

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: 13754
Folder ID Number: 13754-003

Folder Title:
Michigan Commencement 5/4/91 [OA 8322] [3]

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
G	26	21	3	7

kinko's

APR 29 P12: 48

FAX COVER SHEETDate: 4/29/91This fax is directed to: NANCY BENSON

Please notify this person that they have been sent a fax.

URGENT? ☒ Yes ☐ NoDepartment: COMMUNICATIONSCompany: THE WHITE HOUSEBusiness Phone: 202 456 7032 FAX Phone: 202 456 6218Number of pages including this cover sheet: 2Special Instructions: I expect 1,000+ protesters to follow the enclosed instructions atCommencement call of questions.
MarkThis fax has been sent by: MarkDepartment: Univ. of Michigan

Company: _____

Phone: 313 998 1305**Kinko's Public Fax Service.**

Please call us if you have had any problems receiving or if there are any pages missing. We can receive and transmit fax transmissions 24 hours, 7 days a week.

Our Fax number is: (313) 761-1416

Our store number is: (313) 761-4539

540 East Liberty Street

Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

This flyer and these suggestions come from a group of concerned students, faculty, and community members.

BUSH IS SPEAKING AND BEING HONORED AT GRADUATION!

If you are concerned about Bush's recent actions and policies regarding education and other domestic issues or the conflict in the Persian Gulf, **PLEASE PROTEST BUSH'S PRESENCE AT OUR GRADUATION!**

If you plan to protest, the following are a list of non-violent ideas for protesting we would like to suggest, and invite you to join us in:

- 1) Stand and Turn Your Back While Bush Speaks
Stand on your seat, if you like.
- 2) Wear RED, symbolic of all the casualties in the Gulf War.
Wear red clothing and take off your gown when Bush speaks, or
Wear red ribbons, or Wear red tape on your mortarboard.
- 3) BOO loudly during Bush's approach and reception of law degree.
- 4) Yell or say "BULL" or "BULLSHIT" whenever Bush mentions:
"EDUCATION", "PEACE", "DEMOCRACY",
"LIBERATION OF KUWAIT", or "NEW WORLD ORDER".
- 5) Protest by NOT going to graduation, and join the protesters
OUTSIDE.

Snow/Grossman
DRAFT ONE
APRIL 29, 1991
MI

**PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN COMMENCEMENT
MAY 4, 1991
11 a.m.**

It's a pleasure to stand here in Michigan Stadium, a place that has forged its share of football history -- and political history. Lyndon Johnson delivered his Great Society address at a commencement here nearly 27 years ago. Three years earlier, John F. Kennedy proposed creating the Peace Corps.

I will not try to outbid those great men. Instead, I want about **this** historic moment. Your commencement -- your journey into the "real world," coincides with this nation's commencement into a world that for years was only a fond hope -- a world freed from Cold War conflict and opened up to the promise of cooperation and economic competition.

In recent years, we have discovered our potential as the economic engine of the world. More recently, we have secured our place as the world's chief proponent of freedom and democracy. Our participation in the Persian Gulf War proved to the world that Americans really will risk dying for ideals we hold dear. We will extend helping hands to the victims of brutal aggression.

But the war also revived our belief in ourselves. It was as if we had awakened abruptly from a long fitful Vietnam-era sleep, a nightmare time in which we doubted our decency, our values, our abilities. Suddenly, Americans felt free to feel good about

themselves, to cherish their optimism, charity, decency, toleration and ability.

I have traveled around the country in recent months, and I feel an idealism I have not felt for 30 years.

In Sumter, South Carolina I joined citizens who had rebuilt a city after two disasters -- a hurricane and a war. Tears leaped to their eyes as they finally paused to take in the fruits of their labors. Men and women of all ages, colors and backgrounds crowded together into a high school stadium -- to welcome home their sons and daughters -- and to celebrate their turning a torn and demoralized town into a garden of hope. People who once divided themselves into "us" and "them" saw themselves in a new light -- as companions in the great adventure of life.

That spirit helps define this moment in our history. From coast to coast, people are excited. They squint into a hazy future and ask themselves, "What next?" "How can I help?"

Here and everywhere Americans have begun to take on tough tasks: helping the homeless, training the unskilled, pushing back the wave of crime, building schools and neighborhoods in which they may take real pride.

This revival of pride stems from the same source that toppled the Berlin Wall and humbled Saddam Hussein. It comes from the triumph of freedom.

True, Western military contained the growth of communism, but in a very real sense socialism evaporated because despots,

dictators, tanks, walls, prison cells, spies, thugs -- the harsh and ingenious forms of oppression -- could not contain people's natural yearning for freedom.

Our culture -- from the Federalist Papers to rock videos -- proved not only that our culture could produce goods. It showed that it lets hearts sing and laugh. For communism's victims, freedom promises much more than stores filled with goods; it promises lives filled with meaning. It offers the hope, happiness, joy, brotherhood. It replaces a society governed by fear to one brightened by possibility.

It's time we learned from our own triumphs and applied the lessons of liberty to our own problems. I would like to talk today about four aspects of freedom, and how they form the backbone of our domestic agenda.

Let me start with the freedom to create. From its inception, the United States has been a laboratory for creation, invention, exploration. Here, merit conquers circumstance. Here, people of vision -- Abraham Lincoln, Henry Ford, Tom Monaghan -- outgrow rough origins and transform a world.

Our national history proves that capitalism is not a system for accumulating profits. It serves as a seedbed for creativity. It makes it possible for people to accumulate wealth through productivity, rather than just through theft. It enables people to convert good ideas into great works. It lets ideas and information move swiftly and freely -- unfettered by censors of plantation bosses.

Markets collect and distribute the genius of entrepreneurs, scholars and dreamers of every sort.

Every time societies attempt to improve on freedom -- say, by picking winners and losers in the economic market -- they fail. No conclave of experts, no matter how brilliant, can match the genius of a market in which millions of people swap information and inspiration.

Consider a few recent innovations. The information revolution was hatched in garages and basements. The fast-food chain -- an innovation many loathe, but one that has changed life around the planet -- began in obscurity. Domino's Pizza would never have stood a chance before a committee of planners. Tom Monaghan was just a college kid with a good idea.

And that's the genius of the marketplace. Free markets help give everyone access to unexpected discoveries. They give the masses access to goods that once were reserved for kings and party bosses. They spread the proceeds of progress to everyone.

Our domestic program tries in many ways to encourage market innovation, to push aside deadening and demoralizing barriers to creativity. We have proposed re-inventing the American school, in hopes of unleashing our national genius. We have proposed anti-crime measures that would punish the terrorists who shove honest businesses out of neighborhoods in need. He have proposed market incentives that give taxpayers a better return on their dollar. Last year's child care and clean air acts incorporate market incentives. This year's transportation package seeks to

invite entrepreneurship. We even have proposed extending the dignity of home ownership to people who now live in government apartments -- housing blocks in which tenants enjoy no pride of ownership, and in many cases, no rights of protecting their dwellings.

But that's not enough. In a world transformed by freedom, we must look for other ways to unfetter our national ingenuity. We must eliminate the petty harrassments we inflict upon people with dreams.

The average worker in the United States now spends more than four months of each year working just to pay the tax man. Here in Michigan, Tax Freedom Day -- the day on which workers stop paying the federal, state and local authorities -- won't take place for another eight days. That's more than four months of labor that might otherwise have helped pay for the house and car, set aside money for children's educations, purchasing clothes for work or leisure. Four months of labor that might otherwise help a worker create a little nest-egg.

But think about it: do these taxes liberate anyone from four months' worth of want, of responsibility, of anything? Or do they inspire cynicism?

Americans transformed a rugged wilderness into the most prosperous nation on earth not by decree or by tax payment, but by action. If we want to provide the greatest good for the greatest number, we must abandon the stale slogans of redistribution or false compassion. We must look instead to

compassion that works. Free enterprise enables us to spread life-enriching and life-saving goods to corners of society that otherwise would live and die in filth and obscurity. It gives people the freedom to choose the kinds of lives they want to lead. The rest of the world now understands this American truth. It's time we accepted it for ourselves.

We have entered a new industrial revolution, but our government lags behind. If I can risk learning how to use a computer, surely this nation can begin thinking about addressing its problems in new ways.

This leads to a second freedom, the freedom to think and speak one's mind. Free speech may be the defining characteristic of the American ideal. It enables us to expose bad ideas and spread good ones. It highlights and nourishes the diversity upon which our national greatness rests. It allows blacks and whites to share experiences, rich and poor to talk about their needs and frustrations; it gives everyone a chance to learn from everyone else.

Nevertheless, free expression is under assault throughout the United States, and nowhere more than on college campuses. The tornado of Political Correctness has ravaged many fine colleges and universities. Although it arises from the laudable desire to sweep away the debris of racism and hatred, it simply imposes new prejudices. It declares certain topics off-limits, certain expression off-limits, even certain gestures off-limits. But it does not establish new forms of respect. Instead, it

imposes upon people an empty etiquette that grants some people -
- the conservators of rectitude -- power to lord over others.

It encourages its minions to perfect the art of creative suspicion. It teaches them how to look for an insult in every casual word, comment, action. It attempts to force everyone into a conformist mold, to salute authority mutely. In its own Orwellian way, it crushes diversity in the name of diversity.

If we really want to take full advantage of diversity we must encourage open and civil discussion. We must not permit "diversity" to become a code word for intellectual tyranny.

Our Secretary of Education, Lamar Alexander, already has confronted this cult of censorship by challenging college certification organizations to abandon Politically Correct decrees and stick to the business of determining whether colleges meet basic educational requirements.

But it would be wrong to suggest that incivility has been confined to our campuses. The trend toward intellectual bullying has become pronounced everywhere. Too often, advocates of some point of view, liberal or conservative, resort to fighting words -- to taunts and epithets that are supposed to intimidate their opponents, to make people afraid to speak.

This is outrageous, and not worthy of us as a nation. As Americans we ought to recommit ourselves to openness and tolerance. We must trust our persuasive powers to conquer bigotry and prejudice.

Free speech lets us share our thoughts, our hopes, our experiences. Only when we share good times and bad, joys and hardships, can we truly understand and appreciate one another. If harmony be our goal, let's pursue harmony -- rather than establishing our own Age of Inquisition.

The virtue of free speech leads naturally to another, equally important dimension of freedom -- freedom of spirit. In recent ages, often with the noblest intentions, we have discouraged good works. Nowadays, many respond to misfortune by asking: Whom can I sue? And many would-be Samaritans must ask: Who can sue me?

At the same time, government programs have tried to assume roles once reserved for families, schools, churches. Franklin Roosevelt once described the dole -- his word, not mine -- as a narcotic. Every time Washington presumes to improve the quality of people's souls, individuals discard their own sense of responsibility. They say: Why should I help the homeless? I'm already paying taxes to help them. Why should I help the poor? I'm already paying taxes to help them. And who can blame voters for feeling this way. After all, every time Congress passes a bill to address a social issue, it promises to solve that problem. When taxpayers complain, they're simply saying that government didn't keep its word. Yet while politicians demand higher taxes and taxpayers demand better results, the sad fact is that good deeds go undone.

When President Johnson spoke here in 1964 he brought up issues that haunt us still. He proposed revitalizing cities; rejuvenating schools; trampling down the hoary harvest of racism; protecting our environment.

He believed that small cadres of experts could care for the millions. They would calculate ideal tax rates, ideal rates of expenditure on social programs, ideal distributions of wealth and privilege. In many ways, theirs was an America by the numbers: If the numbers were right, America was right.

But bare numbers don't tell you much. Dollars don't always guarantee progress, and the politics of coercion -- the politics of virtue on demand -- have backfired. Programs designed to ensure racial harmony have generated animosity. Programs intended to help people out of poverty have invited them to stay. Although the calculations behind these programs seemed elegant and defensible, they just didn't make sense.

We now must decide whether we want an America by the numbers -- an America defined by equations, and exposed to the tiresome politics of division and derision -- or an America defined by its peoples virtues, desires, dreams.

I choose the latter. Our government ought to tell the people: We believe in you. Not: prove yourselves to our courts, our tax collectors, our meter readers, our agents and agencies.

When I talked of a kinder, gentler nation in my inaugural address, I wasn't trying to create a slogan: I was serious. An effective government must be gentle, kind, firm and humble. It

must know its limitations -- and respect its people's capabilities.

But the flip side of limited government is the fourth face of freedom -- responsibility.

Any introductory course in political philosophy teaches that freedom entails responsibility. People who accept freedom also must accept responsibility for preserving it -- for building a society that prefers creativity to envy, brotherhood to faction, plain talk to PC talk, environmental stewardship to plunder.

I have been accused of lacking agendas or vision. If by that someone means that I don't propose vast or costly new programs, I plead guilty. I don't measure dreams in terms of tax expenditures. My vision for America depends heavily on you, for you are the men and women who will shape our future. You must decide how to defend the freedoms of creation, expression and spirit. You must build a more prosperous and peaceful society.

Politics too often demands nothing but money. I challenge you to use your talents in service of goodness. We don't need a Great Society, dedicated to taking money and power from the many and placing it at the disposal of the incumbent few. We need a Good Society, one that promotes service, selflessness, action.

The antidote to greed is not a tax increase; it is service. If you want to take a stand against self-centeredness, get involved. If you want a direct role in conquering prejudice, get involved. Don't just wave placards and shout: Have the decency to talk with people, to bring out what is best in them.

The Good Society poses a challenge: It dares you to explore the full promise of citizenship. You don't have to do grand and dramatic things to accomplish this. Get to know your neighbors. Try to build bonds of trust at home, at work, wherever you go. Don't just talk about principles: Live them.

Let me leave you today with an exhortation: Make the most of your abilities. Question authority but examine yourself. Demand good government, but strive to do what is good yourself. Muster the courage to be a point of light, to take up the little deeds that enable great things to happen.

Also: define your missions positively. Don't seek out villains. Don't fall prey to obsessions about "freedom from" various ills, such as want or fear of despair. Focus on freedom's promise -- on your promise.

We live in the most exciting period of my lifetime -- and perhaps of yours. The old ways of doing things have run their course, and we must find new ways of chasing our destinies. Dare to serve others, and you will serve your nation well.

It may seem a cliché, but you really do hold the future in your hands. Treat it well -- and future generations will revere you as the pioneers of a world blessed with unprecedented vigor, possibility, prosperity and goodness.

Thank you, God bless you and God bless the United States of America.

SNOW/GROSSMAN
DRAFT ONE
APRIL 27, 1991
MICH

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN COMMENCEMENT
MAY 3, 1991
XXX

President Duderstadt (initial acknowledgments)

It's really a pleasure to stand here in Michigan Stadium, a place that has forged its share of football history -- and political history. Your program today highlights the Great Society address Lyndon Johnson delivered to graduates here nearly 27 years ago. Three years earlier, John F. Kennedy unveiled the Peace Corps here.

I will not try to outbid those great men today. Instead, I would like to talk about the historic moment that dares us to define ourselves. Your commencement -- your journey into the "real world," coincides with this nation's commencement into a world that has lived only in our fondest wishes -- a world in which we are free to explore the full promise of the American dream.

The Gulf War has helped round out an extraordinary two years. The Cold War, which defined much of our foreign policy for a half century, has vanished, opening up the potential for a world united in economic competition -- not divided by military confrontation.

Our very participation in the Persian Gulf told the world that Americans take principles seriously. We really will risk dying for the ideals we hold dear. We really will extend helping hands to those besieged by aggressive dictators.

Our success in the war helped kill Vietnam-era doubts that we could not function in world affairs, that we lacked the certainty or reliability to take a stand in tough times. But more importantly, we regained a sense of ourselves. It was as if we had awakened abruptly from a long fitful sleep, a nightmare time in which we doubted our decency, our values, our abilities.

I have traveled around the country in recent months, and I see an idealism I have not seen in 30 years. As troops went off to fight, ~~and possibly to die, simple, private virtues reasserted themselves.~~ Neighbors comforted those whose loved ones had traveled to the Gulf. ~~People of all races, creeds and classes joined in common cause~~ to strengthen their communities, their lives.

In Sumter, South Carolina I saw citizens who had rebuilt a city after a hurricane, then rebuilt an economy after the troops departed. Tears leaped to their eyes as they reunited. It suddenly occurred to all of us what they had done. They had worked miracles. They were proud to be Americans. They were proud to live in Sumter. But most of all, they were proud of what they had become to one another.

That pattern repeats itself all over the land. You can sense a kind of giddiness. People love themselves and their nation, and they feel again the kind of optimism they felt in the 1960s. This optimism, unfocused and profound, has begun to sweep away the stale layers of confrontation and doubt. It has inspired people to take chances they wouldn't have taken before, to dream dreams they might have suppressed before, to dare wrestle with the startling

It's really a pleasure to stand here in Michigan Stadium, a place that has forged its share of football history -- and political history. Lyndon Johnson delivered his Great Society address at a commencement here nearly 27 years ago. Three years earlier, John F. Kennedy proposed creating the Peace Corps.

I will not try to outbid those great men today. Instead, I want about the historic moment that faces us now. Your commencement -- your journey into the "real world," coincides with this nation's commencement into a world that has lived only in our fondest wishes -- a world in which we are free to explore the full promise of the American dream.

Our participation in the Persian Gulf War told the world that Americans really will risk dying for the ideals we hold dear. We will extend helping hands to those beseiged by aggressive dictators. Our success in the war helped kill Vietnam-era doubts that we could not function in world affairs, that we lacked the certainty or reliability to take a stand in tough times.

But more importantly, we regained a sense of ourselves. It was as if we had awakened abruptly from a long fitful sleep, a nightmare time in which we doubted our decency, our values, our abilities -- to find an America we really did recognize -- a land of optimism, charity, decency, toleration and ability.

I have traveled around the country in recent months, and I see an idealism I have not seen in 30 years. People feel good about themselves. As troops went off to serve in the Gulf, the

ones they left behind banded together. People of all races, creeds and classes worked to strengthen their communities, their lives.

In Sumter, South Carolina I saw citizens who had rebuilt a city after a hurricane, then rebuilt an economy after the troops departed. Tears leaped to their eyes as they finally stopped to see what they had achieved. It suddenly occurred to all of us what they had done. They had worked miracles. They were proud to be Americans. They were proud to live in Sumter. But most of all, they were proud of what they had become to one another.

That pattern repeats itself all over the land. You can sense a kind of giddiness. People feel again the kind of optimism they felt in the 1960s. This optimism, unfocused and profound, has begun to sweep away the stale layers of confrontation and doubt.

In Kuwait, we liberated ourselves and put before ourselves a new challenge. All across the land, you can see people eager to discard easy excuses and take on tough tasks: helping the homeless, training the unskilled, pushing back the wave of crime, building schools and neighborhoods in which they may take real pride.

The events in Kuwait sprung naturally from the revolutions that preceded them. They all represent the triumph of freedom.

Although Western military resolve helped contain the growth of communism, the mirage of socialism vanished because despots, dictators, tanks, walls, prison cells, spies, thugs -- could not contain people's natural yearning for freedom.

The moment Western rock songs made their way into East European culture, the day tourists from that part of the world started smuggling videocassettes from the West, the instant Western radio became more credible and popular than the stilted dull programming of the local communist party -- people in the communist world were hooked. They knew that other systems not only worked better, but also allowed people's hearts to sing and laugh. For them freedom involved more than filled store shelves. It offered the hope of joy, of brotherhood. (look for some Havel or Walesa or Solzhenitsyn quote) It provided the staff of life for civil, productive society.

Now, we must learn from our own triumphs and apply the lessons of liberty to our own nation. I would like to talk today about four aspects of freedom, and how they form the backbone of our domestic agenda.

First, freedom of creation. From its inception, the United States has been a laboratory for creation, a place where merit has conquered circumstance. Most of our great heroes, from Abraham Lincoln to Henry Ford to Tom Monaghan have outgrown rough origins and transformed an entire world.

Many people fail to understand that capitalism is not a system for accumulating profits, so much as a ~~framework in which~~ ^{seed bed for} creativity ~~flourishes~~. Its secret lies in its openness, its informality, its efficiency. Try as we may, experts never can compete with markets, which allow information to roam, genius to flourish.

Industrial policy advocates, for instance, like to talk about "picking technologies." But while they look at large industries, the bulk of our innovation arises in small, unnoticed firms. ~~And~~ many of the innovations that appeal to us never occur to pickers and choosers in the government.

The information revolution was hatched in garages and basements. The fast-food chain -- an innovation many loathe, but one that has changed life around the planet -- began in obscurity. Domino's Pizza would never have stood a chance before a committee of planners. Tom Monaghan was just a college kid with a good idea.

Free markets ~~help~~ give everyone access to unexpected discoveries. And no one in history has made better use of freedom than the American people.

Our domestic program tries in many ways to encourage market innovation, to sweep away deadening and demoralizing barriers to creativity. We have proposed re-inventing the American school, in

hopes of unleashing our national genius. We have proposed anti-crime measures that would put an end to terrorists who push honest businesses out of neighborhoods in need. He have proposed market incentives that give taxpayers a better return on their dollar. Last year's child care and clean air acts incorporate market incentives. This year's transportation package seeks to invite entrepreneurship.

But that's not enough. In a world transformed by freedom, we must find ways to unleash our genius more fully. We must eliminate the petty harrassments we inflict upon people with dreams.

The average worker in the United States now spends more than four months of each year working just to pay the tax man. Four months of labor that might be used for such mundane purposes as paying for the house and car, setting aside money for children's educations, purchasing clothes for work or leisure. Four months of labor that might otherwise help a worker create a little savings nest-egg.

But think about it: do these taxes liberate anyone from four months' worth of want, four months' worth of responsibility, four months of anything? Or do they inspire cynicism? Do they give people the impression that government strives not to help, only to extract?

Politicians often make persuasive cases that vast programs can achieve vast good. But too often we ignore the opportunities we crush when we impose new burdens on people who work. We underestimate the benefits that real freedom produces.

Americans transformed a rough wilderness into the most

prosperous nation on earth not by decree, but by action. If we want to provide the greatest good for the greatest number, we must abandon the stale slogans of redistribution or of false compassion. We must look instead to compassion that works. Free enterprise enables us to spread life-enriching and life-saving goods to corners of society that otherwise would live and die in filth and obscurity. The rest of the world now understands this American truth. It's time we accepted it for ourselves.

We have entered a new industrial revolution, but we still rely upon the managerial equivalent of the steam engine to achieve our government goals. If I can risk venturing around a computer keyboard, surely this nation can begin thinking about addressing its problems in new ways. If Mikhail Gorbachev can wrestle with perestroika, surely our political community can upgrade and update our own ways of doing things. Rather than asking what government can do for us, we ought to ask how it can let us do good for our country.

This leads us naturally to the fourth aspect of freedom, responsibility. Any introductory course in political philosophy notes that freedom entails responsibility. People who accept freedom also must accept responsibility for preserving it -- and for building the kind of society in which liberty can flourish, in which creativity will dominate envy, in which brotherhood will overcome faction, in which people respect themselves, respect one another, respect their land.

I have been accused of lacking agendas or vision. If by that someone means that I don't propose vast or costly new programs, I will gladly accept the accusation. My vision for America depends heavily on you, for you are the men and women who will shape our future. You are the men and women who must decide whether to defend the freedoms of creation, expression and spirit. You are the ones charged with responsibility for building a more prosperous and peaceful society.

Trust me, that responsibility is more daunting and stirring than anything any politician could devise. When politicians devise grandiose programs, they don't ask anything of your talent or commitment; they ask only for your money. The Great Society redistributed money but did not solve the problems it set out to address. I therefore challenge you to build a society dedicated to cultivating goodness -- the Good Society. The Good Society may not strike you as great marketing, but it has one virtue over the Great Society. It can work.

If you want an antidote to greed and self-centeredness, get involved. If you want a direct role in shredding the veils of

prejudice, get involved. The Good Society poses a challenge: It dares you to explore the full promise of citizenship, to begin by getting to know your neighbors, assuming some responsibility for building and maintaining the bonds of trust upon which community life depends, for seeking out your principles and sticking to them.

Let me leave you today with an exhortation: Make the most of your abilities. Question authority. Examine yourself. Strive to do what is good. Muster the courage to be a point of light, to take up the little deeds that enable great things to happen.

Also: define your missions positively. Don't seek out villains or bogeymen. Don't focus on freedom as a "freedom from" such woes and want and fear. Focus on freedom's promise and on your own abilities. Look to what you can do to make life better -- rather than whom you can punish because they don't meet your expectations.

We live in the most exciting period of my lifetime -- and perhaps of yours. The old ways of doing things have run their course, and we must find new ways of chasing our destinies. Dare to serve others, and you will serve your nation well.

I am a little jealous of you, and I am happy for you as well. It may seem a cliché, but you really do hold the future in your hands. Treat it well -- and future generations will revere you as the men and women who kept America great -- and helped deliver freedom to an entire world.

Thank you, God bless you and God bless the United States of America.

This leads to a second freedom, freedom of expression. Free speech may be the defining characteristic of the American ideal. ~~It fosters open debate about everything.~~ It enables us to subject ideas and actions to the withering review of reason. Free expression exposes and nourishes the diversity upon which our national greatness rests; it teaches northerners about southerners, blacks about whites, immigrants about long-established families.

Nevertheless, free expression is under assault throughout the United States, and nowhere more than on college campuses. The concept of Political Correctness threatens to replace thought with empty etiquette. ~~It encourages people to avoid the test of diversity and to retreat instead into gestures that punish the unfashionable, that censure the inquisitive, that impose ruthless punishments upon people guilty of bigotry or stupidity, rather than encouraging them to learn from their errors.~~

The cult of correctness arises from the laudable desire to sweep away the debris of racism and hatred. But its methods ensure failure. By establishing a court etiquette that would have baffled even Louis the Fourteenth, it grants some people -- the conservators of rectitude -- power to lord over others. It trains people in the art of creative suspicion. It encourages them to seek a slight in every casual word, comment, action. ~~It imposes a new kind of tyranny. It attempts to bully people into dressing, speaking, acting correctly. That is, it tries to force everyone~~ into a conformist mold. In its own Orwellian way, it crushes diversity in the name of diversity.

This strange development wastes good minds, forces people to

wonder whether their ideas are correct -- instead of whether they make sense. It kills reason and it attacks our faith in ourselves and our instincts for decency. It requires people to submit to arbitrary courts of taste -- and assails our natural instincts for toleration and open debate. In the end, political correctness substitutes an obedience to authority for genuine compassion.

3.11.11
If we really want to take full advantage of ~~the~~ diversity ~~that represents our greatest hope for the future,~~ we must encourage open discussion -- and civil behavior. We must not permit "diversity" to become a code word for ~~a new kind of~~ intellectual tyranny.

Our Secretary of Education, Lamar Alexander, already has confronted this cult of censorship by challenging college certification organizations to abandon Politically Correct decrees and stick to the business of determining whether colleges meet basic educational requirements.

We as a nation ought to recommit ourselves to openness and tolerance. We can't do that through intimidation and decree. We must trust our own persuasive powers to conquer bigotry and prejudice. Let us dismantle our thought police and encourage people to share experiences, lives, backgrounds. Only when we share good times and bad, joys and hardships, can we truly understand and appreciate one another. If harmony be our goal, let's adopt approaches conducive to harmony -- rather than dusting off the methods and approaches of the Inquisition.

This leads to a third dimension of freedom -- freedom of virtue -- of spirit. In recent ages, often with the nobles of intentions, we have made it difficult to do good works. Nowadays, many respond to misfortune by asking themselves: Can I sue? And many would-be Samaritans must ask: Can I get sued for helping?

At the same time, government programs have tried to assume responsibilities and roles once reserved for families, schools, churches. Franklin Roosevelt once warned that the dole -- his word, not mine -- is a narcotic. The same might be said of a government that attempts to do things beyond its competence. The federal government is a huge and powerful organism. It can take on huge issues, such as wars. But it is no more suited to the tender business of nurturing individual virtue than an elephant is of performing delicate eye surgery.

Yet every time Washington presumes to improve the quality of people's souls, individuals discard their own sense of responsibility. They say: Why should I help the homeless? I'm already paying taxes to help them. Why should I help the poor? I'm already paying taxes to help them. And who can blame voters for feeling this way. After all, every time Congress passes a bill to address a social issue, it promises to solve that problem. When taxpayers complain, they're simply saying that government didn't keep its word. But the tendency in government is to claim that perfection is just another program or another tax increase away.

When President Johnson spoke here in 1964 he brought up issues that haunt us still. He proposed revitalizing cities; rejuvenating schools; trampling down the hoary harvest of racism; protecting our

environment.

He believed that small cadres of experts could anticipate and answer the wants and needs of millions. They would figure out ideal tax rates, ideal rates of expenditure on social programs, ideal distributions of wealth and privilege. In some ways, theirs was an America by the numbers: If the numbers were right, America was right.

But we have learned that bare numbers don't tell you much. Dollars don't always guarantee progress, and the politics of coercion -- the politics of virtue on demand -- have inspired frightening new animosities between races and classes in this nation.

We now must decide whether we want an America by the numbers or an America by the people. Government ought to send the message to every American: We believe in you. Not: Prove yourself to us.

The society I seek depends more on you. It relies on your real compassion -- not on a tax payment that serves as a proxy for a tithe.

When I talked of a kinder, gentler nation in my inaugural address, I wasn't trying to create a slogan: I was trying to set a tone. Government ought to be in the business of helping people achieve their dreams. It shouldn't presume to define those dreams. It shouldn't erect barriers to community action. It should help the people help themselves.

must do what it can to encourage the virtues that the founders of this land held dear.

An effective government must be gentle, kind, firm and humble.

It must know its limitations -- and respect its people's greatness.

Gramm-Rudman-Hollings deficit reduction act put an end to government deficits? Did the war on poverty put an end to poverty?

I don't believe in empty promises, and no one can promise you that government can put an end to ills that plague us all. Government works best when it coaxes people to apply their own genius to problems they care about. It works best when it takes on responsibilities that no other institution can handle -- responsibilities such as maintaining a justice system, providing for the national defense, trying to address social needs that the public agrees government ought to address. It works worst when it pretends to be able to solve problems that are too big and various for any government to solve.

Think of this as the Second Founding. Never before in our history have we faced a future so laced with promise. The cold war has given way to creative ferment. We have joined our European partners in a new order dedicated to securing the blessings of freedom, democracy and enterprise throughout the West. The seeds of enterprise, so long neglected in the socialist world, have received the first sprinkles of encouragement. Slowly, feeble shoots have popped up in places like Hungary, Czechoslovakia, the Far East, Africa. We must encourage those shoots to grow into healthy plants: We must cultivate our own garden of freedom.

Americans always have seen themselves as builders, creators, friends, worshippers. We were the first nation founded in the name of ideals; we still show others that ideas can transform rough

wilderness into modern vistas, can turn sooty industrial landscapes into parks, can replace musty tools and technologies with cleaner, more vibrant vehicles for transforming thoughts into products.

Many of you are thinking today: What next? Your college commencement ushers you into a new world, one you think you understand, but one you never really have explored.

Well, the entire free world is experiencing the same thing. We have our own commencement, and now we have not just the chance, but the duty to explore ideas we hold dear.

topics to touch: a domestic agenda
redefining the separation of powers
reasserting American leadership around the world, a leadership of ideas and actions.

With each new day, with each new invention, with each breath of newness, America tests freedom, demonstrates that good people, left to themselves, achieve great things.

Every generation naturally asks itself: What do we believe? What do we hope to achieve? When the dark curtain draws over us, what will we have wanted to leave behind?

If recent history demonstrates anything, it demonstrates the futility of linking your dreams to narrow ambitions -- money, cars,

Whitehead: harmony, freedom and necessity

freedom means nothing until it refers to our real lives. The term has been abused, reduced to an advertising cliché: In many cases, the term, "free" has no more meaning than the phrase, "new and improved." We need to restore meaning to the term that lies at the heart of the American experiment.

Notes on Michigan

TS Draft

It's a pleasure to stand here in Michigan Stadium, a place that has forged its share of football history -- and political history. Lyndon Johnson delivered his Great Society address at a commencement here nearly 27 years ago. Three years earlier, John F. Kennedy proposed creating the Peace Corps.

I will not try to outbid those great men today. Instead, I want ^{to speak?} about this historic moment. Your commencement -- your journey into the "real world," coincides with this nation's commencement into a world that for years was only a fond hope -- a world in which [we are free to explore the full promise of the American dream.] ^{some qualifiers: free "for the first time?"}

✓ The United States, so long berated as lacking vision and commitment, now stands as the world's chief proponent of freedom and democracy. Our participation in the Persian Gulf War told the world that Americans really will risk dying for the ideals we hold dear. We will extend helping hands to those besieged by aggressive dictators. Our success in the war helped kill Vietnam-era doubts that we could not function in world affairs, that we lacked the certainty or reliability to take a stand in tough times.

~~But~~ the war also revived our belief in ourselves. It was as if we had awakened abruptly from a long fitful Vietnam-era sleep, a nightmare time in which we doubted our decency, our values, our abilities. Suddenly, Americans felt free to feel good about themselves, to cherish their optimism, charity, decency, toleration and ability.

feel(?)
I have traveled around the country in recent months, and I see an idealism I have not seen in 30 years.

In Sumter, South Carolina I joined citizens who had rebuilt a city after two disasters -- first, a hurricane; then, a war. Tears leaped to their eyes as they finally paused to take in the fruits of their labors. There, crowded on bleachers in a high school stadium were men and women of all ages, colors, backgrounds -- friends and neighbors who had turned a torn and demoralized town into a garden of hope. People who once stood on opposing sides of local arguments suddenly saw themselves in a new light -- as companions in the great adventure of life.

This pattern repeats itself all over the land. You can sense a kind of giddiness, a profound unfocused optimism. At our national commencement into the new world, people squint into a hazy future and ask, "What next?" *-- excitement + expectation anticipation*

Here and everywhere Americans have begun to discard easy excuses and take on tough tasks: helping the homeless, training the unskilled, pushing back the wave of crime, building schools and neighborhoods in which they may take real pride.

✓ This revival of pride stems from the same source that toppled the Berlin Wall and humbled Saddam Hussein. It comes from the triumph of freedom.

True,
Although Western military might helped contain the growth of communism, *But in a very real sense,* socialism evaporated because despots, dictators, tanks, walls, prison cells, spies, thugs -- the harsh and

ingenious forms of oppression -- could not contain people's natural yearning for freedom.

From the moment Western rock songs made their way into East European culture -- from the day tourists from that part of the world started smuggling videocassettes from the West -- from the instant Western radio became more credible and popular than the stilted dull programming of the local communist party -- people in the communist world were hooked. They knew that other systems didn't just work. They also offered a precious privilege: they stirred human hearts to sing and laugh. For communism's victims, freedom involved more than filling store shelves. It offered the hope, happiness, joy, brotherhood. It replaced a society governed by fear to one brightened by possibility.

It's time we learned from our own triumphs and applied the lessons of liberty to our own problems. I would like to talk today about four aspects of freedom, and how they form the backbone of our domestic agenda.

First, freedom of creation. From its inception, the United States has been a laboratory for creation, a place where merit has conquered circumstance. This is a land where people of vision -- Abraham Lincoln, Henry Ford, Tom Monaghan -- outgrew rough origins and transformed a world.

Their example demonstrates that capitalism is not a system for accumulating profits. At its heart, it provides a seedbed for creativity. It provides a means by which people convert ideas into great works. It offers a medium in which ideas and

information move swiftly, informally to people who can make best use of them. Markets express the varied genius of entrepreneurs, scholars and dreamers of every sort. And try as we may, *all the so-called* experts *+ planners* never can match the genius of millions of agents swimming amid the marketplace of ideas. *SH*

One of our great recent debates concerns industrial policy - - having the government pick winners, losers, technologies and products. But if you think about it, the idea really is preposterous. While planners might have some skill in picking out the obvious winners in big industries, they simply aren't equipped to foresee whose ideas, whose products, whose inventions will capture a nation's fancy and fulfill a people's needs.

Consider for a moment a few of our most important recent innovations. The information revolution was hatched in garages and basements. The fast-food chain -- an innovation many loathe, but one that has changed life around the planet -- began in obscurity. Domino's Pizza would never have stood a chance before a committee of planners. Tom Monaghan was just a college kid with a good idea.

And that's the genius of the marketplace. Free markets help give everyone access to unexpected discoveries. They make available to the masses products that in socialist societies were reserved for the elite. They spread the proceeds of progress to everyone.

Our domestic program tries in many ways to encourage market innovation, to push aside deadening and demoralizing barriers to

creativity. We have proposed re-inventing the American school, in hopes of unleashing our national genius. We have proposed anti-crime measures that would punish the terrorists who shove honest businesses out of neighborhoods in need. He have proposed market incentives that give taxpayers a better return on their dollar. Last year's child care and clean air acts incorporate market incentives. This year's transportation package seeks to invite entrepreneurship.

But that's not enough. In a world transformed by freedom, we must look for other ways to unfetter our national ingenuity. We must eliminate the petty harrassments we inflict upon people with dreams.

When is taxpayer freedom day in Michigan not around now... The average worker in the United States now spends more than four months of each year working just to pay the tax man. Four months of labor that might be used for such mundane purposes as paying for the house and car, setting aside money for children's educations, purchasing clothes for work or leisure. Four months of labor that might otherwise help a worker create a little savings nest-egg. ✓

But think about it: do these taxes liberate anyone from four months' worth of want, of responsibility, of anything? Or do they inspire cynicism?

Americans transformed a tough wilderness into the most prosperous nation on earth not by ^{state} decree, but by ^{individual} action. If we want to provide the greatest good for the greatest number, we must abandon the stale slogans of redistribution or of false

compassion. We must look instead to compassion that works. Free enterprise enables us to spread life-enriching and life-saving goods to corners of society that otherwise would live and die in filth and obscurity. The rest of the world now understands this American truth. It's time we accepted it for ourselves. — *reaffirmed*

We have entered a new industrial revolution, but we still rely upon the managerial equivalent of the steam engine to achieve our government goals. If ^{*at my advanced age,*} I can risk venturing around a computer keyboard, surely this nation can begin thinking about addressing its problems in new ways. If Mikhail Gorbachev can wrestle with perestroika, surely our political community can upgrade and update our own ways of doing things. Rather than asking what government can do for us, we ought to ask how it can let us do good for our country.

This leads to a second freedom, freedom of expression. Free speech may be the defining characteristic of the American ideal. It enables us to expose bad ideas and spread good ones. It highlights and nourishes the diversity upon which our national greatness rests; it teaches northerners about southerners, blacks about whites, immigrants about first families.

Nevertheless, ^{*speech*} free expression is under assault throughout the United States, and nowhere more than on college campuses. The concept of Political Correctness arises from the laudable desire to sweep away the debris of racism and hatred. But its methods ensure failure. It establishes an empty etiquette that would have baffled even Louis the Fourteenth. It grants some

people -- the conservators of rectitude -- power to lord ^{it} over others. It encourages its minions to perfect the art of creative suspicion. It teaches them how to find an insult in every casual word, comment, action. It attempts to force everyone into a conformist mold. In its own Orwellian way, it crushes diversity in the name of diversity. It kills reason and it attacks our faith in ourselves and our instincts for decency. It requires people to submit to arbitrary courts of taste -- and assails our natural instincts for toleration and open debate. In the end, political correctness substitutes an obedience to authority for genuine compassion.

move down
This trend afflicts not just our campuses, but our national debate about many important aims. Too often, advocates of some point of view, liberal or conservative, resort to fighting words -- to taunts and epithets that are supposed to intimidate their opponents, that are supposed to prevent free and open debate.

If we really want to take full advantage of diversity we must encourage open and civil discussion. We must not permit "diversity" to become a code word for intellectual tyranny.

Our Secretary of Education, Lamar Alexander, already has confronted this cult of censorship by challenging college certification organizations to abandon Politically Correct decrees and stick to the business of determining whether colleges meet basic educational requirements.

We as a nation ought to recommit ourselves to openness and tolerance. We can't do that through intimidation and decree. We

Idea: And campuses should be the last to refuse to censor.

*the power
of mind +
reason*

must trust our persuasive powers to conquer bigotry and prejudice.

Furthermore, we must strive to break down the invisible walls that separate us. Let us dismantle our thought police and encourage people to share experiences, lives, backgrounds. Only when we share good times and bad, joys and hardships, can we truly understand and appreciate one another. If harmony be our goal, let's adopt approaches conducive to harmony -- rather than dusting off the methods and approaches of the *age of* Inquisition.

This leads to a third dimension of freedom -- freedom of virtue -- of spirit. In recent ages, often with the noblest intentions, we have made it difficult to do good works.

Nowadays, many respond to misfortune by asking themselves: *Who* Can I sue? And many would-be Samaritans must ask: Can I get sued for helping?

At the same time, government programs have tried to assume responsibilities and roles once reserved for families, schools, churches. Franklin Roosevelt once warned that the dole -- his word, not mine -- is a narcotic. The same might be said of a government that attempts to do things beyond its competence. The federal government is a huge and powerful organism. It can take on huge issues, such as wars. But it is no more suited to the tender business of nurturing individual virtue than an elephant *is* ~~of performing delicate eye surgery~~ *can perform*.

Yet every time Washington presumes to improve the quality of people's souls, individuals discard their own sense of

responsibility. They say: Why should I help the homeless? I'm already paying taxes to help them. Why should I help the poor? I'm already paying taxes to help them. And who can blame voters for feeling this way. After all, every time Congress passes a bill to address a social issue, it promises to solve that problem. When taxpayers complain, they're simply saying that government didn't keep its word. But the tendency in government is to claim that perfection is just another program or another tax increase away.

When President Johnson spoke here in 1964 he brought up issues that haunt us still. He proposed revitalizing cities; rejuvenating schools; trampling down the hoary harvest of racism; protecting our environment.

He believed that small cadres of experts could anticipate and answer the wants and needs of millions. They would figure out ideal tax rates, ideal rates of expenditure on social programs, ideal distributions of wealth and privilege. In some ways, theirs was an America by the numbers: If the numbers were right, America was right.

But we have learned that bare numbers don't tell you much. Dollars don't always guarantee progress, and the politics of coercion -- the politics of virtue on demand -- have inspired frightening new animosities between races and classes in this nation.

We now must decide whether we want an America by the numbers -- an America defined by (deliberate) class conflict -- or an

with the government as enforcer

America by the people. I choose the latter. Our government ought to tell the people: We believe in you. Not: prove yourselves to our agents.

When I talked of a kinder, gentler nation in my inaugural address, I wasn't trying to create a slogan: I was serious. Government ought to be in the business of helping people achieve their dreams. It shouldn't presume to define those dreams. It shouldn't erect barriers to community action.

An effective government must be gentle, kind, firm and humble. It must know its limitations -- and respect its people's decency and capability.

This leads us naturally to the fourth aspect of freedom, responsibility. Any introductory course in political philosophy notes that freedom entails responsibility. People who accept freedom also must accept responsibility for preserving it -- and for building a society that prefers creativity to envy, brotherhood to faction, (respect to terrorism) stewardship to plunder.

figurative? honest dialogue to intellectual fearism?

I have been accused of lacking agendas or vision. If by that someone means that I don't propose vast or costly new programs, I plead guilty. My vision for America depends heavily on you, for you are the men and women who will shape our future. You are the men and women who must decide whether to defend the freedoms of creation, expression and spirit. You will have to build a more prosperous and peaceful society.

I don't weigh America's dreams in terms of dollars spent.

When politicians devise grandiose programs, they don't ask anything of your talent or commitment; they ask only for your money. I therefore challenge you to build a society dedicated to cultivating goodness -- not a Great Society with its massive means of shifting money from one pocket to another -- but the Good Society, one that promotes service, selflessness, action.

The antidote to greed is not a tax increase; it is service. If you want to take a stand against self-centeredness, get involved. If you want a direct role in shredding the veils of prejudice, get involved. The Good Society poses a challenge: It dares you to explore the full promise of citizenship, to begin by getting to know your neighbors, assuming some responsibility for building and maintaining bonds of trust at home, at work, wherever *you dream take you(?)* you go. It dares you to seeking out principles and stick to them.

Let me leave you today with an exhortation: Make the most of your abilities. Question authority, *-- but also* Examine yourself. Strive to do what is good. Muster the courage to be a point of light, to take up the little deeds that enable great things to happen.

Also: define your missions positively. Don't seek out villains. Don't focus on freedom as a "freedom from" such woes and want and fear. Focus on freedom's promise -- on your promise.

We live in the most exciting period of my lifetime -- and perhaps of yours. The old ways of doing things have run their

course, and we must find new ways of chasing our destinies. Dare to serve others, and you will serve your nation well.

It may seem a cliché, but you really do hold the future in your hands. Treat it well -- and future generations will revere you as the men and women who kept America great -- and helped deliver freedom to an entire world.

Thank you, God bless you and God bless the United States of America.

It's a pleasure to stand here in Michigan Stadium, a place that has forged its share of football history -- and political history. Lyndon Johnson delivered his Great Society address at a commencement here nearly 27 years ago. Three years earlier, John F. Kennedy proposed creating the Peace Corps.

I will not try to outbid those great men ~~(today)~~. Instead, I want ^{to talk} about this historic moment. Your commencement -- your journey into the "real world," coincides with this nation's commencement into a world that for years was only a fond hope -- a world in which we are free to explore the full promise of the American dream. *a world in which a cold war has*

The United States, so long berated as lacking vision and commitment, now stands as the world's chief proponent of freedom and democracy. Our participation in the Persian Gulf War told ^{showed} the world that Americans really will risk dying for the ideals we hold dear. We will extend helping hands to those besieged by aggressive dictators. Our success in the war helped kill Vietnam-era doubts that we could not function in world affairs, that we lacked the certainty or reliability to take a stand in tough times.

~~But~~ the war also revived our belief in ourselves. It was as if we had awakened abruptly from a long fitful Vietnam-era sleep, a nightmare time in which we doubted our decency, our values, our abilities. Suddenly, Americans felt free to feel good about themselves, to cherish their optimism, charity, decency, toleration and ability.

I have traveled around the country in recent months, and I see an idealism I have not seen in 30 years.

In Sumter, South Carolina I joined citizens who had rebuilt a city after two disasters -- first, a hurricane; then, a war. Tears leaped to their eyes as they finally paused to take in the fruits of their labors. There, crowded on bleachers in a high school stadium were men and women of all ages, colors, backgrounds -- friends and neighbors who had turned a torn and demoralized town into a garden of hope. People who once stood on opposing sides of local arguments suddenly saw themselves in a new light -- as companions in the great adventure of life.

This pattern repeats itself all over the land. You can sense a kind of giddiness, a profound ~~unfocused~~ optimism. At our national commencement into the new world, people squint into a hazy future and ask, "What next?"

Here and everywhere Americans have begun to discard easy excuses and take on tough tasks: helping the homeless, training the unskilled, pushing back the wave of crime, building schools and neighborhoods in which they may take real pride.

This revival of pride stems from the same source that toppled the Berlin Wall and humbled Saddam Hussein. It comes from the triumph of freedom.

Although Western military (might helped contain) the growth of communism, socialism evaporated because despots, dictators, tanks, walls, prison cells, spies, thugs -- the harsh and

ingenious forms of oppression -- could not contain people's natural yearning for freedom.

From the moment Western rock songs made their way into East European culture -- from the day tourists from that part of the world started smuggling videocassettes from the West -- from the instant Western radio became more credible and popular than the stilted dull programming of the local communist party -- people in the communist world were hooked. They knew that other systems didn't just work. They also offered a precious privilege: they stirred human hearts to sing and laugh. For communism's victims, freedom involved more than filling store shelves. It offered the hope, happiness, joy, brotherhood. It replaced a society governed by fear to one brightened by possibility.

It's time we learned from our ~~own~~ triumphs and applied the lessons of liberty to our own problems. I would like to talk today about four aspects of freedom, and how they form the backbone of our domestic agenda.

First, freedom of creation. From its inception, the United States has been a laboratory for creation, a place where merit has conquered circumstance. This is a land where people of vision -- Abraham Lincoln, Henry Ford, Tom Monaghan -- outgrew rough origins and transformed a world.

Their example demonstrates that capitalism is not a system for accumulating profits. At its heart, it provides a seedbed for creativity. It provides a means by which people convert ideas into works. It offers a medium in which ideas and

information move swiftly, informally to people who can make best use of them. Markets express the varied genius of entrepreneurs, scholars and dreamers of every sort. And try as we may, experts never can match the genius of millions of agents swimming amid the marketplace of ideas.

One of our great recent debates concerns industrial policy - - having the government pick winners, losers, technologies and products. But if you think about it, the idea really is preposterous. While planners might have some skill in picking out the obvious winners in big industries, they simply aren't equipped to foresee whose ideas, whose products, whose inventions will capture a nation's fancy and fulfill a people's needs.

Consider for a moment a few of our most important recent innovations. The information revolution was hatched in garages and basements. The fast-food chain -- an innovation many loathe, but one that has changed life around the planet -- began in obscurity. Domino's Pizza would never have stood a chance before a committee of planners. Tom Monaghan was just a college kid with a good idea.

And that's the genius of the marketplace. Free markets help give everyone access to unexpected discoveries. They make available to the masses products that in socialist societies were reserved for the elite. They spread the proceeds of progress to everyone.

Our domestic program tries in many ways to encourage market innovation, to push aside deadening and demoralizing barriers to

creativity. We have proposed re-inventing the American school, in hopes of unleashing our national genius. We have proposed anti-crime measures that would punish the terrorists who shove honest businesses out of neighborhoods in need. He have proposed market incentives that give taxpayers a better return on their dollar. Last year's child care and clean air acts incorporate market incentives. This year's transportation package seeks to invite entrepreneurship.

But that's not enough. In a world transformed by freedom, we must look for other ways to unfetter our national ingenuity. We must eliminate the petty harrassments we inflict upon people with dreams.

The average worker in the United States now spends more than four months of each year working just to pay the tax man. Four months of labor that might be used for such mundane purposes as paying for the house and car, setting aside money for children's educations, purchasing clothes for work or leisure. Four months of labor that might otherwise help a worker create a little (savings) nest-egg.

But think about it: do these taxes liberate anyone from four months' worth of want, of responsibility, of anything? Or do they inspire cynicism?

Americans transformed a tough wilderness into the most prosperous nation on earth not by decree, but by action. If we want to provide the greatest good for the greatest number, we must abandon the stale slogans of redistribution or ~~of~~ false

compassion. We must look instead to compassion that works. Free enterprise enables us to spread life-enriching and life-saving goods to corners of society that otherwise would live and die in filth and obscurity. The rest of the world now understands this American truth. It's time we accepted it for ourselves.

We have entered a new industrial revolution, but we still rely upon the managerial equivalent of the steam engine to achieve our government goals. If I can risk venturing around a computer keyboard, surely this nation can begin thinking about addressing its problems in new ways. If Mikhail Gorbachev can wrestle with perestroika, surely our political community can upgrade and update our own ways of doing things. Rather than asking what government can do for us, we ought to ask how it can let us do good for our country.

This leads to a second freedom, freedom of expression. Free speech may be the defining characteristic of the American ideal. It enables us to expose bad ideas and spread good ones. It highlights and nourishes the diversity upon which our national greatness rests; it teaches northerners about southerners, blacks about whites, immigrants about first families.

Nevertheless, free expression is under assault throughout the United States, and nowhere more than on college campuses. The concept of Political Correctness arises from the laudable desire to sweep away the debris of racism and hatred. But its methods ensure failure. It establishes an empty etiquette that would have baffled even Louis the Fourteenth. It grants some

people -- the conservators of rectitude -- power to lord over others. It encourages its minions to perfect the art of creative suspicion. It teaches them how to find an insult in every casual word, comment, action. It attempts to force everyone into a conformist mold. In its own Orwellian way, it crushes diversity in the name of diversity. It kills reason and it attacks our faith in ourselves and our instincts for decency. It requires people to submit to arbitrary courts of taste -- and assails our natural instincts for toleration and open debate. In the end, political correctness substitutes an obedience to authority for genuine compassion.

This trend afflicts not just our campuses, but our national debate about many important aims. Too often, advocates of some point of view, liberal or conservative, resort to fighting words -- to taunts and epithets that are supposed to intimidate their opponents, that are supposed to prevent free and open debate.

If we really want to take full advantage of diversity we must encourage open and civil discussion. We must not permit "diversity" to become a code word for intellectual tyranny.

Our Secretary of Education, Lamar Alexander, already has confronted this cult of censorship by challenging college certification organizations to abandon Politically Correct decrees and stick to the business of determining whether colleges meet basic educational requirements.

We as a nation ought to recommit ourselves to openness and tolerance. We can't do that through intimidation and decree. We

must trust our persuasive powers to conquer bigotry and prejudice.

Furthermore, we must strive to break down the invisible walls that separate us. Let us dismantle our thought police and encourage people to share experiences, lives, backgrounds. Only when we share good times and bad, joys and hardships, can we truly understand and appreciate one another. If harmony be our goal, let's adopt approaches conducive to harmony -- rather than dusting off the methods and approaches of the Inquisition.

This leads to a third dimension of freedom -- freedom of virtue -- of spirit. In recent ages, often with the noblest intentions, we have made it difficult to do good works. Nowadays, many respond to misfortune by asking themselves: Can I sue? And many would-be Samaritans must ask: Can I get sued for helping?

At the same time, government programs have tried to assume responsibilities and roles once reserved for families, schools, churches. Franklin Roosevelt once warned that the dole -- his word, not mine -- is a narcotic. The same might be said of a government that attempts to do things beyond its competence. The federal government is a huge and powerful organism. It can take on huge issues, such as wars. But it is no more suited to the tender business of nurturing individual virtue than an elephant is of performing delicate eye surgery.

Yet every time Washington presumes to improve the quality of people's souls, individuals discard their own sense of

responsibility. They say: Why should I help the homeless? I'm already paying taxes to help them. Why should I help the poor? I'm already paying taxes to help them. And who can blame voters for feeling this way. After all, every time Congress passes a bill to address a social issue, it promises to solve that problem. When taxpayers complain, they're simply saying that government didn't keep its word. But the tendency in government is to claim that perfection is just another program or another tax increase away.

When President Johnson spoke here in 1964 he brought up issues that haunt us still. He proposed revitalizing cities; rejuvenating schools; trampling down the hoary harvest of racism; protecting our environment.

He believed that small cadres of experts could anticipate and answer the wants and needs of millions. They would figure out ideal tax rates, ideal rates of expenditure on social programs, ideal distributions of wealth and privilege. In some ways, theirs was an America by the numbers: If the numbers were right, America was right.

But we have learned that bare numbers don't tell you much. Dollars don't always guarantee progress, and the politics of coercion -- the politics of virtue on demand -- have inspired frightening new animosities between races and classes in this nation.

We now must decide whether we want an America by the numbers -- an America defined by deliberate class conflict -- or an

America by the people. I choose the latter. Our government ought to tell the people: We believe in you. Not: prove yourselves to our agents.

When I talked of a kinder, gentler nation in my inaugural address, I wasn't trying to create a slogan: I was serious. Government ought to be in the business of helping people achieve their dreams. It shouldn't presume to define those dreams. It shouldn't erect barriers to community action.

An effective government must be gentle, kind, firm and humble. It must know its limitations -- and respect its people's decency and capability.

This leads us naturally to the fourth aspect of freedom, responsibility. Any introductory course in political philosophy notes that freedom entails responsibility. People who accept freedom also must accept responsibility for preserving it -- and for building a society that prefers creativity to envy, brotherhood to faction, respect to terrorism, stewardship to plunder.

I have been accused of lacking agendas or vision. If by that someone means that I don't propose vast or costly new programs, I plead guilty. My vision for America depends heavily on you, for you are the men and women who will shape our future. You are the men and women who must decide whether to defend the freedoms of creation, expression and spirit. You will have to build a more prosperous and peaceful society.

When politicians devise grandiose programs, they don't ask anything of your talent or commitment; they ask only for your money. I therefore challenge you to build a society dedicated to cultivating goodness -- not a Great Society with its massive means of shifting money from one pocket to another -- but the Good Society, one that promotes service, selflessness, action.

The antidote to greed is not a tax increase; it is service. If you want to take a stand against self-centeredness, get involved. If you want a direct role in shredding the veils of prejudice, get involved. The Good Society poses a challenge: It dares you to explore the full promise of citizenship, to begin by getting to know your neighbors, assuming some responsibility for building and maintaining bonds of trust at home, at work, wherever you go. It dares you to seeking out principles and stick to them.

Let me leave you today with an exhortation: Make the most of your abilities. Question authority. Examine yourself. Strive to do what is good. Muster the courage to be a point of light, to take up the little deeds that enable great things to happen.

Also: define your missions positively. Don't seek out villains. Don't focus on freedom as a "freedom from" such woes and want and fear. Focus on freedom's promise -- on your promise.

We live in the most exciting period of my lifetime -- and perhaps of yours. The old ways of doing things have run their

course, and we must find new ways of chasing our destinies. Dare to serve others, and you will serve your nation well.

It may seem a cliché, but you really do hold the future in your hands. Treat it well -- and future generations will revere you as the men and women who kept America great -- and helped deliver freedom to an entire world.

Thank you, God bless you and God bless the United States of America.

opportunities that this nation grants us.

In Kuwait, we liberated ourselves and put before ourselves a new challenge. All across the land, you can see people eager to discard easy excuses and take on tough tasks: helping the homeless, training the unskilled, pushing back the wave of crime, building schools and neighborhoods in which they may take real pride.

In Washington, we find a government less and less eager to define policies in terms of good guys and bad guys. Although some people still prefer trying to coerce people to behave well and behave well, most of us agree that it just doesn't make sense to define ourselves and our policies in terms of whom we would like to punish with new laws, regulations, decrees. Most of us want to accept the tougher challenge of defining whom we want to serve, and how.

The uplifting, head-spinning revolutions of the 1980s and 1990s stem from a common source -- the simple concept of freedom.

Although Western military resolve helped contain the growth of communism, the mirage of socialism vanished because despots, dictators, tanks, walls, prison cells, spies, thugs -- none of these could contain the idea of freedom. The moment Western rock songs made their way into East European culture, the day tourists from that part of the world started smuggling videocassettes from the West, the instant Western radio became more credible and popular than the stilted dull programming of the local communist party -- people in the communist world were hooked. They knew that other systems not only worked better, but also allowed people's hearts to sing and laugh. For them freedom involved more than

filled store shelves. It offered the hope of joy, of brotherhood. (look for some Havel or Walesa or Solzhenitsyn quote) It provided the staff of life for civil, productive society.

Now, we must learn from our own triumphs and apply the lessons of liberty to our own nation. I would like to talk today about four aspects of freedom, and how they define the new world that awaits us.

First, freedom of creation. As a people, we always have worshipped people's creative power and celebrated the achievements of men and women who combined innovative insight and entrepreneurial courage. Think of great American heroes, and you think of people like Thomas Edison, Henry Ford, ... Each grew up in circumstances of grinding poverty and, through determined genius, transformed our entire planet.

If you think about it, capitalism is not a system of profits. It is a framework for creativity. It always seems to supply goods and services that would have escaped the attention of government planners. Who, for instance, would have thought to develop Apple Computers? Government didn't. That industry was hatched in a California garage. Or Famous Amos cookies: Imagine just for a moment how some bureaucrat might react when asked to help put up money for a cookie company. Closer to home: Domino's Pizza. A local firm that went national -- and never would have stood a chance before a board of industrial policy advisers.

Free markets help turn the unexpected discovery into a commodity to which everyone has access. Free markets allow people to swap ideas and insights without having to seek permission from

somebody in Washington or Lansing or Ann Arbor.

If you don't believe that freedom works, just look at what central planning did for the Soviet Union, large swaths of Africa, Eastern Europe. It subjected all to a grinding, unimaginative brand of poverty -- poverty enforced by jackboots, cattle prods, dingy jail cells.

Our domestic program calls in many places in many small ways for more market innovation. We incorporated it into the Clean Air Act, into the child care bill, into this year's transportation initiative. The concept of choice in education seeks to make good educations available to all -- not just those with money or political connections. And if you think for one moment that choice is an elitist ideal, consider this: The group that most supports choice in this nation is the poor. The group most opposed are wealthy citizens whose public schools already enjoy private-school prestige and quality.

We run the risk of crushing the creative spirit through taxes, through regulations, through a series of petty harrassments designed to extract wealth rather than to encourage creativity. The average worker in the United States now spends more than four months of each year working just to pay the tax man. Four months of labor that might be used for such mundane purposes as paying for the house and car, setting aside money for children's educations, purchasing clothes for work or leisure. Four months of labor that might otherwise help a worker create a little savings nest-egg.

But think about it: do these taxes liberate anyone from four months' worth of want, four months' worth of responsibility, four

months of anything? Or do they inspire cynicism? Do they give people the impression that government strives not to help, only to extract?

The average worker today pays xxx percent more in taxes than the worker of 27 years ago.

Americans transformed a rough wilderness into the most prosperous nation on earth, and they did so because they enjoyed the freedom to create -- and to distribute the proceeds of their innovation. If we want to provide the greatest good for the greatest number, we must abandon the stale slogans of redistribution or of false compassion. We must look instead to compassion that works. And as odd as it may sound to you, free enterprise enables us to spread life-enriching and life-saving goods to corners of society that otherwise would live and die in filth and obscurity.

At a time when information technologies have revolutionize the world, we still rely on archaic approaches to governing ourselves. If I can risk venturing around a computer keyboard, surely this nation can begin thinking about addressing its problems in new ways. If Mikhail Gorbachev can wrestle with perestroika, surely our political community can upgrade and update our own ways of doing things.

This leads to a second freedom, freedom of expression. Free speech may be the defining characteristic of the American ideal. Our founding fathers took special care to ensure that people be able to speak their minds, to challenge one another with tough

questions and unorthodox ideas. Free expression enables us not merely to express our diversity; it also makes it possible for us to learn from it.

Nevertheless, free expression is under assault throughout the United States, and nowhere more than on college campuses. The concept of Political Correctness threatens to replace thought with empty etiquette. It encourages people not to learn from diversity, but to retreat into gestures that shield us from unpleasant facts, uncongenial ideas -- or even simple stupid statements of bigotry.

The cult of correctness arises from the laudable desire to sweep away the debris of racism and hatred. But its methods ensure its failure. PC does several things. First, it sets people unnecessarily at odds. It crushes diversity in the name of diversity. Second, it paralyzes thought and action. It makes people waste time wondering whether their thoughts and actions meet the test of etiquette, instead of whether their ideas actually make sense. Third, it weakens faith in ourselves and our instincts. The notion of correctness implies that we all suffer taints of hidden imperfections, that we must spend time purging ourselves of bad perceptions, hidden bad motives, blind spots -- in short, that we cannot act without guidance and approval from a bank of experts. It cripples the very sense of decency it claims to protect, and substitutes an obedience to authority for genuine compassion.

Our nation becomes more diverse each year. People from all over the world come here because they still regard it as a land where fond dreams can become reality. It seems perverse that some people would try to squash diversity in the name of diversity.

Our Secretary of Education, Lamar Alexander, already has confronted this cult of censorship. He has suspended the accreditation rights of the Middle Atlantic States.... on grounds that this accreditation organization has stepped beyond its proper bounds. It has begun demanding politically correct syllabuses; politically correct hiring practices; politically correct behavior on campuses. It has moved beyond its original responsibility -- determining whether schools actually educate their students -- and has begun demanding that universities indoctrinate the nation's young.

Third, freedom of virtue -- of spirit. Franklin Delano Roosevelt once described big government as a narcotic. In recent ages, often with the nobles of intentions, we have tried to drug our people into complacency -- or browbeat them into apathy. Never before in this nation's history have people been forced to work so hard to do good deeds. If someone suffers an injury along a roadside, would be Samaritans must ask themselves: Can I get sued for helping?

In schoolyards, youngsters gather to pray beneath a tree during recess. Officials haul them into court and plaster them with cease and desist orders. It seems as if we spend more energy teaching people how to sue than how to help each other.

You don't have to earn a Ph.D. in psychology to understand that we best improve behavior when we reward good deeds -- rather than demanding them on pain of prosecution. You don't have to be a preacher to understand that the bully makes a far less effective savior than the person who dares to care and to lend a hand.

So why have we made it so difficult for people to do what comes naturally to Americans?

Coercion: that is the difference between the Great Society and the Good Society. President Johnson's speech outlined challenges that seem as apt today as they did 27 years ago. He proposed revitalizing cities; rejuvenating schools; trampling down the hoary harvest of racism; protecting our environment.

Although he issued a manifesto for government action and involvement, he also noted that "the solution to these problems does not rest on a massive program in Washington, nor can it rely solely on the strained resources of local authority. They require us to create new concepts of cooperation, a creative federalism, between the National Capital and the leaders of local communities."

The most obvious difference between the Great Society and the Good Society also is the most important. That difference is 27 years. Lyndon Johnson spoke at a time when people believed that small cadres of experts could anticipate and answer the wants and needs of millions. They would figure out ideal tax rates, ideal rates of expenditure on social programs, ideal distributions of wealth and privilege. In some ways, theirs was an America by the numbers: If the numbers were right, social policy would be as well.

But we have learned that bare numbers don't tell you much. There is a huge difference between a welfare program that in practical terms supplies employment to counselors, caseworkers, administrators and a host of "helpers," and one whose proceeds go directly to the poor. In one case, federal dollars give power to the federal government, and give recipients the message: You can't

cope, so we will. In the other case, the dollars say: We trust you to make wise decisions.

We now must decide whether we want an America by the numbers or an America that cherishes individuals and uses them as the measure of all programs. We must choose between the welfare office, with its long lines and weary workers, and the church, where friends and neighbors lend helping hands.

The society I seek depends more on you. It relies on your real compassion -- not on a tax payment that serves as a proxy for a church tithe.

When I talked of a kinder, gentler nation in my inaugural address, I wasn't trying to create a slogan: I was trying to set a tone. Government ought to be in the business of helping people achieve their dreams. It shouldn't presume to define and reach those dreams itself. It shouldn't attack ambition, the fuel of progress. It ought not to strip away incentives to work, which help convert ambition into action. It ought not to steal the rewards of labor, which is what people labor to acquire. Instead, it must do what it can to encourage the virtues that the founders of this land held dear.

A kind government need not be wimpy. One of my favorite songs notes that freedom isn't free. A gentler government need not overlook the grinding facts of real life. But an effective government must be gentle, kind, firm and humble. It must know its limitations -- and respect its people's greatness.

Ultimately, government never can be the pillar upon which

civil society leans. Our society always will rest on smaller, more intimate groupings: family, friends, colleagues, church, school, workplace, community organization. It will require people who act without waiting for someone else to do the tough work of liberty.

NB, the work of liberty tougher at home than abroad.

Finally, I encourage you to cultivate passions for service and for intellectual growth. Franklin Roosevelt once talked of four freedoms: freedom from want,

Note that these are negative freedoms: freedom from. I propose that we begin thinking of freedoms to, that we look not with a fearful eye toward our weaknesses, but that we look with confidence to the virtues that never have failed us.

Freedom is not some thin, expendable concept. Societies cannot live and thrive without it. But the concept of freedom resists our pinning down. Vague, various, people often twist it to their own purposes, treating it as an advertising cliché rather than an ideal that we must explore and define for ourselves.

the impact of change on tradition, on values: the crucial importance of defining freedom.

four aspects of freedom

America by the numbers or a society of virtue

get numbers of size of government, government expenditure, average tax payment, average amount of time working to pay taxes; constraints on the dream

freedom:

free enterprise

free expression

freedom of spirit

responsibility

the four faces of freedom

Defining the defining moment: What is the core of the Bush administration?

We find ourselves at a redefining moment. Many Americans view the last 25 years as years of great vigor, confusion and self-doubt. The past quarter century has yielded up moments of breathtaking greatness and debilitating failure. We reached the moon -- but failed to reach xxxx. We toppled Jim Crow, but left unfinished the business of crushing prejudice and bigotry.

It has summoned our greatest courage and incited our basest emotions. There have been bleak moments that, in the words of the poet, "the best lack all conviction while the worst are full of passionate intensity."

Our world has changed more rapidly than ever before, blurred our conceptions of that world and of ourselves. Only now have we begun feeling comfortable with the phenomenon Alvin Toffler once called "Future Shock." And after spending a decade huddled in fear of change -- a fear best expressed in laws designed to outlaw risk// that is, outlaw the spirit of discovery and essence of progressive change -- we have reconciled ourselves to a new kind of world, a new kind of life.

We also have discovered that we may be better prepared to deal with change than any people on earth -- provided we summon the courage and confidence to grasp the reins of opportunity and ride West, to a great American century.

I wish I had a dime for every time someone claimed that our administration lacks vision. Described us as a bunch of technocrats who had the souls of accountants and hearts of a club chairman. I suppose I have been guilty of hiding our light under a bushel. But if you look carefully at the initiatives this administration has offered over the past years, a real pattern emerges.

This administration believes in people. That's why we have decided to let people decide how best to solve their problems.

This administration believes in enterprise and growth.

This administration believes in opportunity.

This administration believes in taking real chances.

This administration believes that the key to goodness lies in individual choice, and not in government decree.

This administration believes in the corny old traditional values: family, church, community, hard work, risk, merit, growth, love.

I know that this explanation won't satisfy people who want government to announce programs and predict results. But let me ask a rhetorical question: When was the last time we in Washington passed a bill to "solve" a problem -- and actually solved it? Did the Humphrey-Hawkins full employment bill put an end to unemployment? Did the Chrysler bail-out save Chrysler? Did the

goods -- and the necessity of embracing principles.

Know thyself

the failures of declinism

You can find in the idea of freedom a peculiar cycle of life. Each generation seems to rediscover the idea, add to it new luster and ornamentation. And each generation, having tasted a small sliver of freedom's fruit, begins to hoard its bounty, tuck away its small measure of progress, let a fresh ideal wither. But forgetfulness never has been more difficult than today. What we take for granted, others won't. What we refuse to fight for, others will hold dear. Everywhere -- even in pursuit of an ideal we consider our own, our unique contribution to the life of the world -- individuals and nations not only will scramble to fashion new industries out of ingenious dreams; they also will scramble to subdue their competitors.

President Johnson, like the finest thinkers of his generation, believed that the key to human progress lay in assembling the wisest men and women available, seating them around a table, and challenging them to salve the woes that afflicted the world.

This belief enjoyed the advantages of simplicity and

hopefulness. It actually promised fairly concrete results. But unfortunately, it simply couldn't survive the hard test of reality. No one is wise enough to choose the wisest men and women. Few even possess the gift of knowing which questions to ask. Look back over the last couple of decades, and you will find that some of our greatest revolutions were hatched far from the spotlight, in dim garages or dingy offices, where people of genius created whole new industries -- such as the home computer and software industries.

--

If by a domestic agenda, you mean a series of national solutions, I have no domestic agenda. If by a domestic agenda, you mean a series of specific goals -- such as how the auto industry ought to develop over the next decade -- I don't have a domestic agenda. But if by a domestic agenda you mean a form of government that can best inspire men and women to nurture the genius within them; if by a domestic agenda you mean a form of government that fights for freedom and the values it secures; if by a domestic agenda you mean a form of government grounded in the ideals we all hold dear -- ideals of individual liberty, social diversity, tolerance, creativity, productivity, respect for self and others -- the I do have an agenda.

This agenda is not passive: It requires far more than a ritualistic tax payment. This agenda requires commitment, active compassion, regard for self and others. It requires heavy doses of faith and idealism. And unlike others, I have an agenda in

which others may share -- and indeed, it's an agenda that all of us must shape.

Most Americans understand that when we in Washington talk of "solving" national problems, we often mean nothing more than taking the nation's money and attempting to apply it to solutions that we think make sense. In the end, large government confiscates more than money; it chokes off liberty. (founders) If we want to support liberty in deed, and not merely in word, we must assume real responsibility for the kind of society we want. What defines this moment is that we have greater power, and fewer arbitrary barriers between us -- and a future whose dim outlines appear before us, but whose beaming promise shines brightly in our hearts and imaginations.

We do not need to seek shelter in grand, ringing abstractions; terms heavy with symbolism but light with meaning to those who have no homes, whose jobs bore them, whose lives seem to move in slow, unbreakable unbearable circles. We need to fashion for ourselves a plainspoken rhetoric of goodness and cooperation. We need to stop pursuing soundbites long enough to ask ourselves: What can we do? How can we help the child next door to read? Can we lighten the burden of the woman next door, who raises two children, holds two jobs, scrambles nobly to meet her responsibilities? These are not grand questions, but they are more important than virtually any other we can ask.

The state is a mighty and cumbersome thing. It is great at fighting wars, extracting taxes, using its power to work its minions' will. But the state is no better suited to the small and significant needs of neighborhoods, of families, of individuals than an elephant is to brain surgery. We must let the federal government do what it does best -- and let people do what they do best. We all commit unpardonable acts of intellectual laziness when we try to coax that elephant to perform impossible deeds, and we eviscerate ourselves when we refuse to step up to our own challenges on grounds that the elephant ought to do it.

Communism relied on the folly that a few wise officials could solve the varied and unpredictable problems of millions of workers.

This is the age of the idea. While military strength played a small role in stalling communism, communism ultimately fell because it could not hold back the idea of liberty. This idea fell gently upon the unfree world, given wings on radio waves, in video cassettes, in books, thin pamphlets, even sermons delivered in dingy cellars where the faithful would meet to plot their futures.

No wall, no prison, no form of tyranny can crush forever the power of an idea that reverberates in our hearts and souls. And no idea has more power, no idea unleashes so much unexpected creativity and unaccountable virtue -- than the idea that we all must be free to pursue our destinies, even if we choose paths that vanish into the bogs of despair and defeat.

The events of the past decade grant us the rare opportunity to step back and ask ourselves: What is really important? What do we as Americans want to be? How as Americans do we wish to live among one another?

Too often, political disputes center over the dull mechanics of government: Whether we should cut program A or create program B. This crabbed and often selfish view of service merely sets people at odds, invites them to squabble over dollars and cents. Any serious student of the political process will tell you that today's politics bears a depressing resemblance to the politics of the bazaar, where people barter over trinkets. It bears too little resemblance to the sort of crusade that most politicians would love to lead, crusades in which individuals, suffused with the spirit of cooperation and brotherhood, link hands and fortunes in pursuit of real ideals. We don't generate those crusades because we fail to ask the obvious questions that make us pause to think, and later cause us to shake off our own indolence and get on with the task of doing something.

Today, I hope to inspire you -- not by telling you how I plan to spend vast sums of your money, but by asking some obvious questions.

Michigan served as a launching pad for a couple of heroic

initiatives: The Peace Corps and the Great Society. Today's program reprints in full President Lyndon Johnson's commencement speech nearly 22 years ago. But I will not try to outbid Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. They have their places in history and in our nation's heart. Instead, I would like to talk a bit about the goals they expressed in the 1960s, goals that seem fresher today than they did 27 years ago.

Every commencement speech concludes with an exhortation, and mine will follow that sacred formula.

innovation. If we want to provide the greatest good for the greatest number, we must abandon the stale slogans of redistribution or of false compassion. We must look instead to compassion that works. And as odd as it may sound to you, free enterprise enables us to spread life-enriching and life-saving goods to corners of society that otherwise would live and die in filth and obscurity.

We have entered a new industrial revolution, but we still rely upon the managerial equivalent of the steam engine to achieve our government goals. If I can risk venturing around a computer keyboard, surely this nation can begin thinking about addressing its problems in new ways. If Mikhail Gorbachev can wrestle with perestroika, surely our political community can upgrade and update our own ways of doing things. Rather than asking what government can do for us, we ought to ask how it can let us do good for our country.

It's really a pleasure to stand here in Michigan Stadium, a place that has forged its share of football history -- and political history. Your program today highlights the Great Society address Lyndon Johnson delivered to graduates here nearly 27 years ago. Three years earlier, John F. Kennedy unveiled the Peace Corps here.

will
I will not try to outbid those great men today. Instead, I would like to talk about the historic moment that dares us to define ourselves. Your commencement -- your journey into the "real world," coincides with this nation's commencement into a world that has lived only in our fondest wishes -- a world in which we are free to explore the full promise of the American dream.

The Cold War, which defined much of our foreign policy for a half century, has vanished, opening up the potential for a world united in economic competition -- not divided by military confrontation.

1st And our participation in the Persian Gulf War helped us rediscover ourselves. Our very participation in that conflict told the world that Americans take principles seriously. We really will risk dying for the ideals we hold dear. We really will extend helping hands to those besieged by aggressive dictators.

Our success in the war helped kill Vietnam-era doubts that we could not function in world affairs, that we lacked the certainty or reliability to take a stand in tough times. But more importantly, we regained a sense of ourselves. It was as if we had awakened abruptly from a long fitful sleep, a nightmare time in which we doubted our decency, our values, our abilities -- to find an America we really did recognize -- a land of optimism, charity, decency, toleration and ability.

I have traveled around the country in recent months, and I see an idealism I have not seen in 30 years. People feel good about themselves because they answered the war's awful questions. As troops went off to fight, and possibly to die, simple, private virtues reasserted themselves. Neighbors comforted those whose loved ones had traveled to the Gulf. People of all races, creeds and classes joined in common cause to strengthen their communities,

their lives.

In Sumter, South Carolina I saw citizens who had rebuilt a city after a hurricane, then rebuilt an economy after the troops departed. Tears leaped to their eyes as they reunited. It suddenly occurred to all of us what they had done. They had worked miracles. They were proud to be Americans. They were proud to live in Sumter. But most of all, they were proud of what they had become to one another.

That pattern repeats itself all over the land. You can sense a kind of giddiness. People love themselves and their nation, and they feel again the kind of optimism they felt in the 1960s. This optimism, unfocused and profound, has begun to sweep away the stale layers of confrontation and doubt. It has inspired people to take chances they wouldn't have taken before, to dream dreams they might have suppressed before, to dare wrestle with the startling opportunities that this nation grants us.

In Kuwait, we liberated ourselves and put before ourselves a new challenge. All across the land, you can see people eager to discard easy excuses and take on tough tasks: helping the homeless, training the unskilled, pushing back the wave of crime, building schools and neighborhoods in which they may take real pride.

In Washington, we find a government less and less eager to define policies in terms of good guys and bad guys. Although some people still prefer trying to coerce people to behave well and behave well, most of us agree that it just doesn't make sense to define ourselves and our policies in terms of whom we would like to punish with new laws, regulations, decrees. Most of us want to accept the tougher challenge of defining whom we want to serve, and how.

The uplifting, head-spinning revolutions of the 1980s and 1990s stem from a common source -- the simple concept of freedom.

Although Western military resolve helped contain the growth of communism, the mirage of socialism vanished because despots, dictators, tanks, walls, prison cells, spies, thugs -- none of these could contain the idea of freedom.

The moment Western rock songs made their way into East European culture, the day tourists from that part of the world started smuggling videocassettes from the West, the instant Western radio became more credible and popular than the stilted dull programming of the local communist party -- people in the communist world were hooked. They knew that other systems not only worked better, but also allowed people's hearts to sing and laugh. For them freedom involved more than filled store shelves. It offered the hope of joy, of brotherhood. (look for some Havel or Walesa or Solzhenitsyn quote) It provided the staff of life for civil, productive society.

Now, we must learn from our own triumphs and apply the lessons of liberty to our own nation. I would like to talk today about four aspects of freedom, and how they define the new world that awaits us.

First, freedom of creation. From its inception, the United States has been a laboratory for creation. The American dream usually signifies the triumph of merit over circumstance. Horatio Alger works out of grinding poverty to enjoy prosperity and productivity. In real life, Thomas Edison and Henry Ford outgrew rough origins to transform an entire world.

Socialists never understood that capitalism is not a system of profits, but a framework for creativity. But our nation, grounded from the beginning in reverence for free enterprise, has shown what free markets can accomplish.

Industrial planners also trivialize economic freedom. They like to focus on spectacular technologies, and ignore the little conveniences that leaven life. When government picks winners and losers, it applies political standards -- and forces all of us to conform to the dull calculations of planners.

Think of our greatest innovations of late: The information revolution was hatched in garages and basements. The fast-food chain -- an innovation many loathe, but one that has changed life around the planet -- began in obscurity. Domino's Pizza would never have stood a chance before a committee of planners. Tom Monaghan was just a college kid with a good idea.

Free markets help turn the unexpected discovery into a commodity to which everyone has access. Free markets allow people to swap ideas and insights without having to seek permission from somebody in Washington or Lansing or Ann Arbor. And no one in history has made better use of freedom than the American people.

Our domestic program tries in many ways to encourage market innovation, to sweep away deadening and demoralizing regulations. Last year's child care and clean air acts incorporate market incentives. This year's transportation package seeks to invite entrepreneurship.

But that's not enough. In a world transformed by freedom, we must find ways to unleash our genius more fully. We must eliminate the petty harrassments we inflict upon people with dreams.

The average worker in the United States now spends more than four months of each year working just to pay the tax man. Four months of labor that might be used for such mundane purposes as paying for the house and car, setting aside money for children's educations, purchasing clothes for work or leisure. Four months of labor that might otherwise help a worker create a little savings nest-egg.

But think about it: do these taxes liberate anyone from four months' worth of want, four months' worth of responsibility, four months of anything? Or do they inspire cynicism? Do they give people the impression that government strives not to help, only to extract?

Politicians often make persuasive cases that vast programs can achieve vast good. But too often we ignore the opportunities we crush when we impose new burdens on people who work. We underestimate the benefits that real freedom produces.

Americans transformed a rough wilderness into the most prosperous nation on earth, and they did so because they enjoyed the freedom to create -- and to distribute the proceeds of their

innovation. If we want to provide the greatest good for the greatest number, we must abandon the stale slogans of redistribution or of false compassion. We must look instead to compassion that works. And as odd as it may sound to you, free enterprise enables us to spread life-enriching and life-saving goods to corners of society that otherwise would live and die in filth and obscurity.

We have entered a new industrial revolution, but we still rely upon the managerial equivalent of the steam engine to achieve our government goals. If I can risk venturing around a computer keyboard, surely this nation can begin thinking about addressing its problems in new ways. If Mikhail Gorbachev can wrestle with perestroika, surely our political community can upgrade and update our own ways of doing things. Rather than asking what government can do for us, we ought to ask how it can let us do good for our country.

This leads to a second freedom, freedom of expression. Free speech may be the defining characteristic of the American ideal. It fosters open debate about everything. It enables us to subject ideas and actions to the withering review of reason. Free expression exposes and nourishes the diversity upon which our national greatness rests; it teaches northerners about southerners, blacks about whites, immigrants about long-established families.

Nevertheless, free expression is under assault throughout the United States, and nowhere more than on college campuses. The concept of Political Correctness threatens to replace thought with empty etiquette. It encourages people to avoid the test of diversity and to retreat instead into gestures that punish the unfashionable, that censure the inquisitive, that impose ruthless punishments upon people guilty of bigotry or stupidity, rather than encouraging them to learn from their errors.

The cult of correctness arises from the laudable desire to sweep away the debris of racism and hatred. But its methods ensure its failure. By establishing a court etiquette that would have baffled even Louis the Fourteenth, it grants some people -- the conservators of rectitude -- power to lord over others. By attacking prejudices that may seem natural to the untrained mind, it sets people unnecessarily at odds. It crushes diversity in the name of diversity.

Second, it paralyzes thought and action. It forces people to waste their time wondering whether their expressions pass muster, rather than whether their ideas actually make sense.

Third, it weakens faith in ourselves and our instincts. The notion of correctness implies that we all suffer taints of hidden imperfections, that we must spend time purging ourselves of bad perceptions, hidden bad motives, blind spots -- in short, that we cannot act without guidance and approval from a bank of experts. It cripples the very sense of decency it claims to protect, and substitutes an obedience to authority for genuine compassion.

Our nation becomes more diverse each year, and our lives grow ever richer for it. People from all over the world come here because they still regard it as a land where fond dreams can become reality. It seems perverse that some people would try to squash diversity in the name of diversity.

Our Secretary of Education, Lamar Alexander, already has confronted this cult of censorship. He has suspended the accreditation rights of the Middle Atlantic States.... on grounds that this accreditation organization has stepped beyond its proper bounds. It has begun demanding politically correct syllabuses; politically correct hiring practices; politically correct behavior on campuses. It has moved beyond its original responsibility --

determining whether schools actually educate their students -- and has begun demanding that universities indoctrinate the nation's young.

But more generally, we as a nation ought to recommit ourselves to openness and tolerance. We cannot tolerate bigotry of any sort -- and at its heart, PC stands for nothing more than effete bigotry. Let us dismantle our thought police and encourage people instead to share experiences, lives, backgrounds. Only when we share good times and bad, joys and hardships, can we truly

understand and appreciate one another. If harmony be our goal, we should not adopt the methods and approaches of the gulag.

Third, freedom of virtue -- of spirit. In recent ages, often with the nobles of intentions, we have tried to drug our people into complacency -- or browbeat them into apathy. If someone suffers an injury along a roadside, would be Samaritans must ask themselves: Can I get sued for helping?

In schoolyards, youngsters gather to pray beneath a tree during recess. Officials haul them into court and plaster them with cease and desist orders. It seems as if we spend more energy teaching people how to sue than how to help each other.

You don't have to earn a Ph.D. in psychology to understand that we best improve behavior when we reward good deeds -- rather than demanding them on pain of prosecution. You don't have to be a preacher to understand that the bully makes a far less effective savior than the person who dares to care and to lend a hand.

So why have we made it so difficult for people to do what comes naturally to Americans?

Coercion: that is the difference between the Great Society and the Good Society. President Johnson's speech outlined challenges that seem as apt today as they did 27 years ago. He proposed revitalizing cities; rejuvenating schools; trampling down the hoary harvest of racism; protecting our environment.

Although he issued a manifesto for government action and involvement, he also noted that "the solution to these problems does not rest on a massive program in Washington, nor can it rely solely on the strained resources of local authority. They require us to create new concepts of cooperation, a creative federalism, between the National Capital and the leaders of local communities."

Lyndon Johnson expressed the wisdom of his age. He spoke at a time when people believed that small cadres of experts could anticipate and answer the wants and needs of millions. They would figure out ideal tax rates, ideal rates of expenditure on social programs, ideal distributions of wealth and privilege. In some ways, theirs was an America by the numbers: If the numbers were right, America was right.

But we have learned that bare numbers don't tell you much. Dollars as often produce large federal payrolls as bonuses for the intended beneficiaries. (facts about government expenditure, poverty, etc.)

We now must decide whether we want an America by the numbers or an America by the people. We ought to cherish individuals as the measure of all programs. We must choose between the welfare office, with its long lines and weary workers, and the church, where friends and neighbors lend helping hands.

The society I seek depends more on you. It relies on your real compassion -- not on a tax payment that serves as a proxy for a church tithe.

We have stamped on the American spirit by hinting that government can salve every wound, solve every problem, comfort every afflicted person, dab away every tear caused by injustice. This approach invites and often demands that we cease to care.

When I talked of a kinder, gentler nation in my inaugural address, I wasn't trying to create a slogan: I was trying to set a tone. Government ought to be in the business of helping people achieve their dreams. It shouldn't presume to define and reach

those dreams itself. It shouldn't attack ambition, the fuel of progress. It ought not to strip away incentives to work, which help convert ambition into action. It ought not to steal the rewards of labor, which is what people labor to acquire. Instead, it must do what it can to encourage the virtues that the founders of this land held dear.

A kind government need not be wimpy. One of my favorite songs notes that freedom isn't free. A gentler government need not overlook the grinding facts of real life. But an effective government must be gentle, kind, firm and humble. It must know its limitations -- and respect its people's greatness.

This leads to a second freedom, freedom of expression. Free speech may be the defining characteristic of the American ideal. It enables us to expose bad ideas and spread good ones. It highlights and nourishes the diversity upon which our national greatness rests; it teaches northerners about southerners, blacks about whites, immigrants about first families.

Nevertheless, free expression is under assault throughout the United States, and nowhere more than on college campuses. The concept of Political Correctness arises from the laudable desire to sweep away the debris of racism and hatred. But its methods ensure failure. It establishes an empty etiquette that would have baffled even Louis the Fourteenth. It , grants some people -- the conservators of rectitude -- power to lord over others. Those lords train their minions in the arts of creative suspicion. PC encourages people to seek a slight in every casual word, comment, action. It attempts to force everyone into a conformist mold. In its own Orwellian way, it crushes diversity in the name of diversity.

fast.
~~This strange development wastes good minds, forces people to wonder whether their ideas are correct --~~ instead of whether they make sense. It kills reason and it attacks our faith in ourselves and our instincts for decency. It requires people to submit to arbitrary courts of taste -- and assails our natural instincts for toleration and open debate. In the end, political correctness substitutes an obedience to authority for genuine compassion.

If we really want to take full advantage of diversity we must encourage open and civil discussion. We must not permit

"diversity" to become a code word for intellectual tyranny.

Our Secretary of Education, Lamar Alexander, already has confronted this cult of censorship by challenging college certification organizations to abandon Politically Correct decrees and stick to the business of determining whether colleges meet basic educational requirements.

We as a nation ought to recommit ourselves to openness and tolerance. We can't do that through intimidation and decree. We must trust our persuasive powers to conquer bigotry and prejudice.

Let us dismantle our thought police and encourage people to share experiences, lives, backgrounds. Only when we share good times and bad, joys and hardships, can we truly understand and appreciate one another. If harmony be our goal, let's adopt approaches conducive to harmony -- rather than dusting off the methods and approaches of the Inquisition.

To
Bul
Hinchliff

SYMPOSIUM THE INTERACTION OF THE LEGISLATIVE, JUDICIAL, AND EXECUTIVE BRANCHES IN THE MAKING OF FOREIGN POLICY

GEORGE BUSH*

The late Justice Potter Stewart was a great influence in shaping my views about the role of judges, perhaps more influential than any other individual. He was a very dear friend of mine, and a man of extraordinary integrity, ability, and humility. His humility, his sense of his own mortal limitations, was what struck you. He used to say that the greatest difficulty on the bench was to avoid the temptation to allow his sense of what was good policy to substitute for his judgment of what the law required. To resist that temptation is a judge's greatest virtue, and one that we look for in our judicial appointments, as exemplified by the new Chief Justice and by Justice Scalia.

I agree with Justice Stewart that lawyers and judges need to be restrained and disciplined in the exercise of power, but the other two branches of government must be equally disciplined in their exercise of power. This means that the legislative and executive branches, in interpreting the Constitution subject to the Supreme Court's final review, must constantly recognize the constitutional limits on the judiciary.

How did the Framers intend for the executive branch to interact with the legislative branch in conducting the government's foreign policy? As much as I would argue for the primacy of the executive branch in foreign affairs, especially covert operations, I recognize that foreign policy is a shared power. But there must be a better way to share that power than our current system. In the last twenty years we have witnessed a departure from the way in which this nation had conducted its foreign policy for nearly two centuries. Congress has asserted an increasingly influential role in the day-to-day micromanagement of foreign policy, of foreign operations if you will. At the same time, Congress, through its use of law rather than the ex-

* Vice President of the United States.

executive branch's traditional tools of diplomacy and negotiation, has ushered the courts and lawyers into an uncomfortable but very visible role in the development of America's foreign policy.

The Founders did not intend for the foreign policy of our nation to be conducted or reviewed by grand juries. I know that Alexis De Tocqueville observed 150 years ago that Americans have a tendency to convert political issues into legal issues,¹ but this conversion can go too far. The Founders neither intended nor anticipated judicial intervention into foreign policy. Rather, the Founders sought to focus the conduct of foreign policy into one man, the President, so that we as a nation would be able to act quickly, decisively, and where necessary, secretly, to achieve our goals abroad.² The envisioned role for Congress was political, not regulatory. There was no role envisioned for the courts. Accordingly, we must simplify, deregulate if you will, the conduct of our foreign policy generally, and covert actions particularly.

In an anti-terrorist report of 1986, which Attorney General Meese greatly assisted in formulating and of which I was in charge, the executive branch suggested a joint intelligence committee as a way of building mutual confidence, reducing tensions and leaks, and ridding us of inefficiencies in the conduct of foreign policy. Establishing a single committee might make it possible to ensure that covert activity is confined to the

1. See A. DE TOCQUEVILLE, *DEMOCRACY IN AMERICA* 98, 280 (P. Bradley ed. 1948) ("Scarcely any political question arises in the United States that is not resolved, sooner or later, into a judicial question.").

2. See, e.g., *THE FEDERALIST* No. 64, at 392-93 (J. Jay) (C. Rossiter ed. 1961):

It seldom happens in the negotiation of treaties, of whatever nature, but that perfect *secrecy* and immediate *dispatch* are sometimes requisite. . . . [T]here doubtless are many . . . who would rely on the secrecy of the President, but who would not confide in that of the Senate, and still less in that of a large popular assembly. The [Constitutional Convention has] done well, therefore, in so disposing of the power of making treaties that although the President must, in forming them, act by the advice and consent of the Senate, yet he will be able to manage the business of intelligence in such manner as prudence may suggest (emphasis in original).

See also *THE FEDERALIST* No. 75, at 450-52 (A. Hamilton) (C. Rossiter ed. 1961):

To have intrusted the power of making treaties to the Senate alone would have been to relinquish the benefits of the constitutional agency of the President in the conduct of foreign negotiations. . . .

. . . . Accurate and comprehensive knowledge of foreign politics; a steady and systematic adherence to the same views; a nice and uniform sensibility to national character; decision, *secrecy*, and *dispatch*, are incompatible with the [House of Representatives who are] so variable and so numerous.

s of diplomacy and negotiation, vers into an uncomfortable but opment of America's foreign

for the foreign policy of our ed by grand juries. I know that 150 years ago that Americans itical issues into legal issues,¹ far. The Founders neither in- tervention into foreign policy. focus the conduct of foreign it, so that we as a nation would and where necessary, secretly, e envisioned role for Congress re was no role envisioned for st simplify, deregulate if you olicy generally, and covert ac-

986, which Attorney General ating and of which I was in ggested a joint intelligence mutual confidence, reducing s of inefficiencies in the con- ng a single committee might vert activity is confined to the

AMERICA 98, 280 (P. Bradley ed. 1948) nited States that is not resolved, sooner

3 (J. Jay) (C. Rossiter ed. 1961): aties, of whatever nature, but that sometimes requisite. . . . [T]here the secrecy of the President, but te, and still less in that of a large vention has] done well, therefore, eaties that although the President d consent of the Senate, yet he will ence in such manner as prudence

Hamilton) (C. Rossiter ed. 1961): eaties to the Senate alone would onstitutional agency of the Presi-

ge of foreign politics; a steady and ice and uniform sensibility to na- atch, are incompatible with the ble and so numerous.

CIA, subject to appropriate but disciplined executive and legis- lative oversight, that is based on mutual trust rather than com- plicated regulations that frustrate the development of trust.

In this light, do the Founders have anything to teach us about the shared nature of conducting foreign policy? What role, if any, is appropriate for lawyers and the judiciary, and what role is appropriate for the executive and legislative branches? Members of Congress contend that Congress should have greater control over the nation's foreign policy, whereas members of the executive branch, who have, in recent history, witnessed the erosion of presidential authority over foreign af- fairs, argue in favor of returning power to the executive branch. We must ask ourselves what roles would the Founders have as- signed to each of these groups.

We must establish, under the law, with objectivity, what the proper balance between the branches is. There are many ques- tions that must be answered, but can be adequately answered only by looking to the objective principles embodied in the law. Did the War Powers Act³ encroach too far on presidential power? Are the proliferating congressional committee hearings compatible with the vision of the Framers? Can Congress prop- erly dictate the micromanagement of foreign policy by an in- creased use of subcommittees and the use of the appropriations process? Should a presidential administration be required, in advance of operations, to consult or advise Congress? These are pressing questions of vital importance that must be answered intelligently and responsibly, lest we de- stroy our government's ability to function effectively.

3. 50 U.S.C. §§ 1541-1548 (1982).