

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Speechwriting, White House Office of:
Speech Drafts, 1981-1989

Folder Title: Address: National Association of
Evangelicals (Orlando) (Dolan) 03/08/1983 (4)

Box: 77

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
1. draft	7:00 p.m. p.14 (1p, partial)	3/3/83	P5
2. note	from Doug Holiday (1p)	n.d.	P5
3. draft	7:00 p.m. p. 4 (1p, partial)	3/3/83	P5
4. draft	7:00 p.m. p. 13 (1p, partial)	3/3/83	P5 6/5 12/22/00
COLLECTION: SPEECHWRITING, WHITE HOUSE OFFICE OF: Speech Drafts			ggc
FILE FOLDER: Address National Assoc. of Evangelicals (Orlando)(Dolan) 3/8/83 [4 of 6] OA-6384 Box 77			4/20/94

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P-1 National security classified information [(a)(1) of the PRA].
- P-2 Relating to appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA].
- P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA].
- P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA].
- P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA].
- P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA].

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- F-2 Release could disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA].
- F-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA].
- F-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA].
- F-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA].
- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
1. draft	7:00 p.m. p.14 (1p, partial)	3/3/83	P5
2. note	from Doug Holiday (1p)	n.d.	P5
3. draft	7:00 p.m. p. 4 (1p, partial)	3/3/83	P5
4. draft	7:00 p.m. p. 13 (1p, partial)	3/3/83	P5
COLLECTION:			
SPEECHWRITING, WHITE HOUSE OFFICE OF: Speech Drafts			ggc
FILE FOLDER:			
Address National Assoc. of Evangelicals (Orlando)(Dolan) 3/8/83 [4 of 6] OA 6381			4/20/94

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P-1 National security classified information [(a)(1) of the PRA].
- P-2 Relating to appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA].
- P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA].
- P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA].
- P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA].
- P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA].

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- F-2 Release could disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA].
- F-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA].
- F-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA].
- F-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA].
- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 3, 1983 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: 2:00 FRIDAY March 4, 1983
 SUBJECT: DRAFT PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EVANGELICALS
Tuesday, March 8, 1983

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	GERGEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
MEESE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HARPER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BAKER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	JENKINS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DEAVER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MURPHY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
STOCKMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ROLLINS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CLARK	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	WHITTLESEY		
DARMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	WILLIAMSON		
DUBERSTEIN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	VON DAMM		
FELDSTEIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	BRADY/SPEAK		
FIELDING	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ROGERS		
FULLER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Bakshian</u>		

Comments

Remarks:

Please forward comments/edits directly to Aram to my office, by 2:00 tomorrow, March 4.

Thank you.

Richard G. Darman
 Assistant to the President
 (x2702)

Response:

See comments pages 4 and 9 and 14.

Ken D.

(Dolan/AB)
March 3, 1983
7:00 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EVANGELICALS
ORLANDO, FLORIDA
TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 1983

Nancy and I are delighted to be here today. Those of you in the National Association of Evangelicals are known for your spiritual and humanitarian work -- and I would be especially remiss if I did not discharge right now one personal debt of gratitude.

Thank you for your prayers. Nancy and I have felt their presence many times in many ways. Believe me, for us they have made all the difference. The other day in the East Room someone asked me whether I was aware of all the people out there praying for the President. I was touched, of course, but I'll tell you what I told him: Thank you, but please keep it up. And when you're at it, if you get a busy signal sometimes, keep trying. It just means I'm in there ahead of you.

From the joy and good feeling of this conference we leave for the hurly burly of a political reception for the Florida GOP. You can see it's a day of contrasts; it reminds me of a story I may just tell the folks over at that reception. It seems this evangelical minister and politician both died and went to Heaven. St. Peter took them in hand to show them their new quarters. He took the minister to a small room with just a bed and table. So naturally when the politician saw the modest quarters of this holy man he was pretty worried about what was in store for him.

Much to his surprise, St. Peter took him to a great mansion, with beautiful grounds and many servants and told him all this would be his. So naturally, the politician said: "But how can

you give me this mansion and only a small place to that good minister?"

St. Peter replied, "Oh, don't worry, he's an evangelical, we've got plenty of them up here. But you're the first politician we've ever had."

I like that story. It reminds those of us in the political world that our fast-paced existence can sometimes be an obstacle to quiet reflection and deep commitment, that we can easily forget the ideas and principles that brought us into the public arena in the first place. The basis of those ideals and principles is a commitment to freedom and personal liberty, a commitment that itself is grounded in the much deeper realization: that freedom prospers only where the blessings of God are avidly sought and humbly acknowledged.

The American experiment in democracy rests on this insight, its discovery was the great triumph of our Founding Fathers. "Men who will not be ruled by God will be ruled by tyrants," William Penn said. Explaining the inalienable rights of men, Jefferson remarked, "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time." And it was George Washington who said that "of all the disposition and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports."

And finally, that shrewdest of all observers of American democracy, Alexis de Tocqueville, put it eloquently:

"I sought for the greatness and genius of America in fertile fields and boundless forests, it was not there. I sought for it in her free schools and her institutions of learning; it was not there. I sought for it in her matchless Constitution and democratic congress; it was not there. Not until I went to the churches of America and found them aflame with righteousness did I understand the greatness and genius

of America. America is great because America is good. When America ceases to be good, America will cease to be great."

That is why I am so pleased to be here today with the people who are in the business of keeping America great by keeping her good. Only through your work and prayers and those of millions of others can we hope to survive this perilous century and keep alive this experiment in liberty, this last best hope of man called America.

I want you to know this Administration is motivated by a political philosophy that sees the greatness of America in you, her people, and in your families, churches, neighborhoods, communities -- the institutions that foster and nourish values like concern for others and respect for the rule of law under God.

Now I don't have to tell you that our pursuit of this philosophy puts us in opposition to the prevailing attitude of many of those in government, educational foundations and institutions, and significant sectors of the media. The views of such groups, however well intentioned, are deeply secularist and decidedly liberal; their value system is radically different from that of most Americans. Because they view everyday Americans as wanton and unwise, they have taken upon themselves the job of regulating, overseeing and superintending the people from Washington.

Now recent polls have shown a dichotomy between their values and those of the American people. For example, recent surveys of elites in the media and entertainment industry showed they voted in far greater numbers than their fellow Americans for liberal

candidates, that most see nothing wrong with adultery and homosexuality, that they approve of abortion by overwhelming margins and that less than 10 percent give religion any important place in their lives.

I think one recent controversy in Washington, the one over the so-called "squeal rule," is an illustration of this clash between the values of these elites and the rest of America. And don't get me wrong, I'm not attacking or attempting to silence anybody. I just think the difference between the elitist view of the world and ours ought to be fully aired.

Now, as most of you know, the controversy began when a judge struck down rules issued by our Administration requiring family planning clinics to notify parents that they have provided birth control devices to underage teenager girls. Believe me, I wonder, too, what Government is doing in the birth control business at all -- but the Congress passed the legislation several years ago and we have no choice but to carry it out. Now this rule, which is nothing more than an affirmation of the traditional rights of parents, was met with attacks from the left portraying those of us in the Administration as a bunch of pinch-cheeked old prudes out to keep the kids from having a little fun.

It reminded me of a similar storm some years ago in California when I insisted that parents had a right to know if their 15-year-old daughter was going to have an abortion especially since the State was paying for the abortion with welfare funds. This caused quite a stir but who, I asked, are we in government to act in locus parentis? For heaven's sake, that

7
The... ..

girl couldn't have her tonsils out without parental consent, let alone an abortion. It was during the controversy I began to realize that the real agenda of many who subscribe to this liberal, secularist philosophy is to actually impose their values -- to use the power of Government, the media and the schools -- to supercede the family, church and other inculcators of traditional values.

I believe the same mind set is at work in the squeal rule controversy. Hoping to silence the opposition with names like old-fashioned and puritanical, our critics seek to use the power of government to insure the preeminence of their own views, views that are clearly out of step with what most Americans believe and want.

So there you have it: the same liberal secularists who did a marvelous job of giving us inflation, recession, unemployment, unmanageable bureaucracy, a trillion dollar debt and a host of foreign policy debacles now want us to let them preempt parental rights and run the sex lives of our underage teenagers.

Well, I say we fight our battle in the courts, I say the rule stays. And I say the rights of parents and the rights of family take precedence over those of Washington-based bureaucrats and social engineers.

But the squeal rule is really only one example of many attempts to water down traditional values and even abrogate the original terms of American democracy. As I mentioned before, nothing could be more deeply engrained into the American political consensus than the realization that freedom prospers when religion is vibrant and the rule of law under God

acknowledged. When our Founding Fathers passed the first amendment they sought to protect churches from Government interference. They never meant to construct a wall of hostility between Government and the concept of religious belief itself.

The evidence of this permeates our history and our government: The Declaration of Independence mentions the Supreme Being no less than four times; "In God We Trust" is engraved on our coinage; the Supreme Court opens its proceedings with a "religious" invocation; and the Members of Congress open their sessions with a prayer. I just happen to believe the school children of the United States are entitled to the same privileges as Supreme Court Justices and Congressmen -- it's time for Congress to act on the prayer amendment. Let our children pray.

But in the controversy over the prayer amendment, we see once again that will to power that has characterized so much of the liberal social philosophy that dominated American intellectual life in the fifties and sixties. Many advocates of liberal and so-called progressive education hoped that the schools would become social science laboratories where school children could be removed from traditional influences and taught instead the wonders of value-free science and moral relativism.

Now we know that what happened to American education as it increasingly fell under the influence of this social science mentality. The influence of parents and teachers declined, so did excellence and discipline -- and America's school children learned less and less.

As you all know, there has been a rebellion among parents and teachers against these lax educational standards and once again basic learning is being stressed in our schools.

Similarly, the attempt to prohibit the acknowledgement of God in the classroom has come under heavy fire. By overwhelming margins, the American people want prayer returned to the classroom and have been voting for candidates who support that amendment.

Unfortunately, however, this hasn't discouraged the small elite on the left who still want to impose their value system on the vast majority of Americans. Perhaps some of you read recently about the Lubbock school case where a judge actually ruled that it was unconstitutional for a group of students to meet on their own time on school property for religious purposes. You can see, can't you, how the first amendment has been stood on its head? How a constitutional provision designed to promote religious expression has been used to stifle that expression? And you can see, can't you, the irony of those who call themselves "liberals" using their position of power to deny to millions the time-honored right of religious expression in public places?

And let me add here that, like you, I have been deeply concerned about recent controversies in several States between religious schools and State educational authorities. No one questions the right of the individual States to have a voice in establishing certain minimum standards for the education of our children. But, on the other hand, religious schools are entitled

to make basic decisions about their curriculum and not be forced to march in lockstep to the directives of State bureaucrats.

I think you should know that both Senators Denton and Hatfield have proposed legislation in the Congress on the whole question of prohibiting discrimination against religious forms of student speech. I strongly support that legislation, and, with your help, I think it's possible we could get the amendment through the Congress this year.

Now in discussing these instances of the arbitrary imposition of liberal views, we would be remiss not to mention a Supreme Court decision more than a decade ago that, quite literally, wiped off the books the statutes of 50 States protecting the rights of unborn children. Abortion on demand is a great moral evil that takes the lives of ___ fetuses a year. Human life legislation ending this tragedy will someday pass the Congress -- and you and I must never rest until it does.

You may remember that when abortion on demand began many religious leaders warned that the practice would lead to a decline in respect for human life, that the philosophical premises used to justify abortion on demand would ultimately be used to justify other attacks on the sacredness of human life, even infanticide or mercy killings. When these warnings were first spoken, many of those in the intelligensia and the glitter set scoffed at them. But, tragically enough, they proved all too true: only last year a court in Indiana issued an order permitting the death by starvation of a handicapped infant.

Recent legislation introduced in the Congress by Representative Henry Hyde not only increases restrictions on

publicly-financed abortions, it also addresses this whole problem of infanticide. I urge the Congress to begin hearings soon on this legislation, to address the problems of infanticide, to adopt legislation that will protect the right of all children, including the disabled or handicapped, to the right to life.

HHSPut out regulations earlier this week on this. How about neutering?

Now in surveying the effect of several decades of liberal, secularist philosophy -- the wreckage, for example, left by the decisions like those on abortion and school prayer -- it is easy to grow discouraged. But we must never forget that we now stand at a turning point, a time when the old liberalism -- decadent and dying -- is being replaced by a new political consensus, a consensus that wants Government to perform its legitimate duties such as maintaining domestic peace and our national security but otherwise to leave the people alone.

Along with this return to limited Government, there is a great spiritual awakening in America and a renewal of the traditional values that have been the bedrocks of America's goodness and greatness.

One recent survey of thousands of Americans by a Washington based research council concluded that Americans were far more religious than the people of other nations; 95 percent of those surveyed expressed a belief in God and a huge majority believed the Ten Commandments had real meaning for their lives.

Another study of 2,000 Americans by Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance found that -- in contrast to the views of the elites I mentioned earlier -- the following practices were found wrong by large majorities of average Americans: adultery, 85 percent; hard drugs, 84 percent; homosexuality, 71 percent; sex before 16,

71 percent; abortion, 65 percent; and pornography, 68 percent. And this same study showed a deep reverence for the importance of family ties and religious belief.

So I think the items we have discussed today are the political agenda of the future. Remember for the first time the Congress is openly and seriously debating and dealing with the prayer and abortion issues -- that's enormous progress right there. I repeat: America is in the midst of a spiritual awakening and a moral renewal. With your biblical keynote, I say today let "justice roll on like a river, righteousness like a never failing stream."

Now obviously, much of this new political and social consensus I have talked about is based on a positive view of American history, one that takes pride in our country's accomplishments and record. But we must never forget an important distinction between our moral philosophy and that of the liberal secularists. Unlike them, we know that no Government schemes are going to perfect man; we know that living in this world means dealing with what philosophers would call the phenomenology of evil or, as the theologians would put it, the doctrine of sin.

There is sin, there is evil in this world and we are enjoined by scripture and the Lord Jesus to oppose it with all our might. And that is why in talking about America we must never forget that, like any other human entity, our Nation, too, has a legacy of evil with which it must deal.

Now, the glory of this land has been its capacity for transcending the moral evils of our past. For example, the long

struggle of minority citizens for equal rights, once a source of disunity and civil war, is now a point of pride for all Americans. We must never go back. There is no room for racism, anti-semitism or other forms of ethnic and racial hatred in this country. I know you have been horrified as have I by the resurgence of some hate groups preaching bigotry and prejudice. Today I urge you: Use the mighty voice of your pulpits and the powerful standing of your churches to denounce and isolate these hate groups in our midst.

[And I want to mention today another dark legacy of our past -- one that we are also now attempting to address in Washington. For many years in America we tolerated the existence of powerful syndicates of organized crime. As the years went by, these national syndicates increased in power, influence and sophistication. Recently, in the enormous growth of the illegal drug trade, we have seen the tragic results of this permissiveness and the climate of professional lawlessness it fostered. This trade was only a short time ago spreading murder and mayhem throughout South Florida. Today, through the South Florida Task Force headed by Vice President Bush, we have a handle on it. We've cracked down on this drug trade in Florida, and now we're bringing on 200 new prosecutors and 1,000 new investigators to extend that task force model to 12 other regions throughout the United States.

Yes, we are going after the drug cartels. But we're not going to stop there. Through a new presidential commission and several other initiatives, we intend to expose and prosecute the infrastructure of organized crime itself. We mean to cripple

their enterprises, dry up their profits and put their leaders behind bars where they belong.]

But whatever sad episodes exist in our past, any objective observer must hold a positive view of American history, a history that has been the story of hopes fulfilled and dreams made into reality. Especially in this century, America has kept alight the torch of freedom -- not just for ourselves but for millions of others around the world. And this brings me to my final point today, and, by the way, it's another illustration of the gulf between the views of our professional elites and those of everyday Americans.

During my first press conference as President, I pointed out that as good Marxists-Leninists the Soviet leaders have "openly and publicly declared that the only morality they recognize is what will further their cause, meaning they reserve unto themselves the right to commit any crime, to lie, to cheat . . . and that is moral, not immoral." I said that we would do well to keep this in mind during our negotiations with the Soviets.

Well, once again this caused a stir. I saw several accounts that truncated my remarks and suggested they were nothing more than name calling. Other accounts suggested that it was a breach of diplomacy to be that candid about the Soviets.

Now -- putting aside for the moment the fact that the pundits and opinion makers are rarely upset when the Soviets say much worse about us everyday in their press -- I think I should point out I was only quoting Lenin, a saint, a guiding spirit to the Soviet leadership, who wrote in 1920: "We repudiate all

morality that proceeds from supernatural ideas or ideas that are outside class conceptions. Morality is entirely subordinate to the interests of class war. Everything is moral that is necessary for the annihilation of the old exploiting social order and for uniting the proleteriat."

I think the refusal of many influential people to accept this elementary insight into Soviet behavior illustrates the historical reluctance of much of the elite to see totalitarian powers for what they are. We saw this phenomenon in the 1930's; we see it today in the nuclear freeze movement.

But surely, just as we look back in wonder at the self-deception of the 1930's, future historians, looking back at our time, will be shocked by the naivete and moral blindness of the unilateral disarmers. Surely, they will note the real proportions of the threat to peace, that it was the West that refused to use its nuclear monopoly in the forties and fifties for territorial gain -- and that it was not the West that intervened by proxy in Angola, in Ethiopia, in South Yeman or Central America; that it was not the West that invaded Afghanistan, or suppressed Polish Solidarity or used chemical and biological warfare in Afghanistan and Southeast Asia.

Surely, those historians will find in the councils of those who preached the supremacy of the state, who declared its omnipotence over individual man, who predicted its eventual domination of all peoples of the Earth, surely historians will see there . . . the focus of evil in the modern world. It was C.S. Lewis who in his unforgettable Screwtape Letters wrote:

"The greatest evil is not now done in those sordid 'dens of crime' that Dickens loved to paint. It is not

done even in concentration camps and labor camps -- in those we see its final result. But it is conceived and ordered (moved, seconded, carried and minuted) in clear, carpeted, warmed and well-lighted offices by quiet men with white collars and cut fingernails and smooth-shaven cheeks who do not need to raise their voices."

Because these "quiet men" do not "raise their voices," because they sometimes speak in soothing tones of brotherhood and peace, because, like other dictators before them, they are always making "their final territorial demand," some would have us accept them at their word and accommodate ourselves to their aggressive impulses. But, if history teaches anything, it teaches: simple-minded appeasement or self-delusion about our adversaries is folly -- it means the betrayal of our past, the squandering of our freedom.

So I urge you to speak out against those who would place the United States in a position of military inferiority to the Soviet Union. You know, I have always believed that old Screwtape reserves his best efforts for those of you in the Church. So in your discussions of the nuclear freeze movement, I urge you to beware the temptation of pride -- the temptation to blithely declare yourselves above it all and label both sides equally at fault, to ignore the facts of history and the aggressive impulses of an evil empire, to simply call the arms race a giant misunderstanding and thereby remove yourself from the struggle between right and wrong, good and evil.

I ask you to resist the attempts of those who would have you bargain away [for the sake of a few glowing minutes on the nightly news and a little cooing from the glitter set,] your vital

Many evangelicals could find this implication offensive.

support for this Administration's efforts to keep America strong and free.

But, while America's military strength is important, let me add here that I have always maintained that the struggle now going on for the world will never be decided by bombs or rockets, by armies or military might. For the real crisis we face today is a spiritual one, at root it is a test of moral will and religious faith.

Whittaker Chambers, the man whose own religious conversion made him a "witness" to one of the terrible traumas of our age, the Hiss Chambers case, wrote that the crisis of the Western world exists to the degree in which the West is indifferent to God, the degree to which it collaborates in Communism's attempt to make man stand alone without God. For Marxism-Leninism is actually the second oldest faith, he said, first proclaimed in the Garden of Eden with the words of temptation: "Ye shall be as gods."

The Western world can answer this challenge, he wrote, "but only provided that its faith in God and the freedom he enjoins is as great as Communism's faith in man."

I believe we shall rise to this challenge; I believe that Communism is another sad, bizarre chapter in human history whose last pages even now are being written. I believe this because the strength of our cause, the quest for human freedom, is not of this world; and because this strength is spiritual and knows no limitation, it must terrify and ultimately triumph over those who would enslave their fellow man. For, in the words of Isaiah:

"He giveth power to the faint, and to them that have no
might, He increased their strength . . . but they that wait upon
the Lord shall renew their strength . . . they shall mount up
with wings as eagles. They shall run and not be weary . . ."

Thank you and God bless you.

Justice
(Dolan/AB)
March 3, 1983
7:00 p.m.

Roger
Clegg

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EVANGELICALS
ORLANDO, FLORIDA
TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 1983

Nancy and I are delighted to be here today. Those of you in the National Association of Evangelicals are known for your spiritual and humanitarian work -- and I would be especially remiss if I did not discharge right now one personal debt of gratitude.

Thank you for your prayers. Nancy and I have felt their presence many times in many ways. Believe me, for us they have made all the difference. The other day in the East Room someone asked me whether I was aware of all the people out there praying for the President. I was touched, of course, but I'll tell you what I told him: Thank you, but please keep it up. And when you're at it, if you get a busy signal sometimes, keep trying. It just means I'm in there ahead of you.


From the joy and good feeling of this conference we leave for the hurly burly of a political reception for the Florida GOP. You can see it's a day of contrasts; it reminds me of a story I may just tell the folks over at that reception. It seems this evangelical minister and politician both died and went to Heaven. St. Peter took them in hand to show them their new quarters. He took the minister to a small room with just a bed and table. So naturally when the politician saw the modest quarters of this holy man he was pretty worried about what was in store for him.

Much to his surprise, St. Peter took him to a great mansion, with beautiful grounds and many servants and told him all this would be his. So naturally, the politician said: "But how can

you give me this mansion and only a small place to that good minister?"

St. Peter replied, "Oh, don't worry, he's an evangelical, we've got plenty of them up here. But you're the first politician we've ever had."

I like that story. It reminds those of us in the political world that our fast-paced existence can sometimes be an obstacle to quiet reflection and deep commitment, that we can easily forget the ideas and principles that brought us into the public arena in the first place. The basis of those ideals and principles is a commitment to freedom and personal liberty, a commitment that itself is grounded in the much deeper realization: that freedom prospers only where the blessings of God are avidly sought and humbly acknowledged.

The American experiment in democracy rests on this insight;  its discovery was the great triumph of our Founding Fathers. "Men who will not be ruled by God will be ruled by tyrants," William Penn said. Explaining the inalienable rights of men, Jefferson remarked, "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time." And it was George Washington who said that "of all the disposition and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports."

And finally, that shrewdest of all observers of American democracy, Alexis de Tocqueville, put it eloquently:

"I sought for the greatness and genius of America in fertile fields and boundless forests, it was not there. I sought for it in her free schools and her institutions of learning; it was not there. I sought for it in her matchless Constitution and democratic congress; it was not there. Not until I went to the churches of America and found them aflame with righteousness did I understand the greatness and genius

of America. America is great because America is good. When America ceases to be good, America will cease to be great."

That is why I am so pleased to be here today with the people who are in the business of keeping America great by keeping her good. Only through your work and prayers and those of millions of others can we hope to survive this perilous century and keep alive this experiment in liberty, this last best hope of man called America.

I want you to know this Administration is motivated by a political philosophy that sees the greatness of America in you, her people, and in your families, churches, neighborhoods, communities -- the institutions that foster and nourish values like concern for others and respect for the rule of law under God.

Now I don't have to tell you that our pursuit of this philosophy puts us in opposition to the prevailing attitude of many of those in government, educational foundations and institutions, and significant sectors of the media. The views of such groups, however well intentioned, are deeply secularist and decidedly liberal; their value system is radically different from that of most Americans. Because they view everyday Americans as wanton and unwise, they have taken upon themselves the job of regulating, overseeing and superintending the people from Washington.

Now recent polls have shown a dichotomy between their values and those of the American people. For example, recent surveys of elites in the media and entertainment industry showed they voted in far greater numbers than their fellow Americans for liberal

candidates, that most see nothing wrong with adultery and homosexuality, that they approve of abortion by overwhelming margins and that less than 10 percent give religion any important place in their lives.

I think one recent controversy in Washington, the one over the so-called "squeal rule," is an illustration of this clash between the values of these elites and the rest of America. And don't get me wrong, I'm not attacking or attempting to silence anybody. I just think the difference between the elitist view of the world and ours ought to be fully aired.

Now, as most of you know, the controversy began when a judge struck down rules issued by our Administration requiring family planning clinics to notify parents that they have provided birth control devices to underage teenager girls. Believe me, I wonder, too, what Government is doing in the birth control business at all -- but the Congress passed the legislation several years ago and we have no choice but to carry it out. Now this rule, which is nothing more than an affirmation of the traditional rights of parents, was met with attacks from the left portraying those of us in the Administration as a bunch of pinch-cheeked old prudes out to keep the kids from having a little fun.

It reminded me of a similar storm some years ago in California when I insisted that parents had a right to know if their 15-year-old daughter was going to have an abortion especially since the State was paying for the abortion with welfare funds. This caused quite a stir but who, I asked, are we in government to act in locus parentis? For heaven's sake, that

girl couldn't have her tonsils out without parental consent, let alone an abortion. It was during the controversy I began to realize that the real agenda of many who subscribe to this liberal, secularist philosophy is to actually impose their values -- to use the power of Government, the media and the schools -- to supercede the family, church and other inculcators of traditional values.

I believe the same mind set is at work in the squeal rule controversy. Hoping to silence the opposition with names like old-fashioned and puritanical, our critics seek to use the power of government to insure the preeminence of their own views, views that are clearly out of step with what most Americans believe and want.

So there you have it: the same liberal secularists who did a marvelous job of giving us inflation, recession, unemployment, unmanageable bureaucracy, a trillion dollar debt and a host of foreign policy debacles now want us to let them preempt parental rights and run the sex lives of our underage teenagers.

Well, I say we fight our battle in the courts, I say the rule stays. And I say the rights of parents and the rights of family take precedence over those of Washington-based bureaucrats and social engineers.

But the squeal rule is really only one example of many attempts to water down traditional values and even abrogate the original terms of American democracy. As I mentioned before, nothing could be more deeply engrained into the American political consensus than the realization that freedom prospers when religion is vibrant and the rule of law under God

acknowledged. When our Founding Fathers passed the first amendment they sought to protect churches from Government interference. They never meant to construct a wall of hostility between Government and the concept of religious belief itself.

The evidence of this permeates our history and our government: The Declaration of Independence mentions the Supreme Being no less than four times; "In God We Trust" is engraved on our coinage; the Supreme Court opens its proceedings with a "religious" invocation; and the Members of Congress open their sessions with a prayer. I just happen to believe the school children of the United States are entitled to the same privileges as Supreme Court Justices and Congressmen -- it's time for Congress to act on the prayer amendment. Let our children pray.

But in the controversy over the prayer amendment, we see once again that will to power that has characterized so much of the liberal social philosophy that dominated American intellectual life in the fifties and sixties. Many advocates of liberal and so-called progressive education hoped that the schools would become ~~social science~~ laboratories where school children could be removed from traditional influences and taught instead the wonders of value-free science and moral relativism.

Now we know that what happened to American education as it increasingly fell under the influence of this ^{ll} social science mentality. ^{ll} ~~AS~~ The influence of parents and teachers declined, so did excellence and discipline -- and America's school children learned less and less.

means
what

As you all know, there has been a rebellion among parents and teachers against these lax educational standards and once again basic learning is being stressed in our schools.

Similarly, the attempt to prohibit the acknowledgement of God in the classroom has come under heavy fire. By overwhelming margins, the American people want prayer returned to the classroom and have been voting for candidates who support that amendment.

Unfortunately, however, this hasn't discouraged the small elite on the left who still want to impose their value system on the vast majority of Americans. Perhaps some of you read recently about the Lubbock school case where a judge actually ruled that it was unconstitutional for a group of students to meet on their own time on school property for religious purposes. You can see, can't you, how the first amendment has been stood on its head? How a constitutional provision designed to promote religious expression has been used to stifle that expression? And you can see, can't you, the irony of those who call themselves "liberals" using their position of power to deny to millions the time-honored right of religious expression in public places?

And let me add here that, like you, I have been deeply concerned about recent controversies in several States between religious schools and State educational authorities. No one questions the right of the individual States to have a voice in establishing certain minimum standards for the education of our children. But, on the other hand, religious schools are entitled

to make basic decisions about their curriculum and not be forced to march in lockstep to the directives of State bureaucrats.

I think you should know that both Senators Denton and Hatfield have proposed legislation in the Congress on the whole question of prohibiting discrimination against religious forms of student speech. I strongly support that legislation, and, with your help, I think it's possible we could get the amendment through the Congress this year.

Now in discussing these instances of the arbitrary imposition of liberal views, we would be remiss not to mention a Supreme Court decision more than a decade ago that, quite literally, wiped off the books the statutes of 50 States protecting the rights of unborn children. Abortion on demand is a great moral evil that takes the lives of ___ fetuses a year. Human life legislation ending this tragedy will someday pass the Congress -- and you and I must never rest until it does.

1973 — decision may not be known

Philosophy not abortion my skin

You may remember that when abortion on demand began many religious leaders warned that the practice would lead to a decline in respect for human life, that the philosophical premises used to justify abortion on demand would ultimately be used to justify other attacks on the sacredness of human life, even infanticide or mercy killings. When these warnings were first spoken, many of those in the intelligensia and the glitter set scoffed at them. But, tragically enough, they proved all too true: only last year a court in Indiana issued an order permitting the death by starvation of a handicapped infant.

Recent legislation introduced in the Congress by Representative Henry Hyde not only increases restrictions on

publicly-financed abortions, it also addresses this whole problem of infanticide. I urge the Congress to begin hearings soon on this legislation, to address the problems of infanticide, to adopt legislation that will protect the right of all children, including the disabled or handicapped, to the right to life.

Now in surveying the effect of several decades of liberal, secularist philosophy -- the wreckage, for example, left by the decisions like those on abortion and school prayer -- it is easy to grow discouraged. But we must never forget that we now stand at a turning point, a time when the old liberalism -- decadent and dying -- is being replaced by a new political consensus, a consensus that wants Government to perform its legitimate duties such as maintaining domestic peace and our national security but otherwise to leave the people alone.

Along with this return to limited Government, there is a great spiritual awakening in America and a renewal of the traditional values that have been the bedrocks of America's goodness and greatness.

One recent survey of thousands of Americans by a Washington based research council concluded that Americans were far more religious than the people of other nations; 95 percent of those surveyed expressed a belief in God and a huge majority believed the Ten Commandments had real meaning for their lives.

Another study of 2,000 Americans by Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance found that -- in contrast to the views of the elites I mentioned earlier -- the following practices were found wrong by large majorities of average Americans: adultery, 85 percent; hard drugs, 84 percent; homosexuality, 71 percent; sex before 16,

71 percent; abortion, 65 percent; and pornography, 68 percent. And this same study showed a deep reverence for the importance of family ties and religious belief.

So I think the items we have discussed today are the political agenda of the future. Remember for the first time the Congress is openly and seriously debating and dealing with the prayer and abortion issues -- that's enormous progress right there. I repeat: America is in the midst of a spiritual awakening and a moral renewal. With your biblical keynote, I say today let "justice roll on like a river, righteousness like a never failing stream."

Now obviously, much of this new political and social consensus I have talked about is based on a positive view of American history, one that takes pride in our country's accomplishments and record. But we must never forget an important distinction between our moral philosophy and that of the liberal secularists. Unlike them, we know that no Government schemes are going to perfect man; we know that living in this world means dealing with what philosophers would call the phenomenology of evil or, as the theologians would put it, the doctrine of sin.

There is sin, there is evil in this world and we are enjoined by scripture and the Lord Jesus to oppose it with all our might. And that is why in talking about America we must never forget that, like any other human entity, our Nation, too, has a legacy of evil with which it must deal.

Now, the glory of this land has been its capacity for transcending the moral evils of our past. For example, the long

struggle of minority citizens for equal rights, once a source of disunity and civil war, is now a point of pride for all Americans. We must never go back. There is no room for racism, anti-semitism or other forms of ethnic and racial hatred in this country. I know you have been horrified as have I by the resurgence of some hate groups preaching bigotry and prejudice. Today I urge you: Use the mighty voice of your pulpits and the powerful standing of your churches to denounce and isolate these hate groups in our midst.

[And I want to mention today another dark legacy of our past -- one that we are also now attempting to address in Washington. For many years in America we tolerated the existence of powerful syndicates of organized crime. As the years went by, these national syndicates increased in power, influence and sophistication. Recently, in the enormous growth of the illegal drug trade, we have seen the tragic results of this permissiveness and the climate of professional lawlessness it fostered. This trade was only a short time ago spreading murder and mayhem throughout South Florida. Today, through the South Florida Task Force headed by Vice President Bush, we have a handle on it. We've cracked down on this drug trade in Florida, and now we're bringing on 200 new prosecutors and 1,000 new investigators to extend that task force model to 12 other regions throughout the United States.

Yes, we are going after the drug cartels. But we're not going to stop there. Through a new presidential commission and several other initiatives, we intend to expose and prosecute the infrastructure of organized crime itself. We mean to cripple

their enterprises, dry up their profits and put their leaders behind bars where they belong.]

But whatever sad episodes exist in our past, any objective observer must hold a positive view of American history, a history that has been the story of hopes fulfilled and dreams made into reality. Especially in this century, America has kept alight the torch of freedom -- not just for ourselves but for millions of others around the world. And this brings me to my final point today, and, by the way, it's another illustration of the gulf between the views of our professional elites and those of everyday Americans.

During my first press conference as President, I pointed out that as good Marxists-Leninists the Soviet leaders have "openly and publicly declared that the only morality they recognize is what will further their cause, meaning they reserve unto themselves the right to commit any crime, to lie, to cheat . . . and that is moral, not immoral." I said that we would do well to keep this in mind during our negotiations with the Soviets.

Well, once again this caused a stir. I saw several accounts that truncated my remarks and suggested they were nothing more than name calling. Other accounts suggested that it was a breach of diplomacy to be that candid about the Soviets.

Now -- putting aside for the moment the fact that the pundits and opinion makers are rarely upset when the Soviets say much worse about us everyday in their press -- I think I should point out I was only quoting Lenin, a saint, a guiding spirit to the Soviet leadership, who wrote in 1920: "We repudiate all

morality that proceeds from supernatural ideas or ideas that are outside class conceptions. Morality is entirely subordinate to the interests of class war. Everything is moral that is necessary for the annihilation of the old exploiting social order and for uniting the proleteriat."

I think the refusal of many influential people to accept this elementary insight into Soviet behavior illustrates the historical reluctance of much of the elite to see totalitarian powers for what they are. We saw this phenomenon in the 1930's; we see it today in the nuclear freeze movement.

But surely, just as we look back in wonder at the self-deception of the 1930's, future historians, looking back at our time, will be shocked by the naivete and moral blindness of the unilateral disarmers. Surely, they will note the real proportions of the threat to peace, that it was the West that refused to use its nuclear monopoly in the forties and fifties for territorial gain -- and that it was not the West that intervened by proxy in Angola, in Ethiopia, in South Yeman or Central America; that it was not the West that invaded Afghanistan, or suppressed Polish Solidarity or used chemical and ~~biological~~^{YOKIC} warfare in Afghanistan and Southeast Asia.

Surely, those historians will find in the councils of those who preached the supremacy of the state, who declared its omnipotence over individual man, who predicted its eventual domination of all peoples of the Earth, surely historians will see there . . . the focus of evil in the modern world. It was C.S. Lewis who in his unforgettable Screwtape Letters wrote:

"The greatest evil is not now done in those sordid 'dens of crime' that Dickens loved to paint. It is not

done even in concentration camps and labor camps -- in those we see its final result. But it is conceived and ordered (moved, seconded, carried and minuted) in clear, carpeted, warmed and well-lighted offices by quiet men with white collars and cut fingernails and smooth-shaven cheeks who do not need to raise their voices."

Because these "quiet men" do not "raise their voices," because they sometimes speak in soothing tones of brotherhood and peace, because, like other dictators before them, they are always making "their final territorial demand," some would have us accept them at their word and accommodate ourselves to their aggressive impulses. But, if history teaches anything, it teaches: simple-minded appeasement or self-delusion about our adversaries is folly -- it means the betrayal of our past, the squandering of our freedom.

So I urge you to speak out against those who would place the United States in a position of military inferiority to the Soviet Union. You know, I have always believed that old Screwtape reserves his best efforts for those of you in the Church. So in your discussions of the nuclear freeze movement, I urge you to beware the temptation of pride -- the temptation to blithely declare yourselves above it all and label both sides equally at fault, to ignore the facts of history and the aggressive impulses of an evil empire, to simply call the arms race a giant misunderstanding and thereby remove yourself from the struggle between right and wrong, good and evil.

I ask you to resist the attempts of those who would have you bargain away, for the sake of a few glowing minutes on the nightly news and a little cooing from the glitter set, your vital

support for this Administration's efforts to keep America strong and free.

But, while America's military strength is important, let me add here that I have always maintained that the struggle now going on for the world will never be decided by bombs or rockets, by armies or military might. For the real crisis we face today is a spiritual one, at root it is a test of moral will and religious faith.

Whittaker Chambers, the man whose own religious conversion made him a "witness" to one of the terrible traumas of our age, the Hiss Chambers case, wrote that the crisis of the Western world exists to the degree in which the West is indifferent to God, the degree to which it collaborates in Communism's attempt to make man stand alone without God. For Marxism-Leninism is actually the second oldest faith, he said, first proclaimed in the Garden of Eden with the words of temptation: "Ye shall be as gods."

The Western world can answer this challenge, he wrote, "but only provided that its faith in God and the freedom he enjoins is as great as Communism's faith in man."

I believe we shall rise to this challenge; I believe that Communism is another sad, bizarre chapter in human history whose last pages even now are being written. I believe this because the strength of our cause, the quest for human freedom, is not of this world; and because this strength is spiritual and knows no limitation, it must terrify and ultimately triumph over those who would enslave their fellow man. For, in the words of Isaiah:

"He giveth power to the faint, and to them that have no
might, He increased their strength . . . ~~but~~ they that wait upon
the Lord shall renew their strength . . . they shall mount up
with wings as eagles. They shall run and not be weary . . ."

Thank you and God bless you.

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

March 4, 1983

FOR: ARAM BAKSHIAN

FROM: ROBERT B. CARLESON
MICHAEL M. UHLMANN

SUBJECT: Draft Presidential Remarks to NAE

Since the President is mentioning infanticide and the Bloomington Baby in this speech, we ought to give a plug for our new anti-infanticide regulation which Margaret Heckler so strongly endorsed at her hearings on Wednesday. I have attached several draft paragraphs for this purpose. Additional small changes are marked on the draft.

Insert B for p. 8

Last week my Administration took a decisive step to bring infanticide in this country to an immediate halt. Beginning two weeks from today, every federally assisted hospital in the land will be required to post a notice in its infant care wards. That notice will say that discriminatory failure to feed and care for handicapped infants is a violation of federal law.

The notice will list a toll-free national telephone number, a hotline to the Department of Health and Human Services. Anyone who knows that a handicapped infant is being starved or denied customary care will be able to phone in. Immediately, three calls will go out from the hotline operator. First, to the state child protective agency, to investigate under the state child abuse and neglect laws. Second, to the regional office of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, to put an investigator immediately on the case. Third, to the Justice Department, to be on standby in case legal action is needed to save the baby's life.

I know that the vast majority of American doctors and nurses want to care for handicapped children, not kill them. But I have been disturbed by growing reports that denial of food and customary medical care is more widespread than many of us believed possible. Nurses and doctors need a sure and safe way to report these incidents and save the children. I believe the HHS hotline is exactly the answer that is needed, to restore respect for the sanctity of human life in this area.

OFFICE OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT

STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 3/4/83 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: 2:00 TODAY

SUBJECT: DRAFT PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EVANGELICALS
Tuesday, March 8, 1983

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
HARPER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DRUG POLICY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
PORTER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	TURNER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BARR	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	D. LEONARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BLEDSON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	OFFICE OF POLICY INFORMATION		
BOGGS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	HOPKINS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BRADLEY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PROPERTY REVIEW BOARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARLESON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	OTHER		
DENEND	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FAIRBANKS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FERRARA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GALEBACH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GARFINKEL	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GUNN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. LEONARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
LI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
MONTOYA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ROCK	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ROPER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SMITH	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
UHLMANN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ADMINISTRATION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS:

MIKE UHLMANN FOR ACTION

May I please have any comments by 200 today.

Judy Johnston 3/4

Please return this tracking sheet with your response

Edwin L. Harper
 Assistant to the President
 for Policy Development
 (46515)

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 3, 1983 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: 2:00 FRIDAY
March 4, 1983

SUBJECT: DRAFT PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EVANGELICALS
Tuesday, March 8, 1983

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	GERGEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
MEESE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HARPER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BAKER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	JENKINS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DEAVER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MURPHY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
STOCKMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ROLLINS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CLARK	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	WHITTLESEY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input type="checkbox"/> P	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SS	WILLIAMSON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DUBERSTEIN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	VON DAMM	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FELDSTEIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	BRADY/SPEAKES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FIELDING	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ROGERS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FULLER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Bakshian</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Remarks:

Please forward comments/edits directly to Aram Bakshian, with a copy to my office, by 2:00 tomorrow, March 4.

Thank you.

Richard G. Darman
Assistant to the President
(x2702)

Response:

(Dolan/AB)
March 3, 1983
7:00 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EVANGELICALS
ORLANDO, FLORIDA
TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 1983

Nancy and I are delighted to be here today. Those of you in the National Association of Evangelicals are known for your spiritual and humanitarian work -- and I would be especially remiss if I did not discharge right now one personal debt of gratitude.

Thank you for your prayers. Nancy and I have felt their presence many times in many ways. Believe me, for us they have made all the difference. The other day in the East Room someone asked me whether I was aware of all the people out there praying for the President. I was touched, of course, but I'll tell you what I told him: Thank you, but please keep it up. And when you're at it, if you get a busy signal sometimes, keep trying. It just means I'm in there ahead of you.

From the joy and good feeling of this conference we leave for the hurly burly of a political reception for the Florida GOP. You can see it's a day of contrasts; it reminds me of a story I may just tell the folks over at that reception. It seems this evangelical minister and politician both died and went to Heaven. St. Peter took them in hand to show them their new quarters. He took the minister to a small room with just a bed and table. So naturally when the politician saw the modest quarters of this holy man he was pretty worried about what was in store for him.

Much to his surprise, St. Peter took him to a great mansion, with beautiful grounds and many servants and told him all this would be his. So naturally, the politician said: "But how can

you give me this mansion and only a small place to that good minister?"

St. Peter replied, "Oh, don't worry, he's an evangelical, we've got plenty of them up here. But you're the first politician we've ever had."

I like that story. It reminds those of us in the political world that our fast-paced existence can sometimes be an obstacle to quiet reflection and deep commitment, that we can easily forget the ideas and principles that brought us into the public arena in the first place. The basis of those ideals and principles is a commitment to freedom and personal liberty, a commitment that itself is grounded in the much deeper realization: that freedom prospers only where the blessings of God are avidly sought and humbly acknowledged.

The American experiment in democracy rests on this insight, its discovery was the great triumph of our Founding Fathers. "Men who will not be ruled by God will be ruled by tyrants," William Penn said. Explaining the inalienable rights of men, Jefferson remarked, "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time." And it was George Washington who said that "of all the disposition and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports."

And finally, that shrewdest of all observers of American democracy, Alexis de Tocqueville, put it eloquently:

"I sought for the greatness and genius of America in fertile fields and boundless forests, it was not there. I sought for it in her free schools and her institutions of learning; it was not there. I sought for it in her matchless Constitution and democratic congress; it was not there. Not until I went to the churches of America and found them aflame with righteousness did I understand the greatness and genius

of America. America is great because America is good. When America ceases to be good, America will cease to be great."

That is why I am so pleased to be here today with the people who are in the business of keeping America great by keeping her good. Only through your work and prayers and those of millions of others can we hope to survive this perilous century and keep alive this experiment in liberty, this last best hope of man called America.

I want you to know this Administration is motivated by a political philosophy that sees the greatness of America in you, her people, and in your families, churches, neighborhoods, communities -- the institutions that foster and nourish values like concern for others and respect for the rule of law under God.

Now I don't have to tell you that our pursuit of this philosophy puts us in opposition to the prevailing attitude of many of those in government, educational foundations and institutions, and significant sectors of the media. The views of such groups, however well intentioned, are deeply secularist and decidedly liberal; their value system is radically different from that of most Americans. Because they view everyday Americans as wanton and unwise, they have taken upon themselves the job of regulating, overseeing and superintending the people from Washington.

Now recent polls have shown a dichotomy between their values and those of the American people. For example, recent surveys of elites in the media and entertainment industry showed they voted in far greater numbers than their fellow Americans for liberal

candidates, that most see nothing wrong with adultery and homosexuality, that they approve of abortion by overwhelming margins and that less than 10 percent give religion any important place in their lives.

I think one recent controversy in Washington, the one over the so-called "squeal rule," is an illustration of this clash between the values of these elites and the rest of America. And don't get me wrong, I'm not attacking or attempting to silence anybody. I just think the difference between the elitist view of the world and ours ought to be fully aired.

Now, as most of you know, the controversy began when a judge struck down rules issued by our Administration requiring family planning clinics to notify parents that they have provided birth control devices to underage teenager girls. Believe me, I wonder, too, what Government is doing in the birth control business at all -- but the Congress passed the legislation several years ago and we have no choice but to carry it out. Now this rule, which is nothing more than an affirmation of the traditional rights of parents, was met with attacks from the left portraying those of us in the Administration as a bunch of pinch-cheeked old prudes out to keep the kids from having a little fun.

It reminded me of a similar storm some years ago in California when I insisted that parents had a right to know if their 15-year-old daughter was going to have an abortion especially since the State was paying for the abortion with welfare funds. This caused quite a stir but who, I asked, are we in government to act in locus parentis? For heaven's sake, that

girl couldn't have her tonsils out without parental consent, let alone an abortion. It was during the controversy I began to realize that the real agenda of many who subscribe to this liberal, secularist philosophy is to actually impose their values -- to use the power of Government, the media and the schools -- to supercede the family, church and other inculcators of traditional values.

I believe the same mind set is at work in the squeal rule controversy. Hoping to silence the opposition with names like old-fashioned and puritanical, our critics seek to use the power of government to insure the preeminence of their own views, views that are clearly out of step with what most Americans believe and want.

So there you have it: the same liberal secularists who did a marvelous job of giving us inflation, recession, unemployment, unmanageable bureaucracy, a trillion dollar debt and a host of foreign policy debacles now want us to let them preempt parental rights and run the sex lives of our underage teenagers.

Well, I say we fight our battle in the courts, I say the rule stays. And I say the rights of parents and the rights of family take precedence over those of Washington-based bureaucrats and social engineers.

But the squeal rule is really only one example of many attempts to water down traditional values and even abrogate the original terms of American democracy. As I mentioned before, nothing could be more deeply engrained into the American political consensus than the realization that freedom prospers when religion is vibrant and the rule of law under God

acknowledged. When our Founding Fathers passed the first amendment they sought to protect churches from Government interference. They never meant to construct a wall of hostility between Government and the concept of religious belief itself.

The evidence of this permeates our history and our government: The Declaration of Independence mentions the Supreme Being no less than four times; "In God We Trust" is engraved on our coinage; the Supreme Court opens its proceedings with a "religious" invocation; and the Members of Congress open their sessions with a prayer. I just happen to believe the school children of the United States are entitled to the same privileges as Supreme Court Justices and Congressmen -- it's time for Congress to act on the prayer amendment. Let our children pray.

But in the controversy over the prayer amendment, we see once again that will to power that has characterized so much of the liberal social philosophy that dominated American intellectual life in the fifties and sixties. Many advocates of liberal and so-called progressive education hoped that the schools would become social science laboratories where school children could be removed from traditional influences and taught instead the wonders of value-free science and moral relativism.

Now we know that what happened to American education as it increasingly fell under the influence of this social science mentality. The influence of parents and teachers declined, so did excellence and discipline -- and America's school children learned less and less.

I last year I sent Congress a constitutional amendment to restore prayer to the public schools. This week I am resubmitting that amendment and

As you all know, there has been a rebellion among parents and teachers against these lax educational standards and once again basic learning is being stressed in our schools.

Similarly, the attempt to prohibit the acknowledgement of God in the classroom has come under heavy fire. By overwhelming margins, the American people want prayer returned to the classroom and have been voting for candidates who support that amendment.

Unfortunately, however, this hasn't discouraged the small elite on the left who still want to impose their value system on the vast majority of Americans. Perhaps some of you read

recently about the Lubbock school case where a judge actually ruled that it was unconstitutional for a ~~group of students to meet on their own time on school property for religious purposes.~~ ^{school district to give equal treatment to religious and nonreligious student groups, even when the group meetings were during the students' own time.}

You can see, can't you, how the first amendment has been stood on its head? How a constitutional provision designed to promote religious expression has been used to stifle that expression? And you can see, can't you, the irony of those who call themselves "liberals" using their position of power to deny to millions the time-honored right of religious expression in public places?

(A) — INSERT from next page (this is logical spot to dis-
cuss remedial legislation)

And let me add here that, like you, I have been deeply concerned about recent controversies in several States between religious schools and State educational authorities. No one questions the right of the individual States to have a voice in establishing certain minimum standards for the education of our children. But, on the other hand, religious schools are entitled

to make basic decisions about their curriculum and not be forced to march in lockstep to the directives of State bureaucrats.

I think you should know that both Senators Denton and Hatfield have proposed legislation in the Congress on the whole question of prohibiting discrimination against religious forms of student speech. I strongly support that legislation, and, with your help, I think it's possible we could ^{also the Constitutional} get ^{the} amendment through the Congress this year. ~~to restore proper in the schools~~

Now in discussing these instances of the arbitrary imposition of liberal views, we would be remiss not to mention a Supreme Court decision more than a decade ago that, quite literally, wiped off the books the statutes of 50 States protecting the rights of unborn children. Abortion on demand is a great moral evil that takes the lives of ^{1 1/2 million unborn children} ~~fetuses~~ a year.

Human life legislation ending this tragedy will someday pass the Congress -- and you and I must never rest until it does.

You may remember that when abortion on demand began many religious leaders warned that the practice would lead to a decline in respect for human life, that the philosophical premises used to justify abortion on demand would ultimately be used to justify other attacks on the sacredness of human life, even infanticide or mercy killings. When these warnings were first spoken, many of those in the intelligensia and the glitter set scoffed at them. But, tragically enough, they proved all too true: only last year a court in Indiana issued an order permitting the death by starvation of a handicapped infant.

^{IN ADDITION,} Recent legislation introduced in the Congress by Representative Henry Hyde not only increases restrictions on

INSERT at (A) p. 7

"Fetus" is overly technical; we're talking about human beings

192

✓

INSERT (B)

IN addition,

publicly-financed abortions, it also addresses this whole problem of infanticide. I urge the Congress to begin hearings soon on this legislation, to address the problems of infanticide, to adopt legislation that will protect the right of all children, including the disabled or handicapped, to the right to life.

Now in surveying the effect of several decades of liberal, secularist philosophy -- the wreckage, for example, left by the decisions like those on abortion and school prayer -- it is easy to grow discouraged. But we must never forget that we now stand at a turning point, a time when the old liberalism -- decadent and dying -- is being replaced by a new political consensus, a consensus that wants Government to perform its legitimate duties such as maintaining domestic peace and our national security but otherwise to leave the people alone.

Along with this return to limited Government, there is a great spiritual awakening in America and a renewal of the traditional values that have been the bedrocks of America's goodness and greatness.

One recent survey of thousands of Americans by a Washington based research council concluded that Americans were far more religious than the people of other nations; 95 percent of those surveyed expressed a belief in God and a huge majority believed the Ten Commandments had real meaning for their lives.

Another study of 2,000 Americans by Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance found that -- in contrast to the views of the elites I mentioned earlier -- the following practices were found wrong by large majorities of average Americans: adultery, 85 percent; hard drugs, 84 percent; homosexuality, 71 percent; sex before 16,

71 percent; abortion, 65 percent; and pornography, 68 percent. And this same study showed a deep reverence for the importance of family ties and religious belief.

So I think the items we have discussed today are the political agenda of the future. Remember for the first time the Congress is openly and seriously debating and dealing with the prayer and abortion issues -- that's enormous progress right there. I repeat: America is in the midst of a spiritual awakening and a moral renewal. With your biblical keynote, I say today let "justice roll on like a river, righteousness like a never failing stream."

Now obviously, much of this new political and social consensus I have talked about is based on a positive view of American history, one that takes pride in our country's accomplishments and record. But we must never forget an important distinction between our moral philosophy and that of the liberal secularists. Unlike them, we know that no Government schemes are going to perfect man; we know that living in this world means dealing with what philosophers would call the phenomenology of evil or, as the theologians would put it, the doctrine of sin.

There is sin, there is evil in this world and we are enjoined by scripture and the Lord Jesus to oppose it with all our might. And that is why in talking about America we must never forget that, like any other human entity, our Nation, too, has a legacy of evil with which it must deal.

Now, the glory of this land has been its capacity for transcending the moral evils of our past. For example, the long

struggle of minority citizens for equal rights, once a source of disunity and civil war, is now a point of pride for all Americans. We must never go back. There is no room for racism, anti-semitism or other forms of ethnic and racial hatred in this country. I know you have been horrified as have I by the resurgence of some hate groups preaching bigotry and prejudice. Today I urge you: Use the mighty voice of your pulpits and the powerful standing of your churches to denounce and isolate these hate groups in our midst.

[And I want to mention today another dark legacy of our past -- one that we are also now attempting to address in Washington. For many years in America we tolerated the existence of powerful syndicates of organized crime. As the years went by, these national syndicates increased in power, influence and sophistication. Recently, in the enormous growth of the illegal drug trade, we have seen the tragic results of this permissiveness and the climate of professional lawlessness it fostered. This trade was only a short time ago spreading murder and mayhem throughout South Florida. Today, through the South Florida Task Force headed by Vice President Bush, we have a handle on it. We've cracked down on this drug trade in Florida, and now we're bringing on 200 new prosecutors and 1,000 new investigators to extend that task force model to 12 other regions throughout the United States.

Yes, we are going after the drug cartels. But we're not going to stop there. Through a new presidential commission and several other initiatives, we intend to expose and prosecute the infrastructure of organized crime itself. We mean to cripple

their enterprises, dry up their profits and put their leaders behind bars where they belong.]

But whatever sad episodes exist in our past, any objective observer must hold a positive view of American history, a history that has been the story of hopes fulfilled and dreams made into reality. Especially in this century, America has kept alight the torch of freedom -- not just for ourselves but for millions of others around the world. And this brings me to my final point today, and, by the way, it's another illustration of the gulf between the views of our professional elites and those of everyday Americans.

During my first press conference as President, I pointed out that as good Marxists-Leninists the Soviet leaders have "openly and publicly declared that the only morality they recognize is what will further their cause, meaning they reserve unto themselves the right to commit any crime, to lie, to cheat . . . and that is moral, not immoral." I said that we would do well to keep this in mind during our negotiations with the Soviets.

Well, once again this caused a stir. I saw several accounts that truncated my remarks and suggested they were nothing more than name calling. Other accounts suggested that it was a breach of diplomacy to be that candid about the Soviets.

Now -- putting aside for the moment the fact that the pundits and opinion makers are rarely upset when the Soviets say much worse about us everyday in their press -- I think I should point out I was only quoting Lenin, a saint, a guiding spirit to the Soviet leadership, who wrote in 1920: "We repudiate all

morality that proceeds from supernatural ideas or ideas that are outside class conceptions. Morality is entirely subordinate to the interests of class war. Everything is moral that is necessary for the annihilation of the old exploiting social order and for uniting the proleteriat."

I think the refusal of many influential people to accept this elementary insight into Soviet behavior illustrates the historical reluctance of much of the elite to see totalitarian powers for what they are. We saw this phenomenon in the 1930's; we see it today in the nuclear freeze movement.

But surely, just as we look back in wonder at the self-deception of the 1930's, future historians, looking back at our time, will be shocked by the naivete and moral blindness of the unilateral disarmers. Surely, they will note the real proportions of the threat to peace, that it was the West that refused to use its nuclear monopoly in the forties and fifties for territorial gain -- and that it was not the West that intervened by proxy in Angola, in Ethiopia, in South Yeman or Central America; that it was not the West that invaded Afghanistan, or suppressed Polish Solidarity or used chemical and biological warfare in Afghanistan and Southeast Asia.

Surely, those historians will find in the councils of those who preached the supremacy of the state, who declared its omnipotence over individual man, who predicted its eventual domination of all peoples of the Earth, surely historians will see there . . . the focus of evil in the modern world. It was C.S. Lewis who in his unforgettable Screwtape Letters wrote:

"The greatest evil is not now done in those sordid 'dens of crime' that Dickens loved to paint. It is not

done even in concentration camps and labor camps -- in those we see its final result. But it is conceived and ordered (moved, seconded, carried and minuted) in clear, carpeted, warmed and well-lighted offices by quiet men with white collars and cut fingernails and smooth-shaven cheeks who do not need to raise their voices."

Because these "quiet men" do not "raise their voices," because they sometimes speak in soothing tones of brotherhood and peace, because, like other dictators before them, they are always making "their final territorial demand," some would have us accept them at their word and accommodate ourselves to their aggressive impulses. But, if history teaches anything, it teaches: simple-minded appeasement or self-delusion about our adversaries is folly -- it means the betrayal of our past, the squandering of our freedom.

So I urge you to speak out against those who would place the United States in a position of military inferiority to the Soviet Union. You know, I have always believed that old Screwtape reserves his best efforts for those of you in the Church. So in your discussions of the nuclear freeze movement, I urge you to beware the temptation of pride -- the temptation to blithely declare yourselves above it all and label both sides equally at fault, to ignore the facts of history and the aggressive impulses of an evil empire, to simply call the arms race a giant misunderstanding and thereby remove yourself from the struggle between right and wrong, good and evil.

I ask you to resist the attempts of those who would have you bargain away, for the sake of a few glowing minutes on the nightly news and a little cooing from the glitter set, your vital

support for this Administration's efforts to keep America strong and free.

But, while America's military strength is important, let me add here that I have always maintained that the struggle now going on for the world will never be decided by bombs or rockets, by armies or military might. For the real crisis we face today is a spiritual one, at root it is a test of moral will and religious faith.

Whittaker Chambers, the man whose own religious conversion made him a "witness" to one of the terrible traumas of our age, the Hiss Chambers case, wrote that the crisis of the Western world exists to the degree in which the West is indifferent to God, the degree to which it collaborates in Communism's attempt to make man stand alone without God. For Marxism-Leninism is actually the second oldest faith, he said, first proclaimed in the Garden of Eden with the words of temptation: "Ye shall be as gods."

The Western world can answer this challenge, he wrote, "but only provided that its faith in God and the freedom he enjoins is as great as Communism's faith in man."

I believe we shall rise to this challenge; I believe that Communism is another sad, bizarre chapter in human history whose last pages even now are being written. I believe this because the strength of our cause, the quest for human freedom, is not of this world; and because this strength is spiritual and knows no limitation, it must terrify and ultimately triumph over those who would enslave their fellow man. For, in the words of Isaiah:

"He giveth power to the faint, and to them that have no
might, He increased their strength . . . but they that wait upon
the Lord shall renew their strength . . . they shall mount up
with wings as eagles. They shall run and not be weary . . ."

Thank you and God bless you.



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

March 4, 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR: Aram Bakshian
FROM: Lawrence A. Kudlow (McAllister) *EM*
SUBJECT: Draft Presidential Remarks:
-- National Association of Evangelicals
-- Florida GOP Reception - Tuesday, 3/8/83

National Association of Evangelicals

OMB has one slight change:

Page 11:

"We've cracked down on this drug trade in Florida, and now we're bringing on 200 new prosecutors and 1,260 (not 1,000) new investigators"

Florida GOP Reception

OMB has no changes.

cc: Richard Darman

OMB STAFFING OF WHITE HOUSE PAPERS

Doc Date: 3/3/84 Action: X Info: Paper from: Dick Darman

Subj: Draft Presidential Remarks: National Association of Evangelicals Tues. 3/8/83

Distribution within OMB

	<u>Action</u>	<u>FYI</u>		<u>Action</u>	<u>FYI</u>		<u>Action</u>	<u>FYI</u>
Stockman	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	Wright	<u> </u>	<u>✓</u>	Gerson	<u> </u>	<u>✓</u>
Moran	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	Kudlow	<u>✓</u>	<u> </u>	DeMuth	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Clarkson	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	Steinberg	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	Dale	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
ARCESOR	<u>✓*</u>	<u> </u>	Cullen/Hudson	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	Frey	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Smolkin	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	Horowitz	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	Sowle	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Keel	<u>✓*</u>	<u> </u>	Modlin	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	Bryant	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Khedouri	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>

*Please coordinate with and provide comments to _____.

**Should receive first _____ page(s) only.

RESPONSE TO WHITE HOUSE

Lead responsibility for preparing response: Kudlow

Address response to Bakshian
cc -> Darman for signature of Kudlow

Response should arrive in Correspondence Unit by: 1:45 pm TODAY

Concurrence: Initials: _____

Date: / / / /

PLEASE RESPOND IN WRITING TO WHITE HOUSE REQUESTS
IF RESPONSE IS SENT DIRECTLY TO WHITE HOUSE, PLEASE SEND DAVID GERSON A COPY

BRIEFING MATERIAL PREPARATION

Lead responsibility for preparing for meeting: _____

Briefing material should be in Director's Office by: _____

Comments:

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 3, 1983 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: 2:00 FRIDAY
March 4, 1983

SUBJECT: DRAFT PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EVANGELICALS
Tuesday, March 8, 1983

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	GERGEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
MEESE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HARPER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BAKER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	JENKINS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DEAVER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MURPHY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
STOCKMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ROLLINS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CLARK	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	WHITTLESEY	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input type="checkbox"/> P	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SS	WILLIAMSON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DUBERSTEIN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	VON DAMM	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FELDSTEIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	BRADY/SPEAKES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FIELDING	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ROGERS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FULLER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Bakshian</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Remarks:

Please forward comments/edits directly to Aram Bakshian, with a copy to my office, by 2:00 tomorrow, March 4.

Thank you.

Richard G. Darman
 Assistant to the President
 (x2702)

Response:

(Dolan/AB)
March 3, 1983
7:00 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EVANGELICALS
ORLANDO, FLORIDA
TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 1983

Nancy and I are delighted to be here today. Those of you in the National Association of Evangelicals are known for your spiritual and humanitarian work -- and I would be especially remiss if I did not discharge right now one personal debt of gratitude.

Thank you for your prayers. Nancy and I have felt their presence many times in many ways. Believe me, for us they have made all the difference. The other day in the East Room someone asked me whether I was aware of all the people out there praying for the President. I was touched, of course, but I'll tell you what I told him: Thank you, but please keep it up. And when you're at it, if you get a busy signal sometimes, keep trying. It just means I'm in there ahead of you.

From the joy and good feeling of this conference we leave for the hurly burly of a political reception for the Florida GOP. You can see it's a day of contrasts; it reminds me of a story I may just tell the folks over at that reception. It seems this evangelical minister and politician both died and went to Heaven. St. Peter took them in hand to show them their new quarters. He took the minister to a small room with just a bed and table. So naturally when the politician saw the modest quarters of this holy man he was pretty worried about what was in store for him.

Much to his surprise, St. Peter took him to a great mansion, with beautiful grounds and many servants and told him all this would be his. So naturally, the politician said: "But how can

you give me this mansion and only a small place to that good minister?"

St. Peter replied, "Oh, don't worry, he's an evangelical, we've got plenty of them up here. But you're the first politician we've ever had."

I like that story. It reminds those of us in the political world that our fast-paced existence can sometimes be an obstacle to quiet reflection and deep commitment, that we can easily forget the ideas and principles that brought us into the public arena in the first place. The basis of those ideals and principles is a commitment to freedom and personal liberty, a commitment that itself is grounded in the much deeper realization: that freedom prospers only where the blessings of God are avidly sought and humbly acknowledged.

The American experiment in democracy rests on this insight, its discovery was the great triumph of our Founding Fathers. "Men who will not be ruled by God will be ruled by tyrants," William Penn said. Explaining the inalienable rights of men, Jefferson remarked, "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time." And it was George Washington who said that "of all the disposition and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports."

And finally, that shrewdest of all observers of American democracy, Alexis de Tocqueville, put it eloquently:

"I sought for the greatness and genius of America in fertile fields and boundless forests, it was not there. I sought for it in her free schools and her institutions of learning; it was not there. I sought for it in her matchless Constitution and democratic congress; it was not there. Not until I went to the churches of America and found them aflame with righteousness did I understand the greatness and genius

of America. America is great because America is good. When America ceases to be good, America will cease to be great."

That is why I am so pleased to be here today with the people who are in the business of keeping America great by keeping her good. Only through your work and prayers and those of millions of others can we hope to survive this perilous century and keep alive this experiment in liberty, this last best hope of man called America.

I want you to know this Administration is motivated by a political philosophy that sees the greatness of America in you, her people, and in your families, churches, neighborhoods, communities -- the institutions that foster and nourish values like concern for others and respect for the rule of law under God.

Now I don't have to tell you that our pursuit of this philosophy puts us in opposition to the prevailing attitude of many of those in government, educational foundations and institutions, and significant sectors of the media. The views of such groups, however well intentioned, are deeply secularist and decidedly liberal; their value system is radically different from that of most Americans. Because they view everyday Americans as wanton and unwise, they have taken upon themselves the job of regulating, overseeing and superintending the people from Washington.

Now recent polls have shown a dichotomy between their values and those of the American people. For example, recent surveys of elites in the media and entertainment industry showed they voted in far greater numbers than their fellow Americans for liberal

candidates, that most see nothing wrong with adultery and homosexuality, that they approve of abortion by overwhelming margins and that less than 10 percent give religion any important place in their lives.

I think one recent controversy in Washington, the one over the so-called "squeal rule," is an illustration of this clash between the values of these elites and the rest of America. And don't get me wrong, I'm not attacking or attempting to silence anybody. I just think the difference between the elitist view of the world and ours ought to be fully aired.

Now, as most of you know, the controversy began when a judge struck down rules issued by our Administration requiring family planning clinics to notify parents that they have provided birth control devices to underage teenager girls. Believe me, I wonder, too, what Government is doing in the birth control business at all -- but the Congress passed the legislation several years ago and we have no choice but to carry it out. Now this rule, which is nothing more than an affirmation of the traditional rights of parents, was met with attacks from the left portraying those of us in the Administration as a bunch of pinch-cheeked old prudes out to keep the kids from having a little fun.

It reminded me of a similar storm some years ago in California when I insisted that parents had a right to know if their 15-year-old daughter was going to have an abortion especially since the State was paying for the abortion with welfare funds. This caused quite a stir but who, I asked, are we in government to act in locus parentis? For heaven's sake, that

girl couldn't have her tonsils out without parental consent, let alone an abortion. It was during the controversy I began to realize that the real agenda of many who subscribe to this liberal, secularist philosophy is to actually impose their values -- to use the power of Government, the media and the schools -- to supercede the family, church and other inculcators of traditional values.

I believe the same mind set is at work in the squeal rule controversy. Hoping to silence the opposition with names like old-fashioned and puritanical, our critics seek to use the power of government to insure the preeminence of their own views, views that are clearly out of step with what most Americans believe and want.

So there you have it: the same liberal secularists who did a marvelous job of giving us inflation, recession, unemployment, unmanageable bureaucracy, a trillion dollar debt and a host of foreign policy debacles now want us to let them preempt parental rights and run the sex lives of our underage teenagers.

Well, I say we fight our battle in the courts, I say the rule stays. And I say the rights of parents and the rights of family take precedence over those of Washington-based bureaucrats and social engineers.

But the squeal rule is really only one example of many attempts to water down traditional values and even abrogate the original terms of American democracy. As I mentioned before, nothing could be more deeply engrained into the American political consensus than the realization that freedom prospers when religion is vibrant and the rule of law under God

acknowledged. When our Founding Fathers passed the first amendment they sought to protect churches from Government interference. They never meant to construct a wall of hostility between Government and the concept of religious belief itself.

The evidence of this permeates our history and our government: The Declaration of Independence mentions the Supreme Being no less than four times; "In God We Trust" is engraved on our coinage; the Supreme Court opens its proceedings with a "religious" invocation; and the Members of Congress open their sessions with a prayer. I just happen to believe the school children of the United States are entitled to the same privileges as Supreme Court Justices and Congressmen -- it's time for Congress to act on the prayer amendment. Let our children pray.

But in the controversy over the prayer amendment, we see once again that will to power that has characterized so much of the liberal social philosophy that dominated American intellectual life in the fifties and sixties. Many advocates of liberal and so-called progressive education hoped that the schools would become social science laboratories where school children could be removed from traditional influences and taught instead the wonders of value-free science and moral relativism.

Now we know that what happened to American education as it increasingly fell under the influence of this social science mentality. The influence of parents and teachers declined, so did excellence and discipline -- and America's school children learned less and less.

As you all know, there has been a rebellion among parents and teachers against these lax educational standards and once again basic learning is being stressed in our schools.

Similarly, the attempt to prohibit the acknowledgement of God in the classroom has come under heavy fire. By overwhelming margins, the American people want prayer returned to the classroom and have been voting for candidates who support that amendment.

Unfortunately, however, this hasn't discouraged the small elite on the left who still want to impose their value system on the vast majority of Americans. Perhaps some of you read recently about the Lubbock school case where a judge actually ruled that it was unconstitutional for a group of students to meet on their own time on school property for religious purposes. You can see, can't you, how the first amendment has been stood on its head? How a constitutional provision designed to promote religious expression has been used to stifle that expression? And you can see, can't you, the irony of those who call themselves "liberals" using their position of power to deny to millions the time-honored right of religious expression in public places?

And let me add here that, like you, I have been deeply concerned about recent controversies in several States between religious schools and State educational authorities. No one questions the right of the individual States to have a voice in establishing certain minimum standards for the education of our children. But, on the other hand, religious schools are entitled

to make basic decisions about their curriculum and not be forced to march in lockstep to the directives of State bureaucrats.

I think you should know that both Senators Denton and Hatfield have proposed legislation in the Congress on the whole question of prohibiting discrimination against religious forms of student speech. I strongly support that legislation, and, with your help, I think it's possible we could get the amendment through the Congress this year.

Now in discussing these instances of the arbitrary imposition of liberal views, we would be remiss not to mention a Supreme Court decision more than a decade ago that, quite literally, wiped off the books the statutes of 50 States protecting the rights of unborn children. Abortion on demand is a great moral evil that takes the lives of ___ fetuses a year. Human life legislation ending this tragedy will someday pass the Congress -- and you and I must never rest until it does.

You may remember that when abortion on demand began many religious leaders warned that the practice would lead to a decline in respect for human life, that the philosophical premises used to justify abortion on demand would ultimately be used to justify other attacks on the sacredness of human life, even infanticide or mercy killings. When these warnings were first spoken, many of those in the intelligensia and the glitter set scoffed at them. But, tragically enough, they proved all too true: only last year a court in Indiana issued an order permitting the death by starvation of a handicapped infant.

Recent legislation introduced in the Congress by Representative Henry Hyde not only increases restrictions on

publicly-financed abortions, it also addresses this whole problem of infanticide. I urge the Congress to begin hearings soon on this legislation, to address the problems of infanticide, to adopt legislation that will protect the right of all children, including the disabled or handicapped, to the right to life.

Now in surveying the effect of several decades of liberal, secularist philosophy -- the wreckage, for example, left by the decisions like those on abortion and school prayer -- it is easy to grow discouraged. But we must never forget that we now stand at a turning point, a time when the old liberalism -- decadent and dying -- is being replaced by a new political consensus, a consensus that wants Government to perform its legitimate duties such as maintaining domestic peace and our national security but otherwise to leave the people alone.

Along with this return to limited Government, there is a great spiritual awakening in America and a renewal of the traditional values that have been the bedrocks of America's goodness and greatness.

One recent survey of thousands of Americans by a Washington based research council concluded that Americans were far more religious than the people of other nations; 95 percent of those surveyed expressed a belief in God and a huge majority believed the Ten Commandments had real meaning for their lives.

Another study of 2,000 Americans by Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance found that -- in contrast to the views of the elites I mentioned earlier -- the following practices were found wrong by large majorities of average Americans: adultery, 85 percent; hard drugs, 84 percent; homosexuality, 71 percent; sex before 16,

71 percent; abortion, 65 percent; and pornography, 68 percent. And this same study showed a deep reverence for the importance of family ties and religious belief.

So I think the items we have discussed today are the political agenda of the future. Remember for the first time the Congress is openly and seriously debating and dealing with the prayer and abortion issues -- that's enormous progress right there. I repeat: America is in the midst of a spiritual awakening and a moral renewal. With your biblical keynote, I say today let "justice roll on like a river, righteousness like a never failing stream."

Now obviously, much of this new political and social consensus I have talked about is based on a positive view of American history, one that takes pride in our country's accomplishments and record. But we must never forget an important distinction between our moral philosophy and that of the liberal secularists. Unlike them, we know that no Government schemes are going to perfect man; we know that living in this world means dealing with what philosophers would call the phenomenology of evil or, as the theologians would put it, the doctrine of sin.

There is sin, there is evil in this world and we are enjoined by scripture and the Lord Jesus to oppose it with all our might. And that is why in talking about America we must never forget that, like any other human entity, our Nation, too, has a legacy of evil with which it must deal.

Now, the glory of this land has been its capacity for transcending the moral evils of our past. For example, the long

struggle of minority citizens for equal rights, once a source of disunity and civil war, is now a point of pride for all Americans. We must never go back. There is no room for racism, anti-semitism or other forms of ethnic and racial hatred in this country. I know you have been horrified as have I by the resurgence of some hate groups preaching bigotry and prejudice. Today I urge you: Use the mighty voice of your pulpits and the powerful standing of your churches to denounce and isolate these hate groups in our midst.

[And I want to mention today another dark legacy of our past -- one that we are also now attempting to address in Washington. For many years in America we tolerated the existence of powerful syndicates of organized crime. As the years went by, these national syndicates increased in power, influence and sophistication. Recently, in the enormous growth of the illegal drug trade, we have seen the tragic results of this permissiveness and the climate of professional lawlessness it fostered. This trade was only a short time ago spreading murder and mayhem throughout South Florida. Today, through the South Florida Task Force headed by Vice President Bush, we have a handle on it. We've cracked down on this drug trade in Florida, and now we're bringing on ^{OK} 200 new prosecutors and ^{1,260} ~~1,000~~ new investigators to extend that task force model to 12 other regions throughout the United States. X

Yes, we are going after the drug cartels. But we're not going to stop there. Through a new presidential commission and several other initiatives, we intend to expose and prosecute the infrastructure of organized crime itself. We mean to cripple

their enterprises, dry up their profits and put their leaders behind bars where they belong.]

But whatever sad episodes exist in our past, any objective observer must hold a positive view of American history, a history that has been the story of hopes fulfilled and dreams made into reality. Especially in this century, America has kept alight the torch of freedom -- not just for ourselves but for millions of others around the world. And this brings me to my final point today, and, by the way, it's another illustration of the gulf between the views of our professional elites and those of everyday Americans.

During my first press conference as President, I pointed out that as good Marxists-Leninists the Soviet leaders have "openly and publicly declared that the only morality they recognize is what will further their cause, meaning they reserve unto themselves the right to commit any crime, to lie, to cheat . . . and that is moral, not immoral." I said that we would do well to keep this in mind during our negotiations with the Soviets.

Well, once again this caused a stir. I saw several accounts that truncated my remarks and suggested they were nothing more than name calling. Other accounts suggested that it was a breach of diplomacy to be that candid about the Soviets.

Now -- putting aside for the moment the fact that the pundits and opinion makers are rarely upset when the Soviets say much worse about us everyday in their press -- I think I should point out I was only quoting Lenin, a saint, a guiding spirit to the Soviet leadership, who wrote in 1920: "We repudiate all

morality that proceeds from supernatural ideas or ideas that are outside class conceptions. Morality is entirely subordinate to the interests of class war. Everything is moral that is necessary for the annihilation of the old exploiting social order and for uniting the proleteriat."

I think the refusal of many influential people to accept this elementary insight into Soviet behavior illustrates the historical reluctance of much of the elite to see totalitarian powers for what they are. We saw this phenomenon in the 1930's; we see it today in the nuclear freeze movement.

But surely, just as we look back in wonder at the self-deception of the 1930's, future historians, looking back at our time, will be shocked by the naivete and moral blindness of the unilateral disarmers. Surely, they will note the real proportions of the threat to peace, that it was the West that refused to use its nuclear monopoly in the forties and fifties for territorial gain -- and that it was not the West that intervened by proxy in Angola, in Ethiopia, in South Yeman or Central America; that it was not the West that invaded Afghanistan, or suppressed Polish Solidarity or used chemical and biological warfare in Afghanistan and Southeast Asia.

Surely, those historians will find in the councils of those who preached the supremacy of the state, who declared its omnipotence over individual man, who predicted its eventual domination of all peoples of the Earth, surely historians will see there . . . the focus of evil in the modern world. It was C.S. Lewis who in his unforgettable Screwtape Letters wrote:

"The greatest evil is not now done in those sordid 'dens of crime' that Dickens loved to paint. It is not

done even in concentration camps and labor camps -- in those we see its final result. But it is conceived and ordered (moved, seconded, carried and minuted) in clear, carpeted, warmed and well-lighted offices by quiet men with white collars and cut fingernails and smooth-shaven cheeks who do not need to raise their voices."

Because these "quiet men" do not "raise their voices," because they sometimes speak in soothing tones of brotherhood and peace, because, like other dictators before them, they are always making "their final territorial demand," some would have us accept them at their word and accommodate ourselves to their aggressive impulses. But, if history teaches anything, it teaches: simple-minded appeasement or self-delusion about our adversaries is folly -- it means the betrayal of our past, the squandering of our freedom.

So I urge you to speak out against those who would place the United States in a position of military inferiority to the Soviet Union. You know, I have always believed that old Screwtape reserves his best efforts for those of you in the Church. So in your discussions of the nuclear freeze movement, I urge you to beware the temptation of pride -- the temptation to blithely declare yourselves above it all and label both sides equally at fault, to ignore the facts of history and the aggressive impulses of an evil empire, to simply call the arms race a giant misunderstanding and thereby remove yourself from the struggle between right and wrong, good and evil.

I ask you to resist the attempts of those who would have you bargain away, for the sake of a few glowing minutes on the nightly news and a little cooing from the glitter set, your vital

support for this Administration's efforts to keep America strong and free.

But, while America's military strength is important, let me add here that I have always maintained that the struggle now going on for the world will never be decided by bombs or rockets, by armies or military might. For the real crisis we face today is a spiritual one, at root it is a test of moral will and religious faith.

Whittaker Chambers, the man whose own religious conversion made him a "witness" to one of the terrible traumas of our age, the Hiss Chambers case, wrote that the crisis of the Western world exists to the degree in which the West is indifferent to God, the degree to which it collaborates in Communism's attempt to make man stand alone without God. For Marxism-Leninism is actually the second oldest faith, he said, first proclaimed in the Garden of Eden with the words of temptation: "Ye shall be as gods."

The Western world can answer this challenge, he wrote, "but only provided that its faith in God and the freedom he enjoins is as great as Communism's faith in man."

I believe we shall rise to this challenge; I believe that Communism is another sad, bizarre chapter in human history whose last pages even now are being written. I believe this because the strength of our cause, the quest for human freedom, is not of this world; and because this strength is spiritual and knows no limitation, it must terrify and ultimately triumph over those who would enslave their fellow man. For, in the words of Isaiah:

"He giveth power to the faint, and to them that have no
might, He increased their strength . . . but they that wait upon
the Lord shall renew their strength . . . they shall mount up
with wings as eagles. They shall run and not be weary . . ."

Thank you and God bless you.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Doug Holiday
Education - planning &
245-7409 development

Certain groups working
w/ destitute & indigent

(i) Salvation Army
have gone on record
against. Suggests
either cover yourself

"I know some evang. groups
don't agree, but"

or delete.

Sec. Bell Comments
(Dolan/AB)
March 3, 1983
7:00 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EVANGELICALS
ORLANDO, FLORIDA
TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 1983

Nancy and I are delighted to be here today. Those of you in the National Association of Evangelicals are known for your spiritual and humanitarian work -- and I would be especially remiss if I did not discharge right now one personal debt of gratitude.

Thank you for your prayers. Nancy and I have felt their presence many times in many ways. Believe me, for us they have made all the difference. The other day in the East Room someone asked me whether I was aware of all the people out there praying for the President. I was touched, of course, but I'll tell you what I told him: Thank you, but please keep it up. And when you're at it, if you get a busy signal sometimes, keep trying. It just means I'm in there ahead of you.

From the joy and good feeling of this conference we leave for the hurly burly of a political reception for the Florida GOP. You can see it's a day of contrasts; it reminds me of a story I may just tell the folks over at that reception. It seems this evangelical minister and politician both died and went to Heaven. St. Peter took them in hand to show them their new quarters. He took the minister to a small room with just a bed and table. So naturally when the politician saw the modest quarters of this holy man he was pretty worried about what was in store for him.

Much to his surprise, St. Peter took him to a great mansion, with beautiful grounds and many servants and told him all this would be his. So naturally, the politician said: "But how can

you give me this mansion and only a small place to that good minister?"

St. Peter replied, "Oh, don't worry, he's an evangelical, we've got plenty of them up here. But you're the first politician we've ever had."

I like that story. It reminds those of us in the political world that our fast-paced existence can sometimes be an obstacle to quiet reflection and deep commitment, that we can easily forget the ideas and principles that brought us into the public arena in the first place. The basis of those ideals and principles is a commitment to freedom and personal liberty, a commitment that itself is grounded in the much deeper realization: that freedom prospers only where the blessings of God are avidly sought and humbly acknowledged.

The American experiment in democracy rests on this insight, its discovery was the great triumph of our Founding Fathers. "Men who will not be ruled by God will be ruled by tyrants," William Penn said. Explaining the inalienable rights of men, Jefferson remarked, "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time." And it was George Washington who said that "of all the disposition and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports."

And finally, that shrewdest of all observers of American democracy, Alexis de Tocqueville, put it eloquently:

"I sought for the greatness and genius of America in fertile fields and boundless forests, it was not there. I sought for it in her free schools and her institutions of learning; it was not there. I sought for it in her matchless Constitution and democratic congress; it was not there. Not until I went to the churches of America and found them aflame with righteousness did I understand the greatness and genius

of America. America is great because America is good. When America ceases to be good, America will cease to be great."

That is why I am so pleased to be here today with the people who are in the business of keeping America great by keeping her good. Only through your work and prayers and those of millions of others can we hope to survive this perilous century and keep alive this experiment in liberty, this last best hope of man called America.

I want you to know this Administration is motivated by a political philosophy that sees the greatness of America in you, her people, and in your families, churches, neighborhoods, communities -- the institutions that foster and nourish values like concern for others and respect for the rule of law under God.

Now I don't have to tell you that our pursuit of this philosophy puts us in opposition to the prevailing attitude of many of those in government, educational foundations and institutions, and significant sectors of the media. The views of such groups, however well intentioned, are deeply secularist and decidedly liberal; their value system is radically different from that of most Americans. Because they view everyday Americans as wanton and unwise, they have taken upon themselves the job of regulating, overseeing and superintending the people from Washington.

Now recent polls have shown a dichotomy between their values and those of the American people. For example, recent surveys of elites in the media and entertainment industry showed they voted in far greater numbers than their fellow Americans for liberal

candidates, that most see nothing wrong with adultery and homosexuality, that they approve of abortion by overwhelming margins and that less than 10 percent give religion any important place in their lives.

I think one recent controversy in Washington, the one over Parental notification the so-called "squeal rule" is an illustration of this clash between the values of these elites and the rest of America. And don't get me wrong, I'm not attacking or attempting to silence anybody. I just think the difference between the elitist view of the world and ours ought to be fully aired.

Now, as most of you know, the controversy began when a judge struck down rules issued by our Administration requiring family planning clinics to notify parents that they have provided birth control devices to underage teenager girls. Believe me, I wonder, too, what Government is doing in the birth control business at all -- but the Congress passed the legislation several years ago and we have no choice but to carry it out. Now this rule, which is nothing more than an affirmation of the traditional rights of parents, was met with attacks from the left portraying those of us in the Administration as a bunch of pinch-cheeked old prudes out to keep the kids from having a little fun.

It reminded me of a similar storm some years ago in California when I insisted that parents had a right to know if their 15-year-old daughter was going to have an abortion especially since the State was paying for the abortion with welfare funds. This caused quite a stir but who, I asked, are we in government to act in locus parentis? For heaven's sake, that

do not support this group.

*← certain group
Salvation Army
Penny #
Worship*

*Don't
Hollywood
plans & my
245-7709*

girl couldn't have her tonsils out without parental consent, let alone an abortion. It was during the controversy I began to realize that the real agenda of many who subscribe to this liberal, secularist philosophy is to actually impose their values -- to use the power of Government, the media and the schools -- to supercede the family, church and other inculcators of traditional values.

I believe the same mind set is at work in the squeal rule controversy. Hoping to silence the opposition with names like old-fashioned and puritanical, our critics seek to use the power of government to insure the preeminence of their own views, views that are clearly out of step with what most Americans believe and want.

So there you have it: the same liberal secularists who did a marvelous job of giving us inflation, recession, unemployment, unmanageable bureaucracy, a trillion dollar debt and a host of foreign policy debacles now want us to let them preempt parental rights and run the sex lives of our underage teenagers.

Well, I say we fight our battle in the courts, I say the rule stays. And I say the rights of parents and the rights of family take precedence over those of Washington-based bureaucrats and social engineers.

But ^{our parental notification} the ~~squeal~~ rule is really only one example of many attempts to water down traditional values and even abrogate the original terms of American democracy. As I mentioned before, nothing could be more deeply engrained into the American political consensus than the realization that freedom prospers when religion is vibrant and the rule of law under God

still relevant after court ruling?

acknowledged. When our Founding Fathers passed the first amendment they sought to protect churches from Government interference. They never meant to construct a wall of hostility between Government and the concept of religious belief itself.

The evidence of this permeates our history and our government: The Declaration of Independence mentions the Supreme Being no less than four times; "In God We Trust" is engraved on our coinage; the Supreme Court opens its proceedings with a "religious" invocation; and the Members of Congress open their sessions with a prayer. I just happen to believe the school children of the United States are entitled to the same privileges as Supreme Court Justices and Congressmen -- it's time for Congress to act on the prayer amendment. Let our children pray.

But in the controversy over the prayer amendment, we see once again that will to power that has characterized so much of the liberal social philosophy that dominated American intellectual life in the fifties and sixties. Many advocates of liberal and so-called progressive education hoped that the schools would become social science laboratories where school children could be removed from traditional influences and taught instead the wonders of value-free science and moral relativism.

Now we know that what happened to American education as it increasingly fell under the influence of this social science mentality. The influence of parents and teachers declined, so did excellence and discipline -- and America's school children learned less and less.

As you all know, there has been a rebellion among parents and teachers against these lax educational standards and once again basic learning is being stressed in our schools.

Similarly, the attempt to prohibit the acknowledgement of God in the classroom has come under heavy fire. By overwhelming margins, the American people want prayer returned to the classroom and have been voting for candidates who support that amendment.

Unfortunately, however, this hasn't discouraged the small elite on the left who still want to impose their value system on the vast majority of Americans. Perhaps some of you read recently about the Lubbock school case where a judge actually ruled that it was unconstitutional for a group of students to meet on their own time on school property for religious purposes. You can see, can't you, how the first amendment has been stood on its head? How a constitutional provision designed to promote religious expression has been used to stifle that expression? And you can see, can't you, the irony of those who call themselves "liberals" using their position of power to deny to millions the time-honored right of religious expression in public places?

And let me add here that, like you, I have been deeply concerned about recent controversies in several States between religious schools and State educational authorities. No one questions the right of the individual States to have a voice in establishing certain minimum standards for the education of our children. But, on the other hand, religious schools are entitled

to make basic decisions about their curriculum and not be forced to march in lockstep to the directives of State bureaucrats.

I think you should know that both Senators Denton and Hatfield have proposed legislation in the Congress on the whole question of prohibiting discrimination against religious forms of student speech. I strongly support that legislation, and, with your help, I think it's possible we could get the amendment through the Congress this year.

Now in discussing these instances of the arbitrary imposition of liberal views, we would be remiss not to mention a Supreme Court decision more than a decade ago that, quite literally, wiped off the books the statutes of 50 States protecting the rights of unborn children. Abortion on demand is a great moral evil that takes the lives of ___ fetuses a year. Human life legislation ending this tragedy will someday pass the Congress -- and you and I must never rest until it does.

You may remember that when abortion on demand began many religious leaders warned that the practice would lead to a decline in respect for human life, that the philosophical premises used to justify abortion on demand would ultimately be used to justify other attacks on the sacredness of human life, even infanticide or mercy killings. When these warnings were first spoken, many of those in the intelligensia and the glitter set scoffed at them. But, tragically enough, they proved all too true: only last year a court in Indiana issued an order permitting the death by starvation of a handicapped infant.

Recent legislation introduced in the Congress by Representative Henry Hyde not only increases restrictions on

publicly-financed abortions, it also addresses this whole problem of infanticide. I urge the Congress to begin hearings soon on this legislation, to address the problems of infanticide, to adopt legislation that will protect the right of all children, including the disabled or handicapped, to the right to life.

Now in surveying the effect of several decades of liberal, secularist philosophy -- the wreckage, for example, left by the decisions like those on abortion and school prayer -- it is easy to grow discouraged. But we must never forget that we now stand at a turning point, a time when the old liberalism -- decadent and dying -- is being replaced by a new political consensus, a consensus that wants Government to perform its legitimate duties such as maintaining domestic peace and our national security but otherwise to leave the people alone.

Along with this return to limited Government, there is a great spiritual awakening in America and a renewal of the traditional values that have been the bedrocks of America's goodness and greatness.

One recent survey of thousands of Americans by a Washington based research council concluded that Americans were far more religious than the people of other nations; 95 percent of those surveyed expressed a belief in God and a huge majority believed the Ten Commandments had real meaning for their lives.

Another study of 2,000 Americans by Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance found that -- in contrast to the views of the elites I mentioned earlier -- the following practices were found wrong by large majorities of average Americans: adultery, 85 percent; hard drugs, 84 percent; homosexuality, 71 percent; sex before 16,

71 percent; abortion, 65 percent; and pornography, 68 percent. And this same study showed a deep reverence for the importance of family ties and religious belief.

So I think the items we have discussed today are the political agenda of the future. Remember for the first time the Congress is openly and seriously debating and dealing with the prayer and abortion issues -- that's enormous progress right there. I repeat: America is in the midst of a spiritual awakening and a moral renewal. With your biblical keynote, I say today let "justice roll on like a river, righteousness like a never failing stream."

Now obviously, much of this new political and social consensus I have talked about is based on a positive view of American history, one that takes pride in our country's accomplishments and record. But we must never forget an important distinction between our moral philosophy and that of the liberal secularists. Unlike them, we know that no Government schemes are going to perfect man; we know that living in this world means dealing with what philosophers would call the phenomenology of evil or, as the theologians would put it, the doctrine of sin.

There is sin, there is evil in this world and we are enjoined by scripture and the Lord Jesus to oppose it with all our might. And that is why in talking about America we must never forget that, like any other human entity, our Nation, too, has a legacy of evil with which it must deal.

Now, the glory of this land has been its capacity for transcending the moral evils of our past. For example, the long

struggle of minority citizens for equal rights, once a source of disunity and civil war, is now a point of pride for all Americans. We must never go back. There is no room for racism, anti-semitism or other forms of ethnic and racial hatred in this country. I know you have been horrified as have I by the resurgence of some hate groups preaching bigotry and prejudice. Today I urge you: Use the mighty voice of your pulpits and the powerful standing of your churches to denounce and isolate these hate groups in our midst.

[And I want to mention today another dark legacy of our past -- one that we are also now attempting to address in Washington. For many years in America we tolerated the existence of powerful syndicates of organized crime. As the years went by, these national syndicates increased in power, influence and sophistication. Recently, in the enormous growth of the illegal drug trade, we have seen the tragic results of this permissiveness and the climate of professional lawlessness it fostered. This trade was only a short time ago spreading murder and mayhem throughout South Florida. Today, through the South Florida Task Force headed by Vice President Bush, we have a handle on it. We've cracked down on this drug trade in Florida, and now we're bringing on 200 new prosecutors and 1,000 new investigators to extend that task force model to 12 other regions throughout the United States.

Yes, we are going after the drug cartels. But we're not going to stop there. Through a new presidential commission and several other initiatives, we intend to expose and prosecute the infrastructure of organized crime itself. We mean to cripple

their enterprises, dry up their profits and put their leaders behind bars where they belong.]

But whatever sad episodes exist in our past, any objective observer must hold a positive view of American history, a history that has been the story of hopes fulfilled and dreams made into reality. Especially in this century, America has kept alight the torch of freedom -- not just for ourselves but for millions of others around the world. And this brings me to my final point today, and, by the way, it's another illustration of the gulf between the views of our professional elites and those of everyday Americans.

During my first press conference as President, I pointed out that as good Marxists-Leninists the Soviet leaders have "openly and publicly declared that the only morality they recognize is what will further their cause, meaning they reserve unto themselves the right to commit any crime, to lie, to cheat . . . and that is moral, not immoral." I said that we would do well to keep this in mind during our negotiations with the Soviets.

Well, once again this caused a stir. I saw several accounts that truncated my remarks and suggested they were nothing more than name calling. Other accounts suggested that it was a breach of diplomacy to be that candid about the Soviets.

Now -- putting aside for the moment the fact that the pundits and opinion makers are rarely upset when the Soviets say much worse about us everyday in their press -- I think I should point out I was only quoting Lenin, a saint, a guiding spirit to the Soviet leadership, who wrote in 1920: "We repudiate all

morality that proceeds from supernatural ideas or ideas that are outside class conceptions. Morality is entirely subordinate to the interests of class war. Everything is moral that is necessary for the annihilation of the old exploiting social order and for uniting the proleteriat."

I think the refusal of many influential people to accept this elementary insight into Soviet behavior illustrates the historical reluctance of much of the elite to see totalitarian powers for what they are. We saw this phenomenon in the 1930's; we see it today in the nuclear freeze movement.

But surely, just as we look back in wonder at the self-deception of the 1930's, future historians, looking back at our time, will be shocked by the naivete and moral blindness of the unilateral disarmers. Surely, they will note the real proportions of the threat to peace, that it was the West that refused to use its nuclear monopoly in the forties and fifties for territorial gain -- and that it was not the West that intervened by proxy in Angola, in Ethiopia, in South Yeman or Central America; that it was not the West that invaded Afghanistan, or suppressed Polish Solidarity or used chemical and biological warfare in Afghanistan and Southeast Asia.

Surely, those historians will find in the councils of those who preached the supremacy of the state, who declared its omnipotence over individual man, who predicted its eventual domination of all peoples of the Earth, surely historians will see there . . . the focus of evil in the modern world. It was C.S. Lewis who in his unforgettable Screwtape Letters wrote:

"The greatest evil is not now done in those sordid 'dens of crime' that Dickens loved to paint. It is not

↳ Fake because of Agent was contrary Chem-warfare

done even in concentration camps and labor camps -- in those we see its final result. But it is conceived and ordered (moved, seconded, carried and minuted) in clear, carpeted, warmed and well-lighted offices by quiet men with white collars and cut fingernails and smooth-shaven cheeks who do not need to raise their voices."

Because these "quiet men" do not "raise their voices," because they sometimes speak in soothing tones of brotherhood and peace, because, like other dictators before them, they are always making "their final territorial demand," some would have us accept them at their word and accommodate ourselves to their aggressive impulses. But, if history teaches anything, it teaches: simple-minded appeasement or self-delusion about our adversaries is folly -- it means the betrayal of our past, the squandering of our freedom.

So I urge you to speak out against those who would place the United States in a position of military inferiority to the Soviet Union. You know, I have always believed that old Screwtape reserves his best efforts for those of you in the Church. So in your discussions of the nuclear freeze movement, I urge you to beware the temptation of pride -- the temptation to blithely declare yourselves above it all and label both sides equally at fault, to ignore the facts of history and the aggressive impulses of an evil empire, to simply call the arms race a giant misunderstanding and thereby remove yourself from the struggle between right and wrong, good and evil.

I ask you to resist the attempts of those who would have you bargain away, for the sake of a few glowing minutes on the nightly news and a little cooing from the glitter set, your vital

support for this Administration's efforts to keep America strong and free.

But, while America's military strength is important, let me add here that I have always maintained that the struggle now going on for the world will never be decided by bombs or rockets, by armies or military might. For the real crisis we face today is a spiritual one, at root it is a test of moral will and religious faith.

Whittaker Chambers, the man whose own religious conversion made him a "witness" to one of the terrible traumas of our age, the Hiss Chambers case, wrote that the crisis of the Western world exists to the degree in which the West is indifferent to God, the degree to which it collaborates in Communism's attempt to make man stand alone without God. For Marxism-Leninism is actually the second oldest faith, he said, first proclaimed in the Garden of Eden with the words of temptation: "Ye shall be as gods."

The Western world can answer this challenge, he wrote, "but only provided that its faith in God and the freedom he enjoins is as great as Communism's faith in man."

I believe we shall rise to this challenge; I believe that Communism is another sad, bizarre chapter in human history whose last pages even now are being written. I believe this because the strength of our cause, the quest for human freedom, is not of this world; and because this strength is spiritual and knows no limitation, it must terrify and ultimately triumph over those who would enslave their fellow man. For, in the words of Isaiah:

"He giveth power to the faint, and to them that have no
might, He increased their strength . . . but they that wait upon
the Lord shall renew their strength . . . they shall mount up
with wings as eagles. They shall run and not be weary . . ."

Thank you and God bless you.