

Originally Processed With FOIA(s):

S

FOIA Number:

2011-2184-F

FOIA MARKER

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

Record Group/Collection: George H.W. Bush Presidential Records
Collection/Office of Origin: Speechwriting, White House Office of
Series: Speech File Draft Files
Subseries: Chron File, 1989-1993

OA/ID Number: 13488
Folder ID Number: 13488-003

Folder Title:
Coast Guard Academy Commencement, 5/24/89 [1]

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
G	26	15	7	4

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 5/24/89 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: ----

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: COAST GUARD ACADEMY COMMENCEMENT

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



REMARKS:

The attached has been forwarded to the President.

RESPONSE:

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

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: COAST GUARD ACADEMY COMMENCEMENT
NEW LONDON, CONNECTICUT
MAY 24, 1989

THANK YOU, ADMIRAL. [ACKNOWLEDGMENTS, ADMIRAL YOST, SECRETARY SKINNER, ALEX HALEY, DISTINGUISHED GUESTS.] I CONGRATULATE EACH MEMBER OF THIS YEAR'S CLASS ON RECEIVING YOUR COMMISSION INTO SUCH A PROUD SERVICE.

MENTION THE COAST GUARD, AND MOST PEOPLE THINK ABOUT LIVES SAVED AT SEA, DARING RESCUE OPERATIONS. BUT THOSE DAILY ACTS OF HEROISM ARE JUST ONE PART OF THE VITAL WORK THE COAST GUARD PERFORMS. RIGHT NOW, IN PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND, THE COAST GUARD CONTINUES TO WORK AROUND THE CLOCK IN A MAJOR ENVIRONMENTAL CLEAN-UP EFFORT. RIGHT NOW, OFF THE FLORIDA COAST, COAST GUARD PATROLS ARE CHASING DOWN DRUG SMUGGLERS -- AND KEEPING DRUGS OFF OUR STREETS. THAT MAY BE "ALL IN A DAY'S WORK" FOR THE COAST GUARD -- BUT IT'S ABSOLUTELY VITAL TO OUR NATIONAL HEALTH, WELL-BEING AND SECURITY.

I'M SURE ON THAT LONG FIRST DAY OF SWAB SUMMER, YOU NEVER THOUGHT FOUR YEARS COULD PASS SO QUICKLY. BUT THEY HAVE. YOU'VE WORKED HARD, BILLET NIGHT HAS COME AND GONE.... YOU'RE READY -- "SEMPER PARATUS" IN THE WORDS OF YOUR MOTTO -- READY TO ENTER THE COAST GUARD SERVICE, AND THE WORLD. THE TRUTH IS, THAT IS WHAT COMMENCEMENT IS ALL ABOUT. THE WORLD IS YOURS, AND TODAY'S CEREMONY IS REALLY PART OF THE CHANGE OF COMMAND FROM ONE GENERATION TO THE NEXT.

TODAY, OUR WORLD -- YOUR WORLD -- IS CHANGING, EAST AND WEST. TODAY I WANT TO SPEAK TO YOU ABOUT THE WORLD WE WANT TO SEE, AND WHAT WE CAN DO TO BRING THAT NEW WORLD INTO FOCUS.

WE LIVE IN A TIME WHEN WE ARE WITNESSING THE END OF AN IDEA: THE FINAL CHAPTER OF THE COMMUNIST EXPERIMENT. COMMUNISM IS NOW RECOGNIZED -- EVEN BY MANY WITHIN THE COMMUNIST WORLD ITSELF -- AS A FAILED SYSTEM: ONE THAT PROMISED ECONOMIC PROSPERITY BUT FAILED TO DELIVER THE GOODS, A SYSTEM THAT BUILT A WALL BETWEEN THE PEOPLE AND THEIR POLITICAL ASPIRATIONS.

BUT THE ECLIPSE OF COMMUNISM IS ONLY ONE HALF OF THE STORY OF OUR TIME. THE OTHER IS THE ASCENDANCY OF THE DEMOCRATIC IDEA. NEVER BEFORE HAS THE IDEA OF FREEDOM SO CAPTURED THE IMAGINATIONS OF MEN AND WOMEN THE WORLD OVER. NEVER BEFORE HAS THE HOPE OF FREEDOM BECKONED SO MANY. TRADE UNIONISTS IN WARSAW. THE PEOPLE OF PANAMA. RULERS CONSULTING THE RULED IN THE SOVIET UNION. AND EVEN AS WE SPEAK, THE WORLD IS TRANSFIXED BY THE DRAMATIC EVENTS IN TIANANMEN SQUARE. EVERYWHERE, THOSE VOICES ARE SPEAKING THE LANGUAGE OF DEMOCRACY AND FREEDOM. WE HEAR THEM; THE WORLD HEARS THEM; AND AMERICA WILL DO ALL IT CAN TO ENCOURAGE THEM.

SO TODAY, I WANT TO SPEAK ABOUT OUR SECURITY STRATEGY FOR THE 1990S -- ONE THAT ADVANCES AMERICAN IDEALS, AND UPHOLDS AMERICAN AIMS.

AMIDST THE MANY CHALLENGES WE'LL FACE, THERE WILL BE RISKS. BUT LET ME ASSURE YOU: WE'LL FIND MORE THAN OUR SHARE OF OPPORTUNITIES. WE AND OUR ALLIES ARE STRONG -- STRONGER THAN AT ANY POINT IN THE POST-WAR PERIOD, AND MORE CAPABLE THAN EVER OF SUPPORTING THE CAUSE OF FREEDOM.

THERE'S AN OPPORTUNITY BEFORE US TO SHAPE A NEW WORLD.

WHAT IS IT THAT WE WANT TO SEE? IT'S A GROWING COMMUNITY OF DEMOCRACIES ANCHORING INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND STABILITY, AND A DYNAMIC FREE MARKET SYSTEM GENERATING PROSPERITY AND PROGRESS ON A GLOBAL SCALE. THE ECONOMIC FOUNDATION OF THIS NEW ERA IS THE PROVEN SUCCESS OF THE FREE MARKET -- AND NURTURING THAT FOUNDATION ARE THE VALUES ROOTED IN FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY.

AMERICA WAS FOUNDED ON THESE VALUES; THEY GIVE US THE CONFIDENCE THAT FLOWS FROM STRENGTH. SO LET'S BE CLEAR ABOUT ONE THING: AMERICA LOOKS FORWARD TO THE CHALLENGE OF AN EMERGING GLOBAL MARKET. BUT THESE VALUES ARE NOT OURS ALONE; THEY ARE NOW SHARED BY OUR FRIENDS AND ALLIES AROUND THE GLOBE.

THE ECONOMIC RISE OF EUROPE AND THE NATIONS OF THE PACIFIC RIM IS THE CROWNING SUCCESS OF OUR POST-WAR POLICY.

THIS TIME IS A TIME OF TREMENDOUS OPPORTUNITY --
AND DESTINY IS IN OUR OWN HANDS. TO REACH THE WORLD WE
WANT TO SEE, WE'VE GOT HARD WORK AHEAD OF US.

O WE MUST RESOLVE INTERNATIONAL TRADE PROBLEMS THAT
THREATEN TO PIT FRIENDS AND ALLIES AGAINST ONE ANOTHER.

O WE MUST COMBAT MISGUIDED NOTIONS OF ECONOMIC
NATIONALISM THAT TELL US TO CLOSE OFF OUR ECONOMIES TO
FOREIGN COMPETITION, JUST WHEN THE GLOBAL MARKETPLACE
HAS BECOME A FACT OF LIFE.

O WE MUST OPEN THE DOOR TO THE NATIONS OF EASTERN
EUROPE AND OTHER SOCIALIST COUNTRIES THAT EMBRACE FREE
MARKET REFORMS.

O AND FINALLY, FOR DEVELOPING NATIONS HEAVILY
BURDENED WITH DEBT, WE MUST PROVIDE ASSISTANCE AND
ENCOURAGE THE MARKET REFORMS THAT WILL SET THOSE
NATIONS ON A PATH TOWARDS GROWTH.

IF WE SUCCEED, THE NEXT DECADE AND THE CENTURY BEYOND WILL BE AN ERA OF UNPARALLELED GROWTH -- AN ERA WHICH SEES THE FLOURISHING OF FREEDOM, PEACE AND PROSPERITY AROUND THE WORLD.

BUT THIS NEW ERA CANNOT UNFOLD IN A CLIMATE WHERE CONFLICT AND TORMOIL EXIST. THEREFORE, OUR GOALS MUST ALSO INCLUDE SECURITY AND STABILITY: SECURITY FOR OURSELVES, OUR ALLIES AND FRIENDS; STABILITY IN THE INTERNATIONAL ARENA, AND AN END TO REGIONAL CONFLICTS.

SUCH GOALS ARE CONSTANT, BUT THE STRATEGY WE EMPLOY TO REACH THEM CAN, AND MUST, CHANGE AS THE WORLD CHANGES. TODAY, THE NEED FOR A DYNAMIC AND ADAPTABLE STRATEGY IS IMPERATIVE. WE MUST BE STRONG -- ECONOMICALLY, DIPLOMATICALLY, AND MILITARILY -- TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE OPPORTUNITIES OPEN TO US IN A WORLD OF RAPID CHANGE.

AND NOWHERE WILL THE ULTIMATE CONSEQUENCES OF CHANGE HAVE MORE SIGNIFICANCE FOR WORLD SECURITY THAN WITHIN THE SOVIET UNION.

WHAT WE'RE SEEING NOW IN THE USSR IS INDEED
DRAMATIC. THE PROCESS IS STILL ONGOING, UNFINISHED.
BUT MAKE NO MISTAKE: OUR POLICY IS TO SEIZE EVERY, AND
I MEAN EVERY, OPPORTUNITY TO BUILD A BETTER, MORE
STABLE RELATIONSHIP WITH THE SOVIET UNION -- JUST AS IT
IS OUR POLICY TO DEFEND AMERICAN INTERESTS IN LIGHT OF
THE ENDURING REALITY OF SOVIET MILITARY POWER.

WE WANT TO SEE PERESTROIKA SUCCEED. WE WANT TO
SEE THE POLICIES OF GLASNOST AND PERESTROIKA -- SO FAR,
A REVOLUTION IMPOSED FROM THE TOP DOWN --
INSTITUTIONALIZED WITHIN THE SOVIET UNION. AND WE WANT
TO SEE PERESTROIKA EXTENDED AS WELL. WE WANT TO SEE A
SOVIET UNION THAT RESTRUCTURES ITS RELATIONSHIP TOWARD
THE REST OF THE WORLD . . . A SOVIET UNION THAT IS A
FORCE FOR CONSTRUCTIVE SOLUTIONS TO THE WORLD'S
PROBLEMS.

THE GRAND STRATEGY OF THE WEST DURING THE POST-WAR PERIOD HAS BEEN BASED ON THE CONCEPT OF CONTAINMENT: CHECKING THE SOVIET UNION'S EXPANSIONIST AIMS, IN THE HOPE THAT THE SOVIET SYSTEM ITSELF WOULD ONE DAY BE FORCED TO CONFRONT ITS INTERNAL CONTRADICTIONS. THE FERMENT IN THE SOVIET UNION TODAY AFFIRMS THE WISDOM OF THIS STRATEGY. NOW WE HAVE A PRECIOUS OPPORTUNITY TO MOVE BEYOND CONTAINMENT.

OUR GOAL -- INTEGRATING THE SOVIET UNION INTO THE COMMUNITY OF NATIONS -- IS EVERY BIT AS AMBITIOUS AS CONTAINMENT WAS IN ITS TIME. AND IT HOLDS TREMENDOUS PROMISE FOR INTERNATIONAL STABILITY.

COPING WITH A CHANGING SOVIET UNION WILL BE A CHALLENGE OF THE HIGHEST ORDER. BUT THE SECURITY CHALLENGES WE FACE TODAY DO NOT COME FROM THE EAST ALONE. THE EMERGENCE OF REGIONAL POWERS IS RAPIDLY CHANGING THE STRATEGIC LANDSCAPE.

IN THE MIDDLE EAST, IN SOUTH ASIA, IN OUR OWN HEMISPHERE, A GROWING NUMBER OF NATIONS ARE ACQUIRING ADVANCED AND HIGHLY DESTRUCTIVE CAPABILITIES -- IN SOME CASES, WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION, AND THE MEANS TO DELIVER THEM. AND IT IS AN UNFORTUNATE FACT THAT THE WORLD FACES INCREASING THREATS FROM ARMED INSURGENCIES, TERRORISTS, AND (AS YOU IN THE COAST GUARD ARE WELL AWARE) NARCOTICS TRAFFICKERS -- AND, IN SOME REGIONS, AN UNHOLY ALLIANCE OF ALL THREE.

OUR TASK IS CLEAR: WE MUST CURB THE PROLIFERATION OF ADVANCED WEAPONRY; WE MUST CHECK THE AGGRESSIVE AMBITIONS OF RENEGADE REGIMES; AND WE MUST ENHANCE THE ABILITY OF OUR FRIENDS TO DEFEND THEMSELVES. WE HAVE NOT YET MASTERED THIS COMPLEX CHALLENGE. WE AND OUR ALLIES MUST CONSTRUCT A COMMON STRATEGY FOR STABILITY IN THE DEVELOPING WORLD.

HOW WE AND OUR ALLIES DEAL WITH THESE DIVERSE CHALLENGES DEPENDS ON HOW WELL WE UNDERSTAND THE KEY ELEMENTS OF DEFENSE STRATEGY. LET ME FOCUS TODAY ON TWO POINTS IN PARTICULAR.

O FIRST, THE NEED FOR AN EFFECTIVE DETERRENT, ONE THAT DEMONSTRATES TO OUR ALLIES AND ADVERSARIES ALIKE AMERICAN STRENGTH AND RESOLVE;

O SECOND, THE NEED TO MAINTAIN AN APPROACH TO ARMS REDUCTION THAT PROMOTES STABILITY AT THE LOWEST FEASIBLE LEVEL OF ARMAMENTS.

DETERRENCE IS CENTRAL TO OUR DEFENSE STRATEGY. THE KEY TO KEEPING THE PEACE IS CONVINCING OUR ADVERSARIES THAT THE COST OF AGGRESSION AGAINST US OR OUR ALLIES IS SIMPLY UNACCEPTABLE.

IN TODAY'S WORLD, NUCLEAR FORCES ARE ESSENTIAL TO DETERRENCE. OUR CHALLENGE IS TO PROTECT THOSE DETERRENT SYSTEMS FROM ATTACK. THAT'S WHY WE WILL MOVE PEACEKEEPER ICBMS OUT OF FIXED AND VULNERABLE SILOS -- MAKING THEM MOBILE AND THUS HARDER TO TARGET.

LOOKING TO THE LONGER-TERM, WE WILL ALSO DEVELOP AND DEPLOY A NEW HIGHLY MOBILE SINGLE-WARHEAD MISSILE, THE MIDGETMAN. WITH ONLY MINUTES OF WARNING, THESE NEW MISSILES CAN RELOCATE OUT OF HARM'S WAY. ANY ATTACK AGAINST SYSTEMS LIKE THESE WILL FAIL.

WE ARE ALSO RESEARCHING -- AND WE ARE COMMITTED TO DEPLOY -- A MORE COMPREHENSIVE DEFENSIVE SYSTEM, KNOWN AS SDI. OUR PREMISE IS STRAIGHT FORWARD: DEFENSE AGAINST INCOMING MISSILES ENDANGERS NO PERSON AND NO COUNTRY.

WE'RE ALSO WORKING TO REDUCE THE THREAT WE FACE -- BOTH NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL. THE INF TREATY DEMONSTRATES THAT WILLINGNESS. IN ADDITION, IN THE PAST DECADE, NATO HAS UNILATERALLY REMOVED 2400 SHORTER-RANGE THEATER WARHEADS. BUT THEATER NUCLEAR FORCES CONTRIBUTE TO STABILITY, NO LESS THAN STRATEGIC FORCES. IT WOULD BE IRRESPONSIBLE TO DEPEND SOLELY ON STRATEGIC NUCLEAR FORCES TO DETER CONFLICT IN EUROPE.

THE CONVENTIONAL BALANCE IN EUROPE IS JUST AS IMPORTANT -- AND IS LINKED TO -- THE NUCLEAR BALANCE. FOR MORE THAN 40 YEARS, THE WARSAW PACT'S MASSIVE ADVANTAGE IN CONVENTIONAL FORCES HAS CAST A SHADOW OVER EUROPE.

THE UNILATERAL REDUCTIONS PRESIDENT GORBACHEV HAS PROMISED GIVE US HOPE THAT WE CAN NOW REDRESS THAT IMBALANCE. WE WELCOME THOSE STEPS BECAUSE -- IF IMPLEMENTED -- THEY WILL HELP REDUCE THE THREAT OF SURPRISE ATTACK. AND THEY CONFIRM WHAT WE'VE SAID ALL ALONG: THAT SOVIET MILITARY POWER FAR EXCEEDS THE LEVELS NEEDED TO DEFEND THE LEGITIMATE SECURITY INTERESTS OF THE USSR. AND WE MUST KEEP IN MIND THAT THESE REDUCTIONS ALONE -- EVEN IF IMPLEMENTED -- ARE NOT ENOUGH TO ELIMINATE THE SIGNIFICANT NUMERICAL SUPERIORITY THE SOVIETS NOW ENJOY.

THROUGH NEGOTIATION, WE CAN NOW TRANSFORM THE MILITARY LANDSCAPE OF EUROPE. THE ISSUES ARE COMPLEX. THE STAKES ARE HIGH. BUT THE SOVIETS HAVE BEEN FORTHCOMING, AND WE HOPE TO ACHIEVE THE REDUCTIONS WE SEEK.

LET ME EMPHASIZE: OUR AIM IS NOTHING LESS THAN REMOVING WAR AS AN OPTION IN EUROPE.

THE USSR HAS SAID IT IS WILLING TO ABANDON ITS AGE-OLD RELIANCE ON OFFENSIVE STRATEGY. IT'S TIME TO BEGIN. THIS SHOULD MEAN A SMALLER FORCE -- ONE LESS RELIANT ON THE TANKS, ARTILLERY AND PERSONNEL CARRIERS THAT PROVIDE THE SOVIETS' OFFENSIVE STRIKING POWER. A RESTRUCTURED WARSAW PACT -- ONE THAT MIRRORS THE DEFENSIVE POSTURE OF NATO -- WOULD MAKE EUROPE AND THE WORLD MORE SECURE.

PEACE CAN ALSO BE ENHANCED BY MOVEMENT TOWARD MORE OPENNESS IN MILITARY ACTIVITIES. TWO WEEKS AGO, I PROPOSED AN "OPEN SKIES" INITIATIVE, TO EXTEND THE CONCEPT OF OPENNESS. THAT PLAN FOR TERRITORIAL OVERFLIGHTS WOULD INCREASE OUR MUTUAL SECURITY AGAINST SUDDEN AND THREATENING MILITARY ACTIVITIES. IN THE SAME SPIRIT, LET US EXTEND THIS OPENNESS TO MILITARY EXPENDITURES AS WELL. I CALL ON THE SOVIETS TO DO AS WE HAVE ALWAYS DONE. LET'S OPEN THE LEDGERS. PUBLISH AN ACCURATE DEFENSE BUDGET.

BUT AS WE MOVE FORWARD WE MUST ALSO BE REALISTIC. TRANSFORMATIONS OF THIS MAGNITUDE WILL NOT HAPPEN OVERNIGHT. IF WE ARE TO REACH OUR GOALS, A GREAT DEAL IS REQUIRED OF US, OUR ALLIES -- AND OF THE SOVIET UNION. BUT WE CAN SUCCEED.

I BEGAN TODAY BY SPEAKING ABOUT THE TRIUMPH OF A PARTICULARLY AMERICAN IDEAL: FREEDOM. I KNOW THERE ARE THOSE WHO MAY THINK THERE'S SOMETHING PRESUMPTUOUS ABOUT THAT CLAIM -- THOSE WHO WILL THINK IT BOASTFUL. BUT IT'S NOT, FOR ONE SIMPLE REASON:

DEMOCRACY ISN'T OUR CREATION -- IT'S OUR INHERITANCE.

WE CAN'T TAKE CREDIT FOR DEMOCRACY -- BUT WE CAN TAKE THAT PRECIOUS GIFT OF FREEDOM, PRESERVE IT AND PASS IT ON -- AS MY GENERATION DOES TO YOU, AND YOU, TOO, WILL DO ONE DAY. AND PERHAPS -- PROVIDED WE SEIZE THE OPPORTUNITIES OPEN TO US -- WE CAN HELP OTHERS ATTAIN THE FREEDOM WE CHERISH.

AS I SAID ON THE CAPITOL STEPS THE DAY I TOOK THIS OFFICE, "THERE IS BUT ONE JUST USE OF POWER, AND IT IS TO SERVE PEOPLE." AS YOUR COMMANDER IN CHIEF, LET ME CALL ON THIS COAST GUARD CLASS TO REAFFIRM WITH ME THAT AMERICAN POWER WILL REMAIN ALWAYS IN SERVICE TO THE ENDURING IDEALS OF DEMOCRACY AND FREEDOM.

THANK YOU AND GOD BLESS AMERICA.

#

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUMDATE: 5/19/89 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: 5:00 TODAYSUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: COAST GUARD ACADEMY COMMENCEMENT

	ACTION FYI			ACTION FYI	
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE <i>N/C</i>	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>	BOSKIN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY <i>N/C</i>	<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 your comments/recommendations directly to Chriss Winston's office with an information copy to my office by 5:00 TODAY, FRIDAY, MAY 19. Thank you

RESPONSE:

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

McGroarty/Dooley
May 19, 1989
9:00 am
Draft 3

1989 MAY 19 AM 10:00

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: COAST GUARD ACADEMY COMMENCEMENT
NEW LONDON, CONNECTICUT
MAY 24, 1989

Thank you, Admiral. I congratulate each member of this year's class on receiving your commission into such a proud service.

Mention the Coast Guard, and most people think about lives saved at sea, daring rescue operations. But those daily acts of heroism are just one part of vital work the Coast Guard performs. Right now, in Prince William Sound, the Coast Guard is working around the clock in a major environmental clean-up effort -- and I know that some of you receiving commissions will soon be joining the Coast Guard team in Alaska. Right now, off the Florida coast, Coast Guard patrols are chasing down drug smugglers -- and keeping drugs off our streets. That may be "all in a day's work" for the Coast Guard -- but it's absolutely vital to our national health, well-being and security.

((I spoke to your Superintendent earlier about what I'd be saying here today, and he asked me one favor. He said: "Whatever you do, please don't throw a scare into these new Ensigns by telling them the world is theirs."))

The truth is, that is what commencement is all about. The world is yours, and today's ceremony is really part of the change of command from one generation to the next. I'm sure on that long first day of Swab Summer, you never thought four years could

pass so quickly. But they have. You've worked hard, Billet Night has come and gone.... You're ready -- "Semper Paratus" in the words of your motto -- ready to enter the Coast Guard service, and the world.

And today, our world -- your world -- is changing. The signs are everywhere. Look east across the Atlantic. The nations of Western Europe are expanding their economic ties, uniting into a truly common market beginning in 1992. Look west, to the nations of the Pacific Rim -- to Japan's emergence as a world-class economic power, and to a half-dozen other Asian countries moving quickly into the global economy's front ranks.

And changes in the socialist world are even more profound.

We live in a time when we are witnessing the end of an idea: the final chapter in the evolution of the socialist experiment. Socialism is now recognized -- even by many within the socialist world itself -- as a failed system: One that promised economic prosperity but failed to deliver the goods, a system that built a wall between the people and their political aspirations.

But the eclipse of socialism is only one half of the story of our time. The other is the ascendancy of the democratic idea.

Never before has the idea of freedom so captured the imaginations of men and women the world over. Never before has the hope of freedom beckoned so many -- students in Tiananmen Square. Trade unionists in Warsaw. The people of Panama. Millions throughout the Soviet Union, given a voice and vote.

Everywhere, those voices are speaking the language of democracy and freedom.

Today I want to speak to you about the world we want to see, and what we can do to bring that new world into existence. My national security team has now completed a series of systematic reviews that will help us chart that course. I want to speak about our security strategy for the 1990s -- one that advances American aims, and upholds American ideals.

Amidst the many challenges we'll face, there will be risks. But let me assure you: we'll find more than our share of opportunities. We and our allies are strong -- stronger than at any point in the post-war period, and capable of advancing the cause of freedom.

And the world we can help shape is cause for optimism.

Its outlines are clear: A growing community of democracies anchoring international peace and stability, a dynamic free market system generating prosperity and progress on a global scale. The economic foundation of this new era is the free market -- and developing that economic foundation is central to our security strategy.

And let's be clear about one thing: the emergence of a global market is a challenge America looks forward to -- not a threat to our status as a world power.

We all know there are hand-wringers out there, talking about an "America in decline." I can't explain how some people mistake the triumph of American ideas as a sign of defeat and decline....

The plain truth is: the economic rise of Europe and the nations of the Pacific Rim isn't proof of American decline at all -- it is the crowning success of our post-war alliance policy.

So the hand-wringers are wrong. Our time is a time of tremendous opportunity -- and our destiny is in our hands. To reach the world I just spoke of, we've got hard work ahead of us.

- o We've got to resolve international trade problems that threaten to pit friends and allies against one another.

- o We've got to combat misguided notions of economic nationalism that tell us to close off our economies to foreign competition, just when the global marketplace is a fact of life.

- o We've got to open the door to the nations of Eastern Europe and other socialist countries that embrace free market reforms.

- o And finally, for developing nations heavily burdened with debt, we've got to provide debt relief and encourage the market reforms that will set those nations on a path towards growth.

If we succeed, the next decade and the new century beyond will be an era of unparalleled growth -- an era which sees the flourishing of freedom, peace and prosperity around the globe.

But this new era cannot unfold in a climate where conflict and instability prevail. Our goals must also include security and stability: security for ourselves, our allies and friends; stability in the international arena, and an end to regional conflicts.

Those goals don't change, but the strategy we employ to reach those goals can, and must. Today, the need for a dynamic

and adaptable strategy is imperative. We must use all the means at our disposal -- economic, diplomatic, and military -- to take advantage of the opportunities open to us in a world of rapid change.

Nowhere is change more evident than in the Soviet Union, and nowhere are the ultimate consequences of change more important for world security.

I firmly believe that what we're seeing now in the USSR is significant and far-reaching. I also know that the process is still ongoing and unfinished. It is the policy of this Administration to seize every opportunity to build a better, more stable relationship with the Soviet Union -- just as it is our policy to defend American interests in light of the enduring reality of Soviet military power. Socialism may no longer be a moral force in the world, but it is still -- in the Soviet Union -- a military force of considerable power.

I want to see perestroika succeed. I want to see the policies of glasnost and perestroika -- so far, a revolution imposed from the top down -- institutionalized into the Soviet system. And I want to see perestroika extended as well. I want to see a Soviet Union that restructures its relationship within the community of nations.... A Soviet Union that is a force for constructive solutions to the world's problems -- not a power that seeks to exploit and create international conflict to further its own ends.

The grand strategy of the West during the post-war period has centered on the concept of containment: checking the Soviet Union's expansionist aims, in the hope that the Soviet system itself would one day be forced to confront its internal contradictions. The fact that that is happening today spells the ultimate success of our strategy -- and creates an opportunity to move beyond containment.

The goal we've now set for ourselves -- integrating the Soviet Union into the community of nations -- is every bit as ambitious as containment was in its time. And it is a goal that holds tremendous promise for international stability.

Coping with a changing Soviet Union will be a challenge of the highest order. But the security challenges we face today do not come from the East alone. The emergence of regional powers is rapidly changing the strategic landscape.

In the Middle East, in South Asia, in Latin America, a growing number of nations are acquiring advanced and highly destructive capabilities -- in some cases, weapons of mass destruction, and the means to deliver them. And it is an unfortunate fact that the world faces increasing threats from armed insurgencies, terrorists, and (as you in the Coast Guard are well aware) narcotics traffickers -- and, in some regions, an unholy alliance of all three.

Our task is clear: We must curb the proliferation of advanced weaponry, check the aggressive ambitions of renegade regimes, and build up -- by means of economic and security

assistance -- the ability of friendly nations to defend themselves. Our review shows that we have not yet mastered this complex challenge -- that we and our allies must construct a common strategy for stability in the developing world.

How we and our allies deal with these diverse challenges depends on how well we understand the key elements of defense strategy. Let me focus today on three points in particular.

- o First, the need for an effective deterrent, one that demonstrates to our allies and adversaries alike American strength and resolve;
- o Second, the need for a dynamic and durable alliance structure;
- o Third, we must maintain an approach to arms reduction that promotes stability at lower levels of armaments.

Deterrence is central to our defense strategy. The key to keeping the peace is convincing our adversaries that the costs of aggression against us are simply unacceptable.

Conventional capability is crucial. We must be able to defend our interests well forward of our own shores, and to project power when and where we need to, to protect American citizens and interests.

But our nuclear forces remain our ultimate deterrent. My decision to move ahead on a rail-mobile MX force -- and beyond that to develop and deploy the mobile single-warhead Midgetman missile -- will provide the survivable land-based deterrent that will help us keep the peace well into the next century. And maintaining a credible deterrent means moving forward on SDI as

well, to strengthen our deterrent by relying increasingly on defense, and less on the threat of retaliation.

In addition to an effective deterrent, our defense strategy depends upon strong alliances. Coalition defense has been the cornerstone of our security strategy for the past four decades. With the growing trend towards economic interdependence, now is no time for the U.S. to adopt a "go it alone" security policy.

But let me make equally clear that we view our alliances as true partnerships. The United States expects its alliance partners -- many now major economic powers in their own right -- to contribute their fair share to our common defense.

Those who think we've outgrown our alliance system are wrong. A strong security partnership among the democracies of the world will be the key to peace in the 21st Century.

But as our alliances mature, we must make sure our expectations remain realistic. Alliances of sovereign democratic nations will never be free of controversy. But we must never forget that disagreements between democracies are "family quarrels" -- differences that don't obscure the common aims and enduring interests we share.

Finally, we must seek to strengthen our security through significant arms reductions, both nuclear and conventional.

But reductions alone are not enough. Even deep reductions in strategic nuclear arsenals would leave the U.S. and USSR with enormous destructive power. Our aim must be strategic stability: a balance in which neither side can hope to destroy the forces of

the other without bringing destruction on itself. Any agreement that fails to pass that test is not in our national interest.

Next month, our negotiators will be back at the table in Geneva, working to hammer out a treaty that achieves real reductions, ensures stability -- and allows us to know with confidence that any agreement we sign is honored and observed.

In the area of conventional arms reductions, the U.S. and its NATO allies seek stability at lower levels of armaments -- and an agreement that eliminates the massive conventional superiority of the Warsaw Pact forces. President Gorbachev's promise to make a unilateral cut in Soviet conventional forces is a welcome first step -- but it's still a long way from the deep reductions in tanks, artillery and troop strength that will bring real stability to the nations of Europe.

The complex calculations and analysis that are constant factors in setting our course should not obscure the plain truths that guide our defense strategy:

If we remain strong, we remain safe. If we work in concert with our allies, we add their strengths to our own. If we seek stability as well as real reductions in the weapons of war, we make ourselves and our allies more secure.

I began today by speaking about the triumph of a particularly American idea: freedom. I know there will be people who think there's something presumptuous about that -- people who will think it boastful to talk about that triumph. But it's not, for one simple reason:

Democracy isn't our creation -- it's our inheritance.

We can't take credit for democracy -- but we can take the precious gift of freedom, preserve it and pass it on -- as my generation does to you, and you, too, will do one day. And perhaps -- provided we seize the opportunities open to us -- we can help others attain the freedom we cherish.

As I said on the Capitol steps the day I took this office, "There is but one just use of power, and it is to serve people." As your Commander in Chief, let me call on today's class to reaffirm with me that American power will remain always in service to the enduring ideals of democracy and freedom.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 23, 1989

INFORMATION

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT

FROM: DAN MCGROARTY *DMG*

THROUGH: CHRISS WINSTON *W*

RE: U.S. COAST GUARD COMMENCEMENT

I. SUMMARY

At 12:15 p.m., on Wednesday, May 23, you will speak at the U.S. Coast Guard commencement ceremony in New London, Connecticut.

II. DISCUSSION

Your address focuses primarily on nuclear strategy and modernization questions, with some treatment as well of the conventional force balance. The Speechwriters believe the text can be cut to nine pages, but NSC has failed to indicate passages that could be excluded to shorten the speech.

We would appreciate your guidance regarding any passages that you wish to delete.

McGroarty/Rice/Dooley
May 23, 1989
8:00 am
Draft 7

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: COAST GUARD ACADEMY COMMENCEMENT
NEW LONDON, CONNECTICUT
MAY 24, 1989

Thank you, Admiral. I congratulate each member of this year's class on receiving your commission into such a proud service.

Mention the Coast Guard, and most people think about lives saved at sea, daring rescue operations. But those daily acts of heroism are just one part of vital work the Coast Guard performs. Right now, in Prince William Sound, the Coast Guard is working around the clock in a major environmental clean-up effort -- and I know that some of you receiving commissions will soon be joining the Coast Guard team in Alaska. Right now, off the Florida coast, Coast Guard patrols are chasing down drug smugglers -- and keeping drugs off our streets. That may be "all in a day's work" for the Coast Guard -- but it's absolutely vital to our national health, well-being and security.

((I spoke to your Superintendent earlier about what I'd be saying here today, and he asked me one favor. He said: "Whatever you do, please don't throw a scare into these new Ensigns by telling them the world is theirs."))

The truth is, that is what commencement is all about. The world is yours, and today's ceremony is really part of the change of command from one generation to the next. I'm sure on that long first day of Swab Summer, you never thought four years could

pass so quickly. But they have. You've worked hard, Billet Night has come and gone.... You're ready -- "Semper Paratus" in the words of your motto -- ready to enter the Coast Guard service, and the world.

Today, our world -- your world -- is changing, East and West.

We live in a time when we are witnessing the end of an idea: the final chapter in the evolution of the communist experiment. Communism is now recognized -- even by many within the communist world itself -- as a failed system: One that promised economic prosperity but failed to deliver the goods, a system that built a wall between the people and their political aspirations.

But the eclipse of communism is only one half of the story of our time. The other is the ascendancy of the democratic idea.

Never before has the idea of freedom so captured the imaginations of men and women the world over. Never before has the hope of freedom beckoned so many. Students in Tiananmen Square. Trade unionists in Warsaw. The people of Panama. Rulers consulting the ruled in the Soviet Union. Everywhere, those voices are speaking the language of democracy and freedom.

Today, we find ourselves at a turning point: at the end of one era, on the threshold of the next.

There's a world of difference between transition and transformation -- between a process in progress, and one that is final and complete. It is ironic that some think now is the time to deemphasize the very pillars of stability -- our alliances,

our military forces -- that make our future so promising. That would be a grave mistake. History will not forgive us if --in our haste to declare our work done -- we abandon course, and fail to lay a firm foundation, one step at a time, for the peace and freedoms we seek.

Our goals and values are clear and enduring. But our strategy must be flexible and adaptive -- ready to take advantage of opportunities that advance our interests. We have all the instruments of power at our disposal: a strong economy, unmatched technological prowess -- and a moral message that resonates around the world.

And yet, there is no substitute for strong and capable military forces. Make no mistake: we seek military superiority over no one. Our aim is to deter aggression -- to secure the peaceful and stable conditions essential to the realizing the hopes of a new era.

Communism may no longer be a moral force in the world, but the Soviet Union is still a military force of enormous power. Over the past two decades, the Soviet Union has acquired extraordinary military power -- and it has used that power to conduct a foreign policy opposed to Western interests.

The price of containing Soviet military power in Europe and Asia has been high. I speak here not of dollars, marks or francs. The defense of freedom is always worth the cost. I speak of the fear two generations have faced; the specter of a military imbalance that seemed to invite war -- a fear deepened

by the secrecy surrounding the military preparations of the Warsaw Pact. I speak of the Soviet Union's strategic nuclear forces -- large, modern, a single missile carrying many warheads. Those forces appeared to be good for only one thing: a disarming first strike against the United States.

For decades, the U.S. sought -- without real success -- to convince the Soviet Union to transform the size and nature of its military forces through arms control. Today, for the first time in forty years, I believe that the Soviet Union may be ready to significantly reduce and restructure its military forces.

The catalyst for change may well be the pressures of a failing economy -- one that can no longer bear the heavy costs of the excessive military build-up of the past two decades. But whatever the motivation of the Soviet leadership, I welcome the chance now before us -- the chance to transform the military balance, to create a world where the mission of military forces in Europe is clearly to deter aggression -- not to attack.

Let me be clear: a transformation of this magnitude will not happen overnight. A great deal is required of us, our allies, and the Soviet Union if we are to reach this goal. But we can succeed -- if we remain strong, if we resist utopian visions, and if we and our allies work with the Soviet Union to build the changes we want to see into solid agreements.

We must remember: Peace is born of strength. It is ironic that people think the long peace that Europe has enjoyed -- and the trend toward democracy evident elsewhere in the world -- is

reason for us to relax our military strength. Developments in the Soviet Union remain uncertain. A strong military will impress upon Soviet leadership that nothing can be gained by turning back to a more militaristic course. Our forces remain a reliable guarantee that we and our allies are safe and secure.

And we must recognize the plain truth that the preservation of peace rests upon modern nuclear forces. Conventional forces alone cannot prevent war. Two destructive world wars are proof enough of that. The paradox of our time is that nuclear weapons themselves that have made the prevention of war imperative. World war today is deterred by the certain knowledge that no nuclear aggressor can himself escape nuclear destruction.

Our goal is to maintain a deterrent that no aggressor dares attack -- no matter how important the interests, or how high the stakes. We are drawing on some of the brightest minds in science and exploring our most advanced technologies to bring us closer to the day when we can defend ourselves against nuclear attack. I have directed continued development of SDI options -- and I will deploy strategic defenses when they are ready. Effective defenses will enhance deterrence.

For now, the cornerstone of security and stability remains a nuclear arsenal that can survive attack. Let me tell you what I mean when I talk about a survivable force. I mean a nuclear force no aggressor can hope to destroy, without bringing about his own destruction. An aggressor who knows a significant portion of our forces will survive a first strike is one who will

never carry out his attack. A survivable force makes nuclear attack unthinkable.

That is why I have decided to enhance the survivability of our own land-based missiles. We will move Peacekeeper ICBMs out of vulnerable silos and make them mobile -- harder to target and more survivable. Taking our most modern silo-based missiles and redeploying them in a mobile mode is the best near-term solution to increased survivability.

Looking to the longer-term, I have directed the development and deployment of a new mobile single-warhead missile, the Midgetman. Because a Midgetman force will be so highly survivable, there is no conceivable reason -- no matter how grave the crisis -- for the Soviets to try to attack it. These systems, along with our bomber and submarine-based forces give us the sturdy triad of nuclear forces no aggressor can attack with impunity.

To accompany our military programs we need an arms control strategy that will enhance survivability -- and create conditions for increased confidence and cooperation between the U.S. and USSR. That is why we've agreed to return to the table in Geneva, to resume talks on strategic nuclear forces, and nuclear testing.

We want reductions -- but reductions alone are not enough. Agreements that result in reductions without reducing the risk of war do not serve our interests. Vulnerable land-based systems carrying multiple warheads are an inviting target -- a problem of too many eggs in one basket. Mobile missiles are more

survivable, but also far harder to verify: We can't count what we can't find. Our worry is that this could increase the incentives for cheating. And if several warheads are carried by each mobile missile, the problem -- and the penalty for failing to detect cheating -- is compounded.

We don't have answers to all these problems. But we will go to Geneva with new ideas on how best to build on the significant areas of agreement that already exist.

The principle of security through stability does not apply to the United States alone. Our security is bound to that of our allies. We cannot rely on rhetoric to deter a would-be aggressor. Our theater and tactical nuclear forces give substance to that reality -- a link that extends deterrence beyond our shores and serves to strengthen our common security.

We are committed to reducing nuclear weapons when doing so strengthens alliance security and international stability. In the past decade, NATO has unilaterally removed [...] warheads -- to a level 35% lower than in 1979. But theater nuclear forces contribute to our stability no less than strategic forces. We do not want to find ourselves dependent on the threat of a strategic nuclear exchange to deter the threat of war.

The fact that conventional weapons alone do not deter war does not make the conventional balance less important. NATO has had to rely more heavily on nuclear weapons because of the significant conventional force advantage of the Warsaw Pact.

The unilateral reductions President Gorbachev has promised give us hope that we can now redress that imbalance -- not because they transform the balance of conventional forces: none of the promised reductions will seriously affect the significant numerical superiority the Soviets now enjoy. We welcome those steps because they confirm what we've said all along: Soviet military power far exceeds the levels needed to defend the legitimate security interests of the USSR.

The negotiations we are now engaged in offer a chance to transform the military landscape of Europe. The issues are exceedingly complex and the stakes enormously high -- but the Soviets have been forthcoming, and I am genuinely hopeful that we will achieve the reductions we seek.

But as in the case of nuclear forces, numbers alone are not enough. Our aim is nothing less than removing war as an option in Europe. The USSR has said it is willing to restructure its forces. We want the Soviets to deploy a smaller force -- one less reliant on the tanks, artillery and personnel carriers that provide the Soviets' offensive striking power. A restructured Warsaw Pact -- one that cannot threaten a major offensive against the West -- would make Europe and the world more secure.

The same can be said for a movement toward more openness in military activities. In recent years, we have invited observers to each other's military exercises, and expanded the exchange of information on our military forces and their activities. Two weeks ago, I proposed an "open sky" initiative, to take the

concept of openness one step further: a plan for both sides to allow territorial overflights that, together with satellite surveillance, will increase our security against sudden and threatening military activities. In the same spirit, we want to see openness extend to Soviet military expenditures as well. I call on the Soviets to do as we have always done: to publish, for the first time in Soviet history, an accurate defense budget.

This kind of restructuring and openness in the military sphere is the kind that can lead to lower tensions and greater trust between our two nations -- and a safer more secure world.

As we look toward that day, we know now that our defense strategy will be tested severely in the developing world. A growing number of nations are now acquiring advanced and highly destructive military capabilities -- in some cases, nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, and the means to deliver them. And it is an unfortunate fact that the world faces increasing threats from armed insurgencies, terrorists, and (as you in the Coast Guard are well aware) narcotics traffickers -- and, in some regions, an unholy alliance of all three. These emerging challenges will test our traditional concepts of security as never before.

Forging a global strategy for defense is made more difficult by the serious budget constraints that we face. The 12% reduction in real defense spending over the past five years has cut into our capabilities. More tough choices lie ahead -- but one is already made. I will not as Commander-in-Chief, preside

over a return to the "hollow army" of the 1970s -- a force under-trained and ill-equipped to perform its missions. You who choose to serve in America's Armed Forces deserve better. You have my word: our military will be battle ready. You'll have the tools and training you need to do your job.

The reviews we are now completing address the full range of security problems before us. As a global power, it should not surprise us that our ingenuity will be tested in matching our security responsibilities with our resources in the years ahead. But as I go to Europe to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the Atlantic Alliance, I cannot help but notice how far we've come -- and how bright our future is.

I began today by speaking about the triumph of a particularly American idea: freedom. I know there will be people who think there's something presumptuous about that -- people who will think it boastful to talk about that triumph. But it's not, for one simple reason: America knows her place in democracy's unfolding drama.

Democracy isn't our creation -- it's our inheritance.

We can't take credit for democracy -- but we can take the precious gift of freedom, preserve it and pass it on -- as my generation does to you, and you, too, will do one day.

As I said on the Capitol steps the day I took this office, "There is but one just use of power, and it is to serve people." As your Commander in Chief, let me call on today's class to reaffirm with me that American power will remain always in

service to the enduring ideals of democracy and freedom. And let those who follow be able to say that in resisting the pressures of the moment, we delivered peace, freedom and prosperity -- lasting and secure.

#

McGroarty/Rice/Dooley
May 21, 1989
2:00 pm
Draft 5

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: COAST GUARD ACADEMY COMMENCEMENT
NEW LONDON, CONNECTICUT
MAY 24, 1989

Thank you, Admiral. I congratulate each member of this year's class on receiving your commission into such a proud service.

Mention the Coast Guard, and most people think about lives saved at sea, daring rescue operations. But those daily acts of heroism are just one part of vital work the Coast Guard performs. Right now, in Prince William Sound, the Coast Guard is working around the clock in a major environmental clean-up effort -- and I know that some of you receiving commissions will soon be joining the Coast Guard team in Alaska. Right now, off the Florida coast, Coast Guard patrols are chasing down drug smugglers -- and keeping drugs off our streets. That may be "all in a day's work" for the Coast Guard -- but it's absolutely vital to our national health, well-being and security.

((I spoke to your Superintendent earlier about what I'd be saying here today, and he asked me one favor. He said: "Whatever you do, please don't throw a scare into these new Ensigns by telling them the world is theirs."))

The truth is, that is what commencement is all about. The world is yours, and today's ceremony is really part of the change of command from one generation to the next. I'm sure on that long first day of Swab Summer, you never thought four years could

pass so quickly. But they have. You've worked hard, Billet Night has come and gone.... You're ready -- "Semper Paratus" in the words of your motto -- ready to enter the Coast Guard service, and the world.

More than forty years ago, the United States answered the call of a world ravaged by war, and took on responsibilities we still bear today. America itself, protected by vast oceans, was in no imminent danger. Our choice was a moral choice: a decision to take on global responsibilities in defense of freedom. And our decision was also firmly in our interest. We are a global power because we know that our freedom and prosperity are treasures we cannot enjoy in isolation.

It was never our goal to dominate, to stand unquestioned, claiming to have all the answers to the world's problems. That is not democracy's way. Our aim was to build a foundation for freedom, a community dedicated to the democratic idea -- so that even the nations that fought against us would one day work with us as fellow democracies. The splendid success of that strategy is what provides the tremendous opportunities now open to us.

Today, our world -- your world -- is changing. The signs are everywhere. Look east across the Atlantic. The nations of Western Europe are expanding their economic ties, uniting into a truly common market beginning in 1992. Look west, to the nations of the Pacific Rim -- to Japan's emergence as a world-class economic power, and to a half-dozen other Asian countries moving quickly into the global economy's front ranks. Among these

nations we now have like-minded partners. America does not need to-- nor can we-- go it alone.

Changes in the communist world are even more profound.

We live in a time when we are witnessing the end of an idea: the final chapter in the evolution of the communist experiment. Communism is now recognized -- even by many within the communist world itself -- as a failed system: One that promised economic prosperity but failed to deliver the goods, a system that built a wall between the people and their political aspirations. But the eclipse of communism is only one half of the story of our time. The other is the ascendancy of the democratic idea. Never before has the idea of freedom so captured the imaginations of men and women the world over. Never before has the hope of freedom beckoned so many -- students in Tiananmen Square. Trade unionists in Warsaw. The people of Panama. Rulers consulting the ruled in the Soviet Union. Everywhere, those voices are speaking the language of democracy and freedom.

Today, we find ourselves at a turning point: at the end of one era, on the threshold of the next.

There's a world of difference between transition and transformation -- between a process in progress, and one that is final and complete. It is ironic that some think now is the time to deemphasize the very pillars of stability -- our alliances, our military forces -- that now make our future so promising. That would be a grave mistake. History will not forgive us if -- in our haste to declare our work done -- we abandon course, and

fail to lay a firm foundation, one step at a time, for the enduring peace and freedoms we seek.

Our goals and values are clear and enduring. But our strategy must be flexible and adaptive -- ready to take advantage of opportunities that advance our interests. We have all the instruments of power at our disposal: a strong economy, unmatched technological prowess -- and a moral message that resonates around the world.

And yet, there is no substitute for strong and capable military forces. Make no mistake: we seek military superiority over no one. Our aim is to deter aggression -- to secure the peaceful and stable conditions essential to the realizing the hopes of a new era.

Our principle adversary remains the Soviet Union. Communism may no longer be a moral force in the world, but the Soviet Union is still a military force of considerable power. Over the past two decades, the Soviet Union has acquired extraordinary military power, nuclear and conventional -- and it has used that power to conduct a foreign policy opposed to Western interests.

Today, for the first time in forty years, we have reason to hope the Soviet Union is ready to reduce and restructure its forces -- and to adopt a less aggressive policy toward the nations of the world.

We welcome the unilateral reductions President Gorbachev has announced -- not because they transform the balance of conventional forces: none of the promised reductions will

seriously affect the significant numerical superiority the Soviets now enjoy. We welcome those steps because they acknowledge what we've said all along: Soviet military power far exceeds the levels needed to defend the legitimate security interests of the USSR.

If these unilateral cuts are a sign that the Soviets now accept this premise, we are ready to work with them to create a world where nations no longer need to fear one another -- a world that does not live under the specter of war.

The United States is ready to move beyond containment. We are ready to work with the Soviet Union towards a new relationship-- one based on the interests we share in solving the problems and seizing the opportunities before us to build a better world.

Building that new relationship will be a challenge of the highest order. But the security challenges we face today do not come from the East alone. The emergence of regional powers is rapidly changing the strategic landscape.

A growing number of nations are now acquiring advanced and highly destructive military capabilities -- in some cases, nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, and the means to deliver them. And it is an unfortunate fact that the world faces increasing threats from armed insurgencies, terrorists, and (as you in the Coast Guard are well aware) narcotics traffickers -- and, in some regions, an unholy alliance of all three.

Our task is clear: We must curb the proliferation of advanced weaponry, and check the aggressive ambitions of renegade regimes. We cannot sustain our values nor achieve our goals unless this challenge is also met. But we are not and cannot be the world's policeman. We and our allies and others who share our vision of the future need to forge a common strategy for stability in the developing world.

America needs a strategy and forces not only to defend us today but to carry us into the new world of the 21st century.

We seek a military balance that neither threatens nor invites attack. We seek reductions that enhance stability and reduce the risk of war. We seek military forces that deter aggression but do not intimidate. We seek a world with thousands of nuclear warheads dismantled, ten of thousands of tanks destroyed and millions of soldiers returned to civilian life-- A world where increased openness about military activities builds confidence and the fear of surprise attack is virtually gone. These are the principles that can and must guide both our defense planning and our arms control strategy proceed from these principles.

To preserve the peace, we must have modern nuclear forces. The advent of nuclear weapons has made the prevention of war imperative. It is one of the paradoxes of our age that the horrors of nuclear war--understood by all-- help to keep the peace. An aggressor today knows that a nuclear attack would invite devastating retaliation.

We are drawing on some of the brightest minds in science and exploring our most advanced technologies to bring us closer to the day when we can defend ourselves against nuclear attack. I have directed continued development of SDI options, and I will deploy strategic defenses when they are ready. But in today's world, the cornerstone of security and stability remains a survivable offensive nuclear force.

Let me tell you what I mean by the word survivable. I mean a nuclear force no aggressor can hope to destroy, without bringing about his own destruction. An aggressor who knows a significant portion of our forces will survive a first strike is one who will never carry out his attack. A survivable force makes nuclear attack unthinkable.

Enhanced survivability means greater stability. This is why I have decided to move Peacekeeper ICBMs out of vulnerable silos and make them mobile-- and more survivable. That is why I have directed the development and deployment the mobile single-warhead Midgetman missile -- will provide the survivable land-based deterrent that will help us keep the peace well into the next century. These and other improvements to our strategic forces will provide a deterrent that no agresor can attack with impunity and no nation can regard as provocative.

People yearn for a world without nuclear weapons. But mankind has learned to split the atom. Having partaken from that tree of knowledge--there is no turning back. Our task is to temper our knowledge with wisdom. Together, nuclear adversaries

must learn to manage the terrifying reality. That is why effective arms control agreements are a partner with defense modernization.

Next month, the U.S. and Soviet Union will return to the table in Geneva, to resume talks on strategic nuclear forces, defense and space, and nuclear testing. Reductions alone are not enough. Our goal must be stabilizing reductions that reduce the risks of war. Even deep cuts in our strategic nuclear arsenals would leave in place enormous destructive power. The survivability of the forces that remain is as crucial as the cuts we make.

The principle of security through stability does not apply to the United States alone. Our security is bound to that of our allies. Our theater and tactical nuclear forces play an indispensable role in giving substance to that reality -- a link that extends deterrence beyond our shores and serves to strengthen our common security.

We are committed to reducing and -- where possible -- nuclear weapons when that course strengthens alliance security and international stability. But let me say it again: however much we may wish it otherwise, the nuclear genie cannot be put back in the bottle. Modern, diverse, theater nuclear forces are essential to our security as is the strategic nuclear triad.

Conventional forces alone cannot deter war, but they too must be a strong, modern and capable element of our deterrent. The United States and its allies are negotiating with the Warsaw

Pact to reach an agreement eliminating the vast conventional superiority of East over West. The Soviets have been forthcoming and we believe that they are serious. The issues are monstrously complex and the stakes enormously high, but I am more hopeful now than I have been for years that we will achieve the reductions we seek. We may succeed in dismantling XXXx of tanks, XXXX of artillery, XXXX of men and the skies above Europe will be open to territorial overflights that make military activities transparent and less threatening. If my hope is fulfilled we will have taken a huge step toward a new era in which great armies no longer face each other across a divided Europe.

As we look to that day for Europe, we know now that our defense strategy will be tested severely in the developing world. Dramatic changes point toward a new era there too-- one in which people seek democracy and prosperity along a path fraught with dangers. Those dangers threaten both their future and our interests. We have a special responsibility to safeguard the promise of that new era too. Our friends must know that our military power is capable and flexible enough to meet this challenge.

Forging a global strategy for defense is made more difficult by the serious budget constraints that we face. Tough choices lie ahead. One is already made. I will not as Commander-in-Chief, preside over a return to the "hollow army" of the 1970s -- a force under-trained and ill-equipped to perform its missions. You who choose to serve in America's Armed Forces deserve better.

You have my word: our military will be battle ready. You'll have the tools and training you need to do your job.

We must spend limited resources wisely. In the world we're now entering, the ingenuity and technological prowess that have served our nation so well must be turned to our security advantage. We will not neglect our research and development base. To do so would shortchange our future. In a world so filled with promise that would be a crime.

It is ironic that people think that the long peace that Europe has enjoyed-- and the trends toward democracy elsewhere in the world is reason to diminish our commitment to our military strength. Peace is born of strength. A democracy builds and maintains its military forces in hopes it will never have to use them. I've seen the face of battle. I know military force must be an option of last resort. That is why I am so strongly committed to maintaining a deterrent that prevents war and preserves the peace.

Let me assure you too that I know that military power rests upon our economic and technological strength, and our competitiveness in the world marketplace.

If, in the post-war world, our military power has been democracy's shield, our economic power has been its sword -- piercing the illusion that communism was the road to prosperity. I am concerned about maintaining our own economic strength, and that of the international community.

And let's be clear about one thing: the emergence of a global market is a challenge America is now preparing for -- not a threat to our status as a world power.

We are clear-headed about the challenges we'll face in an evolving global economy. As a nation, we've met those challenges before. I'm confident we can meet and master them today.

- o We've got to resolve international trade problems that threaten to pit friends and allies against one another.

- o We've got to combat misguided notions of economic nationalism that tell us that tell us to close off our economies to foreign competition, just when the global marketplace is a fact of life.

- o We've got to open the door to the nations of Eastern Europe and other socialist countries that embrace free market reforms.

- o And finally, for developing nations heavily burdened with debt, we've got to provide debt relief and encourage the market reforms that will set those nations on a path towards growth.

I began today by speaking about the triumph of a particularly American idea: freedom. I know there will be people who think there's something presumptuous about that -- people who will think it boastful to talk about that triumph. But it's not, for one simple reason: America knows her place in democracy's unfolding drama.

Democracy isn't our creation -- it's our inheritance.

We can't take credit for democracy -- but we can take the precious gift of freedom, preserve it and pass it on -- as my generation does to you, and you, too, will do one day.

As I said on the Capitol steps the day I took this office, "There is but one just use of power, and it is to serve people." As your Commander in Chief, let me call on today's class to reaffirm with me that American power will remain always in service to the enduring ideals of democracy and freedom. And let those who follow be able to say that in resisting the pressures of the moment, we delivered peace, freedom and prosperity -- lasting and secure.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 23, 1989

INFORMATION

MEMORANDUM TO THE PRESIDENT

FROM: DAN MCGROARTY *DMG*

THROUGH: CHRISS WINSTON *W*

RE: U.S. COAST GUARD COMMENCEMENT

I. SUMMARY

At 12:15 p.m., on Wednesday, May 23, you will speak at the U.S. Coast Guard commencement ceremony in New London, Connecticut.

II. DISCUSSION

Your address focuses primarily on nuclear strategy and modernization questions, with some treatment as well of the conventional force balance. The Speechwriters believe the text can be cut to nine pages, but NSC has failed to indicate passages that could be excluded to shorten the speech.

We would appreciate your guidance regarding any passages that you wish to delete.

McGroarty/Rice/Dooley
May 23, 1989
8:00 am
Draft 7

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: COAST GUARD ACADEMY COMMENCEMENT
NEW LONDON, CONNECTICUT
MAY 24, 1989

Thank you, Admiral. I congratulate each member of this year's class on receiving your commission into such a proud service.

Mention the Coast Guard, and most people think about lives saved at sea, daring rescue operations. But those daily acts of heroism are just one part of vital work the Coast Guard performs. Right now, in Prince William Sound, the Coast Guard is working around the clock in a major environmental clean-up effort -- and I know that some of you receiving commissions will soon be joining the Coast Guard team in Alaska. Right now, off the Florida coast, Coast Guard patrols are chasing down drug smugglers -- and keeping drugs off our streets. That may be "all in a day's work" for the Coast Guard -- but it's absolutely vital to our national health, well-being and security.

((I spoke to your Superintendent earlier about what I'd be saying here today, and he asked me one favor. He said: "Whatever you do, please don't throw a scare into these new Ensigns by telling them the world is theirs."))

The truth is, that is what commencement is all about. The world is yours, and today's ceremony is really part of the change of command from one generation to the next. I'm sure on that long first day of Swab Summer, you never thought four years could

pass so quickly. But they have. You've worked hard, Billet Night has come and gone.... You're ready -- "Semper Paratus" in the words of your motto -- ready to enter the Coast Guard service, and the world.

Today, our world -- your world -- is changing, East and West.

We live in a time when we are witnessing the end of an idea: the final chapter in the evolution of the communist experiment. Communism is now recognized -- even by many within the communist world itself -- as a failed system: One that promised economic prosperity but failed to deliver the goods, a system that built a wall between the people and their political aspirations.

But the eclipse of communism is only one half of the story of our time. The other is the ascendancy of the democratic idea.

Never before has the idea of freedom so captured the imaginations of men and women the world over. Never before has the hope of freedom beckoned so many. ~~Students in Tiananmen~~

~~Square~~ Trade unionists in Warsaw. The people of Panama. Rulers consulting the ruled in the Soviet Union. ^{And, most recently, the} Everywhere, ^{dramatic} those voices are speaking the language of democracy and freedom. ^{events}

Today, we find ourselves at a turning point: at the end of one era, on the threshold of the next. ⁱⁿ

There's a world of difference between transition and transformation -- between a process in progress, and one that is final and complete. It is ironic that some think now is the time to deemphasize the very pillars of stability -- our alliances, ^{Tiananmen} ^{Square.}

our military forces -- that make our future so promising. That would be a grave mistake. History will not forgive us if --in our haste to declare our work done -- we abandon course, and fail to lay a firm foundation, one step at a time, for the peace and freedoms we seek.

Our goals and values are clear and enduring. But our strategy must be flexible and adaptive -- ready to take advantage of opportunities that advance our interests. We have all the instruments of power at our disposal: a strong economy, unmatched technological prowess -- and a moral message that resonates around the world.

And yet, there is no substitute for strong and capable military forces. Make no mistake: we seek military superiority over no one. Our aim is to deter aggression -- to secure the peaceful and stable conditions essential to the realizing the hopes of a new era.

Communism may no longer be a moral force in the world, but the Soviet Union is still a military force of enormous ^{strength} ~~power~~.

Over the past two decades, the Soviet Union has acquired extraordinary military ~~power~~ ^{strength} -- and it has used that power to conduct a foreign policy opposed to Western interests.

The price of containing Soviet military power in Europe and Asia has been high. I speak here not of dollars, marks or francs. The defense of freedom is always worth the cost. I speak of the fear two generations have faced; the specter of a military imbalance that seemed to invite war -- a fear deepened

by the secrecy surrounding the military preparations of the Warsaw Pact. I speak of the Soviet Union's strategic nuclear forces -- large, modern, a single missile carrying many warheads. Those forces appeared to be good for only one thing: a disarming first strike against the United States.

For decades, the U.S. sought -- without real success -- to convince the Soviet Union to transform the size and nature of its military forces through arms control. Today, for the first time in forty years, ^{there is a possibility} ~~I believe~~ that the Soviet Union may be ready to significantly reduce and restructure its military forces.

The catalyst for change may well be the pressures of a failing economy -- one that can no longer bear the heavy costs of the excessive military build-up of the past two decades. But whatever the motivation of the Soviet leadership, I welcome the chance now before us -- the chance to transform the military balance, to create a world where the mission of military forces in Europe is clearly to deter aggression -- not to attack.

Let me be clear: a transformation of this magnitude will not happen overnight. A great deal is required of us, our allies, and the Soviet Union if we are to reach this goal. But we can succeed -- if we remain strong, if we resist utopian visions, and if we and our allies work with the Soviet Union to build the changes we want to see into solid agreements.

We must remember: Peace is born of strength. It is ironic that people think the long peace that Europe has enjoyed -- and the trend toward democracy evident elsewhere in the world -- is

reason for us to relax our military strength. Developments in the Soviet Union remain uncertain. A strong military will impress upon Soviet leadership that nothing can be gained by turning back to a more militaristic course. Our forces remain a reliable guarantee that we and our allies are safe and secure.

And we must recognize the plain truth that the preservation of peace rests upon modern nuclear forces. Conventional forces alone cannot prevent war. Two destructive world wars are proof enough of that. The paradox of our time is that nuclear weapons themselves that have made the prevention of war imperative. World war today is deterred by the certain knowledge that no nuclear aggressor can himself escape ~~nuclear~~ destruction.

Our goal is to maintain a deterrent that no aggressor dares attack -- no matter how important the interests, or how high the stakes. We are drawing on some of the brightest minds in science and exploring our most advanced technologies to bring us closer to the day when we can defend ourselves against nuclear attack. *My direction on SDI is clear -- vigorous development will continue,* ~~I have directed continued development of SDI options~~ and I will deploy strategic defenses when they are ready. Effective defenses will enhance deterrence.

For now, the cornerstone of security and stability remains a nuclear arsenal that can survive attack. Let me tell you ~~what I~~ ^{why} mean when I talk about a survivable force. ^{is so important} ~~I mean a nuclear~~ ~~force no aggressor can hope to destroy, without bringing about~~ ~~his own destruction.~~ An aggressor who knows a significant portion of our forces will survive a first strike is one who will

Over the last generation, the S. U. has been building ever more menacing strategic nuclear forces -- large, modern missiles, each carrying many warheads. These forces appeared to be designed for a devastating

This means that the more survivable our forces are, the less tempted an aggressor may be -- even during in times of crisis -- to launch a first strike.

never carry out his attack. ~~A survivable force makes nuclear attack unthinkable.~~

That is why I have decided to enhance the survivability of our own land-based missiles. We will move Peacekeeper ICBMs out of vulnerable silos and make them mobile -- harder to target and more survivable. Taking our most modern silo-based missiles and redeploying them in a mobile mode is the best near-term solution to increased survivability.

Strengthen strategic stability by

Looking to the longer-term, I have directed the development and deployment of a new mobile single-warhead missile, the Midgetman. ^(A) Because a Midgetman force will be so highly survivable, there is no conceivable reason -- no matter how grave the crisis -- for the Soviets to try to attack it. These systems, along with our bomber and submarine-based forces give us the sturdy triad of nuclear forces no aggressor can attack with impunity.

To accompany our military programs we need an arms control strategy that will enhance survivability -- and create conditions for increased confidence and cooperation between the U.S. and USSR. That is why we ^{proposed a} ~~ve agreed to~~ return to the table in Geneva ^{next month,} to resume talks on strategic nuclear forces, and nuclear testing.

~~We want reductions -- but reductions alone are not enough. Agreements that result in reductions without reducing the risk of war do not serve our interests. Vulnerable land-based systems carrying multiple warheads are an inviting target -- a problem of too many eggs in one basket. Mobile missiles are more~~

and the less the temptation the greater the stability of the nuclear balance.



(B)

survivable, but also far harder to verify: We can't count what we can't find. Our worry is that this could increase the incentives for cheating. And if several warheads are carried by each mobile missile, the problem -- and the penalty for failing to detect cheating -- is compounded.

are working on these and other problems. And
 We don't have answers to all these problems. But we will go to Geneva with new ideas on how best to build on the significant areas of agreement that already exist.

The principle of security through stability does not apply to the United States alone. Our security is bound to that of our allies. We cannot rely on rhetoric to deter a would-be aggressor. Our theater and tactical nuclear forces give substance to that reality -- a link that extends deterrence beyond our shores and serves to strengthen our common security.

The INF treaty demonstrates our willingness to negotiate reductions in
 We are committed to reducing nuclear weapons when doing so strengthens alliance security and international stability. In

the past decade, NATO has unilaterally removed ²⁴⁰⁰ ~~4000~~ warheads -- to a level 35% lower than in 1979. But theater nuclear forces contribute to our stability no less than strategic forces. We do

not want to find ourselves dependent ^{solidly} on the threat of a strategic nuclear exchange to deter ~~the threat of war~~ *of conflict in Europe.*

(P)
 The fact that conventional weapons alone do not deter war. It is important to remember that the conventional balance in Europe is every bit as important as -- and linked to -- had to rely more heavily on nuclear weapons because of the ~~the nuclear balance. The Warsaw Pact's massive significant conventional force advantage of the Warsaw Pact.~~

→ *H:* So we are committed to maintaining modern, effective US nuclear forces based in Europe -- forces that are militarily effective and that permit no doubt that the US is committed to the defense of

its allies. Our vital interests, our fundamental
goals, and our enduring values ~~remain~~ ^{remain} no less.

Conventional force advantage has cast a shadow of war over Europe for more than 40 years

8

The unilateral reductions President Gorbachev has promised give us hope that we can now redress that imbalance -- not because they transform the balance of conventional forces: none of the promised reductions will seriously affect the significant numerical superiority the Soviets now enjoy. We welcome those steps ^{not just only} because they confirm what we've said all along ^{-- that} Soviet military power far exceeds the levels needed to defend the legitimate security interests of the USSR. ^{if implemented, such steps will also help reduce the threat of a surprise attack.}

The negotiations we are now engaged in offer a chance to transform the military landscape of Europe. The issues are exceedingly complex and the stakes enormously high -- but the Soviets have been forthcoming, and I am genuinely hopeful that we will achieve the reductions we seek.

But as in the case of nuclear forces, numbers alone are not enough. Our aim is nothing less than removing war as an option in Europe. The USSR has said it is willing to restructure its forces. We want the Soviets to deploy a smaller force -- one less reliant on the tanks, artillery and personnel carriers that provide the Soviets' offensive striking power. A restructured Warsaw Pact -- one that cannot threaten a major offensive against the West -- would make Europe and the world more secure.

The same can be said for a movement toward more openness in military activities. In recent years, we have invited observers to each other's military exercises, and expanded the exchange of information on our military forces and their activities. Two weeks ago, I proposed an "open ^{she's} ~~sky~~" initiative, to take the

concept of openness one step further: a plan for both sides to allow territorial overflights that, together with satellite surveillance, will increase our security against sudden and threatening military activities. In the same spirit, we want to see openness extend to Soviet military expenditures as well. I call on the Soviets to do as we have always done: to publish, for the first time in Soviet history, an accurate defense budget.

This kind of restructuring and openness in the military sphere is the kind that can lead to lower tensions and greater trust between our two nations -- and a safer, ^{more} secure world.

~~As we look toward that day, we know now that our defense strategy will be tested severely in the developing world. A growing number of nations are now acquiring advanced and highly destructive military capabilities -- in some cases, nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, and the means to deliver them. And it is an unfortunate fact that the world faces increasing threats from armed insurgencies, terrorists, and (as you in the Coast Guard are well aware) narcotics traffickers -- and, in some regions, an unholy alliance of all three. These emerging challenges will test our traditional concepts of security as never before.~~

Forging a global strategy for defense is made more difficult by the serious budget constraints that we face. The 12% reduction in real defense spending over the past five years has cut into our capabilities. *Secretary Cheney has already made a number of* ~~More~~ tough choices, lie ahead, ~~but~~ *one* is already made. I will not as Commander-in-Chief, preside

and more

over a return to the "hollow army" of the 1970s -- a force under-trained and ill-equipped to perform its missions. You who choose to serve in America's Armed Forces deserve better. You have my word: our military will be battle ready. You'll have the tools and training you need to do your job.

The reviews we are now completing address the full range of security problems before us. As a global power, it should not surprise us that our ingenuity will be tested in matching our security responsibilities with our resources in the years ahead. But as I go to Europe to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the Atlantic Alliance, I cannot help but notice how far we've come -- and how bright our future is.

I began today by speaking about the triumph of a particularly American idea: freedom. I know there will be people who think there's something presumptuous about that -- people who will think it boastful to talk about that triumph. But it's not, for one simple reason: America knows her place in democracy's unfolding drama.

Democracy isn't our creation -- it's our inheritance.

We can't take credit for democracy -- but we can take the precious gift of freedom, preserve it and pass it on -- as my generation does to you, and you, too, will do one day.

As I said on the Capitol steps the day I took this office, "There is but one just use of power, and it is to serve people." As your Commander in Chief, let me call on today's class to reaffirm with me that American power will remain always in

service to the enduring ideals of democracy and freedom. And
let those who follow be able to say that in resisting the
pressures of the moment, we delivered peace, freedom and
prosperity -- lasting and secure.

#

Insert A

This new missile will be able to survive an
~~attack with only minutes of warning.~~
attack with only minutes of warning. ~~(less time~~

~~than it takes for an ICBM to get from the~~

~~Soviet Union to the United States.~~

Insert B

① The START Treaty we are negotiating will lead to significant reductions in the ^{strategic} forces of both sides. But reductions alone are not enough. ^{Agreements} that ^{merely} ^{result} in reductions but do not ~~serve~~ reduce the risks of war do not serve our interests. Indeed, the deeper the cuts, the more ^{care} ~~care~~ we must exercise to ensure that the ^{remaining} ~~remaining~~ forces constitute a stabilizing, survivable, and effective deterrent. And the deeper the cuts, the more insistent we must be that the agreement meet ~~the~~ demanding standards of verification.

② So ~~as we continue~~ as we continue to work toward a START agreement, we will ~~continue~~ ^{be looking}

B. continued

~~how best to address the~~ ^{at the} problem of vulnerable
silo-based missiles with multiple warheads. ~~that~~
~~could pose such tempting targets for a pre-emption~~
~~strike.~~ We likewise will be struggling with the
dilemma posed by mobile missiles which are, at
~~most~~ once, both more survivable and much
harder to count and verify. And if those mobile
missiles are ~~carrying~~ carrying multiple warheads,
the problem -- and the penalty for not catching
any cheating -- is compounded.