

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: 13897
Folder ID Number: 13897-001

Folder Title:
[News Releases, 3/89 - 3/90]

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
G	18	29	2	5

1ST DOCUMENT of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Public Papers of the Presidents

Remarks to the Students and Faculty of Conestoga Valley High
School in Lancaster, Pennsylvania

25 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 395

March 22, 1989

LENGTH: 2467 words

Chad, thank you, and Mr. Wirth, thank you, sir, for having us here. I'm sorry we had a little bad weather a week or two ago, and postponing this visit. Thinking back, regrettably quite a few years, to my own school days, I can imagine one thought that might have run through your mind: I hope he comes back -- anything to get out of class. [Laughter] So, I apologize for any inconvenience on the tests. But I want to thank the students; the parents; the teachers here; Mr. Wirth, your principal; and Chad Weaver, the study body president. Listening to him and his poise up here, I don't know how Senator Specter or Governor Casey or even I might feel. This guy might run against us someday. He sounds terrific -- [laughter] -- pretty tough.

I am particularly grateful to the Governor of the Commonwealth for being here with us and Senator Specter, a most respected leader in the United States Senate, for taking the time out to come here. Your own Congressman has a vote, an important vote, on our side of the aisle -- his side -- today that keeps determining the leadership there that keeps him. I think he planned to be with us if that vote hadn't taken place. But I do want to pay my respects to Bob Walker. And then my special introduction to you -- one who you know well and who has been a symbol of propriety and leadership and enthusiasm for Pennsylvania -- and that, of course, is your own ex-Governor and now the Attorney General of the United States, Dick Thornburgh. What a job he is doing. And the other -- i'm not sure he's been here, but he's been almost every place else. I expect he's been to Lancaster. But Bill Bennett, a former Secretary of Education, is now the first drug czar. Why, in the United States we use the word "czar" to establish a real leader I don't know. But he's tough as the czars were, and he is going to help us whip the scourge of drugs. And here he is, Bill Bennett. [Applause]

You know we often think of drug abuse as an urban, inner-city phenomenon. Millions of Americans think of their own communities, and they say, It can't happen here. Well, the people of rural Pennsylvania know that's not true. And in the past couple of years, drug abuse has escalated here. And the good news is you're fighting back. Your community is too proud, your traditions here too deeply rooted for an invader to threaten your safety and well-being without a fight. And when drugs come here to the Conestoga Valley, that's proof that the drug epidemic is a national problem. Look, Lancaster is a strong community, a place where small town values is not a cliche. It's a way of life. And you know what matters: family and faith and being a good neighbor and a member of the community. The rising problem here simply shows how vulnerable every American city and town is to the menace of drug abuse. And recognizing this fact is the first step towards finding a solution. And Lancaster is on its way.

This morning you heard from Thomas Hipple and Peter True, two young men who for reasons of their own have made a commitment to help others understand the

25 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 395

lasting damage that drugs can do and prevent their peers from making what can be a life-shattering choice. What Tom and Peter are doing takes tremendous courage and commitment. And I'm here to say that you're not alone in this -- battling the drug problem. You have partners in your community and in others across the United States, and you have partners in the war on drugs in Washington, right there on Pennsylvania Avenue. And as I said in my Inaugural Address -- and I will keep saying it because I feel driven by this commitment -- I am committed to the ending of the scourge of drugs across the United States of America, and I need your help.

Our task is not just to deplore the drug problem but to take action against it. What the banners that I've seen here say to me is that this valley and the people of Lancaster are ready to take action to stop the drug scourge. And one of the most powerful weapons against drug use is education.

And of course, there's another side to the drug program. I'm going to be going down with Dick Thornburgh and Bill Bennett, down to Wilmington later on, on my way back to Washington. And there we'll be talking about interdiction, stopping drugs from coming in, and also enforcement, the law enforcement side that Dick Thornburgh has the responsibility for -- our effort to stop the illegal drugs, shut down the trade. But this morning, I want to talk to you all on the means of prevention, on drying up the demand for illegal drugs.

Antidrug education and awareness can help provide the kids and the young adults with both the reasons and the willpower to resist the lure of drugs. And that's the aim of an antidrug education program called DARE-- D-A-R-E -- Drug Abuse Resistance Education, and that's helping, as the people involved with DARE like to say, "drug-proof" our children. The program was pioneered, incidentally, by the Los Angeles Police Department and the L.A. public school system. I've been out there and witnessed the program in action, and DARE sends these police officers into the classroom to work with the kids, build their self-esteem, teach them that they can refuse when they're pressured to try drugs. And the DARE program is teaching youngsters something else: that the police and their schools are united in a common effort to stop drug abuse. In the 6 years since the program began in California, DARE has caught on nationwide. And this year, in 1,200 communities in 45 States, 3 million children will participate.

DARE is just one example of the kind of program that can provide our children both the reasons and the willpower to resist the lure of drugs. There is no one right answer when it comes to battling drug abuse. Each community will find what works best, and we'll learn from each other.

I'm told that right here in Lancaster you have a program called High-Risk Youth in the elementary schools and another called High-Risk Youth in the elementary schools and another called SCIP, the School Community Intervention Program, in place -- that one's in the high schools and in the junior highs. And they aim at indentifying young people whose circumstances and family situations make them most vulnerable to the lure of drugs. Targeting these youth for special attention is crucial, and with High-Risk Youth and SCIP, you're doing something to stop drug problems before they begin.

For my part, I'm going to see that drug education receives the funding it needs. Most of the funding, as you know, comes from local school boards and States. I think it's 7 percent of the funding is Federal. But our budget

25 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 395

this year for 1990 calls for a full \$1.1 billion for drug prevention and antidrug education activity. And even in these tight budget times, that's up 16 percent over 1989. I've urged Congress to provide \$392 million for the Drug Free Schools and Communities program, funds that go to the States and institutions of higher education.

And then as I mentioned earlier with great pride, and I'll say it again, I have selected Bill Bennett to serve as the Director -- this is his official title, I told you the nickname -- the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy to map the strategy and oversee the antidrug campaign. And I'll tell you, I picked him because he's knowledgeable, he's tough, and he is determined and, most importantly though, he cares deeply about the young people of this country.

These initiatives are important, and they're going to have an impact. But there's a role for each of us in the war on drugs, and I hope you'll join me in asking what you can do to help, especially to advance the antidrug education and awareness. You know, we can all play a part in increasing awareness about the ravages of drug dependency. We must get the message across that drugs are not a form of entertainment or a helpless, harmless means of escape. Drugs are a poison, to users and to our communities. But a widespread awareness of the dangers of drug abuse depends on sending consistent signals, on sending a clear message that using drugs is not fashionable, is not fun, and above all else, it is not safe.

For too long -- and this isn't the fault of the young people here -- because for too long, our culture, our popular culture glorified drug use. I think that's changing now, and that's a real change for the better. Consider the antidrug abuse campaign on television. Not long ago, I was told a story about a little girl 4 years old, who's getting the message. She got up from in front of the television to tell her parents something important. "Drugs," she said, "fry your brain like an egg." We've all seen that commercial the little girl was talking about. Whether you're 4 or 14 or 40, the message gets across. And let's carry that message, all of us. And I would say right here: I hope that the movie producers and the movie directors and those involved in the entertainment business will stop, will put an end to the glorification of its humorous treatment of narcotics.

And let's shed some of the perceptions about the drug problem that are comforting, but are completely incorrect. There's no room for saying, Drug abuse doesn't affect me. Think about the costs of drug abuse: the lost time, the waste, the crime, the accidents that can be traced to the influence of drugs. Twenty-three million Americans used illegal drugs last year. Countless thousands died. And the fact is that none of us -- none of us -- is immune to the problems that drug use can cause. So, together, let's you and me send a message on drug abuse to the so-called casual user: Face up to the fact that your so-called recreational drug use contributes to the drug culture -- to the crime, the death, and degradation associated with the drug trade.

The other day I was in New York, and I talked to a group of DEA agents, drug enforcement agents, who lay their lives on the line for us, as they try to interdict narcotics and stop it right there in the street. But there was a team that had worked in a white-collar business, in the brokerage business, of all things, down on Wall Street. They looked like they belonged on Wall Street -- nice clean-cut guys, you know -- a wonderful looking young man and a young

25 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 395

woman. And they said that in that culture there, if people stayed over and worked overtime, their reward might be some cocaine to stay on a little later in the office. It isn't just the impoverished. It isn't just those who are fighting trauma in their lives. There's the whole concept that recreational drug use has been condoned, and we've got to stop it. We have got to make people understand, whatever walk of life you're in, that drug use is bad, it's death, it is degradation. And so, the fight is not going to be just in the ghettos, where the impoverished and the hopeless are; it's going to be all across-the-board.

To parents: Your children know more than you realize about drugs. Make it your business as a parent to know about drug abuse yourself. Educate yourselves. Don't hide from the reality of drug abuse in our communities and then hope for the best -- hope that someone else will solve the problem. Your children depend on you to help separate the fact from the fiction, to help them make a choice and then stick with it, when it comes to resisting drugs.

To the kids: Let's send the message that drugs are dangerous; that you don't need drugs to feel good about yourself or to win approval from others; that your parents, the people in your schools and your community care. But most of all, you must understand that the decision against drugs is yours to make, no one else's. When it's time to draw the line against drugs, the final choice is yours.

I get a lot of mail. Some of it is very serious. Some of it very disturbing. And some of it quite amusing. Get a lot of letters from school kids. I got not one long ago from a girl in California -- fifth grader. She told me how she wanted to change the world -- wonderfully idealistic -- and that making the world a better place meant putting an end to drug abuse. And then she wrote, "I don't know if I can do it all by myself. I need your hlep." Well, she does, and she's going to get it. And, yes, I can help, and so can all of you. And that's the answer we owe our children. But there's something else that the little girl who wrote that letter needs to know. There is something that she can do, that all of us here can do, to bring ourselves one step closer to winning the war on drugs: We can take a stand and say, We don't do drugs. And anytime anyone of us takes that stand, that is another battle won. As a community, we must work to make it easy as possible for our children to make the choice against drugs. We can do it by creating an environment -- a safe, secure space, if you will -- where our kids can acquire a sense of self and self-confidence so secure that no amount of peer group pressure can push them into taking drugs.

I mentioned that I'm going to talk about enforcement later on today, but I don't want to leave here without saying to you the enforcement side of this equation is absolutely essential, whether it's in the corridors of this outstanding high achievement school or whether it's downtown Lancaster or wherever it is. The authorities must enforce the law, and we must make an example of those who are pushing drugs on to the lives of the others around here. You know, most Americans want to see their towns restored to a time when drugs came in from the prescriptions from the local doctor. But with your hard work and commitment, that day will come sonner. It must come.

So, my message to you today is: Don't do drugs. Keep fighting back. Fight for your community, for your childrem. The war on drugs will ultimately be won one day, one battle at a time -- the battles each and every one of us wage to

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

25 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 395

keep our families and communities free from drug abuse. We've learned a hard lesson. Unless we join together and fight, it can happen here. But if we do work as a team and as a community, it won't.

And so, let these banners be a battle cry -- and that Conestoge Valley, in Lancaster, in communities like yours all over the country, we will join together, turn the tide, and bring the drug epidemic to an end with finality -- over -- history. Now, we need your help.

Thank you very much. Thank you all.

Note: The President spoke at 9:17 a.m. in the school gymnasium. He was introduced by Chad Weaver, president of the student body. Prior to the remarks, the President met with participants in a drug rehabilitation program and their families.

2ND STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1989 U.S. News & World Report

April 10, 1989

SECTION: U.S. NEWS; Vol. 106, No. 14; Pg. 20

LENGTH: 5232 words

HEADLINE: Dead zones

BYLINE: By Thomas Moore; Ted Gest; Gordon Witkin; Jeffery L. Sheler; Peter Carey; Stephen J. Hedges; Joseph P. Shapiro; Scott Minerbrook; Pamela Ellis-Simmons; Patrick Barry

DATELINE: New York; Chicago; Los Angeles

HIGHLIGHT:

Whole sections of urban America are being written off as anarchic badlands, places where cops fear to go and acknowledge: "This is Beirut, U.S.A."

BODY:

In "Crack Heaven," a three-block area off Nostrand Avenue in the Flatbush section of Brooklyn, the noise of automatic and semiautomatic weapons, of ambulances and police cars would begin around 8 p.m., residents say, and continue through the night. It often woke up the children in Elaine Underwood's apartment building on East 24th Street. Then, on March 3, New York City police officer Robert Machate was shot to death with his own gun by a man he was trying to arrest, and things got quiet for a while. "It's a terrible thing to say," says Underwood, who is the mother of a 2-year-old daughter named Akisha, "but when that officer died, we all slept through the night for the first time since, I don't know, months. The helicopters and police cars stopped the drug dealers from doing business for about a week. It sounds terrible, but that's when we got some rest."

Twenty years after nightly news programs spilled the carnage of Vietnam into our living rooms, television and daily newspapers are bringing us, live, another escalating war that we are losing. But this time the firefights are taking place on our own territory, within the hearts of our major cities. Every day, there are haunting pictures of the dead being carried off in body bags, of angry, grieving families, of commandos breaking down doors of dilapidated buildings, of armed gangs and wounded children, of burned-out cars and the flash of gunfire. As if to underline this grim message of civil dissolution, these scenes of guerrilla drug battles are often juxtaposed with similar visuals from Beirut, Lebanon, a place that has become a metaphor for institutionalized disorder.

The image that overrides all others is that of urban war zone. However complex the causes and dynamics, however remote any chance of soon resolving this new civil war, one truth is inescapable: From Gangland Los Angeles to Murder Capital Washington, D.C., city after city now tolerates its own Beirut, a no man's land where drug dealers shoot it out to command street corners, where children grow up under a reign of "narcoterror" and civil authority has basically broken down.

Police confirm that identifiable geographical areas with combatlike conditions exist in more than a dozen major cities surveyed by U.S. News

(c) 1989 U.S. News & World Report, April 10, 1989

correspondents. They include: New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, Miami, Cleveland, East St. Louis, Detroit, Chicago, Atlanta, New Orleans, Houston, Dallas, Oakland and Los Angeles. Some cities, like Denver and Seattle, have not yet developed outright war zones but are already experiencing skirmishes that may soon ravage some of their neighborhoods as well.

The extent and nature of these dangerous no man's lands vary from city to city. Some are just open-air drug markets on street corners. Some are housing projects and surrounding tenements riddled with crack houses. Some are whole neighborhoods or vast areas of cities, like South Central L.A. or the West Side of Chicago. Many have nicknames, like the Graveyard in Miami, the War Zone in Dallas or the Wild Wild Western District in Baltimore. Some police departments are more than willing to talk about them, hoping the wave of publicity will lead politicians to give them more resources to restore order. Others are guarded, wary that they will be criticized for not doing a better job of controlling their streets.

What constitutes a war zone? These are places where the level of concentrated violence has risen so high that city services barely function, not simply because workers and administrators blatantly redline the areas as in the past or for lack of resources, but also out of well-grounded fear for their lives. The sheer firepower is awesome. Chicago's "gunbuster" unit recently raided a West Side gang's arm cache and found 23 live hand grenades, eight machine guns, seven sawed-off shotguns, a semiautomatic rifle, 20 handguns, a cluster bomb and thousands of rounds of ammunition. "I don't even know what a cluster bomb is," says Lt. Wayne Wiberg, chief gunbuster, "and I don't want to find out." Cluster bombs are antipersonnel weapons, normally dropped from airplanes, designed to kill and maim anybody within a wide area.

Applying triage to crime reports

These local Beirut look like war zones, too. Unmaintained public housing is literally crumbling, and garbage piles up obscenely in vacant lots, attracting haulers who illegally dump tons more from trucks. Ambulances, firefighters and utility workers often request police escorts, if they go in at all. In Chicago, a 9-year-old boy suffering from an asthmatic attack died last December after paramedics refused to enter a war-zone housing project, claiming they had been assaulted with eggs. Like MASH units in war, overburdened war-zone police districts apply triage to crime reports, focusing mainly on murders and shootings and ignoring burglaries. Implicitly, if not explicitly, many have adopted a policy of crime containment rather than prevention. "Why not let the bozos shoot it out, then go in, pick up the bodies and arrest the winner?" says Cleveland Detective Doug Charney. "That's not what we're paid for, but at least we're using our brains now."

The significance of these Little Beirut, and what they say about our country, is only now hitting home. Many cops, business people and average citizens had written off the drug-dominated chronic-crime areas of inner cities, arguing that the bad guys, like Mafia gangsters, were largely just killing each other, that the shoot-outs did not affect downtown districts or surrounding middle-class neighborhoods. Even liberal police chiefs, politicians and city officials took the view that the problem was too big and that they had too little money to do much about it. "I don't see how we can manage this problem with our resources in New York," New York Governor Mario Cuomo said recently, echoing the frustration of many other government officials. "It's possible you

(c) 1989 U.S. News & World Report, April 10, 1989

won't be able to solve the problem. That's how horrible it is."

But as the homicide tolls continue to jump, city councils, Congress and ultimately President Bush have begun to consider drastic action, such as hiring hundreds of more cops, launching police sweeps in housing projects and schools, and even sending in the National Guard to cordon off the worst areas. Newly confirmed drug czar William Bennett expressed the sudden sense of urgency as well as anyone. Rather than wait the full six months he was given to come up with an overall drug strategy, he launched a number of initiatives he believes will amount to sorely needed "shock treatment" right now. They ranged from declaring the nation's capital the first "high-intensity drug-trafficking area" to pushing Bush, a life member of the National Rifle Association, to halt the import of assault weapons, so many of which end up in the hands of drug dealers. Bennett plans to announce a comprehensive attack plan for Washington this month. "We don't turn to this because we think we've got a quick fix," Bennett said. "We turn to this because, by God, something has got to be done."

Three-year-old Quarshon "Twiggy" Mottley was playing in her home in a drug-plagued northeast Houston neighborhood last summer when her mother's boyfriend burst in, stabbed to death the mother, Lotti Mae Nora, 33, and took her jewelry from her body. He then slashed Twiggy's throat with a butcher knife and threw her bleeding into a closet. Only days before, the 30-year-old man had baby-sat the child in a crack house while the woman ran errands. Twiggy recovered, but she has had trouble adjusting. "She would just go into a daze where she looked off into nowhere," says her father, truckdriver Darwin Mottley, 30. "I have to take her everywhere with me, even to work. She doesn't cry any more, but she'll wake up sometimes and holler, 'Daddy, he got Mama.'"

Slums, run-down housing projects and other bad areas have long been neglected by police and other city services, have always harbored drug dealers and users and have always been dangerous places to live or visit. But crack, a powerful and cheap derivative of cocaine, was the powder that ignited many of these neglected areas into actual war zones. Pharmacologists have proved that crack induces considerably more paranoia and violence than most other street drugs. Some 54 percent to 90 percent of those arrested for serious crimes in 11 big cities tested positive for drugs, according to a Justice Department study.

But the economics of crack undid these neighborhoods more than its chemistry. When cocaine, long considered the rich man's drug, suddenly became available in \$ 5 crack rocks, even the poor could afford it. What was formerly an upscale-niche product was soon mass-marketed, creating an industry that generates tens of billions of dollars all by itself. Established drug markets that centered on poor neighborhoods and housing projects, and were frequented by suburbanites and down-and-outers alike, suddenly bustled with the profitable new business. Adam Smith's invisible hand of capitalism never worked better. Supply and demand converged there, pumping in serious money and soon serious weaponry and gangsters to take and hold market share. The business lent itself to entrepreneurship. Any kid who mixed baking soda and water with cocaine could start dealing off a street corner, and established gangs had to fight it out with interlopers from out of town or new cowboys from their own turf.

As the foot soldiers of crack established beachheads in city after city, these places spiraled out of control:

(c) 1989 U.S. News & World Report, April 10, 1989

* Los Angeles. Drug dealing and high-tech weaponry have escalated the warfare between the city's long-established loosely knit gangs, the Crips and the Bloods. A favorite expression for killing someone these days is "boo-yah" -- the sound from a sawed-off shotgun. The hottest battlefields are four mostly black communities extending from the Harbor Freeway on the east to Los Angeles Airport on the west, touching the San Diego Freeway on the south and coming within 20 blocks of the affluent University of Southern California campus on the north. Outright lawlessness reigns around several projects, according to Deputy Chief William Rathburn, who runs the city's two toughest districts. "We average a murder a day in South Central," he says. "We have drive-by shootings with great regularity. The increase in gang violence has been accelerated by the competition for drug sales, and you are talking large amounts of money, which have provided the gangs with more sophisticated weapons. They buy the AK-47 and a case of ammunition. They are firing 60 rounds at a drive-by."

Several months ago, three telephone-company employees were shot in the area. Martin Luther King, Jr., hospital in Watts has ordered metal detectors for its emergency waiting room to prevent gang members from bringing their guns with them when checking up on injured buddies. The hospital is having trouble filling 90 vacancies on its nursing staff largely because of safety concerns, according to one nurse. People in the hottest areas do not use their front rooms at night for fear of drive-bys, Rathburn adds. Many will not turn on lights at night. And some have told him they sleep on the floor for fear of indiscriminate shootings. Rathburn has a tape he made on New Year's Eve from the police-station roof in the hard-core area that captured the constant popping or crackling of guns being fired, occasionally interrupted by machine-gun pumping.

* East St. Louis, Ill. With one of the highest crime rates in the state, the city recently called in the Illinois State Police to patrol its war zones during the night. "There is no order in East St. Louis, there are no neighborhoods that are safe," says John Baricevic, St. Clair County state's attorney. Across the river in St. Louis, ambulance crews routinely call for police escort into the Cabanne Courts and West Side Apartments complex. Says Gary Ludwig, deputy chief of emergency medical services, "We call it Little Vietnam up there."

* New Orleans. There is a large city map on the wall of the police homicide bureau stuck with dozens of red pins that indicate where every murder of the year took place. The map shows that murder occurs across the city not at random but according to a distinct pattern. Most of the pins are clustered in and around several shaded areas, riddled with pinholes from the year before, denoting the most notorious of the city's 11 housing projects. The biggest in the city, a project named Desire, has drawn the largest cluster of red pins this year and last.

A labyrinth of three-story army-type barracks spread over 97 acres, Desire houses some 9,000 women and children on public welfare and assorted male friends and "uncles" who come and go, sometimes protecting the tenants but more often preying on them at will. Apartments and whole buildings are burned out, their roofs caving in as if they had been hit by distant artillery fire. Brick walls are crumbling, and holes big enough for people to crawl through gape between stairways and apartments.

Drug dealers have turned the project into a vast and dangerous bazaar of narcotics that attracts customers from all over the city, the state and Mississippi next door. Courtyards specializing in one drug or another boast

(c) 1989 U.S. News & World Report, April 10, 1989

names like Cocaine Alley and Clicker Street. The parking lots have been turned into open-air garages where stolen cars are brought to be stripped. "The maze of buildings creates a casbah effect that breeds crime," says police Superintendent Warren Woodfork. "Whoever designed the projects never thought the 1980s were going to come." Mayor Sidney Barthelemy pinned the label Beirut on the place and hopes to eventually tear much of it down, if he can ever find money to relocate the tenants in smaller units scattered elsewhere.

* Washington, D.C. On Clifton and Euclid Streets, on Orleans Place and Drake Place, S.E., in Trinidad and Columbia Heights, the story is sadly the same. Much of the southeast and southwest quadrants of Washington, D.C., is soaked in drug-related violence and murder (see box, page 30). The city's homicide rate last year, 59.4 per 100,000 population, edged out Detroit's to make it the murder capital of the United States. Killings are even worse this year: 127 dead by the end of March vs. 81 a year ago. "The problem is not under control, to put it mildly," says Assistant Police Chief Isaac Fulwood, Jr.

A study of murder in the District from 1985 to 1988, done by the D.C. Office of Criminal Justice Plans and Analysis, shows that 72 percent of homicide victims were age 18-39; 90 percent of the victims were black, and 63 percent had drugs or alcohol in their systems; of the assailants, 96 percent were black and 75 percent were age 18-39; 26 percent of the perpetrators tested positive for cocaine, 23 percent for PCP and 12 percent for opiates, such as heroin. The majority of homicides were not domestic disputes but targeted murders created by drug conflicts.

Some police and criminologists argue that the absence of dominant organized gangs in Washington is the cause of the recent escalation in violence. In their view, this temporary cycle of turf wars will subside when one group establishes control, providing discipline and structure to the free-wheeling drug markets. This cyclical view of gang development could be no more than wishful thinking, however. Detroit police say the decline in the city's murder rate last year had more to do with the department's crackdown on drug activities than with the establishment of any one gang. And this year neither theory seems to account for a new jump in homicides. By the end of February, 95 people had been murdered, compared with 82 a year ago.

Avoiding aggressive enforcement

The most disturbing confirmation that cities now face combat conditions in some areas rather than traditional crime is the widely held view among law-enforcement professionals that police can no longer handle the problem alone. Patrick Murphy, a former chief of police for New York, Detroit and Washington, D.C., and a law-enforcement consultant to the U.S. Conference of Mayors, reports that many of the police chiefs he spoke to at a recent mayors' conference in Washington on urban crime now believe that things are so dangerous in war-zone areas that some police will avoid aggressive enforcement for fear of getting hurt. "Many cops still roam through public housing every day and night like combat troops who believe that their number won't come up that day," he says. "But in some areas, police won't go in unless there are four or five officers. That attitude frightens me."

Many officials are starting to talk openly about the need for federal troops. "The police don't have the staying power or the manpower," says Hubert Williams, president of the Washington, D.C.-based Police Foundation and former Newark

(c) 1989 U.S. News & World Report, April 10, 1989

police chief. "We need to declare martial law and get the drug dealers out of there." Some officials in Los Angeles; Compton, Calif.; Washington, D.C., and New York have called for sending in the National Guard to cordon off and patrol war zones. Under a \$ 40 million appropriation in last year's Anti-Drug Abuse Act, the Guard is already helping Texas and Florida patrol borders for drug smugglers and last week announced it would provide similar drug-interdiction services for law-enforcement agencies in 10 other states. Customs agents have been pleased with the help. But many local officials say they are opposed to using federal troops. "I think it would be a farce. It would be Kent State all over again," says New York special prosecutor Charles Hynes, referring to the college campus where young, inexperienced guardsmen killed four persons during an antiwar protest.

A year ago, February 26, rookie New York City police officer Edward Byrne, 22, was sitting alone in his police car in South Jamaica, Queens, where he was guarding the front door of a drug-trial witness. Two members of a crack "crew," allegedly acting on orders from the dealer on trial, sauntered up to the car at 3 a.m. and shot Byrne in the head. One of the men now on trial for the murder bragged to his girlfriend about shooting the cop. "Bang, bang, bang, bang, four to the head," said Todd Scott, according to testimony. "That's all it took." Assistant District Attorney Kirke Bartley called it "a declaration of war against our society and a message: 'Oppose us and die.'" After a day's deliberation, a jury convicted Scott, 20, and two accomplices of second-degree murder last week.

Short of sending in the Guard, cities are beginning to experiment with a number of other extreme police measures. The evidence seems to be that drastic action can indeed be effective, but only for a short time. Last September, the Chicago Housing Authority enlisted police help to cordon off five of its buildings, searched every apartment for drugs and threw out anyone who was not related to tenants, including boyfriends. The crackdown led to a small rash of marriages and a nose dive in the crime rate. The 24 members of Atlanta's elite year-old "Red Dog" unit, armed with sawed-off shotguns and wearing blue jumpsuits, yellow ascots and flak jackets, started assaulting street dealers in "jump-out" operations about a year ago. In eight months, they arrested 987 people and confiscated \$ 106,000 in cash, 175 weapons and 8,000 hits of crack. Riding horses, vans and patrol cars, Dallas police last fall raided a downtown area known as the War Zone, rounded up drug dealers and bulldozed empty buildings. Houston police have launched similar raids this year. And New York City's Tactical Narcotics Team (TNT) has conducted buy-and-bust operations in targeted crime-ridden neighborhoods for a year. After TNT troops moved in, homicide rates fell dramatically, down 50 percent in an area of Southeast Queens and another area in East Harlem.

A question of civil liberties

The American Civil Liberties Union has challenged many of these police actions, arguing that many suspects are arrested based on scant evidence of drug violations. The ACLU won an out-of-court agreement with the Chicago Housing Authority, for example, which subsequently dropped the visitor curbs and limited searches to housekeeping inspections that preclude rummaging through tenants' drawers. Others question what these actions accomplish. One common complaint is that such raids just shove dealers out of one neighborhood and into another. The police, caught between critics who say they are doing too little and those who say their aggressive tactics are overburdening the system and trammeling civil

(c) 1989 U.S. News & World Report, April 10, 1989

liberties, have become understandably testy about the whole issue. "What more do you want us to do?" Washington police Chief Maurice Turner snapped at reporters after a TV interview recently. "We arrested 43,000 people last year."

What Turner is really asking, as are many other police chiefs in major cities around the U.S., is what is the U.S. government going to do? The drug problem and its accompanying violence have clearly outstripped the resources and capability of local governments, police departments, courts and prisons to cope with them. It is a national epidemic that spreads from city to city, attacking communities with the weakest resistance, infecting healthier surrounding sites and then overwhelming the immune system of the whole body politic. Exasperated local police chiefs like Turner, who have seen their forces trimmed in the face of rising crime, and seen their veteran cops drained off by better-paying jobs, admit their efforts are just a holding action until the federal government steps in. "The phenomenon we're witnessing in Washington is not one the criminal-justice system as originally conceived was really designed to deal with," says Jay Stephens, U.S. Attorney for Washington, D.C. "It was [designed as] a system to deal with aberrant behavior.... What we're seeing now is not aberrant criminal behavior but widespread disregard for the law, and lawlessness."

The unavoidable fact is that even as law-enforcement agencies bring in more drug offenders, they are overwhelming already-creaky back-office operations, from crime labs to courts to prisons. Police crackdowns cannot hope to be successful if those arrested cannot be brought to trial and put away. Next to low pay, the cops' biggest complaint around the country is that the criminals they risk their lives to bust end up back out on the street, sometimes before the officers have finished the paper work.

Since the system's resources are not keeping pace with the exploding demand to imprison drug convicts, street dealers know the odds are in their favor. The chance that any offender will end up in prison is low. Of 185,423 state and local drug-trafficking arrests in 1986, only 28,282 did more than one year in jail. Of 18,106 federal narcotics cases referred to prosecutors, just over half did time. The median sentence was 3 1/2 years.

Special efforts to address the drug menace often run into these existing problems. Drug courts set up to expedite the backlog in cases in New York and New Orleans have speeded up trials and increased convictions. But with sentencing up, says Harry Connick, New Orleans's district attorney, "the state prison is full, and the jail is backing up with people waiting to get into prison." Many are housed temporarily behind police headquarters in a tent city that resembles a POW camp.

The massive volume of drug arrests has jails bulging all around the country. In Chicago, misdemeanor busts have become almost meaningless because the 5,580-bed Cook County Jail is overflowing, forcing the release of some 90 offenders a day on individual-recognizance bonds. The nation's state-prison population is growing by a net of 900 inmates a week -- the equivalent of two new prisons opening weekly -- pushing the total to an estimated 630,000 at the end of last year, a number that exceeds national prison capacity. Add the 300,000 in local jails at any given time and another 50,000 or so in federal prisons and the U.S. could hit the million mark this year.

(c) 1989 U.S. News & World Report, April 10, 1989

Back in 1977, Tedd Miller saw Washington's Columbia Heights neighborhood as a smart place to buy a house. "It seemed to be an up-and-coming neighborhood," says Miller, 43, associate admissions director for the Georgetown University Law Center. But two years ago, the atmosphere started to change. "You're approached by someone trying to sell crack, and then next thing you know, there's three of them," he says. Last year, neighbors who wanted to sell a house figured they'd wait until the cold weather so prospective buyers wouldn't see the crack dealers hanging around. "But in the winter, they stayed there," laments Miller. "If it was raining, they had an umbrella. If it was snowing, they had heavy coats and boots. That's when we knew we had an entrenched problem."

Today there is an open-air drug market on the corner near his house. There are more crack houses around the corner. People walk up and down selling crack 24 hours a day. He hears gunshots on a regular basis, and there was a murder around the corner at the beginning of the year over drug trafficking. After Miller joined the neighborhood advisory commission and attended numerous rallies against crime and drug trafficking, he was threatened. Last spring, he bought a vicious Rottweiler to roust addicts from a garage next door. About the same time, his son Atiba, 12, was approached by a fellow sixth grader with an offer to become a drug courier. And last fall, someone menacingly accosted Atiba on the street and told him that local dealers knew who he was and knew who his father was. The Millers reported the incident, but police said there was little they could do. "I used to send my son out after dark to pick up a bottle of milk at a nearby store. Now, not only will I not ask him to go out, but I wouldn't go out unnecessarily myself."

At the same time he fears for his family's safety, Miller worries that he and his family and friends are becoming dangerously indifferent to the violence that surrounds them: "We're tolerating more than we would have even eight months ago. The height of it was about three months ago when I saw a man dead with a bullet wound in his head. I remember how I used to feel if I saw a dead animal in the road or something. I couldn't eat. But this just sort of struck me as routine, like I almost expected to see it."

The most effective efforts to restore law and order in war-zone areas have originated not with the police but with communities that have decided to fight back, with or without the police. Some have taken a page out of the movie "The Magnificent Seven" in which a poor Mexican village terrorized by banditos hires a group of gunslingers from Texas to drive the villains out. In Washington, for instance, tenants at the Mayfair Mansions housing complex invited in the Black Muslims, who began patrolling the area 24 hours a day by foot and confronting street dealers directly. Today, crime has largely disappeared there, gunfire is rarely heard and children play football and skip rope outdoors once more. The antidrug campaign of the Muslims, who call their security unit the Dopebusters of the Fruit of Islam, is so popular that the group has been deluged with requests to help elsewhere.

Some people resort to outright vigilantism. In Detroit last year, 25 residents of an old Polish-Ukrainian neighborhood on the city's southwest side, disgusted by drug dealers propositioning their children and engaging in sex on the front porch of a crack house, armed themselves with baseball bats, boards and pipes and stormed the place. Days later, someone torched the house. Last fall, two men were acquitted of arson charges even though they admitted burning down two suspected crack houses. "They were pushed to a point where they felt they had to take action," said one juror. "The police couldn't stop the crack

(c) 1989 U.S. News & World Report, April 10, 1989

dealers." Dealers now avoid the neighborhood.

Special vigilance

In Cleveland, a group of tenants at the Lakeview Terrace Estates housing project, fed up with drug dealing, violence and the lack of security, pressured the housing authority to let them run the complex themselves. They immediately shifted more of their budget to security, hiring their own force of six armed guards and four dispatchers to protect the 834 units, compared with 47 guards the city employs for its 12,000 other units. Lakeview residents, led by organizer Lena Jackson, scrutinized prospective tenants more closely and helped police evict and convict drug dealers by hiring a detective and organizing their own sting operation. Now, the tenants' association helps set up drug counseling and treatment for residents, including putting preteen children of abusers into "Ala-Tot," a support program modeled after the Al-Anon and Alateen programs for relatives of alcoholics. Before they took over, some residents called the project "Saigon," recalls current resident manager Dexter Lowe, "because you had to fight your way out of here just like you had to fight your way out of Saigon." Today, the crime rate has dropped significantly, and there are 3,000 people on the waiting list trying to get in.

One of the more successful strategists plotting ways for communities to take back their own ground is Bill Lindsey, the visionary director of Fort Lauderdale's housing authority. He moved into a privately owned slum tenement there in 1972 as a VISTA volunteer, packed a .38-caliber handgun, hired some ex-cons to help him oust dealers and organize a rent strike, cleaned up the building and eventually so impressed the city that he won the housing authority job. Lindsey has since turned 10 other projects in the city's worst neighborhoods into model housing, or "oases," as he calls them. The idea is that, by creating these oases of good housing in bad areas, the surrounding apartment buildings in between will slowly be persuaded to clean up their own act too.

"Police fail because they attack and withdraw," says Lindsey, explaining why law-enforcement agencies cannot eliminate war zones by themselves. "I can't think of anything more politically expedient and less long-term problem solving than running around doing drug raids in public housing. What that does is enforce the government failure model that 'We're doing all that we can do, and nothing can be done.' They have to have a war plan, and the war plan has to take into consideration that they're going to have to occupy the neighborhood on a long-term basis."

Politicians and cops have made careers talking tough about the war on crime and drugs. But tougher laws and more police sweeps will do little, if any, good if criminals bounce back out on the street in short order. The truly tough officials will be those who manage to do something with the criminals that police arrest. Allocating more money for jails, prosecutors and treatment programs is hazardous for politicians constrained by tight budgets, but the political dangers pale beside the life-threatening risks people take every day in city war zones. Two weeks ago, Lee Arthur Lawrence, 51, a Miami grocer who received a flurry of local publicity for driving drug dealers away from his parking lot, was shot dead in a drive-by execution.

GRAPHIC: Picture, No caption, STEVEN M. FALK FOR USN&WR; Picture, Street lords. Los Angeles gang members rule communities with awful shows of force. The local

(c) 1989 U.S. News & World Report, April 10, 1989

expression for killing someone is "boo-yah"--the sound from a sawed-off shotgun, PATRICK FRILLET -- SIPA; Picture, Body counters. In Boston, as in other places, medics and police attend the wounded, but they have little power in the worst areas, RICH FRIEDMAN -- BLACK STAR FOR USN&WR; Picture, Guardian. Residents of some besieged war zones, like those in this Chicago housing project, have fought back by tightening security and screening all arrivals, KEVIN HORAN FOR USN&WR; Picture, Shut-in. When Washington, D.C., crack dealers approached Atiba Miller, 12, his father bought a menacing Rottweiler and forbade Atiba to walk outside alone, CHARLIE ARCHAMBAULT FOR USN&WR; Picture, Handcuffed, Most cities, like Boston, have overflowing jails, RICK FRIEDMAN -- BLACK STAR FOR USN&WR

SUBJECT: Crime

ENHANCEMENT: Drug and narcotic violations; Metropolitan areas; Crim rate; Murder; Gangs

5TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1989 The Washington Post

February 11, 1989, Saturday, Final Edition

SECTION: REAL ESTATE; PAGE E3

LENGTH: 865 words

HEADLINE: New Law Banning Adult-Only Apartments Has Some in Industry Confused

BYLINE: H. Jane Lehman, Special to the Washington Post

BODY:

With only four weeks until a new fair housing law that bars discrimination against families with children takes effect, the apartment industry is still trying to sort out what it must do to comply with recently released rules interpreting the legislation.

Looming largest in the minds of apartment owners of high-rise buildings and adult-only developments with such amenities as sun decks, pools and lakes is whether they are vulnerable to lawsuits if children are injured on the premises, which were designed for use exclusively by adults.

The new law, which also prohibits discrimination against the handicapped, goes into effect March 12. However, the industry is grumbling that the rules published Jan. 23 by the federal government for implementing the Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988 failed to answer several questions regarding the housing of families.

"They punted," said Jonathan L. Kempner, president of the National Multi Housing Council, a trade group that represents apartment owners and developers.

According to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which will administer the new rules, the law does not "limit the ability of landlords or other property managers to develop and implement reasonable rules and regulations relating to the use of facilities associated with dwellings for the health and safety of persons."

According to Kempner, however, the language raises more questions than it answers: "'Reasonable' -- what the hell does that mean?" he said. "We won't know until somebody litigates."

In theory, said Colleen Fisher, director of government relations for the National Apartment Association, another group representing the apartment industry, the new law does not require landlords to make any changes in their operations, other than to revise rental policies that excluded families with children.

In practice, though, Fisher predicted that landlords will cover up swimming pools, fence off ponds and lakes and close down sun decks. "That's what happened in California," she said, where the state's Supreme Court banned all-adult communities a few years ago.

(c) 1989 The Washington Post, February 11, 1989

The owners of the Oakwood Apartments at Landmark, a formerly all-adult community in Northern Virginia, aren't taking any chances. Soon after the federal legislation was signed into law in September, Oakwood's manager, R&B Enterprises of Los Angeles, closed the sun deck atop the 18-story high rise, according to a worker at the complex. The building's balconies also will undergo renovation this spring to make the units safer for children, the worker added.

At the other extreme, Southern Management Corp., the largest apartment owner in the Washington area, with 18,000 units, isn't taking any additional steps at its buildings, which include 10 all-adult communities. "We've never relaxed our safety precautions [just] because all of the tenants were adults," said Ronald Frank, the firm's vice president.

In fact, Southern Management isn't even informing its existing tenants in the all-adult buildings of the new rental policy that will allow children, which the company will institute March 1. "You can overreact to things, and I don't choose to make an issue of it," said Frank.

Word of the law hasn't even reached the management of at least one apartment community. "What law? I hope my boss knows about this," Judy Ladd, resident manager of Colesville Towers in downtown Silver Spring, said when asked whether the building would undergo any physical changes because of the new law.

Industry officials said they also question whether the law will supercede an existing HUD policy, which, said Fisher, recognizes high-rise elevator buildings as an unsuitable environment for children living in government-assisted housing. "What makes kids in public housing any different?" she asked.

However, a HUD official said the industry has misinterpreted that policy. The 1977 Housing and Community Development Act merely encourages the HUD secretary to "look for alternatives" to high-rise elevator buildings, said Harry L. Carey, an assistant general counsel with HUD.

The apartment industry also was disappointed that HUD declined to adopt guidelines that would restrict the number of occupants who can live in a dwelling based on the number of bedrooms.

Elliot Bernold, president of Edgewood Management Corp., which manages 9,123 units in the Baltimore-to-Richmond corridor, is worried that the law "could be used to create future slums" because it would allow families with children to "shoehorn" as many people as possible into an apartment in an effort to cope with the lack of affordable rental housing.

In another area, however, the final regulations did satisfy concerns raised by Rep. Don Edwards (D-Calif.) that the original draft of the rules improperly delved into the use of various marketing techniques to achieve integrated housing.

Edwards -- who, as chairman of the House Civil and Constitutional Rights subcommittee, had threatened to hold up the regulations -- said HUD complied with his wishes by taking out all such references. "Our bill did not address that question and we think it's going to be better that the courts work it out," he said.

(c) 1989 The Washington Post, February 11, 1989

TYPE: NATIONAL NEWS

SUBJECT: APARTMENTS AND CONDOMINIUMS; ADULTS (AGE 21-65); TENANTS; COMMERCIAL
REGULATION; CIVIL RIGHTS

ORGANIZATION: FAIR HOUSING AMENDMENTS ACT; OAKWOOD APARTMENTS; SOUTHERN
MANAGEMENT CORP.

6TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1988 The New York Times Company;
The New York Times

November 20, 1988, Sunday, Late City Final Edition

SECTION: Section 6; Page 45, Column 1; Magazine Desk

LENGTH: 4052 words

HEADLINE: D.C., The Other Washington

BYLINE: By Marianne Szegedy-Maszak; Marianne Szegedy-Maszak is a Washington-based freelance

BODY:

'WASHINGTON' MAY BE THE ULTIMATE Rorschach test for Americans. To some, the White House and the Washington Monument symbolize the capital of the free world; to others, they epitomize the trappings of a company town. The Capitol building and the Pentagon can evoke images of dedicated Government servants or of greedy lobbyists.

Shifts in Presidential power accentuate the clash of contrasting images. When John F. Kennedy arrived, Washington became 'Camelot.'

Eight years ago, it was declared 'Hollywood on the Potomac.' Like others absorbed in the workings of the Federal City, Ronald Reagan has never given any visible sense that a real city surrounds him. Nor is President-elect George Bush likely to, even though the White House is only four blocks from Washington's city hall.

Unless one has acquired the kind of knowledge not generally found in the corridors of power or on the blue-and-white tourmobiles, one image is likely to be rare: Washington as the capital of black America. 'We have the very best of what black America has to offer and we also have the very worst,' says Catherine Liggins Hughes, owner of radio stations WOL and WMMJ, talk show host and community activist.

Seventy percent of Washington, D.C.'s 638,333 residents are black. Most of the city's elected officials are black. The city has the highest median black-household income in the country, a stable black middle class and a large black intelligentsia, including many former Cabinet members and political appointees, such as Donald F. McHenry, Clifford L. Alexander Jr. and Roger W. Wilkins, who have stayed on in the capital.

This is 'the other Washington,' largely unknown, even to white residents of the capital, a city whose municipal schizophrenia is evident even in its name: high-powered officials and socialites who take the shuttle to New York live in 'Washington,' but the city hall employee or the kid in the go-go music club is from 'D.C.'

Two cities, two cultures, many tensions. 'Race relations are awful,' says a frustrated former black political appointee. Washington's often contentious Mayor, Marion S. Barry Jr., agrees. 'I think we are getting along better in the workplace; I think it's worse socially,' he says. 'Now we go to white affairs and my wife and I are the only black people there. And we got there because I

(c) 1988 The New York Times, November 20, 1988

am the Mayor. We go to black affairs and see no whites.'

Perhaps the most powerful symbol of the distance and fundamental lack of understanding between Washington's black and white residents is a concept called 'The Plan' - the theory that white people systematically intend to reclaim the city they lost control of during the troubled 60's. As evidence, believers point to the continuing gentrification of formerly black neighborhoods, like Foggy Bottom and Capitol Hill. They point to real-estate developers, the predominantly white banking system and The Washington Post as The Plan's principal conduits. They point to David A. Clarke, chairman of the City Council of the District of Columbia, as foreshadowing one of The Plan's central tenets: a white mayor.

Although many people of all colors and economic levels dismiss the notion of The Plan as preposterous, it has become a point of reference for most blacks. When The Plan was mentioned to white people during a series of recent interviews, few knew what it meant; black people knew, and had an opinion.

'Whites are going to drive the housing prices up, make it difficult for blacks to get loans, and they are going to elect a white mayor,' says Grier M. Greene, a 27-year-old native Washingtonian who works as an information analyst at The Greater Washington Research Center. 'Those are the basics of The Plan.'

WHEN ASKED ABOUT LIFE IN 'THE OTHER Washington,' many of the 30 black and white politicians, community, business and religious leaders, urban planners, poor people, rich people and young adults interviewed pointed to the paradoxes of living in the capital of the free world. Not until 1964 were Washingtonians able to vote in Presidential elections. Since 1971, they have been represented in Congress by a nonvoting delegate.

And only in 1974 did they regain a semblance of home rule (lost following the Civil War), with an elected mayor and 13 City Council members.

They say that some of the tensions in the local political and social life of today are the inevitable growing pains of a city that has undergone rapid political and economic growth.

What also surfaces is the profound, almost conspiratorial, sense residents have of living in a secret city within a national city, one which 19 million tourists visited last year and to which 400,000 suburbanites commute each day, many to Federal Government jobs.

With it all, Dennis E. Gale, professor of urban planning at George Washington University and director of the Center for Washington Area Studies, says, 'This city has developed new approaches to low-income housing and urban development, so other cities look to D.C. for some ideas.'

Catherine Hughes is less academic when speaking of the city's expansive social welfare system, 'If you answer 'Yes' to 'Are you alive?' then we say, 'O.K., can we get you some clothes, can we get you some food, some housing?,' she says. 'Need some transportation? How about some day care?' Poor people here ain't poor by other people's standards.'

WHILE 'WASHINGTON' CONCERNED ITSELF WITH Presidential politics, 'D.C.' was more fascinated this summer with three events: the fight over whether out-of-towners could hold city jobs, the proliferation of drugs and the

(c) 1988 The New York Times, November 20, 1988

early-morning shooting of a white teen-age intruder by Carl T. Rowan, a black newspaper columnist. To outsiders, these may seem to have been unrelated; they were, in fact, bound together in what many perceive as a web of racial politics.

'The mayor plays race politics, (Continued on Page 58) the white people on the City Council play race politics, everybody is playing race politics,' says John A. Wilson, a black City Council member from Ward 2, which includes the poor black neighborhood of Shaw and the elite white enclave of Georgetown. 'Our biggest problem is the racial healing that needs to take place.'

Roger Wilkins, the writer and civil rights leader, recognizes that the city has made progress: 'Whatever people say about the District of Columbia today, no matter how difficult things get, I am here to tell you that it is a lot better now for everybody than it was before home rule.' Then, many black people lived in slum conditions and all blacks encountered almost daily humiliation in a city dominated by a white police force and ruled by appointed white commissioners.

Under the current home-rule charter, Congress reserved the right to review D.C.'s appropriated budget - of which the Federal Government provides only 16.6 percent - and all legislation passed by the City Council. It also retained direct control over the Federal enclave, which encompasses 41 percent of the city's 69 square miles.

One of the most confrontational episodes between Capitol Hill and the District government occurred this summer. What catalyzed the dispute was a city law requiring people who work in municipal jobs to live in D.C. Of the 45,000 city employees, 41 percent are not D.C. residents, having been grandfathered in when the law took effect in 1980 or were exempted as essential employees with an expertise unavailable among city residents.

A Congressional amendment that would permit nonresidents to qualify for municipal jobs, while giving preference to D. C. residents, was introduced in June by Representative Stan E. Parris. The D.C. Congressional committee member represents a predominately white Virginia suburban district with 83,000 constituents who work in Washington. To expedite its passage, Parris tied the motion to Congressional approval of the District's \$3.2 billion 1989 budget.

Reaction in the city was swift. On the narrow streets of poor and black neighborhoods in the Southeast and on radio call-in shows, Parris's contention that qualified workers had to be brought in was seen as camouflage for something else: people in mostly white suburbs were coveting the jobs of people living in the mostly black city.

At a Ward 4 forum for City Council candidates, more than 40 residents in this primarily black middle-class and residential area in one Northwest section of the city vented their frustration over Congressional intrusion. Many saw it as the unfolding of yet another phase of The Plan.

'I will not be deprived of a job in this city or pay taxes to support these people who come into our community from the suburbs and then leave,' a woman in her early 30's said angrily.

The residency issue triggered an avalanche of Congressional intrusion into local affairs. Congress not only canceled D.C.'s residency requirement, it

(c) 1988 The New York Times, November 20, 1988

repealed a key gay rights section of the city's human rights law, altered the municipal government's AIDS insurance law and eliminated all public funding for abortions in D.C., unless the mother's life was in danger. It tied these items to the loss of funds if the City Council did not implement the measures by certain dates. Congress also prohibited D.C. from expanding a chronically overcrowded correctional facility in Lorton, Va. Stunned, some D.C. officials threatened to 'close down the city.' Once more, Congressional clout prevailed.

The District's Congressional delegate, Walter E. Fauntroy, observed: 'Now I understand why Nelson Mandela said, 'I'd rather die in jail than to come out and be told' that he did not deserve self-government.' '

THE CASE OF CARL Rowan's shooting a white 18-year-old student from the elite suburb of Chevy Chase in the wrist began early on the morning of June 14 and preoccupied the city for months.

Rowan argued that he was protecting his home and his family. Benjamin N. Smith contended that he and his companions were only doing what everybody does -sneaking into private pools in the overlapping Chevy Chase-D.C. neighborhood for a middle-of-the-night swim.

The United States Attorney's office dropped unlawful entry charges against Smith and 19-year-old Laura A. Bachman, the only two apprehended, on the condition that they complete 40 hours of community service. But Rowan had to stand trial for unlawful possession of an unregistered gun and unregistered ammunition. Had the case not resulted in a mistrial, with a decision not to retry, Rowan could have faced, if convicted, up to one year in prison and a \$1,000 fine on each count.

Residents of D.C. took the case personally. Typical of their reactions was one from a caller to a radio talk show, who said: 'I can tell you that if those children had been my black children and Carl Rowan had been David Brinkley my babies would be in jail right now.' Calvin W. Rolark, publisher of The Washington Informer, a black weekly and a recognized community leader, accused Frederick D. Cooke, the black District corporation counsel, of racism in pressing charges against Rowan, who frequently criticizes the city government in his columns. Rolark was quoted in The Washington Post as saying, 'I wish that the corporation counsel were as judicious with Carl Rowan as the special prosecutor was with Ed Meese.'

DESPITE A GUN-CON-trol law that is one of the toughest in the country, D.C. has the third highest murder rate in the nation. This summer, the rate soared. During August, someone was killed every 18 hours on D.C. streets. By September, the homicide rate topped the previous year's total of 225, and early in November stood at 300.

A top rap song in the Washington area throughout the summer was 'D.C. Don't Stand for Dodge City,' by the Go Go Posse.

'There is no law, no order

'cept the gun you hold.

Like the wild, wild

(c) 1988 The New York Times, November 20, 1988

West in all its calamity, but D.C. DON'T MEAN DODGE CITY. . . . I looked in the paper and there I read that three were injured and two were dead from crimes motivated by a common tug, that five letter word we know as drugs . . .

D.C.'s a capital town, but . . . sometimes it's like DODGE CITY'
COPYRIGHT c1988, TIGER FLOWER PUBLISHING COMPANY.

As the song points out, the murder rate is a symptom of a serious drug problem - Washington is one of the leading cities in cocaine- and heroin-related deaths. When asked why he has not been able to control the problem, Mayor Barry said, 'To blame me for the drug epidemic is like blaming you for being at 14th and U' - a rough neighborhood - 'and being robbed.'

'Epidemic' accurately defines the problem's dimensions: between 1985 and 1987, adult drug arrests for sales rose 70 percent and juvenile arrests increased an astonishing 456 percent. 'All these young people using drugs and getting arrested,' Mayor Barry says, 'means we have an effective police department.'

With a local police force of 4,080, and a multidepartmental Federal force of 3,100, covering Federal buildings, parks and Embassy Row, Washington is among the most heavily policed cities - yet there are still more than 80 open-air drug markets. On a neighborhood level, some residents have taken matters into their own hands. In the predominantly black Mayfair Mansions housing complex, residents invited Nation of Islam members to drive drug dealers away. At Kenilworth-Parkside, Kimi O. Gray, a tenant leader in public housing, battles drug dealers more directly. When thousands of junkies invaded her neighborhood, she said, 'I organized our residents and we walked through this area for days getting them out.'

Experts have long agreed that the real trick in controlling drug use is education, prevention and treatment. But the drug problem has greatly stretched the resources of D.C.'s existing treatment centers.

Mayor Barry offers an additional explanation for the intractability of the drug problem. 'All these people who read Regardie's' - a Washington business magazine - 'and complain about drugs would be the first to say they don't want facilities in their neighborhoods,' he says. 'These people who read Regardie's' are mostly whites.

Drugs in D.C. have also stigmatized those who neither deal nor use them. Grier Greene knows that to be young, black and male in this city is to be immediately suspect. Greene, whose role models are the entrepreneurs on the cover of Black Enterprise, moonlights after his daytime white-collar job delivering pizzas. 'You certainly don't make nearly as much money delivering pizzas as selling crack,' he says ruefully. When he went to buy a car recently, Greene, who comes from one of Washington's thousands of stable black families, says, 'The woman sat there with my application and financial statement in front of her and said, 'Do you work?' in this sort of insinuating tone. She was just assuming that I sold drugs.'

LOCATED AS IT IS below the Mason- Dixon line, Washington has traditionally been Southern and, until the 1950's, segregated. Yet even during segregation, it had a large, well-educated black middle and upper-middle class. Government jobs were the vehicle of economic opportunity for the blacks who flooded into

(c) 1988 The New York Times, November 20, 1988

Washington after the 1940's.

After graduating from college in 1951, Elsie M. Monroe came to Washington to work for the Army Map Service as a microfilm operator. 'The job wasn't really rewarding,' she recently recalled. 'But I was extremely proud because I was working 5 days a week and I had sick and annual leave and, most importantly, I was working for the Government.'

Yet D.C. was not the city Monroe had imagined. 'As the nation's capital it was very disappointing,' she said. 'I am from Richmond, the Gateway to the South, and I never remember being turned away from a store there. But blacks could not shop at Garfinckel's,' an exclusive Washington store. Her eyes filled with tears of remembered humiliation. 'You had the money; the money was the color green, but your money would not spend in that store.'

When Elsie Monroe arrived in Washington, the former Nixon speechwriter Patrick J. Buchanan was growing up in the Northwest section of the city, an area that continues to define the city for most white residents. Many businesses, embassies, luxury hotels and fine restaurants are located there. The residential areas are lush with large lawns and tree-lined streets.

'There were no race problems because we simply didn't interact,' Pat Buchanan recalled one afternoon while waiting to tape a television show. 'That bus on Connecticut Avenue symbolized it all: Black women came into our neighborhood in the mornings to work in homes, while white men in their snap-brimmed hats got on the bus to go to work downtown.'

After Martin Luther King Jr. was assassinated in 1968 and riots erupted throughout Washington, this time of simplicity ended.

Nell E. MacCracken was having lunch at the Rive Gauche Restaurant in Georgetown when, she recollected, 'They told us that we had better get home because they were burning down the city.' Blond and imposing, MacCracken is a representative of a dying breed called 'cave dwellers' - white and affluent members of Washington families of at least two generations long considered the backbone of Washington society.

For many cave dwellers, the riots and home rule marked the decline of their home town; it was now a more threatening place. Yet they were largely unaffected by the riots; black neighborhoods burned, black people died.

THE PREDOMINANTLY black area across the Anacostia River is perceived by most whites as a no-man's land. Poverty is, indeed, a part of life in many sections east of the river, where 41 percent of local public housing is located. But there is burgeoning community development, with local black groups like the Marshall Heights Community Development Organization Inc. purchasing shopping centers and luring banks to open branch offices. There are also gracious neighborhoods to rival those in Chevy Chase; the only difference is that black people, like Mayor Marion Barry, live in them.

Kimi Gray, a 43-year-old native Washingtonian and mother of five by the time she was 19, is one of the moving forces behind resident management of public housing. Gray's own 464-unit Kenilworth complex, whose tenants were recently given five years to buy their apartments, now provides a number of services not previously available: a co-op food store, a barber and beauty shop, a snack

(c) 1988 The New York Times, November 20, 1988

bar, a recreation center and a youth education program.

One of Gray's political heroes is Marion Barry. She believes that residents of 'the other Washington,' or those whose children go to public schools and who are black, will guarantee his re-election in 1990.

Not all residents east of the river are Barry supporters. Absalom F. Jordan quit his \$35,000-a-year municipal job to make an unsuccessful bid this year for city council representative from Ward 8. His campaign office was broken into and burglarized before the primary election. Jordan attributed it to dirty tricks, not vandalism. As he sat toying with the parts for a home-security system, Jordan said, 'There have been lots and lots of promises made to this part of the city, but fortunately,' - for Barry - 'voters here have a short memory.'

During the 1960's, Washington became the national focus of the civil rights movement and a metaphor for it locally. Among those who appeared on the political scene then was Marion Barry. As a dashiki-wearing community organizer for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, Barry was so effective that The Washington Post reported that 'he was fast becoming the leading catalyst for change in Washington.'

His reputation since he was elected Mayor in 1978 has suffered from personal excesses and managerial problems: at least 11 municipal officials have been convicted of corruption, and a dozen have resigned or left under a cloud of alleged misconduct.

Barry himself has gained unwanted attention for escapades in his private life and for frequent unofficial absences from the city. This summer when he went on vacation to an undisclosed location - billing D.C. more than \$2,000 for rooms booked at the New York Hilton and Towers to mislead the press - he had to deny rumors that he was at a drug treatment center. He later revealed that he had gone to a health spa in upstate New York to recover from the stress of being mayor.

His response to such visible city problems like clearing snow off the streets or filling potholes has been interpreted as increasing indifference to the nuts and bolts of managing a city. Yet Barry has effectively attracted new development and created an expansive social-welfare system. After the Congressional assault on home rule, when demonstrations were being organized on Capitol Hill by community leaders, Barry's was one of the few voices urging moderation.

His third term runs out in 1990, but he has made it abundantly clear that he has no plans to retire. 'I'm not perfect, but I am perfect for Washington,' is one of his most frequently heard sayings. When asked if he thought he had an image problem, Barry shook his head and said, 'I have a media problem.'

Aside from Barry's deep affection for the office and a well-entrenched political machine, there is another reason behind his being derisively referred to by one small white-owned local paper as 'Mayor for Life.'

As Dennis Gale, the Washington specialist sees it, 'Marion Barry is a guy who is all dressed up politically with no place to go. Does he become a Senator or a Congressman? No, he can't. Why do you think there is so much interest in this city for statehood?'

(c) 1988 The New York Times, November 20, 1988

THE DISTRICT OF CO-lumbia, in effect, has a one-party - Democratic - system. Carol Schwartz, white, Jewish, Republican, female and raised in Texas - 'I have every handicap there is' - is the only non-Democrat on the City Council. 'The one thing I don't like about Washington,' she says, 'is that you don't have the competition of a two-party system. It has not been helpful in establishing good government.'

Since 1975, there have been about 25 elections for various D.C. officials and only 10 incumbents from the 25 major elected offices have been unseated. In September's Democratic primary - the real election in D.C. - all the incumbents who ran were re-elected, despite the stench of ethics charges against a City Council member and Federal and city probes about alleged misuse of funds by another.

Political gridlock extends from the school board to the city's first and only Congressional delegate, Walter Fauntroy, who was one of Martin Luther King's closest advisers. When asked if, after 17 years, he had any plans to leave Congress, Fauntroy was incredulous. 'You mean . . . just, quit? Why no,' he said. 'When I first came to Congress I thought the seniority system was a terrible thing, but now I have seniority in several committees. This is all the clout that the people of the District of Columbia have.'

Technically, Fauntroy is correct. But he may be missing the point.

'I don't mean this as being critical of the current group of people, but we have to make the transition to the next generation of leaders,' says Frederick Cooke, the District corporation counsel. 'Like lots of cities that happen to have had black leadership in the recent past, our leaders tended to be people who were very much involved in the civil rights movement. The manager-leader, like Kurt Schmoke in Baltimore, is maybe the kind of person we are headed for.'

John Wilson, the City Council member who also rose through the civil rights movement and is seen as a possible successor to Marion Barry, is acutely sensitive to the problems and tensions in D.C. He says:

'I am in one of the only wards that could elect a white person. And every year a group of white people ask me if I'm going to go so that there will be an opportunity for more white leadership in this city. And I wonder if they ever ask themselves how I feel when they do that,' he said, his voice cracking with emotion.

'I don't think that there has been anybody on the City Council more protective of the interests of all ethnic groups and still they ask me that. I have had a wonderful life in this city. I really love it. But I hurt. I truly hurt.'

GRAPHIC: Photos of Grier Greene an information analyst (pg. 44); Kimi Gray with neighbor children (Eugene Richards/Magnum) (pg. 45); Talk-show host Catherine Hughes (pg. 46); young women and family in her neighborhood (pg. 47); Marion Barry, Washington's Mayor in 1978 (pg. 47);

SUBJECT: BLACKS (IN US)

(c) 1988 The New York Times, November 20, 1988

NAME: SZEGEDY-MASZAK, MARIANNE

GEOGRAPHIC: WASHINGTON (DC)

13TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

The Associated Press

The materials in the AP file were compiled by The Associated Press. These materials may not be republished without the express written consent of The Associated Press.

August 1, 1985, Thursday, AM cycle

SECTION: Washington Dateline

LENGTH: 151 words

HEADLINE: Self-Help Group Gets Private Grant

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

KEYWORD: BRF--Public Housing

BODY:

A national self-help group said Wednesday it has received a private \$1.9 million grant to promote resident management, home ownership and business development at public housing projects in 15 cities.

Robert Woodson, president of the National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise, said resident management associations at six projects have reduced crime, improved services and rehabilitated housing.

"Not only is it good for the people living there, but it is cost-effective," he said.

The money from the Amoco Foundation will be used to train prospective resident managers, offer staff support, and hire a national accounting firm to provide information on financing home purchases.

Participating in the program are housing projects in Atlanta, Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Denver, Houston, Jersey City, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Louisville, New Orleans, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, Tulsa and Washington.

6TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1989 Newsday, Inc.;
Newsday

May 30, 1989, Tuesday, NASSAU AND SUFFOLK EDITION

SECTION: VIEWPOINTS; Pg. 48

LENGTH: 790 words

HEADLINE: A Faint Pulse Detected in Foreign Policy

BYLINE: William Pfaff. William Pfaff is a syndicated columnist based at the International Herald Tribune in Paris.

KEYWORD: COLUMN; OPINION; GEORGE BUSH; TRAVEL; MIDEAST; FOREIGN POLICY; NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION; ANNIVERSARY; SOVIET UNION; ARMS CONTROL

BODY:

PRESIDENT GEORGE Bush travels to the 40th anniversary North Atlantic Treaty summit with elements - but only elements - of a rethought American foreign policy in his briefcase. The vast policy re-examination his administration has conducted since January seems to have been a waste of time, producing, as such exercises do, recapitulations of conventional views, expressed in committee-speak. On the other hand, two important recent shifts imply change of direction and of pace, suggesting that individual intelligence is being substituted for committee work.

First is movement on the Middle East, presaged by the Reagan administration's decision to open talks with the Palestine Liberation Organization. Secretary of State James Baker's measured speech a week ago to the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee expressed a welcome firmness in distinguishing American from Israeli interests - as the current Israeli government defines its interests - and in defending the American conception of what a Middle East peace settlement requires.

Despite Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir's rejection of Baker's comments, they have had serious effect. Shamir is an intelligent and complex leader in an extremely difficult domestic political situation. Baker's "useless" comments (Shamir's word) may prove anything but useless to Shamir in dealing with his domestic problem. The very reiteration of that epithet by Shamir was, psychologically speaking, of interest. The Middle East deadlock has been shifted a whit, thanks to this sober statement of what the U.S. government wants to see happen, and by its adoption of public as well as private diplomacy to get what it wants.

Equally welcome is Bush's new tone in reacting to the latest Soviet arms reduction proposals, evident in his speech Wednesday to the Coast Guard Academy. The president apparently rejected the draft speech that had been prepared for him and in the text actually delivered responded warmly to the Soviet Union's latest proposal on conventional arms reductions.

It was a marked departure from the grudgingly defensive series of foreign policy speeches he has given in recent weeks. Meant to redefine U.S. foreign policy, they actually displayed a disturbing poverty of thought.

(c) 1989 Newsday, May 30, 1989

Wednesday's speech in Connecticut was no doubt Bush's reaction to the battering his administration has been taking in the press for its negativism and passivity, faced with Mikhail Gorbachev's initiatives - leading up to the White House's foolish characterization of Gorbachev as "a drugstore cowboy." This attitude toward Moscow has seemed motivated more by political timidity, though, than by calculation. Bush's people did not want to go wrong, or to run domestic political risk, hence they practiced what they thought was prudence, demanding further tests of Soviet seriousness and still more Soviet concessions. This merely made them seem unserious. They sought the safety of inaction, which actually proved costly.

They function in a Washington where most of the political class remains confused, even disoriented, by the changes that have come in the Soviet Union and in the rest of the Marxist world, and are now coming in all of Europe. Forty years of Cold War provided a framework and the parameters of the country's modern foreign policy, and as these change the country's political class is rather lost. Senators and congressmen, as well as the administration, are assailed by ideologues of press and think-tank, too often with investments in the closed mind. The executive branch of government is full of people with professional commitments to existing policy and existing solutions, hence to immobility.

Washington is not a particularly intellectual place, and relatively few people there (or anyplace else) think seriously and professionally about where U.S. foreign policy ought ultimately take the country. Henry Kissinger became a celebrity in the 1970s because he was virtually the only man in high office who did think and talk about that while actually possessing power.

Neither President Bush nor Secretary Baker would pretend to be intellectuals or heavy geopolitical thinkers, but they seem to be listening to something other than the conventional judgments and the conventional wisdom; and this is reassuring. The risk the United States has courted in recent months has been that of irrelevance. One reason the West Germans launched into an independent course on short-range nuclear missile negotiations was that they could not get an intelligent response from Washington to their real political problems. Washington simply has not seemed a serious place, and it is overdue that this changes. Mikhail Gorbachev is serious - all too serious.

7TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1989 The New York Times Company;
The New York Times

May 30, 1989, Tuesday, Late Edition - Final

SECTION: Section A; Page 12, Column 1; Foreign Desk

LENGTH: 1323 words

HEADLINE: How a Frustrated Bush Moved to Out-Gorbachev Gorbachev on Weapons

BYLINE: By BERNARD WEINRAUB, Special to The New York Times

DATELINE: BRUSSELS, May 29

BODY:

Ten days ago, a handful of the highest-ranking officials of the Bush Administration gathered in George Bush's Kennebunkport home on a rocky promontory overlooking the Maine coast. Mr. Bush told the group he wanted to take "a bold step" to deal with Mikhail S. Gorbachev's initiatives.

Administration officials, in relating the events that led up to today's announcement of Mr. Bush's new arms control proposals, said that Mr. Bush told the group he was irritated at both his own agencies and at the Europeans.

He was irked that the Defense and State Department bureaucracies had said that cuts in American troops and planes in Europe were unthinkable. And he was irritated at the Europeans for complaining to senior American officials that United States foreign policy seemed improvised and foundering.

He was also unhappy with the West Germans for seeking immediate talks with the Russians on reducing short-range nuclear weapons. And he was irritated at domestic critics of his foreign policy speeches.

Annoyance With Gorbachev

Above all, his closest aides said, Mr. Bush was annoyed with Mr. Gorbachev for privately sending to him what he believed were mixed signals while preparing to make public a major proposal on reducing troops, tanks and artillery in Europe.

By the time most of the senior officials left, Mr. Bush had made his basic decision to cut 30,000 American troops in Europe, accept the Soviet position that aircraft in Europe should be included in a conventional arms treaty in Europe and fix a date within the year to accomplish the reductions by 1992 or 1993.

The initiative gave Mr. Bush, who is by nature very cautious, something that had eluded him for the four months of his Presidency: a foreign policy initiative that rivaled those of Mr. Gorbachev.

By all accounts, Mr. Bush decided to forge a major arms control initiative around May 10, when Mr. Gorbachev, in Moscow, indicated privately to the visiting Secretary of State, James A. Baker 3d, that the Soviet Union was moving toward the framework of the Western position for cutting conventional arms.

(c) 1989 The New York Times, May 30, 1989

'Seriousness of Intent'

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization had begun conventional arms talks in Vienna on March 9, proposing that an agreement be limited to tanks, artillery and armored personnel carriers. The Soviet Union wanted to broaden negotiations to include aircraft and troops. Now the Soviets seemed to be moving toward the allies' position.

'Gorbachev discussed with the secretary a general Soviet response to our March 9 proposal,' a senior Administration official said. 'It was lacking in several respects as far as we were concerned, but nevertheless did show an overall thrust in the direction of the NATO proposal, and did indicate a seriousness of intent.'

Mr. Bush quickly ordered Defense Secretary Dick Cheney and the Joint Chiefs of Staff to shape an arms control initiative in response the secret one made by Mr. Gorbachev.

But Mr. Bush's enthusiasm was dampened by public comments by Mr. Gorbachev and his Foreign Secretary, Eduard A. Shevardnadze, in the weeks that followed. The comments led Administration officials to suggest that Mr. Gorbachev was grandstanding.

Private vs. Public

At the same time that Mr. Gorbachev was privately informing Washington that Moscow was moving toward the West on the conventional arms issue, the Soviet leader announced he would withdraw 500 nuclear warheads from Eastern Europe, a move described by Mr. Cheney as 'a pittance' and a 'p.r. ploy' that only deepened divisions in the NATO alliance. Mr. Shevardnadze then threatened to retain SS-23 nuclear missiles banned under the 1987 treaty on intermediate-range missiles (although he later retracted the threat).

It was then disclosed that Mr. Gorbachev had told Mr. Bush in a letter that he had stopped sending arms to Nicaragua. This also annoyed Mr. Bush, because he saw it as another empty gesture in light of what Washington views as Cuba's major shipments of Soviet-made arms to Nicaragua.

'It was frustrating because Gorbachev was getting a lot of credit but producing nothing,' a senior Administration official said.

Despite this, Mr. Bush and his senior aides, including Brent Scowcroft, the national security adviser, and Secretary of State Baker felt that the private Gorbachev proposals on conventional arms demanded attention.

Crowe Heavily Involved

Adm. William J. Crowe, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was heavily involved in drafting the American plan.

Several Administration aides said that the decisions on the plan were kept to a handful of ranking officials, and out of the hands of arms control and defense specialists in the Pentagon and State Department who have argued that reductions in manpower sought by Moscow would be extremely difficult to verify.

(c) 1989 The New York Times, May 30, 1989

Reductions in land-based combat aircraft have also been opposed in the past by some influential officials in the Government, partly in response to French opposition.

A senior Administration official said that the Soviet proposal to include planes and helicopters posed a problem because they are regarded as "principally a defensive part of our posture." He said the proposal to reduce troops was problematic because of the difficulties of verification.

"But the President decided it was important enough to try to exploit this opportunity," the official said, and that resulted in the proposal today.

'We'll Deal With Both'

Another senior aide said: "The President felt we had a very serious negotiating position from them. We ought to come forward with a position that meets their concerns."

"He wanted something clean, easy to understand," said a White House aide. "He wanted to do something bold. Why not focus on U.S. and Soviet troops? It's easy to implement and, besides, it responds to Congressional pressure on the need for more burden-sharing by Europe."

Coincidentally, the Kennebunkport meeting took place on May 19, the day before the visit of the French President, Francois Mitterrand.

Mr. Baker and Mr. Scowcroft stayed on for the Mitterrand visit and discussed an element of the proposal designed to ease the dispute between the United States and West Germany over short-range nuclear missiles.

The United States has resisted Bonn's call for talks soon on the missiles, arguing that they might result in the elimination of the weapons and leave Western Europe vulnerable.

'Accelerate the Timetable'

Mr. Mitterrand had suggested days earlier that NATO await the progress of negotiations on conventional arms before reaching an agreement on short-range nuclear missiles. The President told the French leader that he was working on a similar proposal.

In his proposal today, Mr. Bush urged both sides to "accelerate the timetable" for reaching an overall agreement on conventional arms reductions. The Soviet Union had set a target date of 1997.

"I believe that it should be possible to reach such agreement in six months or maybe a year, and to accomplish the reductions by 1992 or 1993," said Mr. Bush.

It was unclear if Mr. Bush told Mr. Mitterrand about the aircraft proposal, or if the French were officially informed later in the week by Lawrence S. Eagleburger, the Deputy Secretary of State, who was sent abroad late last week to brief allies on the Bush plan.

(c) 1989 The New York Times, May 30, 1989

Last Tuesday, the Soviets officially placed their conventional arms plan on the table at the talks in Vienna.

That night, Mr. Bush scrapped a foreign policy speech he planned to deliver at a commencement ceremony the next day at the Coast Guard Academy in New London, Conn. Speechwriters worked on drafts through the night, and Mr. Bush reviewed the speech at 6:30 the next morning. He was still working on the speech while flying to New London.

'The Soviets are now being forthcoming,' Mr. Bush told the Coast Guard graduates. 'We hope to achieve the reductions that we seek.'

SUBJECT: UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS; UNITED STATES ARMAMENT AND DEFENSE; US-INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS-USSR; ARMAMENT, DEFENSE AND MILITARY FORCES; ARMS CONTROL AND LIMITATION AND DISARMAMENT

ORGANIZATION: NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION (NATO); NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION (NATO); STATE, DEPARTMENT OF; DEFENSE, DEPARTMENT OF

NAME: WEINRAUB, BERNARD; GORBACHEV, MIKHAIL S; BUSH, GEORGE (PRES)

GEOGRAPHIC: EUROPE; UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS (USSR); WEST GERMANY

10TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1989 The Times Mirror Company;
Los Angeles Times

May 28, 1989, Sunday, Home Edition

SECTION: Opinion; Part 5; Page 1; Column 5; Opinion Desk

LENGTH: 1759 words

HEADLINE: IN WORLD OF CHANGE, BUSH STANDS STILL

BYLINE: By William Schneider, William Schneider is a contributing editor to Opinion.

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

BODY:

George Bush is a status-quo politician. That's why he was elected President last year. Americans liked the status quo under Ronald Reagan and they voted to preserve it.

Reagan, however, was not a status-quo politician. His response to Mikhail S. Gorbachev was remarkably open -- some would say naive. But the last thing anyone would say about Reagan is that he was fearful of change.

That is exactly what people are saying about Bush. "I think perhaps this is a time for caution," said Bush in response to the stirring upheaval in China. Caution? At a time when 1 million people are putting their lives on the line for democracy? That is the sort of thing that could give caution a bad name.

Today Gorbachev has become the symbol of change in the world. Wherever he goes, he seems to spread democracy in his wake. "We need someone like Gorbachev, a man with vision," said a student protester in Beijing last week. Imagine a protester saying that about Bush, who announced that it would be improper for a U.S. President to advise the students "what their course of action should be." Bush added, "We do not exhort in a way that is going to stir up a military confrontation." What does he think he and Reagan have been doing with the Contras for eight years?

Gorbachev represents previously unthinkable aspirations, namely, reforming communism and ending the Cold War. The Bush Administration counters with "the status quo plus," a policy the President describes as "a deliberate, step-by-step approach to East-West relations." In other words, let's slow things down.

When Gorbachev said he would stop sending weapons to Nicaragua, the White House responded with annoyance. Press spokesman Marlin Fitzwater dismissed the gesture as a "public relations gambit" perpetrated by a "drugstore cowboy." The White House just doesn't get it. To say the Soviets are engaging in "public relations" implies that they are being superficial while we are being substantive. But they are reforming their system and making unilateral arms cuts while we are saying, "Let's wait and see."

They act. We complain. They withdraw 500 nuclear missiles from Europe. Defense Secretary Richard B. Cheney complains they have "so many rat-holes

(c) 1989 Los Angeles Times, May 28, 1989

over there in Eastern Europe that 500 is a pittance." This kind of small-minded response gives the United States the same image the Soviet Union had when Andrei Y. Vishinsky represented them at the United Nations and earned the nickname "Mr. Nyet."

There is more than image at stake, however. The United States does not seem able to control events -- or even influence them -- in Panama, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Eastern Europe, the Middle East and China. When a country loses its ability to influence events, it loses power. The United States gained power under Reagan because he succeeded so often in controlling events -- although sometimes, as in Lebanon, he failed. Bush seems buffeted by events -- more like Jimmy Carter.

Conservatives are becoming critical. They were outraged over an incident that happened during Bush's visit to China earlier this year. The Chinese government forcibly excluded China's best-known dissident from a banquet Bush had invited him to. Bush protested the government's action only after aides pressured him.

Recently, at the urging of Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.), the Senate Foreign Relations Committee adopted a resolution supporting the student demonstrators in Beijing and warning Chinese leaders that violent suppression of the protesters would "seriously damage relations with the United States." At the same time, a State Department official said, "The government in trouble in China is a friendly government with which we have had good relations. We don't wish that government ill." Asked to characterize Bush's response to the upheaval in China, one Republican senator said, "He's taken out a patent on banality."

Liberals sometimes sound as if they miss Reagan. Rep. Stephen J. Solarz (D-N.Y.) urged that Bush "publicly identify himself" with the movement for democracy in China by inviting Chinese students to meet with him. "It's time for the President of the United States to find words to encourage them in their struggle for freedom," Solarz said. "Isn't this what we've been talking about for all these years?"

Indeed it is. The fact is, we are winning the Cold War. The Soviets are accepting our initiatives. We have been complaining that it makes no sense for NATO to negotiate a reduction in short-range nuclear missiles as long as the Soviets have a significant edge in conventional forces. So last week, the Soviets offered sweeping reductions in their conventional forces.

The Soviet offer astonished some U.S. officials. But Bush, who had to scrap his prepared remarks at the Coast Guard Academy the next day, responded petulantly. The Soviet offers, he said, "confirm what we've said all along -- that Soviet military power far exceeds the levels needed to defend the legitimate security interests of the U.S.S.R."

Bush hears what the Soviets say, but he says he doesn't see anything warranting a substantive U.S. response. "I welcome (Gorbachev) proposals," Bush said last Sunday at Boston University, "but I would like to see them implemented."

Others are less suspicious. Right now, only 26% of the U.S. public believes that "the military threat from the Soviet Union is constantly growing and presents a real, immediate danger to the United States." That figure is down from 64% in 1983. The status quo is changing. But no one in the Bush

(c) 1989 Los Angeles Times, May 28, 1989

Administration has the courage or the imagination to say so.

Remember when Jesse Jackson went to Syria to rescue the captured U.S. pilot? Reagan refused to be embarrassed. Instead, he held a ceremony at the White House to celebrate the occasion. Bush seems unable to celebrate the breakthrough in U.S.-Soviet relations without casting suspicion on Moscow's motives.

It takes a secure leader to do something like that. Reagan was secure. Despite all the nutty things he said, his sense of personal security was always reassuring. Bush usually says sensible things, but he is so easily rattled that he makes people nervous. He seems to be paralyzed by two fears -- the fear of being called a wimp and the fear of creating a controversy.

Bush refuses to criticize the Beijing government for fear of provoking a controversy. "The world has a stake in China's economic progress, national security and political vitality," the President said in a statement issued at the height of the upheaval last week. "The United States hopes to see the continuing implementation of economic and political reforms, which undoubtedly will also help advance these goals." Take that, communist oppressors!

Bush takes a tough line with the Soviets to show he's no pushover for this glasnost thing. In his May 12 speech, Bush demanded the Soviets pass a series of "tests" to show they had changed. If they passed, the United States would be willing to go "beyond containment." Last week, the President spelled out the reward. If the Soviets are good, he offered to "integrate the Soviet Union into the community of nations." In other words, invite them to accept the status quo.

Bush's foreign policy is Reaganism without risks. Or as one foreign-policy specialist described it, "the Reagan agenda pushed by civil servants."

The fact is, Gorbachev is doing something conservatives have dreamed about for 40 years. He is rolling back communism. A free election was held in the Soviet Union. In China, protesters openly defied the communist government and succeeded in challenging its legitimacy. In Poland, a communist government will face an organized opposition movement at the polls next month -- and it will probably lose. According to the government's poll of Poles, only 12% of the voters say they will vote for the communists.

Is communism in its death throes? A lot of communists say yes. In Hungary, a radical reform faction seems likely to take over the Communist Party. They are calling for a multiparty system, a complete transformation of the economy -- and withdrawal of Hungary from the Warsaw Pact, in favor of "neutralism guaranteed by the two superpowers."

The totalitarian model is crumbling. That model depends on keeping a close link between control of the economy and the monopoly of power. In the Soviet Union, Gorbachev loosened up on the monopoly of power and allowed non-communist candidates to compete in elections. As a result, the party is under pressure to allow a freer economy. In China, Deng Xiaoping loosened up on the party's control of the economy. Now its monopoly of power is being challenged.

No communist leader, not even Gorbachev, believes a communist party should have to compete for power with an organized opposition. The purpose of glasnost is to allow for change and reform within the party. This year's Soviet election was a gigantic primary. Independents were allowed to participate, but

(c) 1989 Los Angeles Times, May 28, 1989

communist rule was never threatened.

The protests in China last week were a kind of impromptu Iowa caucus. Participants started out by calling for a "dialogue" with the authorities and demanding recognition of their movement as "patriotic" -- that is, as legitimate rather than "counterrevolutionary." But as in Iowa, the media attention made the participants feel powerful, and they ended up demanding the ouster of the prime minister. That's when the authorities decided to crack down.

Totalitarianism requires the party be completely identified with the system. Opposition to the party becomes "counterrevolutionary" -- i.e., treason. Separate the party from the system, however, and you make democracy possible. That is what is happening in the Soviet Union, China, Poland and Hungary. Movements are emerging that claim to be loyal to the system ("patriotic") but critical of the Communist Party. When will we know that communism is doomed? When a ruling Communist Party loses power to the opposition. That has never happened. But at times it looked possible last week.

And it had the Bush Administration worried. Secretary of State James A. Baker III said at a news conference, "I don't think it would be in the best interests of the United States for us to see significant instability in the People's Republic of China, just like I don't think it's in the best interests of the United States for us to see significant instability in the Soviet Union."

The message of the Bush Administration is clear: Democracy is fine, as long as it doesn't disturb the status quo.

TYPE: Opinion

12TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1989 The Washington Post

May 28, 1989, Sunday, Final Edition

SECTION: FIRST SECTION; PAGE A30

LENGTH: 951 words

HEADLINE: Bush Finds Theme of Foreign Policy: 'Beyond Containment'

BYLINE: Don Oberdorfer, Washington Post Staff Writer

DATELINE: ROME, May 27, 1989

BODY:

President Bush has found the grand theme of his administration's foreign policy in the idea of moving "beyond containment" to a new era of international cooperation with the Soviet Union, according to White House officials accompanying Bush on his first presidential trip to Europe.

Bush broached the concept in his Soviet policy speech at Texas A&M University May 12 and repeated it with growing emphasis in his addresses at Boston University last Sunday, at the Coast Guard Academy on Wednesday, and in his departure remarks in Washington and arrival remarks in Rome Friday. So far, however, the idea has not received the prominence that Bush's aides say it deserves.

At Boston University last Sunday, Bush defined his approach to the Soviet Union as "moving beyond containment, to seek to integrate the Soviets into the community of nations, to help them share the rewards of international cooperation." In a press conference on the same occasion, Bush called the concept "a bold one" and described it as a goal of his administration.

If taken seriously as a U.S. goal, the concept is a striking reversal of the central objective of American policy in the past four decades: to contain the Soviet Union by building military, economic and political barriers and counterpressures to Soviet expansion. His aides say such a sweeping shift -- executed in a step-by-by step fashion and tightly conditioned on Soviet reciprocity -- is precisely what Bush has in mind.

A White House press briefing Thursday morning by a senior member of the National Security Council staff further explained Bush's concept. In that briefing, "beyond containment" was termed "a positive reaction to reform in the Soviet Union and a radical conceptual departure for American policy in the postwar period toward the U.S.S.R."

The NSC briefer drew a sharp distinction between this concept and the short-lived policy of detente in the early 1970s, which he defined as an attempt to manage superpower competition with "elaborate rules of the game" because of the implicit assumption on both sides that nothing could be done about the root causes of the conflict.

"The president's policy is quite different," the briefer declared. "We want the Soviet Union to become a full partner in the international system and to enjoy the benefits of a system that has supported political freedom and

(c) 1989 The Washington Post, May 28, 1989

economic prosperity around the world.

"We will of course be prudent, given cycles of cooperation and conflict with the Soviet Union. But this time the Soviet Union may be ready to alter fundamentally its military forces, institutions and international behavior. We and the Soviets, for the first time in the postwar period, can build over time a stable, cooperative and open relationship that will endure, unlike [in] the past."

The same White House official, who accompanied Bush to Europe, said today the concept arose from informal and intimate discussions between the president and several senior foreign policy advisors in the weeks immediately preceding the Texas A&M speech.

At that point the formal interagency review of U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union had been completed, with little in the way of major ideas surviving this formal and, in the view of senior administration figures, sterile process.

"The label of status quo plus is a fair way to characterize the result of the policy review," said the NSC official. "But the president had repeatedly said he wanted something more -- a way of expressing a long-term vision for U.S.-Soviet relations which is optimistic in character yet recognizes that we have to proceed in a step-by-step way."

As explained by this official, the concept at this point is "a distant strategic objective -- like Mt. Kilimanjaro, something you can see in the distance as a goal."

As to specific actions, the official said no operational blueprint has been drawn up for reaching Bush's goal, but he maintained that establishing and enunciating the objective are of fundamental importance. He said many future actions, including some of the changes to be disclosed early next week in U.S. and NATO alliance military policy and in Western economic sanctions against the Soviet Union should be seen in the context of movement toward new relationships with Moscow.

Going "beyond containment" has been discussed with congressional leaders and, in diplomatic channels, with key U.S. allies, the official said.

The concept of containment of the Soviet Union was first spelled out in 1946, in the famous "long telegram" from George F. Kennan, then a senior official in the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, and made public the following year in an unsigned version of Kennan's article published in Foreign Affairs magazine.

A public declaration of U.S. intention to move "beyond containment and detente" was made on June 15, 1983, by then Secretary of State George P. Shultz in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The Shultz declaration, which was quickly forgotten, came in a period of unusually high tension between the United States and the Soviet Union shortly after President Reagan described the Soviet Union as an "evil empire." Dramatic progress in improving U.S.-Soviet relations did not begin until Mikhail Gorbachev came to power in the Kremlin in March 1985.

(c) 1989 The Washington Post, May 28, 1989

Moscow's initial reaction to Bush's plan to welcome the Soviet Union into the commonwealth of nations was less than enthusiastic. After his speech in Texas, the Communist Party newspaper Pravda accused Bush of condescension, saying, "To put it mildly, we are bewildered at the attempts of the president to pose conditions under which the U.S. will work to include the U.S.S.R. in the world community."

GRAPHIC: PHOTO, PRESIDENT BUSH AND ITALIAN PRIME MINISTER CIRIACO DE MITA EXCHANGE TOASTS FOLLOWING A LAVISH BLACK TIE DINNER AT THE VILLA MADAMA IN ROME SATURDAY NIGHT. AP; AP,,REUTER, REUTER

TYPE: NATIONAL NEWS, FOREIGN NEWS

SUBJECT: ITALY; GOVERNMENT / OFFICIAL TRAVEL; NATO; SUMMITS AND CONFERENCES; ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT

NAME: GEORGE BUSH; CIRIACO DE MITA

16TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1989 Reuters

May 26, 1989, Friday, PM cycle

LENGTH: 749 words

HEADLINE: BUSH DEPARTS FOR EUROPE SEEKING ALLIANCE UNITY

BYLINE: By Laurence McQuillan

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

KEYWORD: NATO-BUSH

BODY:

President Bush, starting a European trip highlighted by his first NATO summit, vowed Friday to tear down the barriers that divide Europe.

"For too long, unnatural and inhuman barriers have divided East from West," he said during departure ceremonies at Andrews Air Force Base in the nearby Maryland suburbs.

"We hope to overcome that division, to see a Europe that is truly free, united and at peace," he said.

Bush made his remarks amid a newspaper report he was prepared to offer cutting as many as 34,000 U.S. troops in Europe as a response to a proposal by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev for slashing the size of Eastern bloc forces.

Asked about the Washington Times story, that Bush would propose an up to 10 percent cut in U.S. troop strength in Western Europe when a two-day NATO summit begins Monday in Brussels, a White House spokesman said "any specific proposal which he has to make would be made to the allies in Brussels."

Gorbachev formally proposed cutting 1.26 million Soviet troops in Eastern Europe, along with removing tens of thousands of tanks, artillery and armored vehicles.

Bush has been criticized for failing to respond to a series of Gorbachev proposals that the Kremlin leader says would ease East-West tensions.

"America is a proud partner in the Atlantic alliance--and American interests have been well-served by the alliance," Bush said before departing for Rome, the first stop in a week-long trip that also will take him to Bonn and London.

Bush faces a major test at his first NATO summit-- with the United States and West Germany pitted against each other in a fight over entering negotiations with the Soviet Union on reducing short-range nuclear missiles (SNF).

The West Germans have led a spirited challenge to Washington's refusal to start the talks immediately--straining relations as NATO nears its 40th anniversary.

The United States and Britain insist that the Soviet Union needs to reduce the size of its conventional forces in Eastern Europe before negotiations

(c) 1989 Reuters, May 26, 1989

could begin on nuclear weapons.

But in a Wednesday speech at the Coast Guard Academy, Bush seemed to shift his tone by welcoming Gorbachev's latest proposal to trim East bloc conventional forces in Europe as "forthcoming."

National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft said later that Bush, who personally rewrote the speech at the last moment, was concerned that an earlier series of foreign policy addresses had been regarded as too negative.

Bush, in Friday's remarks, stressed that "we welcome the political and economic liberalization that has taken place so far in the Soviet Union and in some countries of Eastern Europe. We watching hoping that more changes will follow."

He also reiterated his belief that a vigilant NATO alliance remained essential to U.S. and European security.

"Today, Europe is enjoying a period of unparalleled prosperity and uninterrupted peace- longer than any it has known in the modern age. NATO had made the difference- and the Alliance will prove every bit as important to American and European security in the decade ahead," he said.

Even as he spoke of the importance of the alliance, he was locked in a thorny dispute with West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl about NATO's nuclear policy.

With the backing of many of the alliance's smaller countries, Kohl is pressing for early talks with Moscow on reducing SNF weapons with a range of less than 300 miles.

The West Germany leader also is resisting U.S. and British demands for modernizing the alliance's aging Lance missiles, which are based in his country.

Washington and London say talks on short-range arms, most of which would be used on German soil in the event of war, should be put off until the Soviet Union agrees to and begins implementing a conventional arms reduction agreement that would give NATO and the Warsaw bloc equivalent forces in Europe.

The United States fears that SNF talks would ultimately lead to the elimination of nuclear weapons from Europe and leave the continent at the mercy of Soviet numerical superiority in conventional forces.

White House spokesman Marlin Fitzwater acknowledged Thursday it was unlikely the dispute over nuclear policy could be resolved in time for next week's summit. But he insisted the disagreement would dominate the meeting, which has been intended as a celebration of the alliance's 40th anniversary.

Bush heads for Brussels Sunday after two days in Italy. He plans stops in West Germany and Britain after the summit.

25TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1989 Chicago Tribune Company;
Chicago Tribune

May 25, 1989, Thursday, NORTH SPORTS FINAL EDITION

SECTION: NEWS; Pg. 8; ZONE: C

LENGTH: 718 words

HEADLINE: Open your ledgers, Bush urges Soviets

BYLINE: By Janet Cawley, Chicago Tribune

DATELINE: NEW LONDON, Conn.

BODY:

President Bush on Wednesday praised the Soviets for their "forthcoming" proposals on arms reductions and suggested they now open their ledgers on military expenditures, as well.

In his commencement speech at the Coast Guard Academy, delivered less than two days before his departure for Europe and a NATO summit, Bush did not refer specifically to Soviet proposals Tuesday for further cuts in their military forces in Europe as part of an agreement with NATO countries on conventional arms.

But White House aide Roman Popadiuk said Bush included those most recent proposals, as outlined by Soviet arms negotiators in Vienna, when he said: "The issues are complex, stakes are very high. But the Soviets are now being forthcoming and we hope to achieve the (arms) reductions that we seek.

"Let me emphasize our aim is nothing less than removing war as an option in Europe."

Bush pointed out, however, that the proposals were not enough to erase the Warsaw Pact's "massive advantage" over NATO.

Presidential spokesman Marlin Fitzwater said the latest Soviet proposals - which actually filled in the specifics of a plan Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev spelled out to Secretary of State James A. Baker III earlier this month - "provided details in a meaningful way at the negotiating table. It is a serious proposal and we look forward to the negotiations."

Later, Fitzwater called it "a very promising development from our standpoint."

Among other things, the Soviet proposed additional cuts of 17,580 tanks, roughly 27,000 personnel carriers and 45,000 troops beyond those previously announced by Gorbachev.

Bush, who according to press secretary Marlin Fitzwater spent several hours working on the speech, spoke primarily in broad strokes and generalities.

He is to leave Friday morning for Europe and the May 29-30 NATO summit in Brussels, and the speech had been billed as a major foreign-policy address in

(c) 1989 Chicago Tribune, May 25, 1989

advance of that meeting.

Asked if the speech represented any change in the administration's assessment of Soviet arms-control proposals, National Security Adviser Brent Scowcroft said: "No, it's a matter of appearance. . . . The President felt he appeared too negative before, so he's trying to appear more positive now."

Bush pointedly did not refer directly to Washington's dispute with West Germany over Bonn's position that the U.S. should negotiate with the Soviets to reduce short range nuclear weapons in Europe. That disagreement threatens to overshadow the NATO summit, which had been planned as a 40th anniversary celebration.

But Bush did emphasize: "Deterrence is central to our defense strategy. . . . In today's world, nuclear forces are essential to deterrence."

At one point he declared that communism finally had been recognized as a "failed system" and at another, he declared, "Our policy is to seize every, and I mean every, opportunity to build a better, more stable relationship with the Soviet Union."

He said that unilateral reductions previously announced by Gorbachev "give us hope that we can now redress" the advantage that the West says the Warsaw Pact has in conventional arms in Europe.

Referring to his "open skies" proposal of two weeks ago, in which he suggested that the Soviet Union and U.S. allow unarmed surveillance flights over each other's countries, Bush said, "Let us extend this openness to military expenditures, as well."

"I call on the Soviets to do as we have always done. Let's open the ledgers. Publish an accurate defense budget."

In a pre-NATO interview with European reporters that was released by the White House on Wednesday, Bush said he thought Gorbachev was "very good at public relations . . . extraordinarily good. And when he makes a proposal to reduce 500 warheads, everyone jumps up and down and says, 'Hooray.' And we've already taken out 2,400."

"I want the alliance to remain strong and to recognize that you do not make foreign policy based on the personality or charm of an individual in another country. You do it on facts."

Bush said he felt "no personal engagement on the PR front" with Gorbachev "or any reason to engage personally on a public relations front."

"Mr. Gorbachev knows directly from me that we want to see perestroika succeed and that we welcome certain steps towards that end," he said.

GRAPHIC: PHOTO: AP Laserphoto. Wendy Abrisz of Savanna, Ill., is congratulated Wednesday by her commander in chief after receiving her Coast Guard commission.

TERMS: SPEECH; QUOTE; UNITED STATES; SOVIET UNION; MILITARY; DEFENSE; STATISTIC; WEAPON; RELATION; BUDGET; ISSUE

37TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1989 The Telegraph Agency of the Soviet Union;
TASS

May 25, 1989, Thursday

LENGTH: 387 words

HEADLINE: BUSH -- COMMENCEMENT SPEECH AT US COAST GUARD ACADEMY

DATELINE: WASHINGTON, MAY 25

BODY:

"THIS IS A TIME OF TREMENDOUS OPPORTUNITY", U.S. PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH TODAY SAID IN NEW LONDON, CONNECTICUT, IN COMMENCEMENT SPEECH TO GRADUATES OF THE U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY.

THE MAIN TOPIC OF THIS SPEECH, THE LAST MAJOR PRONOUNCEMENTS BY THE HEAD OF THE U.S. ADMINISTRATION AHEAD OF THE MEETING OF THE NATO COUNTRIES' LEADERS, DUE TO TAKE PLACE ON MAY 29-30, WAS, AS HE HIMSELF PUT IT, TO DISCUSS "SECURITY STRATEGY FOR THE 1990S, ONE THAT ADVANCES AMERICAN IDEALS AND UPHOLDS AMERICAN AIMS".

"OUR POLICY IS TO SEIZE EVERY -- AND I MEAN EVERY -- OPPORTUNITY TO BUILD A BETTER, MORE STABLE RELATIONSHIP WITH THE SOVIET UNION," THE PRESIDENT SAID. BUSH REPEATED FOR ONE MORE TIME THAT HE "WANTS TO SEE PERESTROIKA SUCCEED". HE WELCOMED THE USSR'S LATEST PROPOSALS ON CONVENTIONAL ARMAMENTS IN EUROPE.

EN ROUTE TO NEW LONDON AN OFFICIAL WHITE HOUSE SPOKESMAN TOLD JOURNALISTS THAT THE UNITED STATES WOULD THOROUGHLY STUDY THE SERIOUS PROPOSAL TABLED BY THE USSR AT THE VIENNA TALKS.

HOWEVER, THE U.S. PRESIDENT AGAIN ALLEGED THAT THE REDUCTIONS IN CONVENTIONAL FORCES AND ARMAMENTS, ENVISAGED BY THESE INITIATIVES, ARE ALLEGEDLY "NOT ENOUGH TO ELIMINATE THE SIGNIFICANT NUMERICAL SUPERIORITY THAT THE SOVIET UNION ENJOYS RIGHT NOW". SUCH THESES, WHICH ARE CONSTANTLY IMPOSED BY WASHINGTON OFFICIALDOM, ARE MEANT TO DIVERT ATTENTION FROM NATO'S EDGE IN SEVERAL OTHER CATEGORIES, FROM THE UNITED STATES' STEADFAST BID TO SHY AWAY FROM NEGOTIATIONS ON CUTTING BACK NAVAL FORCES, THEIR ARMAMENTS AND ON MONITORING THE ACTIVITY OF FLEETS IN SEA AREAS ADJACENT TO EUROPE.

EMPHASIZING THAT THE U.S. "AIM IS NOTHING LESS THAN REMOVING WAR AS AN OPTION IN EUROPE," BUSH SIMULTANEOUSLY UNDERScoreD THE NEED TO CARRY ON "AN EFFECTIVE DETERRENT" POLICY, ONE THAT DEMONSTRATES "AMERICAN STRENGTH, AMERICAN RESOLVE". THE PRESIDENT DESCRIBED THE CONSOLIDATION OF AMERICAN NUCLEAR FORCES AS AN IMPORTANT ELEMENT OF THIS POLICY, UNDERLINING THE U.S. INTENTION TO "DEVELOP AND DEPLOY A NEW HIGHLY MOBILE SINGLE-WARHEAD MISSILE, MIDGETMAN". HE ALSO STATED ABOUT THE UNITED STATES' "COMMITMENT" TO GO ON WITH THE 'STAR WARS' PROGRAMME.

BUSH ONCE AGAIN EXPRESSED WASHINGTON'S DISAGREEMENT WITH SEVERAL U.S. NATO ALLIES WHO ADVOCATE BEGINNING TALKS WITH THE SOVIET UNION ON REDUCING TACTICAL NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN EUROPE.

(c) 1989, The Boston Globe, June 6, 1989

The students praised the president's "measured response" to the crisis but still spoke of the Chinese troops as the "butchers of Beijing." In explaining why he had decided to limit his decision to military contacts, Bush told the students, "I don't want to hurt the Chinese people."

Asked by reporters who were ushered into the Oval Office whether he would consider further economic sanctions against China, Bush replied: "I reserve the right to take a whole new look at things if violence escalates."

Rhode Island Sen. Claiborne Pell, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said that there was general agreement among the congressional leaders who met with Bush that he should not impose further economic sanctions at this time nor order the withdrawal of the US ambassador, James Lilley.

On Capitol Hill, North Carolina Sen. Jesse Helms, a Republican, took a harder stand, saying he will introduce legislation to suspend trade and investment "if the atrocities continue." Later, Helms told reporters: "You cannot deal with rattlesnakes and you cannot deal with communist governments. They are all rattlesnakes and they will bite you when the occasion arises."

Sens. Edward M. Kennedy and John F. Kerry also applauded Bush's handling of the situation.

(c) 1989, The Boston Globe, June 6, 1989

Bush told reporters yesterday that the administration did not know what had led the Chinese government, after weeks of tolerance toward the student demonstrations, to order the violent crackdown. Bush also said he could not confirm media reports of rebellions in military units by soldiers unwilling to participate in the crackdown.

Bush's public comments came after early morning meetings with his national security advisers. White House officials said privately that Bush, who served as US envoy to China in the mid-1970s, expressed anger at Beijing's decision to have its army fire on the students.

However, in his public remarks Bush showed he was trying to find a middle course that would allow him to offer encouragement to the students while avoiding a hostile reaction from Chinese authorities toward the students or the United States.

"I want to encourage the things that have helped the Chinese people, and I think now the suspension is going to send a strong signal," Bush declared. "I'm not saying it's going to cure the short-range problem in China. I'm not sure any outside country can cure the short-range, the today-in-Tiananmen-Square problem."

Under the steps announced by Bush, military sales to China by the US government and US corporations would be suspended. Military cooperation between Washington and Beijing has increased sharply in recent years, with US government approval of the sale of more than \$ 600 million in fighter jet avionics, artillery modernization, naval torpedoes and radar to the People's Liberation Army.

In addition, Bush said Chinese students wishing to extend their US visas would get a sympathetic audience from US officials. Bush said he would encourage the Red Cross and other humanitarian agencies to speed help to the injured.

The State Department advised American students in Beijing to leave their campuses and gather in hotels because of the chaotic situation. Spokeswoman Margaret Tutwiler said there had been no threats against the Americans.

Bush said he was trying to send a message to members of the Chinese civilian and military leadership resisting further violence against the students.

"It's important at this time to act in a way that will encourage the further development and deepening of the positive elements of that relationship and the process of democratization," Bush stated. "It would be a tragedy for all if China were to pull back to its pre-1972 era of isolation and repression."

However, Bush stressed that if attacks against the students continue he would move toward economic sanctions. US-China trade has been growing steadily since the two countries resumed diplomatic relations in 1972. China is seeking admission into the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the collection of Western nations and their trading partners.

While approximately 3,000 supporters of the Chinese students were demonstrating on Capitol Hill, Bush met with four Chinese students attending Washington-area universities as well as a group of congressional leaders.

4TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1989 Globe Newspaper Company;
The Boston Globe

June 6, 1989, Tuesday, City Edition

SECTION: NATIONAL/FOREIGN; Pg. 1

LENGTH: 1035 words

HEADLINE: TURMOIL IN CHINA;
Bush suspends sale of arms

BYLINE: By Stephen Kurkjian, Globe Staff, Globe reporters John Robinson and Michael Frisby contributed to this story.

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

KEYWORD: GEORGE BUSH; CHINA; RELATION; WEAPON; BUSINESS; MAJOR STORY

BODY:

Appealing to the Chinese government to stop its "violent and bloody" attacks on student demonstrators, President Bush yesterday suspended US military sales to China and warned of more significant economic sanctions if the repression continues.

At a hastily called news conference, Bush said that he had decided against imposing the deeper sanctions against China that some congressmen urged. Bush said stronger sanctions would damage the long-term relationship between the United States and China.

"I don't want to see a total break in this relationship, and I will not encourage a total break in the relationship," Bush declared. "This would be a bad time for the United States to withdraw and pull back," leaving the students "to the devices of a leadership that might decide to crack down further."

In a speech to a business group last night, Bush invoked the scene shown throughout the world via television, of the single Chinese demonstrator who had been able to stop a column of tanks in Tiananmen Square for several minutes. "That image I think is going to be with us a long time," Bush said.

"What is it that gives him the courage to stand up in front of a column of tanks right there in front of the world?" Bush asked. "All I can say to him, wherever he might be, and to the people around the world is we are and we must stand with him."

Bush told members of the Business Roundtable that US companies should continue to trade with China and that despite the military brutality, he did not support a suspension of trade.

Bush's actions yesterday were the first taken by the US government since the student takeover of Tiananmen Square began last month. In previous interviews about the situation in China, Bush and other members of his administration have struck a cautious tone, saying the United States should take no action that might provoke the Chinese government to violence.

19TH STORY of Level 2 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1981 The New York Times Company;
The New York Times

March 23, 1981, Monday, Late City Final Edition

SECTION: Section C; Page 16, Column 1; Cultural Desk

LENGTH: 344 words

HEADLINE: CONCERT: CZECHS HONOR OWN DVORAK

BODY:

WHEN the Czech Philharmonic, Antonin Dvorak and Carnegie Hall were united on Wednesday night in a performance of the 'New World' Symphony, the participants had quite a history behind them. The composer conducted the Czechoslovak orchestra in its first concert in 1896. He also attended the world premiere of the work in 1893 - in Carnegie Hall.

Because the orchestra is also one of the world's most distinguished ensembles playing music by one of its most distinguished countrymen, the conjunction was most promising. And under the direction of its chief conductor, Vaclav Neumann, the orchestra did indeed make the score sound with precision and energy.

It was freshly played, cleaned of lush Romanticism. The melodies of the work were sung simply, with elegant instrumental balances. The brassy final movement was sharp and controlled. The orchestra played with the same crisp clarity that it brought to a performance of Smetana's Overture to 'The Bartered Bride.'

But Mr. Neumann did not weave the striking orchestral moments into an effective musical statement. After making one impression, the music moved on to another. Rhythms in the Scherzo were not more than accurate; the multiple climaxes in the final Allegro became repetitions of identical musical gestures.

The similar problems in the performance of Martinu's Symphony No. 6 could be partly blamed on the score, with its potpourri of ideas and effects. But in the Dvorak work, there is an evocation of innocent hopefulness and expanse, sometimes anticipating effects of Copland. While working on the score, Dvorak stated: 'The influence of America can be felt by anyone who has a nose.' As heard in Mr. Neumann's performance, late 19th-century European interest in the young country sounded like a considered collection of pleasant impressions, rather than a more impassioned, more dramatic dream of a New World. Edward Rothstein

TYPE: Review

SUBJECT: MUSIC; MUSIC; CONCERTS AND RECITALS

1ST STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1989 The New York Times Company;
The New York Times

July 21, 1989, Friday, Late Edition - Final

SECTION: Section B; Page 9, Column 1; National Desk

LENGTH: 1145 words

HEADLINE: 2 Congressmen Deal Blows to Nomination for Top Civil Rights Post

BYLINE: By JULIE JOHNSON, Special to The New York Times

DATELINE: WASHINGTON, July 20

BODY:

Further doubt was cast today on the confirmation prospects of William C. Lucas, the Bush Administration's nominee to head the Justice Department's civil rights division, when an important Congressional ally withdrew his endorsement.

Expressing dismay with Mr. Lucas's testimony Wednesday that he viewed as "sound" recent Supreme Court rulings that civil rights groups contend sharply narrowed federal anti-discrimination law, Representative John Conyers Jr., Democrat of Michigan, told the Senate Judiciary Committee, "I come here to withdraw my endorsement of Bill Lucas."

That shift by Mr. Conyers, who only a day before had introduced Mr. Lucas to the committee with a wholehearted recommendation, was quickly followed by another setback for the nominee: Senator Joseph R. Biden Jr., Democrat of Delaware, the committee's chairman, said he was now inclined to vote against Mr. Lucas's confirmation.

Mr. Biden, who had said he planned to back the nomination, cited Mr. Lucas's lack of opinion Wednesday when Mr. Biden asked him "whether or not he thought we were moving in the right direction or the wrong direction on civil rights."

'81 Statement Discussed

After Mr. Biden's statement, Stephen Gillers, a New York University professor who is a legal ethics expert, testified about Mr. Lucas's 1981 application to practice law in New York State. Appearing at the request of Senators Herbert H. Kohl of Wisconsin, Paul Simon of Illinois and Howard M. Metzenbaum of Ohio, all Democratic members of the committee, Mr. Gillers discussed Mr. Lucas's failure to disclose that he failed the District of Columbia bar examination in 1963 or that he had been involved in lawsuits when he was the Sheriff in Wayne County, Mich., from 1969 to 1982.

Professor Gillers told the committee that legal committees on character and fitness that screen applicants to the bar must rely almost entirely on the forthrightness of the individuals. While he would not speculate that Mr. Lucas's actions could prompt a revocation of his license to practice law in New York, Mr. Gillers said in an interview later: "I wouldn't rule it out."

Rights Groups Split

(c) 1989 The New York Times, July 21, 1989

Mr. Conyers's statement was especially devastating since he had been an early supporter of Mr. Lucas. His support came at a time when leaders of civil rights groups were divided over the nominee; he becomes the second prominent black politician to withdraw his support of Mr. Lucas, who is black. The Rev. Jesse Jackson did so late last month.

Mr. Conyers appeared on Mr. Lucas's behalf on the first day of the hearings Wednesday, expressing full confidence in his abilities and scolding his opponents. But today, reading parts of Mr. Lucas's testimony supporting the recent Supreme Court rulings on civil rights, he told the committee:

'I was frankly astounded. We are in a crisis in the civil rights movement.'

He added: 'If you can't figure out that these cases are seriously undermining the progress we've made, then there's no point in me waiting for you to become the assistant attorney general in the civil rights division.'

Personal Commitment Cited

Mr. Conyers said that Mr. Lucas had pledged a personal commitment to civil rights and that he had believed him. But that promise could not, he said, offset Mr. Lucas's statement that he agreed with Attorney General Dick Thornburgh's statements that recent Court rulings do not erode existing civil rights laws.

Mr. Lucas said he would change that opinion only if it could be proven that the Court's action had been detrimental to the rights of women, blacks and other minorities.

'Anybody going into that job with these cases hanging over our heads who would want some more time, you will not get this member of Congress advocating his nomination,' Mr. Conyers said today.

A Justice Department official said today Mr. Conyers's switch surprised Mr. Lucas and Administration officials.

'The Congressman obviously was under enormous pressure from the other side,' the official said, speaking under the condition he not be identified. He characterized the opponents of Mr. Lucas as 'the whole group who would like to see a liberal Democrat appointed to the civil rights division in the Bush Administration. That's just not going to happen.'

But David Runkle, a Justice Department spokesman, said the Administration still 'has every confidence' that Mr. Lucas would be confirmed by the Senate, though it is no longer clear that the nomination will leave the committee with a favorable recommendation.

Vote Expected by Aug. 4

While Senator Biden was unwilling to characterize the current state of the nomination, he said of Mr. Conyers's switch, 'Obviously it doesn't help.' A decision has not yet been made to recall Mr. Lucas for further questioning, he added. A vote on the nomination is expected sometime before the Senate is scheduled to adjourn Aug. 4.

(c) 1989 The New York Times, July 21, 1989

Testimony after the Conyers retraction was divided between representatives of civil rights groups that oppose Mr. Lucas and that of supporters from Michigan and law-enforcement groups.

The opposition of Mr. Lucas by civil rights, legal and women's groups has centered on his lack of experience as a lawyer. Mr. Lucas, who graduated from Fordham Law School in 1962, has spent nearly all of his adult life in law-enforcement careers and began practicing law part time in 1987, after an unsuccessful bid as the Republican nominee for Governor of Michigan.

Bid Called 'Demeaning'

Elaine Jones, a lawyer with the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund Inc., emphasized in her testimony that blacks had long fought for equal opportunity in employment. "But we have never fought and do not fight today for the right to do a job solely because we are black," she said.

She called the Lucas nomination "demeaning" because, while he is suited for numerous jobs in the Bush Administration, his legal background does not appear adequate to be the Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights. "The question is," she said, "if Mr. Lucas were white and knew nothing about civil rights would he be the nominee?"

Earlier today, Benjamin L. Hooks, executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, said Mr. Lucas's expressed agreement with recent Supreme Court rulings should "embarrass any black who has embraced him."

Mr. Hooks spoke at a news conference to announce details for a "silent march" in Washington Aug. 26.

~~"We do not intend to stand idly by and let four men and one woman in black robes halt our long-delayed march to freedom any more than those who wore white robes,"~~ said Mr. Hooks, referring to the five Justices who voted to narrow the law in several civil rights cases.

He also denounced Attorney General Thornburgh, calling him "the most disappointing member of the Bush Administration."

GRAPHIC: Photo of Representative John Conyers Jr. displaying a letter he sent to President Bush withdrawing his support for William C. Lucas. (NYT/Michael Geissinger)

SUBJECT: BLACKS (IN US); CIVIL RIGHTS; APPOINTMENTS AND EXECUTIVE CHANGES

ORGANIZATION: JUSTICE, DEPARTMENT OF

NAME: JOHNSON, JULIE; LUCAS, WILLIAM; BUSH, GEORGE (PRES); CONYERS, JOHN JR (REPR); BIDEN, JOSEPH R JR (SEN)

DATE: JULY 25, 1989

CLIENT:
LIBRARY: NEXIS
FILE: OMNI

YOUR SEARCH REQUEST IS:
CONYERS AND JEWS AND LUCAS

NUMBER OF STORIES FOUND WITH YOUR REQUEST THROUGH:
LEVEL 1... 7

1ST STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

The New Republic Copyright (c) 1989 Information Access Company;
Copyright (c) The New Republic, Inc. 1989

June 19, 1989

SECTION: Vol. 200; No. 25; Pg. 10

LENGTH: 1352 words

HEADLINE: Token enforcer; Richard L. Thornburgh's selection of William R. Lucas as assistant attorney general for civil rights is surprise to White House Notebook

BYLINE: Barnes, Fred

BODY:

In the scheme of things, it was only a small surprise. As President Bush toured the Far East, Attorney General Richard Thornburgh announced in Washington on February 24 that he was recommending William Lucas, a black Democrat-turned-Republican from Detroit, as assistant attorney general for civil rights. This was news to nearly everyone at the White House. And since Bush and his aides don't like surprises, they were ticked. Chase Undermeyer, the White House personnel chief, "yelled at me," says Murray Dickman, Thornburgh's lieutenant for personnel and administration. "Bob Estrada Undermeyer's assistant yelled at me. I can't remember whether John Sununu yelled at me or not."

Thornburgh made the worst out of a touchy situation by going public. He figured that because his recommendation of Lucas had already leaked—even a reporter traveling with Bush in the Orient had gotten wind of it—he might as well make it official. Trouble was, the White House then took two months to act on Thornburgh's advice. In the meantime, critical stories about Lucas appeared, targeting his minimal experience as a lawyer, a mini-scandal or two in his past, and a slightly puffed-up resume. Worse, opposition by an important segment of the civil rights movement concealed "Lucas paid a price for overenthusiasm at justice," says a senior White House aide.

The White House—Undermeyer, to be exact—had urged Thornburgh to consider Lucas for a job. "He was in the pool of people who were going to get something," says a Bush aide. Lee Atwater, the Republican national chairman, is a Lucas fan, which didn't hurt. He put Lucas on a list of blacks who should be hired. Lucas had also been an early Bush supporter in 1988, an important credential.

Undermeyer thought Lucas would make a fine chief U.S. marshal. Or maybe Lucas could head the Customs Service. Or perhaps he'd fit as drug czar Bill Bennett's deputy. "There were three or four things," says a White House official "It wasn't as if we pinned him into a job."

Thornburgh and Dickman did that. They believe the civil rights job was forever changed by Brad Reynolds, the conservative who held it for eight years under President Reagan. "I'd interviewed 20 people who were interested in the job," says Dickman. "Most of them were good white, male, Republican lawyers with good civil rights backgrounds." But he thought they were wrong for the job.

Post-Reynolds, the job "is more visible. It's a public position with a public platform." I half-expected Dickman to say that a public spokesman for

The New Republic (c) 1989 IAC

civil rights enforcement is what he and Thornburgh have in mind. He stopped short of that. But he scarcely bothered to defend Lucas's credentials as a lawyer. "We don't accept the notion you have to be the best civil rights lawyer in the world to be the head of the civil rights division."

Lucas isn't. He served briefly in 1962 and 1963 as an investigator in the civil rights division, quitting after he flunked the bar exam and wasn't eligible to become a lawyer there. Since he stepped down as Wayne County executive in Michigan in 1986, he's worked for a Detroit law firm. But not much. Last year he was paid \$ 25,000 by the firm, and \$ 65,000 for work he did for the Republican National Committee. His inexperience as a litigator prompted a few Republicans, black and white, to lobby quietly against his nomination. This caused a backlash. Conservative activists leaned on Thornburgh, Sununu, and Untermeyer to make sure Bush followed through on the nomination. On April 25, in a perfunctory press release, the White House noted Bush's intention to nominate Lucas.

The nomination has wreaked havoc in the civil rights community "For us, the assistant attorney general for civil rights is the most important position in the executive branch," says Ralph Neas, executive director of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights. "It's not a position for on-the-job training." Neas, Benjamin Hooks of the NAACP, and others met with Lucas to assess his legal skill. They were unimpressed. Members of the Congressional Black Caucus conferred with Lucas and were alarmed at his fuzzy knowledge of an important Supreme Court ruling that limits minority setasides. Oddly enough, another critic of Lucas is conservative legal scholar Bruce Fein. He says Lucas isn't capable of defending the "colorblind, genderblind jurisprudence" pioneered by the Reagan justice Department.

The Leadership Conference on May 9 voted to oppose the nomination. Hours after that was announced, Lucas bravely showed up at the organization's annual dinner in Washington. The next day the conference issued a statement saying Lucas "may well be qualified for other important positions in the federal government, but he does not have the experience, the substantive knowledge of the increasingly technical field of civil rights, or the litigation skills to carry out the duties of the civil rights office effectively." At the justice Department, Dickman dismisses this opposition as "Ralph Neas's spring project." But the Leadership Conference doesn't throw its opposition around lightly. It opposed only three non-judicial nominees (Ed Meese as attorney general, Reynolds as deputy attorney general, and an obscure fellow picked for general counsel of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission) in the Reagan years. It defeated two of them. Neas, of course, spearheaded the lobbying effort that blocked the confirmation of Robert Bork for the Supreme Court.

Lucas is not isolated from the civil rights movement the way Bork was. He has supporters. On May 2, Thornburgh recruited an important one. He met with Jesse Jackson to talk about discrimination against sugar cane workers. "I hope you can support Bill Lucas," Thornburgh interjected. Jackson said he likes Lucas, but suggested that someone with more legal experience should have been chosen. Still, he told Thornburgh he'd back Lucas. Lucas himself lined up Democratic Representative John Conyers of Michigan, who is black. When Lucas switched parties in 1985 and ran for governor as a Republican, Conyers likened him to "some Jews who led their brothers and sisters into the ovens of the Holocaust." After talking to Lucas, Conyers said he's persuaded Lucas is "committed to civil rights enforcement and affirmative action."

The New Republic (c) 1989 IAC

Chances are the complaints of Neas, Hooks, and other civil rights leader won't defeat Lucas. As of early June no Democrats on the Senate judiciary Committee had voiced opposition to Lucas, and one, Dennis DeConcini of Arizona, wrote Thornburgh in support of the nomination. Lucas and DeConcini served together on the Bicentennial Commission. Six of the seven Republicans on the committee are pledged to Lucas. The seventh, Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania, is undecided. So long as Lucas doesn't blunder badly when he testifies before the committee, probably in late June, he should pass the civil rights test.

But there's another test for nominees in 1989—ethics. And Lucas has several trouble spots. The fact that a resume once called him a civil rights "attorney" at justice isn't serious. Nor is the matter of his having taken some trips to Las Vegas in 1975 that were arranged by a man with mob connections. That's ancient history. Rather, judiciary Committee investigators are concentrating on contracts Lucas awarded as Wayne County executive. A \$ 138 million contract to renovate a county office building went to a development group headed by Lucas's chief fund-raiser. And Lucas knew his chief of staff held a 15 percent interest in a construction firm set to work on the project. Then last year Lucas got \$ 15,000 from a businessman and \$ 10,000 from a lawyer who had benefited earlier from a contract he awarded. Lucas has been exonerated before on questions about contracts, and he passed the prenomination check by the FBI. But now he's got to defend himself forcefully in front of the committee. If he does, he's in. If he doesn't, Thornburgh may regret having nominated him early or ever.

SUBJECT: United States. Department of Justice. Civil Rights Div., officials and employees

NAME: Lucas, William R., selection and appointment; Thornburgh, Richard L., personnel management; Bush, George, political activity; Untermeyer, Charles G., political activity

LOAD-DATE-MDC: July 20, 1989

DATE: JULY 25, 1989

CLIENT:
LIBRARY: NEXIS
FILE: OMNI

YOUR SEARCH REQUEST IS:
JACKSON AND CIVIL RIGHTS AND CHINA AND DATE AFT 5/89

NUMBER OF STORIES FOUND WITH YOUR REQUEST THROUGH:
LEVEL 1... 20

6TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

The Associated Press

The materials in the AP file were compiled by The Associated Press. These materials may not be republished without the express written consent of The Associated Press.

July 10, 1989, Monday, PM cycle

SECTION: Domestic News

LENGTH: 487 words

HEADLINE: NAACP Leader Says Supreme Court Eroding Civil Rights Gains

BYLINE: By JOSE MARTINEZ, Associated Press Writer

DATELINE: DETROIT

KEYWORD: NAACP Convention

BODY:

President Bush has lifted the "iron curtain" separating blacks from the White House, but recent Supreme Court rulings pose a critical challenge to minorities, according to the NAACP's executive director.

"The conservative majority that now holds sway seem determined, and yes, hellbent on consigning civil rights and affirmative action gains to the ash heap of history," Benjamin Hooks said Sunday.

Hooks addressed a crowd of 3,800 on the first night of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People's annual convention, which runs through Thursday.

Housing and Urban Development Secretary Jack Kemp was scheduled to speak this morning. Vice President Dan Quayle will address the civil rights organization Wednesday.

"This Supreme Court is dangerous to the well being of black people, women and other minorities," Hooks said Sunday.

"It is more dangerous to the legitimate hopes and aspirations of black people in this nation than any Bull Connor with a firehose; than any Jim Clark with a billy club; more dangerous than any Ross Barnett standing in the schoolhouse saying, 'They shall not pass'; more dangerous than George Wallace proclaiming 'Segregation today, segregation tomorrow, segregation forever,'" he said.

Connor was public safety commissioner in Birmingham, Ala., and Clark was a sheriff in Alabama during the desegregation of the 1950s and early 1960s. Barnett and Wallace were governors of Mississippi and Alabama, respectively.

Minority group leaders may need to revive the civil disobedience of past decades if the Bush administration and Congress fail to counter the anti-civil rights sentiment fostered by the high court, Hooks said.

The Associated Press, July 10, 1989

"If Congress does not act, we must call upon our citizenry to mount such powerful demonstrations that the group gathered in China not long ago will look like a few compared with the millions that we mobilize," he said.

Hooks gave Bush qualified praise for some of the people he appointed to serve in the administration and for meeting with Jesse Jackson and Coretta Scott King.

"Bush has brought civility to Pennsylvania Avenue," he said. "There is no question that President Bush had done much to raise the iron curtain that had separated the White House from black Americans over the past several years."

The NAACP, however, has not given blanket approval to the administration, Hooks said.

"Attorney General Richard Thornburgh must pull his head out of the sand and realize that his advice to the president on these court rulings was totally wrong. We urge him to rethink his position that nothing has really changed," Hooks said.

Bush can make a difference in civil rights legislation, but must take a stronger public stand, the NAACP leader said.

The president, for example, should consider either revamping or dismantling the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, which Hooks said became an "unmitigated disaster" during the Reagan era.

7TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1989 The New York Times Company;
The New York Times

October 29, 1989, Sunday, Late Edition - Final

SECTION: Section 4; Page 23, Column 2; Editorial Desk

LENGTH: 799 words

HEADLINE: As Ideology Dies, Analogies Rise

BYLINE: By Owen Harries; Owen Harries is co-editor of The National Interest, a quarterly journal.

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

BODY:

While much is utterly unpredictable - Mikhail Gorbachev's staying power, the limits of Soviet tolerance in the Baltic and Eastern Europe, China after Deng Xiaoping, the consequences of the European Community's move toward complete economic integration in 1992 - two international developments seem to have achieved a degree of probability approaching certainty.

First, the ideological hostility of international politics is destined to disappear. Whatever happens in the Communist world, the days of Marxism-Leninism as an ideology capable of competing seriously with liberal democracy are over. Too much has been conceded, too much made known, by the Soviet regime, for the mystique to work again.

Second, the extreme bipolarity of the last 40 years is ending and being replaced by a more even distribution of power. Multipolarity - a system with four, five or six major players - is around the corner. Japan, Western Europe, China and perhaps India will be less amenable to superpower influence, more assertive, more promiscuous in their alignments.

What will a multipolar, unideological international system at the end of the 20th century be like? To answer, some commentators - for example, the columnist Charles Krauthammer - turn to pre-1914 Europe. The best analogy, they suggest, is the 19th century's "classical" power politics regime, in which states maneuvered to advance their national interests through the manipulation of alliances and the balance of power, with little concern for ideology.

Analogies are probably indispensable but are also hazardous to intellectual health and tend to take on a life of their own. They need to be carefully scrutinized, especially when advanced by influential opinion-makers.

The 19th century analogy does not bear much scrutiny. For one thing, that century was not a period of "classical" power politics, as claimed, but one in which the game of realpolitik was distorted by ideology almost as much as in the recent past.

The main theme of European politics after the fall of Napoleon in 1815 was the struggle between the upholders of the principle of dynastic legitimacy, led by the Hapsburg Chancellor, Metternich, and the forces of liberalism and nationalism unleashed by the French Revolution.

(c) 1989 The New York Times, October 29, 1989

Nationalism posed a threat to many regimes: a centrifugal threat in the case of multinational states like the Hapsburg and Ottoman empires, a centripetal one in the case of the smaller states of Italy and Germany, where each sovereign entity represented only a fraction of a nation.

Faced with these threats, rulers regularly set aside the rules of realpolitik in the interest of dynastic solidarity. Thus, in the 1848 Revolution in Europe, the Czar of Russia and the King of Prussia stood by the Hapsburgs instead of moving to exploit the Hapsburg empire's difficulties. Thus, too, a shared concern over Polish nationalism kept Prussia and Russia at peace throughout the century.

Sir Lewis Namier, the great Polish-English historian, once observed that a cardinal rule of European power politics - the rule of odd and even numbers, according to which in adjoining states No. 1 and 3 would naturally ally against No. 2 and 4 - was inoperative for much of the 19th century because of overriding and cross-cutting ideological concerns.

Those who wish to present a historical model of 'pure' nonideological realpolitik would do better to turn to the 18th century. In that long breathing space between the religious fanaticism of the previous century and nationalistic fanaticism to come, power politics assumed its most stylized, rational, gamelike character. That game often is depicted as restrained and rather exquisite. In practice, it could be rough: In the Seven Years War (1756 to 1763), Prussia lost half a million lives out of a population of six million.

But even invoking the 18th century analogy, there is a critical problem: How much difference do nuclear weapons make? In the earlier age, war was the ultima ratio regum - the last argument of kings. Clubs were always trumps, and the knowledge that they would be resorted to if all else failed clarified all minds and provided a common basis for calculation.

In the ideologically charged cold-war world, in which international politics were conceived as a life-or-death struggle, that logic continued to work. There was enough fear and hatred present for a theory of mutual deterrence, to be credible.

But will it continue to work in the multipolar, unideological system that we appear destined to experience in the near future - a system that will be more complex and volatile, less ideologically passionate and marked by further nuclear proliferation? We have no theory to cover that state of affairs. Until we do, we should be wary of all historical analogies.

TYPE: Op-ed

SUBJECT: Terms not available

8TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1989 The Washington Post

October 27, 1989, Friday, Final Edition

SECTION: EDITORIAL; PAGE A19

LENGTH: 876 words

HEADLINE: Baker on Perestroika's Promise . . .BYLINE: Charles Krauthammer*Commentators game:
Who is J.O.? AG or GB??*

BODY:

Is Mikhail Gorbachev the Soviet Union's Jimmy Carter? His conduct, which has post-Afghanistan syndrome written all over it, is strikingly reminiscent of American conduct at a similar malaise-ridden juncture in our history. Consider: Gorbachev repudiates his country's role in a losing foreign adventure, denouncing the invasion of Afghanistan as immoral and illegal. He openly admits to a whole host of national sins, the latest being the brazen Soviet violation of the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. He pledges absolute independence and hands off for countries previously under Soviet domination. He at least suspends the Brezhnev Doctrine and lets Eastern Europe go its own way (much as Carter did for our back yard, Latin America -- backing off Nicaragua, decolonizing the Panama Canal and generally retiring the Monroe Doctrine for the rest of the hemisphere). He repeatedly renounces hegemony and embraces interdependence, which recalls Sestanovich's Law (named for the noted Sovietologist) that countries that talk about interdependence -- the United States in the '70s, the Soviets today -- are invariably in decline. His domestic economy is failing, with inflation surging and living standards falling. For his labors, he is earning points abroad, while steadily losing support at home.

K! The reason that this should be a cautionary analogy is that while the Carter years were good for the U.S.S.R., which acquired an impressive Third World empire during that time. Those years were immediately followed by the Reagan reaction, which was bad for the Soviet Union. It is thus quite possible that the Gorbachev years will be followed by the Ligachev reaction -- though the betting is that if there is a Soviet counterrevolution, Gorbachev will lead it -- that will not be good for us.

The corollary is that for now Gorbachev is good for us. Secretary of State James Baker's loud and official declaration to that effect is a welcome development. We do have a large stake in the success of Gorbachev's program. True, the chances of that success are small and receding. Gorbachev's attempt to reform the Soviet economy incrementally has been likened to a country trying to switch, gradually, from driving on the left-hand side of the road to the right.

Nonetheless, even if perestroika ultimately fails, we have an interest in its mere continuation. The longer it goes on, the harder it becomes to reverse its effects. And these effects are dramatic: the rapid de-communication of Hungary and Poland, with East Germany and Czechoslovakia to follow; the arousal of nationalist feelings within the Soviet republics; and, most important, the rise of civil society as a challenge to the state throughout the Soviet Empire, a challenge that heretofore totalitarianism had specialized in crushing.

(c) 1989 The Washington Post, October 27, 1989

China shows that these expressions of popular sentiment are not irreversible. They can be put down. But the longer they go on and the more organized they become, the higher the cost of putting them down and, thus, the less the likelihood of massive repression if Moscow suffers a change of regime or Gorbachev a change of heart.

Baker is less convincing when he says that because Gorbachev may not be there forever, all the more reason for us to hurry and conclude arms control agreements with him while we can. His point is that if these agreements impose structural constraints on the Soviets -- troop withdrawals, reductions in military personnel, destruction of weapons -- even a new regime in the Kremlin could not easily reverse these changes.

True, but it could still reverse them far more easily than any American government could. (Arms agreements would impose structural changes on the United States too.) When it comes to rearmament, the White House is far more politically constrained than the Kremlin. In a soured international environment, which country would be more likely to rebuild the military, reactivate the assembly lines and return troops to Central Europe?

This is not to argue against concluding arms treaties with Gorbachev. It is only to argue against rushing into them. They have to be framed in such a way that if post-Gorbachev they are broken, as the Soviets now admit they broke the ABM Treaty, Western deterrence will not have been fatally compromised.

Those who issue such cautions are usually derided as hard-liners, closed to the marvelous new possibilities of the Gorbachevian universe. As I recall, however, not too long ago those who insisted that the Soviets unconditionally tear down their radar station at Krasnoyarsk were also denounced as hard-liners -- seeking, by stressing Soviet violations, to undermine the entire arms control enterprise. It was a group of congressional soft-liners who traveled to Krasnoyarsk, looked at the radar, and said, with wonderful sophistry, that while it might be illegal it wasn't. Why? Because "it is clearly not deployed. Thus we judge it not to be a violation of the ABM Treaty at this time."

Soft-liners are now in retreat. Indeed, they have suffered the ultimate humiliation: they are being refuted, not by Cap Weinberger but by Eduard Shevardnadze. It is Gorbachev who is telling us that the hard-liners were right all along. His authority is good enough for me.

TYPE: OPINION EDITORIAL

SUBJECT: UNITED STATES; U.S.S.R.; INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

NAMED-PERSONS: MIKHAIL GORBACHEV; JAMES BAKER III

13TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1989 The Washington Post

October 20, 1989, Friday, Final Edition

SECTION: EDITORIAL; PAGE A23

LENGTH: 781 words

HEADLINE: Grumpy At the Movies

BYLINE: Charles Krauthammer

BODY:

I'm 39 and getting out of sorts with my generation. I've developed this grumpiness at the movies, which is not a bad place to commune with my fellow baby boomers, because much of our common consciousness was shaped there. Twenty years ago, I too got off on "The Graduate," "Zabriskie Point," "Monterey Pop" and "Easy Rider." Now I go to the movies and find myself totally out of step. I feel as if I've landed on the moon.

I'm the only (male) person I know who didn't need a hanky to get through "Field of Dreams," which I found merely ridiculous. (Some time ago, I committed that judgment to print. My mail was not friendly.)

I went to "Parenthood" hoping for a good two hours of Steve Martin parodying the current preoccupation of all my contemporaries: raising kids. Instead, I got two hours of melodramatic psycho-babble relieved at rare intervals by vintage Martin shtick. Too rare. The reviewers loved it. I walked out around Act Two.

Then -- I'm getting grumpier -- there was "Dead Poets Society," a romantic self-indulgence so sentimental it made "Field of Dreams" look austere. I sit through two hours of phony setup (liberated teacher vs. repressed prep school, free spirited son vs. tyrannical father, individual vs. society -- not a cliché is missed), and when the credits come on the audience bursts into wild applause, the kind that during the revolution we used to reserve for a Hermann Hesse reading. You would have thought that what ails America in this age of Mapplethorpe and Trump, of rainbow hair and day-glow joggers is a dearth of self-expression.

I don't get it. The hero/martyr in "Dead Poets" is an aspiring actor who puts a bullet through his head rather than, as dad insists, go to Harvard Medical School. A rather unkind judgment on contemporary medical education. Having been through Harvard Medical School, I can say with confidence that it is an experience to be preferred to suicide. Even, I dare say, to life imprisonment. (Dental school, of course, is another matter.)

Now, however, having just endured Woody Allen's "Crimes and Misdemeanors," I am headed for meltdown. Theaters are packed. Critics rave. The New York Times solicits the views of no less than three theologians to plumb the picture's depths.

I am truly baffled. Yes, Allen does discover the problem of death and the problem of evil, important issues for our time that the Aspen Institute has done a marvelous job of tracking. Allen might even one day make the problem of death and evil interesting. But in "Crimes" it becomes the occasion for a cascade of

(c) 1989 The Washington Post, October 20, 1989

banalities -- of the "God sees," "Oh yeah? What about Auschwitz?" variety -- that would be an embarrassment in a late-night bull session at the freshman dorm.

Woody Allen is a clown, a brilliant clown. His tragedy is that he is an artistic transsexual: he is convinced he is Ingmar Bergman trapped in Allen Konigsberg's body. The result is a pretentiousness that is comical.

The banality extends from dialogue to stock characters to imagery. Night. Villain drives to the scene of the crime. Camera pointedly lingers on the headlight being doused. Symbol! (The central metaphor of "Crimes" being ocular: the all-seeing/non-seeing eye of God.) This is exactly the kind of heavy handedness we delighted in seeing Allen parody 20 years ago.

Croons one reviewer, "Crimes" is "about love and death, lust and murder, and attempts to reconcile religious faith in a world where it's now taken for granted that $E=mc^2$." I say, leave Einstein out of this. Allen did once make a wonderful movie about love and death. He called it "Love and Death," his last true farce before he turned serious. It was hilarious in lampooning the metaphysical cant he cannot now help reproducing.

In the '60s, young people were flattered by a culture that declared us uniquely honest, uniquely creative, uniquely "authentic," notions of which we have now, with some embarrassment, been disabused. But boomers have found narcissism hard to give up. So we have adapted it. We think ourselves the first generation to discover the pain of aging parents, of raising children, of making compromises with reality, of having to choose medicine over theater. Movies cater to this narcissism because it has become a reliable formula for success. After all, this generation constitutes a market uniquely large and uniquely flatterable. A little angst, a few laughs, a dose of heaviosity -- and you've got a hit.

Before "Crimes," a preview was shown for a new movie about fathers and sons called "Dad." It's got everything: aging grandfather, young grandson, boomer poised between the two. Just up my alley, I thought.

I thought again. Better stay home.

TYPE: OPINION EDITORIAL

SUBJECT: FILMS; MOTION PICTURE INDUSTRY

22ND STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1989 Newsweek

October 2, 1989, UNITED STATES EDITION

SECTION: THE COLUMNISTS; Meg Greenfield; Pg. 80

LENGTH: 1048 words

HEADLINE: Needed: A New Compass

BYLINE: MEG GREENFIELD

HIGHLIGHT:

We can no longer put our minds on automatic in thinking about these things. It's a damned outrage.

BODY:

These days when I open my paper I am put in mind of that old man in the cartoons who walks around with a sign saying, "Repent, the end is nigh." For the end, we are told, of practically everything is nigh: history, liberalism, ideology, the cold war. I suspect that all these entities actually have a little more life in them and that what's happening is something different. What we are confronting is the destruction of many of our premises and expectations about all of the above. Our pat arguments don't work anymore. We can no longer put our minds on automatic. It is, of course, a damned outrage, as this means we all have to start thinking again.

Nowhere is this more apparent than in our internal conflicts over foreign policy. For years it seemed enough to many people to take their foreign-policy compass reading from what the other side in the domestic argument said; whatever it was, they took the opposite stand and were confirmed in their judgment by the looniness of the forces rallied against them.

Thus, a lot of conservatives did not much credit either complexity or constructive change in communist countries. Evidence of either was dismissed as a trick or a fantasy of the liberal goo-goos, and they could continue to pursue 1951-type approaches to 1980s-style governments in Eastern Europe. This was enough for their liberal counterparts, who found in these absurd rigidities of the right-wingers justification for their own brand of non-sense -- namely, the notion that it was benighted to look upon those governments as oppressive ("mindless anticommunism" was their phrase); they habitually put the word "threat" in quotes when it followed the word "communist."

These were two groups of people so busily and happily fighting each other here at home that for a while they seemed almost not to notice when the objects of their argument abroad managed to mortally undermine both their positions. For only the most paranoid and dimwitted of right-wing observers would any longer deny the reality of enormous change for the better in large parts of the communist world. And only the lunatic left could refuse to see in the reforms and uprisings and remarkable confessions, exposes and commentary coming from the East evidence that the repression has been much more onerous and diabolical than liberal discourse often implied.

If only the changes in the Soviet-bloc world had been clean, clear and totally transforming it would have been easy, but they have not been. We are

(c) 1989 Newsweek, October 2, 1989

faced with an uneven, uncertain and only partially changed situation, one that could, at least in some measure, revert to the old status quo. Therefore across the whole American political spectrum those who would participate in the policy response have been forced to think, to weigh, to choose.

What do we want, anyway, from and for the communist countries? What was and is the nature of their threat to us? Does the definition of our interest begin and end with protecting ourselves against aggression? Or does it also include attempting to preserve and actually extended democratic values? Do we give a hoot what kind of domestic political lives other countries laid? If Third World disputes were not overlaid with East-West meaning, would we care how they came out? Would we be concerned only as our economic interests were affected? Outside the cold-war context, does any of the currently burgeoning ethnic mayhem around the world matter to us, warfare between peoples with exotic names who have been trying to annihilate each other for centuries and whom most of us probably never even heard of until the 6 o'clock news tonight?

Many questions: All of these questions are being wrangled in the current political debate over what to do about Eastern Europe. There are ironies and oversimplifications. The self-evident truth that the Soviet military is exceedingly strong and still being stoked by the Gorbachev leadership is invoked as a way of answering more questions than it actually does. To point to their military might and continuing military ambitions answers the question as to whether this country needs to maintain its own military strength, but it does not tell you how to capitalize on the genuine political changes that are occurring in the Soviet Union. To say that Poland and Hungary, now at the cutting edge of democratic reform, could yet revert to the old dispensation does not tell you what steps we should take to try to encourage them the other way. And to say simply "more money, more money" for the countries struggling to shed their repressive systems does not really address the tougher issues of whether their reforms are solid enough to justify the investment and whether a huge injection of money might not in effect harm reform by enabling the recipients to avoid the painful steps they must take to restructure their economies. These, in other words, are no yes-no, black-white, am too-are not questions. They are questions of proportion and degree and as such require through, calculation, trade-off.

But there is an even more taxing order of questions that have arisen in the wake of the change in Eastern Europe than those concerned with policy and program responses to what is going on. These are the big, blowzy but critical questions of our basic purpose. They have always lurked, unresolved, in our acrimonious debates about human rights, authoritarians versus totalitarians, whose dictators -- those of the left or the right -- are worse, and what if any our interest may be in the various places in which we intervene around the world. Some on the same side of the debate over intervention were always arguing from different values -- American strategic interest, for instance, and American missionary democracy. Are we out there to do good or merely to do in anyone who threatens our well-being?

Charles Krauthammer has wisely written about the way these arguments are playing out within the American conservative complex. The conservatives aren't the only ones affected. The cold war may or may not be over. What is clearly over is the intellectually easy cold-war period in which there seemed to be only two sides in the world and only two ways of thinking about their relationship here at home.

24TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1989 The Washington Post

September 28, 1989, Thursday, Final Edition

SECTION: EDITORIAL; PAGE A31

LENGTH: 888 words

HEADLINE: Stealing From The Future

BYLINE: Charles Krauthammer

BODY:

Budget czar Richard Darman has been waxing eloquent lately on the subject of "now-now-ism." Now-now-ism, explains Darman, is a "shorthand label for our collective shortsightedness, our obsession with the here and now, our reluctance adequately to address the future." It afflicts not just business and culture, argues Darman, but government too. The result? We are "engaged in a massive backward Robin Hood transaction -- robbing the future to give to the present."

Darman is, as usual, right. But the administration for which he is the chief economic thinker is offering the American people what may be the most egregious now-now budget trick of the decade: the two-year capital gains tax cut. The administration, to be fair, wants a permanent cut, but in its uncompromising pursuit of compromise, is foursquare behind a compromise plan that would cut capital gains taxes to 19.6 percent through 1991, then, in 1992, return them to 28 percent, with gains now indexed to inflation.

A two-year capital gains cut is nothing more than a quick-buck device to raise cash for the Treasury. Everyone agrees that during these two years the Treasury will take in a few billion more dollars in taxes, as people prematurely sell stock and bonds and real estate in order to benefit from the temporarily lower rate. And what happens after those two years? Tax revenues will, of course, decline. Since so many capital gains will have been prematurely cashed in, they won't be around in the 1990s to provide tax revenues. As Robert S. McIntyre wrote in *The New Republic*, "It is exactly like offering people 30 percent off next year's taxes, provided they pay in advance, then claiming you've found a great new revenue source."

It is hard to imagine a purer example of stealing from the future to pay for the present. The purpose of the quick fix is to reach, artificially, the Gramm-Rudman deficit targets for 1990 and 1991 without having to do anything real, such as cutting spending or raising taxes.

Democrats have turned the issue into an us/them, rich/poor class war. The rich do benefit vastly more from a capital gains tax cut than everyone else. But if, as the capital gains fundamentalists claim, this tax cut would increase savings and productivity, it would certainly be worth it. If while lifting all boats a few yachts get lifted too, so what?

The problem with the fundamentalists' claim is that it does not hold up. It is contradicted by a 1985 Congressional Budget Office study of the last round of capital gains cuts. And by Herbert Stein, former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under presidents Nixon and Ford, who says flatly that we don't know whether such a cut will increase savings. The question is simply

(c) 1989 The Washington Post, September 28, 1989

unanswered.

Moreover, says Stein, the claim that cutting capital gains will stimulate "risk-taking" investment is an odd one. Why, after all, should government substitute for the market in telling investors what kind of risks to run? "What's so great about risk taking, after all?" he asks. "A good tax system would neither prefer nor penalize risk taking." If you believe in the market, let the market decide.

The best tax code is one that is neutral, that best imitates a world in which there were no taxes at all. It allows the investor to make his decision based on market factors, rather than on Washington's political preferences. By artificially lowering the tax on one kind of income, the investors' decision-making is skewed. And, if you believe in a free market, the more skewed are investors' decisions, the more inefficient is the market, the worse off everyone is in the long run.

We all know what will happen with the capital gains loophole. The only industry it is sure to rebuild is the tax-shelter industry. The cut invites economically pointless schemes, like investing in see-through office towers, for turning present income (high tax) into capital gains (low tax).

A preferential tax on one kind of income corrupts the free market. But it is even more corrupting to the political system. It opens the door to the kinds of special interest tax advantages that were largely swept away by the tax reform of 1986. The current capital gains tax proposal, for example, will treat all sales of timber as capital gains. Timber -- but not, say, medicines or motor scooters. Why is the sale of timber a capital gain and thus a preferentially treated transaction? Because Congress says so. And why does Congress say so? Because the key congressmen needed to get the capital gains cut passed are timber-state Democrats (mostly from the South).

The capital gains tax cut is but an opening wedge. It invites corruption and inefficiencies in future tax writing that will only get worse. That is because the general good -- lower rates for everyone and no loopholes for special interests -- is no match for the determined efforts of well-funded special interests to promote their own good.

The principle that underlay the tax reform of 1986 was that the best tax code is that which gets the government off the backs of the people and out of the minds of investors. Once that principle is undermined, there is no stopping the loophole writers. The capital gains plan will kill tax reform. Free marketeers, as Republicans claim to be, should be stopping the crime, not abetting it.

TYPE: OPINION EDITORIAL

SUBJECT: BUDGET; TAX SYSTEM; TAX LAWS

26TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1989 The Washington Post

September 22, 1989, Friday, Final Edition

SECTION: EDITORIAL; PAGE A27

LENGTH: 879 words

HEADLINE: The Conservative Crackup

BYLINE: Charles Krauthammer

BODY:

The conservative crackup is near. It has never been easy keeping all the strains of conservatism under one roof: the libertarians and the cultural conservatives, the prewar isolationists and the postwar interventionists, the paleoconservatives (conservative since birth) and the neoconservatives (conservative since Vietnam, roughly).

What kept these unlikely comrades under the same tent was "The Enemy." Anticommunism has been the cement of the conservative alliance for 40 years. As communism unravels, so does its anti, and with it, as night follows day, the conservative alliance.

On foreign policy, the splitting of the conservative coalition is at hand. Neoconservatives generally contend that if the decline of the Soviet empire renders anticommunism obsolete, the new motif of American foreign policy should be the promotion of democracy: with such institutions as the National Endowment for Democracy, the United States should actively work around the world, from Poland to Chile, to foster democratic structures and institutions.

Paleoconservatives are skeptical of this new democratic universalism. They generally want the country to return to a more traditional and narrow pursuit of American national interest. What makes them particularly sore is that during the reign of that paleo hero, Ronald Reagan, the neos carried the debate. It was during the Reagan years that American foreign policy shifted gradually from anticommunism to pro-democracy. It was the Reagan administration that helped banish Ferdinand Marcos, tried to undercut Gen. Augusto Pinochet of Chile and pushed for land reform in El Salvador. It was Reagan who created that paleo nemesis, the National Endowment for Democracy.

Some months ago, columnist Ben Wattenberg gave a spirited and unapologetic exposition of the neo view. This week, having let the fuse burn long enough, Pat Buchanan delivered the paleo response, one of the loudest cannon shots in the brewing conservative civil war. It can only be called amazing.

In his column, Buchanan has nothing but contempt for democracy abroad (though he apparently still approves of it at home). He has the warmest recollection of those friendly dictators on whom we could count. Democratic Sweden traded with North Vietnam, he notes, while dictatorial South Korea and the Philippines fought beside us. (He conveniently omits the fact that so did democratic Australia. Nor does he recall, for example, that it was our friend the shah of Iran who led a cabal of other dictators in engineering the oil shocks of the '70s that nearly brought America to its knees.)

(c) 1989 The Washington Post, September 22, 1989

His affection for authoritarianism extends from Franco, Marcos and Pinochet to Napoleon and Louis XVI -- all the way, in fact, to South Africa, which Buchanan quaintly insists on calling "The Boer Republic," as if the Afrikaaner is still feistily fighting European imperialism.

Which brings us to the transition from the merely amusing to the truly amazing. Not content to ask what the "democracies" (his quote marks) have done for us lately, he finally declares for unreconstructed isolationism: "When this Cold War is over, America should come home."

Isolationism has deep roots and great power as an American idea. To be fair, it even has its geopolitical logic: America is a continental island without an obvious need for involvement in the world. It was predictable, therefore, that isolationism would enjoy a resurgence with the waning of the Cold War. Nevertheless, it is hard to believe that it should reemerge so soon and so unrepentantly. Prewar isolationists, after all, did their best to keep us not only out of but also unprepared for World War II.

Buchanan's anticipatory isolationism is important not for what it tells us about the thinking of one columnist but for what it tells us about the thinking of a significant element of the conservative coalition. Those who think that Arthur Vandenberg's postwar conversion of the Republican Party to internationalism is permanent should think again.

And those who think that postwar ideological lines dividing left and right in America are permanent should think again too. Buchanan's isolationism is expressed in language that consciously echoes George McGovern's 1972 campaign slogan, "Come Home, America." It points to the odd and fascinating new coalitions we can expect in a post-Cold War world.

Four years ago I wrote an article called "Isolationism, Left and Right." Liberal isolationism has, since Vietnam, been quite undisguised. At the time, however, discerning the isolationist tendencies of conservatives required some reading between the lines. Buchanan -- subtlety is not his specialty -- has now made such interpretative work obsolete. He is out of the closet. Others are sure to follow.

In some respects we may be headed back to the 1930s, when left and right isolationists made common cause. Liberal isolationism will soon be joined by a strain of conservative isolationism that has been in embarrassed hibernation since Pearl Harbor.

I don't quite expect to see Buchanan and McGovern, arms linked, leading an "America First" parade on the 4th of July. But let the Soviet empire spin off a few more provinces, and who knows? After all, G. Gordon Liddy and Timothy Leary toured together.

GRAPHIC: ILLUSTRATION, CONRAD FOR THE LOS ANGELES TIMES

TYPE: OPINION EDITORIAL

SUBJECT: CONSERVATIVES; INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

17TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1989 The Washington Post

October 13, 1989, Friday, Final Edition

SECTION: EDITORIAL; PAGE A19

LENGTH: 889 words

HEADLINE: Holding On To Brezhnev's Empire

BYLINE: Charles Krauthammer

BODY:

The Soviet Empire is collapsing in the most paradoxical way: the inner empire is rapidly falling apart, while the external empire is managing to hold together. That's not the way things are supposed to happen. That certainly is not the way it had been predicted, say, a year ago when it seemed that the Soviets were being pushed out of their newer colonies of Afghanistan, Cambodia, Angola and Ethiopia.

The collapse of the East European inner empire is proceeding at an astonishing pace. Poland is actively decommunizing under Solidarity. (Though Solidarity may have rushed history a bit by agreeing to act as bill collector for 40 years of Communist misrule.) And Hungary's Communists have molted into what they say is a traditional, albeit left-wing, social democratic party.

East Germany, however, presents the Soviets with the most insoluble imperial dilemma. Hungary or Poland can exist without communism. East Germany cannot. It is not a country but a creation. It exists solely so that one group of Germans may experience the joys of a workers' state. Take that away, and the state ceases to have a reason for existence. Which is why reform in East Germany is almost a contradiction of terms. Perestroika will not solve East Germany's problems. It will make them terminal.

We are speaking here, of course, just of Warsaw Pact allies. Gorbachev has to worry even more about the centrifugal forces at work in Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Georgia, the Ukraine and the Soviet Moslem republics.

Which makes for the oddity: while the Soviet inner empire, the crown jewel of its postwar conquests, spins out of control, the external Third World empire remains intact:

Afghanistan. The puppet government of Najibullah (like Cher and Charlemagne, he goes by one name) has survived far longer than anyone thought possible when Soviet soldiers pulled out in February.

Cambodia. As Vietnam withdraws, its puppet (Hun Sen) is gathering grudging support, even in the West, as perhaps the only realistic alternative to Pol Pot and the Khmer Rouge.

Angola. Jonas Savimbi, trying to topple the Soviet client regime, is on the defensive and having increasing difficulty getting supplies.

(c) 1989 The Washington Post, October 13, 1989

Nicaragua. The contras get ready to test Miami's housing market. The Sandinista regime is as secure as at any time in its 10-year history.

Ethiopia. This may be the exception. Mengistu's regime is retreating in the face of advances by Tigray and Eritrean secessionists. But even this would not be quite the loss it seems, because both the Tigrayans and the Eritreans are led by Communists.

What is going on? It is not an accident, comrade, that Gorbachev is holding on to these colonies. Contrary to expectations, he did not write them off when he began withdrawing Soviet (and proxy Cuban and Vietnamese) troops and calling for negotiation rather than confrontation. He is instead trying to do what Nixon tried to do in South Vietnam: sustain, with huge amounts of aid, a client regime after the metropolitan support troops have gone home. The U.S. Congress cut short that experiment in proxy power in 1975. The Soviet parliament is unlikely to follow suit.

The size of Gorbachev's continued investment in the colonies is breathtaking. Afghanistan is getting a quarter of a billion dollars a month in military supplies from a Soviet economy that is self-advertised as bankrupt. Cambodian aid has apparently doubled in the last year to about half a billion dollars a year. Aid to Angola holds steady at a cool \$ 1 billion a year. And the Sandinistas are getting their usual half a billion, albeit, now in the age of perestroika, laundered through Eastern Europe and Cuba.

Which raises the question: Why, at a time when soap, salt and sugar are rationed even in Moscow, is Gorbachev investing at least \$ 5 billion a year to maintain Brezhnev's empire?

Because empires, even those cobbled together absent-mindedly, do not voluntarily dissolve themselves. As they shed their ideology, the Soviets are reverting to the natural condition of a great power: trying to maintain power where they have it and extend it where they don't. To assume otherwise is to assume that they have not only overthrown Communist ideology but reversed human nature. Great powers do not voluntarily abjure power. Small countries, like Canada or Finland, living in the protective shadow of great powers, sometimes do. But great powers, unless utterly defeated in war, like Germany and Japan, do not.

About Eastern Europe, Gorbachev can do little. The growth of civil society has reached the point at which its challenge to the Soviet-imposed state cannot be resisted. Gorbachev has few tools to arrest the dissolution of the inner empire. Accordingly, his strategy is to finesse the crisis by trying to Finlandize states that he can no longer control.

In the external empire, on the other hand, the anticolonial battle is more primitive: tanks and guns can still decide the issue. And tanks and guns are a Soviet specialty. Gorbachev will use them to try to hang on to what he can.

Gorbachev is not a decolonizer. He is a realist. He will decolonize only where he must. The external empire can still be held together militarily. The internal empire cannot. Where he still retains the means to resist, he shows every willingness of doing so.

7TH STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1989 The Washington Post

November 25, 1989, Saturday, Final Edition

SECTION: FIRST SECTION; PAGE A1

LENGTH: 1436 words

HEADLINE: Dubcek Returns;
'Prague Spring' Reformer Cheered in Wenceslas Square;
Prague Ousts Leaders, Offers Opponents a Role

BYLINE: David Remnick, Marc Fisher, Washington Post Foreign Service

DATELINE: PRAGUE, Nov. 24, 1989

BODY:

Alexander Dubcek, Czechoslovakia's symbol of change, returned tonight for the first time to Wenceslas Square, where 21 years ago Soviet tanks crushed the "Prague Spring" reform movement that he led. This time Dubcek drank champagne.

Dubcek, after a triumphant speech to 300,000 people jammed into the square, appeared at a press conference at the Magic Lantern Theater together with playwright and reform leader Vaclav Havel. As Dubcek spoke, Havel's brother suddenly ran in from the wings and whispered the news of the fall of the entire Communist Party leadership.

Havel threw his arms into the air. Dubcek, unaware, kept talking. Seconds later, Havel passed the word to Dubcek, and for the first time all evening, Dubcek's face broke into a broad smile. His expression immediately announced the news to the rest of the room.

Suddenly, glasses and champagne appeared. Havel hugged Dubcek, then stood up to give the victory toast: "Long live free Czechoslovakia!" Dubcek, vindicated after 20 years of political humiliation, downed his champagne in one long gulp.

What now? a reporter asked. Flustered, Dubcek paused. "I really don't know," he said. "Let developments take their course, and perhaps tomorrow we will be wiser."

By now the news had spread throughout Prague. Champagne corks popped. Taxi drivers led a manic procession through Wenceslas Square, honking their horns. A man carried a victory cake to the center of the celebration. All around, people were lighting firecrackers and sparklers.

A single trumpeter, like the leader of a New Orleans jazz funeral, led a few hundred people up the promenade. Their fingers forming the victory symbol, they softly sang the national anthem. Four soldiers in uniform ran laughing through the square, waving a red, white and blue Czechoslovak flag given to them by celebrating citizens.

"I have no illusions about the gentlemen who will replace those who will resign," Havel said. "But as long as these people do not return to the party leadership, then the door will remain open. All of society will rush through this door to create a democratic Czechoslovakia."

(c) 1989 The Washington Post, November 25, 1989

Havel and Dubcek, along with student leaders, promised that a two-hour general strike set for midday Monday will take place as scheduled. The strike is intended, Havel said, as a show of popular participation in the country's political future.

Dubcek, who has spent recent years in obscurity as a low-level bureaucrat working for the Forestry Ministry in Bratislava, said any question of his return to power was a "very complicated issue. My role is to stay low-key and keep my feet firmly on the ground."

He endorsed the general demands of the reformers, calling for the Communist Party to relinquish its constitutionally guaranteed "leading role" in the government. "I am outside political parties now," Dubcek said.

Although Dubcek and Havel shared the platform and toasted one another on their victory, their approaches to reform are not precisely in sync. Both call themselves socialists, but while Dubcek speaks in Gorbachevian terms of a broad renewal of socialism, Havel embraces a mixed economy that would include limited private enterprises.

Theories of the nation's future, however, were secondary this afternoon, when Dubcek, after two decades of enforced silence, stepped through a door and onto a small balcony of the Socialist Party newspaper, the Free Word, overlooking Wenceslas Square.

Below him a sea of people campaigning for democracy in Czechoslovakia erupted, cheering and chanting "Long live Dubcek!" and "Bring him back to power!" News of the government's mass resignation would not come for another few hours.

Dubcek waited for the roaring to subside, and said, "Twenty years ago, we tried to reform socialism, to make it better. In those days, the army and the police stood with the people, and I am sure it will be the same again today."

All day long, students had roamed the city spreading the word of Dubcek's homecoming. Handbills and banners covered store windows, the sides of streetcars and the doors of government buildings. Businesses shut down. Flag-waving crowds moved into the square and waited, chanting and dangling keyrings and bells to signify the final hour of control by the government headed by Jakes.

The crowd roared for the captain of the national Sparta soccer team and for a folk singer, who led a song about "the lies" of the government. But it was the arrival of Dubcek that triggered the most extraordinary explosion of chants, shouts and cheers.

"Dubcek! Dubcek! Bring him back to the palace!" Old men embraced. Teenagers climbed trees for a better view.

Dubcek spoke in a strained voice, exhorting the people to fight on, but cautioning them to resist "the tendency toward confrontation. Our culture should be evident in all our deeds and passed on to the younger generation."

Dubcek said the present political movement "dates back to the invasion in 1968. This is our terrible legacy, what was called 'normalization.'" He demanded the ouster of all Communist Party leaders tied to the Soviet invasion

(c) 1989 The Washington Post, November 25, 1989

-- a demand that would be fulfilled just a few hours later.

Throughout the afternoon the crowd added to its arsenal of chants: "We have had enough!" they cried. "Jakes's head will fall!" "State TV lies!" and "Europe, we are coming!"

One of the most dramatic moments of the afternoon came when Marta Kubisova, a singer who had been banned from the stage 21 years ago for performing songs directed against the Communist Party, stepped out onto the balcony and delivered a haunting rendition of "A Prayer." The song tells the story of a 17th-century Bohemian hero who fought for the liberation of his people only to find himself cast into exile.

The crowd begged for another song, asking Kubisova to sing the national anthem. Instead, she announced that Roman Catholic Cardinal Frantisek Tomasek would allow her to sing the anthem, called "Where Is My Home," at a mass Saturday morning.

Vera Caslavsa, a gymnast who gave her three gold medals from the 1968 Mexico City Olympic Games to the Dubcek government, told the crowd that the road to political democracy was like the long course of a "marathon runner. We are still in the middle of the race."

After the rally, the demonstrators marched across the Vltava River to the Communist Party headquarters to wait for the outcome of the meeting there. One of the first hints that historic change was in the making came when state television showed for the first time footage of the police beating demonstrators with riot sticks last Friday night. Until now, state censors had prohibited broadcasters and state-run newspapers from describing the bloodshed.

Other crowds gathered in front of stores to watch television coverage of the party Central Committee meeting. Despite a police occupation of the state television center, its staff met and decided they would broadcast all the news they could, a radical break with the practice of decades.

Support for the students' strike and demonstrations spread throughout the country's cultural bureaucracy, shutting down all museums, libraries and theaters. For at least a week, the entire city focused almost solely on Czechoslovakia's political fate.

Havel described the reform movement, which coalesced into a single Civic Forum umbrella group only five days ago, as one of inexperienced amateurs. "Everybody here, with the exception of Mr. Dubcek, is an amateur politician," Havel said. "However, that does not mean that tomorrow we will not be ready to deal with the business of government in a highly competent manner."

The students of Charles University and other institutions had led the massive organizational effort to stage daily street demonstrations and inform a populace left largely in the dark by the state-run media. Thanking them, Havel said, "After 20 years, the students have returned time and history to this country."

Students had gathered early this morning as usual to photocopy pictures of the demonstrations, petitions and news accounts of the protests, taking them to factories, shops and state offices, posting them on street corners and bulletin boards. The participation of hundreds of factories in both the demonstrations

(c) 1989 The Washington Post, November 25, 1989

and the upcoming strike has been instrumental in the extraordinary growth of the democracy movement here.

Late this evening, Jiri Hajek, who served as foreign minister in Dubcek's government two decades ago, welcomed the demise of a leadership that had been installed by Leonid Brezhnev and the Soviet Union. "All I can say is I'm sorry it took so long," Hajek said.

GRAPHIC: PHOTO, FRIDAY'S EVENTS IN EASTERN EUROPE, AP; ILLUSTRATION, TWP

TYPE: FOREIGN NEWS

SUBJECT: CZECHOSLOVAKIA; DEMONSTRATIONS; FOREIGN HEADS OF STATE; TIME / HISTORY;
FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

NAMED-PERSONS: ALEXANDER DUBCEK; VACLAV HAVEL

2ND STORY of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Copyright (c) 1989 The Washington Post

December 5, 1989, Tuesday, Final Edition

SECTION: STYLE; PAGE C1

LENGTH: 1844 words

HEADLINE: In Prague, a Second Breath of Spring;
Opposition Publications and the Arts Pick Up Where They Left Off in 1968

SERIES: Occasional

BYLINE: Mary Battiata, Washington Post Foreign Service

DATELINE: PRAGUE

BODY:

Day 17 of the Czechoslovak revolution.

In a downtown art gallery, intense young women crank illegal mimeograph machines; men with headbands rush up and down the stairs, staggering under arm loads of political pamphlets. Outside, the sidewalks are filled once again with people on the way to the demonstration. There are kids in army surplus jackets and middle-aged men in ponytails. People flash the Victory sign as they cross in front of traffic; the drivers flash them back.

"The Soviet invasion froze everything," says Vladislav Mertel, a folk singer, in his forties. "We were not allowed to age, or gain experience, so we have never lost our idealism. We are all 20 years younger than our physical selves.

"It's true; the '60s never ended here; in fact, they are just beginning."

To Wenceslas Square, then, where people strum guitars, candles burn all night, and there are flowers everywhere.

"Candles and national heroes. It's like Latin America!" says Jachym Topol, the 27-year-old poet and editor and co-founder of the audacious Revolver Revue.

In the two weeks since a quarter-million people came to Wenceslas Square to demand democracy, the enormous, brooding statue of mail-draped St. Wenceslas on his horse has become a kind of mystic national shrine.

By day, it draws students, artists, dissidents and ordinary citizens who have come together under the banner of Civic Forum, the mass democratic movement led by the playwright and dissident Vaclav Havel.

Late at night, the setting becomes more surreal. There are deranged people, drunks and old prostitutes, kneeling and praying before pictures of Alexander Dubcek, the leader who was ousted in the 1968 Soviet invasion. Hundreds of colored candles flicker in the dark in memory of the students beaten by police on Nov. 17.

"I will have to write about this," says Topol.

(c) 1989 The Washington Post, December 5, 1989

Under Topol, Revolver Revue has become the liveliest and most sophisticated opposition publication. For five years, under police harassment and threat of imprisonment, Topol and his co-editor published scores of banned Czechoslovak and foreign authors, as well as political commentary so biting it was rejected by the leading opposition magazine.

Last February's Revolver, for example, featured Czech novelist Ludwik Vaculik declaring that "communism has violence in its philosophical genes," and, in a deliberate swipe at the small-town roots of the Czechoslovak hard-line Communist leadership, that "when that violence is crossed with the genes of village stupidity, a red flower blooms."

"It may not seem like much now," Topol says. "But believe, me, it was brave then."

Since the revolution began, however, playwrights have become politicians, university students have become detectives, coal miners have become orators and poets have become pamphleteers.

So Topol and a dozen stalwarts have moved into a second-story art gallery on Vodickova Street, near Wenceslas Square, where they run the Independent Information Service, a clearinghouse for news from the streets and the newly accessible halls of government.

They've produced 100,000 leaflets a day, and 30,000 newsletters. The office, in a frescoed atelier, has become a mecca for the unsung heroes of the Czechoslovak uprising.

The office attracts a varied crowd: depressed factory workers hoping to talk anti-communist tactics, sombrero-topped Slovakian Gypsies offering their fund-raising services, pink-cheeked septuagenarians bearing reams of paper and jars of tomato preserves.

And there is "Scarface," the intense young fellow who showed up a few days ago and now sometimes guards the wrought-iron gate down on the street. An orphan, and a veteran of a four-year hitch in Afghanistan, he came telling tales about two special military schools run by the state, where orphans allegedly are turned into trained assassins.

"We're making a kind of record, a list of what people are thinking in these days," Topol says.

"If someone comes from a little village in Slovakia, it's not possible for him to talk to the big bosses" of the Civic Forum movement, Topol explains. "If someone needs to talk, we talk. We really need a psychologist for these people. It's a shock for them to be in Prague."

And for Topol, as well.

"Every morning I have to go on the street, and until the moment I see the first leaflet, the first poster, I still don't believe this has all happened -- 'So this is the end of communism! It was not a dream!'"

"We Don't Act, We Discuss," read the sign on the Balustrade Theater door on Saturday night.

(c) 1989 The Washington Post, December 5, 1989

It is a testament to the singular nature of this revolution that its story can be told in a tour of the Prague theater district.

There is the Realist Theater, where the actors first tested the regime's mettle by staging a Havel play more than two months ago. It is also where the actors voted to strike, following the brutal police beating of peaceful student demonstrators on Nov. 17.

There is the Cinoherny Klub, where Havel and several other dissidents, students and artists met two nights later to form Civic Forum. And the Magic Lantern, the oldest, most celebrated pantomime theater in Europe, where Civic Forum set up temporary offices and has held chaotic press conferences ever since.

Officially, the theaters have been on strike every night for the past two weeks, but unofficially they've been open for political discussions. Attending one is a little like watching a Phil Donahue show, only one moderated by the nation's most thoughtful and elegant stage and screen stars.

The actors sit on stage, the audiences overflow the balconies. The nation has been muzzled for 20 years, one actress explains, and now nobody can stop talking.

At the Realist Theater, Mertel, the folk singer, took the stage. "I am speaking in the name of the cowards," Mertel said. "I have never signed anything," Mertel went on, referring to the human rights declaration, Charter 77.

"You remember how in earlier times people always said, 'I can't demonstrate, because I have children who want to study at the university.' It's different today. Today we must demonstrate because we have children at the university.

"Now we are coming forward. You cowards in our midst, don't lose hope. We are in the majority."

Last week, the actors at the Realist rigged up a loudspeaker phone, and then telephoned the state artist who designed the new 100-crown note (worth about \$ 10). The new bill has a picture of Klement Gottwald, the communist who with the help of Soviet troops, took over Czechoslovakia in 1948. Almost as soon as the note appeared this year, people began defacing it. The most popular gesture was to ink a small, Hitler mustache on Gottwald's upper lip.

"Why did you put this communist murderer on our money?" the theatergoers demanded.

"I didn't make the decision!" the artist kept saying. "I just designed it."

The state put Topol in a mental hospital for three months when he refused to join the army. He was lucky. In the office of the Independent News Service there are people who served years in jail for similar offenses.

But now the years of living dangerously appear to be waning. Under pressure of Civic Forum, the Czechoslovak Communist Party is slowly, reluctantly, beginning to surrender power. Free elections may be held by next summer. The newspapers are freer every day. Television broadcasts live from the Square.

(c) 1989 The Washington Post, December 5, 1989

Topol has gone from being mad, bad and dangerous to know, to trying to figure out how to pay copyrights.

"All our lives we have been living up against the wall. Now, if that wall is disappearing, I don't know what we will do," says Topol. He rolls his mordant blue eyes, pushes back a lock of green-gold hair and gives into the temptation for a joke. "I guess I will have to go to Romania."

In the next year or two, as it already has in Poland, the center of Czechoslovak political life will shift from book-lined dissidents' apartments to government buildings. The moral certainties of being in opposition will be replaced, if all goes well, by the complexities of political pluralism.

Already, the print world is exploding. Czechoslovak writers met over the weekend and formed an independent writers union. Novelist Ivan Klima, banned for years, reckons that he will bring out all of his titles in the next two years. The leading opposition paper, Lidove Noviny, long banned, has already been granted office space and equipment, and soon will become the first independent daily here.

It's a little intimidating for a 27-year-old, no matter how bold.

"We have been making Revolver Revue like pirates," Topol says, smiling wryly. "If we wanted to publish Sam Shepard, we published him. Now, if we are legal, we will have to pay. Where will we find the money for that?"

In his audacity, most likely.

Topol is the baby in a small army of a few thousand dissidents who have spent most of their adult lives openly resisting the Czechoslovak Communist Party. He is closer in age to newly radicalized university students than longtime opposition leaders like Havel (who is a friend of Topol's family).

As members readily admit, the venerable Czechoslovak opposition is a kind of establishment now. Topol's sensibility is more ironic, more modern and much needed. He is a Talking Head to their Jefferson Airplane.

"Jachym is the poet of the 1990s. I'm still a romantic poet of the 19th century," says songwriter Mertel. "There's a gap between us of not 10 years, but a whole century."

The title of Topol's last collection of poems, "I Love You to Madness," was meant to tweak the Czechoslovak romantic poets who devote their poetry to tragic, impossible love. One of his poems was about what it feels like to write a love letter and seal it with a postage stamp that portrays a "mass murderer." (Gottwald again.)

Revolver Revue has published memoirs of World War II Czechoslovak anti-communist partisans too, and cheered on the publication at a sister publication of an expose' on Communist Party treatment of workers entitled "How to Kill a Miner."

The Revue has also published the gritty American poet Charles Bukowski, and erotica by Henry Miller and other writing that the older, more established dissident publications consider obscene.

(c) 1989 The Washington Post, December 5, 1989

That is where Topol expects to find his niche, if he can find a benefactor to keep Revolver and the Independent News Service going once the revolution is over and the striking university students who now crank the mimeograph machine have gone back to class.

"We will be critical, and we will be controversial," says Topol.

He's got an entire issue of articles very critical of Civic Forum. He wants to publish Celine, who hasn't seen print here since the '30s.

And he's planning to publish a Czech American named Jan Novak. "He's written three very good novels," says Topol. "But some people from the opposition establishment told us they think it's pornography.

"The novels are brutal and full of sex. They are 'vulgar.'

"But I don't care," Topol says, grinning. "I will publish him because he is a good writer."

GRAPHIC: PHOTO, CZECHOSLOVAK PUBLISHER JACHYM TOPOL IN THE OFFICES OF HIS MAGAZINE. CAROL GUZY; PHOTO, REUTER

TYPE: FOREIGN NEWS

SUBJECT: CZECHOSLOVAKIA; DEMONSTRATIONS; POLITICS; FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

1ST DOCUMENT of Level 1 printed in FULL format.

Public Papers of the Presidents

Remarks and a Question-and-Answer Session at a White House
Briefing for Members of the Board of Directors of the
National Newspaper Association

25 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 423

March 15, 1990

LENGTH: 3541 words

The President. Actually, I just came from a St. Patrick's Day lunch put on by Speaker Foley up in the Capitol. Very good hands-across-the aisle kind of thing.

Well, welcome. We call this the White House complex. That's not the "beltway syndrome," but this is the White House complex. And you don't have to show any ID to get out of the place, so, I'll put you at ease. I know it's been a pain coming in.

But I'm just delighted you all were here. I hope you've benefited from some of the briefings you've had here. And I'm delighted to see you all. We'll go to the questions, but I want to underscore some of the same points that I tried to make this morning to the National Association of Manufacturers annual Washington meeting about the economy.

The fact is that the economy remains sound and steady. The facts are these: The gross national product, up; the exports, up; personal income, up. Take a look, then, at the trade deficit; it's down. The Federal deficit -- I'm not happy with it, but down. And the prime rate -- far better than it was several years ago. And of course, unemployment is down. Last year's rate was the lowest in the past 16 years.

So, that is good news, but there's a great deal that we have to do to keep this expansion going. The economy at this moment isn't as robust as I'd like to see it; but we've got, basically, I think, a sound economy. Now, we've got to do certain things. We've got to create incentive for investment. And I get hit in the political arena on my concept of cutting the capital gains tax, or reestablishing what we call a capital gains differential, some calling that a tax that favors the rich. I think it favors jobs. And I cited some statistics today that Japan taxes capital gains at 5 percent; Korea, Germany, Hong Kong, Taiwan tax capital gain at 0.

Now, you should be saying, What are you doing to help us be more competitive around the world? And the capital gains -- one of the reasons I favored it is, is I do think it will help us be much more competitive around the world. I'm also proposing to the Congress incentives to encourage research and development, so that'll keep us competitive.

Of course the most crucial investment is in the field of education. We know that we can't remain competitive or remain a world-class economy without first-class schools. So, we got together with the Governors and adopted national goals, not trying to tell the local schools what kind of curriculum to have but goals that all the Governors agreed with, and now try to go forward

25 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 423

and try to meet those goals, such as Head Start and a literate America and then passing certain standards as the kids go from 4th-grade and 8th-grade and 12th-grade level.

And so, we've got sound goals. And if these work and if we're successful, not only in the tax end but in the education goals, then we're going to have not a "peace dividend" but a "growth dividend" and a return on our investment in expanded opportunity, more jobs, and a higher standard of living for Americans.

I made that point this morning, and I will continue to make the point that we need to do certain things to stimulate investment and savings. And that, I think, will help us become very competitive. I've had some fascinating meetings in the last couple of weeks with, first, the Japanese Prime Minister and then just a few days ago with Takeshita, former Prime Minister and very much of a power in Japan. And I did my level best to impress on these very important leaders, these friends of the United States, the need for us to have more access to their markets. So, we'll see where we end up.

But no further ado, who wants to go -- yes, sir?

Soviet Political Developments

Q. I'm Jerry Moriarity [Pine-Palm Publishing], from Minnesota and Arizona. I'd like to ask you, with all the power that's gravitating into the hands of Gorbachev while the Soviet world is collapsing about him, do you see any danger of a dictatorship evolving?

The President. No, because I think there's much less danger today given what they've done in their Parliament, or in their congressional side of things. They've come out of the totalitarianism of the past. They give the new President great power, but I don't see it as a threat, and I certainly don't see it as a threat at this juncture in history.

You know, I shifted our support from going more like this: "We support reform and perestroika," to "We support perestroika and reform, and we want to see Gorbachev succeed." I am convinced that one of the reasons we've had peaceful change in Eastern Europe is because of the approach that Gorbachev himself brought to bear on the problem. And I've consulted with him, had communications from him -- one, for example, on the question of Germany -- and I think he's a reasonable man.

So, I'm not worried about the constitutional changes because as you look at the total picture inside the Soviet Union, you see an evolution that none of us would have believed possible 5 years ago or 3 or 2 in terms of democratic institutions. And I'm talking about the power in their Congress. They had a guy named Primakov who is the head of their Congress. And he was over here, and he came and told me -- he said, "Well, I'm here to learn from the United States." And I said, "Mr. Primakov, you've come to the wrong guy in telling you what to do about the Congress. I'm not having too much luck." [Laughter]

But the very fact that he was here, you know, and in a spirit of very good will, getting -- and I was only being semifacetious there -- but it's very different, Jerry, than it used to be. It's amazingly different. I dealt with these guys back in the United Nations, and I can't tell you how different it is in terms of self-criticism on their part or debate. When you have a

25 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 423

difference, you can do it agreeably. It doesn't have to be disagreeable like it was in the heart of the Cold War days. So, I am not overly concerned.

American Hostages in Lebanon

Q. You said in your national newscast [see news conference, March 13] the other day that the media and all the people there would be surprised and fascinated when the hostage situation is resolved. What did you mean by that? Can you expand on it?

The President. Well, I can't really expand, except to say I was addressing myself more to this incident of this phone call that proved to be a hoax and that I am not at liberty to discuss. In terms of the hostages, there was a wave of speculation a week or so ago that frankly confused me because we are going down every alley, we are trying every avenue to free the hostages. But there is no negotiation going on with any part of the U.S. Government or anything of that nature.

I saw the speculation, and I was wondering if it was some private initiatives on the part of lawyers or those representing the families of individuals held hostages, because I wish I could tell you that there was a serious, immediate effort that would pay off, but that isn't the case. So, when I was talking there, I was really talking about this phone call. And some of you may remember there were some cartoonists -- I gave them a great deal of opportunity to have some fun at, you know, picking up the phone, "Who is this," you know, and all that. [Laughter]

But I would do it again because I feel -- I don't know why -- it weighs on me, the burden of Americans held against their will. And I don't mind taking one on the chin if I go the extra mile. I ought to do that as your President, I think. And I made the comment that the next phone call of that nature may have a little more difficulty getting through -- [Laughter] -- but I'm glad we tried. So, I was talking in that context.

U.S. Economy

Q. More from the spirit of democracy, this good economy -- what can be done to move some of that into the Rust Belt areas, the pockets like the Ohio Valley Rust Belt?

The President. Not sure I have a specific idea, but I'll guarantee you that if we are successful in getting the budget deficit down, then you have an economic climate in which new businesses start up. We've had a reasonable success -- and I'm not crowing about it -- in the creation of small businesses that are not identified with one industry. And so, I think from the Federal standpoint the best thing we can do is to see that where we do have assistance -- education, and to installations going into places -- that there's fairplay. But I really believe, for the Ohio Valley or wherever else it is, that just fundamentally sound fiscal policy is the answer.

I am not in favor -- maybe this will be a disappointment, but I had better level with you all -- in targeting funds or kind of choosing winners and losers. I don't think that is the role of the Federal Government -- industrial policy in a broader sense, where you say we're going to put our efforts into one industry or another. I don't think that's the role of the Federal Government.

25 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 423

Certainly, I don't think it's the philosophy under which I was elected.

So, there are programs. I'm strongly in favor of job retraining -- Job Training Partnership Act -- I think we're doing better on that. I hope our whole approach to education pays off. So, it's a general response to a very specific question.

Q. There's a growing sense of frustration across America that the standard of living in this country may be in decline. We hear the rich are getting richer, the poor are getting poorer. There are always reports that this country is no longer able to provide the standards of education, health, care, housing that other nations in the industrialized world are able to give their people.

The President. We still have the highest standard of living in the world. I think if we are successful in our battle against narcotics, which is not going to be done by the Federal Government alone, but certainly I must use the bully pulpit and our National Drug Strategy I, National Strategy II to try to set a tone for the rest of the country in what can be done to fight narcotics for a successful education, antidrug fight, and then the competitiveness legislation that I've referred to -- math and science education, R&D, capital gains -- I believe that we will continue to have the highest living standard.

So, I am not that pessimistic, and yet I don't want to stand here with some Pollyannish attitude about the economy. There are some signs that worry me. There are some signs that make me feel that growth will continue and that the economy may be doing better now than it was a month or two ago. But I don't accept the premise that we're a second-class power or that we are in decline.

There's a marvelous book that was quoted around here about the decline of the United States. We've got some problems. But if you want to put it in a broad philosophical sense, we're winning. Our concept of freedom and democracy is winning around the world. And I sometimes wish as President that there were more funds readily available -- read that less of a deficit -- to help the fledgling democracies of Eastern Europe or of our own neighbors to the south, which we must never neglect.

But even then, even without the largess that we could bestow on others from budget surplus or operating in balance, we still can help countries; and we are winning in the ideological battle and the philosophical battle. And if we can make fair markets -- help create market incentives and then have fair markets -- I really believe we're just on the threshold of a whole age of increased living standards for the United States. But that's our goal.

American Volunteers in Nicaragua

Q. Mr. President, will you encourage the use of Peace Corps volunteers who see that aid actually gets to the poorest villagers to be a substantial part of the aid you're seeking for Nicaragua and Panama?

The President. Yes, I'm strongly in favor of the Peace Corps. I've talked to our Peace Corps Director. You know, it's not quite right there. Let me tell you something that does trouble me, though, in Nicaragua. I've answered the question because I'm a great believer in the Peace Corps. And I'll tell you, the demands for Peace Corps in some of these countries, particularly in Eastern Europe, now Poland and Czechoslovakia, is wonderful. It's a wonderful tribute

25 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 423

to the young volunteers that go into the Peace Corps and to the concept of a great nation willing to help emerging democracies. But I am frustrated a little bit by some of the Americans that have gone down to Nicaragua, been there for 2 years allegedly to help the people of Nicaragua. And then Nicaragua has a free and fair election, and it turns out these people were interested in helping the Sandinistas, the Sandinismos. And now they're picketing. Some of them have been -- I don't know whether they're still there -- in front of the U.S. Embassy because in their view the wrong people won the election. But that's not the role of the United States. If we want to help the people and there are verifiably, certifiably free elections, they ought to stay down there -- if they're acting in this philanthropic way -- and try to help, as the Peace Corps does in Nicaragua. Consider my spleen vented. [Laughter]

Federal Budget

Q. This noon you had lunch with Speaker Foley. In the spirit of St. Patrick, did you work out a deal on how to reduce defense spending?

The President. No, that has not been worked out. We've made some proposals; and he is, I think, waiting, in fairness to him, for his budget process to work. But I find him very reasonable. We differ philosophically on some of these questions. I've cited capital gains, for example. I mean, I just haven't properly sold an honorable man like Foley on what it means to create jobs, what it means to be competitive -- I cited for you now the differential between what it is in Japan, what it is in Korea, and all of this -- so I've got to do better in communicating with some of those people on the other side.

But on the defense, I think we must retain a reasoned defense. Colin Powell [Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff] and Cheney [Secretary of Defense] have testified on a different kind of force. I've had strong support, vocal support, from Foley on things like our latest proposal on reducing our force levels in Europe, the proposal with Gorbachev to both reduce to 195,000 in central Europe and then 30,000 additional troops that can be deployed under agreement with the Soviets. So, we're getting some support there, and I believe we will be able to work out an agreed defense program. I hope we will because I don't want to have to see defense all caught up in politics. And the rapidity of change is such that I think we are in a good position to negotiate further reductions with the Soviet Union, and that's one of the reasons I'm looking forward to the summit with Mr. Gorbachev.

Lithuania

Q. Under what circumstances would the United States begin the process and when would we begin the process of recognizing an independent Lithuania or any other Soviet republic?

The President. In the first place, we have never recognized the incorporation of the Baltic States, which you are talking about -- Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia -- into the Soviet Union. It was never a question of having recognized their incorporation into the Soviet Union.

I think there are standards of control over one's country -- or control over one's, in this instance, territory -- that guide recognition. But I think that the best role for the United States, having encouraged self-determination, having not been willing to recognize Lithuania being incorporated into the

25 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 423

Soviet Union, is to encourage a peaceful evolution from now on.

Lithuania, under the right of self-determination, expressed themselves. To the credit of the Soviet leaders, all the way from Ligachev [Communist Party Chairman, Agrarian Policy Commission] to Gorbachev on over, they have said: We will not use force. We're peaceful. It is very important to the people in these Baltic States that the evolution be peaceful. And so, I am, just as in East Germany when the Berlin Wall started down -- some of my political opponents were saying I was unenthusiastic about it. And I told one of our star TV commentators, Well, that's the kind of person I am. I mean, some people jump with joy and do cartwheels, and I've got different genes or something. [Laughter]

But having said that, another political leader said, Well, you ought to go to Berlin, and the President should be seen at the Wall. I had communications from the most respected leaders in East and West, several of them, saying, Don't do anything silly. I mean, we're concerned now as this evolves.

And sometimes caution and prudence, I think, are right. And I think in this case it proved right because that evolution has moved peacefully, and we did not provoke some kind of outbreak through exhorting there at the Berlin Wall that could have caused other countries to act differently.

I'm very pleased with the way the Lithuanian situation is developing, and we're watching it closely. We will encourage the fundamental principles of self-determination, and we will encourage the concept of peaceful change. And I hope both major parties in that discussion will continue to adhere to peaceful change.

Voice of America

Q. It seems to me that the Voice of America has been one of our best tools for exporting the ideas of democracy, and yet I understand that we want to cut their budget. Don't you think that it would be better if we just maintained the budget in order to continue to have this influence in the countries of the Eastern bloc?

The President. I'm embarrassed to say I don't have the figures, but I am not aware of any cut in the budget. Because like you, I accept your premise, your hypothesis. And you know why? Because Havel, Vaclav Havel, the playwright President of Czechoslovakia, expressed his not only appreciation for what the Voice of America did in keeping the hope of democracy and freedom alive but also insisted that it's essential that the Voice still go in there.

So, I don't think -- can someone -- we don't think that we have recommended cuts in the Voice, but maybe we could get your name. It's a good specific question. And, Barrie [Barrie Tron, Deputy Director of Media Relations], maybe you could find that, and we'll let you know the exact numbers.

But whatever the figures, believe me, there is no philosophical commitment to ratchet down or cut back on the Voice, because I agree with you that it's even more important that that message of freedom continue to be heard; and I accept the word of Havel in the process.

25 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 423

Now, we've got one more, and I see an urgent -- I've not been very good about the left side of the room. Yes, sir?

Foreign Aid

Q. Don Mulford, Montclair Times. Does it bother you at all the proportion of the foreign aid budget going to two nations, Israel and Egypt? Irrespective of any comment on Jerusalem -- [laughter] -- is there some thought of perhaps lowering the level of the funds going there in the hope that it might promote peace -- to stop funding both nations on such a large level of our resources?

The President. I would not favor that. I do favor greater flexibility for the President, which means a weakening of or an elimination of earmarking, because what's happened is a tremendous percentage, as Don points out, of our foreign aid budget is going to just a handful of countries. And you cited Israel, and I could add Egypt -- well, you added Egypt -- and there's Pakistan and one or two others. And by the time that money is disbursed, there is almost nothing.

And I'll give you an example. In Jamaica, I must confess that when Mr. Manley [Prime Minister] came in, based on his past record and his proximity to Cuba and his former fraternity with Mr. Castro [President of Cuba], I didn't know how it would go. Manley campaigned on a different policy this time. He said, "I'm not going to push our country into the arms of Fidel Castro." And he's been very good, and I salute him. And when I go to try to help the impoverished people of Jamaica, we have very little flexibility.

And so, I don't want to suggest cutting to good friends, but I have asked that we be accorded more flexibility, perhaps a fund that's known as a discretionary fund, for the President to be able to prioritize the interests of this country and go forward with them.

So, Bob Dole raised the question, and I saluted him for raising the question. And we will continue to work with the Congress. I think there may be some sentiment for it, but I don't think you'll see it in slashes in the budget to accomplish that end because there's some strong reasons of friendship for that and there's some powerful political forces that would argue against that.

Well, listen, thank you all very, very much. A pleasure to be with you.

Note: The President spoke at 3:34 p.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building.