

Apr. 30 / Administration of George W. Bush, 2001

Remarks at the First Hundred Days Congressional Luncheon
April 30, 2001

Thank you all. Thank you for coming. I appreciate you bringing such nice weather. It's good to see members of my Cabinet who are here. Mr. Secretary, thank you for being here.

Today marks our 100th day of working together for the American people. We've had some good debates. We've made some good progress, and it looks like we're going to pass some good law.

I've now met with most of you, and here's what I think: I think America is lucky to have such distinguished citizens coming to Washington to represent them. I've been impressed by the caliber of the person. I've been impressed by the conviction that you brought to the Oval Office.

Oh, I know we always don't agree. But we're beginning to get a spirit here in Washington where we're more agreeable, where we're setting a different tone. So when the good folks of this country look

at our Nation's Capital, they see something they can be proud of.

I want to thank you all very much for your service to the country. I want to thank your families for the sacrifice they make. I also want to thank you for the constructive spirit in which we've conducted the people's business. I know this: That whatever your views on a particular issue are, that we share a common goal, and that is to serve our country. And it's okay sometimes to share a meal, and that's why we're here. *[Laughter]*

So I want to thank you for being here. If you will join me in the East Room, I think we've got some pretty good food for you.

Thanks for your service. God bless.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:45 a.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House.

Statement on the Death of Richard M. Scammon
April 30, 2001

Richard Scammon was a groundbreaking analyst of American politics. He brought rigor and insight to the study of elections.

And he studied elections because he loved democracy. All who share that passion will miss him.

Remarks at the National Defense University
May 1, 2001

Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary. I appreciate you being here. I also want to thank Secretary Powell for being here, as well. My National Security Adviser, Condi Rice, is here, as well as the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Myers. I appreciate Admiral Clark and General Ryan

here—for being here, as well. But most of all, I want to thank you, Admiral Gaffney, and the students for NDU for having me here today.

For almost 100 years, this campus has served as one of our country's premier centers for learning and thinking about America's national security. Some of America's finest soldiers have studied here—Dwight Eisenhower and Colin Powell. Some of America's finest statesmen have taught here—George Kennan.

Today, you're carrying on this proud tradition forward, continuing to train tomorrow's generals, admirals, and other national security thinkers, and continuing to provide the intellectual capital for our Nation's strategic vision.

This afternoon I want us to think back some 30 years to a far different time in a far different world. The United States and the Soviet Union were locked in a hostile rivalry. The Soviet Union was our unquestioned enemy, a highly armed threat to freedom and democracy. Far more than that wall in Berlin divided us. Our highest ideal was—and remains—individual liberty; theirs was the construction of a vast Communist empire. Their totalitarian regime held much of Europe captive behind an Iron Curtain.

We didn't trust them, and for good reason. Our deep differences were expressed in a dangerous military confrontation that resulted in thousands of nuclear weapons pointed at each other on hair trigger alert. Security of both the United States and the Soviet Union was based on a grim premise that neither side would fire nuclear weapons at each other because doing so would mean the end of both nations.

We even went so far as to codify this relationship in a 1972 ABM Treaty, based on the doctrine that our very survival would best be ensured by leaving both sides completely open and vulnerable to nuclear attack. The threat was real and vivid. The Strategic Air Command had an airborne command post called the Looking Glass aloft 24 hours a day, ready in case the President ordered our strategic forces to move towards their targets and release their nuclear ordnance.

The Soviet Union had almost 1.5 million troops deep in the heart of Europe, in Poland and Czechoslovakia, Hungary and East Germany. We used our nuclear weapons not just to prevent the Soviet Union from using their nuclear weapons but also to contain their conventional military forces, to prevent them from extending the Iron Curtain into parts of Europe and Asia that were still free.

In that world, few other nations had nuclear weapons, and most of those who did were responsible allies, such as Britain and France. We worried about the proliferation of nuclear weapons to other countries, but it was mostly a distant threat, not yet a reality.

Today, the Sun comes up on a vastly different world. The Wall is gone, and so is the Soviet Union. Today's Russia is not yesterday's Soviet Union. Its Government is no longer Communist. Its President is elected. Today's Russia is not our enemy but a country in transition with an opportunity to emerge as a great nation, democratic, at peace with itself and its neighbors. The Iron Curtain no longer exists. Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic are free nations, and they are now our Allies in NATO, together with a reunited Germany.

Yet, this is still a dangerous world, a less certain, a less predictable one. More nations have nuclear weapons, and still more have nuclear aspirations. Many have chemical and biological weapons. Some already have developed the ballistic missile technology that would allow them to deliver weapons of mass destruction at long distances and at incredible speeds. And a number of these countries are spreading these technologies around the world.

Most troubling of all, the list of these countries includes some of the world's least responsible states. Unlike the cold war, today's most urgent threat stems not from thousands of ballistic missiles in Soviet hands but from a small number of missiles in the hands of these states, states for whom terror and blackmail are a way of

life. They seek weapons of mass destruction to intimidate their neighbors and to keep the United States and other responsible nations from helping allies and friends in strategic parts of the world.

When Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait in 1990, the world joined forces to turn him back. But the international community would have faced a very different situation had Hussein been able to blackmail with nuclear weapons. Like Saddam Hussein, some of today's tyrants are gripped by an implacable hatred of the United States of America. They hate our friends. They hate our values. They hate democracy and freedom and individual liberty. Many care little for the lives of their own people. In such a world, cold war deterrence is no longer enough.

To maintain peace, to protect our own citizens and our own allies and friends, we must seek security based on more than the grim premise that we can destroy those who seek to destroy us. This is an important opportunity for the world to rethink the unthinkable and to find new ways to keep the peace.

Today's world requires a new policy, a broad strategy of active nonproliferation, counterproliferation, and defenses. We must work together with other like-minded nations to deny weapons of terror from those seeking to acquire them. We must work with allies and friends who wish to join with us to defend against the harm they can inflict. And together we must deter anyone who would contemplate their use.

We need new concepts of deterrence that rely on both offensive and defensive forces. Deterrence can no longer be based solely on the threat of nuclear retaliation. Defenses can strengthen deterrence by reducing the incentive for proliferation.

We need a new framework that allows us to build missile defenses to counter the different threats of today's world. To do so, we must move beyond the constraints of the 30-year-old ABM Treaty. This Treaty

does not recognize the present or point us to the future; it enshrines the past. No treaty that prevents us from addressing today's threats, that prohibits us from pursuing promising technology to defend ourselves, our friends, and our allies is in our interests or in the interests of world peace.

This new framework must encourage still further cuts in nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons still have a vital role to play in our security and that of our allies. We can and will change the size, the composition, the character of our nuclear forces in a way that reflects the reality that the cold war is over.

I am committed to achieving a credible deterrent with the lowest possible number of nuclear weapons consistent with our national security needs, including our obligations to our allies. My goal is to move quickly to reduce nuclear forces. The United States will lead by example to achieve our interests and the interests for peace in the world.

Several months ago, I asked Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld to examine all available technologies and basing modes for effective missile defenses that could protect the United States, our deployed forces, our friends, and our allies. The Secretary has explored a number of complementary and innovative approaches.

The Secretary has identified near-term options that could allow us to deploy an initial capability against limited threats. In some cases, we can draw on already established technologies that might involve land-based and sea-based capabilities to intercept missiles in midcourse or after they re-enter the atmosphere. We also recognize the substantial advantages of intercepting missiles early in their flight, especially in the boost phase.

The preliminary work has produced some promising options for advanced sensors and interceptors that may provide this capability. If based at sea or on aircraft, such approaches could provide limited but effective defenses.

We have more work to do to determine the final form the defenses might take. We will explore all these options further. We recognize the technological difficulties we face, and we look forward to the challenge. Our Nation will assign the best people to this critical task. We will evaluate what works and what does not. We know that some approaches will not work. We also know that we will be able to build on our successes. When ready, and working with Congress, we will deploy missile defenses to strengthen global security and stability.

I've made it clear from the very beginning that I would consult closely on any important subject with our friends and allies who are also threatened by missiles and weapons of mass destruction. Today I'm announcing the dispatch of high-level representatives to allied capitals in Europe, Asia, Australia, and Canada to discuss our common responsibility to create a new framework for security and stability that reflects the world of today. They will begin leaving next week.

The delegations will be headed by three men on this stage, Rich Armitage, Paul Wolfowitz, and Steve Hadley, Deputies of the State Department, the Defense Department, and the National Security staff. Their trips will be part of an ongoing process of consultation involving many people and many levels of government, including my Cabinet Secretaries.

These will be real consultations. We are not presenting our friends and allies with unilateral decisions already made. We look forward to hearing their views, the views of our friends, and to take them into account. We will seek their input on all the issues surrounding the new strategic environment.

We'll also need to reach out to other interested states, including China and Russia. Russia and the United States should work together to develop a new foundation for world peace and security in the 21st century. We should leave behind the constraints of an ABM Treaty that perpetuates

a relationship based on distrust and mutual vulnerability. This Treaty ignores the fundamental breakthroughs in technology during the last 30 years. It prohibits us from exploring all options for defending against the threats that face us, our allies, and other countries.

That's why we should work together to replace this Treaty with a new framework that reflects a clear and clean break from the past and especially from the adversarial legacy of the cold war. This new cooperative relationship should look to the future, not to the past. It should be reassuring rather than threatening. It should be premised on openness, mutual confidence, and real opportunities for cooperation, including the area of missile defense. It should allow us to share information so that each nation can improve its early warning capability and its capability to defend its people and territory. And perhaps one day, we can even cooperate in a joint defense.

I want to complete the work of changing our relationship from one based on a nuclear balance of terror to one based on common responsibilities and common interests. We may have areas of difference with Russia, but we are not and must not be strategic adversaries. Russia and America both face new threats to security. Together, we can address today's threats and pursue today's opportunities. We can explore technologies that have the potential to make us all safer.

This is a time for vision, a time for a new way of thinking, a time for bold leadership. The Looking Glass no longer stands its 24-hour-a-day vigil. We must all look at the world in a new, realistic way to preserve peace for generations to come.

God bless.

NOTE: The President spoke at 2:40 p.m. outside Eisenhower Hall at Fort McNair. In his remarks, he referred to Vice Adm. Paul G. Gaffney II, USN, president, National Defense University; and President Saddam Hussein of Iraq.