

Originally Processed With FOIA(s):

FOIA Number:

S

# FOIA MARKER

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

---

**Record Group/Collection:** George H.W. Bush Presidential Records  
**Collection/Office of Origin:** Speechwriting, White House Office of  
**Series:** Snow, Tony, Files  
**Subseries:** Subject File, 1988-1993

---

**OA/ID Number:** 13894  
**Folder ID Number:** 13894-015

---

**Folder Title:**  
Foreign Policy [1989]

---

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
<b>G</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>

---

## Office of the Press Secretary

For Immediate Release

April 6, 1989

REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT  
AND PRIME MINISTER SHAMIR OF ISRAEL  
UPON DEPARTURE

The South Grounds

12:15 P.M. EDT

FOR  
BILLIE  
TAYLOR  
POLICY  
485-8037

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the Prime Minister Shamir and I have had a very productive meeting. My message to him and, through him, to the government and the people of Israel was clear. We are friends, strategic partners, and allies. And the mutual interests that bind together the people of the United States and Israel are broad and deep. The Prime Minister and I dedicated ourselves to maintaining and, where possible, improving the relationship between our two countries. Both of us are committed to this goal.

Throughout the world, old enemies are finding ways to talk to one another and to end conflicts in a manner that preserves the basic interests of all concerned. This can and must happen in the Middle East. The Arab-Israeli conflict can be resolved. Peace, security, and political rights can be attained through direct negotiations. The status quo serves the interests of no one.

In this spirit, I reiterated to Prime Minister Shamir the resolve of the United States to assist the parties of the Middle East in their pursuit of a comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Our responsibility as friends and as partners in the search for peace is to help develop approaches that enhance peace prospects. Problems do not resolve themselves; leaders acting with courage and vision solve problems. Menachem Begin and Anwar Sadat demonstrated this truth a decade ago at Camp David. Today's leaders can afford to do no less.

I reassured the Prime Minister that the fundamental basis of our approach to a Middle East settlement has not changed. The United States is committed to a comprehensive peace achieved through direct negotiations based on U.N. Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. This remains the building block for a viable negotiation for a durable settlement. This is our goal. With regard to final status issues, I reaffirmed to the Prime Minister that we do not support an independent Palestinian state, nor Israeli sovereignty or permanent occupation of the West Bank and Gaza.

To move the peace process forward, I discussed with the Prime Minister, as I had earlier this week with President Mubarak, an ambitious but realistic approach. Progress will require meaningful steps to reduce tensions, political dialogue between Israel and Palestinians, and clear indications that all concerned are prepared to think creatively about key substantive issues. Israel has an obligation to contribute to this process, but it cannot be expected to assume the entire burden. The Palestinians, the Arab states, and other interested parties must demonstrate that they, too, are willing to make peace a reality.

I stressed that no peace process can succeed in a political vacuum. I believe it is in Israel's interest to engage in a serious dialogue with Palestinians that address their legitimate political rights. The United States believes that elections in the territories can be designed to contribute to a political process of dialogue and negotiation. We urge Israel and the Palestinians to arrive at a mutually acceptable formula for elections. And we plan

MORE

in the days and weeks ahead to work toward that end.

In negotiations, Israel understands that Palestinians will be free to bring their own positions and preferences to the bargaining table. The Prime Minister assured me that Israel is committed to negotiating an agreement on final status that is satisfactory to all sides. And he made it clear that interim arrangements on Palestinian self-rule are not the end of the road, but are directly linked to a broader political process that includes negotiating and concluding an agreement on final status.

I'm encouraged by the Prime Minister's assurance that all options are open for negotiation. The Prime Minister and I agreed that our governments would remain in close touch to ensure that everything possible is being done to promote the prospects for peace in the Middle East. And speaking for myself and for the American people, I want to assure everyone that the United States is committed to promoting this goal.

Mr. Prime Minister, we're delighted you're here. The floor is yours, sir.

PRIME MINISTER SHAMIR: Thank you, Mr. President. I am honored to be here today. Let me first, on behalf of the people of Israel and on behalf of my wife and myself, express our warm wishes on your assuming the mantle of leadership of the United States and the free world.

We have cherished your personal friendship and warm humanitarian concern for many years. We shall never forget the help you have extended our brothers and sisters in distress, just as we shall always remember the role the United States has played in our history.

Our alliance is based on common values and shared interests. Our agreements on strategic cooperation and free trade area benefit both countries. They help us continue as a vanguard of democracy in the Middle East. I am confident that under your administration our bonds of friendship and cooperation will grow even stronger.

Our two nations share the values and ideas of the free world and the ideals of democracy and freedom. What we do not share is a neighborhood. For us the carnage in Beirut, the use of poison gas against civilians, and acts of terrorism and fanaticism are not news from afar. For as they are events happening around the corner; they are our daily reality. If there is one mistake Israel cannot afford to make, it is the mistake of forgetting where we live.

I would like to reiterate here what I said to you in private: we shall make the greatest possible efforts to achieve peace, short of endangering the security of our state. We consider the establishment of a Palestinian state west of the Jordan River, which is an objective of the PLO, a mortal threat to our security.

I have assured you that we would sit with anyone, anytime, anywhere, without preconditions if we thought it would advance the cause of peace. But we cannot lend ourselves to any steps that will result in a Palestinian state, which is a prescription not for peace, but for war. I can assure you we will be forthcoming. We believe the Camp David Accords based on Resolutions 242 and 338 are the cornerstone of peace in our region. We faithfully abide by your agreements and we expect others to do so, as well.

Mr. President, to advance the cause of peace, we have put forward a four-point peace initiative. First, we propose an effort to make the existing peace between Israel and Egypt based on the Camp David Accords a cornerstone for expanding peace in the region. We call upon the three signatories of the Camp David Accords at this 10th anniversary of the treaty of peace to reaffirm in deed their dedication to the Accords.

MORE

Second, we call upon the United States and Egypt to make it clear to the Arab governments that they must abandon their hostility and belligerency toward Israel. They must replace political warfare and economic boycott with negotiations and cooperation.

Third, we call for a multinational effort under the leadership of the U.S. and with substantial Israeli participation to finally solve the Arab refugee problem perpetuated by Arab governments while Israel absorbs hundreds of thousands of Jewish refugees from Arab countries. All these refugees should have decent housing and live in dignity. This process does not have to await a political solution or to substitute for it.

Fourth, in order to launch a political negotiating process, the proposed free democratic elections, free from an atmosphere of PLO violence, terror and intimidation among the Palestinian Arabs of Judea, Samaria, and Gaza. Their purpose is to produce a delegation to negotiate an interim period of self-governing administration. To shape modalities and participation in the elections will have to be discussed. The interim phase will provide a vital test of coexistence and cooperation. It will be followed by negotiations for a permanent agreement.

All proposed options will be examined during these negotiations. This is an outline of our comprehensive plan for peace. It is based on democratic principles. It addresses the real issues. Together, I believe we can achieve these goals.

May God lead us to the right decision. Thank you, Mr. President.

END

12:25 P.M. EDT

# The Democratic Message of Wei Jingsheng Holds True Today

*During Beijing's Democracy Spring, in 1978, a young Chinese electrician, Wei Jingsheng, wrote a series of articles on the politics of his country and the universal need for democracy. Mr. Wei was arrested in March 29, 1979, and sentenced to 15 years in prison. He is still serving that sentence—if, indeed, he is still alive. China's communist authorities allow no communication with Mr. Wei, and there are no definitive reports on his condition.*

*The most famous of Mr. Wei's essays is "The Fifth Modernization—Democracy." At The Asian Wall Street Journal, it has become a tradition to reprint that essay at the start of each new year. Certainly any*

## Asia

*attempt to understand Asia today must take into account Mr. Wei's axiom, that the modernization of any country—West or East—requires democracy. In the 10 years since Mr. Wei went to prison, the world has seen a democratic tide pulling at the Philippines, South Korea, Pakistan and, to an increasing degree, Nationalist China on Taiwan. In Communist China, the democratic urge has yet to be met. As Mr. Wei's prison term grinds into its second decade, it seems fitting to share with an American audience the excerpts from his "Fifth Modernization" reprinted below.*

Journals, magazines and radios no longer play up themes on dictatorship of the proletariat and class struggle. One reason is that this line of propaganda was used as some magical power by the "gang of four" who have been overthrown. Another reason, which is even more important, is that the people have had enough of it so that it can no longer deceive anybody.

According to the laws of history, the new will not come until the old is gone. Now that the old is gone, the people are rubbing their eyes in eager expectation. Finally, with God's blessing, they got a great promise—the "four modernizations." Chairman Hua, the wise leader, and Vice Chairman Deng, an even wiser and greater leader in the people's minds, have defeated the "gang of four," and the very eager hope for democracy and prosperity by those who had shed their blood at Tiananmen Square seemed soon to materialize.

However, to the people's regret, the hated old political system has not changed and even any talk about the much hoped for democracy and freedom is forbidden.

Now do people have democracy? No. Do they want to be masters of their own destiny? Definitely yes. This was the reason for the Communist Party's victory over the Kuomintang. But what has happened to the promise of democracy when victory was already won? The slogan of people's democratic dictatorship was followed by that of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

There is no need now to determine the ratio of Mao Tse-tung's merits and shortcomings. He first spoke about this as a self-defense. People should now think for a while and see if, without Mao Tse-tung's autocracy, China would be in its present backward state. Are Chinese people stupid, or lazy, or unwilling to enjoy wealth? Are they expecting too much? Quite the opposite. Then why?

The answer is quite obvious. Chinese people should not have taken this road. Then why did they take it? Only because they were led by that self-exalting autocrat. If they did not take this road, he would exercise dictatorship over them. The people could see no other road, and therefore had no choice. Is this not deception? Can there be any merit in deception?

What road is that? It is called the "socialist road." According to the definition of the Marxist ancestors, socialism means that the people, or the proletariat, are their own masters. Let me ask the Chinese workers and peasants: "With the meager wages you get every month, whose master and what kind of master can you be?" Sad to relate, you are "mastered" by somebody else.

What is true democracy? It means the right of the people to choose their own representatives to work according to their will and in their interest. Only this can be called democracy. Furthermore, the people must also have the power to replace their representatives any time so that these representatives cannot go on deceiving others in the name of the people. This is the kind of democracy enjoyed by people in European and American countries. In accordance with their will, they could run such people as Nixon, de Gaulle and Tanaka out of office; they can reinstate them if they want, and nobody can interfere with their democratic rights.

In China, however, if people even comment on the already dead "Great Helmsman Mao Tse-tung" or the "Great Man" without peers in history, the jail will be ready for him with open doors and various unpredictable calamities may befall him.

Will there be great disorder across the land and defiance of laws human and divine once people enjoy democracy? Do not recent periodicals show that just because of the absence of democracy, dictators, big and small, were defying laws human and divine? How to maintain democratic order is the domestic problem requiring solution by the people themselves, and there is no need for the privileged overlords to worry about it. Therefore, judging from past history, a democratic social system is the major premise or the prerequisite for all developments—or modernizations. Without this major premise or prerequisite, it

would be impossible not only to continue further development but also to preserve the fruits of the present stage of development. The experiences of our great motherland over the past 30 years have provided the best evidence.

Why must human history take the road toward prosperity or modernization? The reason is that human beings need a prosperous society to produce realistic fruits and to provide them with maximum opportunity to pursue their first goal of happiness, namely freedom. Democracy means the maximum attainable freedom so far known by human beings. It is quite obvious that democracy has become the goal in contemporary human struggles.

Is the struggle for democracy what the Chinese people really want? The Cultural Revolution was the first occasion for them to demonstrate their strength, and all reactionary forces trembled before them. Because the people had then no clear orientation and the democratic forces did not play the main role in the struggle, the majority of them were bought over by the autocratic tyrant, led astray, divided, slandered and finally violently suppressed. Thus these forces came to an end.

Today, 12 years later, the people have finally learned where their goal is. They have a clear orientation and a real leader—the democratic banner. The Xidan Democracy Wall has become their first battlefield in their fight against reactionaries and their struggle will certainly be victorious, or, as so often talked about, the people will certainly be liberated. This is a slogan with new significance. There will still be bloodshed and sufferings, and we may be covertly plotted against. However, the democratic banner cannot be obscured by the miasmal mists. Let us unite under this great and real banner and march toward modernization for the sake of the people's peace, happiness, rights and freedom!

# Washington Ponders a Mideast Role As Bush Meets Arab, Israeli Leaders

WASHINGTON

INSIGHT 4/3/86

By GERALD F. SEIB

Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

WASHINGTON — As President Bush launches into a period of intense Middle East diplomacy, a basic question is rattling around inside his administration: Is it wise for the U.S. to get deeply involved in the Arab-Israeli mess right now?

Administration officials are understandably skeptical about becoming too embroiled. But a variety of factors suggest that the U.S. should take a moderately active role in trying to transform the violence in the West Bank and Gaza Strip into a constructive peace process.

Whatever details are discussed when

Mr. Bush meets Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak today, Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir Thursday and Jordan's King Hussein on April 19, the talks will determine the extent and shape of administration diplomacy and help set the tone for the nascent U.S. dialogue with the Palestine Liberation Organization.

## High Profile Questioned

For good reasons, administration analysts question the wisdom of a high-profile U.S. role now in resolving the Palestinian problem. When the U.S. gets too involved, they note, both Arabs and Israelis tend to focus on making peace deals with the U.S. rather than with each other.

But the proposals that Israel's Mr. Shamir plans to bring on his White House visit illustrate why the U.S. is needed to play the role of persistent prodder. The Israeli leader will suggest moving toward peace talks by allowing Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza Strip to elect representatives for talks with Israel. Mr. Shamir will insist, though, that the Palestinian uprising on the West Bank, the so-called *intifada*, end before any talks begin.

Mr. Shamir's goal—to create home-grown Palestinian leaders Israel can deal with—is logical. But it may be 20 years too late. Jerusalem has undercut the credibility of West Bank elections by expelling elected Palestinian mayors when they did things that angered Israeli leaders.

Moreover, now that the U.S. has opened face-to-face talks with the Palestine Liberation Organization, it may no longer be sufficient for Israel to start thinking about creating other credible Palestinian leaders on the West Bank.

## Bridging the Gap

Israel may have to be convinced that if it wants to talk with credible Palestinians from the occupied territories, it must talk with Palestinians openly designated by the PLO. And the PLO will have to be convinced that if it wants talks to get started, it must delegate the task to some West Bank Palestinians because Israel simply isn't ready to talk to the PLO directly. As Avi Pazner, Mr. Shamir's chief spokesman, reiterated in remarks to reporters Friday, the PLO "isn't a partner on anything for Israel."

In short, the trick at the moment will be to bridge the gap between Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, with whom Israel can comfortably negotiate, and the PLO leaders outside the territories, who are recognized by Palestinians just about everywhere as the legitimate leaders of their people. The U.S. probably is needed to nudge both sides across this divide.

There are other reasons why Washington should be involved now. For one, the U.S. raised expectations throughout the Middle East with its historic decision last December to open talks with the PLO. If it doesn't follow up that precedent-breaking step, it would both fail to exploit a potential opening and raise doubts about the steadiness of its foreign policy. The Soviet Union has shown in recent weeks that it would love to capitalize on any doubts about America in the region.

Still, as administration officials assert, it probably wouldn't be smart for the U.S. to be a hard-charging leader of a Middle East peace process now. The chances of success aren't high enough yet, and such an American role would tend to take the pressure off both Palestinians and Israelis to make their own tough choices. But a low-profile U.S. diplomatic effort may well be the grease needed to keep the gears of Arab-Israeli diplomacy moving.

4/5/89

## REVIEW & OUTLOOK

### Middle Eastern Realities

The Middle East, its problems normally far away, is on America's doorstep this week. Israel's Yitzhak Shamir and Egypt's Hosni Mubarak are both making separate visits to talk with President Bush. With Secretary of State Baker in the lead, Mr. Bush is talking about an international peace conference and the need for "a new atmosphere." Over the years, Washington probably has spent more time sitting in rooms in Washington talking about the Middle East than any other foreign-policy problem. We suspect the quality of that talk would benefit greatly if both George Bush and Jim Baker personally toured those portions of the old Palestine Mandate that sit at the heart of this matter.

We did so recently, particularly the hills of Samaria. The United Nations had allotted these hills to the Jordanians in 1947. They would still have them but for the fact that in 1967 during the Six Day War, when it looked as if Israel would be destroyed by Syria and Egypt, Jordan belatedly joined the fray, only to lose Judea as well as Samaria. Arab attacks in 1973 failed to destroy Israel, and Jordan abandoned its claim to the lands last year.

We entered by car northeast of Tel Aviv, at a point where according to the old lines of 1949, Israel was but nine miles wide. The rocky hills rise sharply (some, but not all, have enough grass to graze goats, and in the valleys there is increasing agriculture by Arabs and Jews). In 1977 in Judea and Samaria there were 25 Jewish settlements and two more under construction; today there are 138. Our guide—Ariel Sharon, who was a minister involved in the development of this region when much of the expansion was planned—routed us near or through a dozen of these towns, neat concrete and stucco housing, some with factories, university or agricultural buildings.

To the Israelis, the most striking thing about this area is its military significance by three important measures: depth (from the Samaritan hills one can scan with the naked eye the Israeli coast and its main population centers); the eastern front (a quick drive inland and one is looking at the Jordan River and the potential invasion routes of Jordan, Syria and Iraq); and Jerusalem (these hills feed to the approaches of Israel's capital). Jewish towns now overlook the most important military vantage points, intersections and roads.

It is sobering to stand in the Samaritan hills with General Sharon, to listen to his explication of their military significance and to be reminded by him that Czechoslovakia's key defensive positions lay in the Sudetenland, which was lost through peace negotiations at Munich. One thing the visitor notices is how small the perspectives are in this region, which is why global strategists worry about a conflict today escalating out of control. Imagine, for instance, the implications of Iraqi chemical weapons being launched indiscriminately aboard inaccurate missiles. Israel would no doubt take what measures it thought necessary to end an assault by such weapons.

It is difficult to find in Israel a responsible official who doubts that the Arab riots and the current peace overtures are part of a broader military strategy. While the PLO's chairman, Yasser Arafat, is talking peace to the Americans and the Western press, his PLO colleagues are reminding the Arabs of the "phased plan" adopted in 1974 by the Palestine National Council in Cairo. The plan eyes the destruction of Israel in phases, starting with the declaration of a PLO state on any land that can be gained and operating from there.

As recently as November of last year, the PLO journal *Al-Yom Al-Sabah* quoted Abu Iyad, Mr. Arafat's key deputy, as saying that the PNC decisions last year in Algiers, which set the stage for the current peace overtures, "are a refinement of the Palestinian position as adopted in the Phased Plan in Cairo 14 years ago."

The PNC session in Algiers in 1988 was meant to revitalize this program and to create a mechanism to get it moving.

In January, the *Agence France Press* quoted Nayif Hawatmeh, chairman of the Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine, a PLO constituent, as saying, "The Palestine struggle should now be aimed at creating a state in the West Bank and Gaza. This will not prevent us from achieving our final aim of liberating all of Palestine." Mr. Bush's State Department Arabists undoubtedly can provide him with reams of this documentary material.

Even in the volatile politics of the Middle East it's important to note gradations of responsibility among the players. Egypt concluded and has honored a peace with its Israeli neighbor. In resolving the Taba dispute recently, Egypt showed an ability to negotiate responsibly toward a goal, rather than bluster for the world media. Jordan obviously wants out of this conflict. It is harder to gauge precisely the intentions of a Saudi Arabia that is embarking on a \$30 billion arms-buying binge.

But can Israel assume that any of these could stand aside in a war provoked by Arab hotheads such as Iraq and Syria? Israel faces on its eastern front more combat divisions than the 21 active divisions that exist in the U.S. Army; Iraq's army alone has ballooned since 1979 to 47 divisions from seven. Israeli analysts have little doubt that were a Palestinian state to be set up on the West Bank, the region's forces would gradually (or suddenly) be brought forward and, without a buffer, the Jewish state would be in mortal peril.

To put it plainly, what is at stake in any "new" political arrangement is Israel's survival. And in turn what is at stake for the United States is the credibility of this country's commitment to an embattled nation that has remained a democratic outpost for 40 years. Rather than see Israel destroyed in any war, the U.S. almost certainly would feel forced to intervene, politically and perhaps militarily. If, however, it remains the goal of U.S. policy to prevent war in this region, it is no doubt easier to do so by making its loyalties clear now, rather than when the armies are moving.

erally expanding and one is generally contracting.

The report—the first piece of economic data for March—comes as economists are at odds over whether a recession is imminent or whether the economy is still steaming along in its seventh year of expansion.

The purchasers said experience indicates that if the March average were to continue for the rest of the year, it would be consistent with real, or inflation-adjusted, gross national product growth of about 2.5%.

The purchasers' index measures new orders, production, vendor deliveries, inventory and employment. The report, compiled from data provided by more than 250 purchasing managers, looks at several economic measurements and asks whether each one strengthened or weakened from the previous month.

Orders increased for the 46th consecutive month, but the increase slowed sharply. For the month, 27% of the purchasers said orders were better, while 55% said they were unchanged and 18% said orders were worse. The new orders index fell to 50.9% from 55.9% in February, for its lowest level since June 1985. The purchasers said the weakness in order growth "suggests an even slower economy as it enters the second quarter."

The report said the production index fell to 50.7% from 53.7% the previous month, its third consecutive drop. The price index rose to 68.3% in March from 66% in February. The purchasers said the rate of increase in the price index was the lowest in 22 months except for February, but prices are still rising. In March, 41% reported higher prices, 54% reported prices unchanged, and 5% said prices were lower.

Vendor deliveries slowed again in March, but by the smallest margin in more than two years, the report said. It added that inventories declined for the third month in a row, indicating that manufacturers aren't building stocks at a time of slower growth.

Further reflecting a slowing economy, the purchasers' employment index fell for the second month in a row, to 49.4% from 49.7% in February. It now stands at its lowest since last May.

The government will release March data on the labor force Friday, and many economists are forecasting a slightly higher unemployment rate. But they caution that the March report may look weak partly because February's 5.1% rate was

# JOURNAL.

WHITE OAK, MARYLAND

## The Outlook

### New 'One-Worlders' Are Conservatives

WASHINGTON

The "one-worlders" are back.

Once upon a time, it was fashionable to label as "one-worlders" radical socialists who believed that national governments were an anachronism and that the peoples of the world would one day unite under a single workers' state. Those folks aren't very numerous anymore. Even in the Soviet Union, the concept is in disrepute.

But some new "one-worlders" have emerged—conservatives, this time.

They are the economists and academics who believe that in a global economy, with goods and especially capital surging across political borders, the economic fortunes of individual countries aren't important anymore. The U.S. trade deficit and other statistics, they argue, are only artificial figures in what has become a multinational corporate economy in which political distinctions matter little. It's all one big market, they contend, so why worry about it?

These experts see the world economy almost solely in financial terms and dispute the idea that relative economic flows can have real long-term effects on national security or geopolitical power. When it comes to whether the U.S. remains a world leader if its junior allies are its senior creditors, their motto is, "Don't worry, be happy."

The U.S. trade deficits with Japan and Hong Kong don't matter any more than a deficit Kansas might run with Montana, they argue. After all, it's all one system—one world. Or, there's this variation, from a U.S. government economist: "It doesn't matter if Hong Kong fixes its currency to the dollar; they're just operating like a part of the Federal Reserve System."

But, unlike Kansas and Montana, Japan and Hong Kong aren't part of our political union. Their citizens don't pay taxes to support American schools and public health, and their sons and daughters don't enlist in the U.S. military. They are economic partners and strategic allies, but they are not—nor do they wish to be—part of the American nation. And so, they do have economic interests and characteristics distinct from our own.

Just last month, a top Japanese thinker and management consultant, Kenichi Ohmae, startled a Washington audience by insisting that multinational corporations, not countries, matter. He dismissed the U.S. trade deficit as a fiction, saying that so long as U.S. multinationals were content to make products in Japan, the U.S. shouldn't care if fewer American goods are exported.

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL (USPS 664-880)  
11501 Columbia Pike, Silver Spring, Md. 20904

Published daily except Saturdays, Sundays and general legal holidays. Second class postage is paid at New York, N.Y., and other mailing offices. Subscription rates (postage paid): In the United States, territories and possessions, two years \$217, one year \$129; 6 months \$65, 3 months \$34; to other countries, two years \$383, one year \$212, 6 months \$156.50. Editorial and publication headquarters at 200 Liberty St., New York, N.Y. 10281. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to The Wall Street Journal, 200 Burnett Road, Chicopee, Mass. 01020.

All Advertising published in The Wall Street Journal is subject to the applicable rate card, copies of which are available from the Advertising Services Department, Dow Jones & Co. Inc., 420 Lexington Ave., New York, N.Y. 10170. The Journal reserves the right not to accept an advertiser's order. Only publication of an advertisement shall constitute final acceptance of the advertiser's order.

The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to republish news dispatches originated by The Wall Street Journal. All other republication rights are reserved.

# Talks on Revising War Powers Resolution Reaching Deadlock

By David Hoffman  
Washington Post Staff Writer

Although President Bush has called for a new bipartisan consensus in foreign policy, recent private talks between the administration and Congress on revising the controversial 1973 War Powers Resolution have revealed deep and possibly irreconcilable differences, according to administration and congressional sources.

While some discussions may continue, officials said prospects appear dim for an early compromise on one of the most nettlesome foreign policy issues of the last 15 years. They said fundamental differences remain between Bush and

Congress, and among lawmakers in both parties and both chambers.

"This doesn't seem to be something that is possible to resolve quickly," said a participant in recent discussions between Secretary of State James A. Baker III and congressional leaders.

In his campaign last year, Bush called for repeal of the War Powers Resolution, saying it represented an encroachment on the constitutional prerogatives of the president. The resolution, passed over President Richard M. Nixon's veto in 1973, includes a provision requiring congressional approval for the president to keep U.S. troops in combat for more than 90 days.

The measure has led to repeated conflicts between Congress and the

White House over deployments such as President Ronald Reagan's naval reflagging operation in the Persian Gulf. Nixon and his successors have refused to acknowledge the measure's constitutionality.

Many leading House and Senate members also have declared the resolution unworkable. Some, including Senate Judiciary Committee Chairman Joseph R. Biden Jr. (D-Del.), have suggested strengthening the law; others, including Senate Majority Leader George J. Mitchell (D-Maine), have urged that the legislation be scrapped and another mechanism substituted to provide for cooperation between the president and Congress.

At the outset of his presidency, Bush expressed a desire for bipar-

tisan cooperation on national security issues. He met with a group of lawmakers who had urged a new effort to avoid the partisan wrangling of the Reagan years. Two of the most sensitive issues have been the War Powers Resolution and procedures for notifying Congress of covert actions.

The early overtures toward bipartisanship from Bush raised the possibility of some compromise on the war powers issue, especially since Mitchell and Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman Sam Nunn (D-Ga.) have pushed an alternative that would repeal the resolution and establish a permanent group of congressional leaders who would consult regularly with the president. Officials said Mitchell

intends to continue pressing for his proposal despite the impasse in talks with the White House.

Shortly after the inauguration, Baker met with a group of House leaders, including Speaker Jim Wright (D-Tex.) and Majority Leader Thomas S. Foley (D-Wash.), to explore a possible compromise. But recently, sources said, Foley informed Baker that Congress remains badly divided on the issue.

"The general sense we got was that we'll have to deal with this when we get to a crisis," an administration official said. "The members are all over the map."

But a congressional participant said the administration failed to realize how contentious revising the War Powers Resolution would be-

come. "Rewriting the act is not going to be easy," he said, with some lawmakers wanting to repeal the law "root and branch" and others insisting that the congressional reins on foreign policy be tightened.

In reaching a compromise on aid to the Nicaraguan contra rebels, Bush agreed to an unusual deal in which four key committees effectively will have veto power over the aid, an arrangement that White House counsel C. Boyden Gray criticized as congressional encroachment on presidential power.

Although Bush went along with the compromise, White House officials said he was not prepared to make such concessions on the War Powers Resolution and that Bush would not accept a permanent consultative group of lawmakers.

"He doesn't want something that will have to meet every other Wednesday," a senior aide said.

# When our diplomacy whispers

**W**hy do presidents fumble so on human rights? On what should be a clear winner — after all, that's what America is all about, and where the world is heading — presidents flounder about. It's largely because of false faith in "quiet diplomacy."

President George Bush ended his Asian sweep with limp protests over authoritarian practices in China, which kept the leading Chinese dissident from the president's barbecue. The White House spokesman later said Mr. Bush prefers to handle human rights low-key and in private.

Let's hope not. Let's hope that was the beginning and end of relying

primarily upon "quiet diplomacy" in this presidency.

Granted, Mr. Bush is not uniquely wrong. President Richard M. Nixon still extols "quiet diplomacy" as the most productive way of springing people from oppressed lands. His successor, Gerald R. Ford, kept Alexander Solzhenitsyn out of the White House, and Ronald Reagan tiptoed through three summits softly murmuring about Soviet abuses until he unfurled as "Ronnie Applesseed" to spread the message of democracy in Moscow.

And granted, pushing human rights in China is tricky business, given America's security interests, China's cultural makeup and legitimate questions of the effectiveness of our banging on them.

Even Jimmy Carter, human rights devotee, ran into trouble when meeting with Chinese leader Deng Xiaoping in 1979. After Mr. Carter pushed for freer emigration, Deng retorted coyly, "Fine. We'll let them go. Are you prepared to take 10 million?" Hearty-harrs filled the Oval Office.

"Quiet diplomacy" is no way to approach human rights now, if it ever was.

Why should the Free World leader cling to such a tepid approach when the un-Free World leader praises liberty? "Freedom of choice is a universal principle which allows no exceptions," Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev told the U.N. General Assembly last December. Surely an American president cannot relinquish the moral high ground and dive underground just as the Soviet president goes public in championing human rights.

And Mr. Gorbachev is not alone. In another amazing move last week, the Hungarian deputy foreign minister publicly accused a fellow Communist country of abuses. At the U.N. Human Rights Commission, he

lambasted Romania for demolishing villages, destroying cultural and historical sites, and repressing religion. Hungary supports a Western insistence that the United Nations investigate such squalid practices.

If this Communist leader can forthrightly denounce human indignities in an allied Communist nation, why is our president keeping mum about worse conditions in a different Communist land?

As Bob Dylan said, "You don't need a weatherman to know which way the wind is blowing." Today, the wind is blowing our way, toward greater freedom and free enterprise.

Dictators' days are numbered. Leaders can no longer be legitimate authoritarians.

Every government seeks legitimacy, bestowed these days by the peoples' consent, which is best expressed in free and fair elections.

This change in world values has come largely from a public outcry against oppression.

Practicing "quiet diplomacy" softens that outcry, and can be an excuse

for "no diplomacy." That was true under Mr. Nixon, who lacked sufficient appreciation for democratic procedures here, let alone abroad. And it may have been true of Mr. Bush in China.

But even when practiced, "public diplomacy" surrenders the public debate to dictators. It leaves the molding of world public opinion to the oppressors rather than to the liberators.

That warps the truth. After President Bush departed, China's party leader asserted that Chinese dissidents threaten the economic reforms. This is part of an old line that economic and social rights take precedence over political and civil rights.

That's self-serving and wrong. The focus on economic and social rights assigns power to the government, which is supposed to provide those goods, rather than to the individual, where civil and political rights naturally reside.

Besides, political rights are supreme. They allow economic and social benefits, as well as assure civil liberties. As said by Fang Lizhi, the Chinese dissident barred from the Bush barbecue, "You can't develop a modern economy without democracy."

"Quiet diplomacy" mistakes the trees for the forests. While it can help release individuals or groups repressed or detained, it cannot effectively tackle the prime problem of an oppressive political system.

Human rights is not case work. To equate the two makes progress on specific cases — who's released? who's kept from the barbecue? — the measure of U.S. commitment, rather than our push for systematic change to assure that no more abuses can happen.

Democracy has, at long last, come out of the closet. Its value has become universally recognized. Let's not be the ones to put it back in hiding with a return to "quiet diplomacy."

**"Quiet diplomacy" is no way to approach human rights now, if it ever was.**