

Originally Processed With FOIA(s):

S

FOIA Number:

S

FOIA MARKER

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

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

OA/ID Number: 13530
Folder ID Number: 13530-002

Folder Title:
Oklahoma State University Commencement Address 5/4/90 [OA 4729] [2]

Stack:

G

Row:

26

Section:

16

Shelf:

3

Position:

1

CLOSE HOLD

Document No. _____

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

1990 MAY -2 PM 11:55

DATE: 5/2/90 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: 6:00 TODAY

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: COMMENCEMENT OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	☐	☒	MCCLURE	☐	☐
SUNUNU	☐	☒	NEWMAN	☐	☐
SCOWCROFT	☒	☐	PORTER	☐	☐
DARMAN	☐	☐	ROGICH	☐	☐
BATES	☐	☐	UNTERMAYER	☐	☐
CARD	☐	☐	_____	☐	☐
CICCONI	☐	☐	_____	☐	☐
DEMAREST	☐	☐	_____	☐	☐
FITZWATER	☐	☐	_____	☐	☐
GRAY	☐	☐	_____	☐	☐
HAGIN	☐	☐	_____	☐	☐

REMARKS:

Please provide your comments/recommendations directly to my office by 6:00 TODAY, Wednesday, May 2, 1990 Thank you.

RESPONSE:

CLOSE HOLD

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

CLOSE HOLD

(Lange/Cawley)
May 1, 1990
1:20 P.M.
[NATO.DOC]

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: COMMENCEMENT, OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
LEWIS STADIUM
FRIDAY, MAY 4, 1990
2:00 P.M.

[[Thank you, Governor Bellmon. President Campbell, Secretary Cavazos; Senator Don Nickles; Congressmen Jim Inhofe and Wes Watkins; Chief Mankiller, Mr. Donnelly; faculty, parents, but most of all -- O.S.U.'s graduating Class of 1990 ! \\

I'll try to be brief -- Barbara and I can't wait to get a beer and some cheese fries over at Eskimo Joe's... \\
Hope they have enough T-shirts for all the grandkids... \\

~~This is the end zone where Barry Sanders ran back kickoffs for touchdowns in two opening games. So I stand and deliver on hallowed ground... After I finish, I hope I can resist the urge to spike this speech and do a little dance. \\\ You toe?]]~~

You know, when graduates of my vintage were sitting through ceremonies like this, right after the Second World War, we faced a world of changes -- full of potential and new possibilities.

Barbara and I got into an old two-door Studebaker -- you still drive those, right? -- in the summer of 1948. Drove down to Texas. [[Of course, who knows how far we could've gone in life if we'd made it to Oklahoma...]]

Post-war America was ready for peace and prosperity. But while the free world was recovering, the nations of Eastern Europe were being "consolidated" behind an Iron Curtain. So began four decades of division in Europe -- and 40 long years of

CLOSE HOLD

→ Now Europe, and the world, have entered a new era -- the age of freedom.

suspicion between superpowers.

Today, you also graduate at the end of an era of conflict -- but a contest of a different kind -- a cold and abstract war of words and walls. ~~That conflict, at last, is coming to a close. We're going to leave the cold war, ladies and gentlemen, in history's dust. \~~ ^{I hope may soon come}

I'll be reflecting on the power and potential of democratic change in each of the commencement addresses I make this year.

I begin today with ~~[the future of democracy -- and the defense of freedom -- in Europe.]~~ ^{America's place in the new Europe.}

A few of you may be wondering what a continent 4000 miles away has to do with you. Many of the graduates of America's class of ¹⁹¹⁶ ~~1917~~ may have wondered why the faraway war they read about in the daily newspapers should have anything to do with them. But within a year they were fighting in the trenches, struggling in a hell beyond human imagination. To a cause that hadn't been clear to them on graduation day, they were willing to give their lives.

Two decades later, on the eve of another World War, another generation of Americans sat in the bright sun of commencement ceremonies at colleges across the country. At first, many were reluctant about the struggle for freedom in Europe -- but again, many would die to preserve it.

Near the end of that war, in a speech delivered to graduates of a small school in Missouri, an Englishman said, "There never was a war in all history easier to prevent by timely action than

replace
with
insert A

the one which has just desolated such great areas of the globe. It could have been prevented in my belief without the firing of a single shot... but no one would listen, and one by one we were all sucked into the awful whirlpool. We surely must not let that happen again."

^{When that war ended,}
~~The words they heard were Winston Churchill's~~ and those students no longer questioned our role in the future of Europe. They no longer asked what Europe had to do with them, because they knew the answer: everything. ~~In the forests of Argonne and on the beaches of Normandy, two generations of Americans became part of this nation's mission to Europe.~~ Today, I'm going to outline a new American mission in Europe, as we enter a new age of freedom.

Europe is a continent whose future has always been intertwined with ours. And now we are poised at a moment of choice -- a critical time in our strategic relationship with our ~~neighbors across the Atlantic.~~ About a year ago, in Germany, I defined the kind of Europe this Administration is committed to: ^{a peaceful, stable} Europe -- a Europe whole and free. Today that goal is within our reach.

^
 We are entering a new age of freedom in a time of uncertainty, but great hope. Emerging democracies in Eastern Europe are going through social, political, and economic transformations -- shaking loose stagnant, centralized bureaucracies that have smothered initiative and choice for generations.

In this time of transition, moving away from the postwar era

→ The process of change in the Soviet Union is also still unfinished. It will be crucial to see, for example, whether Moscow chooses coercion or peaceful dialogue in responding to the aspirations of the Lithuanian people, and nationalities within the Soviet Union.

and beyond containment, we cannot know what choices the people of Eastern Europe will make for their future. ~~Our role is to ensure that the choice is theirs.~~

President Gorbachev has made profound progress in his country. Reforms so fundamental that the clock cannot be turned back. Yet neither can we turn the clock ahead, to know what kind of country the Soviet Union will be in years to come.

But this we know: The Soviet Union will remain -- even after all the planned reductions in its forces are complete, even if our current arms control proposals are agreed to, and implemented -- the strongest military power on the Eurasian landmass, armed with thousands of nuclear weapons, dwarfing all other European states in size, population, and armed strength.

For the sake of the future we share with Europe, our policies and presence must be ^{appropriate for} ~~equal to~~ this period of transition -- with a constancy and reliability that will reassure our friends, both old and new. *We face many challenges around the world, and there is no set formula for success. But*

We have global responsibilities. *My European colleagues I believe they are right. I believe*
want the United States to be part of Europe's future. ~~So we will~~
that the United States should
remain a European power in the broadest sense of that idea -- politically, militarily, and economically. And the foundation for America's peaceful engagement in Europe has been, and will continue to be, NATO.

↙ Because of our commitment to peace in Europe, there hasn't been a war on that continent in 45 years. The "long peace" now enjoyed by Europe is a fact we should view through the long lens

INSERT
B

See p. 7 pp. 2
on new
draft

of history: Europe has now experienced the longest uninterrupted period of international peace in centuries -- in fact, in the recorded history of that continent. ^{The Alliance is now ready to build} ~~Gurs is an engagement that~~ ^{on the achievements of the last forty years and define its objectives for the next} ~~has helped European democracies enjoy unprecedented stability and~~ ^{century.} ~~prosperity.~~ So the Alliance must join together to craft a new Western strategy for new and changing times.

I have consulted with my Allied colleagues, and with the Secretary General of NATO, Manfred Woerner. Based on these discussions, ~~today~~ ^{am} ~~I~~ ^{ing} ~~call~~ ^{an early} for a ~~June~~ Summit meeting of all NATO leaders. The time is right for the Alliance to act.

^{the fundamental purpose of this is to} I believe ~~this~~ Summit should ^{NATO Strategy Review} launch a wide-ranging review of ~~Alliance policy~~ for the transformed Europe of the 1990's. To my NATO colleagues, I suggest that our Summit ^{provide direction for this Review by addressing} ~~should address~~ four critical points:

One, the ~~new~~ political role NATO can play in the new Europe.

Two, the conventional forces the Alliance will need in the time ahead, and NATO's goals for conventional arms control.

Three, the role of nuclear weapons based in Europe -- and ~~the~~ Western objectives in new nuclear arms control negotiations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

Four, strengthening the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe -- the CSCE -- to reinforce NATO and help protect democratic values, in a Europe whole and free.

The first task the NATO Summit should consider is the future political mission of the Alliance. As military threats fade, the political dimension of NATO's work -- always there but seldom

noticed -- becomes more prominent. So at the NATO Summit we should look for ways to help our German friends achieve **freedom and unity** -- something which we and our Allies have supported for over 40 years. And we should reaffirm the importance of keeping a united Germany ^{a full member of} ~~fully committed to~~ NATO.

The Alliance needs to find ways to work more closely with a vigorous European Community ^{that is rightly asserting its own distinct views.} And in Eastern Europe, governments that were once military adversaries are now our partners in building a new continent. So we must also talk about how to encourage further ^{peaceful} democratic change in Eastern Europe, ^{and in the Soviet Union.}

But even as NATO gives more emphasis to its political mission, its guarantee of European security must remain firm. Our enemy today is uncertainty, and instability. ^{the Alliance} So ~~we~~ will need to maintain a sound, collective military structure with forces in the field, backed by larger forces that can be called upon in a crisis.

Which brings me to the second task for the NATO Summit -- a review of how the Alliance should plan its conventional defenses. While we need to recognize that it will take ^{some time} ~~several years at a minimum~~ before the Soviet military presence is gone from Eastern Europe -- and before the major reductions contemplated by both sides can be implemented -- ^{for that world,} we need to develop our strategy now.

✗ Militarily significant ~~number of~~ U.S. ~~conventional~~ forces must remain on the other side of the Atlantic for as long as our Allies want and need them. These forces demonstrate, as no words can, the enduring ^{political} compact that binds America's fate with Europe's

→ Obviously, Soviet actions will be critical. Yet even if all Soviet armed forces return to the USSR, and conventional arms control moves forward, the Soviet military will still field forces many times larger than those of any other single European state.

see P 6
PP 4

democracies.

7
[But if words might serve, I would turn again to Churchill's: "Before we cast away the solid assurances of national armaments," he said at that commencement forty-four years ago, "we must be certain that our temple is built not upon shifting sands or quagmires, but upon the rock." And so we must.]

would face an entirely different kind of threat. To meet it, we should plan for a different kind of military presence, one focused less on the danger of an immediate outbreak of war and more on how to promote long-term stability and prevent crises from escalating, relying on reduced forces that show our capability -- and readiness -- to respond to whatever may arise.

If the Soviet withdrawal continues and our arms control efforts are successful, we ~~will profoundly turn the postwar buildup around -- building down forces in a transformed Europe.~~

conventional
The CFE treaty we have proposed would be the most ambitious arms control agreement ever concluded. We must finish the work on a Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty soon, and plan to sign it at a CSCE Summit ^{this} [next] fall. But at the Summit we need to look further ahead, preparing for follow-on negotiations after the conclusion of a CFE treaty. The NATO Summit should develop the Alliance's objectives for these talks.

Third,
The NATO Summit should also assess the future of U.S. nuclear forces in Europe. As democracy blooms in Central and Eastern Europe, as Soviet troops return home and tanks are dismantled, there is less need for nuclear systems of the shortest range. The NATO Summit should accelerate the ongoing [strategic] work within the Alliance.

to determine the minimum number and types of weapons that will be needed to deter war -- credibly and effectively.

I've reviewed our plan to produce and deploy newer, more modern, short-range nuclear missiles to replace the Lance system now in place in Europe. We've just about finished the research and development work for these new missiles. But I've decided,

→ In light of these new political conditions, and the limited range and flexibility of short-range nuclear missile forces based in Europe,

after consulting with our Allies, to terminate the Follow-On To Lance program -- and to withdraw the funding request now before Congress. I have also decided to cancel any further modernization of U.S. nuclear artillery shells [new] deployed in Europe.

There are still [many] short-range U.S. -- and many more Soviet -- nuclear missile systems now deployed in Europe. We've said we're prepared to negotiate the reduction of these forces as well, in a new set of arms control talks. At the NATO Summit, I will call upon my colleagues to agree on the broad objectives for these future negotiations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union, and kick off the preparations within the Alliance for these talks.

would also like to suggest
 Today, I [ask] ~~that the startup of these negotiations be accelerated~~ so that these new U.S.-Soviet arms control talks [can] begin shortly after a CFE treaty on conventional forces has been signed.

In taking these steps, the United States is not going to allow Europe to become "safe for conventional war." There are few lessons so clear in history as this: *deterrence by conventional forces alone often has not worked.* ~~the unprecedented peace of Europe hasn't been preserved by chance.~~ It has been the ~~result of~~ NATO's reliance on both nuclear and conventional forces ^{hes.}

But every aspect of America's engagement in Europe -- military, political, and economic -- must be complementary. And one place where they all come together is in the Conference on

Security and Cooperation in Europe -- an organization of 35 states of Europe and North America. ^{must be} ~~It~~ ^{The CSCE is already} should take on a broader role.

So the fourth task for a NATO Summit is to reach common Allied objectives for the future of the CSCE ~~which should be a beacon for human rights and individual freedoms.~~ It can help the victorious forces of democracy in Eastern Europe secure their revolutions, ^{-- as they join the commonwealth of free nations --} and be assured a voice in the new Europe.

~~The CSCE should expand its ability to offer guidelines for building free societies. The NATO Summit should consider a much more ambitious agenda for the CSCE~~ -- including setting standards for truly free elections, adopting measures to strengthen the rule of law, and pointing the way in the needed but painful transition from centralized, command economies to free markets.

^{CSCE can also provide a forum for political dialogue in a more united Europe. I agree with those leaders who have called for regular consultations among senior representatives from the CSCE countries.} ~~Finally~~ we should consider whether new mechanisms within the CSCE can help mediate and peacefully settle disputes in Europe, ^{and look for other steps to reduce tensions among European states.} I believe my Allied colleagues and I should agree to take up these ideas at a CSCE Summit later this year, in conjunction with the signing of a CFE treaty.

In Eastern Europe, in this hemisphere, the triumph of democracy has cast its warm light on the face of the world like a miraculous dawn. But the outcome of this struggle for freedom is not ordained, and it will not be the work of miracles. At home and abroad, democracy's deliverance must be America's work.

All of you who graduate here today, were witness to wondrous change in the world last year. And you're part of an important, historic American commitment to a new American mission in Europe.

The security of Europe and the world has become very complex in this century. But America's commitment to stability and peace is profoundly clear. Its motivation derives from the strength of our forefathers -- from the blood of those who have died for freedom -- and for the sake of all who would live in peace.

And every voice, every heart's commitment to freedom is important. There's a story, about an old man and a boy climbing a mountain one winter morning. It began to snow, very lightly. The boy said to the old man, "Tell me the weight of a snowflake."

(Insert C)
"Almost nothing," the old man said. They reached the top of the mountain, and watched the valley beneath fill up with snow, until those weightless snowflakes, one by one, became an avalanche whose thunder shook the earth.

"Maybe," the boy said, "there is only one person's voice lacking for the world to be free."

The thunderous cry for freedom -- in Eastern Europe, in South Africa, in this hemisphere -- was heard around the world in the Revolution of '89. So understand how America's mission in Europe, like millions of decisions made for freedom, makes a world of difference. And add your voice to the thundering chorus.

Thank you. God bless you. And God bless the United States of America.

#

Insert A

A few of you may be wondering what a continent 4000 miles away has to do with you. Revolutionary change is transforming Europe. Throughout our history, great upheavals in Europe have forced the American people to respond, to make deep judgments about the part we should have in European affairs. This has been true from the time of the French Revolution and the wars which followed it, to World War I and the flawed peace which ended it, to the Second World War and the creation of the postwar order. I believe that, now, we are poised at another such moment -- a critical time in our strategic relationship with our neighbors across the Atlantic.

Many of the graduates of America's class of 1916 may have wondered why the faraway war they read about in the newspapers should have anything to do with them. They might have agreed with President Wilson, who that year said "we are not interested" in the causes of the war, in "the obscure foundations from which its stupendous flood has burst forth." But a year later those classmates, and their country, were swept up in the torrent, carrying them to the horror of the trenches in France.

Yet after the war we again turned away from active involvement in European affairs. Instead, we sponsored a treaty to outlaw war. And then, as the outlaws gained strength, the United States declared its neutrality. As the Western democracies quailed in the face of the totalitarian powers, we passed new neutrality laws. Another generation of Americans sat in the bright sun of commencement ceremonies at colleges across the country thinking war in Europe could pass them by. But when war came, they paid an awful price for America's isolation.

Insert B

We chose to join with the free nations of Europe and form an Atlantic Community, an enduring political compact, recognizing in peace what we had learned from war. Our help is not a charitable donation. Our engagement in Europe has meant that the Europeans accept America as part of their continent's future, taking our interests into account across the board. Our commitment is not just in defense; it must be a well-balanced mix of involvement in all dimensions of European affairs. Our political commitment, with our troops and the deterrent potential of our nuclear weapons standing as the proof of our determination, has made a difference.

Insert C

In Eastern Europe, in this hemisphere, the triumph of democracy has cast its warm light on the face of the world like a miraculous dawn. But the outcome of this struggle for freedom is not ordained, and it will not be the work of miracles.

All of you who graduate here today are part of a historic decision for America -- to continue our active engagement in the future of Europe. I am convinced that this work to protect freedom, to build free societies, will safeguard our own peace, and prosperity.

We have always been a leader within the Atlantic Community. It has been the most successful international friendship of modern times. So understand how your decisions about America's place in Europe, like millions of decisions made for freedom, make a difference. We should go on showing how free peoples, sharing a common purpose, can create a bright morning for the nations, shaping the future of our world.

Thank you. God bless you. And God bless the United States of America.

strength, United States passed new neutrality laws. Another generation of Americans sat in the bright sun of commencement ceremonies at colleges across the country, thinking war in Europe would pass them by. But when war came, they paid an awful price for America's isolation.

When that war ended, those students no longer questioned our role in the future of Europe. They no longer asked what Europe had to do with them, because they knew the answer: everything.

About a year ago, in Germany, I defined the kind of Europe this Administration is committed to: a peaceful, stable Europe -- a Europe whole and free. Today that goal is within our reach.

We are entering a new age of freedom in a time of uncertainty, but great hope. Emerging democracies in Eastern Europe are going through social, political, and economic transformations shaking loose stagnant, centralized bureaucracies that have smothered initiative for generations.

In this time of transition, moving away from the postwar era and beyond containment, we cannot know what choices the people of Eastern Europe will make for their future. The process of change in the Soviet Union is also still unfinished. It will be crucial to see, for example, whether Moscow chooses coercion or peaceful dialogue in responding to the aspirations of the Lithuanian people, and nationalities within the Soviet Union.

President Gorbachev has made profound progress in his country. Reforms so fundamental that the clock cannot be turned

back. Yet neither can we turn the clock ahead, to know what kind of country the Soviet Union will be in years to come.

For the sake of the future we share with Europe, our policies and presence must be appropriate for this period of transition -- with a constancy and reliability that will reassure our friends, both old and new.

My European colleagues want the United States to be part of Europe's future. I believe they are right. The United States should remain a European power in the broadest sense -- ^{as} politically, militarily, and economically. And, ^{as part of our global responsibility} the foundation for America's peaceful engagement in Europe has been, and will continue to be, NATO.

Recognizing in peace what we had learned from war, we joined with the free nations of Europe to form an Atlantic Community, an enduring political compact. Our engagement in Europe has meant that the Europeans accept America as part of their continent's future, taking our interests into account across the board. Our commitment is not just in defense; it must be a well-balanced mix of involvement in all dimensions of European affairs.

Because of our political commitment to peace in Europe, there hasn't been a war on that continent in 45 years. ~~That~~

~~commitment, along with our troops and the deterrent potential of our nuclear weapons demonstrating our determination, made a~~

~~difference.~~ ^{This} The "long peace" now enjoyed by Europe should be viewed through the long lens of history: Europe has now experienced the longest uninterrupted period of international

peace in the recorded history of that continent. The Alliance is now ready to build on ^{this history} ~~the achievements of the last forty years~~ and define its objectives for the next century. So the Alliance must join together to craft a new Western strategy for new and changing times.

^{Having} ~~I have~~ consulted with my Allied colleagues, and with the Secretary General of NATO, Manfred Woerner, ~~Based on these discussions~~ I am calling for an early Summit meeting of all NATO leaders. The time is right for the Alliance to act.

The fundamental purpose of this Summit should be to launch a wide-ranging NATO Strategy Review for the transformed Europe of the 1990's. To my NATO colleagues, I suggest that our Summit ^{this Review on} ~~provide it direction by~~ addressing four critical points:

One, the political role NATO can play in the new Europe.

Two, the conventional forces the Alliance will need in the time ahead, and NATO's goals for conventional arms control.

Three, the role of nuclear weapons based in Europe -- and Western objectives in new nuclear arms control negotiations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

Four, strengthening the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe -- the CSCE -- to reinforce NATO and help protect democratic values, in a Europe whole and free.

The first task the NATO Summit should consider is the future political mission of the Alliance. As military threats fade, the political dimension of NATO's work -- always there but seldom noticed -- becomes more prominent. So at the NATO Summit we

should look for ways to help our German friends sustain freedom and achieve unity -- something which we and our Allies have supported for over 40 years. And we should reaffirm the importance of keeping a united Germany a full member of NATO.

The Alliance needs to find ways to work more closely with a vigorous European Community that is rightly asserting its own distinct views. And in Eastern Europe, governments once our ~~military~~ adversaries are now our partners in building a new continent. So we must also talk about how to encourage further peaceful democratic change in Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union.

But even as NATO gives more emphasis to its political mission, its guarantee of European security must remain firm. Our enemy today is uncertainty, and instability. So the Alliance will need to maintain a sound, collective military structure with forces in the field, backed by larger forces that can be called upon in a crisis.

Which brings me to the second task for the NATO Summit -- a review of how the Alliance should plan its conventional defenses. While we need to recognize that it will take some time before the Soviet military presence is gone from Eastern Europe -- and before the major reductions contemplated by both sides can be implemented -- we need to develop our strategy for that world now.

Obviously, Soviet actions will be critical. Yet even after all the planned reductions in its forces are complete, even if

our current arms control proposals are agreed to and implemented, the Soviet military will still field forces dwarfing those of any other single European state -- armed with thousands of nuclear weapons. Militarily significant U.S. forces must remain on the other side of the Atlantic for as long as our Allies want and need them. These forces demonstrate, as no words can, the enduring political compact that binds America's fate with Europe's democracies.

If the Soviet withdrawal continues and our arms control efforts are successful, we must plan for a different kind of military presence focused less on the danger of an immediate outbreak of war. We must promote long-term stability and prevent crises from escalating by relying on reduced forces that show our capability -- and readiness -- to respond to whatever may arise.

The CFE treaty, we have proposed, would be the most ambitious conventional arms control agreement ever concluded. We must finish the work on ~~a Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty~~ soon, and plan to sign it at a CSCE Summit this fall. But at the Summit we need to look further ahead, preparing for **follow-on negotiations** after the conclusion of a CFE treaty. The NATO Summit should develop the Alliance's objectives for these talks.

Third, the NATO Summit should also assess the future of U.S. nuclear forces in Europe. As democracy blooms in Eastern Europe, as Soviet troops return home and tanks are dismantled, there is less need for nuclear systems of the shortest range. The NATO Summit should **accelerate** ongoing work within the Alliance to

determine the minimum number and types of weapons that will be needed to deter war -- credibly and effectively.

In light of these new political conditions, and the limited range and flexibility of short-range nuclear missile forces based in Europe, I've reviewed our plan to produce and deploy newer, more modern, short-range nuclear missiles to replace the Lance system now in Europe. We've almost finished the research and development work for these new missiles. But I've decided, after consulting with our Allies, to terminate the Follow-On To Lance program, ~~and to withdraw the funding request now before Congress.~~ I have also decided to cancel any further modernization of U.S. nuclear artillery shells deployed in Europe.

There are still short-range U.S. -- and many more Soviet -- nuclear missile systems deployed in Europe. We're prepared to negotiate the reduction of these forces as well, in a new set of arms control talks. At the NATO Summit, I will urge my colleagues to agree on the broad objectives for these future U.S.-Soviet negotiations and begin preparations within the Alliance for these talks. I would also like to suggest that these new U.S.-Soviet arms control talks begin shortly after a CFE treaty on conventional forces has been signed.

In taking these steps, the United States is not going to allow Europe to become "safe for conventional war." There are few lessons so clear in history as this: Only the combination of

Stuffed copy - 5/2

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

(Lange/Cawley)
May 1, 1990
1:20 P.M.
[NATO.DOC]

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: COMMENCEMENT, OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
LEWIS STADIUM
FRIDAY, MAY 4, 1990
2:00 P.M.

[[Thank you, Governor Bellmon. President Campbell, ~~Secretary~~
~~Cavazos~~; Senator Don Nickles; ~~Congressmen Jim Inhofe~~ and Wes
Watkins; Chief Mankiller, Mr. Donnelly; faculty, parents, but
most of all -- O.S.U.'s ^{Centennial} ~~graduating~~ Class of 1990 ! \\

~~I'll try to be brief --~~ ^{Sorry} Barbara and I ^{think she's over @} ~~can't wait to get~~
^{couldn't be here}
a beer and some cheese fries over at Eskimo Joe's... \\

Hope they have enough T-shirts for all the grandkids... \\

This is the end zone where Barry Sanders ran back kickoffs
for touchdowns in two opening games. So I stand and deliver on
hallowed ground... After I finish, I hope I can resist the urge
to spike this speech and do a little dance. \\\\ You too?]]

You know, when graduates of my vintage were sitting through
ceremonies like this, right after the Second World War, we faced
a world of changes -- full of potential and new possibilities.

Barbara and I got into an old two-door Studebaker -- you
still drive those, right? -- in the summer of 1948. Drove down
to Texas. [[Of course, who knows how far we could've gone in
life if we'd made it to Oklahoma...]]

Post-war America was ready for peace and prosperity. But
while the free world was recovering, the nations of Eastern
Europe were being "consolidated" behind an Iron Curtain. So
began four decades of division in Europe -- and 40 long years of

Harry

-Looking Forward
Audio of GB
P.22



THE WHITE HOUSE

suspicion between superpowers.^{WASHINGTON}

Today, you also graduate at the end of an era of conflict -- but a contest of a different kind -- a cold and abstract war of words and walls. That conflict, at last, is coming to a close. **We're going to leave the cold war, ladies and gentlemen, in history's dust. **

I'll be reflecting on the power and potential of democratic change in each of the commencement addresses I make this year.
I begin today with the future of democracy -- and the defense of freedom -- in Europe.

A few of you may be wondering what a continent 4000 miles away has to do with you. Many of the graduates of America's class of 1917 may have wondered why the faraway war they read about in the daily newspapers should have anything to do with them. But within a year they were fighting in the trenches, struggling in a hell beyond human imagination. To a cause that hadn't been clear to them on graduation day, they were willing to give their lives.

Two decades later, on the eve of another World War, another generation of Americans sat in the bright sun of commencement ceremonies at colleges across the country. At first, many were reluctant about the struggle for freedom in Europe -- but again, many would die to preserve it.

Near the end of that war, in a speech delivered to graduates of a small school in Missouri, an Englishman said, "There never was a war in all history easier to prevent by timely action than

Winston S Churchill:
His Complete
Speeches,
1897-1963
Vol. VII, 1943-49
p. 7286

p. 7292

THE WHITE HOUSE

1-7203
the one which has just desolated such great areas of the globe. It could have been prevented in my belief without the firing of a single shot... but no one would listen, and one by one we were all sucked into the awful whirlpool. We surely must not let that happen again."

The words they heard were Winston Churchill's -- and those students no longer questioned our role in the future of Europe. They no longer asked what Europe had to do with them, because they knew the answer: everything. In the forests of Argonne and on the beaches of Normandy, two generations of Americans became part of this nation's mission to Europe. **Today, I'm going to outline a new American mission in Europe, as we enter a new age of freedom.**

NEC Draft
Europe is a continent whose future has always been intertwined with ours. And now we are poised at a moment of choice -- a critical time in our strategic relationship with our neighbors across the Atlantic. About a year ago, in Germany, I defined the kind of Europe this Administration is committed to: a Europe whole and free. Today that goal is within our reach.

We are entering a new age of freedom in a time of uncertainty, but great hope. Emerging democracies in Eastern Europe are going through social, political, and economic transformations -- shaking loose stagnant, centralized bureaucracies that have smothered initiative and choice for generations.

In this time of transition, moving away from the postwar era

THE WHITE HOUSE

and beyond containment, ^{WASHINGTON} we cannot know what choices the people of Eastern Europe will make for their future. **Our role is to ensure that the choice is theirs.**

President Gorbachev has made profound progress in his country. Reforms so fundamental that the clock cannot be turned back. Yet neither can we turn the clock ahead, to know what kind of country the Soviet Union will be in years to come.

But this we know: The Soviet Union will remain -- even after all the planned reductions in its forces are complete, even if our current arms control proposals are agreed to, and implemented -- the strongest military power on the Eurasian landmass, armed with thousands of nuclear weapons, dwarfing all other European states in size, population, and armed strength.

For the sake of the future we share with Europe, our policies and presence must be equal to this period of transition -- with a constancy and reliability that will reassure our friends, both old and new.

We have global responsibilities. My European colleagues want the United States to be part of Europe's future. So we will remain a European power in the broadest sense of that idea -- politically, militarily, and economically. And the foundation for America's peaceful engagement in Europe has been, and will continue to be, NATO.

Because of our commitment to peace in Europe, there hasn't been a war on that continent in 45 years. The "long peace" now enjoyed by Europe is a fact we should view through the long lens

THE WHITE HOUSE

of history: Europe has now ^{WASHINGTON} experienced the longest uninterrupted period of international peace in centuries -- in fact, in the recorded history of that continent. Ours is an engagement that has helped European democracies enjoy unprecedented stability and prosperity. So the Alliance must join together to craft a new Western strategy for new and changing times.

I have consulted with my Allied colleagues, and with the Secretary General of NATO, Manfred Woerner. Based on these discussions, today I call for a June Summit meeting of all NATO leaders. The time is right for the Alliance to act.

I believe this Summit should launch a wide-ranging review of Alliance policy for the transformed Europe of the 1990's. To my NATO colleagues, I suggest that our Summit should address four critical points:

One, the new political role NATO can play in the new Europe.

Two, the conventional forces the Alliance will need in the time ahead, and NATO's goals for conventional arms control.

Three, the role of nuclear weapons based in Europe -- and the Western objectives in new nuclear arms control negotiations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

Four, strengthening the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe -- the CSCE -- to reinforce NATO and help protect democratic values, in a Europe whole and free.

The first task the NATO Summit should consider is the future political mission of the Alliance. As military threats fade, the political dimension of NATO's work -- always there but seldom

THE WHITE HOUSE

noticed -- becomes more ^{WASHINGTON} prominent. So at the NATO Summit we should look for ways to help our German friends achieve **freedom and unity** -- something which we and our Allies have supported for over 40 years. And we should **reaffirm the importance of keeping a united Germany fully committed to NATO.**

The Alliance needs to find ways to work more closely with a vigorous European Community. And in Eastern Europe, governments that were once military adversaries are now our **partners** in building a new continent. So we must also talk about how to encourage further democratic change in Eastern Europe.

But even as NATO gives more emphasis to its political mission, its guarantee of European security must remain firm. **Our enemy today is uncertainty, and instability.** So we will need to maintain a sound, collective military structure with forces in the field, backed by larger forces that can be called upon in a crisis.

Which brings me to the second task for the NATO Summit -- a review of how the Alliance should plan its conventional defenses. While we need to recognize that it will take several years at a minimum before the Soviet military presence is gone from Eastern Europe -- and before the major reductions contemplated by both sides can be implemented -- **we need to develop our strategy now.**

A militarily significant number of U.S. conventional forces must remain on the other side of the Atlantic for as long as our Allies want and need them. These forces demonstrate, as no words can, the enduring compact that binds America's fate with Europe's

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

democracies.

But if words might serve, I would turn again to Churchill's: "Before we cast away the solid assurances of national armaments," he said at that commencement forty-four years ago, "we must be certain that our temple is built not upon shifting sands or quagmires, but upon the rock." And so we must.

If the Soviet withdrawal continues and our arms control efforts are successful, we will profoundly turn the postwar buildup around -- building down forces in a transformed Europe.

The CFE treaty we have proposed would be the most ambitious arms control agreement ever concluded. We must finish the work on a Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty soon, and plan to sign it at a CSCE Summit [next] fall. But at the Summit we need to look further ahead, preparing for **follow-on negotiations** after the conclusion of a CFE treaty. The NATO Summit should develop the Alliance's objectives for these talks.

The NATO Summit should also assess the future of U.S. **nuclear** forces in Europe. As democracy blooms in Central and Eastern Europe, as Soviet troops return home and tanks are dismantled, there is less need for nuclear systems of the shortest range. The NATO Summit should **accelerate** the ongoing strategic work within the Alliance.

I've reviewed our plan to produce and deploy newer, more modern, short-range nuclear missiles to replace the Lance system now in place in Europe. We've just about finished the research and development work for these new missiles. But I've decided,

J. Churchill:
AS Collected
Speeches, p 7287

THE WHITE HOUSE

after consulting with our ^{WASHINGTON} Allies, to terminate the Follow-On To Lance program -- and to withdraw the funding request now before Congress. I have also decided to **cancel any further modernization of U.S. nuclear artillery shells now deployed in Europe.**

There are still many short-range U.S. -- and many more Soviet -- nuclear missile systems now deployed in Europe. We've said we're prepared to negotiate the reduction of these forces as well, in a new set of arms control talks. At the NATO Summit, I will **call upon my colleagues to agree on the broad objectives for these future negotiations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union, and kick off the preparations within the Alliance for these talks.**

Today, I ask **that the startup of these negotiations be accelerated** -- so that these new U.S.-Soviet arms control talks can begin shortly after a CFE treaty on conventional forces has been signed.

In taking these steps, **the United States is not going to allow Europe to become "safe for conventional war."** There are few lessons so clear in history as this: the unprecedented peace of Europe hasn't been preserved by chance. It has been the result of NATO's reliance on both nuclear and conventional forces.

But every aspect of America's engagement in Europe -- military, political, and economic -- must be complementary. And one place where they all come together is in the Conference on

Security and Cooperation in Europe -- an organization of 35 states of Europe and North America. It should take on a broader role.

So the fourth task for a NATO Summit is to reach common Allied objectives for the future of the CSCE -- which should be a beacon for human rights and individual freedoms. It can help the victorious forces of democracy in Eastern Europe secure their revolutions, and be assured a voice in the new Europe.

The NATO Summit should **consider a much more ambitious agenda for the CSCE** -- including setting standards for truly free elections, adopting measures to strengthen the rule of law, and pointing the way in the needed but painful transition from centralized, command economies to free markets.

Finally, we should consider whether new mechanisms within the CSCE can help mediate and peacefully settle disputes in Europe. I believe my Allied colleagues and I should **agree to take up these ideas at a CSCE Summit later this year, in conjunction with the signing of a CFE treaty.**

In Eastern Europe, in this hemisphere, the triumph of democracy has cast its warm light on the face of the world like a miraculous dawn. But the outcome of this struggle for freedom is not ordained, and it will not be the work of miracles. At home and abroad, **democracy's deliverance must be America's work.**

All of you who graduate here today, were witness to wondrous change in the world last year. And you're part of an important, historic American commitment to **a new American mission in Europe.**

The security of Europe and the world has become very complex in this century. But America's commitment to stability and peace is profoundly clear. Its motivation derives from the strength of our forefathers -- from the blood of those who have died for freedom -- and for the sake of all who would live in peace.

And every voice, every heart's commitment to freedom is important. There's a story, about an old man and a boy climbing a mountain one winter morning. It began to snow, very lightly. The boy said to the old man, "Tell me the weight of a snowflake."

"Almost nothing," the old man said. They reached the top of the mountain, and watched the valley beneath fill up with snow, until those weightless snowflakes, one by one, became an avalanche whose thunder shook the earth.

"Maybe," the boy said, "there is only one person's voice lacking for the world to be free."

The thunderous cry for freedom -- in Eastern Europe, in South Africa, in this hemisphere -- was heard around the world in the Revolution of '89. So understand how America's mission in Europe, like millions of decisions made for freedom, makes a world of difference. And add your voice to the thundering chorus.

Thank you. God bless you. And God bless the United States of America.

#

CLOSE HOLD

Document No. _____

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

1990 MAY -2 PM 11:55

DATE: 5/2/90 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: 6:00 TODAY

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: COMMENCEMENT OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERS

	ACTION FYI			ACTION FYI	
VICE PRESIDENT	☐	☒	MCCLURE	☐	☐
SUNUNU	☐	☒	NEWMAN	☐	☐
SCOWCROFT	☒	☐	PORTER	☐	☐
DARMAN	☐	☐	ROGICH	☐	☐
BATES	☐	☐	UNTERMAYER	☐	☐
CARD	☐	☐	_____	☐	☐
CICCONI	☐	☐	_____	☐	☐
DEMAREST	☐	☐	_____	☐	☐
FITZWATER	☐	☐	_____	☐	☐
GRAY	☐	☐	_____	☐	☐
HAGIN	☐	☐	_____	☐	☐

REMARKS:

Please provide your comments/recommendations directly to my office by 6:00 TODAY, Wednesday, May 2, 1990 Thank you.

RESPONSE:

CLOSE HOLD

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

CLOSE HOLD

(Lange/Cawley)
May 1, 1990
1:20 P.M.
[NATO.DOC]

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: COMMENCEMENT, OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
LEWIS STADIUM
FRIDAY, MAY 4, 1990
2:00 P.M.

132 316
[[Thank you, Governor Bellmon. President Campbell, ~~Secretary~~
~~Cavazos~~; Senator Don Nickles; Congressmen Jim Inhofe and Wes
Watkins; Chief Mankiller, Mr. Donnelly; faculty, parents, but
most of all -- O.S.U.'s graduating Class of 1990 ! \]

I'll try to be brief -- Barbara and I can't wait to get
a beer and some cheese fries over at Eskimo Joe's... \]

Hope they have enough T-shirts for all the grandkids... \]

~~This is the end zone where Barry Sanders ran back kickoffs~~
for touchdowns in two opening games. So I stand and deliver on
hallowed ground... After I finish, I hope I can resist the urge
to spike this speech and do a little dance. \\\\ You too? \]]

You know, when graduates of my vintage were sitting through
ceremonies like this, right after the Second World War, we faced
a world of changes -- full of potential and new possibilities.

Looking Forward
Autobiog of GB
p. 22
Barbara and I got into an old ~~two~~-door Studebaker -- you
still drive those, right? -- in the ~~summer~~ of 1948. Drove down
to Texas. [[Of course, who knows how far we could've gone in
life if we'd made it to Oklahoma...]]

Post-war America was ready for peace and prosperity. But
while the free world was recovering, the nations of Eastern
Europe were being "consolidated" behind an Iron Curtain. So
began four decades of division in Europe -- and 40 long years of

CLOSE HOLD

enter 2 → Now Europe, and the world, have
entered a new era -- the age of freedom.

suspicion between superpowers.

Today, you also graduate at the end of an era of conflict -- but a contest of a different kind -- a cold and abstract war of words and walls. ~~That conflict, at last, is coming to a close. We're going to leave the cold war, ladies and gentlemen, in history's dust. //~~ ^{I hope may soon come}

I'll be reflecting on the power and potential of democratic change in each of the commencement addresses I make this year.

I begin today with ~~the future of democracy -- and the defense of freedom -- in Europe.~~ ^{(America's place) in the new Europe.}

A few of you may be wondering what a continent 4000 miles away has to do with you. Many of the graduates of America's class of ¹⁹¹⁶ 1917 may have wondered why the faraway war they read about in the daily newspapers should have anything to do with them. But within a year they were fighting in the trenches, struggling in a hell beyond human imagination. To a cause that hadn't been clear to them on graduation day, they were willing to give their lives.

Two decades later, on the eve of another World War, another generation of Americans sat in the bright sun of commencement ceremonies at colleges across the country. At first, many were reluctant about the struggle for freedom in Europe -- but again, many would die to preserve it.

Near the end of that war, in a speech delivered to graduates of a small school in Missouri, an Englishman said, "There never was a war in all history easier to prevent by timely action than

pp 12-13
insert A

the one which has just desolated such great areas of the globe. It could have been prevented in my belief without the firing of a single shot... but no one would listen, and one by one we were all sucked into the awful whirlpool. We surely must not let that happen again."

^{When that war ended,}
~~The words they heard were Winston Churchill's~~ and those students no longer questioned our role in the future of Europe. They no longer asked what Europe had to do with them, because they knew the answer: everything. ~~In the forests of Argonne and on the beaches of Normandy, two generations of Americans became part of this nation's mission to Europe. Today, I'm going to outline a new American mission in Europe, as we enter a new age of freedom.~~

Europe is a continent whose future has always been intertwined with ours. And now we are poised at a moment of choice -- a critical time in our strategic relationship with our ~~neighbors across the Atlantic.~~ About a year ago, in Germany, I defined the kind of Europe this Administration is committed to:
 2 peaceful, stable Europe --
 a Europe whole and free. Today that goal is within our reach.

We are entering a new age of freedom in a time of uncertainty, but great hope. Emerging democracies in Eastern Europe are going through social, political, and economic transformations -- shaking loose stagnant, centralized bureaucracies that have smothered initiative and choice for generations.

In this time of transition, moving away from the postwar era

~~del~~ The process of change in the Soviet Union is also still unfinished. It will be crucial to see, for example, whether Moscow chooses coercion or peaceful dialogue in responding to the aspirations of the Lithuanian people, and nationalities within the Soviet Union and beyond containment, we cannot know what choices the people of Eastern Europe will make for their future. ~~Our role is to ensure that the choice is theirs.~~

President Gorbachev has made profound progress in his country. Reforms so fundamental that the clock cannot be turned back. Yet neither can we turn the clock ahead, to know what kind of country the Soviet Union will be in years to come.

But this we know: The Soviet Union will remain -- even after all the planned reductions in its forces are complete, even if our current arms control proposals are agreed to, and implemented -- the strongest military power on the Eurasian landmass, armed with thousands of nuclear weapons, dwarfing all other European states in size, population, and armed strength.

For the sake of the future we share with Europe, our policies and presence must be ^{appropriate for} ~~equal to~~ this period of transition -- with a constancy and reliability that will reassure our friends, both old and new. ^{we face many challenges around the world, and there is no set formula for success. But}

We have global responsibilities. ^{My European colleagues} ~~I believe they are right. I believe~~ want the United States to be part of Europe's future. ~~So we will~~ ^{that the United States should} remain a European power in the broadest sense of that idea -- politically, militarily, and economically. And the foundation for America's peaceful engagement in Europe has been, and will continue to be, NATO.

Because of our commitment to peace in Europe, there hasn't been a war on that continent in 45 years. The "long peace" now enjoyed by Europe is a fact we should view through the long lens

INSERT

B

of history: Europe has now experienced the longest uninterrupted period of international peace in centuries -- in fact, in the recorded history of that continent. ^{The Alliance is now ready to build} ~~On the achievements of the last forty years and define its objectives for the next~~ ^{ours is an engagement that} ~~has helped European democracies enjoy unprecedented stability and prosperity.~~ So the Alliance must join together to craft a new Western strategy for new and changing times.

I have consulted with my Allied colleagues, and with the Secretary General of NATO, Manfred Woerner. Based on these discussions, ~~today~~ ^{am calling for an early} I call for a ~~June~~ Summit meeting of all NATO leaders. The time is right for the Alliance to act.

^(the fundamental purpose of this is to be to) I believe ~~this~~ Summit should ^{NATO Strategy Review} launch a wide-ranging review of ~~the Alliance policy~~ for the transformed Europe of the 1990's. To my NATO colleagues, I suggest that our Summit ^{provide direction for this Review by addressing} ~~should address~~ four critical points:

One, the ~~(new)~~ political role NATO can play in the new Europe.

Two, the conventional forces the Alliance will need in the time ahead, and NATO's goals for conventional arms control.

Three, the role of nuclear weapons based in Europe -- and ~~the~~ Western objectives in new nuclear arms control negotiations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

Four, strengthening the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe -- the CSCE -- to reinforce NATO and help protect democratic values, in a Europe whole and free.

The first task the NATO Summit should consider is the future political mission of the Alliance. As military threats fade, the political dimension of NATO's work -- always there but seldom

noticed -- becomes more prominent. So at the NATO Summit we should look for ways to help our German friends achieve freedom and unity -- something which we and our Allies have supported for over 40 years. And we should reaffirm the importance of keeping a united Germany ^{a full member of} ~~fully committed to~~ NATO.

The Alliance needs to find ways to work more closely with a vigorous European Community ^{that is rightly asserting its own distinct views.} And in Eastern Europe, governments that were once military adversaries are now our partners in building a new continent. So we must also talk about how to encourage further ^{peaceful} democratic change in Eastern Europe, ^{and in the Soviet Union.}

But even as NATO gives more emphasis to its political mission, its guarantee of European security must remain firm. Our enemy today is uncertainty, and instability. ^{the Alliance} So ~~we~~ will need to maintain a sound, collective military structure with forces in the field, backed by larger forces that can be called upon in a crisis.

Which brings me to the second task for the NATO Summit -- a review of how the Alliance should plan its conventional defenses. While we need to recognize that it will take ^{some time} ~~several years at a~~ ~~minimum~~ before the Soviet military presence is gone from Eastern Europe -- and before the major reductions contemplated by both sides can be implemented -- we need to develop our strategy ^{for that world} now.

3. ~~Militarily significant~~ ~~number of~~ U.S. ~~conventional~~ forces must remain on the other side of the Atlantic for as long as our Allies want and need them. These forces demonstrate, as no words can, the enduring ^{political} compact that binds America's fate with Europe's

→ Obviously, Soviet actions will be critical. Yet even if all Soviet armed forces return to the USSR, and conventional arms control moves forward, the Soviet military will still field forces many times larger than those of any other single European state.

democracies.

7

[But if words might serve, I would turn again to Churchill's: "Before we cast away the solid assurances of national armaments," he said at that commencement forty-four years ago, "we must be certain that our temple is built not upon shifting sands or quagmires, but upon the rock." And so we must.]

would face an entirely different kind of threat. To meet it, we should plan for a different kind of military presence, one focused less on the danger of an immediate outbreak of war and more on how to promote long-term stability and prevent crises from escalating, relying in reduced show our capability -- and readiness -- to respond to whatever may arise.

If the Soviet withdrawal continues and our arms control efforts are successful, we ~~will profoundly turn the postwar buildup around -- building down forces in a transformed Europe.~~

Conventional The CFE treaty we have proposed would be the most ambitious arms control agreement ever concluded. We must finish the work on a Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty soon, and plan to sign it at a CSCE Summit ^{this} [next] fall. But at the Summit we need to look further ahead, preparing for follow-on negotiations after the conclusion of a CFE treaty. The NATO Summit should develop the Alliance's objectives for these talks.

Third, The NATO Summit should also assess the future of U.S. nuclear forces in Europe. As democracy blooms in Central and Eastern Europe, as Soviet troops return home and tanks are dismantled, there is less need for nuclear systems of the shortest range. The NATO Summit should accelerate the ongoing [strategic] work within the Alliance.

to determine the minimum number and types of weapons that will be needed to deter war -- credibly and effectively.

I've reviewed our plan to produce and deploy newer, more modern, short-range nuclear missiles to replace the Lance system now in place in Europe. We've just about finished the research and development work for these new missiles. But I've decided,

→ In light of these new political conditions, and the limited range and flexibility of short-range nuclear missile forces based in Europe,

after consulting with our Allies, to terminate the Follow-On To Lance program -- and to withdraw the funding request now before Congress. I have also decided to cancel any further modernization of U.S. nuclear artillery shells [new] deployed in Europe.

There are still [many] short-range U.S. -- and many more Soviet -- nuclear missile systems now deployed in Europe. We've said we're prepared to negotiate the reduction of these forces as well, in a new set of arms control talks. At the NATO Summit, I will call upon my colleagues to agree on the broad objectives for these future negotiations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union, and kick off the preparations within the Alliance for these talks.

would also like to suggest
 Today, I [ask] ~~that the startup of these negotiations be accelerated~~ so that these new U.S.-Soviet arms control talks [can] begin shortly after a CFE treaty on conventional forces has been signed.

In taking these steps, the United States is not going to allow Europe to become "safe for conventional war." There are few lessons so clear in history as this: *deterrence by conventional forces alone often has not worked.* ~~the unprecedented peace of Europe hasn't been preserved by chance. It has been the result of NATO's reliance on both nuclear and conventional forces~~ ^{has.}

But every aspect of America's engagement in Europe -- military, political, and economic -- must be complementary. And one place where they all come together is in the Conference on

The CSCE is already a beacon for human rights and individual freedoms. Now,

Security and Cooperation in Europe -- an organization of 35 states of Europe and North America. *It should take on a broader role.*

So the fourth task for a NATO Summit is to reach common Allied objectives for the future of the CSCE ~~which should be a beacon for human rights and individual freedoms.~~ It can help the victorious forces of democracy in Eastern Europe secure their revolutions, *-- as they join the commonwealth of free nations --* and be assured a voice in the new Europe.

The CSCE should expand its ability to offer guidelines for building free societies --
~~The NATO Summit should consider a much more ambitious agenda for the CSCE~~ -- including setting standards for truly free elections, adopting measures to strengthen the rule of law, and pointing the way in the needed but painful transition from

centralized, command economies to free markets.

CSCE can also provide a forum for political dialogue in a more united Europe. I agree with the
(Finally) we should consider whether new mechanisms within *Leader*

the CSCE can help mediate and peacefully settle disputes *in* *who have called for regular*
and look for other steps to reduce tensions among European states.
 Europe, I believe my Allied colleagues and I should agree to take

up these ideas at a CSCE Summit later this year, in conjunction *among senior representatives from the CSCE countries*
 with the signing of a CFE treaty.

In Eastern Europe, in this hemisphere, the triumph of democracy has cast its warm light on the face of the world like a miraculous dawn. But the outcome of this struggle for freedom is not ordained, and it will not be the work of miracles. At home and abroad, democracy's deliverance must be America's work.

All of you who graduate here today, were witness to wondrous change in the world last year. And you're part of an important, historic American commitment to a new American mission in Europe.

Insert
C

The security of Europe and the world has become very complex in this century. But America's commitment to stability and peace is profoundly clear. Its motivation derives from the strength of our forefathers -- from the blood of those who have died for freedom -- and for the sake of all who would live in peace.

And every voice, every heart's commitment to freedom is important. There's a story, about an old man and a boy climbing a mountain one winter morning. It began to snow, very lightly. The boy said to the old man, "Tell me the weight of a snowflake."

"Almost nothing," the old man said. They reached the top of the mountain, and watched the valley beneath fill up with snow, until those weightless snowflakes, one by one, became an avalanche whose thunder shook the earth.

"Maybe," the boy said, "there is only one person's voice lacking for the world to be free."

The thunderous cry for freedom -- in Eastern Europe, in South Africa, in this hemisphere -- was heard around the world in the Revolution of '89. So understand how America's mission in Europe, like millions of decisions made for freedom, makes a world of difference. And add your voice to the thundering chorus.

Thank you. God bless you. And God bless the United States of America.

#

Insert A

A few of you may be wondering what a continent 4000 miles away has to do with you. Revolutionary change is transforming Europe. Throughout our history, great upheavals in Europe have forced the American people to respond, to make deep judgments about the part we should have in European affairs. This has been true from the time of the French Revolution and the wars which followed it, to World War I and the flawed peace which ended it, to the Second World War and the creation of the postwar order. I believe that, now, we are poised at another such moment -- a critical time in our strategic relationship with our neighbors across the Atlantic.

Many of the graduates of America's class of 1916 may have wondered why the faraway war they read about in the newspapers should have anything to do with them. They might have agreed with President Wilson, who that year said "we are not interested" in the causes of the war, in "the obscure foundations from which its stupendous flood has burst forth." But a year later those classmates, and their country, were swept up in the torrent, carrying them to the horror of the trenches in France.

Yet after the war we again turned away from active involvement in European affairs. Instead, we sponsored a treaty to outlaw war. And then, as the outlaws gained strength, the United States declared its neutrality. As the Western democracies quailed in the face of the totalitarian powers, we passed new neutrality laws. Another generation of Americans sat in the bright sun of commencement ceremonies at colleges across the country thinking war in Europe could pass them by. But when war came, they paid an awful price for America's isolation.

Insert B

We chose to join with the free nations of Europe and form an Atlantic Community, an enduring political compact, recognizing in peace what we had learned from war. Our help is not a charitable donation. Our engagement in Europe has meant that the Europeans accept America as part of their continent's future, taking our interests into account across the board. Our commitment is not just in defense; it must be a well-balanced mix of involvement in all dimensions of European affairs. Our political commitment, with our troops and the deterrent potential of our nuclear weapons standing as the proof of our determination, has made a difference.

Insert C

In Eastern Europe, in this hemisphere, the triumph of democracy has cast its warm light on the face of the world like a miraculous dawn. But the outcome of this struggle for freedom is not ordained, and it will not be the work of miracles.

All of you who graduate here today are part of a historic decision for America -- to continue our active engagement in the future of Europe. I am convinced that this work to protect freedom, to build free societies, will safeguard our own peace, and prosperity.

We have always been a leader within the Atlantic Community. It has been the most successful international friendship of modern times. So understand how your decisions about America's place in Europe, like millions of decisions made for freedom, make a difference. We should go on showing how free peoples, sharing a common purpose, can create a bright morning for the nations, shaping the future of our world.

Thank you. God bless you. And God bless the United States of America.

(Lange/Cawley)
May 1, 1990
1:20 P.M.
[NATO.DOC]

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: COMMENCEMENT, OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
LEWIS STADIUM
FRIDAY, MAY 4, 1990
2:00 P.M.

[[Thank you, Governor Bellmon. President Campbell, Secretary Cavazos; Senator Don Nickles; Congressmen Jim Inhofe and Wes Watkins; Chief Mankiller, Mr. Donnelly; faculty, parents, but most of all -- O.S.U.'s graduating Class of 1990 ! \\

I'll try to be brief -- Barbara and I can't wait to get a beer and some cheese fries over at Eskimo Joe's... \\
Hope they have enough T-shirts for all the grandkids... \\

This is the end zone where Barry Sanders ran back kickoffs for touchdowns in two opening games. So I stand and deliver on hallowed ground... After I finish, I hope I can resist the urge to spike this speech and do a little dance. \\\ You too?]]

You know, when graduates of my vintage were sitting through ceremonies like this, right after the Second World War, we faced a world of changes -- full of potential and new possibilities.

Barbara and I got into an old two-door Studebaker -- you still drive those, right? -- in the summer of 1948. Drove down to Texas. [[Of course, who knows how far we could've gone in life if we'd made it to Oklahoma...]]

Post-war America was ready for peace and prosperity. But while the free world was recovering, the nations of Eastern Europe were being "consolidated" behind an Iron Curtain. So began four decades of division in Europe -- and 40 long years of

suspicion between superpowers.

Today, you also graduate at the end of an era of conflict -- but a contest of a different kind -- a cold and abstract war of words and walls. That conflict, at last, is coming to a close. We're going to leave the cold war, ladies and gentlemen, in history's dust. \\\

I'll be reflecting on the power and potential of democratic change in each of the commencement addresses I make this year.
I begin today with the future of democracy -- and the defense of freedom -- in Europe.

A few of you may be wondering what a continent 4000 miles away has to do with you. Many of the graduates of America's class of 1917 may have wondered why the faraway war they read about in the daily newspapers should have anything to do with them. But within a year they were fighting in the trenches, struggling in a hell beyond human imagination. To a cause that hadn't been clear to them on graduation day, they were willing to give their lives.

Two decades later, on the eve of another World War, another generation of Americans sat in the bright sun of commencement ceremonies at colleges across the country. At first, many were reluctant about the struggle for freedom in Europe -- but again, many would die to preserve it.

Near the end of that war, in a speech delivered to graduates of a small school in Missouri, an Englishman said, "There never was a war in all history easier to prevent by timely action than

the one which has just desolated such great areas of the globe. It could have been prevented in my belief without the firing of a single shot... but no one would listen, and one by one we were all sucked into the awful whirlpool. We surely must not let that happen again."

The words they heard were Winston Churchill's -- and those students no longer questioned our role in the future of Europe. They no longer asked what Europe had to do with them, because they knew the answer: everything. In the forests of Argonne and on the beaches of Normandy, two generations of Americans became part of this nation's mission to Europe. **Today, I'm going to outline a new American mission in Europe, as we enter a new age of freedom.**

Europe is a continent whose future has always been intertwined with ours. And now we are poised at a moment of choice -- a critical time in our strategic relationship with our neighbors across the Atlantic. About a year ago, in Germany, I defined the kind of Europe this Administration is committed to: a Europe whole and free. Today that goal is within our reach.

We are entering a new age of freedom in a time of uncertainty, but great hope. Emerging democracies in Eastern Europe are going through social, political, and economic transformations -- shaking loose stagnant, centralized bureaucracies that have smothered initiative and choice for generations.

In this time of transition, moving away from the postwar era

and beyond containment, we cannot know what choices the people of Eastern Europe will make for their future. Our role is to ~~ensure~~ *make* ~~that the choice is theirs.~~

President Gorbachev has made profound progress in his country. Reforms so fundamental that the clock cannot be turned back. Yet neither can we turn the clock ahead, to know what kind of country the Soviet Union will be in years to come.

But this we know: The Soviet Union will remain -- even after all the planned reductions in its forces are complete, even if our current arms control proposals are agreed to, and implemented -- the strongest military power on the Eurasian landmass, armed with thousands of nuclear weapons, dwarfing all other European states in size, population, and armed strength.

For the sake of the future we share with Europe, our policies and presence must be equal to this period of transition -- with a constancy and reliability that will reassure our friends, both old and new.

We have global responsibilities. My European colleagues want the United States to be part of Europe's future. So we will remain a European power in the broadest sense of ~~that idea~~ -- politically, militarily, and economically. And the foundation for America's peaceful engagement in Europe *will be, as it has always been,* ~~has been, and will~~ ~~continue to be~~ NATO.

Because of our commitment to peace in Europe, there hasn't been a war on that continent in 45 years. The "long peace" now enjoyed by Europe is a fact we should view through the long lens

of history: Europe has now experienced the longest uninterrupted period of international peace in centuries -- in fact, in the recorded history of that continent. Ours is an engagement that has helped European democracies enjoy unprecedented stability and prosperity. So the Alliance must join together to craft a new Western strategy for new and changing times.

I have consulted with my Allied colleagues, and with the Secretary General of NATO, Manfred Woerner. Based on these discussions, today I call for a June Summit meeting of all NATO leaders. The time is right for the Alliance to act.

I believe this Summit should launch a wide-ranging review of Alliance policy for the transformed Europe of the 1990's. To my NATO colleagues, I suggest that our Summit should address four critical points:

One, the new political role NATO can play in the new Europe.

Two, the conventional forces the Alliance will need in the time ahead, and NATO's goals for conventional arms control.

Three, the role of nuclear weapons based in Europe, -- and the Western objectives in new nuclear arms control negotiations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

Four, strengthening the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe -- the CSCE -- to reinforce NATO and help protect democratic values, in a Europe whole and free.

The first task the NATO Summit should consider is the future political mission of the Alliance. As military threats fade, the political dimension of NATO's work -- always there but seldom

noticed -- becomes more prominent. So at the NATO Summit we should look for ways to help our German friends achieve **[freedom and unity]** -- something which we and our Allies have supported for over 40 years. And we should **reaffirm the importance of keeping a united Germany fully committed to NATO.**

The Alliance needs to find ways to work more closely with a vigorous European Community. And in Eastern Europe, governments that were once military adversaries are now our **partners** in building a new continent. So we must also talk about how to encourage further democratic change in Eastern Europe.

But even as NATO gives more emphasis to its political mission, its guarantee of European security must remain firm.

Every time we say this
Our enemy today is [uncertainty, and instability.] So we will need to maintain a sound, collective military structure with forces in the field, backed by larger forces that can be called upon in a crisis.

Which brings me to the second task for the NATO Summit -- a review of how the Alliance should plan its conventional defenses. While we need to recognize that it will take several years at a minimum before the Soviet military presence is gone from Eastern Europe -- and before the major reductions contemplated by both sides can be implemented -- **we need to develop our strategy now.**

A militarily significant number of U.S. conventional forces must remain on the other side of the Atlantic for as long as our Allies want and need them. These forces demonstrate, as no words can, the enduring compact that binds America's fate with Europe's

democracies.

But if words might serve, I would turn again to Churchill's: "Before we cast away the solid assurances of national armaments," he said at that commencement forty-four years ago, "we must be certain that our temple is built not upon shifting sands or quagmires, but upon the rock." And so we must.

If the Soviet withdrawal continues and our arms control efforts are successful, we will profoundly turn the postwar buildup around -- building down forces in a transformed Europe. *Let the iron curtain rise -- and let every corner of the European stage be lit with the brilliant drama of democratic freedom.*

The CFE treaty we have proposed would be the most ambitious arms control agreement ever concluded. We must finish the work on a Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty soon, and plan to sign it at a CSCE Summit [next] fall. But at the Summit we need to look further ahead, preparing for **follow-on negotiations** after the conclusion of a CFE treaty. The NATO Summit should develop the Alliance's objectives for these talks.

The NATO Summit should also assess the future of U.S. nuclear forces in Europe. As democracy blooms in Central and Eastern Europe, as Soviet troops return home and tanks are dismantled, there is less need for nuclear systems of the shortest range. The NATO Summit should **accelerate** the ongoing strategic work within the Alliance.

I've reviewed our plan to produce and deploy newer, more modern, short-range nuclear missiles to replace the Lance system now in place in Europe. We've just about finished the research and development work for these new missiles. But I've decided,

after consulting with our Allies, to terminate the Follow-On To Lance program -- and to withdraw the funding request now before Congress. I have also decided to **cancel any further modernization of U.S. nuclear artillery shells now deployed in Europe.**

There are still many short-range U.S. -- and many more Soviet -- nuclear missile systems now deployed in Europe. We've said we're prepared to negotiate the reduction of these forces as well, in a new set of arms control talks. At the NATO Summit, I will call upon my colleagues to agree on the broad objectives for these future negotiations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union, and kick off the preparations within the Alliance for these talks.

Today, I ask that the startup of these negotiations be **accelerated** -- so that these new U.S.-Soviet arms control talks can begin shortly after a CFE treaty on conventional forces has been signed.

In taking these steps, the United States is not going to allow Europe to become "safe for conventional war." There are few lessons so clear in history as this: the unprecedented peace of Europe hasn't been preserved by chance. It has been the result of NATO's reliance on both nuclear and conventional forces.

But every aspect of ^{the} American ^{mission} engagement in Europe -- military, political, and economic -- must be complementary. And one place where they all come together is in the Conference on

Security and Cooperation in Europe -- an organization of 35 states of Europe and North America. It should take on a broader role.

So the fourth task for a NATO Summit is to reach common Allied objectives for the future of the CSCE -- which should be a beacon for human rights and individual freedoms. It can help the victorious forces of democracy in Eastern Europe secure their revolutions, and be assured a voice in the new Europe.

The NATO Summit should **consider a much more ambitious agenda for the CSCE** -- including setting standards for truly free elections, adopting measures to strengthen the rule of law, and pointing the way in the needed but painful transition from centralized, command economies to free markets.

Finally, we should consider whether new mechanisms within the CSCE can help mediate and peacefully settle disputes in Europe. I believe my Allied colleagues and I should **agree to take up these ideas at a CSCE Summit later this year, in conjunction with the signing of a CFE treaty.**

In Eastern Europe, in this hemisphere, the triumph of democracy has cast its warm light on the face of the world like a miraculous dawn. But the outcome of this struggle for freedom is not ordained, and it will not be the work of miracles. At home and abroad, **democracy's deliverance must be America's work.**

All of you who graduate here today,  were witness to wondrous change in the world last year. And you're part of an important, historic American commitment to **a new American mission in Europe.**

The security of Europe and the world has become very complex in this century. But America's commitment to stability and peace is profoundly clear. Its motivation derives from the strength of our forefathers -- from the blood of those who have died for freedom -- and for the sake of all who would live in peace.

And every voice, every heart's commitment to freedom is important. There's a story, about an old man and a ^{small girl?} boy climbing a mountain one winter morning. It began to snow, very lightly. The ^{girl} boy said to the old man, "Tell me the weight of a snowflake."

"Almost nothing," the old man said. They reached the top of the mountain, and watched the valley beneath fill up with snow, until those weightless snowflakes, one by one, became an avalanche whose thunder shook the earth.

"Maybe," the ^{girl} boy said, "there is only one person's voice lacking for the world to be free."

The thunderous cry for freedom -- in Eastern Europe, in South Africa, in this hemisphere -- was heard around the world in the Revolution of '89. So understand how America's mission in Europe ^A like millions of decisions made for freedom ^A makes a world of difference. And add your voice to the thundering ^{38F.} chorus.

Thank you. God bless you. And God bless the United States of America.

#

DAS66
.9
.65
.7
WH

Winston S. Churchill
His Complete Speeches
1897-1963

"Iron Curtain"
is on the 6th page.

Edited by
Robert Rhodes James

Volume
VII
1943-1949

Chelsea House Publishers
in association with
R. R. Bowker Company
New York and London

1974

UPI

education invaluable to the formation of character and to the development of those qualities by which freedom and justice are preserved in strong nations and by the strong for weak nations. They must also be given the wider view, in outline at any rate, of the treasures which mankind has gathered in its long, chequered pilgrimage across the centuries. You do well to provide, as you are doing, on this prodigious scale for the baptism of such as are of riper years.

This is an age of machinery and specialisation but I hope, none the less—indeed all the more—that the purely vocational aspect of university study will not be allowed to dominate or monopolise all the attention of the returned Service men. Engines were made for men, not men for engines. Mr. Gladstone said many years ago that it ought to be part of a man's religion to see that his country is well governed. Knowledge of the past is the only foundation we have from which to peer into and try to measure the future. Expert knowledge, however indispensable, is no substitute for a generous and comprehending outlook upon the human story with all its sadness and with all its unquenchable hope.

May I not also advance the claims of literature and language. The great Bismarck—there were great Germans in those days—said at the close of his life, that the most important fact in the world was that the British and American peoples spoke the same language. Certainly we have a noble inheritance in literature. It would be an enormous waste and loss to us all if we did not respect, cherish, enjoy and develop this magnificent estate, which has come down to us from the past and which not only unites us as no such great communities have ever been united before, but is also a powerful instrument whereby our conception of justice, of freedom, and of fair play and good humour may make their invaluable contribution to the future progress of mankind.

THE SINEWS OF PEACE

March 5, 1946

Westminster College,
Fulton, Missouri

$$\begin{array}{r} 90 \\ - 46 \\ \hline 44 \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{r} 131 \\ 46 \\ - 17 \\ \hline 29 \end{array}$$

This speech may be regarded as the most important Churchill delivered as Leader of the Opposition (1945-1951). It contains certain phrases—"the special relationship," "the sinews of peace"—which at once entered into general use, and which have survived. But it is the passage on "the iron curtain" which attracted immediate international attention, and had incalculable impact upon public opinion in the United States and in Western Europe. Russian historians date the beginning of the Cold War from this speech. In its phraseology, in its intricate drawing together of several themes to an electrifying climax—this speech may be regarded as a technical classic.

I am glad to come to Westminster College this afternoon, and am complimented that you should give me a degree. The name "Westminster" is somehow familiar to me.

I seem to have heard of it before. Indeed, it was at Westminster that I received a very large part of my education in politics, dialectic, rhetoric, and one or two other things. In fact we have both been educated at the same, or similar, or, at any rate, kindred establishments.

It is also an honour, perhaps almost unique, for a private visitor to be introduced to an academic audience by the President of the United States. Amid his heavy burdens, duties, and responsibilities—unsought but not recoiled from—the President has travelled a thousand miles to dignify and magnify our meeting here to-day and to give me an opportunity of addressing this kindred nation, as well as my own countrymen across the ocean, and perhaps some other countries too. The President has told you that it is his wish, as I am sure it is yours, that I should have full liberty to give my true and faithful counsel in these anxious and baffling times. I shall certainly avail myself of this freedom, and feel the more right to do so because any private ambitions I may have cherished in my younger days have been satisfied beyond my wildest dreams. Let me, however, make it clear that I have no official mission or status of any kind, and that I speak only for myself. There is nothing here but what you see.

I can therefore allow my mind, with the experience of a lifetime, to play over the problems which beset us on the morrow of our absolute victory in arms, and to try to make sure with what strength I have that what has been gained with so much sacrifice and suffering shall be preserved for the future glory and safety of mankind.

The United States stands at this time at the pinnacle of world power. It is a solemn moment for the American Democracy. For with primacy in power is also joined an awe-inspiring accountability to the future. If you look around you, you must feel not only the sense of duty done but also you must feel anxiety lest you fall below the level of achievement. Opportunity is here now, clear and shining for both our countries. To reject it or ignore it or fritter it away will bring upon us all the long reproaches of the after-time. It is necessary that constancy of mind, persistency of purpose, and the grand simplicity of decision shall guide and rule the conduct of the English-speaking peoples in peace as they did in war. We must, and I believe we shall, prove ourselves equal to this severe requirement.

When American military men approach some serious situation they are wont to write at the head of their directive the words "over-all strategic concept." There is wisdom in this, as it leads to clarity of thought. What then is the over-all strategic concept which we should inscribe today? It is nothing less than the safety and welfare, the freedom and progress, of all the homes and families of all the men and women in all the lands. And here I speak particularly of the myriad cottage or apartment homes where the wage-earner strives amid the accidents and difficulties of life to guard his wife and children from privation and bring the family up in the fear of the Lord, or upon ethical conceptions which often play their potent part.

To give security to these countless homes, they must be shielded from the two giant marauders, war and tyranny. We all know the frightful disturbances in which the ordinary family is plunged when the curse of war swoops down upon the bread-winner and those for whom he works and contrives. The awful ruin of Europe, with all its vanished glories, and of large parts of Asia glares us in the eyes. When the designs of wicked men or the aggressive urge of mighty States dissolve over large areas the frame

of civilised s
cannot cope.

When I
happening to
stalks the ea
human pain."
from the hor

Our A
strategic con
step—namely
sation has al
successor of
all that that
that it is a
frothing of
nations can
Before we c
we must be
upon the ro
also long, bu
alas, in the i
purpose in th

I have
magistrates
The United
international
begin now. I
a certain nu
squadrons v
around in r
their own c
against their
organisation
grew. I wish
done forthw

It wor
or experienc
now share,
criminal ma
any country
and the raw
do not belie
if some Co
agencies. Th
systems up

of civilised society, humble folk are confronted with difficulties with which they cannot cope. For them all is distorted, all is broken, even ground to pulp.

When I stand here this quiet afternoon I shudder to visualise what is actually happening to millions now and what is going to happen in this period when famine stalks the earth. None can compute what has been called "the unestimated sum of human pain." Our supreme task and duty is to guard the homes of the common people from the horrors and miseries of another war. We are all agreed on that.

Our American military colleagues, after having proclaimed their "over-all strategic concept" and computed available resources, always proceed to the next step—namely, the method. Here again there is widespread agreement. A world organisation has already been erected for the prime purpose of preventing war, UNO, the successor of the League of Nations, with the decisive addition of the United States and all that that means, is already at work. We must make sure that its work is fruitful, that it is a reality and not a sham, that it is a force for action, and not merely a frothing of words, that it is a true temple of peace in which the shields of many nations can some day be hung up, and not merely a cockpit in a Tower of Babel. Before we cast away the solid assurances of national armaments for self-preservation we must be certain that our temple is built, not upon shifting sands or quagmires, but upon the rock. Anyone can see with his eyes open that our path will be difficult and also long, but if we persevere together as we did in the two world wars—though not, alas, in the interval between them—I cannot doubt that we shall achieve our common purpose in the end.

I have, however, a definite and practical proposal to make for action. Courts and magistrates may be set up but they cannot function without sheriffs and constables. The United Nations Organisation must immediately begin to be equipped with an international armed force. In such a matter we can only go step by step, but we must begin now. I propose that each of the Powers and States should be invited to delegate a certain number of air squadrons to the service of the world organisation. These squadrons would be trained and prepared in their own countries, but would move around in rotation from one country to another. They would wear the uniform of their own countries but with different badges. They would not be required to act against their own nation, but in other respects they would be directed by the world organisation. This might be started on a modest scale and would grow as confidence grew. I wished to see this done after the first world war, and I devoutly trust it may be done forthwith.

It would nevertheless be wrong and imprudent to entrust the secret knowledge or experience of the atomic bomb, which the United States, Great Britain, and Canada now share, to the world organisation, while it is still in its infancy. It would be criminal madness to cast it adrift in this still agitated and un-united world. No one in any country has slept less well in their beds because this knowledge and the method and the raw materials to apply it, are at present largely retained in American hands. I do not believe we should all have slept so soundly had the positions been reversed and if some Communist or neo-Fascist State monopolised for the time being these dread agencies. The fear of them alone might easily have been used to enforce totalitarian systems upon the free democratic world, with consequences appalling to human

A Time of Triun

Now, when we come to the civil war, nor the so-called fraternal relationship between them. This is no time when the world requires not only vast but kindred between our men and cadets at the facilities for the possession of the property of the American British Empire. It is an important financial matter, and may well be entirely

The Union of Canada and the British Empire. This Agreement made under former wealths with full secure ourselves to us and bode come—the principal destiny, whose o

There is no relationship between our over-riding interest and it is probably the strength. They have just mentioned the South American Union and Mutual Secretary of General concerned. We also have an alliance results at critical of a world agreement father's house at United Nations harbour no design harmful, are bene

I spoke ear
that temple. If t

I have now stated the two great dangers which menace the homes of the people: War and Tyranny. I have not yet spoken of poverty and privation which are in many cases the prevailing anxiety. But if the dangers of war and tyranny are removed, there is no doubt that science and co-operation can bring in the next few years to the world, certainly in the next few decades newly taught in the sharpening school of war, an expansion of material well-being beyond anything that has yet occurred in human experience. Now, at this sad and breathless moment, we are plunged in the hunger and distress which are the aftermath of our stupendous struggle; but this will pass and may pass quickly, and there is no reason except human folly or sub-human crime which should deny to all the nations the inauguration and enjoyment of an age of plenty. I have often used words which I learned fifty years ago from a great Irish-American orator, a friend of mine, Mr. Bourke Cockran. "There is enough for all. The earth is a generous mother; she will provide in plentiful abundance food for all her children if they will but cultivate her soil in justice and in peace." So far I feel that we are in full agreement.

cf. SCI.DOC

Now, while still pursuing the method of realising our overall strategic concept, I come to the crux of what I have travelled here to say. Neither the sure prevention of war, nor the continuous rise of world organisation will be gained without what I have called the fraternal association of the English-speaking peoples. This means a special relationship between the British Commonwealth and Empire and the United States. This is no time for generalities, and I will venture to be precise. Fraternal association requires not only the growing friendship and mutual understanding between our two vast but kindred systems of society, but the continuance of the intimate relationship between our military advisers, leading to common study of potential dangers, the similarity of weapons and manuals of instructions, and to the interchange of officers and cadets at technical colleges. It should carry with it the continuance of the present facilities for mutual security by the joint use of all Naval and Air Force bases in the possession of either country all over the world. This would perhaps double the mobility of the American Navy and Air Force. It would greatly expand that of the British Empire Forces and it might well lead, if and as the world calms down, to important financial savings. Already we use together a large number of islands; more may well be entrusted to our joint care in the near future.

The United States has already a Permanent Defence Agreement with the Dominion of Canada, which is so devotedly attached to the British Commonwealth and Empire. This Agreement is more effective than many of those which have often been made under formal alliances. This principle should be extended to all British Commonwealths with full reciprocity. Thus, whatever happens, and thus only, shall we be secure ourselves and able to work together for the high and simple causes that are dear to us and bode no ill to any. Eventually there may come—I feel eventually there will come—the principle of common citizenship, but that we may be content to leave to destiny, whose outstretched arm many of us can already clearly see.

There is however an important question we must ask ourselves. Would a special relationship between the United States and the British Commonwealth be inconsistent with our over-riding loyalties to the World Organisation? I reply that, on the contrary, it is probably the only means by which that organisation will achieve its full stature and strength. There are already the special United States relations with Canada which I have just mentioned, and there are the special relations between the United States and the South American Republics. We British have our twenty years Treaty of Collaboration and Mutual Assistance with Soviet Russia. I agree with Mr. Bevin, the Foreign Secretary of Great Britain, that it might well be a fifty years Treaty so far as we are concerned. We aim at nothing but mutual assistance and collaboration. The British have an alliance with Portugal unbroken since 1384, and which produced fruitful results at critical moments in the late war. None of these clash with the general interest of a world agreement, or a world organisation; on the contrary they help it. "In my father's house are many mansions." Special associations between members of the United Nations which have no aggressive point against any other country, which harbour no design incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations, far from being harmful, are beneficial and, as I believe, indispensable.

I spoke earlier of the Temple of Peace. Workmen from all countries must build that temple. If two of the workmen know each other particularly well and are old

friends, if their families are inter-mingled, and if they have "faith in each other's purpose, hope in each other's future and charity towards each other's shortcomings"—to quote some good words I read here the other day—why cannot they work together at the common task as friends and partners? Why cannot they share their tools and thus increase each other's working powers? Indeed they must do so or else the temple may not be built, or, being built, it may collapse, and we shall all be proved again unteachable and have to go and try to learn again for a third time in a school of war, incomparably more rigorous than that from which we have just been released. The dark ages may return, the Stone Age may return on the gleaming wings of science, and what might now shower immeasurable material blessings upon mankind, may even bring about its total destruction. Beware, I say; time may be short. Do not let us take the course of allowing events to drift along until it is too late. If there is to be a fraternal association of the kind I have described, with all the extra strength and security which both our countries can derive from it, let us make sure that that great fact is known to the world, and that it plays its part in steadying and stabilising the foundations of peace. There is the path of wisdom. Prevention is better than cure.

A shadow has fallen upon the scenes so lately lighted by the Allied victory. Nobody knows what Soviet Russia and its Communist international organisation intends to do in the immediate future, or what are the limits, if any, to their expansive and proselytising tendencies. I have a strong admiration and regard for the valiant Russian people and for my wartime comrade, Marshal Stalin. There is deep sympathy and goodwill in Britain—and I doubt not here also—towards the peoples of all the Russias and a resolve to persevere through many differences and rebuffs in establishing lasting friendships. We understand the Russian need to be secure on her western frontiers by the removal of all possibility of German aggression. We welcome Russia to her rightful place among the leading nations of the world. We welcome her flag upon the seas. Above all, we welcome constant, frequent and growing contacts between the Russian people and our own people on both sides of the Atlantic. It is my duty however, for I am sure you would wish me to state the facts as I see them to you, to place before you certain facts about the present position in Europe.

From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the Continent. Behind that line lie all the capitals of the ancient states of Central and Eastern Europe. Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Bucharest and Sofia, all these famous cities and the populations around them lie in what I must call the Soviet sphere, and all are subject in one form or another, not only to Soviet influence but to a very high and, in many cases, increasing measure of control from Moscow. Athens alone—Greece with its immortal glories—is free to decide its future at an election under British, American and French observation. The Russian-dominated Polish Government has been encouraged to make enormous and wrongful inroads upon Germany, and mass expulsions of millions of Germans on a scale grievous and undreamed-of are now taking place. The Communist parties, which were very small in all these Eastern States of Europe, have been raised to pre-eminence and power far beyond their numbers and are seeking everywhere to obtain totalitarian control. Police governments are prevailing in nearly every case, and so far, except in Czechoslovakia, there is no true democracy.

Turkey and which are being Government. A quasi-Communist to groups of 1 American and agreement, to a miles, in order which the West

If now the Communist Government British and American themselves upon conclusions made the Liberated Europe of permanent peace

The safety should be permanent Europe that they have sprung. They wish and they to comprehend victory of the occurred. Twice across the Atlantic dwell between grand pacification accordance with importance.

In front of In Italy the Communist-traffic Adriatic. Never imagine a regime worked for a few hours. I will not Russian frontier and work in connection from the Communist States where Communist constitute a grave facts for anyone splendid comrades should be most

The outline

Turkey and Persia are both profoundly alarmed and disturbed at the claims which are being made upon them and at the pressure being exerted by the Moscow Government. An attempt is being made by the Russians in Berlin to build up a quasi-Communist party in their zone of Occupied Germany by showing special favours to groups of left-wing German leaders. At the end of the fighting last June, the American and British Armies withdrew westwards, in accordance with an earlier agreement, to a depth at some points of 150 miles upon a front of nearly four hundred miles, in order to allow our Russian allies to occupy this vast expanse of territory which the Western Democracies had conquered.

If now the Soviet Government tries, by separate action, to build up a pro-Communist Germany in their areas, this will cause new serious difficulties in the British and American zones, and will give the defeated Germans the power of putting themselves up to auction between the Soviets and the Western Democracies. Whatever conclusions may be drawn from these facts—and facts they are—this is certainly not the Liberated Europe we fought to build up. Nor is it one which contains the essentials of permanent peace.

The safety of the world requires a new unity in Europe, from which no nation should be permanently outcast. It is from the quarrels of the strong parent races in Europe that the world wars we have witnessed, or which occurred in former times, have sprung. Twice in our own lifetime we have seen the United States, against their wishes and their traditions, against arguments, the force of which it is impossible not to comprehend, drawn by irresistible forces, into these wars in time to secure the victory of the good cause, but only after frightful slaughter and devastation had occurred. Twice the United States has had to send several millions of its young men across the Atlantic to find the war; but now war can find any nation, wherever it may dwell between dusk and dawn. Surely we should work with conscious purpose for a grand pacification of Europe, within the structure of the United Nations and in accordance with its Charter. That I feel is an open cause of policy of very great importance.

In front of the iron curtain which lies across Europe are other causes for anxiety. In Italy the Communist Party is seriously hampered by having to support the Communist-trained Marshal Tito's claims to former Italian territory at the head of the Adriatic. Nevertheless the future of Italy hangs in the balance. Again one cannot imagine a regenerated Europe without a strong France. All my public life I have worked for a strong France and I never lost faith in her destiny, even in the darkest hours. I will not lose faith now. However, in a great number of countries, far from the Russian frontiers and throughout the world, Communist fifth columns are established and work in complete unity and absolute obedience to the directions they receive from the Communist centre. Except in the British Commonwealth and in the United States where Communism is in its infancy, the Communist parties or fifth columns constitute a growing challenge and peril to Christian civilisation. These are sombre facts for anyone to have to recite on the morrow of a victory gained by so much splendid comradeship in arms and in the cause of freedom and democracy; but we should be most unwise not to face them squarely while time remains.

The outlook is also anxious in the Far East and especially in Manchuria. The

Agreement which was made at Yalta, to which I was a party, was extremely favourable to Soviet Russia, but it was made at a time when no one could say that the German war might not extend all through the summer and autumn of 1945 and when the Japanese war was expected to last for a further 18 months from the end of the German war. In this country you are all so well-informed about the Far East, and such devoted friends of China, that I do not need to expatiate on the situation there.

I have felt bound to portray the shadow which, alike in the west and in the east, falls upon the world. I was a high minister at the time of the Versailles Treaty and a close friend of Mr. Lloyd-George, who was the head of the British delegation at Versailles. I did not myself agree with many things that were done, but I have a very strong impression in my mind of that situation, and I find it painful to contrast it with that which prevails now. In those days there were high hopes and unbounded confidence that the wars were over, and that the League of Nations would become all-powerful. I do not see or feel that same confidence or even the same hopes in the haggard world at the present time.

On the other hand I repulse the idea that a new war is inevitable; still more that it is imminent. It is because I am sure that our fortunes are still in our own hands and that we hold the power to save the future, that I feel the duty to speak out now that I have the occasion and the opportunity to do so. I do not believe that Soviet Russia desires war. What they desire is the fruits of war and the indefinite expansion of their power and doctrines. But what we have to consider here to-day while time remains, is the permanent prevention of war and the establishment of conditions of freedom and democracy as rapidly as possible in all countries. Our difficulties and dangers will not be removed by closing our eyes to them. They will not be removed by mere waiting to see what happens; nor will they be removed by a policy of appeasement. What is needed is a settlement, and the longer this is delayed, the more difficult it will be and the greater our dangers will become.

From what I have seen of our Russian friends and Allies during the war, I am convinced that there is nothing they admire so much as strength, and there is nothing for which they have less respect than for weakness, especially military weakness. For that reason the old doctrine of a balance of power is unsound. We cannot afford, if we can help it, to work on narrow margins, offering temptations to a trial of strength. If the Western Democracies stand together in strict adherence to the principles of the United Nations Charter, their influence for furthering those principles will be immense and no one is likely to molest them. If however they become divided or falter in their duty and if these all-important years are allowed to slip away then indeed catastrophe may overwhelm us all.

Last time I saw it all coming and cried aloud to my own fellow-countrymen and to the world, but no one paid any attention. Up till the year 1933 or even 1935, Germany might have been saved from the awful fate which has overtaken her and we might all have been spared the miseries Hitler let loose upon mankind. There never was a war in all history easier to prevent by timely action than the one which has just desolated such great areas of the globe. It could have been prevented in my belief without the firing of a single shot, and Germany might be powerful, prosperous and honoured to-day; but no one would listen and one by one we were all sucked into the

awful whirlp
by reaching
general auth
good unders
by the whol
the solution
title "The Si

Let no
wealth. Bec
of which the
restarting o
not suppose
come throug
not see 70 c
our tradition
the populat
United State
globe and ir
precarious b
contrary, th
to the Char
seeking no
thoughts of
with your o
only for us t

I was
branches of
Virginia. I t
task. I alwa
occasions in
Canadian Pa
recently, an
House of C
things to sa
grateful, fro
would have

awful whirlpool. We surely must not let that happen again. This can only be achieved by reaching now, in 1946, a good understanding on all points with Russia under the general authority of the United Nations Organisation and by the maintenance of that good understanding through many peaceful years, by the world instrument, supported by the whole strength of the English-speaking world and all its connections. There is the solution which I respectfully offer to you in this Address to which I have given the title "The Sinews of Peace."

Let no man underrate the abiding power of the British Empire and Commonwealth. Because you see the 46 millions in our island harassed about their food supply, of which they only grow one half, even in war-time, or because we have difficulty in restarting our industries and export trade after six years of passionate war effort, do not suppose that we shall not come through these dark years of privation as we have come through the glorious years of agony, or that half a century from now, you will not see 70 or 80 millions of Britons spread about the world and united in defence of our traditions, our way of life, and of the world causes which you and we espouse. If the population of the English-speaking Commonwealths be added to that of the United States with all that such co-operation implies in the air, on the sea, all over the globe and in science and in industry, and in moral force, there will be no quivering, precarious balance of power to offer its temptation to ambition or adventure. On the contrary, there will be an overwhelming assurance of security. If we adhere faithfully to the Charter of the United Nations and walk forward in sedate and sober strength seeking no one's land or treasure, seeking to lay no arbitrary control upon the thoughts of men; if all British moral and material forces and convictions are joined with your own in fraternal association, the high-roads of the future will be clear, not only for us but for all, not only for our time, but for a century to come.

THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING PEOPLES

March 8, 1946

General Assembly of Virginia

I was deeply moved by the glowing terms of the Joint Resolution of both branches of the Legislature inviting me here to address the General Assembly of Virginia. I take it as a high honour to be present here this morning to discharge that task. I always value being asked to address a Parliament. I have already on two occasions in the war addressed the Congress of the United States. I have addressed the Canadian Parliament. I have addressed a Joint Session of the Belgian Legislature, more recently, and there is a place of which you may have heard across the ocean called the House of Commons, to which, invited or uninvited, I have, from time to time, had things to say. I have also had invitations, couched in terms for which I am most grateful, from the State Legislatures of South Carolina, Kentucky and Mississippi. It would have given me the greatest pleasure to accept and fulfil all these. But as I have

(Lange/Cawley)
May 1, 1990
12:20 P.M.
[NATO.DOC]

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: COMMENCEMENT, OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
LEWIS STADIUM
FRIDAY, MAY 4, 1990
2:00 P.M.

[[Thank you, Governor Bellmon. President Campbell, Secretary Cavazos; Congressmen Jim Inhofe and Wes Watkins, Senator Don Nickles; Chief Mankiller, Mr. Donnelly; faculty, parents, but most of all -- O.S.U.'s graduating Class of 1990 ! \\

I'll try to be brief -- Barbara and I can't wait to get a beer and some cheese fries over at Eskimo Joe's... \\
Hope they have enough T-shirts for all the grandkids... \\

This is the end zone where Barry Sanders ran back kickoffs for touchdowns in two opening games. So I stand and deliver on hallowed ground... After I finish, I hope I can resist the urge to spike this speech and do a little dance. \\\ You too?]]

You know, when graduates of my vintage were sitting through ceremonies like this, right after the Second World War, we faced a world of changes -- full of potential and new possibilities.

Barbara and I got into an old two-door Studebaker -- you still drive those, right? -- in the summer of 1948. Drove down to Texas. [[Of course, who knows how far we could've gone in life if we'd made it to Oklahoma...]]

Post-war America was ready for peace and prosperity. But while the free world was recovering, the nations of Eastern Europe were being "consolidated" behind an Iron Curtain. So began four decades of division in Europe -- and 40 long years of

suspicion between superpowers.

Today, you also graduate at the end of an era of conflict -- but a contest of a different kind -- a cold and abstract war of words and walls. That conflict, at last, is coming to a close. We're going to leave the cold war, ladies and gentlemen, in history's dust. \\\

I'll be reflecting on the power and potential of democratic change in each of the commencement addresses I make this year.

I begin today with the future of democracy -- and the defense of freedom -- in Europe.

A few of you may be wondering what a continent 4000 miles away has to do with you. Many of the graduates of America's class of 1917 may have wondered why the faraway war they read about in the daily newspapers should have anything to do with them. But within a year they were fighting in the trenches, struggling in a hell beyond human imagination. Devoted to a cause that hadn't been clear to them on graduation day, they were willing to give their lives.

Two decades later, on the eve of another World War, another generation of Americans sat in the bright sun of commencement ceremonies at colleges across the country. At first, many were reluctant about the struggle for freedom in Europe -- but again, many would die to preserve it.

Near the end of that war, in a speech delivered to graduates of a small school in Missouri, an Englishman said, "There never was a war in all history easier to prevent by timely action than

the one which has just desolated such great areas of the globe. It could have been prevented in my belief without the firing of a single shot... but no one would listen, and one by one we were all sucked into the awful whirlpool. We surely must not let that happen again."

and! Those students no longer questioned ^{our} ~~their~~ role in the future *they no longer asked what Europe had to do with them because* of Europe. The words they heard were Winston Churchill's -- and *they knew* the answer ~~was~~ ^{forever of me} everything. In the ~~Argonne~~ ^{of Americans a} and on the beaches of Normandy, two generations ^{of Americans a} ~~had~~ ^{of Americans a} become part of ^{of Americans a} ~~America's~~ ^{of Americans a} mission ^{of Americans a} to Europe. Today, I'm going to outline ^{of Americans a} the new American mission in Europe, *as we enter a new age of freedom.*

Europe is a continent whose future has always been intertwined with ours. And now we are poised at a moment of choice -- a critical time in our strategic relationship with our neighbors across the Atlantic. About a year ago, in Germany, I defined the kind of Europe this Administration is committed to: a Europe whole and free. Today that goal is within our reach.

are We ^{are} enter ^{are} a new age of freedom -- ⁱⁿ a time of uncertainty, but great hope. Emerging democracies in Eastern Europe are going through social, political, and economic transformations -- shaking loose stagnant, centralized bureaucracies that have smothered initiative and choice for generations.

In this time of transition, moving away from the postwar era and beyond containment, we cannot know what choices the people of Eastern Europe will make for their future. Our role is to ensure that the choice is theirs.

President Gorbachev has made profound progress in his country. Reforms so fundamental that the clock cannot be turned back. Yet neither can we turn the clock ahead, to know what kind of country the Soviet Union will be in years to come.

But this we know: The Soviet Union will remain -- even after all the planned reductions in its forces are complete, even if our current arms control proposals are agreed and implemented -- the strongest military power on the Eurasian landmass, armed with thousands of nuclear weapons, dwarfing all other European states in size, population, and armed strength.

For the sake of the future we share with Europe, our policies and presence must be equal to this period of transition -- with a constancy and reliability that will reassure our friends, both old and new.

We have global responsibilities. My European colleagues want the United States to be part of Europe's future. So we will remain a European power in the broadest sense of that idea -- politically, militarily, and economically. And the foundation for America's peaceful engagement in Europe has been, and will continue to be, NATO.

Because of our commitment to peace in Europe, there hasn't been a war on that continent in 45 years. The "long peace" now enjoyed by Europe is a fact we should view through the long lens of history: Europe has now experienced **the longest uninterrupted period of international peace in centuries** -- in fact, in the recorded history of that continent.

Ours is an engagement that has helped European democracies enjoy unprecedented stability and prosperity. ~~Europeans expect America to be part of their continent's future -- just as we have been part of their past.~~ So the Alliance must join together to craft a new Western strategy for new and changing times.

I have consulted with my Allied colleagues, and with the Secretary General of NATO, Manfred Woerner. Based on these discussions, today I call for a June Summit meeting of all NATO leaders. The time is right for the Alliance to act.

I believe this Summit should launch a wide-ranging review of Alliance policy for the transformed Europe of the 1990's. To my NATO colleagues, I suggest that our Summit should address four critical points:

One, the new political role NATO can play in the new Europe.

Two, the conventional forces the Alliance will need in the time ahead, and NATO's goals for conventional arms control.

Three, the role of nuclear weapons based in Europe -- and the Western objectives in new nuclear arms control negotiations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

Four, strengthening the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe -- the CSCE -- to reinforce NATO and help protect democratic values, in a Europe whole and free.

The first task the NATO Summit should consider is the future political mission of the Alliance. As military threats fade, the political dimension of NATO's work -- always there but seldom noticed -- becomes more prominent. So at the NATO Summit we

should look for ways to help our German friends achieve **freedom and unity** -- something which we and our Allies have supported for over 40 years. And we should **reaffirm the importance of keeping a united Germany fully committed to NATO.**

The Alliance needs to find ways to work more closely with a vigorous European Community. And in Eastern Europe, governments that were once military adversaries are now our **partners** in building a new continent. So we must also talk about how to encourage further democratic change in Eastern Europe.

But even as NATO gives more emphasis to its political mission, its guarantee of European security must remain firm. **Our enemy today is uncertainty, and instability.** So we will need to maintain a sound, collective military structure with forces in the field, backed by larger forces that can be called upon in a crisis.

Which brings me to the second task for the NATO Summit -- a review of how the Alliance should plan its conventional defenses. While we need to recognize that it will take several years at a minimum before the Soviet military presence is gone from Eastern Europe -- and before the major reductions contemplated by both sides can be implemented -- **we need to develop our strategy now.**

A militarily significant number of U.S. conventional forces must remain on the other side of the Atlantic for as long as our Allies want and need them. These forces demonstrate, as no words can, the enduring compact that binds America's fate with Europe's democracies.

But if words might serve, I would turn again to Churchill's: "Before we cast away the solid assurances of national armaments," he said at that commencement forty-four years ago, "we must be certain that our temple is built not upon shifting sands or quagmires, but upon the rock." And so we must. Let the iron curtain rise -- and let every corner of the European stage be lit with the brilliant drama of democratic freedoms.

If the Soviet withdrawal continues and our arms control efforts are successful, we will profoundly turn the postwar buildup around -- building down forces in a transformed Europe.

The CFE treaty we have proposed would be the most ambitious arms control agreement ever concluded. We must finish the work on a Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty soon, and plan to sign it at a CSCE Summit [next] fall. But at the Summit we need to look further ahead, preparing for **follow-on negotiations** after the conclusion of a CFE treaty. The NATO Summit should develop the Alliance's objectives for these talks.

The NATO Summit should also assess the future of U.S. nuclear forces in Europe. As democracy blooms in Central and Eastern Europe, as Soviet troops return home and tanks are dismantled, there is less need for nuclear systems of the shortest range. The NATO Summit should **accelerate** the ongoing strategic work within the Alliance.

I've reviewed our plan to produce and deploy newer, more modern, short-range nuclear missiles to replace the Lance system now in place in Europe. We've just about finished the research

and development work for these new missiles. But I've decided, after consulting with our Allies, to terminate the Follow-On To Lance program -- and to withdraw the funding request now before Congress. I have also decided to **cancel any further modernization of U.S. nuclear artillery shells now deployed in Europe.**

There are still many short-range U.S. -- and many more Soviet -- nuclear missile systems now deployed in Europe. We've said we're prepared to negotiate the reduction of these forces as well, in a new set of arms control talks. At the NATO Summit, I will **call upon my colleagues to agree on the broad objectives for these future negotiations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union, and kick off the preparations within the Alliance for these talks.**

Today, I ask **that the startup of these negotiations be accelerated -- so that these new U.S.-Soviet arms control talks can begin shortly after a CFE treaty on conventional forces has been signed.**

In taking these steps, **the United States is not going to allow Europe to become "safe for conventional war."** There are few lessons so clear in history as this: the unprecedented peace of Europe hasn't been preserved by chance. It has been the result of NATO's reliance on both nuclear and conventional forces.

But every aspect of America's engagement in Europe -- military, political, and economic -- must be complementary. And

one place where they all come together is in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe -- an organization of 35 states of Europe and North America. It should take on a broader role.

So the fourth task for a NATO Summit is to reach common Allied objectives for the future of the CSCE -- which should be a beacon for human rights and individual freedoms. It can help the victorious forces of democracy in Eastern Europe secure their revolutions, and be assured a voice in the new Europe.

The NATO Summit should **consider a much more ambitious agenda for the CSCE** -- including setting standards for truly free elections, adopting measures to strengthen the rule of law, and pointing the way in the needed but painful transition from centralized, command economies to free markets.

Finally, we should consider whether new mechanisms within the CSCE can help mediate and peacefully settle disputes in Europe. I believe my Allied colleagues and I should **agree to take up these ideas at a CSCE Summit later this year, in conjunction with the signing of a CFE treaty.**

In Eastern Europe, in this hemisphere, the triumph of democracy has cast its warm light on the face of the world like a miraculous dawn. But the outcome of this struggle for freedom is not ordained, and it will not be the work of miracles. At home and abroad, **democracy's deliverance must be America's work.**

All of you who graduate here today, were witness to wondrous change in the world last year. And you're part of an important

and historic American commitment -- to a new American mission in Europe.

The security of Europe and the world has become very complex in this century. But America's commitment to stability and peace is profoundly clear. It is a commitment whose motivation derives from the strength of our forefathers -- from the blood of those who have died for freedom -- and for the sake of all who would live in peace.

And every voice, every heart's commitment to freedom is important. There's a story, about an old man and a boy climbing a mountain one winter morning. It began to snow, very lightly. The boy said to the old man, "Tell me the weight of a snowflake."

"Almost nothing," the old man said. They reached the top of the mountain, and watched the valley beneath fill up with snow, until those weightless snowflakes, one by one, became an avalanche whose thunder shook the earth.

"Maybe," the boy said, "there is only one person's voice lacking for the world to be free."

The thunderous cry for freedom -- in Eastern Europe, in South Africa, in this hemisphere -- was heard around the world in the Revolution of '89. So understand how ^{America's mission in Europe} millions of decisions ^{are} made for freedom, make a world of difference. And add your voice to the thundering chorus.

Thank you. God bless you. And God bless the United States of America.

#

(Lange/Cawley)
May 1, 1990
11:20 A.M.
[NATO.DOC]

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: COMMENCEMENT, OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
 LEWIS STADIUM
 FRIDAY, MAY 4, 1990
 2:00 P.M.

[[Thank you, Governor Bellmon. President Campbell, Secretary
Cavazos; Congressmen Jim Inhofe and Wes Watkins, Senator Don
Nickles; Chief Mankiller, Mr. Donnelly; faculty, parents, but
most of all -- O.S.U.'s graduating Class of 1990 ! \]

 I'll try to be brief -- Barbara and I can't wait to get
a beer and some cheese fries over at Eskimo Joe's... \]
Hope they have enough T-shirts for all the grandkids... \]

 This is the end zone where Barry Sanders ran back kickoffs
for touchdowns in two opening games. So I stand and deliver on
hallowed ground... After I finish, I hope I can resist the urge
to spike this speech and do a little dance. \\\\ You too?]]

 You know, when graduates of my vintage were sitting through
ceremonies like this, right after the Second World War, we faced
a world of changes -- full of potential and new possibilities.

 Barbara and I got into an old two-door Studebaker -- you
still drive those, right? -- in the summer of 1948. Drove down
to Texas. [[Of course, who knows how far we could've gone in
life if we'd made it to Oklahoma...]]

 Post-war America was ready for peace and prosperity. But
while the free world was recovering, the nations of Eastern
Europe were being "consolidated" behind an Iron Curtain. So
began four decades of division in Europe -- and 40 long years of

suspicion between superpowers.

Today, you also graduate at the end of an era of conflict -- but a contest of a different kind -- a cold and abstract war of words and walls. That conflict, at last, is coming to a close. **We're going to leave the cold war, ladies and gentlemen, in history's dust. **

I'll be reflecting on the power and potential of democratic change in each of the commencement addresses I make this year.
I begin today with the future of democracy -- and the defense of freedom -- in Europe.

A few of you may be wondering what a continent 4000 miles away has to do with you. Many of the graduates of America's class of 1917 may have wondered why the faraway war they read about in the daily newspapers should have anything to do with them. But within a year they were fighting in the trenches, struggling in a hell beyond human imagination. Devoted to a cause that hadn't been clear to them on graduation day, they were willing to give their lives.

Two decades later, on the eve of another World War, another generation of Americans sat in the bright sun of commencement ceremonies at colleges across the country. At first, many were reluctant about the struggle for freedom in Europe -- but again, many would die to preserve it.

Near the end of that war, in a speech delivered to graduates of a small school in Missouri, an Englishman said, "There never was a war in all history easier to prevent by timely action than

the one which has just desolated such great areas of the globe. It could have been prevented in my belief without the firing of a single shot... but no one would listen, and one by one we were all sucked into the awful whirlpool. We surely must not let that happen again." [

Those students no longer questioned their role in the future of Europe. The words they heard were Winston Churchill's -- and the answer was, everything. In the ^{front of} Argonne and on the beaches of Normandy, two generations had become part of America's mission to Europe. **Today, I'm going to outline the new American mission in Europe.**

Europe is a continent whose future has always been intertwined with ours. And now we are poised at a moment of choice -- a critical time in our strategic relationship with our neighbors across the Atlantic. About a year ago, in Germany, I defined the kind of Europe this Administration is committed to: a Europe whole and free. Today that goal is within our reach.

We enter a new age of freedom -- a time of uncertainty, but great hope. Emerging democracies in Eastern Europe are going through social, political, and economic transformations -- shaking loose stagnant, centralized bureaucracies that have smothered initiative and choice for generations.

In this time of transition, moving away from the postwar era and beyond containment, we cannot know what choices the people of Eastern Europe will make for their future. **Our role is to ensure that the choice is theirs.**

President Gorbachev has made profound progress in his country. Reforms so fundamental that the clock cannot be turned back. Yet neither can we turn the clock ahead, to know what kind of country the Soviet Union will be in years to come.

But this we know: The Soviet Union will remain -- even after all the planned reductions in its forces are complete, even if our current arms control proposals are agreed and implemented -- the strongest military power on the Eurasian landmass, armed with thousands of nuclear weapons, dwarfing all other European states in size, population, and armed strength.

For the sake of the future we share with Europe, our policies and presence must be equal to this period of transition -- with a constancy and reliability that will reassure our friends, both old and new.

We have global responsibilities. My European colleagues want the United States to be part of Europe's future. So we will remain a European power in the broadest sense of that idea -- politically, militarily, and economically. And the foundation for America's peaceful engagement in Europe has been, and will continue to be, NATO.

Because of our commitment to peace in Europe, there hasn't been a war on that continent in 45 years. The "long peace" now enjoyed by Europe is a fact we should view through the long lens of history: Europe has now experienced **the longest uninterrupted period of international peace in centuries** -- in fact, in the recorded history of that continent.

Ours is an engagement that has helped European democracies enjoy unprecedented stability and prosperity. Europeans expect America to be part of their continent's future -- just as we have been part of their past. So the Alliance must join together to craft a new Western strategy for new and changing times.

I have consulted with my Allied colleagues, and with the Secretary General of NATO, Manfred Woerner. Based on these discussions, today I call for a June Summit meeting of all NATO leaders. The time is right for the Alliance to act.

I believe this Summit should launch a wide-ranging review of Alliance policy for the transformed Europe of the 1990's. To my NATO colleagues, I suggest that our Summit should address four critical points:

One, the new political role NATO can play in the new Europe.

Two, the conventional forces the Alliance will need in the time ahead, and NATO's goals for conventional arms control.

Three, the role of nuclear weapons based in Europe -- and the Western objectives in new nuclear arms control negotiations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

Four, strengthening the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe -- the CSCE -- to reinforce NATO and help protect democratic values, in a Europe whole and free.

The first task the NATO Summit should consider is the future political mission of the Alliance. As military threats fade, the political dimension of NATO's work -- always there but seldom noticed -- becomes more prominent. So at the NATO Summit we

should look for ways to help our German friends achieve **freedom and unity** -- something which we and our Allies have supported for over 40 years. And we should **reaffirm the importance of keeping a united Germany fully committed to NATO.**

The Alliance needs to find ways to work more closely with a vigorous European Community. And in Eastern Europe, governments that were once military adversaries are now our **partners** in building a new continent. So we must also talk about how to encourage further democratic change in Eastern Europe.

But even as NATO gives more emphasis to its political mission, its guarantee of European security must remain firm. **Our enemy today is uncertainty, and instability.** So we will need to maintain a sound, collective military structure with forces in the field, backed by larger forces that can be called upon in a crisis.

Which brings me to the second task for the NATO Summit -- a review of how the Alliance should plan its conventional defenses. While we need to recognize that it will take several years at a minimum before the Soviet military presence is gone from Eastern Europe -- and before the major reductions contemplated by both sides can be implemented -- **we need to develop our strategy now.**

A militarily significant number of U.S. conventional forces must remain on the other side of the Atlantic for as long as our Allies want and need them. These forces demonstrate, as no words can, the enduring compact that binds America's fate with Europe's democracies.

But if words might serve, I would turn again to Churchill's: "Before we cast away the solid assurances of national armaments," he said at that commencement forty-four years ago, "we must be certain that our temple is built not upon shifting sands or quagmires, but upon the rock." And so we must. Let the iron curtain rise -- and let every corner of the European stage be lit with the brilliant drama of democratic freedoms.

If the Soviet withdrawal continues and our arms control efforts are successful, we will profoundly turn the postwar buildup around -- building down forces in a transformed Europe.

The CFE treaty we have proposed would be the most ambitious arms control agreement ever concluded. We must finish the work on a Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty soon, and plan to sign it at a CSCE Summit [next] fall. But at the Summit we need to look further ahead, preparing for **follow-on negotiations** after the conclusion of a CFE treaty. The NATO Summit should develop the Alliance's objectives for these talks.

The NATO Summit should also assess the future of U.S. nuclear forces in Europe. As democracy blooms in Central and Eastern Europe, as Soviet troops return home and tanks are dismantled, there is less need for nuclear systems of the shortest range. The NATO Summit should **accelerate** the ongoing strategic work within the Alliance.

I've reviewed our plan to produce and deploy newer, more modern, short-range nuclear missiles to replace the Lance system now in place in Europe. We've just about finished the research

and development work for these new missiles. But I've decided, after consulting with our Allies, to terminate the Follow-On To Lance program -- and to withdraw the funding request now before Congress. I have also decided to **cancel any further modernization of U.S. nuclear artillery shells now deployed in Europe.**

There are still many short-range U.S. -- and many more Soviet -- nuclear missile systems now deployed in Europe. We've said we're prepared to negotiate the reduction of these forces as well, in a new set of arms control talks. At the NATO Summit, I will **call upon my colleagues to agree on the broad objectives for these future negotiations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union, and kick off the preparations within the Alliance for these talks.**

Today, I ask **that the startup of these negotiations be accelerated -- so that these new U.S.-Soviet arms control talks can begin shortly after a CFE treaty on conventional forces has been signed.**

In taking these steps, **the United States is not going to allow Europe to become "safe for conventional war."** There are few lessons so clear in history as this: the unprecedented peace of Europe hasn't been preserved by chance. It has been the result of NATO's reliance on both nuclear and conventional forces.

But every aspect of America's engagement in Europe -- military, political, and economic -- must be complementary. And

one place where they all come together is in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe -- an organization of 35 states of Europe and North America. It should take on a broader role.

So the fourth task for a NATO Summit is to reach common Allied objectives for the future of the CSCE -- which should be a beacon for human rights and individual freedoms. It can help the victorious forces of democracy in Eastern Europe secure their revolutions, and be assured a voice in the new Europe.

The NATO Summit should **consider a much more ambitious agenda for the CSCE** -- including setting standards for truly free elections, adopting measures to strengthen the rule of law, and pointing the way in the needed but painful transition from centralized, command economies to free markets.

Finally, we should consider whether new mechanisms within the CSCE can help mediate and peacefully settle disputes in Europe. I believe my Allied colleagues and I should **agree to take up these ideas at a CSCE Summit later this year, in conjunction with the signing of a CFE treaty.**

In Eastern Europe, in this hemisphere, the triumph of democracy has cast its warm light on the face of the world like a miraculous dawn. But the outcome of this struggle for freedom is not ordained, and it will not be the work of miracles. At home and abroad, **democracy's deliverance must be America's work.**

All of you who graduate here today, were witness to wondrous change in the world last year. And you're part of an important

and historic American commitment -- to a new American mission in Europe.

The security of Europe and the world has become very complex in this century. But America's commitment to stability and peace is profoundly clear. It is a commitment whose motivation derives from the strength of our forefathers -- from the blood of those who have died for freedom -- and for the sake of all who would live in peace.

And every voice, every heart's commitment to freedom is important. There's a story, about an old man and a boy climbing a mountain one winter morning. It began to snow, very lightly. The boy said to the old man, "Tell me the weight of a snowflake."

"Almost nothing," the old man said. They reached the top of the mountain, and watched the valley beneath fill up with snow, until those weightless snowflakes, one by one, became an avalanche whose thunder shook the earth.

"Maybe," the boy said, "there is only one person's voice lacking for the world to be free."

The thunderous cry for freedom -- in Eastern Europe, in South Africa, in this hemisphere -- was heard around the world in the Revolution of '89. So understand how ^{America's mission in Europe -- like} millions of ^{decisions} ^{actions taken} ~~made~~ for freedom, makes a world of difference. And add your voice to the thundering chorus.

Thank you. God bless you. And God bless the United States of America.

#

every ballot cast
every action taken
commitment made

like to vote
or don't
effort

(Lange/Cawley)
May 1, 1990
2:15 P.M.
[PARANATO.DOC]

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: COMMENCEMENT, OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
LEWIS STADIUM
FRIDAY, MAY 4, 1990
2:00 P.M.

[[Introductory acknowledgements...]]

You know, when graduates of my vintage were sitting through ceremonies like this, right after the Second World War, we faced a world of changes -- full of potential and new possibilities.

Barbara and I got into an old two-door Studebaker in the summer of 1948. Drove down to Texas. [[Of course, who knows how far we could've gone in life if we'd made it to Oklahoma...]]

America, post-war, was ready for peace and prosperity. But while the free world was recovering, the nations of Eastern Europe were being "consolidated" behind an Iron Curtain. So began four decades of division in Europe -- and suspicion between superpowers.

Today, you also graduate at the end of an era of conflict -- a contest of a different kind -- a cold and abstract war of words and walls. But that conflict, at last, is coming to a close. **The cold war, ladies and gentlemen, will be left in the dust of history. **

In Eastern Europe, in this hemisphere, the triumph of democracy warms the face of the world like a miraculous dawn -- a dawn that might somehow cast every corner in its light at once. But it is not ordained, and it will not be the work of miracles.

At home and abroad, **democracy's deliverance must be America's work.**

awesome trans!

I'll be reflecting on the power and potential of democratic change in the five commencement addresses I make this year. And I'll begin today with the future of democracy here in the land of its birth -- and the defense of democracy ~~with our European allies.~~ *across the Atlantic.*

don't think this works on that Pootis will buy it.

These United States have been divided in the past -- North from South in the Civil War, [left from right in Vietnam]. In the 1980's we faced extremes of greed on Wall Street and the homeless on mainstreet. And we struggled to overcome obstacles less tangible but no less troubling than the Berlin Wall: false divisions and barriers between left and right, have's and have-nots, black and white.

quite, more thoughtful, more careful, more honesty

I want Americans to think about the goals and values they **share** -- not the differences that divide them. The commonwealth and well-being of our nation demand that we find strength in shared principles. Because behind the false barriers, beyond the heat of politics, we all want the same things: A just society. Opportunity. Prosperity.

So if your future begins with a new decade, let it begin with hope, that the 1990's might be a less divisive decade. *a decade*
negative → *positive*
It is time to reaffirm the values we share.

I sought the Presidency for a single purpose -- and believe that government has a singular responsibility -- **to use power to help people.** We know that America transcends adversity, and

finds her highest expression and greatest power, in **diversity**.
 Ours is a nation of imagination. Of principle, and tolerance.
 Of quiet strength. Faith. And freedom.

So the government of such a nation should be active -- but not invasive. Democratic -- but not bureaucratic. And it should show restraint and a healthy humility -- for if the crumbling of centralized bureaucracies and the collapse of dictators has ^{reminded} ~~taught~~ us ^{at} anything, it is this: The center of power is not an entrenched bureaucratic elite -- it is the people. And **the best government does not rule -- it serves.**

Until now, this idea called America has compelled the world toward freedom. Now, the world has changed. And so too, must America change. It is time to revise our assumptions, and to reconsider what all of us know about this democracy.

We have, within our reach, the promise of a new and more ennobling age. A new age of empowerment -- an independence movement that restrains the paternalistic impulse, the grand experiments, and the noble intentions of bureaucratic central planning. That unleashes free market forces, and puts power where it belongs. Where it's best used: in the hands of people.

If bureaucracy is the Titanic, we'll have to do more than rearrange the deck chairs. At every step we should be asking ourselves, what works? Because there's never "one answer" to the challenges we face in America. There are many creative solutions -- and government's role should be to find the best.

provide the freedom that allows people to *idea (do it's best - + let others do theirs)*

That means new ideas, like school vouchers to give poor parents the power of an alternative, and choice in where to send their kids. More tenant control ^{and even ownership} of public housing. Tax credits for child care without restrictions of any kind, ~~religious or otherwise~~, to give parents more flexibility and choice.

Here at home, we don't need **more** government. We don't need **less** government. We need capable government -- and a renewed sense that government exists to empower people. America's best hope is the creative talent she's had all along -- through a revitalized democracy that applies the forces of the free market, choice, decentralization, and emphasizes on what works.

We come from a tradition that seeks power to give it away -- to states, localities, private enterprise, community groups, citizens of every kind. ^{TRANS} Because what the world has learned only recently, America has known for 200 years. **Democracy... is another way of saying opportunity.**

Until now, I've been talking about the future of democracy in America. I want to turn now to the future of democracy in Europe -- a place of recent and revolutionary change, whose future has always been intertwined with ours.

We are poised at a moment of choice -- a critical time in our strategic relationship with our neighbors across the Atlantic. About a year ago, in Germany, I defined the kind of Europe this Administration is committed to: a Europe whole and free. Today that goal is within our reach.

We enter a new age of freedom -- a time of uncertainty, but great hope. Emerging democracies in Eastern Europe are going through social, political, and economic transformations -- shaking loose institutions that have smothered initiative and choice for generations.

to make sure
"the choice is theirs..."
 In this time of transition, moving ^{dway} from the postwar era and beyond containment, we cannot know and cannot dictate what choices the people of Eastern Europe will make for their future.

-- but we can
TRANS to
USSR
 President Gorbachev has made profound changes in his country. Reforms so fundamental that the clock cannot be turned back. Yet neither can we turn the clock ahead, to know what kind of country the Soviet Union will be in years to come.

"the badass of the landmass"
 But this we know. The Soviet Union will remain -- even after all planned reductions in its forces are complete, even if our current arms control proposals are agreed and implemented -- the strongest military power on the Eurasian landmass, armed with thousands of nuclear weapons, dwarfing all other European states in size, population, and armed strength.

I believe our policies must be equal to this period of transition -- with a constancy and reliability that will reassure our friends, both old and new.

We have global responsibilities. My European colleagues want the United States to be part of Europe's future. So the United States should be a European power in the broadest sense of that term -- politically, militarily, and economically. And the

starting point for America's peaceful engagement in Europe has been, and will continue to be, NATO.

Because of our determination for peace in Europe, there hasn't been a war on that continent in 45 years. The "long peace" enjoyed by Europe doesn't suggest that human nature has changed. It's a fact that we should view through the long lens of history: ~~the whole of~~ Europe has now experienced **the longest uninterrupted period of international peace in the recorded history of the continent, measured in terms of centuries.**

Ours is an engagement that has helped the democracies enjoy unprecedented stability and prosperity. And it also means that the Europeans understand America to be part of their continent's future, as we have been part of their past. **Now is the time for the Alliance to act -- to craft a new Western strategy for new and changing times.**

I have consulted with my Allied colleagues, and with the Secretary General of NATO, Manfred Woerner. **Based on these discussions, I am calling for a June Summit meeting of all NATO leaders.**

This Summit should, in my view, launch a wide-ranging review of Alliance policy for the transformed Europe of the 1990's. To my NATO colleagues, I suggest that our Summit should address four critical points:

One, the new **political role** NATO can play in the new Europe.

Two, the **conventional forces** the Alliance will need in the time ahead, and NATO's goals for **conventional arms control**.

Three, the role of nuclear weapons based in Europe -- and the Western objectives in new nuclear arms control negotiations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

Four, strengthening the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe -- the CSCE -- to reinforce NATO and help protect democratic values in a Europe whole and free.

The first task the NATO Summit should consider is the future political mission of the Alliance. As the military threat fades, the political dimension of NATO's work -- always there but seldom noticed -- becomes more prominent. So at the NATO Summit we should look for ways to help our German friends achieve **freedom and unity** -- something which we and our Allies have supported for over 40 years -- and we should **reaffirm the importance of keeping a united Germany fully committed to NATO**.

The Alliance needs to find ways to work more closely with a vigorous European Community -- and we must also talk about how to encourage further democratic change in Eastern Europe. Those governments, once military adversaries, are now our partners in building a new continent.

But even as NATO gives more emphasis to its political mission, its guarantee of European stability must remain secure. **The enemy is uncertainty, and instability**. So we will need to maintain a sound collective military structure with forces in the field, backed by larger forces that can be called upon in a crisis.

Which brings me to the second task for the NATO Summit -- a review of how the Alliance should plan its conventional defenses.

While we need to recognize that it will take several years at a minimum before the Soviet military presence is gone from Eastern Europe -- and before the major reductions contemplated by both sides can be implemented -- **we need to develop our strategy now.**

If the Soviet withdrawal continues and our arms control efforts are successful, we will profoundly turn the postwar buildup around -- building down forces in a transformed Europe.

The CFE treaty we have proposed would be the most ambitious arms control agreement ever concluded. We must finish the work on a CFE treaty soon and plan to sign it at a CSCE Summit last [sic] fall. But at the Summit we need to look further ahead, preparing for **follow-on negotiations** after the conclusion of a CFE treaty. The NATO Summit should present the Alliance's objectives for these talks.

I believe that militarily significant U.S. conventional forces should remain on the other side of the Atlantic for as long as they are wanted. They demonstrate, as no words can, the enduring compact that binds America's fate with Europe's democracies.

The NATO Summit should also assess the future of U.S. nuclear forces in Europe. As democracy blooms in Central and Eastern Europe, as Soviet tanks and troops ^{are} return home, there is a reduced need for nuclear systems of the shortest range. The

*are dismantled
& demobilized...*

*spell out
CFE:
Conv.
forces in
Europe*

next

NATO Summit should accelerate the ongoing strategic work within the Alliance.

I've reviewed our plan to produce and deploy newer, more modern, short-range nuclear missiles to replace the Lance system now in place in Europe. Although we've substantially completed the research and development work for these new missiles, I have decided, after consulting with our Allies, to **terminate the Follow-On To Lance program** -- and to withdraw the funding request now before Congress. I have also decided to **cancel any further modernization of U.S. nuclear artillery shells** ^{now} **deployed in Europe.**

There are still many short-range U.S. -- and many more Soviet -- nuclear missile systems now deployed in Europe. We have said we are prepared to negotiate the reduction of these forces as well, in a new set of arms control talks. At the NATO Summit, I will **call upon my colleagues to agree on the broad objectives for these future negotiations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union, and kick off the preparations within the Alliance for these talks.**

Moreover, I would like to suggest, today, **that the startup of these negotiations might be advanced**, so that these new U.S.-Soviet arms control talks **would begin shortly after a CFE treaty on conventional forces has been signed.**

In taking these steps, **the United States is not going to allow Europe to become** ["] **safe for conventional war.** ["] There are few lessons so clear in history as this: Reliance on conventional

deterrence alone often has not worked. Reliance by NATO on a mix of nuclear and conventional forces has.

All of the aspects of America's engagement in Europe -- military, political, and economic -- must complement each other. One place where they all come together is in the CSCE, an organization of 35 states of Europe, *and North Amer. (?)* including the United States, Canada, the Soviet Union, and Eastern Europe's emerging democracies. [Now, it should take on a broader role.]

The fourth task for a NATO Summit is to reach common Allied objectives for the future of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe -- using it to build on current institutions such as NATO and the EC.

✓ The CSCE can be a beacon for human rights and individual freedoms. It can help the victorious forces of democracy in Eastern Europe secure their revolutions, and *[be assured]* gain a voice in the new Europe. So the NATO Summit should **consider a much more ambitious agenda for the CSCE** -- including setting standards for truly free elections, adopting measures to strengthen the rule of law, and pointing the way in the needed but painful transition from centralized, command economies to free markets.

Finally, we should consider whether new mechanisms within the CSCE can help mediate and peacefully settle disputes in Europe. I believe my Allied colleagues and I should **agree to take up these ideas at a CSCE Summit later this year, in conjunction with the signing of a CFE treaty.**

[Conclusion -- democracy at home and abroad.]

Quotes from commencement

Up front Why this is important

Bring them back @ end

→ Today you've had a lot of
to go.

The soupport - humanize -

833 mi June X - Churchill talked about iron Captain

what does this have to do with a small town in Wisconsin
The answer is, everything

Colonization

In 1718 heard commencement

The June grads of a year later those grads or better June were
lying in trenches for something
that was not

I read for my commone

- wishing to avoid.

(Lange/Cawley)
May 1, 1990
7:15 P.M.
[~~SECRET~~INATO.DOC]

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: COMMENCEMENT, OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
LEWIS STADIUM
FRIDAY, MAY 4, 1990
2:00 P.M.

[[Thank you, Governor Bellmon. President Campbell, Secretary Cavazos; Congressmen Jim Inhofe and Wes Watkins, Senator Don Nickles; Chief Mankiller, Mr. Donnelly; faculty, parents, but most of all, O.S.U.'s graduating Class of 1990! \\

I'll try to be brief -- Barbara and I can't wait to get a beer and some cheese fries over at Eskimo Joe's... \\
you think
Hope they have enough T-shirts for all the grandkids? ~~you~~ \\

This is the end zone where Barry Sanders ran back kickoffs for touchdowns in two opening games. So I stand and deliver on hallowed ground... After I finish, I hope I can resist the urge to spike this speech and do a little dance. \\ *V*]]
you too?

You know, when graduates of my vintage were sitting through ceremonies like this, right after the Second World War, we faced a world of changes -- full of potential and new possibilities.

Barbara and I got into an old two-door Studebaker in the summer of 1948. Drove down to Texas. [[Of course, who knows how far we could've gone in life if we'd made it to Oklahoma...]]

Post-war America was ready for peace and prosperity. But while the free world was recovering, the nations of Eastern Europe were being "consolidated" behind an Iron Curtain. So began four decades of division in Europe -- and 40 long years of suspicion between superpowers.

Today, you also graduate at the end of an era of conflict -- a contest of a different kind -- a cold and abstract war of words and walls. But that conflict, at last, is coming to a close. **The cold war, ladies and gentlemen, will be left in history's dust. **

Concl
In Eastern Europe, in this hemisphere, the triumph of democracy casts its warm light on the face of the world like a miraculous dawn. But the outcome of this struggle for freedom is not ordained, and it will not be the work of miracles. At home and abroad, **democracy's deliverance must be America's work.**

I'll be reflecting on the power and potential of democratic change in the five commencement addresses I make this year. ~~And~~

~~Let's~~ **begin today with the defense of democracy across the Atlantic.** *subject*

Both at home and abroad.
~~You'll enjoy a degree of opportunity in America unequalled anywhere in the world. But you've heard it said that with opportunity comes responsibility -- so I need to turn your attention to one of America's most serious responsibilities: the future of democracy, and the defense of freedom, in Europe.~~

A place ~~of recent and revolutionary change~~, whose future has always been intertwined with ours.

We are poised at a moment of choice -- a critical time in our strategic relationship with our neighbors across the Atlantic. About a year ago, in Germany, I defined the kind of

Europe this Administration is committed to: a Europe whole and free. Today that goal is within our reach.

We enter a new age of freedom -- a time of uncertainty, but great hope. Emerging democracies in Eastern Europe are going through social, political, and economic transformations -- shaking loose institutions that have smothered initiative and choice for generations.

In this time of transition, moving away from the postwar era and beyond containment, we cannot know what choices the people of Eastern Europe will make for their future -- but we know we must ensure the choice is theirs.

President Gorbachev has made profound changes in his country. Reforms so fundamental that the clock cannot be turned back. Yet neither can we turn the clock ahead, to know what kind of country the Soviet Union will be in years to come.

But this we know. The Soviet Union will remain -- even after all planned reductions in its forces are complete, even if our current arms control proposals are agreed and implemented -- the strongest military power on the Eurasian landmass, armed with thousands of nuclear weapons, dwarfing all other European states in size, population, and armed strength.

I believe our policies must be equal to this period of transition -- with a constancy and reliability that will reassure our friends, both old and new.

We have global responsibilities. My European colleagues want the United States to be part of Europe's future. So the

United States should remain a European power in the broadest sense of that term -- politically, militarily, and economically. And the starting point for America's peaceful engagement in Europe has been, and will continue to be, NATO.

Because of our commitment to peace in Europe, there hasn't been a war on that continent in 45 years. The "long peace" now enjoyed by Europe is a fact we should view through the long lens of history: Europe has now experienced **the longest uninterrupted period of international peace in the recorded history of the continent.**

Ours is an engagement that has helped European democracies enjoy unprecedented stability and prosperity. And it also means that the Europeans expect America to be part of their continent's future -- just as we have been part of their past. **So now is the time for the Alliance to act -- to craft a new Western strategy for new and changing times.**

I have consulted with my Allied colleagues, and with the Secretary General of NATO, Manfred Woerner. **Based on these discussions, I am calling for a June Summit meeting of all NATO leaders.**

This Summit should, in my view, launch a wide-ranging review of Alliance policy for the transformed Europe of the 1990's. To my NATO colleagues, I suggest that our Summit should address four critical points:

One, the new **political role** NATO can play in the new Europe.

Two, the **conventional forces** the Alliance will need in the time ahead, and NATO's goals for **conventional arms control**.

Three, the role of **nuclear weapons** based in Europe -- and the **Western objectives** in new nuclear arms control negotiations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

Four, **strengthening the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe** -- the CSCE -- to reinforce NATO and help protect democratic values in a Europe whole and free.

The first task the NATO Summit should consider is the future political mission of the Alliance. As the military threat fades, the political dimension of NATO's work -- always there but seldom noticed -- becomes more prominent. So at the NATO Summit we should look for ways to help our German friends achieve **freedom and unity** -- something which we and our Allies have supported for over 40 years -- and we should **reaffirm the importance of keeping a united Germany fully committed to NATO**.

The Alliance needs to find ways to work more closely with a vigorous European Community. And in Eastern Europe, governments that were once military adversaries are now our partners in building a new continent. So we must also talk about how to encourage further democratic change in Eastern Europe.

But even as NATO gives more emphasis to its political mission, its guarantee of European security must remain firm. **Our enemy today is uncertainty, and instability**. So we will need to maintain a sound, collective military structure with forces in

the field, backed by larger forces that can be called upon in a crisis.

Which brings me to the second task for the NATO Summit -- a review of how the Alliance should plan its conventional defenses.

While we need to recognize that it will take several years at a minimum before the Soviet military presence is gone from Eastern Europe -- and before the major reductions contemplated by both sides can be implemented -- **we need to develop our strategy now.**

I believe that militarily significant U.S. conventional forces should remain on the other side of the Atlantic for as long as they are wanted. They demonstrate, as no words can, the enduring compact that binds America's fate with Europe's democracies.

If the Soviet withdrawal continues and our arms control efforts are successful, we will profoundly turn the postwar buildup around -- building down forces in a transformed Europe.

The CFE treaty we have proposed would be the most ambitious arms control agreement ever concluded. We must finish the work on a CFE treaty soon and plan to sign it at a CSCE Summit [next] fall. But at the Summit we need to look further ahead, preparing for **follow-on negotiations** after the conclusion of a CFE treaty. The NATO Summit should present the Alliance's objectives for these talks.

The NATO Summit should also assess the future of U.S. nuclear forces in Europe. As democracy blooms in Central and Eastern Europe, as Soviet tanks are dismantled and troops return

home, there is a reduced need for nuclear systems of the shortest range. The NATO Summit should accelerate the ongoing strategic work within the Alliance.

I've reviewed our plan to produce and deploy newer, more modern, short-range nuclear missiles to replace the Lance system now in place in Europe. Although we've substantially completed the research and development work for these new missiles, I have decided, after consulting with our Allies, to **terminate the Follow-On To Lance program** -- and to withdraw the funding request now before Congress. I have also decided to **cancel any further modernization of U.S. nuclear artillery shells now deployed in Europe.**

There are still many short-range U.S. -- and many more Soviet -- nuclear missile systems now deployed in Europe. We have said we are prepared to negotiate the reduction of these forces as well, in a new set of arms control talks. At the NATO Summit, I will **call upon my colleagues to agree on the broad objectives for these future negotiations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union, and kick off the preparations within the Alliance for these talks.**

Moreover, I would like to suggest, today, **that the startup of these negotiations might be advanced, so that these new U.S.-Soviet arms control talks would begin shortly after a CFE treaty on conventional forces has been signed.**

In taking these steps, the United States is not going to allow Europe to become "safe for conventional war." There are

few lessons so clear in history as this: Reliance on conventional deterrence alone often has not worked. Reliance by NATO on a mix of nuclear and conventional forces has.

All of the aspects of America's engagement in Europe -- military, political, and economic -- must complement each other. One place where they all come together is in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe -- an organization of 35 states of Europe and North America. It should take on a broader role.

So the fourth task for a NATO Summit is to reach common Allied objectives for the future of the CSCE -- using it to build on current institutions such as NATO and the EC.

The CSCE can be a beacon for human rights and individual freedoms. It can help the victorious forces of democracy in Eastern Europe secure their revolutions, and be assured a voice in the new Europe. So the NATO Summit should **consider a much more ambitious agenda for the CSCE** -- including setting standards for truly free elections, adopting measures to strengthen the rule of law, and pointing the way in the needed but painful transition from centralized, command economies to free markets.

Finally, we should consider whether new mechanisms within the CSCE can help mediate and peacefully settle disputes in Europe. I believe my Allied colleagues and I should **agree to take up these ideas at a CSCE Summit later this year, in conjunction with the signing of a CFE treaty.**

[Conclusion -- democracy at home and abroad.]

I am asking for your support in a historic decision for our country, to continue active engagement in the future of Europe.

abroad, a new peaceful engagement.

Letter Bridge

Man from
Churchill
in air

WWI-

(Lange/Cawley)
May 1, 1990
2:15 P.M.
[PARANATO.DOC]

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: COMMENCEMENT, OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
LEWIS STADIUM
FRIDAY, MAY 4, 1990
2:00 P.M.

[[Introductory acknowledgements...]]

You know, when graduates of my vintage were sitting through ceremonies like this, right after the Second World War, we faced a world of changes -- full of potential and new possibilities.

Barbara and I got into an old two-door Studebaker in the summer of 1948. Drove down to Texas. [[Of course, who knows how far we could've gone in life if we'd made it to Oklahoma...]]

America, post-war, was ready for peace and prosperity. But while the free world was recovering, the nations of Eastern Europe were being "consolidated" behind an Iron Curtain. So began four decades of division in Europe -- ^{40 long years of} and suspicion between superpowers.

Today, you also graduate at the end of an era of conflict -- a contest of a different kind -- a cold and abstract war of words and walls. But that conflict, at last, is coming to a close. The cold war, ladies and gentlemen, will be left in the dust of history. \\\

In Eastern Europe, in this hemisphere, the triumph of democracy ^{casts its warm light upon} ~~warms~~ the face of the world like a miraculous dawn, ~~a dawn that might somehow cast every corner in its light at once.~~ ^{the outcome of this struggle for freedom} But it is not ordained, and it will not be the work of miracles.

At home and abroad, **democracy's deliverance must be America's work.**

I'll be reflecting on the power and potential of democratic change in the five commencement addresses I make this year. And I'll begin today with the future of democracy here (in the land of its birth) -- and the defense of democracy with our European allies.

These United States have been divided in the past -- North from South in the Civil War, left from right in Vietnam. In the 1980's, we faced extremes of greed on Wall Street and the homeless on mainstreet. And we struggled to overcome obstacles less tangible but no less troubling than the Berlin Wall: false divisions and barriers between left and right, have's and have-nots, black and white.

I want Americans to think about the goals and values they **share** -- not the differences that divide them. The ~~commonwealth~~ ~~and well-being~~ of our nation demands that we find strength in shared principles. Because behind the false barriers, beyond the heat of politics, we all want the same things: A just society.

Small A prosperous nation.
Opportunity. Prosperity.

Each of your graduations today begins
~~So if your future begins~~ with a new decade, let it begin with hope, that the 1990's might be ~~a less divisive decade.~~

It is time to reaffirm the values we share.

I sought the Presidency for a single purpose -- and believe that government has a singular responsibility -- **to use power to help people.** We know that America transcends adversity, and

finds her highest expression and greatest power, in **diversity**.
Ours is a nation of imagination. Of principle, and tolerance.
Of quiet strength. Faith. And freedom.

So the government of such a nation should be active -- but not invasive. Democratic -- but not bureaucratic. And it should show restraint and a healthy humility -- for if the crumbling of centralized bureaucracies and the collapse of dictators has taught us anything, it is this: The center of power is not an entrenched bureaucratic elite -- it is the people. And **the best government does not rule -- it serves.**

For 200 years,
~~Until now,~~ this idea called America has compelled the world toward freedom. Now, the world ^{is} ~~has~~ ^{changed}. And so too, must America change. It is time to revise our assumptions, and to reconsider what all of us know about this democracy.

We have, within our reach, the promise of a new and more ennobling age. A new age of empowerment -- an independence movement that restrains the paternalistic impulse, the grand experiments, and the noble intentions of bureaucratic central planning. That unleashes free market forces, and puts power where it belongs. Where it's best used: in the hands of people.

[If bureaucracy is the Titanic, we'll have to do more than rearrange the deck chairs. At every step we should be asking ourselves, what works. Because there's never "one answer" to the challenges we face in America. There are many creative solutions -- and government's role should be to find the best.

That means new ideas, like school vouchers to give poor parents the power of an alternative, and choice in where to send their kids. More tenant control of public housing. Tax credits for child care without restrictions of any kind, religious or otherwise, to give parents more flexibility and choice. ✓

Here at home, we don't need ~~more~~ government. ~~We don't need less government.~~ We need capable government -- and a renewed sense that government exists to empower people. America's best hope is the creative talent she's had all along -- through a revitalized democracy that applies the forces of the free market, choice, decentralization, and emphasizes on what works. S

We come from a tradition that seeks power to give it away -- to states, localities, private enterprise, community groups, citizens of every kind. Because what the world has learned only recently, America has known for 200 years. **Democracy... is another way of saying opportunity.**

brief
Until now, I've been talking about the future of democracy in America. I want to turn now to the future of democracy in Europe -- a place of recent and revolutionary change, whose future has always been intertwined with ours.

We are poised at a moment of choice -- a critical time in our strategic relationship with our neighbors across the Atlantic. About a year ago, in Germany, I defined the kind of ✓ Europe this Administration is committed to: a Europe whole and free. Today that goal is within our reach.

We enter a new age of freedom -- a time of uncertainty, but great hope. Emerging democracies in Eastern Europe are going through social, political, and economic transformations -- shaking loose institutions that have smothered initiative and choice for generations.

In this time of transition, moving from the postwar era and beyond containment, we cannot know and cannot dictate what choices the people of Eastern Europe will make for their future.

President Gorbachev has made profound changes in his country. Reforms so fundamental that the clock cannot be turned back. Yet neither can we turn the clock ahead, to know what kind of country the Soviet Union will be in years to come.

But this we know. The Soviet Union will remain -- even after all planned reductions in its forces are complete, even if our current arms control proposals are agreed and implemented -- the strongest military power on the Eurasian landmass, armed with thousands of nuclear weapons, dwarfing all other European states in size, population, and armed strength.

I believe our policies must be equal to this period of transition -- with a constancy and reliability that will reassure our friends, both old and new.

We have global responsibilities. My European colleagues want the United States to be part of Europe's future. So the United States should be a ^{Norman} European power in the broadest sense of that term -- politically, militarily, and economically. And the

starting point for America's peaceful engagement in Europe has been, and will continue to be, NATO.

Because of our determination for peace in Europe, there hasn't been a war on that continent in 45 years. The "long peace" enjoyed by Europe doesn't suggest that human nature has changed. ~~It's a fact~~ ^{but} that we should view ^{through the long lens} of history -- the whole of Europe has now experienced **the longest uninterrupted period of international peace in the recorded history of the continent, measured in terms of centuries**.

rocky Ours is an engagement that has helped ^{European} the democracies enjoy unprecedented stability and prosperity. And it also means that the Europeans ^{want/expect} understand America to be part of their continent's future, as we have been part of their past. **Now is the time for the Alliance to act -- to craft a new Western strategy for new and changing times.**

I have consulted with my Allied colleagues, and with the Secretary General of NATO, Manfred Woerner. **Based on these discussions, I am calling for a June Summit meeting of all NATO leaders.**

This Summit should, in my view, launch a wide-ranging review of Alliance policy for the transformed Europe of the 1990's. To my NATO colleagues, I suggest that our Summit should address four critical points:

One, the new **political role** NATO can play in the new Europe.

Two, the **conventional forces** the Alliance will need in the time ahead, and NATO's goals for **conventional arms control**.

Four, strengthening the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe -- the CSCE -- to reinforce NATO and help protect democratic values in a Europe whole and free.

The first task the NATO Summit should consider is the future political mission of the Alliance. As the military threat fades, the political dimension of NATO's work -- always there but seldom noticed -- becomes more prominent. So at the NATO Summit we should look for ways to help our German friends achieve **freedom and unity** -- something which we and our Allies have supported for over 40 years -- and we should **reaffirm the importance of keeping a united Germany fully committed to NATO**.

The Alliance needs to find ways to work more closely with a vigorous European Community -- and we must also talk about how to encourage further democratic change in Eastern Europe. Those governments, once military adversaries, are now our partners in building a new continent. So?

But even as NATO gives more emphasis to its political mission, its guarantee of European ^{security} stability must remain ^{firm} secure. ^{our} ^{today} The enemy is uncertainty, and instability. So we will need to maintain a sound ⁽¹⁾ collective military structure with forces in the field, backed by larger forces that can be called upon in a crisis.

Which brings me to the second task for the NATO Summit -- a review of how the Alliance should plan its conventional defenses. While we need to recognize that it will take several years at a minimum before the Soviet military presence is gone from Eastern Europe -- and before the major reductions contemplated by both sides can be implemented -- **we need to develop our strategy now.**

If the Soviet withdrawal continues and our arms control efforts are successful, we ^{can} ~~will~~ profoundly turn the postwar buildup around -- building down forces in a transformed Europe.

The CFE treaty we have proposed would be the most ambitious arms control agreement ever concluded. We ^{hope to} ~~must~~ finish the work on a CFE treaty soon ^{that can be} ~~and plan to~~ sign ^{ed at} ~~it~~ at a CSCE Summit ^{this} ~~last~~ ~~[sic]~~ fall. But at the ^{NATO} ~~Summit~~ ^{even} we need to look further ahead, preparing for **follow-on negotiations** after the conclusion of a CFE treaty. The NATO Summit should ^{develop} ~~present~~ the Alliance's objectives for these talks. ?

I believe that militarily significant U.S. conventional forces should remain on the other side of the Atlantic for as long as they are wanted. They demonstrate, as no words can, the enduring compact that binds America's fate with Europe's democracies.

The NATO Summit should also assess the future of U.S. nuclear forces in Europe. As democracy blooms in Central and Eastern Europe, as Soviet tanks and troops return home, there is a reduced need for nuclear systems of the shortest range. The

NATO Summit should accelerate the ongoing strategic work within the Alliance.

I've reviewed our plan to produce and deploy newer, more modern, short-range nuclear missiles to replace the Lance system now in place in Europe. Although we've substantially completed the research and development work for these new missiles, I have decided, after consulting with our Allies, to **terminate the Follow-On To Lance program** -- and to withdraw the funding request now before Congress. I have also decided to **cancel any further modernization of U.S. nuclear artillery shells deployed in Europe.**

There are still many short-range U.S. -- and many more Soviet -- nuclear missile systems now deployed in Europe. We have said we are prepared to negotiate the reduction of these forces as well, in a new set of arms control talks. At the NATO Summit, I will **call upon my colleagues to agree on the broad objectives for these future negotiations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union, and kick off the preparations within the Alliance for these talks.**

Moreover, I would like to suggest, today, **that the startup of these negotiations might be advanced, so that these new U.S.-Soviet arms control talks would begin shortly after a CFE treaty on conventional forces has been signed.**

In taking these steps, the United States is not going to allow Europe to become safe for conventional war. There are few lessons so clear in history as this: Reliance on conventional

deterrence alone often has not worked. Reliance by NATO on a mix of nuclear and conventional forces has.

All of the aspects of America's engagement in Europe -- military, political, and economic -- must complement each other.

One place where they all come together is in the CSCE, an organization of 35 states of Europe, including the United States, Canada, the Soviet Union, and Eastern Europe's emerging democracies. Now, it should take on a broader role.

The fourth task for a NATO Summit is to reach common Allied objectives for the future of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe -- using it to build on current institutions such as NATO and the EC.

The CSCE can be a beacon for human rights and individual freedoms. It can help the victorious forces of democracy in Eastern Europe secure their revolutions, and gain a voice in the new Europe. So the NATO Summit should **consider a much more ambitious agenda for the CSCE** -- including setting standards for truly free elections, adopting measures to strengthen the rule of law, and pointing the way in the needed but painful transition from centralized, command economies to free markets.

Finally, we should consider whether new mechanisms within the CSCE can help mediate and peacefully settle disputes in Europe. I believe my Allied colleagues and I should **agree to take up these ideas at a CSCE Summit later this year, in conjunction with the signing of a CFE treaty.**

[Conclusion -- democracy at home and abroad.]

LANE

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

30 April 1990

NOTE TO: Governor Sununu

FROM: Bob Gates

John

Attached is a copy of the proposed speech for the President's use at Oklahoma State on May 4th. Please hold very tightly as once the speech is ready, we will need to communicate with our Allies and the NATO Secretary General. Therefore, the substance is very sensitive.

Many thanks.

Bob

cc: Dave Demarest

(Our staff will work closely with the speechwriter.)

~~CONFIDENTIAL/EYES ONLY~~

LANGE

PHILIP ZELIKOW
x5646

Determined To Be an Administrative
Marking Per E.O. 12356 Sec. 1.1 (a)

REL 9/29/04

4/30/90

[intro para for audience/venue]

You have all probably already heard that, as you graduate from college, you are turning a page in your lives and making important choices about your future. I suppose that is true. But I would like you to join me in reflecting on other choices we all must make. These are not decisions about careers. They are decisions we must make -- as Americans -- about our country's future, and our role in the world.

Revolutionary change is transforming Europe. The Old World is being renewed, as old divisions disappear and old fears fade. Great upheavals in Europe have always forced the American people to respond, to make deep judgments about what part we will have in European affairs. From the time of the French Revolution and the wars which followed it, to World War I and the flawed peace which ended it, to the Second World War and the creation of the postwar order, Americans have made these choices. I believe that, now, we are poised at another such moment -- a critical time in our strategic relationship with our neighbors across the Atlantic. That is what I want to talk to you about today.

The Age of Freedom: A Time of Uncertainty

Europe, and the world, has entered a new era -- the age of freedom. The revolutionaries of 1989 in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Bulgaria, and East Germany cast aside the dictators. The people of these nations have taken back

~~CONFIDENTIAL/EYES ONLY~~

control of their societies from the Communist officials who ruled in their name but without their consent. The Berlin Wall, for decades a grotesque symbol of an effort to imprison an entire country, now lies broken and in ruins.

About a year ago, I spoke in Germany about the goal of my Administration: a Europe whole and free. Today that goal is within our reach. The heart of divided Europe has been a divided Germany. Now, the unification of Germany, which we and our Allies have supported for more than forty years, is finally coming to pass, in peace and freedom.

This new age of freedom is a time of uncertainty and hope in Eastern Europe. These new democracies have undergone a social, political, and economic convulsion, shaking loose institutions that have smothered initiative and free choice for generations. Many of the people in these countries are fearful about the future. That is understandable. But these anxieties are mixed with a liberating sense of opportunity, of new possibilities that are opening for growth, prosperity, and personal freedom.

The dramatic changes in Eastern Europe will diminish the military threat from the Soviet Union. The Soviet leaders are preoccupied with remaking their own society, the process of perestroika. They have shown real statesmanship in accepting, even encouraging, the free expression of popular desires for change in Eastern Europe.

Yet we are still living through a period of transition,

moving from the postwar era, beyond containment, into the age of freedom. [We do not know what choices the people of Eastern Europe will make for their future.] The process of change in the Soviet Union is still unfinished -- and we do not know where it will lead. It will be crucial to see, for example, whether Moscow chooses coercion or peaceful dialogue in responding to the aspirations of the Lithuanian people, and nationalities within the Soviet Union.

President Gorbachev has made profound changes in his country. There is no doubt in my mind that these reforms are so fundamental that the clock cannot be turned back. Yet, unfortunately for us, we cannot turn the clock ahead, cannot see what kind of country the Soviet Union will be in years to come. It will certainly be different -- this we know. Here is what we also know: the Soviet Union will remain, even after all planned reductions in its forces are complete, even if our current arms control proposals are agreed and implemented, the strongest military power on the Eurasian landmass, armed with thousands of nuclear weapons, dwarfing all other European states in size, population, and armed strength.

I believe that our policies now must be appropriate to a period of transition, displaying a constancy and reliability that will reassure our friends, both old and new. But as Europe evolves, our policies must also prepare for a new era in European history. If the promise of peaceful political change and Soviet

military adjustment is fulfilled, we will be ready.

America In Europe

The United States has global responsibilities. We face many kinds of challenges around the world, and there is no pat formula that is good for all places, or all occasions. But, in looking across the Atlantic, America's place in the new Europe should continue to be based on the North Atlantic Alliance and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization -- NATO. My European colleagues want the United States to be part of Europe's future. I believe they are right. I believe, in short, that the United States should be a European power in the broadest sense of that term -- politically, militarily, and economically. The starting point for America's engagement in Europe is NATO.

NATO is not now, and has never been, just a military alliance. From the start, the North Atlantic Treaty was a basic political statement about America and Europe. Through this treaty we said, in effect, for the first time in our country's history that: 'The fate of the United States cannot be separated from the fate of Europe. We are going to recognize this fact and do something about it.'

Nations, like people, can learn from mistakes. We thought we could stay clear of Europe's quarrels in World War I. In 1916, President Wilson said "we are not concerned" with the causes of the war and "we are not interested" in "the obscure foundations from which its stupendous flood has burst forth." A

year later America had been swept along by the torrent and our soldiers were on their way to the battlefields of France.

Yet after the war we again **turned away** from active involvement in European affairs. Instead, we sponsored a treaty to outlaw war. And then, as the outlaws gained strength, the United States declared its neutrality. As the Western democracies quailed in the face of the totalitarian powers, we passed new **neutrality laws**. When war finally came, the most devastating conflict in human history, America could not avoid its terrible consequences. We paid an awful price for our isolation. When that war ended, America's statesmen believed a new, and different, approach was needed to keep the peace.

We chose to join with the free nations of Europe and form an Atlantic Community, an enduring political compact, recognizing in peace what we had learned from war. Military arrangements to assist in the common defense flowed naturally from this underlying political covenant. When the NATO Treaty was being negotiated in 1948, the head of our team, Robert Lovett, put it this way: "After many heartbreaks," America had "reversed its policy and was seeking to deter aggression by proof of determination. The only question was how its determination should be implemented."

The result of our giving this "proof of determination," has been decades of peace in Europe. There has not been a war anywhere on the continent of Europe in 45 years. This fact

✓ should be viewed with the perspective of history: the whole of Europe has now experienced the longest uninterrupted period of international peace in the recorded history of the continent, stretching back over the centuries.

We should reflect carefully on the cause of this extraordinary 'long peace.' What has been different? There is abundant evidence around the world that we have not yet witnessed a transformation of human nature -- indeed, we are only now emerging from many years of sustained political hostility and global polarization between East and West. Our political compact with the free nations of Europe, backed by the tangible presence of our troops and the deterrent potential of nuclear weapons, has made a difference.

Our help is not a charitable donation. It is for our protection. It is in our interest. Our engagement in Europe has helped the democracies enjoy unprecedented stability and prosperity, but it has also meant that the Europeans accept America as part of their continent's future, taking our interests into account across the board. Our commitment is not just in defense matters; it must be a well-balanced mix of political, economic, and military involvement in European affairs. { I have concluded, } as we enter this age of freedom, we must retain the vital American contribution to the peace of Europe, and the peace of the United States of America.

NATO will remain vital to America's place in Europe. The

exceptional solidarity the Alliance has fostered among its members over the year^S and the institutions it has built for collective defense provide a proven structure to help resist any relapse into narrow nationalism and the pursuit of individual dominance. The Alliance today enjoys wide popular support. I am pleased that the leaders of the Federal Republic of Germany and of the German Democratic Republic have both declared their belief that a united Germany should retain its membership in the North Atlantic Alliance.

Article Two of the NATO Treaty pledges the members to build their free institutions, promote the ideals of democracy, and cooperate to promote conditions of stability and well-being. The last year has shown us just how far we have come in accomplishing these goals. Politically, and militarily, the Alliance is now ready to take on new challenges, to build on the achievements of the past forty years, sustain the triumph of democratic values, and define the objectives and agenda that we, and our Allies, should pursue for the remainder of this century and beyond.

Four Goals for A NATO Summit

Now is the time for the Alliance to act, to set a new Western strategy for these new times. I have consulted with my Allied colleagues, and with the Secretary General of NATO, Manfred Woerner. Based on these discussions, I am calling for a June Summit meeting of all NATO leaders.

This Summit should, in my view, launch a wide-ranging review

of Alliance policy for the transformed Europe of the 1990s. Yesterday, the dictators were swept away. Today, we can consolidate freedom's gains. (Tomorrow,] we ^{can reach ...} want a Europe whole and free. To my NATO colleagues, I suggest that our Summit prepare the Alliance for the future by answering four key questions:

One, what political role can NATO play in the new Europe?

Two, what conventional forces will the Alliance need in years to come and what should be NATO's goals in future negotiations on conventional arms control?

Three, what should be the place of nuclear weapons based in Europe in the Alliance's future military strategy and what are the Western objectives in new nuclear arms control negotiations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union?

Four, how can the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the CSCE, be strengthened to reinforce NATO and help protect democratic values in a Europe whole and free?

NATO's Future Political Role

The first task the NATO Summit should consider is the future political mission of the Alliance. (As the military threat fades,) the political dimension of NATO's work -- always there but seldom noticed -- becomes more prominent. Some familiar features of the European landscape are gone forever, wrenched into radically new forms by a massive political earthquake. Since the 1940s, it has never been so important for the Atlantic nations to come together

*For POMS
fair optimism
of uncertainty*

and consider the uncertainties that lie ahead -- the magnificent opportunities.

At the NATO Summit, we should discuss how our friends achieve their long-sought goal -- and reaffirm the importance of keeping a united front committed to NATO. The Alliance needs to find ways to work more closely with a vigorous European Community, a Community that is quite rightly asserting its own distinct views in foreign affairs as well as economics. We must also talk together about how to encourage further democratic change in Eastern Europe. The governments of Eastern Europe, once military adversaries, are now our partners in building a new continent. And we should further consider how to interpret anew the developments in the Soviet Union which can be unsettling but, at times, so full of promise.

NATO should be a place for Western democracies to join in managing this transformation of Europe. The NATO Summit should chart the political course for this new era.

NATO and Conventional Defense

Even as NATO gives more emphasis to its political mission, its guarantee of European stability must remain secure. These are turbulent times. No one predicted the events of the past year -- we will surely find surprises in the future. NATO deters aggression by taking the steps to make it clear that its members are ready to unite in the common defense. Even as the military threat to Europe recedes, military balance needs to be

maintained. That is best achieved by the NATO countries acting together, rather than each of us just taking care of our own security needs. The enemy is uncertainty, and instability. As we seek to end the confrontation of armies in the center of Europe, the Alliance will need to maintain a sound collective military structure with forces in the field, backed by larger forces that can be called upon in a crisis. ✓

This brings me to the second task for the NATO Summit -- a review of how the Alliance should plan its conventional defenses for the period ahead. Forty years ago, after the experience of the Berlin blockade and the outbreak of war in Korea, NATO began a massive buildup of its conventional forces in Europe to deal with the constant danger of an attack that could be launched with little warning, capable of overwhelming Western Europe, and spearheaded by powerful Soviet mechanized forces deployed in the center of Europe.

*Where
is
Warsaw
Pact??*

As I said earlier, we are in a time of transition. While we need to recognize that it will take several years at a minimum before the Soviet military presence is gone from Eastern Europe and before the major reductions contemplated by both sides under a CFE agreement can be implemented, we need to begin now to develop our strategy for that world.

*entirely
?*

If the Soviet withdrawal continues and our arms control efforts are successful, we will profoundly turn that postwar buildup around. We will build down forces in a transformed

Europe. In this situation, we would face an entirely different kind of threat. To meet it, we should plan for a different kind of military presence, one focused less on the danger of an immediate outbreak of war and more on how to promote long-term stability and prevent crises from escalating, relying on reduced forces that show our capability -- and readiness -- to respond to whatever may arise.

7 Conventional arms control can help. The CFE treaty we have proposed would be the most ambitious arms control agreement ever concluded. We must finish the work on a CFE treaty soon and plan to sign it at a CSCE Summit last fall. We have made great progress since last May, when the Alliance called for the Treaty to be ready within a year. I believe now that the major issues in CFE can and should be resolved by the time of the NATO Summit in June.

At the Summit, however, we need to look ahead further into the future. We need to prepare for follow-on negotiations, after conclusion of a CFE treaty. We should use the arms control process in a coordinated, stabilizing way to adjust to the new requirements of European security. The NATO Summit should present the Alliance's objectives for these future talks.

As we think about a builddown in NATO's conventional forces, we must consider what kind of U.S. military presence should be maintained in Europe. Obviously, Soviet actions will be critical. Yet even if all Soviet armed forces return to the

USSR, and conventional arms control moves forward, the Soviet military will have forces many times larger than any other single European state.

I therefore believe that militarily significant U.S. conventional forces should remain on the other side of the Atlantic for as long as they are wanted. As they help to guard against potential instability within Europe, our troop presence demonstrates -- as no words can -- the strength of the enduring political compact that binds our fate with that of the democracies of Europe.

U.S. Nuclear Weapons and Deterrence in Europe

The NATO Summit should also examine the future of U.S. nuclear forces in Europe. As the threat of immediate and overwhelming aggression recedes, the nuclear forces needed to deter aggression will change. As democracy blooms in Central and Eastern Europe and Soviet tanks and troops return home, there is a reduced need for nuclear systems of the shortest range. The NATO Summit should accelerate the ongoing work within the Alliance, to determine the minimum number and types of weapons that will be needed to deter war -- credibly, and effectively.

In light of these new political conditions, and the limited range and flexibility of short-range nuclear missile forces based in Europe, I have reviewed our plan to produce and deploy newer, more modern, short-range nuclear missiles to replace the Lance system we now have in place in Europe. Although we have

substantially completed the research and development work for these new missiles, I have decided, after consulting with our Allies, to terminate the Follow-On To Lance program and to withdraw the funding request now before the Congress. I have also decided to cancel any further modernization of U.S. nuclear artillery shells deployed in Europe.

There are still many short-range US -- and many more Soviet -- nuclear missile systems now deployed in Europe. We have said we are prepared to negotiate the reduction of these forces as well, in a new set of arms control talks. At the NATO Summit I will call upon my colleagues to agree on the broad objectives for these future negotiations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union and kick off the preparations within the Alliance for these talks.

Moreover, I would like to suggest, today, that the startup of these negotiations might be advanced, so these new U.S.-Soviet arms control talks would begin shortly after a CFE treaty on conventional forces has been signed.

In taking these steps, the United States is not going to allow Europe to become safe for conventional war. There are few lessons so apparent in history as that reliance on conventional deterrence alone often has not worked. Reliance by NATO on a mix of nuclear and conventional forces has.

The Soviet Union is and will remain a nuclear superpower. Most of our allies have no nuclear weapons of their own and do

not now wish to acquire them. We will keep U.S. nuclear forces deployed in Europe, with the support of our friends, to assure our Allies that we stand together -- sharing the risk -- to prevent a return to the ways of war.

An Expanding Role for the CSCE

The various aspects of American engagement in Europe -- military, political, and economic -- must complement each other. One place where they come together is in the CSCE, an organization of 35 states of Europe, *including EE + neutrals*, including the United States, Canada, and the Soviet Union. The CSCE is already a beacon for human rights and individual freedoms. Now, it should take on a broader role.

The fourth task for a NATO Summit is to arrive at common Allied objectives for the future of the CSCE, ones that use the CSCE to build on current institutions, such as NATO and the EC. CSCE can help the victorious forces of democracy in Eastern Europe secure their revolutions. These new governments must know that, as they join the commonwealth of free nations, they will have a place -- and a voice -- in the new Europe.

The NATO Summit should consider a much more ambitious agenda for the CSCE to give it a more active part in shaping Europe's future. The CSCE can offer guidelines for building free societies. As it continues to promote respect for personal liberties, we think the CSCE should set standards for the conduct of truly free elections; adopt measures to strengthen the rule of

law; and point the way for necessary but painful transition from command economies to free markets.

CSCE can also provide a forum for political dialogue in a more united Europe. I agree with those leaders who have called for regular consultations among senior representatives from the CSCE countries. We should also examine whether new mechanisms within the CSCE can help mediate and peacefully settle disputes in Europe, and look for other steps that would reassure and reduce tensions among all European states. My Allied colleagues and I should agree to take up these ideas at a subsequent CSCE Summit later this year, in conjunction with the signing of a CFE treaty.

America as A European Power

My main message today is not only about the details of military strategy or the institutions of a new Europe. I am again asking for your support in a historic decision for our country to continue active ^{"place time engagement"?} engagement in the future of Europe. I am convinced that our involvement and influence in Europe is the best way to secure our own peace and prosperity.

The United States has always been a leader within the Atlantic Community, from the day the NATO Treaty was signed on a spring day in Washington, forty-one years ago. It has been the most successful international alliance of modern times. We will go on, with our Allies, to show together how free peoples, sharing a common purpose, can shape the future of the world.

David -- Bent asked me
to give you suggestions
on shortening the speech.

4/30/90 1800

[intro para for audience/venue]

pgs. 7-15 are the crucial

You have all probably already heard that, as you graduate from college, you are turning a page in your lives and making important choices about your future. I suppose that is true. But I would like you to join me in reflecting on other choices we all must make. These are not decisions about careers. They are decisions we must make -- as Americans -- about our country's future, and our role in the world.

ones. Hy
this helps.
BD Blunt

Revolutionary change is transforming Europe. ~~The Old World is being renewed, as old divisions disappear and old fears fade.~~ Great upheavals in Europe have always forced the American people to respond, to make deep judgments about what part we will have in European affairs. From the time of the French Revolution and the wars which followed it, to World War I and the flawed peace which ended it, to the Second World War and the creation of the postwar order, Americans have made these choices. I believe that, now, we are poised at another such moment -- a critical time in our strategic relationship with our neighbors across the Atlantic. That is what I want to talk to you about today.

The Age of Freedom: A Time of Uncertainty

Europe, and the world, has entered a new era -- the age of freedom. The revolutionaries of 1989 in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Bulgaria, and East Germany cast aside the dictators. ~~The people of these nations have taken back~~

~~control of their societies from the Communist officials who ruled in their name but without their consent.~~ The Berlin Wall, for decades a grotesque symbol of an effort to imprison an entire country, now lies broken and in ruins.

About a year ago, I spoke in Germany about the goal of my Administration: a Europe whole and free. Today that goal is within our reach. The heart of divided Europe has been a divided Germany. Now, the unification of Germany, which we and our Allies have supported for more than forty years, is finally coming to pass, in peace and freedom.

This new age of freedom is a time of uncertainty and hope in Eastern Europe. These new democracies have undergone a social, political, and economic convulsion, shaking loose institutions that have smothered initiative and free choice for generations. ~~Many of the people in these countries are fearful about the future. That is understandable. But these anxieties are mixed with a liberating sense of opportunity, of new possibilities that are opening for growth, prosperity, and personal freedom.~~

The dramatic changes in Eastern Europe will diminish the military threat from the Soviet Union. The Soviet leaders are preoccupied with remaking their own society, the process of perestroika. They have shown real statesmanship in accepting, even encouraging, the free expression of popular desires for change in Eastern Europe.

W We are still living through a period of transition,

moving from the postwar era, beyond containment, into the age of freedom. We do not know what choices the people of Eastern Europe will make for their future. The process of change in the Soviet Union is still unfinished -- and we do not know where it will lead. It will be crucial to see, for example, whether Moscow chooses coercion or peaceful dialogue in responding to the aspirations of the Lithuanian people, and nationalities within the Soviet Union.

President Gorbachev has made profound changes in his country. There is no doubt in my mind that these reforms are so fundamental that the clock cannot be turned back. Yet, unfortunately for us, we cannot turn the clock ahead, cannot see what kind of country the Soviet Union will be in years to come. It will certainly be different -- this we know. Here is what we also know: the Soviet Union will remain, even after all planned reductions in its forces are complete, even if our current arms control proposals are agreed and implemented, the strongest military power on the Eurasian landmass, armed with thousands of nuclear weapons, dwarfing all other European states in size, population, and armed strength.

I believe that our policies now must be appropriate to a period of transition, displaying a constancy and reliability that will reassure our friends, both old and new. ~~But as Europe evolves, our policies must also prepare for a new era in European history. If the promise of peaceful political change and Soviet~~

~~military adjustment is fulfilled, we will be ready.~~

America In Europe

The United States has global responsibilities. We face many kinds of challenges around the world, and there is no pat formula that is good for all places, or all occasions. But, in looking across the Atlantic, America's place in the new Europe should continue to be based on the North Atlantic Alliance and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization -- NATO. My European colleagues want the United States to be part of Europe's future. I believe they are right. I believe, in short, that the United States should be a European power in the broadest sense of that term -- politically, militarily, and economically. The starting point for America's engagement in Europe is NATO.

NATO is not now, and has never been, just a military alliance. From the start, the North Atlantic Treaty was a basic political statement about America and Europe. Through this treaty we said, in effect, for the first time in our country's history that: 'The fate of the United States cannot be separated from the fate of Europe. We are going to recognize this fact and do something about it.'

Nations, like people, can learn from mistakes. We thought we could stay clear of Europe's quarrels in World War I. In 1916, President Wilson said "we are not concerned" with the causes of the war and "we are not interested" in "the obscure foundations from which its stupendous flood has burst forth." A

year later America had been swept along by the torrent and our soldiers were on their way to the battlefields of France.

Yet after the war we again turned away from active involvement in European affairs. Instead, we sponsored a treaty to outlaw war. And then, as the outlaws gained strength, the United States declared its neutrality. As the Western democracies quailed in the face of the totalitarian powers, we passed new neutrality laws. When war finally came, the most devastating conflict in human history, America could not avoid its terrible consequences. We paid an awful price for our isolation. When that war ended, America's statesmen believed a new, and different, approach was needed to keep the peace.

We chose to join with the free nations of Europe and form an Atlantic Community, an enduring political compact, recognizing in peace what we had learned from war. Military arrangements to assist in the common defense flowed naturally from this underlying political covenant. When the NATO Treaty was being negotiated in 1948, the head of our team, Robert Lovett, put it this way: "After many heartbreaks," America had "reversed its policy and was seeking to deter aggression by proof of determination. The only question was how its determination should be implemented."

transition

The result of our giving this "proof of determination," has been decades of peace in Europe. There has not been a war anywhere on the continent of Europe in 45 years. This fact

should be viewed with the perspective of history: the whole of Europe has now experienced the longest uninterrupted period of international peace in the recorded history of the continent, stretching back over the centuries.

We should reflect carefully on the cause of this extraordinary 'long peace.' What has been different? There is abundant evidence around the world that we have not yet witnessed a transformation of human nature -- indeed, we are only now emerging from many years of sustained political hostility and global polarization between East and West. Our political compact with the free nations of Europe, backed by the tangible presence of our troops and the deterrent potential of nuclear weapons, has made a difference.

Our help is not a charitable donation. It is for our protection. It is in our interest. Our engagement in Europe has helped the democracies enjoy unprecedented stability and prosperity, but it has also meant that the Europeans accept America as part of their continent's future, taking our interests into account across the board. Our commitment is not just in defense matters; it must be a well-balanced mix of political, economic, and military involvement in European affairs. I have concluded, as we enter this age of freedom, we must retain the vital American contribution to the peace of Europe, and the peace of the United States of America.

~~NATO will remain vital to America's place in Europe. The~~

exceptional solidarity the Alliance has fostered among its members over the year and the institutions it has built for collective defense provide a proven structure to help resist any relapse into narrow nationalism and the pursuit of individual dominance. The Alliance today enjoys wide popular support. I am pleased that the leaders of the Federal Republic of Germany and of the German Democratic Republic have both declared their belief that a united Germany should retain its membership in the North Atlantic Alliance.

Article Two of the NATO Treaty pledges the members to build their free institutions, promote the ideals of democracy, and cooperate to promote conditions of stability and well-being. The last year has shown us just how far we have come in accomplishing these goals. Politically, and militarily, the Alliance is now ready to take on new challenges, to build on the achievements of the past forty years, sustain the triumph of democratic values, and define the objectives and agenda that we, and our Allies, should pursue for the remainder of this century and beyond.

Four Goals for A NATO Summit

Now is the time for the Alliance to act, to set a new Western strategy for these new times. I have consulted with my Allied colleagues, and with the Secretary General of NATO, Manfred Woerner. Based on these discussions, I am calling for a June Summit meeting of all NATO leaders.

This Summit should, in my view, launch a wide-ranging review

of Alliance policy for the transformed Europe of the 1990s. ~~Yesterday, the dictators were swept away. Today, we can consolidate freedom's gains. Tomorrow, we want a Europe whole and free.~~ To my NATO colleagues, I suggest that our Summit prepare the Alliance for the future by answering four key questions:

One, what political role can NATO play in the new Europe?

Two, what conventional forces will the Alliance need in years to come and what should be NATO's goals in future negotiations on conventional arms control?

Three, what should be the place of nuclear weapons based in Europe in the Alliance's future military strategy and what are the Western objectives in new nuclear arms control negotiations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union?

Four, how can the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the CSCE, be strengthened to reinforce NATO and help protect democratic values in a Europe whole and free?

NATO's Future Political Role

The first task the NATO Summit should consider is the future political mission of the Alliance. As the military threat fades, the political dimension of NATO's work -- always there but seldom noticed -- becomes more prominent. ~~Some familiar features of the European landscape are gone forever, wrenched into radically new forms by a massive political earthquake. Since the 1940s, it has never been so important for the Atlantic nations to come together~~

~~and consider the uncertainties that lie ahead, and -- most of all -- the magnificent opportunities.~~

amph
At the NATO Summit, we should discuss how to help our German friends achieve their long-sought goal -- freedom and unity -- and reaffirm the importance of keeping a united Germany fully committed to NATO. The Alliance needs to find ways to work more closely with a vigorous European Community, a Community that is quite rightly asserting its own distinct views in foreign affairs as well as economics. We must also talk together about how to encourage further democratic change in Eastern Europe. The governments of Eastern Europe, once military adversaries, are now our partners in building a new continent. And we should further consider how to interpret anew the developments in the Soviet Union which can be unsettling but, at times, so full of promise.

~~NATO should be a place for Western democracies to join in managing this transformation of Europe. The NATO Summit should chart the political course for this new era.~~

NATO and Conventional Defense

Even as NATO gives more emphasis to its political mission, its guarantee of European stability must remain secure. ~~These are turbulent times. No one predicted the events of the past year -- we will surely find surprises in the future.~~ NATO deters aggression by taking the steps to make it clear that its members are ready to unite in the common defense. ~~Even as the military threat to Europe recedes, military balance needs to be~~

~~maintained. That is best achieved by the NATO countries acting together, rather than each of us just taking care of our own security needs.~~ The enemy is uncertainty, and instability. As we seek to end the confrontation of armies in the center of Europe, the Alliance will need to maintain a sound collective military structure with forces in the field, backed by larger forces that can be called upon in a crisis.

This brings me to the second task for the NATO Summit -- a review of how the Alliance should plan its conventional defenses for the period ahead. Forty years ago, after the experience of the Berlin blockade and the outbreak of war in Korea, NATO began a massive buildup of its conventional forces in Europe to deal with the constant danger of an attack that could be launched with little warning, capable of overwhelming Western Europe, and spearheaded by powerful Soviet mechanized forces deployed in the center of Europe.

As I said earlier, we are in a time of transition. While we need to recognize that it will take several years at a minimum before the Soviet military presence is gone from Eastern Europe and before the major reductions contemplated by both sides under a CFE agreement can be implemented, we need to begin now to develop our strategy for that world.

If the Soviet withdrawal continues and our arms control efforts are successful, we will profoundly turn that postwar buildup around. We will build down forces in a transformed

Europe. In this situation, we would face an entirely different kind of threat. To meet it, we should plan for a different kind of military presence, one focused less on the danger of an immediate outbreak of war and more on how to promote long-term stability and prevent crises from escalating, relying on reduced forces that show our capability -- and readiness -- to respond to whatever may arise.

Conventional arms control can help. The CFE treaty we have proposed would be the most ambitious arms control agreement ever concluded. We must finish the work on a CFE treaty soon and plan to sign it at a CSCE Summit last fall. ~~We have made great progress since last May, when the Alliance called for the Treaty to be ready within a year. I believe now that the major issues in CFE can and should be resolved by the time of the NATO Summit in June.~~

At the Summit, however, we need to look ahead further into the future. We need to prepare for follow-on negotiations, after conclusion of a CFE treaty. ~~We should use the arms control process in a coordinated, stabilizing way to adjust to the new requirements of European security.~~ The NATO Summit should present the Alliance's objectives for these future talks.

As we think about a builddown in NATO's conventional forces, we must consider what kind of U.S. military presence should be maintained in Europe. Obviously, Soviet actions will be critical. Yet even if all Soviet armed forces return to the

USSR, and conventional arms control moves forward, the Soviet military will have forces many times larger than any other single European state.

I therefore believe that militarily significant U.S. conventional forces should remain on the other side of the Atlantic for as long as they are wanted. As they help to guard against potential instability within Europe, our troop presence demonstrates -- as no words can -- the strength of the enduring political compact that binds our fate with that of the democracies of Europe.

U.S. Nuclear Weapons and Deterrence in Europe

The NATO Summit should also examine the future of U.S. nuclear forces in Europe. As the threat of immediate and overwhelming aggression recedes, the nuclear forces needed to deter aggression will change. As democracy blooms in Central and Eastern Europe and Soviet tanks and troops return home, there is a reduced need for nuclear systems of the shortest range. The NATO Summit should accelerate the ongoing work within the Alliance, to determine the minimum number and types of weapons that will be needed to deter war -- credibly, and effectively.

In light of these new political conditions, and the limited range and flexibility of short-range nuclear missile forces based in Europe, I have reviewed our plan to produce and deploy newer, more modern, short-range nuclear missiles to replace the Lance system we now have in place in Europe. Although we have

substantially completed the research and development work for these new missiles, I have decided, after consulting with our Allies, to terminate the Follow-On To Lance program and to withdraw the funding request now before the Congress. I have also decided to cancel any further modernization of U.S. nuclear artillery shells deployed in Europe.

There are still many short-range US -- and many more Soviet -- nuclear missile systems now deployed in Europe. We have said we are prepared to negotiate the reduction of these forces as well, in a new set of arms control talks. At the NATO Summit I will call upon my colleagues to agree on the broad objectives for these future negotiations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union and kick off the preparations within the Alliance for these talks.

Moreover, I would like to suggest, today, that the startup of these negotiations might be advanced, so these new U.S.-Soviet arms control talks would begin shortly after a CFE treaty on conventional forces has been signed.

In taking these steps, the United States is not going to allow Europe to become safe for conventional war. There are few lessons so apparent in history as that reliance on conventional deterrence alone often has not worked. Reliance by NATO on a mix of nuclear and conventional forces has.

~~The Soviet Union is and will remain a nuclear superpower.~~
~~Most of our allies have no nuclear weapons of their own and do~~

~~not now wish to acquire them. We will keep U.S. nuclear forces deployed in Europe, with the support of our friends, to assure our Allies that we stand together -- sharing the risk -- to prevent a return to the ways of war.~~

An Expanding Role for the CSCE

The various aspects of American engagement in Europe -- military, political, and economic -- must complement each other. One place where they come together is in the CSCE, ^{→ team incl. nations of Warsaw Pact & Eur's emerging democr.} an organization of 35 states of Europe, including the United States, Canada, and the Soviet Union. ^{can be} The CSCE is already a beacon for human rights and individual freedoms. Now, it should take on a ^{? usg} broader role. ^{Soviet's Bulgaria}

The fourth task for a NATO Summit is to arrive at common Allied objectives for the future of the CSCE, ones that use the CSCE to build on current institutions, such as NATO and the EC. CSCE can help the victorious forces of democracy in Eastern Europe secure their revolutions. These new governments must know that, as they join the commonwealth of free nations, they will have a place -- and a voice -- in the new Europe.

The NATO Summit should consider a much more ambitious agenda for the CSCE to give it a more active part in shaping Europe's future. The CSCE can offer guidelines for building free societies. As it continues to promote respect for personal liberties, we think the CSCE should set standards for the conduct of truly free elections; adopt measures to strengthen the rule of

freedom mandate?

law; and point the way for necessary but painful transition from command economies to free markets.

CSCE can also provide a forum for political dialogue in a more united Europe. I agree with those leaders who have called for regular consultations among senior representatives from the CSCE countries. We should also examine whether new mechanisms within the CSCE can help mediate and peacefully settle disputes in Europe, and look for other steps that would reassure and reduce tensions among all European states. My Allied colleagues and I should agree to take up these ideas at a subsequent CSCE Summit later this year, in conjunction with the signing of a CFE treaty.

America as A European Power

My main message today is not only about the details of military strategy or the institutions of a new Europe. I am again asking for your support in a historic decision for our country to continue ^{peaceful} active engagement in the future of Europe. I am convinced that our involvement and influence in Europe is the best way to secure our own peace and prosperity.

The United States has always been a leader within the Atlantic Community, from the day the NATO Treaty was signed on a spring day in Washington, forty-one years ago. It has been the most successful international alliance of modern times. We will go on, with our Allies, to show together how free peoples, sharing a common purpose, can shape the future of the world.

IN THIS TIME OF TRANSITION, MOVING AWAY FROM THE POSTWAR ERA AND BEYOND CONTAINMENT, WE CANNOT KNOW WHAT CHOICES THE PEOPLE OF EASTERN EUROPE WILL MAKE FOR THEIR FUTURE. THE PROCESS OF CHANGE IN THE SOVIET UNION IS ALSO STILL UNFINISHED. IT WILL BE CRUCIAL TO SEE, FOR EXAMPLE, WHETHER MOSCOW CHOOSES COERCION OR PEACEFUL DIALOGUE IN RESPONDING TO THE ASPIRATIONS OF THE LITHUANIAN PEOPLE, AND NATIONALITIES WITHIN THE SOVIET UNION.

PRESIDENT GORBACHEV HAS MADE PROFOUND PROGRESS IN HIS COUNTRY. REFORMS SO FUNDAMENTAL THAT THE CLOCK CANNOT BE TURNED BACK. YET NEITHER CAN WE TURN THE CLOCK AHEAD, TO KNOW FOR SURE WHAT KIND OF COUNTRY THE SOVIET UNION WILL BE IN YEARS TO COME.

FOR THE SAKE OF THE FUTURE WE SHARE WITH EUROPE, OUR POLICIES AND PRESENCE MUST BE APPROPRIATE FOR THIS PERIOD OF TRANSITION -- WITH A CONSTANCY AND RELIABILITY THAT WILL REASSURE OUR FRIENDS, BOTH OLD AND NEW.

*only noble
we all hope the answer
lies in with a dialogue that results
in a free and independent Lithuania
in unencumbered self-determination for Lithuania*

82:8v 4 JAN 90

THE CONVENTIONAL FORCES IN EUROPE TREATY, WE HAVE PROPOSED, WOULD BE THE MOST AMBITIOUS CONVENTIONAL ARMS CONTROL AGREEMENT EVER CONCLUDED. WE MUST FINISH THE WORK ON THIS TREATY SOON, AND PLAN TO SIGN IT AT A CSCE SUMMIT THIS FALL. BUT AT ~~THE~~ ^{NATO} SUMMIT WE NEED TO LOOK FURTHER AHEAD, PREPARING FOR FOLLOW-ON NEGOTIATIONS AFTER THE CONCLUSION OF A CFE TREATY. THE NATO SUMMIT SHOULD DEVELOP THE ALLIANCE'S OBJECTIVES FOR THESE TALKS.

which?

THIRD, THE NATO SUMMIT SHOULD ALSO ASSESS THE FUTURE OF U.S. NUCLEAR FORCES IN EUROPE. AS DEMOCRACY BLOOMS IN EASTERN EUROPE, AS SOVIET TROOPS RETURN HOME AND TANKS ARE DISMANTLED, THERE IS LESS NEED FOR NUCLEAR SYSTEMS OF THE SHORTEST RANGE. THE NATO SUMMIT SHOULD ACCELERATE ONGOING WORK WITHIN THE ALLIANCE TO DETERMINE THE MINIMUM NUMBER AND TYPES OF WEAPONS THAT WILL BE NEEDED TO DETER WAR -- CREDIBLY AND EFFECTIVELY.

82:8v 4 MAY 86

NATO
16
(N.G. W.P. 1)
(12)

What we make
The Cold War is fading into the mist of history.
recesses

Importance of NATO - later interrelated

Calling for June Summit - review of alliance policy

4 key questions

CSCE Probe Role - arms, etc
convention before us

Resolute stance, with US

afraid - today I must focus on EU - NATO. ✓
set NATO context ✓ for understanding.
(fighter context - 2013)

calling for June Summit.

↓
not 4 "key questions" 4 points

Need for reduced nuclear
of short range.