

Executive Registry
76-9315/2A

P-Loeb, William

~~SECRET~~

CIA 5.03.1

P-Finnegan, James
~~Orig: Frank Pierce~~
College
CIA 101 Bush George
Coigunder
Loeb

May 26, 1976

Dear Mr. Loeb,

Thank you for your letter of May 24th. I'm delighted that Mr. Finnegan found my commencement remarks at Rindge useful in putting together his May 19th editorial.

I also appreciate your words of support for the important work of this Agency. I am convinced that the American people strongly support the mission of the Central Intelligence Agency. I can assure you that this institution has not been devastated by recent publicity, and I am determined to do what I can to see that our country continues to have an intelligence capability second to none.

Thanks for writing.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ George Bush

George Bush

Mr. William Loeb
President and Publisher
Manchester Union Leader
Union Leader Corporation
Manchester, New Hampshire 03105

- DCI/GB/dlg
- Orig - Adse
- 1 - DCI (w/basic)
- 1 - ER
- 1 - A/DCI (w/basic)

19 MAY 1976

CLASS 031

CIA 101 Bush, George

0291 Franklin Pierce

College

Who Cares About Freedom?

Speaking last Sunday at the eleventh Commencement exercise of Franklin Pierce College in Rindge, Central Intelligence Agency Director George Bush raised the most important issue of our times, one to which every student, parent, faculty member and guest who heard him should give top priority in his thinking. (A strikingly similar theme, was sounded by former United Nations Ambassador Daniel Patrick Moynihan in his commencement address last Sunday at St. Anselm's College).

"All through our history," Bush pointed out, "we have had a commitment to freedom," but now, both our friends and foes all over the world are questioning the commitment of the United States to stop communism and to defend liberty and are wondering if that commitment is strong enough to make this country willing to sacrifice for its goals.

THE ANSWER, WE FEAR, IS THAT NOT ONLY IS AMERICA NO LONGER WILLING TO SACRIFICE FOR FREEDOM, BUT ALSO THAT OUR CURRENT LEADERSHIP HAS DECIDED TO ACCOMMODATE THE ENEMIES OF FREEDOM AROUND THE WORLD.

In a recent column, former U.S. Ambassador to Switzerland Henry J. Taylor reflects on Secretary of State Henry Kissinger's visits with and promises of aid to leaders of African "nations" which prattle about democracy, but whose sole interest is power.

In Kenya, his host was the former murderous Mau Mau leader, President Jomo Kenyatta, who has "killed off his opponents with all the eclat of a Borgia at a feast," and for whom "no glittering luxury is today too good."

In Zaire, Kissinger saw dictator Mobutu Sese Seko, a "fake soothsayer with his rheumy metaphysics and huckster's magic," a "carny quack and total swine" who "lives a champagne life . . . while Zaire's impoverished people are too diseased to work at a trade and too miserable to have hope."

Columnist Taylor also cites "Field Marshal" Idi Amin, President of Uganda, who is notorious for blasting the United States, and Marien Ngouabi,

President of the Brazzaville Congo -- both of whom are ruthless killers who care not a whit for their enslaved people.

Commenting on the lunacy of proposing assistance to countries that lack "the essential underpinnings for an equivalent of the Marshall Plan that saved Europe." Taylor points out that the current total U.S. government debt and that of every segment of our society has increased to more than three trillion -- yes, trillion -- dollars!

There is a direct correlation, we suggest, between this nuzzling up to African dictators and the feeling of the new isolationists that the United States must accommodate itself to communism, its military power, the massive populations under its control, the persuasiveness of Marxist ideology to the masses of mankind.

The view that there is nothing extraordinarily wrong with communism as such, which holds also that the Soviet Union is not significantly worse than the United States, has become a major concern to increasing numbers of political commentators. For example, consider the question posed by CIA Director Bush before the backdrop of the perceptive observations offered by Commentary editor Norman Podhoretz in the April issue of the American Jewish Committee's monthly publication:

"What we see in this newly tolerant, and even benevolent, attitude toward communism is the slow erosion of our own sense of political value in response to the Communist challenge -- an accommodation in the sphere of ideas to match the accommodation we have been making in the sphere of power. Our own political culture has always held up liberty as the highest political value, while the political culture of communism has always scoffed at and denigrated liberty as a bourgeois delusion.

"Therefore, our unwillingness or inability to condemn their crimes against political liberty -- which they of course do not regard as crimes at all -- can fairly be described as a symptom of the surrender of our political culture to theirs."

CIA 01 Bush, George

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS
HERALD AMERICAN

M - 371,664

MAY 17 1976

Org. Franklin Pierce
College

Bill Lee, Purdue honored

CIA director speaks to Pierce grads

By JAMES McPARLAND

RINDGE, N.H.—Central Intelligence Agency Director George H. W. Bush said yesterday he was worried "about the credibility and the commitment of our country as seen through the eyes of foreign countries—friend and foe alike."

Speaking at Franklin Pierce College commencement exercises, Bush, former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, said many countries, including China, "are looking at us and trying to decide where we are at" after 200 years of freedom of speech, religion and enterprise.

CHINA IS asking itself if the USA is committed after 200 years of democracy or whatever one calls our magnificent system," stated Bush, a former U.S. Envoy to China.

"Many other countries are asking the same questions. These are questions all of us should ask."

Bush, who received an honorary doctor of laws degree at the commencement, noted that both China and the Soviet Union are committed to world socialism. Cuba and Russia displayed credibility in Angola while the USA did not, he said.

"The administration made a commitment to the Roberto Savimbia factions in Angola, much like Cuba and Russia made a commitment to the MPLA in Angola," the former Texas congressman asserted.

"Our commitment proved to be a commitment without credibility. Theirs was credible. Angola hurt us some in Africa but it hurt elsewhere, too.

"**JAPAN**, A jillion miles away from Angola, wonders whether we'll stand firm. China, concerned about Soviet troops on its northern border, also wonders.

"Our Asian allies in Southeast Asia say we didn't keep that commitment (Angola) and will we keep a commitment to help them stay free. Our NATO allies talk about isolation and withdrawal.

"It is a worldwide problem," stressed Bush.

Bush said he was not suggesting this country was dedicated to intervention, "nor am I suggesting we must export our system to other countries.

"I am saying we have obligations to countries that want to be free.

"**WE ARE A** world power and we properly have worldwide obligations."

Franklin Pierce College, a four-year liberal arts school, also awarded honorary degrees to humanitarian Roy Nie-man, Frank Purdue, the chicken king, C. Robertson Trow-bridge, publisher of Yankee Magazine and the Old Farmer's Almanac, and Red Sox pitcher Bill Lee. The latter was not

orig Franklin Pierce College

Same as 8 May 1976

TRINITY COLLEGE
Spartan

Commencement Address
at
Franklin Pierce College
by
George Bush
Director of Central Intelligence
16 May 1976

I want to speak to you -- briefly, you'll be happy to hear -- about credibility and commitment.

To be believed you really should be committed. To be committed you must really believe.

I am worried about the credibility and the commitment of our country as seen through the eyes of foreign countries, friend and foe alike.

You see, I am convinced that many countries are looking at the USA, and they are trying to decide where we're at.

Let's start at the beginning. We need an assumption.

Assumed, we have the best system of government in the world. There are inequities, no argument on that point, but there are comparatively few; and compared to any other system, we enjoy freedom -- much more freedom than most countries have.

We have existed for 200 years. We have stability, and all through our history we have had a commitment to freedom -- freedom of speech, of religion, of enterprise.

Christmas 1974 I was in China. I had only been there a couple of months, but already the enormous differences between our systems had been brought dramatically and very personally home to me.

China has done a great job in bringing minimal health care to hundreds of millions of people, and a great job in

containing crime, and in providing basic clothing and basic food to the masses; but they have paid an enormous price, at least by our standards, and that price is "freedom."

A radical group, visiting China, came to our house for Christmas Eve. They were travelling in China, staying at the hotel, and I thought it would be nice for them to hear some Christmas carols and be on the closest thing in China to U.S. turf.

I was moved by the strolling British carolers who had come by the U.S. Liaison Office, and I made a comment about "Aren't we lucky to be a free country."

One of the visitors spoke up and said, "We have no freedom in our country. We should emulate this system in China..."

I argued a little -- saw the case was hopeless, stopped, but continued to think about the exchange.

On the plus side, to be fair, China has done a remarkable job. Since what the Chinese refer to as "the liberation," they have made unbelievable strides. I was continually impressed by their sense of pride and their sense of commitment -- their dedication to the principles of Chairman Mao and their commitment to the revolution.

On the minus side, they dare not deviate from the approved line. They have no free press. They have initiative, but it must be channeled into the course dictated by the state.

They are not free to worship. They cannot choose their career. They cannot even choose if they want to get a higher

education. They are inhibited from marrying when they want to. Someone else, somewhere else makes these kinds of decisions.

But China is committed, and it is credible.

Incidentally, the Chinese put great trust in one's word of honor from a foreign relations standpoint.

Okay -- committed and credible; but they look at us today, and I really wonder what they think.

I think they respect our country. I know that individually there is little, if any, hostility to Americans in Peking.

China sees us as a strong country, rich in resources, with a military might unsurpassed in the world. I'm not sure they know enough about our system to give us credit for the diversity that marks our system, or to envy us our freedoms.

I do feel they understand our importance as a world power.

They know our system is different, and they feel that our relationship should be built on our self interest and theirs.

A lot of people speculated at the time of former President Nixon's recent trip to China. Why? Why the trip? Why Nixon? The answer was not related to the domestic political scene in the U.S., or to China's hope that we'd make dramatic policy changes. It was related to the fact

that Mr. Nixon told the Chinese when he took his historic trip, "I come in the self interest of my country."

To the Chinese this was commitment, and it was very credible.

Yes, China sees our importance as a world power. For their "self interest" they want a good relationship, but let's face it, they are asking themselves -- "Is the USA, after 200 years of democracy, or freedom, or whatever one calls our magnificent system -- is the USA committed? Do the people still believe? Do they believe enough to sacrifice for themselves, to say nothing of sacrificing for others."

They are asking the right questions. Many other countries are asking the same questions. These are questions that all of us should ask.

In my new job, I see lots of information on various countries. From this it is easy to conclude that China is a committed nation and that the USSR is a committed nation. I am not saying there is no dissent, but because of the way in which they establish leadership and stifle dissent, it doesn't matter much.

They are committed to world socialism, if you will. You and I should neither doubt that nor underestimate that.

But they look at us and they wonder about our commitment to democracy, or put it this way -- our commitment to oppose the export of communism or, in the example I want to use, the export of Russian hegemony.

The administration made a commitment to the Roberto and Savimbi factions in Angola just as Cuba and Russia made a commitment to the MPLA in Angola. Our commitment proved to be a commitment without credibility. Theirs was credible.

You might say, "So what, we stayed out; we didn't get involved in another Vietnam." True, but here's the problem: I saw an African leader this week. He used this example: you are walking down the street. You're a little man with a big guy as your friend. Another big guy comes along and says to you, "Come with me; you cannot trust your big friend." Then you have a fight with another person and the big friend does not stand up for you, so you go over to the other big guy for help. And then one other little guy over there, not in the fight -- he says, "Which one can I trust?"

He turned to me and said, "You, sir, know the answer." This man, representing a long-time African ally committed to freedom but too weak to preserve it alone, asked the key question.

Angola hurt us some in Africa, but it hurt elsewhere, too.

Japan, a jillion miles away from Angola, wonders, will we stand firm.

China, concerned about Soviet troops on her northern border, sees a strong NATO confronting the USSR in the west

as vital to China's interest, and she wonders.

Our Asian allies in Southeast Asia say, "They didn't keep that commitment. Will they keep a commitment to help us stay free?"

Our NATO allies themselves hear talk about isolation and withdrawal. They don't doubt the Soviets' commitment to Eastern Europe's domination -- and they wonder -- will the U.S. stay committed, credibly, to Western Europe's freedom?

It is a worldwide problem. I am not suggesting we be dedicated to intervention. Nor am I suggesting we must export our system to other countries. I am saying that we have obligations to countries that want to be free.

We are a world power, and we properly have worldwide obligations.

And so what does this all have to do with your graduation?

It gets us to the point where you get the free advice.

Our freedom I have been referring to gives you the right to tune it out -- I recognize that, but here it is:

First, as you leave here, don't give up your interest in learning. Study beyond the confines of your job.

Second, expand your interest to include a comparative look at the world. You'll see plenty of stories criticizing our country, our institutions, our leaders; and that is okay but -- just as the guy when asked "How's your wife?"

responded "Compared to whom?" -- you ask "Okay, we've got problems here. But how are we doing compared to others?"

If you conclude we're doing pretty well, then make a commitment. A commitment to participate in public affairs, a commitment to help in your community, a commitment to do something for someone else. A commitment, if you want, that De Tocqueville understood when he wrote: "The greatness of America lies not in being more enlightened than any other nation, but rather in her ability to repair her faults."

Lastly, save some time for contemplating our role in the world. For studying the realities we face. For understanding that because of our position in world leadership, what we do here shapes the destiny of many peoples all over the world. And then for doing something that will help make our commitment to freedom credible.

In these days of cynicism, there is an obvious question -- how many feel as strongly as Horace Mann did when he said, "Be ashamed to die until you have won some victory for humanity."

Answer -- I think you do; I know you must.

Thank you very much.

ORG, Franklin Pierce College

14 May 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Central Intelligence
FROM :
Office of the Assistant to the Director
SUBJECT : Background Information on Franklin
Pierce College

Franklin Pierce College is fourteen years old; it is a coeducational Liberal Arts College of under 1,000 students. Sports appear to be an important part of college life -- sailing and swimming in good weather on the campus lake, skiing in the winter on a student-constructed slope (complete with two jumps) and cross country trails. Mountain climbing, hiking, hang-gliding, etc., are also featured.

Degrees are offered in: Anthropology, Biology, Economics & Management, English, Psychology, and Sociology. Additional emphasis is put on creative arts, marine science, teacher preparation, and mass media specialties.

The campus pub is the Raven's Nest.

Other commencement guests are: William Lee, left-handed pitcher of the Boston Red Sox; LeRoy Neiman, sports artist; C. Robertson Trowbridge, publisher of Yankee Magazine, and Franklin Perdue of Salisbury, Maryland, who has developed a better chicken (honestly, that's what he did).

JOINED

STAT