

Originally Processed With FOIA(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 Draft Files  
**Subseries:** Chron File, 1989-1993

---

**OA/ID Number:** 13487  
**Folder ID Number:** 13487-012

---

**Folder Title:**  
Boston University Address, 5/21/89 [2]

---

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
<b>G</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>

---

Davis/Zelikow/Martin  
May 16, 1989/6 p.m.  
Draft: Three

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: BOSTON UNIVERSITY/Nickerson Field  
MAY 21, 1989/11 a.m.

Thank you, John. It's a pleasure to be back in Boston.  
((And it's a pleasure to be back in one of my home states . . .  
Congratulations, Barbara, on a B.U. degree of your very own. And  
now that you're an alumna, take note -- this kinder and gentler  
America I'm always speaking of doesn't include the Terriers . .  
.))

I am pleased to share this opportunity with a special friend  
of America . . . President Mitterand, you have the warm affection  
and high regard of the American people. ((Anecdote to come.))

My sincerest congratulations go to every Boston University  
graduate, and to every proud parent. As B.U. grads, you take  
with you a degree from a great institution, and something more --  
knowledge of the past, and responsibility for the future.

It is with your future in mind that I have undertaken a  
series of foreign policy reviews, the basis for bold new  
policies. On April 17, I went to Michigan to outline how my  
Administration will meet welcome changes in Eastern Europe. I  
announced that the United States will actively encourage and

assist reform in Eastern Europe, and I backed up this commitment with measures to deepen economic relations as those governments allow for greater freedom. A few days ago in Texas, I spoke to another group of graduates about our changing relationship with the Soviet Union. I declared our intention to move beyond containment, to integrate the Soviet Union into the community of nations. I said the United States will work **with** the leaders of the Soviet Union, not **against** them, as they institutionalize changes that encourage freedom and peaceful cooperation.

But today, I want to discuss the future of Europe, that mother of nations and ideas that are so much a part of America. Just consider this city. From the Old North Church, to Paul Revere's home now nestled in the warm heart of the Italian North End, to the song-filled Irish pubs of Southy . . . the Old and New Worlds are inseparable in Boston.

But as we look back to Old World tradition, we must look ahead to changes in Europe. From foreign policy to economics -- these changes will shape your careers and your very lives. Can America keep up with the brisk pace of change around the world? More importantly, can we stay ahead of those changes? Absolutely.

Forty-two years ago, just across the Charles River, Secretary of State George Marshall gave a commencement address

that outlined a plan to revive Europe. Western Europe responded heroically, and then joined with us to protect this fragile reconstruction. Behind this shield, Europe has now enjoyed forty years of peace, the longest period of peace Europeans have ever known. Behind this shield, the nations of Western Europe have risen from privation to prosperity -- all because freedom works.

Of course, the generations coming of age in America and Western Europe today can hardly be expected to feel the grip of past anxieties -- the fears of those who fought in a wars that began at Sarajevo (Sarah-HAY-vo) and Danzig. But the history you learned in this university is the only past you will inherit. Any student of history will remember that democracies reach the moment of maximum danger when they reach maximum complacency. I understand that when people have been at peace for a long time, it is easy to forget that it could be otherwise. I can understand the frustration of those who rush to embrace the new millennia. But our expectations cannot race so far ahead of reality that we lose sight of what's at stake.

There is a great irony here. At the very moment the Alliance is tested by complacency, an ideological earthquake in the societies of the East is shaking asunder the very premise of Communism. In Eastern Europe, a powerful yearning for self-determination is asserting itself, a yearning which will not be satisfied by a mere easing of the grip of illegitimate regimes.

In the Soviet Union, the extent of reform itself is a dramatic confession of failure. Yet they cling to the enforced division of Europe. As the Soviets continue to talk about a united Europe, we will remind them that it is **their** Berlin Wall, **their** Brezhnev Doctrine, **their** guard towers, **their** barbed wire, which divide Europe. **Mr. Gorbachev says he has a vision of a common European home. But Mr. Gorbachev, your vision of this home will not inspire us until you first unlock doors and open windows to the world . . .**

My vision goes far beyond the boundaries of mere geography. My vision is one of a **global Commonwealth of Free Nations** united by eternal values of democracy, openness and respect for human rights -- with the nations of the Alliance as its founding members.

The Alliance is also the means through which West will deal with East. ((Quote to come from Raymond Aron on partnership)) Our allies should know that we will consult with them constantly, and remain sensitive to their vital interests. **They should also know this: There will be no surprises from the United States.**

As democracies, we will have disagreements. But the West must ultimately stand solid and united in the face of the Soviet threat. The United States remains committed to the belief that

the defense of Europe and the deterrence of war requires nuclear weapons, including short-range nuclear weapons. These weapons have made the prevention of war an absolute and fearsome necessity. The destructive power of these weapons is so terrible as to banish forever the delusions of a would-be aggressor. And it is this very destructive power which serves a constructive purpose -- to bring the ancient dream of ending war within our reach.

Common sense tells us that we must maintain the means to convince an aggressor that he would be met in Western Europe with any level of force needed to repel his attack and frustrate his designs. This is the essence of our strategy of "flexible response." We will keep and maintain the nuclear forces we base in Europe as proof of our commitment. We will hold these weapons at the lowest possible level. Mr. Gorbachev's latest promise to withdraw 500 warheads means we should withdraw a proportionate equivalent. Fine. **((That's four warheads.))** So much for public relations. Now let's get back to substance.

The fact is, we have unilaterally withdrawn thousands of weapons in the last decade, more than a third of our stockpile. Still, as my friend President Mitterand recognizes in word and deed, **nuclear forces still remain the ultimate deterrent. There is no substitute.**

Our policy approach springs from seventy years of Soviet international behavior. We welcome Soviet reforms, but we will continue to scrupulously evaluate Soviet intentions.

Last week, I gave concrete proposals to seek more openness between the United States and the Soviet Union on military and trade issues. But, I also warned of the Soviet season, where every summer of friendship is followed by a winter of suspicion. A look at last week's headlines proves this point. The Soviet Foreign Minister has threatened to violate the INF treaty if we take actions fully allowed by the treaty, and fully foreseeable at the time the treaty was signed. Are we now to understand that the Soviet implementation of the INF Treaty is conditional? Is this an example of what we can expect from "new thinking?" Or is it the same old party line? Whatever it is, it does not bring us closer together.

We also remain committed to the conventional defense of Europe. Of course, we want a more secure balance, at lower levels. But I will reject legislative attempts to unilaterally withdraw U.S. troops from Europe. We are disturbed by the way in which the Soviet Union deploys its forces in a forward posture, taking full advantage of its superior geographic position. We will maintain, in cooperation with our allies, U.S. ground and air forces in Europe so long as the Soviet Union remains the dominant military power in Eurasia.

We welcome European defense coordination as a new stage in trans-Atlantic relations. The Alliance needs a strong European "pillar." And we see such a pillar of strength arising in the revitalized Western European Union, and in its coordinated effort with the United States in the Persian Gulf. We applaud the growing defense cooperation of West Germany and France, and support the modernization of the British and French independent nuclear deterrent.

In these ways, the Western Alliance can maintain a common strategic policy. But in a time of peace, economic and political cooperation can be almost as critical to the Alliance as a united strategic approach. Some in the United States are ambivalent about the integration of Europe in 1992. They look to the past. My mission is to look to the future. The United States welcomes a larger European role in the world. **We believe that European unity and the NATO partnership are not in conflict. We believe they reinforce each other.**

We will seek new ways to manage the transition to 1992. And the United States also welcomes the political role of the European Community. If the EC agrees, we are eager to develop and intensify new avenues of consultation and cooperation on global issues -- whether it is strengthening the economies of the

Third World, encouraging the spread of democracy, or protecting the environment.

We must especially avoid prolonged and bitter disputes over trade. Just as we must not mistake adversaries for allies, so we must not mistake our allies for adversaries. What a tragedy -- what an absurdity -- it would be if future historians attribute the demise of the Western Alliance to disputes over produce, and wars over pasta.

We want the Europe of 1992 to adopt the lower barriers of the modern world economy, not the high walls and moats of medieval commerce. We want to see what President Kennedy referred to as an "outward-looking" Europe. And we are hopeful that a resurgent Western Europe will be a magnet drawing the nations of Eastern Europe into the Twenty-First Century.

Twice in this century, American blood has been shed over conflicts that began in Europe. So Americans share the fervent desire of Europeans to relegate war forever to the province of distant memories.

Nineteen-ninety-two is the five hundredth anniversary of the discovery of the New World. So we have five centuries to celebrate, not just four decades. We will celebrate the American Bill of Rights and the French Rights of Man, the ancient and

unwritten Constitution of Great Britain, and the democratic vision of Konrad Adenauer and Alcide de Gasperi.

((Quote to come from Jean Monnet))

Davis/Zelikow/Martin  
May 17, 1989/ 2:00 p.m.  
Draft: Four

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: BOSTON UNIVERSITY/Nickerson Field  
May 21, 1989/11 a.m.

Thank you, John. It's a pleasure to be back in Boston.  
((And it's a pleasure to be back in one of my home states . . .  
Congratulations, Barbara, on a B.U. degree of your very own. And  
now that you're an alumna, take note -- this kinder and gentler  
America I'm always speaking of doesn't include the Terriers . .  
.))

My sincerest congratulations go to every Boston University  
graduate, and to every proud parent. As B.U. grads, you take  
with you a degree from a great institution, and something more --  
knowledge of the past, and responsibility for the future.

It is with your future in mind that, after a pause for  
deliberation and review, I am now putting into place a new  
foreign policy for a new period of extraordinary change and hope.  
On April 17, I went to Michigan to outline how my Administration  
will engage to promote change in Eastern Europe. I used the  
example of Poland to show that the United States will take an  
active part in encouraging, and assisting, fundamental political  
and economic reform. On May 2 I addressed the Council of the  
Americas on my policies toward Latin America. A few days ago, in  
Texas, I spoke to another group of graduates about our new

approach to the Soviet Union, about our intention to move **beyond containment** to seek to integrate the Soviet Union into the community of nations and help them share in the benefits of international cooperation. I said we will work **with** the Soviet leaders, not against them, as they make enduring and ingrained changes that encourage freedom, as they become a partner in solving the world's problems rather than contributing to them.

But today, I want to discuss our relationship with Western Europe, the source of so much of the culture and so many of the ideas that are part of America. I am pleased to share this opportunity with a special friend of America . . . President Mitterrand, you have the warm affection and high regard of the American people. I remember well when I joined you in Yorktown, in 1981, to celebrate the bicentennial of that first Franco-American partnership in the decisive battle to win America's freedom. It is highly appropriate that you should now be here in Boston, where that struggle began, and that, on July 14, I will join you in Paris for the 200th anniversary of France's fight for political freedom. The interrelationship between our revolution and yours is but one example of the inseparable bond between the United States and Western Europe.

From the Old North Church, to Paul Revere's home now nestled in the warm heart of the Italian North End, to the song-filled Irish pubs of Southy, the Old World and the New come together in

Boston. But as we look back to Old World tradition, we must look ahead to a changing Europe. From foreign policy to economics -- these changes will shape your careers and your very lives.

Forty-two years ago, just across the Charles River, Secretary of State George Marshall gave a commencement address that outlined a plan to help Europe revive. Western Europe responded heroically, and then joined with us in a partnership to protect this fragile reconstruction. Behind this shield, Europe has now enjoyed forty years of peace, the longest period of peace the continent has ever known. Behind this shield, the nations of Western Europe have risen from privation to prosperity -- all because freedom works.

Today, of course, the generations coming of age in America and Western Europe can hardly be expected to feel the grip of past anxieties. We have been at peace for so long, it is hard to remember how it could be otherwise. I can understand the eagerness to embrace the millennium and declare concerns about security and freedom to be troubles of the past. But our expectations should not race so far ahead of reality that we lose our sense of perspective.

There is a great irony here. While the West is tested by complacency, an ideological earthquake in the East is shaking asunder the very foundation of Communist societies. Eastern

European peoples are asserting their yearning for self-determination, for a reconciliation of the two halves of Europe. Yet, while the Soviets continue to talk about a united Europe, we will remind them that **they** are responsible for the Berlin Wall, the Brezhnev Doctrine, the guard towers, which divide Europe. **Mr. Gorbachev speaks of a vision of a Europe joined in a 'common European home.'** But, friends, when were you last in a home in which the rooms were separated by barbed wire?

I too have a vision of why nations join together. It is not limited by the accidents of mere geography. It is, instead, a kinship rooted in common values, in common ideals for the way people should live. I believe the nations of the Atlantic community have been the founding members of a **global Commonwealth of Free Nations**, open to all who share the eternal values of democracy, openness, and respect for human rights and private endeavor.

So, as the democracies enter a new era of testing and of hope, let me declare some of the principles which guide America's policies toward our friends in Western Europe. First and foremost, the transatlantic relationship remains at the center of American foreign policy, as it has throughout our history. Two world wars in this century have reminded us that Europe's future, and Europe's security, is inseparable from our own future, and our security.

America therefore remains committed to preserving freedom in Europe by whatever means are necessary, in accordance with agreed Alliance strategy. Our nuclear forces must be part of this commitment. Nuclear weapons make the prevention of war so imperative that, for that very reason, the ancient dream of preventing war has -- for the first time -- become attainable. We cannot unlearn how to make these weapons. So, instead of vainly attempting to turn back the clock, we should decide how to use this terrifying reality to fulfill the potential for a safer, more stable, world.

Common sense tells us that any would-be aggressor must understand that he would be met, in Western Europe, with any level of force needed to repel his attack and frustrate his designs. The option of going to war must always be full of incalculable risks for a possible attacker. This is the essence of our strategy of "flexible response." And the nuclear forces we base in Europe, kept up to date as needed, are the proof of our commitment to make this strategy work. Naturally, we try to hold these weapons to the lowest possible level. The fact is, we have unilaterally withdrawn, and destroyed, thousands of weapons from Europe in the last decade. Without much fanfare, a third of our stockpile has been removed. Still, as my friend President Mitterrand has recognized both in word and deed, **nuclear forces remain the ultimate deterrent against aggression. There is no**

substitute.

((I want to comment briefly on the Soviet approach. Last week, I made concrete proposals to bring more openness to military activities and trade relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. But, I also warned that history has revealed a seasonal nature to Soviet policy, with summers of friendship followed by winters of malice. I said that perestroika raises our hopes that Moscow is ready for a true break with the past. Last week's headlines were not encouraging. The Soviet Foreign Minister threatened to violate the INF Treaty, a solemn agreement signed and ratified by our two countries, if we plan our defense in a way - perfectly legal under the treaty - which the Soviet Union does not like. Are we now to understand that Soviet adherence to this treaty is conditional? This does not seem to be an example of 'new thinking,' and it does not bring us closer together.))

Let me return to another vital principle of America's relationship to Western Europe. In addition to nuclear forces, we remain committed to the conventional defense of Europe. Specifically, **we are prepared to maintain, in cooperation with our allies, U.S. ground and air forces in Europe so long as the Soviet Union remains the dominant military power in Eurasia.** I will reject legislative attempts to unilaterally withdraw U.S. troops from Europe. At the same time, we seek a less militarized

Europe, with a secure balance at lower levels of forces. Arms control efforts to achieve this goal will be a high priority of my Administration.

We also welcome, without reservation, more cooperation, within Western Europe, to strengthen the European "pillar" in Alliance defense. European defense cooperation is part of a more mature transatlantic relationship, and we applaud the work of the revitalized Western European Union -- which worked with us in keeping open the sealanes of the Persian Gulf -- and the growing military cooperation between West Germany and France. We continue to support British and French programs to modernize their own nuclear deterrent forces. Granted, part of our allies' motivation is to be a little more independent of us. But it is perfectly right and proper that Europeans should see defense as an enterprise they engage in for their own future.

In these ways, the West can prepare for a new century of peace. The future holds tremendous promise and, in this time of peace, economic and political cooperation are as the common defense.

Western Europe is moving towards far greater integration of national economies, with the ambitious goal of a single European market in 1992. For decades we have said that we want a more integrated Europe, healing national emnities. Now we must

actually prepare to live with it. Some in the United States are ambivalent about this prospect and fearful that Europe will become an economic fortress shutting out the U.S. and others. I tell you today that I reject this ambivalence. The United States welcomes a strong, prosperous, and economically united Europe -- a Europe able and willing to play a larger role in the world economy. **We believe that European unity and the NATO partnership are not in conflict. They can and will reinforce each other.**

We will seek an enhanced dialogue with the European Community and new mechanisms for cooperation in the economic transition to 1992. And the United States also welcomes the growing political role of the European Community. We are ready to develop -- in partnership with the EC -- new avenues of consultation and cooperation on global issues, whether it is strengthening the economies of the Third World, encouraging the spread of democracy, or protecting the world environment.

A more mature partnership with Western Europe will not be easy. There will be differing views, on trade and on other problems. But just as we must not mistake adversaries for allies, so we must not mistake our allies for adversaries. What a tragedy -- what an absurdity -- it would be if future historians traced the demise of the Western alliance to dispute over produce, and wars over pasta.

We are confident that the Europe of 1992 will adopt the lower barriers of the modern international economy, not the walls and moats of medieval commerce. We want to see what President Kennedy referred to as an "outward-looking" Europe, and I know this vision is shared by President Mitterrand.


We see a new resurgence of the vast genius and potential of Europe. **Such a resurgent Western Europe will be a magnet drawing the nations of Eastern Europe into the Twenty-First century, into the commonwealth of free nations.**

Nineteen-ninety-two is the five hundredth anniversary of the discovery of the New World. So we have five centuries to celebrate, not just four decades. We will celebrate the American Bill of Rights and the French Rights of Man, the ancient and unwritten Constitution of Great Britain, and the democratic vision of Konrad Adenauer and Alcide de Gasperi. The modern vitality of Europe -- its prosperity, its freedom, and its unity -- is the vindication and culmination of values that we cherish.

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

May 19, 1989

Memorandum to Chriss Winston

From: Jim Pinkerton   
Re: BU Commencement draft

I think the draft that went to the President is good enough, except for one oddball phrase:

On page 6, line 6, do we really want the President to say that the Alliance has always been driven by "the spirit of crisis"?

What does that mean?

cc: Jim Cicconi

Davis/Zelikow/Martin  
May 17, 1989/ 2:00 p.m.  
Draft: Four

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: BOSTON UNIVERSITY/Nickerson Field  
May 21, 1989/11 a.m.

Thank you, John. It's a pleasure to be back in Boston.  
(And it's a pleasure to be back in one of my home states . . .  
Congratulations, Barbara, on a B.U. degree of your very own. And  
now that you're an alumna, take note -- this kinder and gentler  
America I'm always speaking of doesn't include the Terriers . .  
(Now THAT THE TWO Pres. on this st. have been AWARDED A  
.)) Doctor of Laws - ~~at this point just~~

My sincerest congratulations go to every Boston University  
graduate, and to every proud parent. As B.U. grads, you take  
with you a degree from a great institution, and something more --  
knowledge of the past, and responsibility for the future.

It is with your future in mind that, after a pause for  
deliberation and review, I am now putting into place a new  
foreign policy for a new period of extraordinary change and  
hope. On April 17, I went to Michigan to outline how my  
Administration will engage to promote change in Eastern Europe.  
I used the example of Poland to show that the United States will  
take an active part in encouraging, and assisting, fundamental  
political and economic reform. On May 2 I addressed the Council  
of the Americas on my policies toward Latin America. A few days  
ago, in Texas, I spoke to another group of graduates about our

new approach to the Soviet Union, about our intention to move **beyond containment** to seek to integrate the Soviet Union into the community of nations and help them share in the benefits of international cooperation. I said we will work **with** the Soviet leaders, not against them, as they make enduring and ingrained changes that encourage freedom, as they become a partner in solving the world's problems rather than contributing to them.

But today, I want to discuss our relationship with Western Europe, the source of so much of the culture and so many of the ideas that are part of America. I am pleased to share this opportunity with a special friend of America . . . President Mitterrand, you have the warm affection and high regard of the American people. I remember well when I joined you in Yorktown, in 1981, to celebrate the bicentennial of that first Franco-American partnership in the decisive battle to win America's freedom. It is highly appropriate that you should now be here in Boston, where that struggle began, and that, on July 14, I will join you in Paris for the 200th anniversary of France's fight for political freedom. The interrelationship between our revolution and yours is but one example of the inseparable bond between the United States and Western Europe.

From the Old North Church, to Paul Revere's home now nestled in the warm heart of the Italian North End, to the song-filled Irish pubs of Southy, the Old World and the New come together in

Boston. But as we look back to Old World tradition, we must look ahead to a changing Europe. From foreign policy to economics -- these changes will shape your careers and your very lives.

Forty-two years ago, just across the Charles River, Secretary of State George Marshall gave a commencement address that outlined a plan to help Europe revive. Western Europe responded heroically, and then joined with us in a partnership to protect this fragile reconstruction. Behind this shield, Europe has now enjoyed forty years of peace, the longest period of peace the continent has ever known. Behind this shield, the nations of Western Europe have risen from privation to prosperity -- all because freedom works.

Today, of course, the generations coming of age in America and Western Europe can hardly be expected to feel the grip of past anxieties. We have been at peace for so long, it is hard to remember how it could be otherwise. I can understand the eagerness to embrace the millen<sup>n</sup>ium and declare concerns about security and freedom to be troubles of the past. But our expectations should not race so far ahead of reality that we lose our sense of perspective.

There is a great irony here. While the West is tested by complacency, an ideological earthquake in the East is shaking asunder the very foundation of Communist societies. Eastern

European peoples are asserting their yearning for self-determination, for a reconciliation of the two halves of Europe. Yet, while the Soviets continue to talk about a united Europe, we will remind them that **they** are responsible for the Berlin Wall, the Brezhnev Doctrine, the guard towers, which divide Europe.

Mr. Gorbachev speaks of a vision of a Europe joined in a common European home.' But, friends, when were you last in a home in which ~~the rooms were separated by barbed wire?~~ *the doors to Europe locked, windows closed to the world.*

I too have a vision of why nations join together. It is not limited by the accidents of mere geography. It is, instead, a kinship rooted in common values, in common ideals for the way people should live. I believe the nations of the Atlantic community have been the founding members of a **global Commonwealth of Free Nations**, open to all who share the eternal values of democracy, openness, and respect for human rights and private endeavor.

*R.A. quote*

So, as the democracies enter a new era of testing and of hope, let me declare some of the principles which guide America's policies toward our friends in Western Europe. First and foremost, the transatlantic relationship remains at the center of American foreign policy, as it has throughout our history. Two world wars in this century have reminded us that Europe's future, and Europe's security, is inseparable from our own future, and our security.

America ~~therefore~~ remains committed to preserving freedom in Europe by whatever means are necessary, in accordance with agreed Alliance strategy. Our nuclear forces must be part of this commitment. Nuclear weapons make the prevention of war so imperative that, for that very reason, the ancient dream of preventing war has -- for the first time -- become attainable. We cannot unlearn how to make these weapons. So, instead of vainly attempting to turn back the clock, we should decide how to use this terrifying reality to fulfill the potential for a safer, more stable, world.

Common sense tells us that any would-be aggressor must understand that he would be met, in Western Europe, with any level of force needed to repel his attack and frustrate his designs. The option of going to war must always be full of incalculable risks for a possible attacker. This is the essence of our strategy of "flexible response." And the nuclear forces we base in Europe, kept up to date as needed, are the proof of our commitment to make this strategy work. Naturally, we try to hold these weapons to the lowest possible level. The fact is, we have unilaterally withdrawn ((and destroyed)) thousands of weapons from Europe in the last decade. Without much fanfare, a third of our stockpile has been removed. Still, as my friend President Mitterrand has recognized both in word and deed, **nuclear forces remain the ultimate deterrent against aggression.**

**There is no substitute.**

((I want to comment briefly on the Soviet approach. Last week, I made concrete proposals to bring more openness to military activities and trade relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. But, I also warned that history has revealed a seasonal nature to Soviet policy, with summers of friendship followed by winters of ~~malice~~ <sup>suspicion</sup>. I said that perestroika raises our hopes that Moscow is ready for a true break with the past. Last week's headlines were not encouraging. The Soviet Foreign Minister threatened to violate the INF Treaty, a solemn agreement signed and ratified by our two countries, if we plan our defense in a way - perfectly legal under the treaty - which the Soviet Union does not like. Are we now to understand that Soviet adherence to this treaty is conditional? This does not seem to be an example of 'new thinking,' and it does not bring us closer together.))

Let me return to another vital principle of America's relationship to Western Europe. In addition to nuclear forces, we remain committed to the conventional defense of Europe. Specifically, **we are prepared to maintain, in cooperation with our allies, U.S. ground and air forces in Europe so long as the Soviet Union remains the dominant military power in Eurasia.** I will reject legislative attempts to unilaterally withdraw U.S. troops from Europe. At the same time, we seek a less militarized

A lasting peace must be built on a solid foundation. The differences of half a century cannot be settled by fleeting proclamations and ambiguous promises. It must be grounded in deeds that are concrete, not cosmetic. It must be based on changes in military and political institutions, changes that endure beyond one day's headline.

Europe, with a secure balance at lower levels of forces. Arms control efforts to achieve this goal will be a high priority of my Administration.

We also welcome, without reservation, more cooperation, within Western Europe, to strengthen the European "pillar" in Alliance defense. European defense cooperation is part of a more mature transatlantic relationship, and we applaud the work of the revitalized Western European Union -- which worked with us in keeping open the sealanes of the Persian Gulf -- and the growing military cooperation between West Germany and France. We continue to support British and French programs to modernize their own nuclear deterrent forces. Granted, part of our allies' motivation is to be a little more independent of us. But it is perfectly right and proper that Europeans should see defense as an enterprise they engage in for their own future.

In these ways, the West can prepare for a new century of peace. The future holds tremendous promise and, in this time of peace, economic and political cooperation are as the common defense.

Western Europe is moving towards far greater integration of national economies, with the ambitious goal of a single European market in 1992. For decades we have said that we want a more integrated Europe, healing national emnities. Now we must

actually prepare to live with it. Some in the United States are ambivalent about this prospect and fearful that Europe will become an economic fortress shutting out the U.S. and others. I tell you today that I reject this ambivalence. The United States welcomes a strong, prosperous, and economically united Europe -- a Europe able and willing to play a larger role in the world economy. **We believe that European unity and the NATO partnership are not in conflict. They can and will reinforce each other.**

We will seek an enhanced dialogue with the European Community and new mechanisms for cooperation in the economic transition to 1992. And the United States also welcomes the growing political role of the European Community. We are ready to develop -- in partnership with the EC -- new avenues of consultation and cooperation on global issues, whether it is strengthening the economies of the Third World, encouraging the spread of democracy, or protecting the world environment.

A more mature partnership with Western Europe will not be easy. There will be differing views, on trade and on other problems. But just as we must not mistake adversaries for allies, so we must not mistake our allies for adversaries. What a tragedy -- what an absurdity -- it would be if future historians traced the demise of the Western alliance to dispute over produce, and wars over pasta.

We are confident that the Europe of 1992 will adopt the lower barriers of the modern international economy, not the walls and moats of medieval commerce. We want to see what President Kennedy referred to as an "outward-looking" Europe, and I know this vision is shared by President Mitterrand.

We see a new resurgence of the vast genius and potential of Europe. **Such a resurgent Western Europe will be a magnet drawing the nations of Eastern Europe into the Twenty-First century, into the commonwealth of free nations.**

Nineteen-ninety-two is the five hundredth anniversary of the discovery of the New World. So we have five centuries to celebrate, not just four decades. We will celebrate the American Bill of Rights and the French Rights of Man, the ancient and unwritten Constitution of Great Britain, and the democratic vision of Konrad Adenauer and Alcide de Gasperi. (The modern vitality of Europe -- its prosperity, its freedom, and its unity -- is the vindication and culmination of values that we cherish.)

Map  
Council committee:  
time / new policy

MSC draft

Libertarianism  
- apply to cons  
- Cicconi

SMF - cons pic.  
Goeb.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 17, 1989

MEMORANDUM TO CHRISS WINSTON

FROM: JIM PINKERTON 

SUBJECT: Boston University Draft Speech

-----

This important and serious speech is well-written. We liked lines like "disputes over produce, and wars over pasta." We also liked the linkage established on the first and second pages, between the various commencement speeches.

While we have no problem with the tough tone on pages 4, 5 and 6, we are concerned about several perhaps overly-hawkish statements [e.g., see 3,2 below]. We want to share our feeling that this speech could be seen as added frost on the verbal exchanges of the last couple of days.

Pg. 1, para. 3, line 2 "...grads..." is too colloquial. We suggest "graduates."

3,1,1-5 We see two problems: First, "fragile reconstruction" is the wrong choice of words to describe 40 years of prosperity. We'd suggest "heroic reconstruction."

Second, we wonder what "this shield" refers to. If we are talking about NATO, or Western resolve, or containment, we ought to say what we mean.

3,2,4 "But the history you learned in this university is the only past you will inherit." This is obviously untrue in the sense that you learn history, and inherit the past, outside of college as well. We suggest omitting the line.

If we wish to refer to the B.U. audience in stressing the importance of not forgetting history, we can do it in the next sentence by saying something like "Any student of history, especially at B.U, will remember...."

(more)

2-2-2

3,2 "Sarajevo," "Danzig," etc.: This digression into the origins of the past two World Wars seems ripe for misunderstanding. To repeat, we aren't questioning the strategy involved here, we are simply sharing our concern about possible reaction to some of these word choices.

3,3,6 We question the use of "...illegitimate regimes...." Do we, at this point in time, want to blanketly stigmatize all Eastern European governments? If the President says this, people will ask what business we have dealing with them, our precise criteria for determining illegitimacy, etc. Far better, we think, to simply say "repressive."

6,2,3 "[T]he Soviet season" should be plural since we are speaking of more than one season.

7,3,1 "...transition to 1992..." is inadequate. We suggest a stronger formulation of our goal in the lead sentence, such as: "We will seek to cooperate with the European Economic Community to promote prosperity and cooperation on both sides of the Atlantic in the crucial years to come."

8,3,1 We suggest changing "We want the Europe of 1992 to adopt..." to "We hope that Europe of 1992 will adopt...."

8,3,3 Again, we suggest changing "We want..." to "We hope...."

8,3,4 And we suggest changing "And we are hopeful..." to "And we are confident...."

#

# WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 05/16/89 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: Noon 05/17/89

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: BOSTON UNIVERSITY  
(05/16 6:00 p.m.-draft 3)

	ACTION FYI			ACTION FYI	
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUNUNU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NEWMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	STUDDERT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
BATES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	UNTERMAYER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BREEDEN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ROGERS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PINKERTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CICCONI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	WINSTON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ROSE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HAGIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**REMARKS:**

Please provide any comments/recommendations directly to Chriss Winston (Rm. 122, x2930) by Noon on Wednesday, 05/17, with an info copy to my office. Thanks.

**RESPONSE:**

*See charges*

**James W. Cicconi**  
**Assistant to the President**  
**and Deputy to the Chief of Staff**  
**Ext. 2702**

Davis/Zelikow/Martin  
May 16, 1989/6 p.m.  
Draft: ~~Three~~

MAY 13 PM 7:20

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: BOSTON UNIVERSITY/Nickerson Field  
MAY 21, 1989/11 a.m.

Thank you, John. It's a pleasure to be back in Boston.  
((And it's a pleasure to be back in one of my home states . . .  
Congratulations, Barbara, on a B.U. degree of your very own. And  
now that you're an alumnus, take note -- this kinder and gentler  
America I'm always speaking of doesn't include the Terriers . .  
.))

I am pleased to share this opportunity with a special friend  
of America . . . President Mitterand, you have the warm affection  
and high regard of the American people. ((Anecdote to come.))

My sincerest congratulations go to every Boston University  
graduate, and to every proud parent. As B.U. grads, you take  
with you a degree from a great institution, and something more --  
knowledge of the past, and responsibility for the future.

It is with your future in mind that I have undertaken a  
series of foreign policy reviews, the basis for bold new  
policies. On April 17, I went to Michigan to outline how my  
Administration will meet welcome changes in Eastern Europe. I  
announced that the United States will actively encourage and

assist reform in Eastern Europe, and I backed up this commitment with measures to deepen economic relations as those governments allow for greater freedom. A few days ago in Texas, I spoke to another group of graduates about our changing relationship with the Soviet Union. I declared our intention to move beyond containment, to integrate the Soviet Union into the community of nations. I said the United States will work **with** the leaders of the Soviet Union, not **against** them, as they institutionalize changes that encourage freedom and peaceful cooperation.

But today, I want to discuss the future of Europe, that mother of nations and ideas that are so much a part of America. Just consider this city. From the Old North Church, to Paul Revere's home now nestled in the warm heart of the Italian North End, to the song-filled Irish pubs of Southy . . . the Old and New Worlds are inseparable in Boston.

But as we look back to Old World tradition, we must look ahead to changes in Europe. From foreign policy to economics -- these changes will shape your careers and your very lives. Can America keep up with the brisk pace of change around the world? More importantly, can we stay ahead of those changes? Absolutely.

Forty-two years ago, just across the Charles River, Secretary of State George Marshall gave a commencement address

that outlined a plan to revive Europe. Western Europe responded heroically, and then joined with us <sup>to form the NATO Alliance that has protected</sup> ~~to protect~~ this fragile reconstruction. Behind this shield, Europe has now enjoyed forty years of peace, the longest period of peace Europeans have ever known. Behind this shield, the nations of Western Europe have risen from privation to prosperity -- all because freedom works.

Of course, the generations coming of age in America and Western Europe today can hardly be expected to feel the grip of past anxieties -- the fears of those who fought in a wars that began at Sarajevo (Sarah-HAY-vo) and Danzig. But the history you learned in this university is the only past you will inherit. Any student of history will remember that democracies reach the moment of maximum danger when they reach maximum complacency. I understand that when people have been at peace for a long time, it is easy to forget that it could be otherwise. I can understand the frustration of those who rush to embrace the new millennium. <sup>um</sup> But our expectations cannot race so far ahead of reality that we lose sight of what's at stake.

B. Howard

Paragraph a bit obscure

?

?

Raul 5044

too bombastic

Raul 5044

There is a great irony here. At the very moment the Alliance is tested by complacency, an ideological earthquake in the societies of the East is shaking asunder the very premise of Communism. In Eastern Europe, a powerful yearning for self-determination is asserting itself, a yearning which will not be satisfied by a mere easing of the grip of illegitimate regimes.

In the Soviet Union, the extent of reform itself is a dramatic confession of failure. Yet they cling to the enforced division of Europe. As the Soviets continue to talk about a united Europe, we will remind them that it is **their** Berlin Wall, **their** Brezhnev Doctrine, **their** guard towers, **their** barbed wire, which divide Europe. **Mr. Gorbachev says he has a vision of a common European home. But Mr. Gorbachev, your vision of this home will not inspire us until you first unlock doors and open windows to the world . . .**

My vision goes far beyond the boundaries of mere geography. My vision is one of a **global Commonwealth of Free Nations** united by eternal values of democracy, openness and respect for human rights -- with the nations of the Alliance as its founding members.

The Alliance is also the means through which West will deal with East. ((Quote to come from Raymond Aron on partnership)) Our allies should know that we will consult with them constantly, and remain sensitive to their vital interests. **They should also know this: There will be no surprises from the United States.**

As democracies, we will have disagreements. But the West must ultimately stand solid and united in the face of the Soviet threat. The United States remains committed to the belief that

the defense of Europe and the deterrence of war requires nuclear weapons, including short-range nuclear weapons. These weapons have made the prevention of war an absolute and fearsome necessity. The destructive power of these weapons is so terrible as to banish forever the delusions of a would-be aggressor. And it is this very destructive power which serves a constructive purpose -- to bring the ancient dream of ending war within our reach.

press release says he wants

Common sense tells us that we must maintain the means to convince an aggressor that he would be met in Western Europe with any level of force needed to repel his attack and frustrate his designs. This is the essence of our strategy of "flexible response." We will keep and maintain the nuclear forces we base in Europe as proof of our commitment. We will hold these weapons at the lowest possible level. Mr. Gorbachev's latest ~~promise to withdraw 500 warheads~~ <sup>means we should</sup> ~~means we should~~ withdraw a proportionate ~~number, it would be just equivalent.~~ <sup>number, it would be just</sup> ~~equivalent.~~ <sup>equivalent.</sup> ~~Fine. ((That's four warheads.))~~ So much for public relations. Now let's get back to substance.

Paul  
75044

*Fine. But he has so many more than we have that if we were to*

Mr. Gorbachev's

The fact is, we have unilaterally withdrawn thousands of weapons in the last decade, more than a third of our stockpile. Still, as my friend President Mitterand recognizes in word and deed, nuclear forces still remain the ~~ultimate~~ deterrent. There is no substitute.

to war and safeguards for peace.

most powerful

Our policy approach springs from seventy years of Soviet international behavior. We welcome Soviet reforms, but we will continue to scrupulously evaluate Soviet intentions.

Last week, I gave concrete proposals to seek more openness between the United States and the Soviet Union on military and trade issues. But, I also warned of the Soviet season, where every summer of friendship is followed by a winter of suspicion. A look at last week's headlines proves this point. The Soviet Foreign Minister has <sup>already</sup> threatened to violate the INF <sup>that just signed.</sup> treaty if we ~~take actions fully allowed by the treaty, and fully foreseeable at the time the treaty was signed.~~ Are we now to understand that <sup>adherence to</sup> the Soviet ~~implementation of~~ the INF Treaty is conditional? Is this an example of what we can expect from "new thinking?" Or is it the same old party line? Whatever it is, it does not bring us closer together.

Rec'd 45044

to our making further concessions to them

→ Add reference to recent news articles on Soviet Constitution

We also remain committed to the conventional defense of Europe. Of course, we want a more secure balance, at lower levels. But I will reject legislative attempts to unilaterally withdraw U.S. troops from Europe. We are disturbed by the way in which the Soviet Union deploys its forces in a forward posture, taking full advantage of its superior geographic position. We will maintain, in cooperation with our allies, U.S. ground and air forces in Europe so long as the Soviet Union remains the dominant military power in Eurasia.

We welcome European defense coordination as a new stage in trans-Atlantic relations. The Alliance needs a strong European "pillar." And we see such a pillar of strength arising in the revitalized Western European Union, and in its coordinated effort with the United States in the Persian Gulf. We applaud the growing defense cooperation of West Germany and France, and support the modernization of the British and French independent nuclear deterrent.

In these ways, the Western Alliance can maintain a common strategic policy. But in a time of peace, economic and political cooperation can be almost as critical to the Alliance as a united strategic approach. Some in the United States are ambivalent about the integration of Europe in 1992. They look to the past. My mission is to look to the future. The United States welcomes a larger European role in the world. **We believe that European unity and the NATO partnership are not in conflict. We believe they reinforce each other.**

We will seek new ways to manage the transition to 1992. And the United States also welcomes the political role of the European Community. If the EC agrees, we are eager to develop and intensify new avenues of consultation and cooperation on global issues -- whether it is strengthening the economies of the

Third World, encouraging the spread of democracy, or protecting the environment.

We must especially avoid prolonged and bitter disputes over trade. Just as we must not mistake adversaries for allies, so we must not mistake our allies for adversaries. What a tragedy -- what an absurdity -- it would be if future historians attribute the demise of the Western Alliance to disputes over produce, and wars over pasta.

We want the Europe of 1992 to adopt the lower barriers of the modern world economy, not the high walls and moats of medieval commerce. We want to see what President Kennedy referred to as an "outward-looking" Europe. And we are hopeful that a resurgent Western Europe will be a magnet drawing the nations of Eastern Europe into the Twenty-First Century.

Twice in this century, American blood has been shed over conflicts that began in Europe. So Americans share the fervent desire of Europeans to relegate war forever to the province of distant memories.

Nineteen-ninety-two is the five hundredth anniversary of the discovery of the New World. So we have five centuries to celebrate, not just four decades. We will celebrate the American Bill of Rights and the French Rights of Man, the ancient and

unwritten Constitution of Great Britain, and the democratic vision of Konrad Adenauer and Alcide de Gasperi.

((Quote to come from Jean Monnet))

# WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 05/16/89 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: Noon 05/17/89

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: BOSTON UNIVERSITY  
(05/16 6:00 p.m.-draft 3)

	ACTION FYI			ACTION FYI	
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUNUNU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NEWMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	STUDDERT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
BATES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	UNTERMAYER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BREEDEN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ROGERS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PINKERTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CICCONI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	WINSTON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ROSE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HAGIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**REMARKS:**

Please provide any comments/recommendations directly to Chriss Winston (Rm. 122, x2930) by Noon on Wednesday, 05/17, with an info copy to my office. Thanks.

**RESPONSE:**

*OK  
 (Cicconi)  
 5/17*

**James W. Cicconi**  
 Assistant to the President  
 and Deputy to the Chief of Staff  
 Ext. 2702

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

May 17, 1989

MEMORANDUM FOR CHRISS WINSTON  
DEPUTY ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT  
FOR COMMUNICATIONS

FROM: PATRICIA MACK BRYAN *PMB*  
ASSOCIATE COUNSEL TO THE PRESIDENT

SUBJECT: Presidential Remarks: Boston University

Pursuant to James W. Cicconi's staffing memorandum of May 16, 1989, Counsel's Office has reviewed the above referenced presidential remarks. We have no legal objection to these remarks; although we defer to the NSC as to the accuracy of the statements on page 6 involving the meaning of the INF treaty.

Thank you for bringing this matter to our attention.

cc: James W. Cicconi

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 16, 1989

MEMORANDUM FOR CHRISS WINSTON

FROM: ROGER B. PORTER *RBP*  
SUBJECT: Presidential Remarks: Boston University

I have reviewed the draft remarks for the President's address at Boston University and have no policy changes to suggest. The thrust of the speech is on foreign policy and I have all that I can handle attempting to keep track of economic and domestic policy.

I do, however, have one minor editorial suggestion in the second paragraph of page seven. I recommend that the third sentence read: "Some in the United States are ambivalent about the European Community's efforts to create a single internal market by the year 1992."

If you have any questions, please let me know.

cc: James W. Cicconi

## WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** 05/16/89      **ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY:** Noon 05/17/89

**SUBJECT:** PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: BOSTON UNIVERSITY  
(05/16 6:00 p.m.-draft 3)

	ACTION FYI			ACTION FYI	
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUNUNU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NEWMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	STUDDERT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
BATES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	UNTERMAYER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BREEDEN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ROGERS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	PINKERTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CICCONI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	WINSTON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ROSE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HAGIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**REMARKS:**

Please provide any comments/recommendations directly to Chriss Winston (Rm. 122, x2930) by Noon on Wednesday, 05/17, with an info copy to my office. Thanks.

**RESPONSE:**

**James W. Cicconi**  
 Assistant to the President  
 and Deputy to the Chief of Staff  
 Ext. 2702

Davis/Zelikow/Martin  
May 16, 1989/6 p.m.  
Draft: ~~three~~

MAY 13 PM 7:20

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: BOSTON UNIVERSITY/Nickerson Field  
MAY 21, 1989/11 a.m.

Thank you, John. It's a pleasure to be back in Boston.  
((And it's a pleasure to be back in one of my home states . . .  
Congratulations, Barbara, on a B.U. degree of your very own. And  
now that you're an alumnus, take note -- this kinder and gentler  
America I'm always speaking of doesn't include the Terriers . .  
.))

I am pleased to share this opportunity with a special friend  
of America . . . President Mitterand, you have the warm affection  
and high regard of the American people. ((Anecdote to come.))

My sincerest congratulations go to every Boston University  
graduate, and to every proud parent. As B.U. grads, you take  
with you a degree from a great institution, and something more --  
knowledge of the past, and responsibility for the future.

It is with your future in mind that I have undertaken a  
series of foreign policy reviews, the basis for bold new  
policies. On April 17, I went to Michigan to outline how my  
Administration will meet welcome changes in Eastern Europe. I  
announced that the United States will actively encourage and

assist reform in Eastern Europe, and I backed up this commitment with measures to deepen economic relations as those governments allow for greater freedom. A few days ago in Texas, I spoke to another group of graduates about our changing relationship with the Soviet Union. I declared our intention to move beyond containment, to integrate the Soviet Union into the community of nations. I said the United States will work **with** the leaders of the Soviet Union, not **against** them, as they institutionalize changes that encourage freedom and peaceful cooperation.

But today, I want to discuss the future of Europe, that mother of nations and ideas that are so much a part of America. Just consider this city. From the Old North Church, to Paul Revere's home now nestled in the warm heart of the Italian North End, to the song-filled Irish pubs of Southy . . . the Old and New Worlds are inseparable in Boston.

But as we look back to Old World tradition, we must look ahead to changes in Europe. From foreign policy to economics -- these changes will shape your careers and your very lives. Can America keep up with the brisk pace of change around the world? More importantly, can we stay ahead of those changes? Absolutely.

Forty-two years ago, just across the Charles River, Secretary of State George Marshall gave a commencement address

that outlined a plan to revive Europe. Western Europe responded heroically, and then joined with us to protect this fragile reconstruction. Behind this shield, Europe has now enjoyed forty years of peace, the longest period of peace Europeans have ever known. Behind this shield, the nations of Western Europe have risen from privation to prosperity -- all because freedom works.

Of course, the generations coming of age in America and Western Europe today can hardly be expected to feel the grip of past anxieties -- the fears of those who fought in a wars that began at Sarajevo (Sarah-HAY-vo) and Danzig. But the history you learned in this university is the only past you will inherit. Any student of history will remember that democracies reach the moment of maximum danger when they reach maximum complacency. I understand that when people have been at peace for a long time, it is easy to forget that it could be otherwise. I can understand the frustration of those who rush to embrace the new millennia. But our expectations cannot race so far ahead of reality that we lose sight of what's at stake.

There is a great irony here. At the very moment the Alliance is tested by complacency, an ideological earthquake in the societies of the East is shaking asunder the very premise of Communism. In Eastern Europe, a powerful yearning for self-determination is asserting itself, a yearning which will not be satisfied by a mere easing of the grip of illegitimate regimes.

In the Soviet Union, the extent of reform itself is a dramatic confession of failure. Yet they cling to the enforced division of Europe. As the Soviets continue to talk about a united Europe, we will remind them that it is **their** Berlin Wall, **their** Brezhnev Doctrine, **their** guard towers, **their** barbed wire, which divide Europe. **Mr. Gorbachev says he has a vision of a common European home. But Mr. Gorbachev, your vision of this home will not inspire us until you first unlock doors and open windows to the world . . .**

My vision goes far beyond the boundaries of mere geography. My vision is one of a **global Commonwealth of Free Nations** united by eternal values of democracy, openness and respect for human rights -- with the nations of the Alliance as its founding members.

The Alliance is also the means through which West will deal with East. ((Quote to come from Raymond Aron on partnership)) Our allies should know that we will consult with them constantly, and remain sensitive to their vital interests. **They should also know this: There will be no surprises from the United States.**

As democracies, we will have disagreements. But the West must ultimately stand solid and united in the face of the Soviet threat. The United States remains committed to the belief that

the defense of Europe and the deterrence of war requires nuclear weapons, including short-range nuclear weapons. These weapons have made the prevention of war an absolute and fearsome necessity. The destructive power of these weapons is so terrible as to banish forever the delusions of a would-be aggressor. And it is this very destructive power which serves a constructive purpose -- to bring the ancient dream of ending war within our reach.

Common sense tells us that we must maintain the means to convince an aggressor that he would be met in Western Europe with any level of force needed to repel his attack and frustrate his designs. This is the essence of our strategy of "flexible response." We will keep and maintain the nuclear forces we base in Europe as proof of our commitment. We will hold these weapons at the lowest possible level. Mr. Gorbachev's latest promise to withdraw 500 warheads means we should withdraw a proportionate equivalent. Fine. **((That's four warheads.))** So much for public relations. Now let's get back to substance.

The fact is, we have unilaterally withdrawn thousands of weapons in the last decade, more than a third of our stockpile. Still, as my friend President Mitterand recognizes in word and deed, **nuclear forces still remain the ultimate deterrent. There is no substitute.**

Our policy approach springs from seventy years of Soviet international behavior. We welcome Soviet reforms, but we will continue to scrupulously evaluate Soviet intentions.

Last week, I gave concrete proposals to seek more openness between the United States and the Soviet Union on military and trade issues. But, I also warned of the Soviet season, where every summer of friendship is followed by a winter of suspicion. A look at last week's headlines proves this point. The Soviet Foreign Minister has threatened to violate the INF treaty if we take actions fully allowed by the treaty, and fully foreseeable at the time the treaty was signed. Are we now to understand that the Soviet implementation of the INF Treaty is conditional? Is this an example of what we can expect from "new thinking?" Or is it the same old party line? Whatever it is, it does not bring us closer together.

We also remain committed to the conventional defense of Europe. Of course, we want a more secure balance, at lower levels. But I will reject legislative attempts to unilaterally withdraw U.S. troops from Europe. We are disturbed by the way in which the Soviet Union deploys its forces in a forward posture, taking full advantage of its superior geographic position. We will maintain, in cooperation with our allies, U.S. ground and air forces in Europe so long as the Soviet Union remains the dominant military power in Eurasia.

We welcome European defense coordination as a new stage in trans-Atlantic relations. The Alliance needs a strong European "pillar." And we see such a pillar of strength arising in the revitalized Western European Union, and in its coordinated effort with the United States in the Persian Gulf. We applaud the growing defense cooperation of West Germany and France, and support the modernization of the British and French independent nuclear deterrent.

In these ways, the Western Alliance can maintain a common strategic policy. But in a time of peace, economic and political cooperation can be almost as critical to the Alliance as a united strategic approach. Some in the United States are ambivalent about the ~~integration of Europe in~~ <sup>single</sup> 1992. They look to the past. *the European Community's efforts to create a common internal market by the year* My mission is to look to the future. The United States welcomes a larger European role in the world. We believe that European unity and the NATO partnership are not in conflict. We believe they reinforce each other.

We will seek new ways to manage the transition to 1992. And the United States also welcomes the political role of the European Community. If the EC agrees, we are eager to develop and intensify new avenues of consultation and cooperation on global issues -- whether it is strengthening the economies of the

Third World, encouraging the spread of democracy, or protecting the environment.

We must especially avoid prolonged and bitter disputes over trade. Just as we must not mistake adversaries for allies, so we must not mistake our allies for adversaries. What a tragedy -- what an absurdity -- it would be if future historians attribute the demise of the Western Alliance to disputes over produce, and wars over pasta.

We want the Europe of 1992 to adopt the lower barriers of the modern world economy, not the high walls and moats of medieval commerce. We want to see what President Kennedy referred to as an "outward-looking" Europe. And we are hopeful that a resurgent Western Europe will be a magnet drawing the nations of Eastern Europe into the Twenty-First Century.

Twice in this century, American blood has been shed over conflicts that began in Europe. So Americans share the fervent desire of Europeans to relegate war forever to the province of distant memories.

Nineteen-ninety-two is the five hundredth anniversary of the discovery of the New World. So we have five centuries to celebrate, not just four decades. We will celebrate the American Bill of Rights and the French Rights of Man, the ancient and

unwritten Constitution of Great Britain, and the democratic vision of Konrad Adenauer and Alcide de Gasperi.

((Quote to come from Jean Monnet))

#655

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary  
(Boston, Massachusetts)

For Immediate Release

May 21, 1989

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT  
AT BOSTON UNIVERSITY COMMENCEMENT CEREMONY

Boston University  
Boston, Massachusetts

12:33 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, President Silber. And President and Madame Mitterrand, it's a great honor to have you here today. And to Governor Dukakis, my respects -- the Chief Executive of this great state and my friend as well. To Mayor Flynn, His Eminence Cardinal Law, and Dr. Metcalf, Dr. Wiesel, and yes, Kimberly, to you for that wonderful speech earlier on. And to Nancy Joaquim, who rendered both The Marseillaise and The Star-Spangled Banner in such fine way.

It's a pleasure to be back in Boston, back in one of my home states -- (laughter) -- and I am delighted and honored to receive a Doctor of Laws from Boston University along with President Mitterrand. (Applause.) Doctor of Laws -- does this now make us a couple of Boston lawyers, my friend, Mr. Mitterrand? (Laughter.) Who knows?

I also would like to salute another most distinguished visitor -- Prime Minister Mahathir of Malaysia -- a friend to the United States, whose son is graduating today. We're honored to have him here. (Applause.)

And I want to congratulate Barbara on a B.U. degree of her very own. (Laughter and applause.) And now that you're an alumna, take note -- this kinder and gentler America that I'm speaking of does not always include the Terriers. (Laughter.)

My sincerest congratulations go to every Boston University graduate, and to all you proud parents cooking out along the 50-yard line there. (Laughter and applause.) And as Boston University graduates, you take with you a degree from a great institution, and something more -- (applause) -- something more -- knowledge of the past and responsibility for the future. And take a look at our world today. Nations are undergoing changes so radical that the international system you know and will know in the future will be as different from today's, as today's world is from the time of Woodrow Wilson. How will America prepare, then, for the challenges ahead?

It's with your future in mind that, after deliberation and a review, we are adapting our foreign policies to meet this

1981 to celebrate the bicentennial of that first Franco-American fight for freedom. And soon, I will join you in Paris, sir, to observe the 200th anniversary of the French struggle for liberty and equality. (Applause.)

And this is just one example of the special bond between two continents. But consider this city. From the Old North Church to Paul Revere's home nestled in the warm heart of the Italian North End, to your famous song-filled Irish pubs -- the Old and New Worlds are inseparable in this city. But as we look back to Old World tradition, we must look ahead to a new Europe. Historic changes will shape your careers and your very lives.

The changes that are occurring in Western Europe are less dramatic than those taking place in the East, but they are no less fundamental. The postwar order that began in 1945 is transforming into something very different. And yet certain essentials remain, because our Alliance with Western Europe is utterly unlike the cynical power alliances of the past. It is based on far more than the perception of a common enemy. It is a tie of culture and kinship and shared values. And as we look toward the 21st century, Americans and Europeans alike should remember the words of Raymond Aron, who called the Alliance a "moral and spiritual community." Our ideals are those of the American Bill of Rights and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man. And it is precisely because the ideals of this community are universal that the world is in ferment today.

Now a new century holds the promise of a united Europe. And as you know, the nations of Western Europe are already moving toward greater economic integration, with the ambitious goal of a single European market in 1992. The United States has often declared it seeks a healing of old enmities, an integration of Europe. And at the same time, there has been an historical ambivalence on the part of some Americans towards a more united Europe. To this ambivalence has been added apprehension at the prospect of 1992. But whatever others may think, this administration is of one mind. We believe a strong, united Europe means a strong America. (Applause.)

Western Europe has a gross domestic product that is roughly equal to our own and a population that exceeds ours. European science leads the world in many fields, and European workers are highly educated and highly skilled. We are ready to develop, with the European Community and its member states, new mechanisms of consultation and cooperation on political and global issues from strengthening the forces of democracy in the Third World to managing regional tensions, to putting an end to the division of Europe. A resurgent Western Europe is an economic magnet, drawing Eastern Europe closer toward the commonwealth of free nations. A more mature partnership with Western Europe will pose new challenges. There are certain to be clashes and controversies over economic issues. America will, of course, defend its interests. But it is important to distinguish adversaries from allies and allies from adversaries. What a tragedy; what an absurdity it would be if future historians attribute the demise of the Western Alliance to disputes over beef hormones and wars over pasta. We must all work hard to ensure that the Europe of 1992 will adopt the lower barriers of the modern international economy, not the high walls and the moats of medieval commerce.

of peace the continent has ever known. (Applause.) Behind this shield, the nations of Western Europe have risen from privation to prosperity -- all because of the strength and resolve of free peoples.

With a Western Europe that is now coming together, we recognize that new forms of cooperation must be developed. We applaud the defense cooperation developing in the revitalized Western European Union, whose members worked with us to keep open the sea-lanes of the Persian Gulf. And we applaud the growing military cooperation between West Germany and France. And we welcome British and French programs to modernize their deterrent capability and their moves toward cooperation in this area. It is perfectly right and proper that Europeans increasingly see their defense cooperation as an investment in a secure future. But we do have a major concern of a different order -- a growing complacency throughout the West.

And, of course, your generation can hardly be expected to share the grip of past anxieties. With such a long peace, it is hard to imagine how it could be otherwise. But our expectations in this rapidly changing world cannot race so far ahead that we forget what is at stake. There's a great irony here. While an ideological earthquake is shaking asunder the very communist foundation, the West is being tested by complacency.

We must never forget that twice in this century, American blood has been shed over conflicts that began in Europe. And we share the fervent desire of Europeans to relegate war forever to the province of distant memory. (Applause.) But that is why the Atlantic Alliance is so central to our foreign policy. And that's why America remains committed to the Alliance and the strategy which has preserved freedom in Europe. We must never forget that to keep the peace in Europe is to keep the peace for America.

NATO's policy of flexible response keeps the United States linked to Europe and lets any would-be aggressors know that they will be met with any level of force needed to repel their attack and frustrate their designs. And our short-range deterrent forces based in Europe, and kept up-to-date, demonstrate that America's vital interests are bound inextricably to Western Europe, and that an attacker can never gamble on a test of strength with just our conventional forces. Though hope is now running high for a more peaceful continent, the history of this century teaches Americans and Europeans to remain prepared.

As we search for a peace that is enduring, I'm grateful for the steps that Mr. Gorbachev is taking. If the Soviets advance solid and constructive plans for peace, then we should give credit where credit is due. And we're seeing sweeping changes in the Soviet Union that show promise of enduring, of becoming ingrained. At the same time, in an era of extraordinary change, we have an obligation to temper optimism -- and I am optimistic -- with prudence.

For example, the Soviet Foreign Minister informed the world last week that his nation's commitment to destroy SS-23 missiles under the recently enacted INF Treaty may be reversible. And the Soviets must surely know the results of failure to comply with this solemn agreement. Perhaps their purpose was to divide the West on other issues that you're reading about in the papers today.

- 4 -

my administration will place a high and continuing priority on negotiating a less militarized Europe, one with a secure conventional force balance at lower levels of forces. Our aspiration is a real peace -- a peace of shared optimism, not a peace of armed camps. (Applause.)

Nineteen-ninety-two is the 500th anniversary of the discovery of the New World. So we have five centuries to celebrate, nothing less than our very civilization -- the American Bill of Rights and the French Rights of Man, the ancient and unwritten Constitution of Great Britain, and the democratic visions of Konrad Adenauer and Alcide de Gasperi.

And in all our celebrations, we observe one fact: this truly is a moral and spiritual community. It is our inheritance and so let us protect it. Let us promote it. Let us treasure it for our children, for Americans and Europeans yet unborn. We stand with France as part of a solid Alliance. And once again, let me say how proud I am to have received this degree from this noble institution and to have shared this platform with the President of the French Republic Francois Mitterrand.

Thank you very, very much. Viva la France and long live the United States of America. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END

12:50 P.M. EDT