUPLE. TODAY, PARATROOPER JOSEPH HUDERT [WHO-DERT] OF THE 82ND AIRBORNE DIVISION IS SERVING IN SAUDI ARABIA -- AND HIS WIFE, NURSE DOMINIQUE ALLEN OF THE 44TH MEDICAL BRIGADE, WILL BE DEPLOYED THERE WITHIN THE NEXT TWO WEEKS. FINALLY, RECALL THE EIGHT-YEAR OLD WHO, WATCHING HER DAD LEAVE FOR THE MEDITERRANEAN, SPOKE TRUTH FROM THE MOUTHS OF BABES. "I JUST THINK," SHE SAID, "THAT [THEY] SHOULDN'T LET DADDIES GO AWAY THIS LONG. BUT THEY STILL HAVE TO, TO KEEP THE WORLD SAFE." //

THESE PROFILES SHOW THE TRUE CALIBER OF AMERICA -- AND THE VITAL ESSENCE OF OUR MISSION. WHAT'S MORE, THEY REMIND US OF THE FIFTH AND FINAL LESSON REAFFIRMED BY THE PAST EIGHTEEN DAYS: THE NEED FOR A CONTINUED STRONG DEFENSE BUDGET TO SUPPORT AMERICAN TROOPS. OR AS GEORGE WASHINGTON SAID IN HIS FIRST INAUGURAL ADDRESS, "TO BE PREPARED FOR WAR IS ONE OF THE MOST EFFECTUAL MEANS OF PRESERVING PEACE." // HISTORY HAS SHOWN THE WISDOM OF HIS WORDS -- ESPECIALLY IN OUR CENTURY. WHAT DESERT SHIELD HAS SHOWN IS THAT AMERICA CAN ENSURE THE PEACE BY REMAINING MILITARILY STRONG. //

NOW, I KNOW WE'RE OPERATING IN A TIME OF BUDGET RESTRAINT: WE HAVE LIMITED RESOURCES -- WE MUST USE THEM WISELY. THE BUDGET DEFICIT IS A THREAT TO OUR VITAL INTERESTS AT HOME, AND WON'T BE MADE EASIER BY TODAY'S THREAT ABROAD. EVERYONE REALIZES THAT THE DEFICIT IS TOO LARGE -- THAT IT MUST BE BROUGHT DOWN -- AND THAT CONGRESS MUST ACT, COURAGEOUSLY AND IMMEDIATELY, WHEN IT RETURNS FROM RECESS.

BUT WE CANNOT ATTACK THE DEFICIT BY ATTACKING THE
VERY HEART OF OUR ARMED FORCES -- COMMITTED MEN AND
WOMEN WHO ARE MOTIVATED AND READY. // LAST WEEK, I
ASKED CONGRESS TO DO WHAT WE HAVE DONE -- PRODUCE A
BUDGET PROPOSAL, INCLUDING DEFENSE, THAT IS BOTH
RESPONSIVE AND RESPONSIBLE AND MOST OF ALL. . .FAIR.
WHEN THEY DO, I WILL LISTEN -- LISTEN, BUT NOT BREAK
FAITH WITH THE TROOPS I COMMAND. // MAKE NO MISTAKE:
TO STOP AGGRESSION -- TO KEEP AMERICA MILITARILY
PREPARED -- I WILL OPPOSE THE DEFENSE-BUDGET SLASHERS
WHO ARE OUT OF TUNE WITH WHAT AMERICA NEEDS TO KEEP
DEMOCRACY SECURE AND SAFE. //

MOST AMERICANS KNOW THAT WHEN IT COMES TO NATIONAL DEFENSE, FINISHING SECOND MEANS FINISHING LAST. SO THEY REJECT WHAT THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE RECENTLY SUGGESTED: UNACCEPTABLE CUTS FROM OUR DEFENSE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991. // MOST AMERICANS KNOW, TOO, THAT GIVING PEACE A CHANCE DOES NOT MEAN TAKING A CHANCE ON PEACE. SO THEY ENDORSE GIVING THE MILITARY THE TOOLS TO DO ITS JOB: THE PEACEKEEPER, MIDGETMAN, B-2 BOMBER, AND THE STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE. // AMERICANS WANT ARMS NEGOTIATIONS TO SUCCEED -- BUT THEY KNOW THAT EVEN A START TREATY WILL NOT HELP OUR SECURITY IF WE DISARM UNILATERALLY. LET US NEVER FORGET THAT OUR STRONG NATIONAL DEFENSE POLICIES HAVE HELPED US GAIN THE PEACE. WE NEED A STRONG DEFENSE TODAY TO MAINTAIN THAT PEACE. // I WILL FIGHT FOR THAT DEFENSE -- AND I NEED YOUR HELP. //

((LET ME TELL YOU A STORY ABOUT WHY I FEEL SO STRONGLY. I WAS TALKING TO SOME OF THE YOUNG SOLDIERS WHO LIBERATED PANAMA -- AND I ASKED ONE OF THEM -- A MEDIC -- ABOUT THE OPERATION. CORPORAL RODERICK RINGSTAFF SPOKE OF COMBAT AND THE HEROICS OF OTHERS -- BUT NOT OF HIS OWN. SO HIS COMMANDING OFFICER FILLED IN THE REST. THIS MEDIC HAD BEEN WOUNDED, BUT REPEATEDLY BRAVED FIRE TO RESCUE OTHER WOUNDED -- AND WAS AWARDED THE SILVER STAR FOR BRAVERY. LISTENING, I THOUGHT TO MYSELF: I WILL NEVER SEND YOUNG MEN AND WOMEN INTO BATTLE WITH LESS THAN THE VERY BEST THIS NATION CAN PROVIDE THEM. // I WILL NEVER -- EVER -- LET AMERICANS LIKE THIS DOWN.)) //

AUGUST 1990 HAS WITNESSED WHAT HISTORY WILL JUDGE ONE OF THE MOST CRUCIAL DEPLOYMENTS OF ALLIED POWER SINCE WORLD WAR II. TWO WEEKS AGO, I CALLED FOR THE COMPLETE, IMMEDIATE, AND UNCONDITIONAL WITHDRAWAL OF ALL IRAQI FORCES FROM KUWAIT; SECOND, THE RESTORATION OF KUWAIT'S LEGITIMATE GOVERNMENT; THIRD, THE SECURITY AND STABILITY OF SAUDI ARABIA, AND THE PERSIAN GULF; AND FOURTH, THE SAFETY AND PROTECTION OF AMERICAN CITIZENS ABROAD. TODAY, I SAY: THOSE OBJECTIVES ARE, AND WILL REMAIN, UNCHANGED. //

WILL IT TAKE TIME? OF COURSE. FOR WE ARE ENGAGED IN A CAUSE LARGER THAN OURSELVES. A CAUSE PERHAPS BEST SHOWN BY WORDS MANY OF YOU REMEMBER -- AND THAT I'D LIKE TO CLOSE WITH. JUNE 6, 1944. AS DWIGHT EISENHOWER ADDRESSED THE SAILORS, SOLDIERS, AND AIRMEN OF THE ALLIED EXPEDITIONARY FORCE.

HE TOLD THEM, "THE EYES OF THE WORLD ARE UPON YOU. THE HOPES AND PRAYERS OF LIBERTY-LOVING PEOPLE EVERYWHERE MARCH WITH YOU." AND THEN IKE SPOKE THIS MOVING PRAYER: "LET US ALL BESEECH THE BLESSING OF ALMIGHTY GOD, UPON THIS GREAT AND NOBLE UNDERTAKING."

FELLOW VETERANS, MORE THAN HALF OF ALL VFW MEMBERS FOUGHT IN WORLD WAR II -- MANY OF YOU SERVING UNDER DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER. // YOU KNOW HOW AMERICA REMAINS THE HOPE OF "LIBERTY-LOVING PEOPLE EVERYWHERE." HALF-A-CENTURY AGO, THE WORLD HAD THE CHANCE TO STOP AN AGGRESSOR, AND MISSED IT. I PLEDGE TO YOU: WE WILL NOT MAKE THAT MISTAKE AGAIN. //

TOGETHER WE CAN DEFEAT TYRANNY -- AND HELP THOSE
NATIONS WHO LOOK TO US FOR LEADERSHIP AND VISION.
THANK YOU FOR YOUR SUPPORT AND YOUR PRAYERS. AND MAY
GOD BLESS THE LAND WE SO DEEPLY LOVE -- THESE UNITED
STATES OF AMERICA.

#

January 18, 1991

(UNOFFICIAL)

TO: Leigh Ann Metzger
FROM: Jan Burmeister
RE: The President's Remarks to National Religious Broadcasters

If you think it is appropriate, would you let the speech-writer for the NRB speech know that for the first time this year the NRB's convention is addressing the issue of disabilities, taking their cue from the American Disabilities Act the President signed this summer.

The convention committee has even included a workshop wholly dedicated to exploring the promotion of ministry to persons with disabilities. Some points:

- . It shows great foresight, particularly in light of Senate Bill 1974 signed in October requiring new televisions to have built in decoder circuitry by 1993. It is the programmers and broadcasters who have planned for closed captioning that will get their message out.
- . Addressing disabilities issues IS coming of age--legislatively, socially, politically, and now technologically. (It has always been scriptural.)

Thanks.

1-18-91
Please forward
to Mary Kate G-
Kurt Smith
Thanks
LA

DOCUMENT NUMBER = 002621

OPID	PS
DOCDATE	890127
RECTYP	OBA
MEDIA	L
NAME	MR. FREDERICK N. KHEDOURI
PSAL	FRED
ORG	BEAR, STEARNS & CO., INC.
STREET	805 15TH STREET, NORTHWEST SUITE 1120
ADDR	WASHINGTON DC 20005
SUBJECT	SUPPORT LETTER
SUBCODE	PRO03 <u>PP005-01</u>
INDCODE	5300
ACTION	RM RSZ 890127 FL1 A 890127

Factcheck Copy

(Smith/Cawley)
January 18, 1991
10 A.M.
HUNDRED

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: TEAM 100 DINNER
EAST ROOM/STATE FLOOR
THURSDAY, JAN. 24, 1991
7:30 P.M.

It is a pleasure to be with this distinguished group -- all of you who serve the Republican Party, and America. You've been friends and colleagues. You've endorsed what is right, and good. I thank you from the bottom of my heart. //

RNC Press
Office
863-8550

I also want to salute two people close to our hearts. The first is the man who tomorrow will become the new RNC Chairman, Clayton Yeutter. // Most of you know him -- all of you will admire him. He will be an enormous asset to the Republican Party. //

The second person I wish to thank has enriched our party for many years. He is a fighter // a winner // above all, he's our friend and inspiration. The man who tomorrow will become our great General Chairman, Lee Atwater. //

" " Nancy

Lee has been forced to keep a low profile. But he, himself, is a profile in courage. All of us extend prayers to Lee, his wife Sally, and his three daughters, Sara Lee, Ashley Page, and Sally T. Here's to the Grand Young Man of the Grand Old Party. //

Like Lee, you know what Team 100 is all about. It's about the civilized values that America embodies and reveres. Last

week, I addressed the American people on why we must go to war to protect those values. No one wanted war less than I. No one is more determined to seize from blood and tears the real peace that can create a new world order. //

*Press Conference
1-18-91
10AM* Our goals are the same as when Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait: Iraq must withdraw from Kuwait -- completely, immediately, and without condition. The security and stability of the Persian Gulf must be assured. Kuwait's legitimate government must be restored. **Kuwait will once again be free.** //

Let's remember how in the first day we flew over 1,000 pinpoint sorties on military targets. And Saddam's response? He targeted innocent civilians -- as any butcher would. // If doubt existed, none remains: The issue is whether aggression pays -- or whether aggression is punished. // I cannot tell you how long we will remain in the Gulf. I can tell you: We will stay just as long as it takes to complete our mission. //

To finish the job will require the support of our friends and allies. We have it. Think of the unprecedented United Nations' unity. And the aid -- economic and military -- from countries who support self-determination. Think of our Arab allies who are sacrificing so much. As Saddam is learning, this isn't the U.S. against Iraq. It's Iraq against the world. We're not going it alone -- and believe me, we are going to see it through. //

We will prevail for all these reasons -- and because we have the finest armed forces in the history of the world. // Look at

WATERSMEET

NYT
1-18-91
P. A10

Captain Steve Tate of Waterswet, Michigan, who downed the first

Irqi airplane in air-to-air combat. Or Lieutenant Commander

Michael Speicher, our first missing in action. / Look at the

other servicemen and women -- their ground crews, their officers,

their families, their friends. / They make us proud. They make

us humble. I pledge to you: We will not let them down. //

Right now -- half a world away -- our young men and women are showing that America would not be the land of the free if it were not also the home of the brave. // Let's stand up for them at home and abroad -- showing that we will not waver -- and that Saddam's aggression will not stand. //

On the floor in the entrance outside several hundred feet from here is a seal that bears an eagle. In one set of talons are the arrows of war: in the other, the olive branch. //

After World War II, it was decided that never again should the eagle's head look toward the arrows. Ever since, it has looked in the direction of honor -- the direction of peace. That is our purpose in the Persian Gulf. It is the purpose that you have aided so generously. It is why we are relying on the courage of our outstanding men and women in uniform. //

So I'd like to conclude with a toast to the finest soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines any Nation ever had: May God bring them back home, and soon. //

Thank you all for being here -- and God bless the United States of America.

#

Col. Hester
SIP 1940

The Eagle & the
Shield - History
of the Great Seal
of the U.S.
by Peterson & Douglass
p. 449

COAST GUARDIAN

Michael
"Scott"
Spiker }

lost 2 others MIA

Lt. Robert Wetzell
30

Lt. Jeffrey Zahn
28

AIR FORCE

Col. Harn's 697-3329

695 5766

24 HR P.A.

DIRECT

EACH SVC. HAS A CASUALTY CTR, SENDS TO EACH
AF - SAN ANTONIO

(Smith/Blessey)
Draft Two
November 17, 1989
FUN

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: EVANGELICAL LEADERS
ROOM 450
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1989
3:20 P.M.

Dr. Falwell, Dr. Robertson, Dr. Carlson, Reverend Crouch,
Ladies and gentlemen. ((You know, it is often said of a group or
individual that "He hasn't got a prayer." Well, I am delighted
to address an audience about whom that will never be said.)) //

It is a pleasure to welcome you, and to have you here. We
gather as friends, and as fellow believers. For although we
demand the separation of church and state -- we do not -- must
never -- accept a separation of morality and state.

Perhaps a little boy once expressed it best. "God bless
mother and daddy, my brother and sister," he said. And then he
went on to pray: "And, oh God, do take care of yourself, because
if anything happens to you we're all sunk." //

Those words, I think, say much about America. And about the
evangelical movement which so uplifts America. They remind us
that we are a religious people. And that political values
without spiritual values cannot sustain a Nation.

George Washington knew this. Addressing his troops in 1776,
he said, "The fate of unborn millions will now depend, under God,
on the courage and conduct of this army." And so did Dwight
Eisenhower. He began his first Inaugural Address with a hand-

written missive. "Give us, we pray," he said, "the power to discern clearly right from wrong."

For decades, America's evangelical movement has worked to reaffirm Ike's message: To do right, reject wrong, and make America a more decent place. You do so now. And I am with you.

You know, I look around here. // Jerry [FALWELL], I remember your kindness in inviting me to speak at Liberty. // Pat [ROBERTSON], thinking back to the '88 Campaign, seems like old times. // And so many of you -- old friends, inspiring millions; your movement growing by leaps and bounds. And I think of how people ask, "Who are the born-again? What do they believe in? What do they expect from government?"

First questions, first. Who are they? -- these evangelical Christians. They are young and old, rural and urban, Protestant and Catholic. They come from the heart of America. They show that the heart of America is good.

What do you believe in? You believe what I believe. You cherish home and family. You believe that the only true special interest is America's. Above all, you accept Jesus Christ as your personal savior.

Next, what do you expect from government? You don't ask for privileged treatment. You do ask to be respected. And this Administration does. You want to be listened to. And we do -- and will. You want evangelicals to influence government policy. And you have -- and are. For your philosophy is our philosophy: Morality forms the rock upon which America's greatness rests.

That is why we have acted to enhance the quality and diversity of our public and private schools. Our "Educational Excellence Act of 1989" seeks to reward education. To demand educational accountability. And to let parents choose which schools their children will attend. A final note: You know the realities of the Federal budget. But when the Budget allows, I'm going to fulfill the pledge I made in last year's Campaign: We need tuition tax credits for the parents of America.

A second concern, I know, is abortion. And here, too, we're trying to make America a more decent place. I know that this is matter of conscience -- that Americans of good faith can, and do, disagree. But my position has not and will not change. I believe that life does not begin at birth -- it begins at conception. So we support the Hyde Amendment which supports Federal financing of abortions only when the life's mother is in danger. Of this you have my word. //

Then, there is the issue of child care. For often, while parents work, love and care come from the extended family -- grandparents, aunts, and uncles. In many ways, the church community is the greatest extended family. So I am determined to protect every church-sponsored child care center in America.

In that spirit, we have proposed a child-care tax credit, focused on putting money in the hands of low-income parents. Our approach is different than past programs. It would empower parents, not the government, to choose the best care for their

kids -- be it a grandparent, a neighbor, or a local church. We will not discriminate against church-sponsored child care. //

Finally, let me mention another Campaign pledge I intend to fulfill. Before the Supreme Court outlawed it, voluntary school prayer forced religion on no one. But lack of prayer has denied many that opportunity. We should remember: "I pledge Allegiance -- one Nation, under God." So we support a Constitutional Amendment restoring voluntary prayer. And I ask you to help me spread this gospel: We need the Federal Courts out of our Nation's schools -- and we need the Faith of our Fathers back in.

Together -- through voluntary prayer and excellence in education, through protecting our kids and protecting the unborn -- we can do great things for our Nation. For times change -- but principles do not.

As individuals -- as public officials -- we know that we must honor God with the lives we lead. So in closing, let me recall what Lincoln said in January 1861, leaving his home people to assume the Presidency. "The great God," he said, "which helped General Washington must now help me. Without that great assistance, I will surely fail. With it, I cannot fail."

Thank you for coming here this afternoon -- and for all you're doing, with God's help, to make ours a better, more peaceful world. I want to hear from you. I want to benefit from your counsel. Let's work together, God bless you, and God bless America.

#

Grant/Simon
January 22, 1991
A:RNCBRIEF

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE BRIEFING
ROOM 450
FRIDAY, JANUARY 25, 1991
7:45 A.M.

Thank you, Charlie, very much -- it's great to see so many old friends here today. And what a pleasure it is to see the next Chairman of the Republican Party -- Clayton Yeutter. ///

Clayton has proven himself as a tough, articulate member of this Administration, and his leadership and vision have been valuable to me time and time again. My excitement at the prospect of having him as Chairman of this great Party is matched only by the promise of having his continued counsel. In fact, I told the Cabinet the other day that nothing will change -- because Clayton will still have a seat at the table.

Clayton, you've got some pretty big shoes to fill. Lee Atwater has done a phenomenal job fighting the opposition -- and now, as he fights his biggest battle, I know that everyone in this room is behind him -- **100 percent**. //// I am thrilled that Lee has agreed to become General Chairman of this party, because I feel very strongly that his advice and insight are invaluable.

I'm also very happy that Jeanie Austin has agreed to stay on as Co-Chairman of the Party. She has been an anchor through some stormy times, and her dedication and tireless commitment are real assets to this Party. **Jeanie, thank you.** /// And there's another person I want to say thank you to: a friend of mine -- and a true friend of Lee Atwater's -- Charlie Black. ///

The Republican National Committee meets at a difficult time, while America and her allies fight a war none of us wanted. But it was Saddam Hussein who chose war over peace, and now our job is cut out for us -- **our objectives are clear.** Kuwait will be liberated, and its legitimate government will be restored. Iraq will comply with all relevant U.N. resolutions; and after peace is again established, the security and stability of the Gulf will be enhanced.

There were those who wanted to extend the U.N. deadline, to give the sanctions more time to work. **But the world could wait no longer.** Sanctions showed no signs of accomplishing their objectives, and while time passed, Saddam Hussein raped and pillaged Kuwait. Each day, he sought to add to his chemical weapons arsenal an infinitely more dangerous weapon of mass destruction -- a nuclear weapon. While the clock ticked, he wreaked havoc on the fragile economies of the Third World, the developing democracies of Eastern Europe, the international economy, and our own economy.

And so 28 nations allied with the United States have joined the battle to put an end to his aggression, to liberate the nation of Kuwait. As I told the American people when we entered the war, our troops will have the best possible support in the entire world. **And they will not be asked to fight with one hand tied behind their back.//**

We will prevail -- because we have top-notch leaders like Dick Cheney, Colin Powell, Norman Schwarzkopf and Brent

Scowcroft at the helm. And most importantly, we will prevail because we have the **best-trained and most highly motivated servicemen and women in the world -- bar none.**

We've already heard of the heroism of these young men and women. And we strongly condemn the brutal treatment of our brave American pilots who have been taken prisoner by the Iraqis. Our hearts and prayers are with the pilots and their families but I can assure them that we will hold Saddam Hussein responsible for this outrageous behavior which defies the Geneva Conventions. Their mistreatment defies the Geneva Conventions and we will hold those responsible up to full prosecution.

I'm proud of all our men and women in the Gulf. With fighting forces like these, I'm convinced we will succeed. And I'm also convinced that we have the support of the American people. I've never paid much attention to polls, but it's clear that the American people support Operation Desert Storm. Take a look at the tremendous outpouring of community support from St. Augustine to Seattle, as neighborhoods, schools and churches send everything from hot sauce to Hi-C to hair care products to our troops.

But aside from all that -- including all the letters sent and pints of blood donated -- what is **most** moving to me is the **prayers**. Churches and synagogues are reporting record attendance at services, and you can find chapels packed during working hours as Americans stop in for a moment or two, to pray for peace.

With the support and prayers of so many, many people, there should be no question in the minds of our soldiers -- or in the minds of our enemy -- that the American people are united in support of our cause.

Add to that the support of the United States Congress. The House and Senate have acted resolutely, after an historic debate -- in which its members spoke openly and passionately. And yet, in the fiery heat of debate, we heard a deeper, stronger note of unity -- the vital solidarity of freedom. Yet while we witnessed democracy at its finest, Saddam Hussein confused **dissent** with **disunity**. It is this American paradox, this unity not only **out** of diversity, but **because** of diversity -- this "e pluribus unum" -- that the enemies of freedom will never comprehend.

The 28 nations who are allied with us know that the dream of a new world order awaits us. Together, we are looking to the day when the nations of the world can secure a just and lasting peace -- a world in which the **rule of law**, not the law of the jungle, governs men. **A world in which nations shall no longer make war against other nations.**

Our purpose is just and right; our troops are the best; our technology is proving its worth. We will not be defeated. We will win **peace** -- not a truce, not an armistice, not a cease fire arrangement. But a peace that will allow our children to grow up in a new world we've never known. I thank each and every one of you for your support, and ask only for your continued prayers.

Next you'll hear from Bob Gates of the N.S.C.

Thank you and God bless America. # # #

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

Embargoed until delivered -- 12:00pm PST, January 8, 1991

PREPARED TEXT OF REMARKS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

REMARKS TO THE LOS ANGELES WORLD AFFAIRS COUNCIL

As some of you may know, over the New Year I had the opportunity to visit our marines, soldiers, sailors, and airmen in Saudi Arabia. The two days I spent with our troops brought home to me again that our armed forces are the best in the world. Our volunteer army is working, and our troops are determined to achieve our objectives. Today, I'd like to give you a report on my trip. I'd also like to tell you about the brave men and women who are serving our country with great courage in the Gulf.

My first stop was a visit to Marine Air Group 13. They are the most forward-deployed of any American fixed-wing aircraft unit in the region. Their mission is to provide close air support and airborne fire. Their confidence, their sense of purpose, and their expertise was both inspiring and reassuring. I asked Captain Don Peros -- an Arizonan from Yuma -- how things were going. He replied, in a soft-spoken Western drawl, "The sky is quiet. They know we are here."

Later that day we helicoptered out to the most forward-deployed of any American forces, the Army's Third Armored Cavalry Regiment. Their motto is "Brave Rifles" -- and brave they most certainly are. Commanded by Colonel Doug Starr, a Vietnam hero whose awards include two Silver Stars and five Bronze Stars, they are deployed less than sixty miles from the Kuwaiti border. One of the first American units to deploy in August of last year, they have been away from home for nearly five months. They live in tents in the middle of the desert, enduring the heat, the sand storms, and the tension of knowing they are the first line of defense in Saudi Arabia. Yet their spirit remains high and their professionalism is evident in every move they make.

They are ready to do whatever their President asks. Their biggest concern is domestic political considerations. They are concerned their mission may not be finished, and they'll go home -- only to be called back again in a year or two to finish the job. They want to avoid this, and so does the President.

On board the aircraft carrier, the U.S.S. John F. Kennedy, which I visited the next day, our sailors were equally ready. Their F-14 pilots, like Lieutenant Kevin McHugh of Carmel, Indiana are prepared to do to Saddam Hussein's air-force what they did to Qaddafi's MIG-23's in 1989 -- clear them out of the skies. The last unit I visited, the Air Force's 48th Tactical Fighter Wing, also has had experience against Qaddafi. In 1986, they participated in our retaliation against Libyan terrorism. And when I asked the officers and men of the "Statue of Liberty" Wing if there was any doubt that we could force Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait, their answer was a resounding "No!".

In sum, the brave men and women of our armed forces stand ready to protect the vital interests of America. They will do their duty and they will do it well. They deserve our total and enthusiastic support.
overted

You know, when I visited the Marine base, on the walls of one of the tents I saw a series of letters to the Marines from someone named Colleen. I asked who Colleen was, and the Marines told me that she was a seven year old girl with cancer, who took the time every day to write them and express her support for what they are doing. The Marines also wrote back to her, to encourage her in her fight. And Colleen sent them a sign, made on her home computer, that said, "You are my heroes." Colleen's words are proudly displayed on their tent wall.

Well, Colleen has it exactly right. Those men and women on duty in the Gulf are America's heroes. The President and I are proud of them -- and I know you are too. And let me assure you: Their morale is sky high, and they are ready!

Of course, the main reason that morale among our troops is so high is because they know that the people at home overwhelmingly support them -- and support their mission. The American people understand that Saddam Hussein's occupation of Kuwait poses a long term threat not just to his neighbors, but to the entire world. They know that over the past decade, Saddam Hussein has bankrupted his people to bankroll his army. They know that he has launched two wars of aggression, against Iran and against Kuwait, at the cost of some one million casualties. They know that he is acquiring a stock-pile of chemical and biological agents, and has used chemical weapons against both Iran and his own people. They know he has launched an intensive campaign to acquire nuclear weapons. And they know that unless he is stopped today, a nuclear-armed Iraq will control the bulk of the world's energy supply tomorrow, thereby holding a gun to all our heads.

Saddam should make no mistake about it: The American people are not in the least bit naive about his intentions. They know that Saddam's ambitions are not confined to Kuwait. Rather, his goal is to dominate the Middle East as the leader of an aggressive superpower, armed to the teeth with weapons of mass destruction.

The American people are equally clear about what's at stake in the Gulf: Our long-term security, the future of the Middle East, and the nature of the post-Cold War world. They remember the Carter Doctrine -- reinforced by Presidents Reagan and Bush -- which warned that, "Any attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf will be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States of America, and such an assault will be repelled by any means necessary including military force."

The American people know that if Saddam Hussein wins, all our friends in the Middle East will be in grave danger. They know that Iraq's invasion of Kuwait is the first crisis of the post-Cold War era. One way or another, it is bound to set a

precedent -- either on behalf of greater world order, or on behalf of greater chaos. If Saddam Hussein succeeds in his aggression, it is likely that his success will embolden other dictators to emulate his example. But if he fails -- and believe me, he will fail -- others will draw the lesson that might does not make right and that aggression will not be allowed to succeed.

For all these reasons, the American people are prepared to use force, if they have to, should Saddam Hussein not get out of Kuwait. The American people support the goals laid out by President Bush at the start of this crisis, goals endorsed in twelve U.N. Security Council Resolutions. These goals are clear: The immediate, complete and unconditional withdrawal of Iraq from Kuwait; the security of American citizens; the restoration of Kuwait's legitimate government; and a commitment to the security and stability of the Persian Gulf. These are moral goals. These are legitimate goals. And these goals are not subject to negotiation.

Of course, in every crisis, there are always some critics and arm-chair strategists who are convinced that they know better than the President -- and the Gulf crisis is no exception. Today, these critics argue for patience. They say: "Wait a year or two, be patient, act with caution." Well, George Bush is a cautious man. And he has been patient. Our armed forces have been patient. That is why, despite the use of American hostages as human shields, despite the outrages against the people of Kuwait, despite Iraq's continued defiance of the world community, we have refrained, so far, from military action against Saddam Hussein. And that is why the President went the extra mile for peace last week by proposing that Secretary Baker and Iraqi Foreign Minister Aziz meet in Geneva. I am pleased that meeting will be taking place tomorrow.

We hope Secretary Baker's meeting will get the message across to Saddam Hussein: You must withdraw from Kuwait. Your withdrawal must be complete, immediate and unconditional. There will be no negotiations over the terms of your withdrawal. There will be no linkage between your withdrawal and any other issues. There will be no reward for your aggression. Your only chance for a peaceful resolution of this conflict is to heed the call of the international community, as expressed in twelve U.N. Security Council Resolutions, and leave Kuwait now.

I truly hope that tomorrow's meeting between Secretary Baker and Foreign Minister Aziz helps Iraq understand the gravity of the situation, and the determination of the entire world to undo its aggression. I truly hope that war can be averted. I truly hope that Saddam Hussein does not allow this last chance for peace to fail.

The United Nations has given Saddam Hussein until January 15th to leave Kuwait. If he refuses, U.N. Security Council Resolution 678 authorizes U.N. Member States to use "all necessary means" to achieve Iraq's unconditional withdrawal. We need to hold Saddam Hussein to this deadline. We will not permit him to manipulate the deadline, or to try to extend it, through

offers to negotiate -- when there is nothing to negotiate. Talking about patience will take the pressure off Saddam Hussein to withdraw from Kuwait. It is only the probability of the imminent use of force against Saddam Hussein that may convince him to resolve the crisis peacefully by withdrawing from Kuwait.

But in addition to keeping the pressure on Saddam Hussein, there are other reasons for not being excessively patient with Iraq. For at some point, the costs of prolonged patience outweigh the benefits. As the President argued in his radio address on Saturday, we are fast approaching that point.

Consider the impact of prolonged patience on the people of Kuwait. A recent report by Amnesty International documents, in considerable detail, the ongoing agony of the Kuwaiti people. The report contains eye-witness accounts of how Iraqi forces have tortured and killed many hundreds of victims, taken several thousand prisoners, and left more than 300 premature babies to die after looting incubators from Kuwaiti hospitals. The report catalogues 38 methods of torture used by the Iraqi military. Iraqi forces have gouged out people's eyes, cut off their tongues and ears, shot people in the arms and legs, used electric shocks, and raped many victims. Moreover, the Amnesty International report notes that, "The massive scale of destruction and looting" ... suggests that such incidents were neither arbitrary nor isolated, but rather reflected a policy adopted by the government of Iraq."

The Amnesty report was based on medical evidence and on in-depth interviews with more than a hundred people from about a dozen countries. Its findings completely coincide with testimony given before the Congressional Human Rights Caucus. As Congressman Tom Lantos, the Democratic co-chairman of the Caucus, put it back in October: "In the eight-year history of the ... Caucus, we have never had the degree of ghoulish and nightmarish horror stories coming from totally credible eye-witnesses that we have had this time."

It seems to me that those who advocate endless patience with Saddam Hussein should think long and hard about what Congressman Lantos and Amnesty International have said. And they should ask themselves a few simple questions: Is it moral to prolong the agony of the Kuwaiti people indefinitely? After all, brave Kuwaitis helped and sheltered Americans as they were being hunted down by Iraqis, and put their own lives at risk by hiding many of our citizens in their homes. Is it right for Americans to stand by as Kuwaitis are being tortured and raped and brutalized? And would there even be a Kuwait left to save in a year or two years' time?

Advocates of prolonged patience should also consider the impact of the crisis on nations such as Turkey, Egypt and the emerging democracies of Eastern Europe. These friends of ours, who are among the hardest hit by the economic impact of increased oil prices, are also the least able to afford it. With every day that the crisis is allowed to continue, their economic plight worsens and their hopes for a better future recede. Under these circumstances, is patience with Saddam Hussein a wise course of

action? Is it a moral course of action?

Or consider the effects of the Persian Gulf crisis on our own economy. Even though world oil prices have declined from their post-invasion peak, they are 40 to 50 percent higher than they were before the invasion. The resulting \$1.5 billion per month added to our own oil import bills constitutes a "tax" on the American and world economies at a time of growing recessionary pressure. And with the passage of time, the costs of maintaining American troops in the Gulf would mount.

Or consider Iraq's drive for nuclear weapons, which Saddam Hussein plans to add to his arsenal of chemical and biological weapons. As President Bush told American troops in Saudi Arabia during Thanksgiving, "Each day that passes brings Saddam Hussein one day closer to realizing his goal of a nuclear weapons arsenal And we do know this for sure: He has never possessed a weapon that he didn't use." Would indefinite patience with Iraq result in a world more vulnerable to nuclear blackmail by Saddam Hussein? And if so, would this be a wise course of action? Would this be a moral course of action?

Or consider the effects of indefinite patience on Saddam Hussein's military ability. The longer we refrain from military action against Iraq, the more time Saddam Hussein has to tighten his grip on Kuwait. As President Bush said on Saturday, "Each day that passes, Saddam's forces also fortify and dig in deeper into Kuwait. We risk paying a higher price in the most precious currency of all, human life, if we give Saddam more time to prepare for war...." Thus, the longer we wait, the harder it may be to prevail if force must be used. Does not patience today risk greater American and allied casualties tomorrow? And if so, is this a wise course of action? A moral course of action?

Or consider the impact of prolonged patience on the international coalition arrayed against Saddam Hussein. Today, we and our allies have more than half a million troops in the Persian Gulf. Twenty-eight nations have committed support to the allied effort, including eleven Moslem nations. But holding such a broadly-based coalition together is not easy. And the internal situation of our partners could be tested. The presence of foreign troops might become a contentious issue.

Can we really afford to give Saddam Hussein a lengthy breathing space -- a pause he could exploit to undermine the embargo and break up the multinational coalition? We must remember that, rightly or wrongly, the world would attribute such patience to a lack of resolve. Unlimited patience with Saddam Hussein would therefore all too likely lead to appeasement of Saddam Hussein. This is unacceptable.

Finally, advocates of endless patience should talk to our troops in the Gulf. When I spoke to those men and women a few days ago, their views came across loud and clear. They feel they have been patient. They want to get the job done and then come home to their loved ones. They don't look forward to spending the next couple of years waiting around in the Saudi desert while Congress debates what to do next. As the President has said,

"This will not be another Vietnam."

I am convinced that if force is necessary it will be quick, massive and decisive. President Bush knows full well the lessons of Vietnam. He knows that the policy of "gradual escalation" that we pursued in Southeast Asia turned out to be a recipe for stalemate. He knows that trying to fight a war "on the cheap" only results in higher costs over the long run. He knows that war is a terrible thing -- but if we must use force, there can be no half-measures: Either we go in to win quickly and decisively, or we shouldn't go in at all.

The real question is: Have the President's critics learned the lessons of Vietnam? Aren't their recommendations for relying solely on sanctions yet another flawed attempt to defeat aggression "on the cheap"? Aren't their calls for endless patience a sure-fire formula for getting us bogged down in the Gulf indefinitely? And aren't their arguments against the use of force an example of wishful thinking masquerading as statesmanship?

When Secretary Baker meets Iraq's Foreign Minister tomorrow, he will call on Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait immediately and unconditionally. It is important that he be able to deliver this message as forcefully and convincingly as possible. Unfortunately, Saddam may still not believe that force is a credible option. He may have a difficult time understanding our political system. Democracy is by far the best political system ever created, but it is complex and, at times, messy. This is one of the messy moments.

When a Senator or Congressman criticizes the President's policy the media deem it newsworthy. Therefore, the critics have a direct line to Saddam Hussein, because, we are told, he is an avid watcher of CNN. Thus, when he sees our Congressional critics getting world media coverage the message to Saddam may well be that the President cannot and will not use force because the Congress will not let him.

Let me set the record straight: Unless Congress denies funds for Operation Desert Shield, as suggested by Democratic Majority Leader Gephardt, Saddam Hussein should understand that his aggression will not stand. Saddam Hussein should understand that we will use force, if necessary, to expel him from Kuwait.

Congress could help Saddam Hussein understand this. It could pass a favorable resolution in support of the United Nations resolutions. President Bush has today asked that Congress pass such a resolution. This would be helpful.

On the other hand, Congress could choose to pass resolutions that would be harmful. Any resolution that suggested to Saddam Hussein that the threat of force is not credible would, in fact, undermine the chances for a peaceful solution. Simply put, it would take the pressure off Saddam Hussein to pull out now.

Finally, Congress could do nothing, knowing full well that the President will act within Constitutional guidelines, and that

Congress will be consulted and informed of all important decisions.

Thus, Congress has the following choices: To support the President, to dispute the President, or not to act at all. We hope the Congress will join the American people in supporting the President. What Congress must know is that the world watches and interprets every move it makes. This is our political system.

If Congress supports the President, we may at this eleventh hour be able to convince Saddam Hussein that the threat of force is not an idle one. I hope Saddam Hussein comes to understand this.

If he does understand, I think he will withdraw his forces from Kuwait before January 15th. But if he does not understand, then we and our partners will have to expel him from Kuwait. One way or another, I am certain that Saddam Hussein will yield: Either to the force of logic, or the logic of force.

Why am I so confident? Let me answer that question by reading you part of a letter I recently received. It's from Brian Scocchio, a sailor serving aboard the U.S.S. Saratoga.

"I have been away from home for four months now. I would very much like to get home as soon as possible, but not until Iraq has released Kuwait and we have removed Hussein's ability to use his army as an offensive weapon.... If this means fighting, and possibly giving up my life, then that is a small price to pay for ensuring that my children will grow up in a world that is safe from madmen like Hussein.

I have never been in battle and I know it easy to say things when you may never have to back up your words, but I truly believe in what we are doing out here and that I will serve my country with honor.

Please relay to Congress that everyone that I have talked to believes pretty much the same way that I do. We are ready to do whatever is necessary."

These are the words of a brave and wise American. They complement the words of President Bush, who has pledged that "there will not be any murky ending. If one American soldier has to go into battle, that soldier will have enough force behind him to win."

These are difficult times. The President knows the gravity of the crisis. He has been patient, he is a cautious man -- but he is more determined now than ever to achieve his objectives.

The President wants peace more than anyone. He prays for peace. He has worked for peace. But if peace may be established only by the use of force, so be it.

Let us as a nation, in this time of peril, support our President and support our brave men and women in the Persian Gulf.

Thank you and God bless you.

####

Reprinted from
December 10, 1990



Vice President Quayle

America's Strategic Objectives In the Persian Gulf

*Address at Seton Hall University, South
Orange, New Jersey, November 29, 1990*

As always, I am happy to once again talk to the student body of an outstanding American university—I did so last month at DePauw [Greencastle, Indiana]. As Vice President, I do a lot of international travel. Nothing makes me more proud than to hear the international community rave about America's colleges and universities.

Our finest schools have kept firmly in mind what Dr. Samuel Johnson, the great 18th-century British man of letters, termed the "supreme end of education: expert discernment in all things—the power to tell the good from the bad, the genuine from the counterfeit, and to prefer the good and the genuine to the bad and the counterfeit."

I am honored to have the opportunity to address the Seton Hall community—a community which truly strives to promote "expert discernment in all things." Since your founding in 1856 by Bishop James Roosevelt Bayley, you have understood that questions of good and bad, right and wrong, are not just minor add-ons to the serious business of life. Rather, they constitute its very core. As the eighth largest Catholic university in the United States, you have drawn on a rich tradition to promote a greater sense of moral discernment throughout your commu-

nity and your country. Your motto puts it in perspective: "Advance despite difficulties."

As all of you know, our country, along with the rest of the international community, currently faces a grave crisis in the Persian Gulf. This crisis carries with it the risk of war. Some in this country have questioned whether the United States has any interest in the gulf that is worth fighting for. Today, I would like to step back a bit from the current debate. I'd like to speak to the larger perspectives of the subject that is too often presented in 10-second soundbites on television. Why is the region so important? What have the strategic goals of US Middle East policy been over the last 40 years? And how do these goals apply in the current crisis?

The Middle East, as everyone knows, is the source of much of the oil on which the industrialized world and developing nations depend. It is a region of striking contrasts: vast wealth and grinding poverty; secular radicalism and religious fundamentalism; hatred of the West and emulation of the West. Most importantly, perhaps, the Middle East is caught up in a vast process of change as ancient societies and cultures strive to adapt to the modern world. This process of adaptation, which entails much turmoil

and instability, is what makes the Middle East such an interesting place. Unfortunately, it also makes the Middle East a dangerous place.

Since the onset of the Cold War, the United States has had three strategic objectives in the region. The first objective was to contain Soviet expansionism. In 1947, the Soviet threat to one regional state, Turkey, played a role in President Truman's decision to issue the doctrine that bears his name. Thirty-three years later, the threat of Soviet encroachment on another region of the Middle East—the Persian Gulf—led President Carter to proclaim the equivalent of the Truman Doctrine for the gulf. The Carter Doctrine, which also was reinforced by President Reagan, warned that, "Any attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf region will be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States of America, and such an assault will be repelled by any means necessary, including military force."

But the Cold War is over. And because it is over—because one of America's strategic objectives has been realized—some commentators have assumed that all of our objectives have been realized. They could not be more mistaken. For in addition to containing the Soviets, American foreign policy has traditionally pursued two other strategic objectives in the Middle East.



It has sought to prevent any local Middle East power from achieving hegemony over its neighbors, and it has sought to secure the uninterrupted supply of oil at a reasonable price. Let me describe both of these objectives in greater detail.

Today, all the states of the Middle East face a major threat in Saddam Hussein's Iraq. Saddam's ambitions are not confined to Kuwait. Rather, his goal is to dominate the Persian Gulf region and use its vast wealth to become the greatest Arab hero of modern times, the leader of a new Arab superpower. To that end, he spent some \$50 billion on arms imports during the 1980s alone. He has launched two wars of aggression during this period, against Iran and against Kuwait, at a cost of some 1 million lives—thus far. He has built the sixth largest military force in the world. He has acquired a sizable stockpile of both chemical and biological weapons and is estimated to have employed several thousand tons of chemical agents against Iranians and against his own people—Iraqi Kurds—in the 1980s. And he has launched a massive program to acquire nuclear weapons.

The United States opposes Saddam Hussein's bid for regional hegemony for the same reasons that we have opposed other bids. We do not think any government has the right to impose its political will on other countries through subversion or conquest. We do not think Israel's existence, or the existence of other friendly regional states, should be threatened. And, of course, the prospect of Saddam Hussein strutting across the world stage at the head of a malevolent global power, armed to the teeth with weapons of mass destruction, and controlling a large portion of the world's energy supplies, is something no sane person would welcome. That is why we are working to contain Saddam Hussein's bid for hegemony today—just as we worked to contain other bids for hegemony yesterday.

Of course, no discussion of America's strategic objectives in the

region is complete without mention of oil, so let me turn to that issue now. A key strategic goal of US Middle East policy has been to assure the uninterrupted flow of oil at reasonable prices. This does not mean, as some cynics have suggested, that we are risking war to prevent the price of oil from going up a few cents a gallon. During the Arab oil embargo of 1973-74 and during the 1979 oil price shock that came in the wake of the Iranian revolution, the price of oil went up much more than that. But we never thought of going to war because the price of oil was too high. We were confident that market forces would eventually bring the price of oil down—and we were right.

We did prepare for all contingencies, however, when the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, coupled with instability

“... there is another strategic American objective in the current crisis... This objective might be described as strengthening the foundations of world order.”

in Iran, brought Soviet forces within striking distance of the Persian Gulf—hence the Carter Doctrine. For if “any outside force,” as the Carter Doctrine put it, could control the flow of Persian Gulf oil, it would, as President Bush said, place our independence and way of life at risk. No nation should be willing to tolerate such a state of affairs, just as no individual should be willing to allow anyone to hold a gun to his or her head.

That is why President Carter was willing to commit the United States to preventing a single power—the Soviet Union—from controlling the gulf. And that is why President Bush has dispatched American troops to Saudi Arabia to prevent another power—

Iraq, this time—from doing likewise. Neither President was prepared to jeopardize American security by permitting, in President Bush's words, “a resource so vital to be dominated by one so ruthless”—either Leonid Brezhnev of Moscow or Saddam Hussein of Baghdad.

So far, I have talked about traditional US strategic objectives in the Middle East. But there is another strategic American objective in the current crisis that is not traditional—that has only emerged, in fact, as a result of the end of the Cold War. This objective might be described as strengthening the foundations of world order. Let me explain what I mean.

When the Cold War was still raging, any regional crisis in the Third World contained within it the seeds of a possible Soviet-American confrontation. That is why, in the Middle East and elsewhere, both the United States and the Soviet Union often made significant efforts to restrain their clients from rash behavior. These efforts were part of the unwritten “rules of the game” that prevented Soviet-American competition from getting out of hand during the Cold War.

With the end of the Cold War, the chances of a Soviet-American clash in any Third World conflict, including the Middle East, have greatly diminished. Unfortunately, so have the traditional restraints that the superpowers used to impose on their regional clients. As a result, unless the UN Charter's rules about using force are not reaffirmed and defended fairly quickly, we face the dangerous prospect of a new, post-Cold War world that is actually more anarchic, and more violence prone, than the world which preceded it.

Iraq's invasion of Kuwait is the first crisis of the post-Cold War world. One way or another, it is bound to set a precedent—either on behalf of greater world order or on behalf of greater chaos. If Saddam Hussein succeeds in his aggression, it is likely that his success will embolden other dictators to emulate his example. But if he fails—

and believe me, he will fail—others will draw the lesson that might does not make right and that aggression will not be allowed to succeed.

This is why President Bush has sought to rally the international community against Iraq's aggression. This is why the UN Security Council has passed 11 resolutions condemning Iraq, and is considering yet another resolution today. This is why scores of nations have agreed to contribute economically or militarily to the joint effort against Saddam Hussein. And this is why 27 nations have sent troops or military materiel to the Persian Gulf. Everyone recognizes that this is a test case. Everyone can see that, beyond America's traditional objectives in the region, what is at stake is nothing less than the shape of tomorrow.

None of these considerations, of course, frees us from the responsibility to proceed carefully. The moral and human implications of war—any war—are very grave. No reasonable effort should be spared in the quest for a peaceful solution. That is why, despite the use of American hostages as human shields, despite the outrages against our embassy, despite Iraq's continued barbarism in Kuwait, we have refrained from military action against Saddam Hussein.

But even as we exercise patience and restraint, we also must be alert to the moral costs of such a course. Consider, for example, the fate of the people of Kuwait. With every day that passes, their plight grows more desperate. Being patient with Iraq allows Saddam Hussein to prolong their agony. Is this a moral course of action?

Or consider the fate of American military personnel in Saudi Arabia. The longer we refrain from action against Iraq, the more time Saddam Hussein has to tighten his grip on Kuwait, and the harder it may be to break that grip, if and when war comes. Does patience today risk greater American casualties tomorrow? And if so, is this a moral course of action?

Or consider Iraq's drive for nuclear weapons. As President Bush told American troops in Saudi Arabia during Thanksgiving, each day that passes brings Saddam one day closer to realizing his goal of a nuclear weapons arsenal. And we do know this for sure: He has never possessed a weapon that he didn't use. Will continued patience with Iraq help make the world vulnerable to nuclear blackmail by Saddam Hussein? And if so, is this a moral course of action?

Please don't misunderstand me. I believe that every reasonable effort must be made to resolve this crisis peacefully. I also think that there must be limits to our patience. And those limits are reached when our restraint threatens to undermine other, equally moral goals. These goals, as I said, include ending Kuwait's agony as soon as possible; minimizing American casualties in the event of war; and preventing Saddam Hussein from adding nuclear weapons to his already formidable arsenal of mass destruction. It is in order to prevent Saddam Hussein from thwarting these goals that the UN Security Council is expected to adopt a resolution today endorsing the use of force against Iraq if Saddam does not withdraw his forces from Kuwait.

The challenge the civilized world faces today is very grave. But it is not unprecedented. In 1936, the world faced a rather similar challenge when Adolf Hitler, who had only recently come to power, moved German troops into the Rhineland, in open defiance of the treaties of Versailles and Locarno. British and French leaders faced a major dilemma. To confront Hitler militarily could mean war. Not to confront him meant acquiescing in a cynical breach of international law. What to do?

But while British and French leaders vacillated between their hopes and their fears, one voice rang out loud and clear. On March 13, 1936, Winston

Churchill called on the League of Nations to take tough action against German aggression. His words deserve to be quoted at some length:

If no means of lawful redress can be offered to the aggrieved party," Churchill wrote, "the whole doctrine of international law and cooperation upon which the hopes of the future are based would lapse ignominiously. . . .

But the risk! No one must ignore it. How can it be minimized? There is a simple method: the assembly of an overwhelming force, moral and physical, in support of international law... If the forces at the disposal of the League of Nations are four or five times as strong as those that the aggressor can yet command, the chances of a peaceful and friendly solution are very good. . . .

The constabulary of the world is at hand. On every side of Geneva stand great nations, armed and ready, whose interests as well as whose obligations bind them to uphold, and in the last resort enforce, the public law. This may never come to pass again. The fateful moment has arrived for choice between the New Age and the Old.

Tragically, most leaders did not see the stakes as clearly as Churchill did. They did not force the issue to a head in the League of Nations. Instead, they acquiesced in Hitler's aggression. When, many years later, Churchill called World War II the "unnecessary war," it was the failure of British and French statesmanship during the Rhineland crisis that he had in mind.

Today, the UN Security Council stands poised at a historic juncture not unlike that faced by the League of Nations in 1936. We are hopeful—indeed, we are confident—that it will not fail the test. Some will thoughtlessly say that a vote for today's UN resolution is a vote for war. We reject this idea. Saddam has shown that he understands no language other than the language of force. Today's UN resolution is our last and best hope for peace—for a genuine peace, not the false peace that is only a prelude to another "unnecessary war." ■

Reprinted from
December 24, 1990

DISPATCH

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE
BUREAU OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Vice President Quayle

The Gulf: In Defense of Moral Principle

Remarks at the Foreign Policy Research Institute conference, Washington, DC, December 18, 1990.

I am delighted to be here this afternoon to address this distinguished group of scholars and policymakers.

The topic of your conference could not be more timely. For the more we learn about Saddam Hussein's barbarism in Kuwait, the clearer it becomes that the crisis is not, as Neville Chamberlain once said of Czechoslovakia, "A quarrel in a far-away country between people of whom we know nothing."

Rather, Kuwait's plight and the future security of the Gulf are vital issues that affect us all—strategically, economically, and morally. But before addressing some of the issues your conference poses, I would like to take just a moment to pay tribute to the valor of some of the Kuwaiti people.

When Saddam Hussein was trying to round up Americans in Kuwait to serve as his "human shields," the people of Kuwait hid many of our citizens in their homes, and provided them with food, medicine, and desperately needed shelter. In doing so, they quite literally put their own lives, and the lives of their loved ones, in terrible danger. I know I speak for President Bush and all Americans in saying that the Kuwaiti people have upheld the true honor and good name of the Arabs. Their courage and humanity will always be remembered.

Today, thanks to President Bush's firm policy, the nightmare has ended for Saddam's American hostages. The nightmare has also ended for those Americans who lived in hiding in Kuwait these past 4 months, dreading the knock on the door by Iraqi troops.

But for the people of Kuwait, the nightmare is not over. For them, the agony continues, and what an agony it is.

Summary executions of scores of people in front of their families; public hangings; families being terrorized by midnight searches; arbitrary arrests of thousands of people, including children; detainees being tortured with electric shocks and prolonged beatings; hospitals being taken over by Iraqi military authorities; medical personnel being detained or killed; and an entire nation being systematically looted of its food, its equipment, and its supplies.

The cruelty of the Iraqi forces occupying Kuwait is almost unbelievable. Listen to Deborah Hadi, an American woman married to a Kuwaiti:

We took our cousin, who was in labor, to Sabah Maternity Hospital. Upon our arrival, we saw a Kuwaiti woman at the front door—in hysterics, because she was in labor and Iraqi troops would not allow her to enter. When she continued to scream they put a bayonet through her stomach, pinning her to the wall. We left the hospital immediately and delivered my cousin's baby at home.

Or listen to Abdulal, a Kuwaiti:

While at the market buying food for a family, I saw two boys, 15 and 16 years old, in handcuffs escorted to a house by Iraqi soldiers. . . . The Iraqi soldiers then asked their mother to call all family members outside the house. . . . In full view of the mother, sister, and brother, as well as 15 men and women in the marketplace, the Iraqi soldiers shot and killed them.

As Congressman Tom Lantos, the Democratic co-chairman of the congressional Human Rights Caucus, put it back in October,

In the 8-year history of the . . . caucus, we have never had the degree of ghoulish and nightmarish horror stories coming from totally credible eyewitnesses that we have had this time.

It seems to me that those who advocate endless patience with Saddam Hussein, those who say we should give

him 12 months, or 18 months before contemplating the use of force, ought to think long and hard about what Congressman Lantos said.

And those who call for unlimited patience on moral grounds should ask themselves a few simple questions: Is it moral to prolong the agony of the Kuwaiti people indefinitely? If Kuwaitis refused to stand by as Americans were being hunted down by the Iraqis, is it right for Americans to stand by as Kuwaitis are being tortured and raped and brutalized? And will there even be a Kuwait left to save in a year or a year-and-a-half's time?

For our part, the Bush Administration's policy is clear and firm today, as it has been for the past 4 months. We are not going to budge one iota from the goals the President laid out at the start of this crisis, goals reaffirmed in 12 Security Council resolutions: achieving the complete and unconditional withdrawal of all Iraqi forces from Kuwait, restoring the legitimate government of Kuwait, releasing all the hostages, and maintaining the security and stability of the Gulf region. We must achieve all of these objectives.

Some critics of the Administration have questioned these goals. In particular, they have questioned the morality of coming to the defense of what they call a "feudal," "reactionary," and "repressive" regime.

Quite frankly, I am always astonished whenever I hear these charges made. First of all, the accusations against Kuwait are false. Secondly, since when has it become acceptable to loot and rape and torture people because they happen to live in a society whose customs differ from our own? And since when have Americans subscribed to a false, class-based morality that classifies some groups as "reactionary," and therefore expendable, and others as "progressive," and therefore beyond reproach?



This is precisely the warped and evil morality used by Stalin and his henchmen to justify their infamous campaign of terror during the 1930s. The people of the Soviet Union have turned their backs on the morally demented legacy of Stalinism. And so shall we.

The government of Kuwait is not the result of conspiracy and *coup d'etat*, and its rule is not enforced by terror and repression. The United States and the world, therefore, have no reason to apologize for demanding that the legitimate government of Kuwait be restored. Nor have we any reason to demand or accept anything less than the total and unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait. These are legitimate demands. These are moral demands. And these demands are not subject to negotiation.

In support of these demands, close to half a million troops are gathered in the Persian Gulf. Today, over one-third of the troop count is provided by our allies. But, some contributing nations are providing proportionately a greater percentage of their military forces than we are. Twenty-eight nations have committed military support to the allied Persian Gulf effort. This support comes from all quarters of the world, including members of the Warsaw Pact.

The majority of Muslim nations opposes the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait; 11 have committed military forces to the crisis. Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Syria lead in terms of numbers of troops and equipment.

The UK has supported the allied effort in every way possible, including tens of thousands of troops, squadrons of fighter/bombers, and several navy vessels in the Gulf. The French have been supportive, with more tens of thousands of committed troops and equipment. Turkey, which borders much larger Iraq, from the outset courageously condemned the Iraqi invasion and pledged to send troops into combat in event of an Iraqi attack. The Germans and Japanese have pledged considerable sums of money.

The American people—like the international community as a whole—understand and support our objectives. A majority of the public approves of the President's decision to send troops to the Persian Gulf. And an equally large majority believes that the United States should, if need be, take all action neces-

sary, including military force, to compel Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait.

The American people understand that Saddam Hussein's Iraq poses a long-term threat not just to its neighbors, but to us. They know that over the past decade, Saddam Hussein has bankrupted his people to bankroll his army. They know that he has launched two wars of aggression, against Iran and against Kuwait, at the cost of some 1 million lives—thus far. They know he is acquiring a sizable stockpile of chemical and biological weapons, and has used chemical weapons against both Iran and his own people. They know he has launched an ambitious campaign to acquire nuclear weapons. And they know that unless he is stopped today, a nuclear-armed Iraq will control the bulk of the world's energy supply tomorrow, thereby holding a gun to all our heads.

Because the President is determined to leave no stone unturned in the search for peace, he has offered to send Secretary of State Baker to Baghdad, and has invited Iraq's Foreign Minister [Tariq Aziz] to Washington.

Unfortunately, Iraq's attempt to manipulate this process makes it far from certain that these meetings will take place. But one thing is certain. If Secretary Baker does go to Baghdad, his message to Saddam Hussein will be loud and clear: You may leave all of Kuwait peacefully, without conditions, or you will leave Kuwait by force.

Once Iraqi forces have left Kuwait, however, and once the legitimate Kuwaiti government has been restored, our job will still not be over. We will have to work to see that the President's final objective—maintaining security and stability in the region—is achieved. We cannot allow a situation in which an aggressive dictator has a million-man army, thousands of tanks and artillery pieces, hundreds of jets, and access to billions of petro-dollars.

We cannot allow such a dictator credibly to threaten any of his neighbors should they not meet his political and economic demands. Neither we nor our friends in the region are prepared to live with such a situation. Moreover, we cannot allow the development of new and more deadly chemical and biological weapons, and the long-range delivery systems to threaten every nation in the

region. And we can't allow the acquisition of an indigenous nuclear weapons production capability—also deliverable at long ranges.

Saddam's record makes it clear that he would not hesitate to use these weapons, just as he has not hesitated to use chemical weapons against his own people. And we are not willing to let that happen.

That is why we intend to see all the President's objectives attained, and all 12 UN Security Council resolutions carried out—including UN Security Council Resolution 674, which declares Iraq responsible for all damage resulting from its occupation of Kuwait.

Restoring the *status quo ante* would not be enough. Having tried to erase an entire nation from the face of the earth, Saddam cannot simply walk away without penalty and in a position to repeat his aggression.

As for the United States, we will continue to play a positive role in the region. Presidents Truman, Carter, and Reagan all recognized that the US has vital interests in the Middle East. And President Bush is fully determined to defend these interests.

As the President said in his September 11 speech to Congress [*Dispatch*, Vol. 1, No. 3, p. 91]:

Our interest, our involvement in the Gulf is not transitory. It predated Saddam Hussein's aggression and it will survive it. Long after our troops come home... there will be a lasting role for the United States in assisting the nations of the Persian Gulf. Our role then: To deter future aggression... to help our friends in their own self-defense... and to curb the proliferation of chemical, biological, ballistic missile, and above all nuclear technologies.

Of course, it won't be easy. Of course, we will all have our work cut out for us. But failure to achieve our objectives is unacceptable. Failure would mean that no future aggressor would be deterred by warnings from the United States or the United Nations. Failure would lead to a new, post-Cold War world more prone to anarchy, and more violent, than the world which preceded it.

We will not fail. We will act decisively in defense of our moral principles and strategic interests. And we will work together to ensure the security of all the states in the region. This is both the challenge and the opportunity facing us today. ■

1ST STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1991 Chicago Tribune Company;
Chicago Tribune

January 22, 1991, Tuesday, NORTH SPORTS FINAL EDITION

SECTION: NEWS; Pg. 1; ZONE: C

LENGTH: 1032 words

HEADLINE: Bush decries Baltic violence
Summit, aid imperiled by Kremlin crackdown

BYLINE: By George de Lama, Chicago Tribune. Tribune correspondents Vincent Schodolski in Moscow, Timothy J. McNulty in Washington and the contributed to this report

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

BODY:

An angry President Bush on Monday condemned the Soviet military crackdown in Latvia, and administration officials concluded Moscow intends to use the world's preoccupation with the Persian Gulf war as a cover to crush dissent in the Baltic republics.

Bush served notice "the world is very much concerned" about the Soviets' resort to force over the weekend in Latvia, where Black Beret troops stormed the Latvian Interior Ministry building in a hail of gunfire, leaving five dead.

Reports from Moscow Monday indicated Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev had summoned the leaders of all 15 Soviet republics to the Kremlin for an emergency meeting. The summons came amid published warnings by the Soviet news agency Tass that Gorbachev might establish direct presidential rule over Latvia if scheduled talks with its leaders fail.

Senior administration officials stressed that Bush has made no final decision on a formal U.S. response but said it is increasingly unlikely the president will attend his scheduled Feb. 11-13 summit in Moscow with Gorbachev.

One official who is monitoring Soviet events said, "The smart money is not on the summit."

The administration also is considering revoking as much as \$1 billion in recently announced grain credits for the Soviet Union as well as suspending other recent trade and cooperation accords with Moscow, senior officials said.

"I am increasingly concerned," Bush told reporters. "I would again appeal to the Soviet Union leaders to resist using force."

At the same time, Soviet and U.S. arms negotiators huddled at the State Department to try to overcome remaining differences on a long-range nuclear-weapons reduction treaty and on their recent conventional arms accord. Bush wants to lock in arms control advances before U.S.-Soviet relations suffer further.

(c) 1991 Chicago Tribune, January 22, 1991

The president and Secretary of State James A. Baker III were closely coordinating a response to the Soviet actions with NATO allies, who publicly have warned that members of the Western alliance may revoke aid and impose sanctions against Moscow if the repression in the Baltics continues.

In Washington, the State Department on Sunday quietly summoned a diplomat from the Soviet Embassy and delivered a formal note protesting the raid against local police in the Latvian capital, officials disclosed.

"The note said the incident was deeply disturbing and not consistent with the Soviet declarations of their interest in settling things peacefully," said another senior official involved in formulating U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union.

The Soviets so far have responded to U.S. complaints by saying that their elite troops were fired upon by pro-independence Latvian forces inside the Interior Ministry building in Riga, officials said.

"Their explanation is that there were shots fired from inside the building at their Black Berets," the senior official said. "We cannot discount this. It may well be true. But our answer is that even if this were true, the Soviets still bear blame because the presence of those troops there inflamed the situation."

In an attempt to sort out the facts and hold talks with local independence leaders, U.S. officials from the embassy in Moscow are in Lithuania, Latvia and other restive Soviet republics, officials in Washington said.

"We're going to wait until we get a readout back from them before we proceed to make any decisions about what we're going to do," one U.S. official here said.

As Bush pondered the deteriorating situation within the Soviet Union, Baker and other top deputies were increasingly of the view that Gorbachev is using the gulf war as a political cover for stepping up repression in the Baltic republics.

Worrying that other Soviet ethnic hotbeds such as the republic of Georgia may be next, officials said Moscow's repression looked like an ominous repeat of 1956, when the Soviet Union invaded Hungary to quash a rebellious reform movement at a time when world attention was focused on another Middle East crisis, over the Suez Canal.

Beyond analyzing the Soviet leader's tactics, administration policymakers increasingly are concerned that Gorbachev either has abandoned all pretense of following his earlier reform programs or has lost control of his government's actions to hard-line factions in the army and the KGB.

One official suggested the transformation in the Soviet leader - until recently such a darling of the West that he was given the Nobel Peace Prize - amounted, in effect, to a coup in the Soviet Union.

"Yes," this official said, "Gorbachev succeeded Gorbachev."

Although Moscow denied any advance knowledge of Sunday's assault, Latvian leaders said they were sure the Kremlin either knew of the attack ahead of

(c) 1991 Chicago Tribune, January 22, 1991

time or ordered it.

In Riga, the Latvian Parliament approved the creation of an all-volunteer defense force to confront future Soviet military attacks.

The latest decision in Riga compounded an already confused situation in the three Baltic states of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia. All three were independent until 1940, when they forcibly were incorporated into the Soviet Union as a result of a secret pact between Soviet dictator Josef Stalin and Nazi leader Adolf Hitler.

Lithuania so far has been the boldest of the three Baltics in pressing for its independence. Moscow on Monday appeared to be seeking to isolate Lithuania in its campaign to block any quick move toward secession by the three republics.

The independent Baltfax news agency reported that an agreement has been reached between Gorbachev and Estonian leader Arnold Ruutel on talks that would seek to resolve the Baltic confrontation and prevent the use of any Soviet troops in Estonia.

At the same time, the Tass news agency reported, in a speculative story that appeared to be a warning to the Latvian leadership, that Gorbachev was prepared to introduce direct presidential rule over Latvia if his scheduled talks with the Latvian leadership Tuesday failed.

Tass quoted the chairman of the Soviet parliamentary commission on ethnic affairs, Anatoly Denisov, as saying that Gorbachev might take such a step and use the armed forces to impose it if necessary.

GRAPHIC: PHOTO: A Soviet soldier stands guard at the Latvian Interior Ministry on Monday. Earlier, elite Soviet Black Berets attacked the building, resulting in five deaths. Agence France-Presse Photo.

PHOTO: A Lithuanian civilian unloads rifles from his car outside Parliament in the republic's capital of Vilnius on Monday. Reuters photo (published on page 2, Final edition).

SOVIET UNION; OPPOSITION; GOVERNMENT; MILITARY; REACTION; EUROPE; MEETING; TRIP; DELAY; UNITED STATES; DATE

7TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1991 The Washington Post

January 21, 1991, Monday, Final Edition

SECTION: FIRST SECTION; PAGE A1

LENGTH: 1186 words

HEADLINE: Soviets Seize Latvian Ministry;
5 Dead, 9 Wounded in Attack;
Moscow Demonstrators Demand Gorbachev's Resignation

SERIES: Occasional

BYLINE: Michael Dobbs, Washington Post Foreign Service

DATELINE: MOSCOW, Jan. 21 (Monday), 1991

BODY:

Soviet internal security troops attacked the Latvian Interior Ministry in Riga Sunday night, leaving five people dead and nine wounded in the latest battle over political control in the Soviet Baltic republics, according to the Latvian parliament's information office.

A Latvian parliamentary spokesman said that about 100 members of a Soviet anti-terrorist unit known as the "black berets," which is loyal to the Kremlin, took over the ground and top floors of the building in a burst of gunfire shortly after 9 p.m. Outnumbered Latvian police battled to defend other floors for about 90 minutes but were overpowered, the spokesman said. Early this morning, after about six hours in which they apparently searched the building for weapons, the troops left the building.

The Soviet military commander in the region had demanded last Monday that Latvian police surrender their arms, a demand rejected by Latvian Interior Minister Aloizs Vaznis. "Black beret" units then raided a Latvian police academy outside Riga, the Latvian capital, shoved aside a dozen trainees and confiscated an undetermined number of weapons.

Few other details were available on Sunday's attack, which came just hours after tens of thousands of demonstrators massed in Moscow to denounce last week's army crackdown in neighboring Soviet Lithuania, where paratroops stormed a television station, killing at least 13 civilians. The demonstrators, estimated at between 100,000 and 300,000, demanded a halt to suppression of democratic movements around the country and called for the resignation of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev.

The Latvian spokesman identified a civilian killed at the Interior Ministry building in Riga as Andris Slapins, a cameraman who was filming the attack. Other casualties included two Latvian policemen who were defending the building, the spokesman said.

The seizure of the Interior Ministry, which was a potential focus of Latvian resistance because of its role in directing the republic's newly organized police force, appeared to mark an escalation in the continuing power struggle in the Baltic republics, all three of which have begun moving to secede from the

(c) 1991 The Washington Post, January 21, 1991

Soviet Union.

The "black berets" were formerly under the command of the Soviet Interior Ministry, but last week were transferred to a Communist-dominated so-called National Salvation Committee in Latvia that announced Saturday it was seizing power in the republic.

In Washington, White House spokesman Bill Harlow said President Bush was "deeply troubled" by the events in Latvia and was monitoring the situation. The State Department contacted the Soviet Embassy late Sunday afternoon, asking that it transmit to Moscow an urgent U.S. request to end the violence.

U.S. officials said it was unclear whether Bush would take any formal steps to protest the Baltic crackdown, such as cancelling the Moscow summit scheduled for Feb. 11-13. Bush said Friday that he had stressed his demands for a peaceful solution in the Baltics in a phone conversation with Gorbachev, the second time in a week he had made that point to the Soviet president.

The demonstrators in Moscow's Manezh Square chanted, "Lithuania today, Russia tomorrow!" suggesting that the military action in the Baltics could be the start of a more general crackdown throughout the Soviet Union. Smaller demonstrations took place in Leningrad, Kiev -- the Ukrainian capital -- and a half-dozen other Soviet cities.

The rallies demonstrated that the Soviet democratic movement is very much alive despite Gorbachev's sharp shift toward a more hard-line position in recent months. But the mood was grim, and many demonstrators agreed that such protests are unlikely to be very effective if the Kremlin decides on full-scale repression.

Nearly a year ago, more than 100,000 demonstrators rallied at the same Moscow square to press the Communist Party to give up its constitutional guarantee of power. At that rally, however, many of the demonstrators had expressed support for Gorbachev against his hard-line opponents.

At this Sunday's rally, the protesters shouted, "Dictatorship will not pass!" and "Down with the Communist Party!" In a message to the demonstrators, Russian republic President Boris Yeltsin said that the "danger of dictatorship" is becoming a reality, but he declared he still is prepared to talk with Gorbachev.

"Economic reform has been blocked, democracy betrayed, glasnost trampled upon. Arbitrariness and lawlessness are being restored in the Soviet Union," Yeltsin said in the message. Aides said the Russian leader did not appear in person because of fears of a possible assassination attempt.

Leading radical-reform politicians, including Leningrad Mayor Anatoly Sobchak, have called for the formation of a national coalition government based on the core Soviet republics of Russia, the Ukraine, Byelorussia and Kazakhstan. They have argued that such a coalition could represent the last chance of averting a military-backed countrywide crackdown and the restoration of authoritarian rule.

Gorbachev's allies insist that he is still ready for a dialogue with advocates of radical reform, despite the recent removal of leading political moderates from his inner circle.

(c) 1991 The Washington Post, January 21, 1991

Speakers at the Moscow demonstration called for the resignation of Gorbachev, Defense Minister Dmitri Yazov, KGB chief Vladimir Kryuchkov and Interior Minister Boris Pugo, accusing them of authorizing the storming of the television station in Lithuania. "We are to say a decisive 'No' to the reactionary policy of Gorbachev and his team," shouted historian Yuri Afanasyev, a radical Soviet legislator who was the main speaker at the rally.

Yeltsin has summoned the Russian legislature into emergency session today to discuss the country's political crisis. Some Russian lawmakers believe that they could be asked to approve direct presidential elections in Russia to strengthen Yeltsin's political authority.

A resolution adopted at Sunday's Moscow rally called for immediate withdrawal of "punitive forces" from the three Baltic republics and arrest of the leaders of what it called an "attempted coup" there. In both Lithuania and Latvia, self-proclaimed "national salvation committees" dominated by pro-Moscow Communists have announced that they are taking power, overturning the republics' democratically elected parliaments.

Saturday's claim by the Latvian National Salvation Committee that it was seizing power was ridiculed by the Latvian government, which said it remains in full control in the republic. A parliamentary spokesman said Latvian Prime Minister Ivars Godmanis called Yazov in Moscow to protest the attack but that Yazov said he had no knowledge of it. Godmanis then called Interior Minister Pugo, a former head of the Latvian KGB, who promised steps to control the situation, the spokesman said.

Meanwhile Sunday, in Baku, capital of the Soviet republic of Azerbaijan, up to 1 million people gathered Sunday at a cemetery to commemorate the deaths of more than 100 people a year ago when Soviet troops stormed the city to quell ethnic rioting.

GRAPHIC: PHOTO, BODY OF SLAIN LATVIAN LIES COVERED IN FOREGROUND AS INJURED MAN, SEATED, RECEIVES TREATMENT AT RIGA WAR MUSEUM. AP; MAP, LARRY FOGEL; PHOTO, REUTER

TYPE: FOREIGN NEWS

SUBJECT: U.S.S.R.; HUMAN RIGHTS; ARMED FORCES; DEMONSTRATIONS; SHOOTINGS; FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

ORGANIZATION: LATVIA; LITHUANIA

NAMED-PERSONS: MIKHAIL GORBACHEV; ANATOLY SOBCHAK

ENHANCEMENT: INDEPENDENCE

10TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1991 Chicago Tribune Company;
Chicago Tribune

January 19, 1991, Saturday, NORTH SPORTS FINAL EDITION

SECTION: NEWS; Pg. 9; ZONE: C

LENGTH: 625 words

HEADLINE: Bush keeping eye on Lithuania crackdown
Solve it peacefully, Gorbachev urged

BYLINE: From Chicago Tribune wires

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

BODY:

President Bush said Friday he had spoken to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev earlier in the day and had expressed his feeling that the tense situation in the Baltic republics should be resolved peacefully.

"I took the opportunity . . . to express again my deep concern over the Baltics and the need to ensure that there is a peaceful resolution to the situation there," Bush said.

In Vilnius, Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis said he had received U.S. assurances of support for his republic, which is trying to buck a crackdown by Soviet troops.

At an evening news conference Friday, Landsbergis said he had met with George A. Krol, the U.S. consul based in Leningrad. He quoted Krol as telling him, "The United States guarantees that at this time in our crisis, the United States is on our side."

The diplomat told him the U.S. supports a peaceful settlement in Lithuania, Landsbergis said. No confirmation from Krol on the comments was immediately available.

The U.S. has been watching the situation in the Soviet Union with increasing concern in recent weeks and has been particularly bothered by events in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. The concern was highlighted by recent White House comments indicating that a Bush-Gorbachev summit, planned for Feb. 11-13 in Moscow, could be scuttled by events.

Bush made no further comment on U.S.-Soviet relations at a news conference Friday in the White House briefing room. But Marlin Fitzwater, the White House spokesman, said, "The summit is still on."

Thirteen Lithuanians and one Soviet soldier were killed Sunday in a Soviet military assault on the broadcasting center in Vilnius. On Wednesday, special "black beret" police units killed a man in Riga, capital of the neighboring republic of Latvia. And the next day Soviet troops detained a Lithuanian member of parliament overnight, fanning fears that the Persian Gulf war could provide cover for a new Kremlin crackdown.

(c) 1991 Chicago Tribune, January 19, 1991

In Estonia, the third Baltic republic, residents of Tallinn blocked roads to the hilltop parliament building with stone barricades Friday.

In addition, a news report said Russian-speaking workers pressing the pro-independence Estonian government to resign went on strike at 16 large factories. But despite the tension, no violence has been reported in Estonia.

The events in the Baltics, and the larger sense that the Soviet Union may be seriously backsliding on recent reforms, have put a frost on the warming ties between the two superpowers. Those ties resulted in historic arms control agreements, and Washington recently granted \$1 billion in export credits to the Soviet Union to help it buy winter food.

The White House said recently that the economic assistance to Moscow was under review.

On Friday, U.S. officials, speaking on condition of anonymity, said the Kremlin had raised tension in the Baltics with false and biased press and television accounts.

The officials cited as an example Soviet reports that Lithuanians guarding the television tower in Vilnius Sunday fired first on the Soviet troops. Witnesses contradicted those reports. In another example, they cited baseless charges by the so-called National Salvation Committee that the Lithuanian government intended to assassinate Soviet military and civilian officials and to terrorize the Lithuanian population.

Lithuania's embattled independence government raised some cheer from behind its bunker walls Friday by resuming television broadcasting to rebut Kremlin propaganda salvos.

With Soviet armor still holding the main television tower, the Lithuanian government managed to construct a new antenna and begin broadcasting from inside the parliament building, where independence leaders are barricaded.

SOVIET UNION; UNITED STATES; REACTION; OPPOSITION; GOVERNMENT; VIOLENCE;
MILITARY

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

January 28, 1991

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT
IN ADDRESS TO THE NATIONAL RELIGIOUS BROADCASTERS CONVENTION

The Sheraton Washington Hotel

Washington, D.C.

9:03 A.M. EST

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. President Rose, thank you, sir. And Executive Director Gustavson -- all. First, let me salute your leadership of the NRB -- Billy Graham and Jerry Falwell, Pat Robertson, James Dobson, Chuck Colson; the FCC Commissioners -- Sikes and Duggan and James Quello.

This marks the fifth time that I've addressed the Annual Convention of the National Religious Broadcasters. And once again, let me say it is, for both Barbara and me, an honor to be back here.

Let me begin by congratulating you on your theme of declaring His glory to all nations. It's a theme eclipsing denominations and which reflects many of the eternal teachings in the Scripture. I speak, of course, of the teachings which uphold moral values, like tolerance, compassion, faith and courage. They remind us that while God can live without man, man cannot live without God. His love and His justice inspire in us a yearning for faith and a compassion for the weak and oppressed, as well as the courage and conviction to oppose tyranny and injustice.

And I'm very grateful for that resolution that has just been read prior to my speaking here.

Matthew also reminds us in these times that the meek shall inherit the Earth. At home, these values imbue the policies which you and I support. Like me, you endorse adoption, not abortion. (Applause.) And last year you helped ensure that the options of religious-based child care will not be restricted or eliminated by the federal government. (Applause.)

And I commend your concern, your heartfelt concern on behalf of Americans with disabilities, and your belief that students who go to school to nourish their minds should also be allowed to nourish their souls. And I have not lessened my commitment to restoring voluntary prayer in our schools. (Applause.)

These actions can make America a kinder and gentler place because they reaffirm the values that I spoke of earlier -- values that must be central to the lives of every individual and the life of every nation. The clergyman Richard Cecil once said, "There are two classes of the wise; the men who serve God because they have found Him, and the men who seek Him because they have not found Him yet." Abroad, as in America, our task is to serve and seek wisely through the policies we pursue.

Nowhere is this more true than in the Persian Gulf where, despite protestations of Saddam Hussein, it is not Iraq against the United States, it's the regime of Saddam Hussein against the rest of the world. Saddam tried to cast this conflict as a religious war. *But it has nothing to do with religion per se. It has, on the other hand, everything to do with what religion embodies -- good versus evil, right versus wrong, human dignity and freedom versus tyranny and oppression.*

MORE.

The war in the Gulf is not a Christian war, a Jewish war, or a Moslem war -- it is a just war. And it is a war with which good will prevail. (Applause.) We're told that the principles of a just war originated with classical Greek and Roman philosophers like Plato and Cicero. And later they were expounded by such Christian theologians as Ambrose Augustine, Thomas Aquinas.

The first principle of a just war is that it support a just cause. Our cause could not be more noble. We seek Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait -- completely, immediately and without condition; the restoration of Kuwait's legitimate government and the security and stability of the Gulf. We will see that Kuwait once again is free, that the nightmare of Iraq's occupation has ended, and that naked aggression will not be rewarded.

We seek nothing for ourselves. As I have said, U.S. forces will leave as soon as their mission is over, as soon as they are no longer needed or desired. And let me add, we do not seek the destruction of Iraq. We have respect for the people of Iraq, for the importance of Iraq in the region. We do not want a country so destabilized that Iraq itself could be a target for aggression.

But a just war must also be declared by legitimate authority. Operation Desert Storm is supported by unprecedented United Nations' solidarity, the principle of collective self-defense, 12 Security Council resolutions and, in the Gulf, 28 nations from six continents united -- resolute that we will not waiver and that Saddam's aggression will not stand.

I salute the aid -- economic and military -- from countries who have joined in this unprecedented effort -- whose courage and sacrifice have inspired the world. We're not going it alone -- but believe me, we are going to see it through. (Applause.)

Every war -- every war -- is fought for a reason. But a just war is fought for the right reasons -- for moral, not selfish reasons. Let me take a moment to tell you a story -- a tragic story -- about a family whose two sons, 18 and 19, reportedly refused to lower the Kuwaiti flag in front of their home. For this crime, they were executed by the Iraqis. Then, unbelievably, their parents were asked to pay the price of the bullets used to kill them.

Some ask whether it's moral to use force to stop the rape, the pillage, the plunder of Kuwait. And my answer: Extraordinary diplomatic efforts having been exhausted to resolve the matter peacefully, then the use of force is moral. (Applause.)

A just war must be a last resort. As I have often said, we did not want war. But you all know the verse from Ecclesiastics: There is "a time for peace, a time for war." From August 2, 1990 -- last summer, August 2nd -- to January 15, 1991 -- 166 days -- we tried to resolve this conflict. Secretary of State Jim Baker made an extraordinary effort to achieve peace. More than 200 meetings with foreign dignitaries, 10 diplomatic missions, six congressional appearances. Over 103,000 miles traveled to talk with, among others, members of the United Nations, the Arab League, and the European Community. And sadly, Saddam Hussein rejected out of hand every overture made by the United States and by other countries as well. He made this just war an inevitable war.

We all know that war never comes easy or cheap. War is never without the loss of innocent life. And that is war's greatest tragedy. But when a war must be fought for the greater good, it is our gravest obligation to conduct a war in proportion to the threat. And that is why we must act reasonably, humanely, and make every effort possible to keep casualties to a minimum. And we've done so. I'm very proud of our military in achieving this end. (Applause.)

From the very first day of the war, the allies have waged war against Saddam's military. We are doing everything possible, believe me, to avoid hurting the innocent. Saddam's response?

MORE

Wanton, barbaric bombing of civilian areas. America and her allies value life. We pray that Saddam Hussein will see reason. To date, his indiscriminate use of those Scud missiles -- nothing more than weapons of terror; they have no military -- they can offer no military advantage, weapons of terror -- it outraged the world what he has done.

The price of war is always high. And so it must never, ever, be undertaken without total commitment to a successful outcome. It is only justified when victory can be achieved. I have pledged that this will not be another Vietnam. And let me reassure you here today, it won't be another Vietnam. (Applause.)

We are fortunate, we are very fortunate to have in this crisis the finest Armed Forces ever assembled. An all-volunteer force, joined by courageous allies. And we will prevail because we have the finest soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines, and Coast Guardsmen that any nation has ever had. (Applause.)

But above all, we will prevail because of the support of the American people. Armed with a trust in God and in the principles that make men free. People like each of you in this room. I salute Voice of Hope's live radio programming for U.S. and allied troops in the Gulf. And your Operation Desert Prayer, and worship services for our troops held by, among others, the man who over a week ago led a wonderful prayer service at Fort Myer over here across the river in Virginia, the Reverend Billy Graham.

America has always been a religious nation -- perhaps never more than now. Just look at the last several weeks. Churches, synagogues, mosques reporting record attendance at services. Chapels packed during working hours as Americans stop in for a moment or two. Why? To pray for peace. And I know -- of course, I know -- that some disagree with the course that I've taken, and I have no bitterness in my heart about that at all, no anger. I am convinced that we are doing the right thing. And tolerance is a virtue, not a vice. (Applause.)

But with the support and prayers of so many, there can be no question in the minds of our soldiers or in the minds of our enemy about what Americans think. We know that this is a just war. And we know that, God willing, this is a war we will win. But most of all, we know that ours would not be the land of the free if it were not also the home of the brave. No one wanted war less than I did. No one is more determined to seize from battle the real peace that can offer hope, that can create a new world order.

When this war is over, the United States, its credibility and its reliability restored, will have a key leadership role in helping to bring peace to the rest of the Middle East. And I have been honored to serve as President of this great nation for two years now, and believe more than ever that one cannot be America's President without trust in God. I cannot imagine a world, a life, without the presence of the one through whom all things are possible. (Applause.)

During the darkest days of the Civil War, a man we revere not merely for what he did, but what he was, was asked whether he thought the Lord was on his side. And said Abraham Lincoln, "My concern is not whether God is on our side, but whether we are on God's side." (Applause.) My fellow Americans, I firmly believe in my heart of hearts that times will soon be on the side of peace because the world is overwhelmingly on the side of God.

Thank you for this occasion. And may God bless our great country. And may we remember -- and please remember all of our coalition's Armed Forces in your prayers. Thank you and God bless you. (Applause.)