

REMARKS OF  
SENATOR BOB DOLE  
REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

BEFORE  
  
CHICAGO COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS  
8:00 P.M., CST  
APRIL 26, 1972

I AM PLEASED TO BE HERE WITH YOU THIS EVENING. AS I AM SURE YOU APPRECIATE, I COME HERE NOT SO MUCH AS AN EXPERT IN FOREIGN POLICY -- WHICH I DON'T CLAIM TO BE; BUT AS A STUDENT OF FOREIGN POLICY -- WHICH WE ALL ARE; AND AS AN ADVOCATE OF THE PRESIDENT'S FOREIGN POLICY -- WHICH SOME OF YOU MAY ALSO BE.

MY INTEREST IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IS THAT OF A UNITED STATES SENATOR, WHO MUST PARTICIPATE IN ITS CONDUCT THROUGH MY PARTICIPATION IN THE SENATE'S CONSTITUTIONALLY LIMITED OVERSIGHT RESPONSIBILITY -- ADVICE AND CONSENT IN THE FORMAL PHRASE.

IT IS ALSO THAT OF CONCERNED AMERICAN CITIZEN, AT A TIME WHEN MOST AMERICAN CITIZENS ARE -- AND HAVE BEEN FOR SOME YEARS -- CONCERNED ABOUT AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY.

AND MY INTEREST, TOO, IS THAT OF CHAIRMAN OF THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE, IN WHICH POSITION I HAVE A SPECIAL INTEREST IN SEEING THAT THE POLICIES OF THE REPUBLICAN PRESIDENT ARE GENERALLY UNDERSTOOD -- REPORTED FAIRLY -- AND GET THE CREDIT THEY DESERVE, WHEN AND WHERE IT IS DUE.

-2-

OBSTACLES TO DEBATE

IN THE LATTER CAPACITY, AS MY PARTY'S NATIONAL CHAIRMAN AND A COMMITTED ADVOCATE OF THE PRESIDENT'S POLICIES, I FIND SERIOUS OBSTACLES BLOCKING A PROPER PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING OF THOSE POLICIES, BLOCKING THEIR FAIR REPORTAGE -- AND OFTEN EVEN BLOCKING SERIOUS ATTEMPTS AT RATIONALLY DISCUSSING THEM.

I CANNOT EXPLAIN -- AND WILL NOT ATTEMPT TO EXPLAIN ALL THOSE OBSTACLES. I FIND THE UNWILLINGNESS OR EVEN THE INABILITY OF SOME TO DISCUSS RATIONALLY THE PRESIDENT'S POLICIES TOTALLY UNEXPLAINABLE. THIS IS AN ELECTION YEAR OF COURSE, AND THE OLD AXIOM ABOUT POLICIES STOPPING AT THE WATER'S EDGE TO THE CONTRARY NOTWITHSTANDING, SOME PARTISAN DIFFERENCES WITH THE NIXON ADMINISTRATION'S IN BOTH DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS IS EXPECTED. ESPECIALLY MIGHT IT BE EXPECTED IN THE PRESENT CONTEXT, WHEN THE WAR IN VIETNAM PRESENTS SO CONTROVERSIAL A STIMULANT FOR DISAGREEMENT AND FOR PARTISANSHIP.

FOREIGN POLICY POLITICIZED

IT IS NOT MY INTENTION HERE TO DELIVER A STRICTLY PARTISAN ADDRESS. IT IS MY INTENTION, HOWEVER, TO DISCUSS THE REASONS FOR MY SUPPORT OF THE POLICIES OF RICHARD NIXON. AND REGRETTABLY, IN THIS HIGHLY POLITICIZED

-3-

YEAR, SOME POLITICIANS, FAR FROM STOPPING AT THE WATER'S EDGE, HAVE TAKEN TO DIVING STRAIGHT INTO INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL WATERS, POLITICIZING THE CONDUCT OF THE WAR AND THE PURSUIT OF THE PEACE.

MY POINT, LET ME ASSURE YOU, IS NOT THAT THERE IS NO ROOM FOR DISAGREEMENT WITH THE PRESIDENT OR FOR DISSENT FROM HIS FOREIGN POLICY. I WOULD WAGER THAT IF I TRIED TO MAKE THAT POINT, I SHOULD SUDDENLY FIND MYSELF A QUITE UNWELCOME GUEST HERE. SO LET ME REPEAT THAT I DO NOT SEEK TO SHUT OFF DEBATE OVER THE WAY IN WHICH THIS PRESIDENT HAS PURSUED THIS COUNTRY'S OBJECTIVES IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS. FAR FROM IT. I SEEK TO ENCOURAGE THAT DEBATE.

MY POINT, QUITE SIMPLY, IS THAT IN THIS ELECTION YEAR, IT HAS BEEN SOME OF THE PRESIDENT'S OPPONENTS -- SOME OF HIS "WOULD BE OPPONENTS" MIGHT BE MORE ACCURATE, AT LEAST UNTIL JULY -- WHO HAVE WITH ASTONISHING DEDICATION AND SINGLE MINDED PURPOSE, SOUGHT TO SHUT OFF THAT DEBATE.

EMOTIONAL ARGUMENTS OFFERED BY CRITICS

IN THE CONTEXT OF THE CURRENT INTENSIFIED FIGHTING IN VIETNAM, FOR EXAMPLE, THERE MAY BE RATIONAL DISAGREEMENT OVER THE MANNER IN WHICH PRESIDENT NIXON CHOSE TO RESPOND. I OF COURSE FIND NO FAULT WITH THAT RESPONSE BUT SOME MAY. SOME DO, OF COURSE. REASONABLE MEN CAN DIFFER AND THAT IS THEIR RIGHT.



-4-

MY QUARREL IS WITH THOSE WHO SEEK TO PRECLUDE DEBATE ON  
THE MATTER.

LOOK, FOR A MOMENT, AT THE CHARGES THEY HURL AT THE PRESIDENT'S  
INITIATIVES. SOME CALL IT BARBARIC.

AND SURELY THAT PRECLUDES DEBATE.

SOME HAVE CALLED IT IRRESPONSIBLE.

AND SURELY THAT PRECLUDES DEBATE.

IF THEY HAD SAID, ILL-ADVISED, I COULD HANDLE THAT. IF THEY  
HAD SAID, ILL-CONCEIVED, THAT TOO COULD BE DISCUSSED. OR RISKY, PERHAPS; -- IF  
THEY HAD TERMED THE PRESIDENT'S DECISION RISKY, OR ILL-ADVISED OR ANY OF THE  
TERMS I SUGGEST, THEN THE DISAGREEMENT COULD BE DEBATED, COULD BE DISCUSSED AND  
REBUTTED.

BUT IRRESPONSIBLE WAS THE WORD SOME OF THE PRESIDENT'S CRITICS  
CHOSE -- IRRESPONSIBLE, BARBARIC OR IMMORAL.

AND SURELY THOSE TERMS PRECLUDE DEBATE.

IT MAKES NO DIFFERENCE REALLY WHICH OF THE TERMS IS USED. MY  
QUESTION IS STILL THE SAME. FOR ME, AT LEAST, THE QUANDARY IS STILL THE SAME.

-5-

HOW DO YOU REBUT, IN RATIONAL TERMS, CHARGES LIKE THESE,  
WHICH ARE MADE IN SUCH HIGHLY EMOTIONAL TERMS?

COMMITMENT TO REASON

BUT I AM SURE THAT IS NOT A PROBLEM HERE. YOU ARE HERE BECAUSE  
YOU ARE COMMITTED TO TREATING THESE MATTERS REASONABLY -- TO LOOKING AT THE  
FACTS, ALL OF THEM, AND BASING YOUR JUDGMENTS ON THOSE FACTS.

I WOULD CALL THE CURRENT COMMUNIST OFFENSIVE IN VIETNAM --  
TRIGGERED BY THEIR INVASION OF THE SOUTH -- AN IMMORAL ACT.

I THINK EVENTS WILL PROVE EVEN TO THEIR LEADERS -- AND FROM  
THEIR OWN POINT OF VIEW -- THAT IT WAS AN IRRESPONSIBLE ACT.

AND IT WAS CERTAINLY AN ACT OF BARBARISM.

BUT YOU AND I KNOW THERE IS MORE TO IT THAN THAT. THERE IS  
MORE TO THE ARGUMENT AGAINST THE INVASION BY THE NORTH VIETNAMESE THAN SIMPLY  
THE FACT THAT IT MAY OFFEND MY MORAL SENSIBILITIES -- OR YOURS.

FIRST, IT WAS AN ACT OF BLATANT AND OVERT AGGRESSION. IN THE  
PAST, GREAT CARE HAS BEEN TAKEN BY THE COMMUNISTS TO CREATE THE ILLUSION OF  
CIVIL WAR IN VIETNAM -- AND THEY CONVINCED MANY. BUT THIS TIME, IN THIS  
OFFENSIVE, THERE WAS NO DOUBT AS TO THE ENEMY'S IDENTITY OR HIS INTENTIONS.  
IT WAS THE REGULAR ARMY OF NORTH VIETNAM, 12 DIVISIONS STRONG -- AND THE OB-  
JECTIVE OF ITS INVASION OF THE SOUTH WAS THE OVERTHROW OF A SOVEREIGN GOVERN-  
MENT NOT ITS OWN.

AND THAT MAY BE CHARACTERIZED AS IMMORAL.

-6-

### COMMUNIST MISCALCULATIONS

THAT THE INVASION WAS IRRESPONSIBLE AND WILL PROVE TO BE SO EVEN FROM THE COMMUNISTS' OWN PERSPECTIVE, I DO NOT DOUBT, BUT THE FINAL PROOF OF THAT AWAITS FURTHER DEVELOPMENTS. IT WILL PROVE A DETRIMENT EVEN TO THEIR OWN INTEREST BECAUSE THE ENEMY PLANNERS MADE SERIOUS AND MULTIPLE MISCALCULATIONS.

FIRST, THEY UNDERESTIMATED THE PRESIDENT'S RESOLVE TO CARRY OUT HIS PLAN OF VIETNAMIZATION AND TO CARRY THROUGH ON HIS REPEATED WARNINGS OF A STERN RESPONSE TO ANY ESCALATED THREAT FROM THE NORTH TO OUR REMAINING FORCES IN VIETNAM.

SECOND, THE ENEMY UNDERESTIMATED THE ABILITY OF THE SOUTH VIETNAMESE TO FIGHT EFFECTIVELY. ARVN HAS LOST BATTLES, TO BE SURE, BUT THE COMMUNISTS EXPECTED THAT THEY WOULD LOSE THE WAR, AS WELL, AND I HAVE YET TO SEE EVIDENCE OF THAT. THE SOUTH VIETNAMESE, ESPECIALLY THEIR MORE EXPERIENCED DIVISIONS, APPEAR TO BE HOLDING THEIR OWN.

AND THIRDLY, THE NORTH VIETNAMESE UNDERESTIMATED THE RESOLVE OF THE PEOPLE OF THE SOUTH TO CONTINUE TO OPPOSE THE AGGRESSION OF THE NORTH, EVEN IN THE FACE OF THIS NEWEST OFFENSIVE IN A WAR THAT HAS BEEN PROCEEDING FOR DECADES. HERE THEY DUPLICATED THE MISTAKE THEY MADE IN TET OF 1968 WHEN THEY EXPECTED MASSIVE UPRISINGS AGAINST THE SAIGON GOVERNMENT THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY-SIDE OF THE SOUTH.



-7-

BY ALL REPORTS -- EXCEPT OF COURSE, A RECENT ONE BY MADAME BINH WHICH MAY BE SAID TO BE SUSPECT IN SPITE OF THE APPARENT UNWILLINGNESS OF SOME OF MY COLLEAGUES IN THE SENATE TO REPUDIATE IT -- BUT BY ALL REPORTS THE INVASION HAS RESULTED PRIMARILY IN RENEWED AND REVITALIZED POPULAR SUPPORT FOR THE SAIGON GOVERNMENT FROM MOST OF THE SOUTH VIETNAMESE.

BY ALL REPORTS, THOSE REFUGEES WHO HAVE BEEN FORCED TO FLEE THEIR HOMES -- AND TWO WEEKS AGO THE NEW YORK TIMES ESTIMATED THAT EVEN THEN THEY NUMBERED 100,000 -- THESE REFUGEES HAVE FLED TO THE SOUTH. IN MY BOOK, THE CLICHE THAT COVERS THAT PHENOMENON IS THAT THEY ARE "VOTING WITH THEIR FEET."

#### FACTS DIFFER WITH CITIES

THE NORTH VIETNAMESE DECISION TO INVADE WAS NOT OUR FAULT. THE MASSIVE SOVIET MILITARY SUPPORT THAT SUPPLIED THEIR INVASION WAS NOT OUR IDEA.

CERTAINLY THERE WAS BARBARISM, BUT IT WAS NOT OURS. AND THE CHARGE THAT IT WAS IS LUDICROUS.



-8-

THOSE WHO VIEW THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM DIFFERNTLY, FORGET A FEW ESSENTIAL FACTS. THEY FORGET, FOR EXAMPLE, THAT FOR FOUR MONTHS, THE UNITED STATES SHOWED RESTRAINT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA BY CONTINUING ITS POLICIES OF VIETNAMIZATION AND CONTINUING TO HONOR THE UNDERSTANDINGS OF 1968, IN SPITE OF MOUNTING EVIDENCE OF A PLANNED INVASION FROM THE NORTH.

FOR FOUR MONTHS WE CONTINUED TO ABIDE BY THE UNDERSTANDINGS, EVEN AS THE NORTH VIETNAMESE BUILT ROADS THROUGH THE DMZ, EVEN AS THEY MASSED REGULAR FORCE UNITS AT THE DMS, EVEN AS THEY MASSED MAIN FORCES IN CAMBODIA AND LAOS. FOR FOUR MONTHS, AS WE WATCHED -- AND AS THE PENTAGON REPORTED THESE ENEMY MOVEMENTS -- WE CONTINUED TO ABIDE BY THE UNDERSTANDINGS UNDER WHICH WE HAD HALTED OUR BOMBING OF THE NORTH, AND HAD UNDERSTOOD THAT THEY WOULD HONOR THE DMZ.

SOVIET SUPPORT ARMS INVASION

IT WAS NOT UNTIL SOVIET SUPPLIED TANKS AND ARTILLERY, AND 12 DIVISIONS OF REGULAR NORTH VIETNAMESE FORCES ROLLED THROUGH THE DMZ THAT PRESIDENT NIXON TOOK THE STERN ACTION OF WHICH HE HAD SO OFTEN WARNED.

FOR FOUR MONTHS, I REPEAT, AS THE COMMUNISTS' PREPARATIONS FOR WAR BECAME INCREASINGLY EVIDENT, WE SHOWED RESTRAINT. THEIR ACTIVITIES IN AND AROUND THE DEMILITARIZED ZONE WERE CLEAR EVIDENCE OF THEIR HOSTILE INTENTIONS BUT WE NEVER ACTED PREMATURELY. WE INVESTED SOLELY ON THE BASIS OF EVEN OUR BEST GUESSES AS TO THEIR INTENTIONS.

THE PRESIDENT WAITED -- TACITLY ACKNOWLEDGING THE POSSIBILITY THAT WE MAY HAVE MISJUDGED INTENT -- PERHAPS, MORE TO THE POINT, HOPING THAT THEIR INTENTIONS WOULD CHANGE. WHEN THEY DID NOT, HE ACTED.

AND INDEED, WHAT WERE THE ALTERNATIVES TO ACTION? STANDING BY AND DOING NOTHING IN THE FACE OF NAKED AGGRESSION UPON AN ALLY WHOM WE HAVE SUPPORTED FOR SO LONG WAS AN ALTERNATIVE -- BUT NOT SURELY, AN ACCEPTABLE ONE. CALLING FOR IMMEDIATE NEGOTIATIONS WITH AN ENEMY IN THE MIDDLE OF HIS OFFENSIVE -- IN THE HOPES THAT WE COULD TALK HIM OUT OF THAT ON-GOING INVASION -- WAS AN ALTERNATIVE, BUT IT WAS SURELY NOT A REALISTIC ONE.

IN FACT THERE WAS, TO MY MIND, IN THE CONTEXT OF MANIFEST NORTHERN INTRANSIGENCE, NO OTHER RESPONSIBLE ALTERNATIVE FOR A PRESIDENT AS CONCERNED AS RICHARD NIXON IS ABOUT THE SECURITY OF OUR ALLY IN THE SOUTH, ABOUT THE CREDIBILITY OF THE AMERICAN RESOLVE, AND CONCERNED, MOST CERTAINLY, ABOUT THE SAFETY OF REMAINING AMERICAN MILITARY MEN IN VIETNAM.



VIETNAMIZATION IS RIGHT POLICY

I AM CONVINCED THAT VIETNAMIZATION IS GOING TO WORK. I THINK IT IS WORKING. AND ITS SUCCESS IS GOING TO DEMONSTRATE THE VALIDITY AND THE WORKABILITY OF THE NIXON DOCTRINE. I SAY I AM CONVINCED OF IT AND I THINK THAT THE PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE SUPPORTS MY CONFIDENCE.

BUT EVEN IF IT WERE TO FAIL -- AND IN MY OWN MIND THIS NEED BE BROUGHT UP ONLY FOR THE SAKE OF ARGUMENT -- BUT IF IT WERE TO FAIL, I AM CONVINCED NONETHELESS THAT VIETNAMIZATION IS THE RIGHT POLICY. YES, EVEN THE MORAL POLICY, IF WE ARE SPEAKING IN THOSE TERMS. AN EMINENTLY RESPONSIBLE POLICY AND A CIVILIZED ONE WITH WHICH TO COUNTER THE BARBARISM OF THE COMMUNISTS IN THE NORTH.

FOR THE SOLE OBJECTIVE OF THE POLICY OF VIETNAMIZATION HAS BEEN TO GIVE TO THE SOUTH VIETNAMESE THE CAPACITY TO DEFEND THEMSELVES AND TO SECURE FOR THEMSELVES A STABLE FUTURE IN WHICH THEY MIGHT DETERMINE FREELY AND WITHOUT INTERFERENCE FROM THE OUTSIDE, THEIR OWN POLITICAL DESTINY.

SUCCESSSES SEEN

VIETNAMIZATION, IN THAT RESPECT, HAS WORKED. WE HAVE GIVEN THEM THAT CAPABILITY. AND I KNOW OF NO REASONABLE ARGUMENTS WHY WE SHOULD NOT HAVE GIVEN IT TO THEM, AS LONG AS NEGOTIATIONS FAILED TO PRODUCE MEANINGFUL RESULTS.

BUT IN THIS SENSE, THE SUCCESS OF VIETNAMIZATION ALONE IS NOT ENOUGH TO ASSURE A SECURE FUTURE FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE SOUTH. AND IT NEVER HAS BEEN ARGUED THAT IT WOULD BE. THE DETERMINATION OF THE SOUTH TO USE THAT CAPABILITY TO DEFEND THEMSELVES AND TO CONFRONT THE AGGRESSION OF THE NORTH IS, IN THE FINAL ANALYSIS, THE ONLY GUARANTOR OF THEIR SECURITY.

THE FATE OF THE SOUTH IS ULTIMATELY IN THE HANDS OF THE PEOPLE OF THE SOUTH. AND, COME TO THINK OF IT, THAT IS WHAT VIETNAMIZATION IS SUPPOSED TO BE ALL ABOUT.

I HAVE ALREADY OBSERVED THAT THE SOUTH VIETNAMESE ARE GIVING EVIDENCE THAT THEY HAVE DEVELOPED THAT DETERMINATION. AND THAT IS THE BASIS OF MY CONFIDENCE IN THE FINAL OUTCOME OF THIS SAD CHAPTER IN THEIR LONG AND SAD HISTORY OF WAR.

PROSPECTS FOR PEACE

ONE FOOTNOTE MUST BE ADDED TO THIS DISCUSSION. THERE ARE THOSE WHO HAVE ASSERTED THAT THE BOMBING OF THE NORTH, OF STRATEGIC TARGETS IN AND AROUND HANOI AND HAIPHONG, BROUGHT US TO THE BRINK OF WORLD WAR. FOR SOME, THIS WAS THE BASIS OF THEIR CHARGE OF IRRESPONSIBILITY.

I ONLY NOTE THAT AT THE VERY TIME SOME WERE MAKING THIS CHARGE, PLANS WERE BEING MADE, NOT FOR WAR WITH THE SOVIETS, BUT FOR A SUMMIT CONFERENCE WITH THEM. AS WE LEARNED YESTERDAY, EVEN WHILE SOME WERE STILL STICKING TO THEIR APOCALYPTIC STORIES, PREDICTING THE DIREST OF CONSEQUENCES TO THE FUTURE OF WORLD PEACE, THE PRESIDENT'S FOREIGN POLICY ADVISER WAS IN MOSCOW PREPARING FOR THE PRESIDENT'S TRIP NEXT MONTH. DR. KISSINGER WAS THE APPARENTLY WELCOME GUEST OF THE LEADERS OF A NATION SOME IMPLIED MIGHT BE WILLING TO GO TO WAR OVER THE MINOR HULL DAMAGE THEIR SHIPS SUFFERED IN HAIPHONG HARBOR -- SHIPS THAT WERE THERE TO DELIVER TO THE NORTH VIETNAMESE THE MATERIAL THEY NEEDED IN THEIR ATTEMPT TO FORCE THEIR OWN PLANS FOR THE POLITICAL FUTURE OF OUR ALLY, SOUTH VIETNAM.



AND AT THE SAME TIME, IT SEEMS TO BE LOST ON SOME THAT WE ARE STILL ONLY TWO MONTHS REMOVED FROM THE PRESIDENT'S TRIP TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLICA OF CHINA.

THE PRESIDENT SAID IN HIS INAUGURAL ADDRESS THAT "THE TIMES ARE ON THE SIDE OF PEACE. THE NORTH VIETNAMESE EXCEPTED, I BELIEVE MOST OF THE WORLD HOPES AND BELIEVES THAT HE IS RIGHT.

-15-

AS YOU KNOW, THE PRESIDENT IS SCHEDULED TO ADDRESS THE NATION ON THE SITUATION IN SOUTHEAST ASIA IN A MATTER OF MINUTES. HE WILL ANNOUNCE AMONG OTHER THINGS HIS DECISION ON FUTURE AMERICAN TROOP LEVELS IN VIETNAM -- LEVELS WHICH I'M SURE YOU'RE AWARE -- HAVE BEEN REDUCED BY ALMOST HALF A MILLION FROM OUR PEAK INVOLVEMENT IN 1968.

THE PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENT COMES AT A TIME OF MIXED DEVELOPMENTS, ON THE ONE HAND WE HAVE THE ON-GOING INVASION BY THE NORTH VIETNAMESE AND ON THE OTHER WE HAVE LAST NIGHT'S ANNOUNCEMENT THAT THE PARIS NEGOTIATIONS WOULD BE RESUMED.

WE HAVE AS WELL, THE ANNOUNCEMENT OF YESTERDAY AFTERNOON CONCERNING DR. KISSINGER'S TRIP TO MOSCOW. THERE ARE MANY HOPEFUL SIGNS INSPITE OF THE HOSTILE ACTIVITIES OF THE NORTH VIETNAMESE THAT WE MAY YET BE ABLE TO BUILD A PEACEFUL TOMORROW FOR VIETNAM AND FOR THE WORLD OUT OF PRESENT TURMOIL. THAT THAT POSSIBILITY EXISTS AT ALL IS TESTIMONY TO THE PRESIDENT'S EXCELLENT LEADERSHIP IN WORLD AFFAIRS.

WHETHER THAT POTENTIAL CAN BE REALIZED -- WHETHER OUR FONDEST HOPES FOR PEACE CAN COME TO FRUITION -- NOW RESTS IN LARGE MEASURE WITH THE ENEMY.



AS WE AWAIT THE PRESIDENT'S ANNOUNCEMENT LET US HOPE THAT HIS DOMESTIC CRITICS WILL AVOID THEIR PAST TENDANCIES TO CRITICIZE AND POLITICIZE HIS EFFORTS FOR PEACE.

THE PRECEDENTS ALLOW FOR LITTLE HOPE, BUT NONETHELESS, I CALL UPON HIS CRITICS IN THE DEMOCRAT PARTY AT LEAST TO THINK BEFORE THEY TALK -- AT LEAST TO CONSIDER WHAT THE PRESIDENT WILL SHORTLY SAY BEFORE THEY ISSUE THEIR LOFTY AND SELF-RIGHTEOUS PRONOUNCEMENTS ABOUT IT. AS FOR RESULTS, WE CAN ONLY WAIT FOR THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS TONIGHT AND LOOK FORWARD TO HIS TRIP TO MOSCOW NEXT MONTH SECURE IN OUR KNOWLEDGE THAT PEACE IS THE OVER-RIDING INTENT OF HIS POLICIES. WE CAN HOPE -- WE CAN PRAY -- THAT THE INTENT OF HIS POLICIES, A GENERATION OF PEACE, WILL TURN OUT AS WELL TO BE THE RESULT OF HIS POLICIES.

# # #