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INTRODUCTION:

PRESIDENT CLINTON

CHANCELLOR KOHL

AMBASSADOR HOLBROOKE

......

......

(SUBJECT TO CHANGE)
FELLOW GENERAL OFFICERS, TROOP COMMANDERS, DISTINGUISHED GUESTS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN

ON BEHALF OF THE BERLIN BRIGADE AND THE BERLIN MILITARY COMMUNITY, I WOULD LIKE TO WELCOME YOU TO THIS CEREMONY HONORING THE SOLDIERS PAST AND PRESENT WHO MANED THIS OUTPOST OF FREEDOM. IT IS A GREAT HONOR AND PLEASURE TO HAVE YOU WITH US TODAY IN THIS GREAT CITY.

SOLDIERS OF THE BERLIN BRIGADE AND THE BERLIN MILITARY COMMUNITY, LAST WEEK ON THE 4TH OF JULY, WE CONDUCTED A PARADE HERE CELEBRATING THE 218TH ANNIVERSARY OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE. AN IMPORTANT DAY IN THE LIVES OF ALL AMERICANS.

THE 4TH OF JULY WAS ALSO AN IMPORTANT DAY IN THE LIVES OF ALL BERLINERS. IT WAS THE DAY IN 1945 WHEN WE FIRST MARCHED INTO BERLIN TO BEGIN OUR OCCUPATION OF THE AMERICAN SECTOR.

TODAY, ON THE 12TH OF JULY, WE ARE CONDUCTING OUR LAST PARADE IN BERLIN. YOU SOLDIERS ON PARADE ARE A GRAND AND MOVING SIGHT FOR ALL OF US TO BEHOLD. FROM EVERY STATE AND TERRITORY OF OUR GREAT NATION, YOU EMBODY THE BEST THAT OUR NATION HAS TO OFFER. YOU ARE A GREAT CREDIT TO OUR SERVICE AND TO THE COUNTRY YOU SERVE. LAST WEEK WE COMPLETED OUR 49TH YEAR OF SERVICE IN BERLIN AND BEGAN OUR 50TH YEAR OF SERVICE HERE. HOWEVER, WE WILL NOT COMPLETE OUR 50TH YEAR OF SERVICE HERE. ON THE 7TH OF SEPTEMBER,
WE WILL LOWER THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FROM OVER CLAY HEADQUARTERS FOR THE LAST TIME AND DEPART THE CAPITAL OF A REUNITED GERMANY.

IT IS IMPORTANT THAT YOU KNOW AND THAT YOU REMEMBER THAT YOU SERVED IN A HISTORIC PLACE AND DURING HISTORIC TIMES WHEN HISTORIC EVENTS WERE UNFOLDING.

A GREAT AMERICAN LEADER, MARTIN LUTHER KING, ONCE SAID:

THE ULTIMATE MEASURE OF A MAN IS NOT WHERE HE STANDS IN MOMENTS OF COMFORT, BUT WHERE HE STANDS IN TIMES OF CHALLENGE AND CONTROVERSY.

YOU WERE NOT ON THE SIDELINES OF THE COLD WAR, YOU WERE CENTER STAGE. AND YOU DID YOUR JOB EXTREMELY WELL.

NOR WERE YOU ON THE SIDELINES OF THE PEACEKEEPING AND OTHER OPERATIONS THAT FOLLOWED THE COLD WAR - YOU WERE CENTER STAGE IN SAUDIA ARABIA AND IRAQ, IN TURKEY, IN KENYA, IN CROATIA AND IN MACEDONIA AND YOU DID YOUR JOB WELL.

FOR YOUR OUTSTANDING SERVICE AND SACRIFICE AND THAT OF YOUR FAMILIES AND OUR CIVILIANS, YOU HAVE JUST BEEN RECOGNIZED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES WITH THE ARMY SUPERIOR UNIT AWARD. AND FOR THAT MR. PRESIDENT, WE THANK YOU.
YOU ARE THE GREATEST SOLDIERS THAT I HAVE EVER HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO SERVE AND FOR THAT I THANK YOU.

AND TO OUR DEAR BERLINERS, THE TIME IS RAPIDLY APPROACHING WHEN WE WILL LEAVE YOU. IT WILL NOT BE AN EASY PARTING. I WOULD ONLY ASK THAT YOU REMEMBER ALL THE GREAT CHALLENGES THAT WE FACED TOGETHER. ALL THE GREAT SACRIFICES THAT WE SHARED TOGETHER, AND THE GREAT REWARD THAT WE GATHERED TOGETHER.

IN GERMAN

BLESS ARE THE PEACEMAKERS, FOR THEY SHALL BE CALLED CHILDREN OF GOD.

IN GERMAN

MAY GOD BLESS OUR GREAT SOLDIERS, MAY GOD BLESS BERLIN AND MAY GOD BLESS THE UNITES STATES OF AMERICA.
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THE PRESIDENT: Mr. President, distinguished deputies, representatives of the people of France.

It is a high honor for me to be invited here, along with my wife and our distinguished Ambassador Pamela Harriman, to share with you this occasion. There is between our two peoples a special kinship. After all, our two republics were born within a few years of each other. Overthrowing the rule of kings, we enthroned in their places common ideals, equality, liberty, community, the rights of man.

For two centuries, our nations have given generously to each other. France gave to our founders the ideas of Montesque and Rousseau. And then Lafayette and Rochambeau helped to forge those ideas into the reality of our own independence. For just as we helped to liberate your country in 1944, you helped to liberate our country two full centuries ago.

Your art and your culture have inspired countless Americans for that entire time, from Benjamin Franklin to John and Jacqueline Kennedy. In turn, we lent to you the revolutionary genius of Thomas Jefferson, the fiery spirit of Thomas Paine, and the lives of so many of our young men when Europe's liberty was most endangered.

This week you have given us yet another great gift in the wonderful commemorations of the Allied landings at Normandy. I compliment President Mitterrand and all the French people for your very generous hospitality. I thank especially the thousands of French families who have opened their homes to our veterans.

Yesterday's sights will stay with me for the rest of my life -- the imposing cliffs of Pointe du Hoc, the parade of our Allied forces on Utah Beach, the deadly bluffs at bloody Omaha, the rows upon rows of gravestones at our cemetery at Colleville.

D-Day was the pivot point of the 20th century. It began Europe's liberation. In ways great and small, the Allied victory proved how democracy's faith in the individual saved democracy itself. From the daring of the French Resistance to the inventiveness of the soldiers on Omaha Beach, it proved what free nations can accomplish when they unite behind a great and noble cause.
The remarkable unity among the Allies during World War II -- let us face it -- reflected the life-or-death threat facing freedom. Democracies of free and often unruly people are more likely to rally in the face of that kind of danger. But our challenge now is to unite our people around the opportunities of peace as those who went before us united against the dangers of war.

Once in this century, as your President so eloquently expressed, following World War I, we failed to meet that imperative. After the Armistice, many Americans believed our foreign threats were gone. America increasingly withdrew from the world, opening the way for high tariffs, for trade wars, for the rise to fascism and the return of global war in less than 20 years.

After World War II, America, France, and the other democracies did better. Led by visionary statesmen like Truman and Marshall, De Gaulle, Monet and others. We reached out to rebuild our allies and our former enemies -- Germany, Italy and Japan, and to confront the threat of Soviet expansion and nuclear power. Together, we founded NATO, we launched the Marshall Plan, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and other engines of economic development. And in one of history’s great acts of reconciliation, France reached out to forge the Franco-German partnership, the foundation of unity and stability in modern Western Europe.

Indeed, the members of the European Union have performed an act of political alchemy, a magical act that turned rubble into renewal, suspicion into security, enemies into allies.

Now we have arrived at this century’s third moment of decision. The Cold War is over. Prague, Warsaw, Kiev, Riga, Moscow and many others stand as democratic capitals, with leaders elected by the people. We are reducing nuclear stockpile, and America and Russia no longer aim their nuclear missiles at each other.

Yet, once again, our work is far from finished. To secure this peace, we must set our sites on a strategic star. Here, where America and our allies fought so hard to save the world, let that star for both of us -- for Americans and for Europeans alike -- be the integration and strengthening of a broader Europe. It is a mighty challenge. It will require resources. It will take years, even decades. It will require us to do what is very difficult for democracies -- to unite our people when they do not feel themselves in imminent peril to confront more distant threats and to seize challenging and exciting opportunities.

Yet, the hallowed gravestones we honored yesterday speak to us clearly. They define the price of failure in peacetime. They affirm the need for action now.

We can already see the grim alternative. Militant nationalism is on the rise, transforming the healthy pride of nations, tribes, religious and ethnic groups into cancerous prejudice, eating away at states and leaving their people addicted to the political painkillers of violence and demagoguery, and blaming their problems on others when they should be dedicated to the hard work of finding real answers to those problems in reconciliation, in power-sharing, in sustainable development.

We see the signs of this disease from the purposeful slaughter in Bosnia to the random violence of skinheads in all our nations. We see it in the incendiary misuses of history, and in the anti-Semitism and irredentism of some former communist states. And beyond Europe, we see the dark future of these trends in mass slaughter, unbridled terrorism, devastating poverty and total environmental and social disintegration.
Our transatlantic alliance clearly stands at a critical point. We must build the bonds among nations necessary for this time, just as we did after World War II. But we must do so at a time when our safety is not directly threatened, just as after World War I.

The question for this generation of leaders is whether we have the will, the vision and, yes, the patience to do it. Let me state clearly where the United States stands. America will remain engaged in Europe. The entire transatlantic alliance benefits when we, Europe and America, are both strong and engaged. America wishes a strong Europe, and Europe should wish a strong America, working together.

To ensure that our own country remains a strong partner, we are working hard at home to create a new spirit of American renewals, to reduce our budget deficits, to revive our economy, to expand trade, to make our streets safer from crime, to restore the pillars of our American strength -- work and family, and community, and to maintain our defense presence in Europe.

We also want Europe to be strong. That is why America supports Europe’s own steps so far toward greater unity -- the European Union, the Western European Union, and the development of a European defense identity. We now must pursue a shared strategy -- to secure the peace of a broader Europe and its prosperity. That strategy depends upon integrating the entire continent through three sets of bonds. First, security cooperation; second, market economics; and third, democracy.

To start, we must remain strong and safe in an era that still has many dangers. To do so we must adapt our security institutions to meet new imperatives. America has reduced the size of its military presence in Europe, but we will maintain a strong force here.

The EU, the WBU, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and other organizations must all play a larger role. I was pleased that NATO recently approved an American proposal to allow its assets to be used by the WBU. To foster greater security cooperation all across Europe, we also need to adapt NATO to this new era.

At the NATO Summit in January, we agreed to create the Partnership for Peace in order to foster security cooperation among NATO allies and the other states of Europe -- both former Warsaw Pact countries, states of the former Soviet Union and states not involved in NATO for other reasons. And just six months later, this Partnership for Peace is a reality. No less than 19 nations have joined, and more are on the way. Russia has expressed an interest in joining.

The Partnership will conduct its first military exercises this fall. Imagine the transformation -- troops that once faced each other across the Iron Curtain will now work with each other across the plains of Europe.

We understand the historical anxieties of Central and Eastern Europe. The security of those states is important to our own security. And we are committed to NATO’s expansion. At the same time, as long as we have the chance -- the chance -- to create security cooperation everywhere in Europe, we should not abandon that possibility anywhere.

There are signs that such an outcome may be possible. Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Belarus have now committed to eliminate all the nuclear weapons on their soil. And by this August we may well see all Russian troops withdrawn from Eastern Europe and the Baltics for the first time since the end of World War II.
Do these developments guarantee that we can draw all the former communist states into the bonds of peaceful cooperation? No. But we would fail our own generation and those to come if we did not try.

Do these arrangements mean we can solve all the problems? No, at least not right away. The most challenging European security problem and the most heartbreaking humanitarian problem is, of course, Bosnia. We have not solved that problem, but it is important to recognize what has been done, because France, the United States, Great Britain and others have worked together through the United Nations and through NATO. Look what has been done. First, a determined and so far successful effort has been made to limit that conflict to Bosnia, rather than having it spread into a wider Balkan war. Second, the most massive humanitarian airlift in history has saved thousands of lives; as has the UNPROFOR mission, in which France has been the leading contributor of troops.

We have prevented the war from moving into the air. We have seen an agreement between the Bosnian Muslims and the Croats. Progress has been made. What remains to be done? Today, the United Nations has put forward the proposal by Mr. Akashi for a cessation of hostilities for a period of several months. The United States supports this program; France supports this proposal. We must do all we can to get both sides to embrace it.

Then, the Contact Group is working on a map, which can be the basis of a full and final cessation of hostilities there. We must do all we can, once all parties have been heard from, to secure that agreement.

And finally, let us not forget what has happened to make that more likely, and that is that Russia has been brought into the process of attempting to resolve this terrible crisis in what so far has been a very positive way, pointing the way toward a future in which we may all be able to work together to solve problems like this over a period of time. We must be patient. We must understand that we do not have total control of events within every nation. But we have made progress in Bosnia, and we must keep at it, working together -- firmly together -- with patience and firmness, until the job is done. We can do this if we stay together and work together.

The best way to sustain this sort of cooperation is to support the evolution of Europe across the board. We must also have an economic dimension to this. We must support Europe’s East in their work to integrate into the thriving market democracies. That brings me to the second element of our strategy of integration. Integration requires the successful transition to strong market economies all across broader Europe.

Today, the former communist states face daunting transitions. Our goal must be to help them succeed -- supporting macroeconomic reforms, providing targeted assistance to privatization, increasing our bonds of trade and investment. That process invariably will proceed slowly and, of course, unevenly. It will depend in part on what happens within those countries. We have seen voters in former communist states cast ballots in a protest against reform and its pain. Yet as long as these states respect democratic processes, we should not react with too much alarm. The work of reform will take years and decades.

Despite many problems the economic reforms in Europe’s East have still been impressive. Russia’s private sector now employs 40 percent of the work force and 50 million Russians have become shareholders in privatizing companies. In Prague last January, I said the West needed to support such reforms by opening our markets as much as possible to the exports of those nations. For if our new friends are not able to export their goods, they may instead export instability, even against their own will.
We can also support other reforms by stimulating global economic growth. One of the most important advances toward that goal in recent years has been the new GATT Agreement. It will create millions of jobs. France played an absolutely pivotal role in bringing those talks to fruition. I know it was a difficult issue in this country. I know it required statesmanship. I assure you it was not an easy issue in the United States.

We have issues left to resolve. But now that we have opened the door to history’s most sweeping trade agreement, let us keep going until it is done. My goal is for the United States Congress to ratify the GATT Agreement this year, and to pursue policies through the G-7 that can energize all our economies.

We have historically agreed among the G-7 nations that we will ask each other the hard questions: What can we do to promote economic growth and job creation? Why kind of trade policies are fair to the working people of our countries? How can we promote economic growth in a way that advances sustainable development in the poorer countries of the world so that they do not squander their resources and, in the end, assure that all these endeavors fail? These are profoundly significant questions. They are being asked in a multilateral forum for the first time in a serious way. And this is of great significance.

In the end, no matter what we do with security concerns or what we do with economic concerns, the heart of our mission must be the same as it was on Normandy’s beaches a half a century ago. That is democracy. For, after all, democracy is the glue that can cement economic reforms and security cooperation. That is why our third goal must be to consolidate Europe’s recent democratic gains.

This goal resonates with the fundamental ideals of both of our republics. It is, after all, how we got started. It also serves our most fundamental security interests, for democracy is a powerful deterrent; it checks the dark ambitions of would-be tyrants and aggressors as it respects the bright hopes of free citizens.

Together, our two nations and others have launched a major effort to support democracy in the former communist states. Progress will not come overnight. There will be uneven developments, but already we see encouraging and sometimes breathtaking results. We have seen independent television stations established where once only the state’s version of the truth was broadcast. We’ve seen thousands of people from the former communist world -- students, bankers, political leaders -- come to our nations to learn the ways and the uses of freedom.

We’veseen new constitutions written and new states founded around the principles that inspired our own republics at their birth. Ultimately, we need to foster democratic bonds, not only within these former communist states, but also among our states and theirs.

There is a language of democracy spoken among nations. It is expressed in the way we work out our differences, in the way we treat each other’s citizens, in the way we honor each other’s heritages. It is the language our two republics have spoken with each other for over 200 years. It is the language that the Western Allies spoke during the second world war.

Now we have the opportunity to hear the language of democracy, spoken across this entire continent. And if we can achieve that goal, we will have paid a great and lasting tribute to those from both our countries who fought and died for freedom 50
years ago.

Nearly 25 years after D-Day, an American veteran who had served as a medic in that invasion returned to Normandy. He strolled down Omaha Beach where he had landed in June of 1944, and then walked inland a ways to a nearby village. There, he knocked on a door that seemed familiar.

A Frenchwoman answered the door and then turned suddenly and called to her husband. "He's back. The American doctor is back," she called. After a moment, the husband arrived, carrying a wine bottle covered with dust and cobwebs. "Welcome, Doctor," he cried. "In 1944, we hid this bottle away for the time when you would return. Now, let us celebrate."

Well, this week, that process of joyous rediscovery and solemn remembrance happened all over again. It unfolded in countless reunions, planned and unplanned.

As our people renewed old bonds, let us also join to resume the timeless work that brought us here in the first place and that brought our forebears together 200 years ago -- the work of fortifying freedom's foundation and building a lasting peace for generations to come. I believe we can do it. It is the only ultimate tribute we can learn -- we can give, for the ultimate lesson of World War II and Normandy.

Thank you. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

END 3:35 P.M. (L)
I am grateful for the continuing support of the Congress for U.S. efforts, including the deployment of U.S. Armed Forces to Macedonia, towards peace and stability in the former Yugoslavia. I remain committed to consulting closely with the Congress on our foreign policy, and I look forward to continued cooperation as we move forward toward attainment of our goals in the region.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Robert C. Byrd, President pro tempore of the Senate. This letter was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on January 10.

Remarks to the North Atlantic Council in Brussels
January 10, 1994

Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary General, and distinguished leaders. I am deeply honored to represent my Nation at the North Atlantic Council this morning, as eight previous Presidents have done before me. Each of us came here for the same compelling reason: The security of the North Atlantic region is vital to the security of the United States. The founders of this alliance created the greatest military alliance in history. It was a bold undertaking. I think all of us know that we have come together this week because history calls upon us to be equally bold once again in the aftermath of the cold war. Now we no longer fear attack from a common enemy. But if our common adversary has vanished, we know our common dangers have not.

With the cold war over, we must confront the destabilizing consequences of the unfreezing of history which the end of the cold war has wrought. The threat to us now is not of advancing armies so much as of creeping instability. The best strategy against this threat is to integrate the former Communist states into our fabric of liberal democracy, economic prosperity, and military cooperation. For our security in this generation will be shaped by whether reforms in these states succeed in the face of their own very significant economic frustration, ethnic tensions, and intolerant nationalism.

The size of the reactionary vote in Russia’s recent election reminds us again of the strength of democracy’s opponents. The ongoing slaughter in Bosnia tallies the price when those opponents prevail. If we don’t meet our new challenge, then most assuredly, we will once again, someday down the road, face our old challenges again. If democracy in the East fails, then violence and disruption from the East will once again harm us and other democracies.

I believe our generation’s stewardship of this grand alliance, therefore, will most critically be judged by whether we succeed in integrating the nations to our east within the compass of Western security and Western values. For we’ve been granted an opportunity without precedent: We really have the chance to recast European security on historic new principles: the pursuit of economic and political freedom. And I would argue to you that we must work hard to succeed now, for this opportunity may not come to us again.

In effect, the world wonders now whether we have the foresight and the courage our predecessors had to act on our long-term interests. I’m confident that the steel in this alliance has not rusted. Our nations have proved that by joining together in the common effort in the Gulf war. We proved it anew this past year by working together, after 7 long years of effort, in a spirit of compromise and harmony to reach a new GATT agreement. And now we must do it once again.

To seize the great opportunity before us I have proposed that we forge what we have all decided to call the Partnership For Peace, opened to all the former Communist states of the Warsaw Pact, along with other non-NATO states. The membership of the Partnership will plan and train and exercise together and work together on missions of common concern. They should be invited to work directly with NATO both here and in the coordination cell in Mons.

The Partnership will prepare the NATO alliance to undertake new tasks that the times impose upon us. The Combined Joint Task Force Headquarters we are creating will let
us act both effectively and with dispatch in helping to make and keep the peace and in helping to head off some of the terrible problems we are now trying to solve today. We must also ready this alliance to meet new threats, notably from weapons of mass destruction and the means of delivering them.

Building on NATO's creation of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council 2 years ago, the Partnership For Peace sets in motion a process that leads to the enlargement of NATO. We began this alliance with 12 members. Today there are 16, and each one has strengthened the alliance. Indeed, our treaty always looked to the addition of new members who shared the alliance's purposes and who could enlarge its orbit of democratic security. Thus, in leading us toward the addition of these Eastern states, the Partnership For Peace does not change NATO's original vision, it realizes that vision.

So let us say here to the people in Europe's east, we share with you a common destiny, and we are committed to your success. The democratic community has grown, and now it is time to begin welcoming these newcomers to our neighborhood.

As President Mitterrand said so eloquently, some of the newcomers want to be members of NATO right away, and some have expressed reservations about this concept of the Partnership For Peace. Some have asked me in my own country, "Well, is this just the best you can do? Is this sort of splitting the difference between doing nothing and full membership at least for the Visegrad states?" And to that, let me answer at least for my part an emphatic no, for many of the same reasons President Mitterrand has already outlined.

Why should we now draw a new line through Europe just a little further east? Why should we now do something which could foreclose the best possible future for Europe? The best possible future would be a democratic Russia committed to the security of all of its European neighbors. The best possible future would be a democratic Ukraine, a democratic government in every one of the newly independent states of the former Soviet Union, committed to market cooperation, to common security, and to democratic ideals. We should not foreclose that possibility.

The Partnership For Peace, I would argue, gives us the best of both worlds. It enables us to prepare and to work toward the enlargement of NATO when other countries are capable of fulfilling their NATO responsibilities. It enables us to do it in a way that gives us the time to reach out to Russia and to these other nations of the former Soviet Union, which have been almost ignored through this entire debate by people around the world, in a way that leaves open the possibility of a future for Europe that totally breaks from the destructive past we have known.

So I say to you, I do not view this as some sort of half-hearted compromise. In substance, this is a good idea. It is the right thing to do at this moment in history. It leaves open the best possible future for Europe, and leaves us the means to settle for a future that is not the best but is much better than the past. And I would argue that is the course that we all ought to pursue.

I think we have to be clear, in doing it about certain assumptions and consequences. First, if we move forward in this manner, we must reaffirm the bonds of our own alliance. America pledges its efforts in that common purpose. I pledge to maintain roughly 100,000 troops in Europe, consistent with the expressed wishes of our allies. The people of Europe can count on America to maintain this commitment.

Second, we have to recognize that this new security challenge requires a range of responses different from the ones of the past. That is why our administration has broken with previous American administrations in going beyond what others have done to support European efforts to advance their own security and interests. All of you have received our support in moving in ways beyond NATO. We supported the Maastricht Treaty. We support the commitment of the European Union to a common foreign and security policy. We support your efforts to refurbish the Western European Union so that it will assume a more vigorous role in keeping Europe secure. Consistent with that goal, we have proposed making NATO assets available to WEU operations in which NATO itself is not involved.

Finally, I believe that President Mitterrand has with previous American administrations in doing a bit at a time. He has put forward a new concept, a new forum. We supported the Maastricht Treaty. We stated that the expansion should not mean a burden for Europe or for Russia. There are half a dozen other countries of central Europe that are not yet on the European Council. There are half a dozen more countries that we think could be considered for membership. There are other countries of central Europe that we think could be considered for membership.
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not involved. While NATO must remain the linchpin of our security, all these efforts will show our people and our legislatures a renewed purpose in European institutions and a better balance of responsibilities within the transatlantic community.

Finally, in developing the Partnership For Peace, each of us must willingly assume the burdens to make that succeed. This must not be a gesture. It is a forum. It is not just a forum. This Partnership For Peace is also a military and security initiative, consistent with what NATO was established to achieve. There must be a somber appreciation that expanding our membership will mean extending commitments that must be supported by military strategies and postures. Adding new members entails not only hard decisions but hard resources. Today those resources are not great, but nonetheless, as the Secretary General told me in the meeting this morning, they must be forthcoming in order for this to be taken seriously by our allies and our friends who will immediately subscribe to the Partnership.

Let me also—in response to something that President Mitterrand said and that is on all of our minds, the problem in Bosnia—say that when we talk about making hard decisions, we must be prepared to make them. And tonight I have been asked to talk a little bit about the work I have been doing with Russia and what I believe we all should be doing to support democracy and economic reform there. But I'd like to make two points about Bosnia.

First, I want to reaffirm that the United States remains ready to help NATO implement a viable settlement in Bosnia voluntarily reached by the parties. We would, of course, have to seek the support of our Congress in this, but let me say I think we can get it if such an operation would clearly be under NATO command, that the means of carrying out the mission be equivalent to its purposes, and that these purposes be clear in scope and in time.

Second, I welcome the reassertion by the alliance in this declaration of our warning against the strangeling of Sarajevo and the safe areas. But if we are going to reassert this warning it cannot be seen as mere rhetoric. Those who attack Sarajevo must under­

stand that we are serious. If we leave the sentence in the declaration we have to mean it.

Those of us gathered here must understand that, therefore, if the situation does not improve, the alliance must be prepared to act. What is at stake is not just the safety of the people in Sarajevo and any possibility of bringing this terrible conflict to an end but the credibility of the alliance itself. And that, make no mistake about it, will have great ramifications in the future in other contexts.

Therefore, in voting for this language, I expect the North Atlantic Council to take action when necessary. And I think if anyone here does not agree with that, you shouldn't vote for language. I think it is the appropriate language, but we have to be clear when we put something like this in the declaration.

Let me say finally that I ran across the following quotation by a distinguished and now deceased American political writer, Walter Lippmann. Three days after the North Atlantic Treaty was signed Lippmann wrote this, prophetically, "The pact will be remembered long after the conditions that have provoked it are no longer the main business of mankind. For the treaty recognizes and proclaims a community of interest which is much older than the conflict with the Soviet Union and, come what may, will survive it.

Well, this meeting will prove him right. The Soviet Union is gone, but our community of interest endures. And now it is up to us to build a new security for a new future for the Atlantic people in the 21st century.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 10:15 a.m. at NATO Headquarters. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

The President’s News Conference in Brussels
January 10, 1994

Initiatives in Europe

The President. Good evening. Ladies and gentlemen, I came to Europe to help strengthen European integration, to create a new security for the United States and its
WELCOMING CEREMONY by new German President, Villa Hammerschmidt, Bonn.

THE PRESIDENT departs (possibly on foot through gardens) en route meeting with Chancellor Kohl at nearby Chancellery.

MEETING WITH CHANCELLOR KOHL AND CABINET, Chancellery.

Possible press availability on lawn behind Chancellery (weather permitting).

Visit at old Rathaus (Town Hall).

GREET AMERICAN COMMUNITY PLITTERSDORF/US EMBASSY possible sites

Private time at hotel

MEETING WITH OTHER GERMAN OFFICIALS, Petersberg Hotel

OFFICIAL DINNER hosted by Chancellor Kohl, Petersberg Guesthouse (Business suits).

MARINE ONE DEPARTS enroute Bonn-Cologne airport.

AIR FORCE ONE DEPARTS Tegel Airport, Bonn, Germany enroute Berlin.

AIR FORCE ONE arrives Berlin

SIGN Berlin’s Golden Book at City Hall.

PRESIDENT MEETS with Chancellor Kohl and Economic Union President Jacques DeLors, REICHSTAG (photo op, closed bilaterals, possible press availability afterward) Most will be pooled.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT, Pariser Platz at Brandenburg Gate. OPEN PRESS (NOTE: Traveling correspondents will be located near president’s speaker stand and pool stands at spots to facilitate exit afterward from what is expected to be a throng for those wanting to cover McNair Barracks event in person as well, Ms. Edwards says.)

VISITS Jewish Center at Neue Synagogue on Oranienburger Strasse. (Pool coverage while press corps relocates to next event.)

Ceremony deactivating Berlin Brigade, McNair Barracks. OPEN PRESS.

THE PRESIDENT departs Berlin via Air Force One en route Okecie Airport, Warsaw, Poland.
NOTE: Because of filing time and close connections after open press events in Germany, tonight's coverage in Poland may be entirely pool with a second pool sent ahead on backup Air Force One after Brandenburg Gate event to be in position.)

VENUES (Bonn)

KOHL FAMILY RESIDENCE, OGGERSHEIM: (Not surveyed this trip. Pooler's previous visits were at a rather modest private home close by its neighbors on a normal street in the chancellor's home state of Palatinate. Usually a press stand is set up on opposite side of narrow street for press availability afterward and little chance of indoor contact there. I believe it is law that it must rain on such occasions.)

VILLA HAMMERSCHMIDT: President arrives at far end of gardens from house which is called the German "White House" for its color and function as presidential residence. During military ceremony, Clinton and president (yet to be elected but conventional wisdom says Herzog, now president of federal court) will stand alone near the car during anthems, then walk through gardens past fountain across red carpet on cobbled courtyard. Two flagpoles at their right while walking bear German and US flags. The house front is rather plain but there is a dramatic balcony above the front door. Schoolchildren likely to be among invited crowd of 200 or so in secure area for the 10-minute ceremony. House takes its name from a millionaire who bought it in 1899. Other presidents have been to Villa including JFK who attended ceremonies there establishing the German Peace Corps.

CHANCELLERY: Kohl meets Clinton at photo op out front unless they choose to have him meet him in the gardens at gate in the fence separating Chancellery from Villa Hammerschmidt. Nice walk on a nice day. Press stand out front of the building and small pool would go inside for photo op at start. This 1976 structure is typical German geometric architecture, lots of glass and right angles in a three-story aluminum building of bronze color within a highly secured complex of identical buildings including the parliament's present home. It has 240 rooms, a pool, gym, restaurant and library, plus underground garage for 350 cars, and houses about 420 of the Chancellor's staff.

BONN RATHAUS (City Hall): The stairs of this building have hosted speeches by only two foreign leaders in the past, Charles deGaulle (1962) and John Kennedy (1963). Queen Elizabeth II visited in 1965 and 1978. In 1989 Mikhail Gorbachev did his thing there. The present building was erected in 1737 and restored in 1949 from WWII damage. Clinton will first meet Oberburgermeister Hans Daniels in a large studio with a fireplace and sign the ubiquitous Golden Book which is the third for this city since the custom began in 1926. In addition to Kennedy, Presidents Carter and Nixon visited and signed during their trips to the wall as did former President Truman. Mr. Carter's daughter Amy distinguished herself by drawing a picture of Mickey Mouse, which remains unique. Clinton's picture may be added to the collection that already houses Corazon Aquino, and the leaders of Malaysia, Spain, Netherlands, Japan, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia. Germans told us about 10,000 people can fit into the market square outside. (Aging White House advancer questions that number.)
building is pink and gray with bright gold trim and has a clock that works above the door. The front entrance is regal and has a balcony and wrought iron rails about 15 feet above the crowd. Not likely to be in the pictures are the restaurants that flank it (German on the left and on the right a Chinese and a creperie).

PETERSBERG GUESTHOUSE: This isolated high-on-a-hill guesthouse (Gasthaus) is used so often for foreign visitors that photo-op lights are permanently installed. It is at Konigswinter, across the Rhine from Bonn. There are million-mark views of the Rhine from up there and the ballroom alone has 17 floor-to-ceiling windows. It may still be light at 10 p.m. when the president visits. From the glass-walled rooms or outdoor plazas you can see the flatlands along the winding river to the north or the castle-studded mountains to the south. A glider soared at an altitude below where we stood. Clinton would use Suite 500, the Berlin Suite. Outer rooms were heavily marbled with chairs arranged in conversational squares around coffee tables. Little decor but great view of castles to the south. Even the elevators are glass all around. In addition to the government guesthouse (acquired in 1979), there is a hotel in the other wing with about 70 rooms. Grounds at the peak of a heavily secured hill. First opened in 1892, was seat of Allied High Commission until 1952. Shah of Iran, Queen Elizabeth II and Secy. Gen. Brezhnev stayed there (not simultaneously). It has closed at times but has been open again since 1990.

VENUES (Berlin)

REICHSTAG: Parliament completed in 1894 and now used for conferences and occasional caucuses of the Bundestag. It was rebuilt from war damage in the 1960s and reopened in 1971. Public Act of Unification was signed on its steps Oct. 4, 1990, and later that month it was site of first reunified Bundestag meeting. That parliamentary role becomes permanent again when Bundestag moves back from Bonn in the next five years (Berlin already is the national capital, but government's still in Bonn). Hitler's appointment as chancellor was done there on Jan. 30, 1933, followed by the Feb. 27, 1933, Reichstag Fire which was the pretext for abolishing democratic rights. Reichstag official says it was not used officially by Nazis. As with most buildings older than 1945, the scars of bullets and bombs are clearly visible. Red Army raised Soviet flag from a corner tower of the Reichstag in May 1945, signalling the end of the battle for Berlin. It is just a few feet inside West Berlin and less than a block north from Brandenburg Gate. Presidents Truman and Reagan and Kennedy have visited the site but it still had holes in the wall and the dome was girders when Kennedy got there in 1963, we were told.

Its interior is strikingly (discordantly?) modern, starkly white. Chrome is the dominant theme and a huge chrome and Porsche red mobile hangs from the three-story ceiling in the 70-foot x 70-foot main entry hall whose eastern wall is glass and overlooks the parliamentary area from behind the speaker's platform (a visitor there is looking over the presiding officer's shoulder at the delegates.)

BRANDENBURG GATE (BRANDENBURGER TOR): (Site is Pariser Platz at whose center stands the Gate and which is some 100 feet from where American Embassy once stood, and where its replacement may be built as German
government moves to Berlin. U.S. soil fell into in East Zone during Cold War and is marked now with a plaque, nice lawn, and unobstructed view of piles of debris at site of Hitler's bunker south of Brandenburg Gate.)

Clinton's chance for oratorical greatness occurs at a former tollgate in what was East Berlin. The Brandenburg Gate, which was entirely within the East zone, was completed in 1791 as a tollgate for King Frederick William II. It is crowned by a four-horse chariot sculpture (Quadriga) that faces east. Napoleon's troops marched through in 1806 after defeating the Prussians. After Waterloo in 1815, the Prussians reversed the roles. And it was there that storm troopers marched when Hitler assumed power in 1933. During the Occupation it was a major crossing between East and West Berlin but that ended when it was walled off by the Berlin Wall in 1961. On Nov. 9, 1989, it was the focal point when the Wall was opened and crowds began chipping it away.

One scenario has Clinton walking about one block from their previous event at the Reichstag, and through the gate's center arch to a speaker's stand at what would be the north side of the street, just off center from the gate and far enough away that it would tower over them in photographs and TV shots. Only taxis, buses and pedestrians are allowed through the gate now and traffic all uses the center arch, one way at a time. On an ordinary day the scene has a somewhat circusy atmosphere, complete with organ grinder. Tourists mill about taking pictures and patronizing the slew of souvenir stands (all offering pieces of the wall with suspiciously bright paint on them).

NEUE SYNAGOGUE: Clinton may tour construction of Jewish Community Center at site of Oranienburger Strasse Synagogue in eastern Berlin. The synagogue facade (Neue Synagogue when it was opened on May 9, 1866) has been declared a historic monument by the city government and German governments have put some 80 million DMs into reconstruction (about $50 million). Our host for interesting survey was a colorful story-teller named Konstantin Munz, a mid-fortyish redhead with heavy red beard who is a director of the restoration work. He said the synagogue was spared from 1938 Kristallnacht pogroms by intercession of district police commissioner Wilhelm Kreuzfeld (or Krutzfeld), who told firemen at the point of a gun to put out the flames. On the night of Nov. 9-10, fires destroyed 2,675 synagogues in Germany including the other 116 in Berlin. The Neue Synagogue was set ablaze but was saved when Kreuzfeld ordered firemen to put it out and it was in use again on April 2, 1939, the first night of Passover. After the last service, on April 13, 1941, the synagogue was seized by the German Army to store uniforms. It was heavily damaged in a November 22, 1943, air raid by the Royal Air Force. "You must know I'm happy at this bombing," Munz said, since it was aimed at hastening the end of the war. The attack did great damage to the synagogue's nave (if that is the right word), which was about 300 feet long and 100 feet to the roof. That main portion was taken demolished in 1958 for unexplained reasons. The front portion, which housed the dome and meeting rooms, was heavily damaged on upper floors but basically spared because the Germans had added a concrete ceiling and used the front rooms for air raid shelters. "Bombs fall from the sky, after all," Munz said, explaining why damage was more severe on upper floors. The few original decorated frieze reliefs or ceiling panels,
or portions of them, remain in dark red or other colors while all restoration is in pale white or beige to show visitors the extent of the damage. An ornate old pillar will stand next to a plain steel or plaster support. "My grandchild must see what was done," Munz said. "We want a sign, where we are, what we are. ... We are not Jewish people in Berlin, Germany. We are German Jews."

The 19th Century synagogue, which seated 3,200, was in the traditional Jewish Quarter and was a center of Jewish life and culture in the city. It claims to have been the first to include an organ. It was the site of a violin concert by Albert Einstein on Sept. 29, 1930.

GDR (East Germany) began rebuilding the synagogue in 1988 as part of what U.S. background papers call an attempt "to underline its denial of responsibility for Nazism and the Holocaust." Construction due to continue through 1995 although parts of the building are in use. (Munz said government money is used only for exterior construction with donations from elsewhere throughout the world going for inside work. He said that money is one area in which Germans can express what he called "feedback" about what happened before Auschwitz. "Money is a good point on which to talk.") Pillars are for position only and do not bear the weight of the new roof. Surviving rooms on first of three floors were main entrance hall, the men's vestibule, and the marriage room. Virtually all above that is rebuilt with just scraps of the original in place. The back wall of each floor is all glass, looking out on the football-field-sized area that once housed the main congregation. Today it is not yet a synagogue again, however, and has no congregation or minyan of its own. It is an educational center for adults and community center --"a communication point for Jews in the city, a place people can talk together." "It is a small address. God at this moment in this city doesn't need a big address," Munz told us. Its community is 10,000 Jews, mostly immigrants from the former Soviet Union and about 3,000 Germans. Before WWII, there were 173,000 Jews in Berlin. Now the communities of Berlin Jews in New York and London are larger than in Berlin, he said. The community center also houses archives of Jews in the former East Germany. The completed building will include a 20-foot by 20-foot synagogue chapel on the third floor. Asked if the institution's Torah was saved, Mr. Munz (not a rabbi) said that 76 of the scrolls were saved (he attributed 68 of them to intervention by a trash-collector who picked them out of a dump and took them in 1943 to a rabbi holding forth from a Jewish cemetery). "One can't be too certain which came from which and we believe one is ours. One Torah roll was taken from our synagogue and no one can say we are not correct."

NOTE: When your pool passed Oranienburger on Saturday evening, there were barricades around the entranceway and several police stood outside, some wearing bulletproof vests and carrying automatic weapons. Embassy people said it was not a normal thing. Mr. Munz tells us they have been there since April because of bombing attacks and threats elsewhere in Germany, but not at Neue Synagogue. While we were there, police on the guard detail freely acted as tour guides for German tourists, pointing out items of interest on the outside and explaining the reconstruction. Visitors are not permitted inside.
MC NAIR BARRACKS: Site surveyed for ceremony to end the Brigade's role has been the place for nearly every major ceremonial event held by the U.S. Army in Berlin. Ceremony would be on broad paved avenue (perhaps 50 feet across) where there is a permanent tri-level shelter some 150 feet long for VIP ceremony-watchers on one side of the street which will be lined with state and territory flags. On the other side are 19 permanent flagpoles on which red and white bunting is normally arrayed. This time, however, the reviewing stand -- which normally is in front of the permanent VIP stand -- may be across the street with its back to a hedge that shields a cemetery. Col. Al Baker, an Airborne kind of guy, suggested a large crowd would be on hand and some 10,000 tiny flags would be distributed among them. Public will be in bleachers and SRO areas at both ends of the street.

Clinton will arrive to usual musical honors and 21-gun salute. Commander in Chief then will "troop the line" in a specially outfitted Jeep. It is Patton-style jeep painted a bit more specially and chromed wherever. After German and U.S. anthems are played he will affix a ribbon unit citation to the service flag (like the ones in White House Roosevelt Room) and the colors will be cased in canvas containers ("rolling the colors" or "retiring the colors"), symbolically taking down the military's Stars and Stripes in Berlin for the last time. The commanding general then will speak followed by Clinton. Troops will march in review (936 soldiers, of whom 720 plus the band will march) while three helicopters do a fly-by.

This will be the big American farewell although a few token American troops will be in Berlin with French and German forces for Sept. 8 formalities. (Boris Yeltsin is scheduled to attend Aug. 31 ceremony for departure of last 50,000 Russian troops.) Approximately 1,000 U.S. troops will remain at time of president's visit, down from 7,000 in 1990.

Within a couple of days of the ceremony, virtually all remaining uniformed U.S. troops will leave Berlin which they first occupied formally on July 4, 1945. The last president to visit the U.S. troops at their base here was President Truman who arrived on July 20, 1945 (cq), bringing a flag that had flown over the U.S. Capitol on Dec. 7, 1941 (which later was taken to Tokyo as well). Of course, Reagan spoke in 1987 at the wall site closest to Brandenburg and Kennedy spoke at the West Berlin City Hall, a temporary Cold War location about 4 miles or so from the Wall (the real City Hall in East Berlin is intended to be a presidential visit site).

The barracks has 54 beige buildings on 90 acres in southwestern section of Berlin. It is home to 4th, 5th and Combat Support Battalions of the 502nd Infantry and 320th Field Artillery. During the war the site was a Telefunken anti-aircraft gun factory bombed by a U.S. Army Air Corps raid in 1944 that hit storage facilities but not the weapons plant. Barracks named for Gen. Leslie James McNair (of D.C.'s Fort McNair), a 1904 West Point grad killed in France in 1944 by "friendly fire" when bombs fell short.

BERLIN CITY HALL: Not to be confused with interim West Berlin City Hall where Kennedy spoke, which is miles away. This was THE pre-war city hall and wound up behind the wall. It returned to use by a reunified city government in 1990. Building renovated since then and
is very ceremonial inside with stained-glass windows, photo displays, etc. The balcony from which Hitler spoke to Berliners looks out on a park area dominated by a large electronic Coke billboard. The ceremony likely would take place in a hall used for nothing else and which accommodates about 200. It also has permanent press stands for 40, eight stained-glass windows each marked for a district, and a stage with table for signing and lectern for spreken.

FACILITIES


One interesting innovation. Guest room keys also needed to summon elevator and to work controls inside (when card is swiped your floor lights up and elevator won't stop at other floors).

Scandic Crown
2 Berliner Freiheit
Bonn 53111
Telephone: (02 28) 7 26 90
FAX (02 28) 7 26 97 00

Maritim Hotel Bonn
Godesberger Allee
Bonn 53175
Telephone: (02 28) 8 10 80
FAX: (02 28) 8 10 88 11

In Berlin, press stays at the Schweizerhof Intercontinental across the street from the Intercontinental itself, perhaps the president's RON, and whose new conference center will house the press filing center. One convenience note: charges to your room at either hotel may be signed for at either hotel. Schweizerhof is a middle-age hotel, more European than is the Intercon, and sports Chaine des Rotisseurs plaque and offers CNN, hair dryers, modular phones in some rooms (with old German plugs) and mini-bars.

Schweizerhof Hotel
Budapest Street
Berlin 10787

Intercontinental
2 Budapest Street
Berlin 10787
Telephone 49 (30) 26020
FAX: 49 (30) 260 28 0760

MISCELLANEOUS

Page - 17
Don't count too heavily on using credit cards in German restaurants or stores outside of hotels. Though Visa won't like it, many don't take Visa, MC or Amex. Nicht.

On the off-chance that anyone gets a lunch or dinner opportunity in Berlin, I can recommend an outstanding German restaurant (low prices, great food and beer, and just the atmosphere I hoped for, mitout music), the Zur Letzten Instanz (The Last Instance) which claims to date from 1621 and be the oldest pub in Berlin. It is a block or two from the Rathaus (City Hall) which is in the old East Zone. Like many restaurants, an English-language menu is available on request.

Please note that German hotels have modular phones with one of two German plugs, old or new. (Poland and Italy have RJ-11s like the U.S.) Suggest adapters for those planning to log-on from hotel rooms.

Also note, at the risk of branding myself some kind of a puritan, some men and women planning to use the saunas in Germany might prefer not to be surprised to learn that nudity in them is co-ed.

This is a triple-election year for Germany (not counting the June 9 European election). For those interested, the presidential election in late May by an ad hoc group called the Bundesversammlung (something of an Electoral College assembled from 662 federal parliamentarians and 662 persons elected from the states). Chancellor comes from the fall elections and there are local elections.

Decision on when to move government from Bonn to capital in Berlin remains uncertain, but is expected in 1998. The national political decision is tied into embassy relocations as well as new uses for federal center in Bonn.

Jogging in Bonn is fine, widely done. Hotel is not far from Rheinaue Park, which has excellent running paths along the Rhine River. No info on jogging in Berlin but watch out for bike paths, which are jealously guarded by the wheelies.
McNAIR BARRACKS

(POSSIBLE INACTIVATION CEREMONY SITE)

The Fourth of July parade ground at McNair Barracks has been the site for nearly every major ceremonial event held by the U.S. Army in Berlin. McNair Barracks consists of 54 buildings on 90 acres in southwestern Berlin. McNair currently is home for several units, including the 4th, 5th and combat support battalions of the 502nd Infantry, 42nd engineer company, Berlin Brigade headquarters company and E battery, 320th field artillery. Previous units assigned to McNair include the 6th Infantry and battery C, 94th artillery.

During World War II, the site was a Telefunken facility. The site was bombed by the Army Air Force during March 1994. The raid destroyed a storage building but not the production area where anti-aircraft artillery was manufactured. In 1945, the remaining buildings were requisitioned for use by the Army. The buildings from the 1920s and 30s are considered historical by the Berlin Senat as the architect, Dr. Hans Hertelein, was nationally known.

The barracks are named after General Leslie James McNair. Son of Scottish immigrants, Leslie McNair graduated from West Point in 1904. He served in the Mexican campaign and in France during WWI. As a staff officer in Washington in 1940, General McNair instituted revised training procedures. He emphasized physical fitness and simulated battle conditions which remain the basis for training today.

He was killed in France during July 1944 when a bombing attack on enemy forces fell short. Fort McNair in Washington D.C. is also named after him.
MEMORANDUM

TO: National Security Council - Mr. Will Itoh  
White House Scheduling Office - Ms. Kathy Roth

FROM: Embassy Bonn - Pete Ito

SUBJECT: Proposed List of VIP Invitees for July 12 Berlin Brigade Decommissioning Ceremony

Attached is the Embassy's proposed list of VIP invitees for the subject ceremony. It has been discussed with the Berlin Brigade, which is handling administrative arrangements for the event. It embellishes on the list of VIP invitees the Brigade has prepared for the July 4 parade in Berlin (also attached), and is intended to be the "maximum" list for your consideration.

We would propose that as the July 12 event is a U.S. (or U.S.-FRG) event and the Allied farewell from Berlin is in September, the U.K. and French representation should be at the level of Ambassador. The Russian Ambassador is also included as a proposed invitee. Finally, we would note that the Berlin Brigade has an 84-page list of all proposed invitees for July 4 which you may wish to discuss with them as the possible basis for deciding on non-VIP invitees for July 12.

When you have decided on the final list of VIP invitees, please FAX it back for my attention or that of Mr. Rich Collins of the Administrative Section. We would also appreciate knowing which invitations will be issued from Washington and which should be issued from Berlin. We will coordinate with the Berlin Brigade on the latter.
BÉRÉLH BRIGADE DECOMMISSIONING CEREMONY
JULY 12, 1994

PROPOSED V.I.P. GUEST LIST

U.S.
President and Mrs. William J. Clinton
President and Mrs. George Bush
President and Mrs. Ronald Reagan
President and Mrs. Jimmy Carter
President and Mrs. Gerald Ford

Warren M. Christopher
Secretary of State

Lawrence S. Eagleburger
Former Secretary of State

James A. Baker III
Former Secretary of State

George P. Schulz
Former Secretary of State

Alexander M. Haig, Jr.
Former Secretary of State

Edmund S. Muskie
Former Secretary of State

Cyrus R. Vance
Former Secretary of State

Henry A. Kissinger
Former Secretary of State

William P. Rogers
Former Secretary of State

Dean Rusk
Former Secretary of State

William J. Perry
Secretary of Defense
Les Aspin
Former Secretary of Defense

Richard B. Cheney
Former Secretary of Defense

Frank C. Carlucci
Former Secretary of Defense

Caspar W. Weinberger
Former Secretary of Defense

Harold Brown
Former Secretary of Defense

Anthony Lake
Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs

Peter Tarnoff
Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs

Stephen A. Oxman
Assistant Secretary of State for European and Canadian Affairs

General John Shalikashvili
Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff

General Colin L. Powell
Former Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff

General George A. Joulwan
Commander in Chief, U.S. European Command

General Charles G. Boyd
Deputy Commander in Chief, U.S. European Command

Togo West
Secretary of the Army

General Gordon Sullivan
Chief of Staff of the Army

Richard C. Holbrooke
Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany
Robert M. Kimmitt
Former Ambassador to the FRG (1991-1993)

Vernon A. Walters
Former Ambassador to the FRG (1989-1991)

Richard Burt
Former Ambassador to the FRG (1985-1989)

Martin J. Hillenbrand
Former Ambassador to the FRG (1972-1976)

Kenneth Rush
Former Ambassador to the FRG (1969-1972)

George C. McGhee
Former Ambassador to the FRG (1963-1968)

Richard Barkley
Former Ambassador to the GDR (1988-1990)

Francis J. Meehan
Former Ambassador to the GDR (1985-1988)

Rozanne L. Ridgway
Former Ambassador to the GDR (1983-1985)

Herbert S. Okun
Former Ambassador to the GDR (1980-1983)

David B. Bolen
Former Ambassador to the GDR (1977-1980)

John Sherman Cooper
Former Ambassador to the GDR (1974-1976)

Douglas H. Jones

Ambassador Richard Miles
Former Minister to the U.S. Mission in Berlin (1991-1992)

Ambassador Harry Gilmore

Ambassador John C. Kornblum
Former Minister to the U.S. Mission in Berlin (1985-1987)
Ambassador Nelson C. Ledsky
Former Minister to the U.S. Mission in Berlin (1981-1985)

David Anderson
Former Minister to the U.S. Mission in Berlin (1978-1981)

Scott George
Former Minister to the U.S. Mission in Berlin (1975-1978)

David Klein
Former Minister to the U.S. Mission in Berlin (1971-1974)

Brewster H. Horris
Former Minister to the U.S. Mission in Berlin (1967-1971)

John A. Calhoun
Former Minister to the U.S. Mission in Berlin (1963-1966)

MG Walter H. Yarham, Jr.
U.S. Commander, Berlin

MG Raymond E. Haddock
Former U.S. Commander, Berlin

MG John H. Mitchell
Former U.S. Commander, Berlin

MG James G. Boatner
Former U.S. Commander, Berlin

MG Calvert P. Benedict
Former U.S. Commander, Berlin

MG Joseph C. McDonough
Former U.S. Commander, Berlin

MG William W. Cobb
Former U.S. Commander, Berlin

MG George M. Seignious II
Former U.S. Commander, Berlin

MG Robert G. Fergusson
Former U.S. Commander, Berlin
Federal Republic of Germany

President Richard von Weiszäcker

President Walter Scheel (1974-79)

Chancellor Helmut Kohl

Helmut Schmidt
Chancellor (1974-82)

Klaus Kinkel
Minister for Foreign Affairs

Hans-Dietrich Genscher
Former Minister for Foreign Affairs

Volker Rühe
Minister of Defense

Dr. Gerhard Stoltenberg
Former Minister of Defense (1989-1992)

Dr. Rupert Scholz

Dr. Manfred Wörner
NATO Secretary General

Hans Apel
Former Minister of Defense (1978-1982)

Georg Leber
Former Minister of Defense (1972-1978)

Kai Uwe von Hassel
Former Minister of Defense (1963-1966)

General Klaus Naumann
Chief of Defense

Admiral Dieter Wellershoff

General Wolfgang Altenburg

General Jürgen Brandt
Former Chief of Defense (1979-1983)
General Harald Wust  
Former Chief of Defense (1976-1979)

General Heinz Trettner  
Former Chief of Defense (1964-1966)

Joachim Bitterlich  
Office of the Federal Chancellor, Security and Foreign Policy Advisor

Dr. Peter Hartmann  
German Ambassador to the U.K. (Former Security and Foreign Policy Advisor)

Horst Teltschik  
Former Foreign and Security Policy Advisor

General Jörg Schönbohm  
State Secretary, Ministry of Defense

---

**Officials of the City of Berlin**

Governing Mayor Eberhard Diepgen

Walter Momper  
Former Governing Mayor (1989-1990)

Dr. Hans-Jochen Vogel  
Former Governing Mayor (1981)

Dietrich Stobbe  
Former Governing Mayor (1977-1981)

Klaus Schütz  
Former Governing Mayor (1967-1977)

---

**United Kingdom**

Sir Nigel Broomfield  
Ambassador of the United Kingdom

Rosemary Spencer  
Representative in Berlin
France

Mr. Francois Scheer
Ambassador of France

Mr. Christian Connan
Representative in Berlin

Russian Federation

Wladislaw Petrowitsch Terechow
Ambassador of the Russian Federation

Valentin Alexejewitsch Koptelzew
Representative in Berlin
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE H. BUSH</td>
<td>FORMER PRESIDENT</td>
<td>HONORABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RONALD REAGAN</td>
<td>FORMER PRESIDENT</td>
<td>HONORABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JIMMY CARTER</td>
<td>FORMER PRESIDENT</td>
<td>HONORABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERALD R. FORD</td>
<td>FORMER PRESIDENT</td>
<td>HONORABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASPER WEINBERGER</td>
<td>FORMER SEC OF STATE</td>
<td>HONORABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD B. Cheney</td>
<td>FORMER SEC OF DEFENSE</td>
<td>HONORABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD HELMS</td>
<td>FORMER CIA CHIEF</td>
<td>HONORABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN C. MARSH</td>
<td>FORMER SEC OF DEFENSE</td>
<td>HONORABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN F. KENNEDY, JR.</td>
<td>MEMBER OF KENNEDY FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANK B. CLAY</td>
<td>MEMBER OF CLAY FAMILY</td>
<td>MG-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOGO WEST</td>
<td>SECURITARY OF THE ARMY</td>
<td>HONORABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM J. PERRY</td>
<td>SECURITARY OF DEFENSE</td>
<td>HONORABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD C. HOLBROKE</td>
<td>AMBASSADOR TO GERMANY</td>
<td>AMBASSADOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERNON WALTERS</td>
<td>FORMER AMB TO GERMANY</td>
<td>AMBASSADOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRY J. GILMORE</td>
<td>FORMER MINISTER</td>
<td>AMBASSADOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD MILES</td>
<td>FORMER MINISTER</td>
<td>AMBASSADOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHARD BURT</td>
<td>FORMER MINISTER</td>
<td>AMBASSADOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT KIMMETT</td>
<td>FORMER AMB TO GERMANY</td>
<td>AMBASSADOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETER BURKE</td>
<td>FORMER SPEC ASST TO USCOB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILL ROONEY</td>
<td>FORMER SPEC ASST TO USCOB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLENN K. OTIS</td>
<td>FORMER CINC</td>
<td>GEN-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROSBIE E. SAINT</td>
<td>FORMER CINC</td>
<td>GEN-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN R. GALVIN</td>
<td>FORMER CINC</td>
<td>GEN-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLIN L. POWELL</td>
<td>FORMER JCS</td>
<td>GEN-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE S. BLANCHARD</td>
<td>FORMER CINC</td>
<td>GEN-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT G. FERGUSSON</td>
<td>FORMER USCOB</td>
<td>MG-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE M. SEIGNICUS</td>
<td>FORMER USCOB</td>
<td>MG-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM W. COBB</td>
<td>FORMER USCOB</td>
<td>MG-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOSEPH C. MCDONOUGH</td>
<td>FORMER USCOB</td>
<td>MG-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALVERT P. BENEDICT</td>
<td>FORMER USCOB</td>
<td>MG-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN H. MITCHELL</td>
<td>FORMER USCOB</td>
<td>MG-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAYMOND E. HADDOCK</td>
<td>FORMER USCOB</td>
<td>MG-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. DEAN TICE</td>
<td>FORMER BRIGADE CDR</td>
<td>LTG-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS N. GRIFFIN, JR.</td>
<td>FORMER BRIGADE CDR</td>
<td>LTG-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE T. DUNCAN</td>
<td>FORMER BRIGADE CDR</td>
<td>MG-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM C. MOORE</td>
<td>FORMER BRIGADE CDR</td>
<td>MG-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEROY N. SUDDATH, JR.</td>
<td>FORMER BRIGADE CDR</td>
<td>MG-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN E. ROGERS</td>
<td>FORMER BRIGADE CDR</td>
<td>BG-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES S. D'ORSA</td>
<td>FORMER BRIGADE CDR</td>
<td>BG-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREDERICK O. HARTEL</td>
<td>FORMER BRIGADE CDR</td>
<td>BG-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMUEL McC. GOODWIN</td>
<td>FORMER BRIGADE CDR</td>
<td>BG-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAROLD I. HAYWARD</td>
<td>FORMER BRIGADE CDR</td>
<td>BG-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond O. Miller</td>
<td>Former Brigade CDR</td>
<td>BG-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert D. Stevenson</td>
<td>Former Brigade CDR</td>
<td>BG-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter E. Adams</td>
<td>Former Brigade CDR</td>
<td>BG-RET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caryl G. Marsh</td>
<td>Former Brigade CDR</td>
<td>MG (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney Shachnow</td>
<td>Former Brigade CDR</td>
<td>MG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John M. Shalikashvili</td>
<td>Joint Chiefs of Staff</td>
<td>GENERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon R. Sullivan</td>
<td>Chief of Staff, Army</td>
<td>GENERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George A. Joulwan</td>
<td>SACEUR/CINC, EUCOM</td>
<td>GENERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles G. Boyd</td>
<td>DCINC, EUCOM</td>
<td>GENERAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Western Allied troops marched together for the last time in Berlin today as part of a stirring farewell to the forces who have protected the city for nearly half a century.

An estimated 100,000 people stood three- and four-deep along Berlin's grandest boulevard, the 17th of June Avenue, as 2,000 U.S., French and British soldiers tramped by with bayonets fixed and brass bands crashing through a medley of marches.

Today's festivities were part of a summer-long string of departure events, which will culminate on Aug. 31, when the last Russian troops leave the former East Germany, and on Sept. 8, when the Western Allies formally leave Berlin. Such arrangements are spelled out in the 1990 treaty that led to German reunification and the pullout of all ex-Soviet occupation forces.

This was the 27th parade held by the British, French and Americans, a tradition begun in 1964 as a show of unity following erection of the Berlin Wall in 1961. The annual event was suspended in 1989 after the Wall fell but was re instituted one final time to honor the forces that arrived as occupiers at the end of World War II but soon became guarantors of the city's freedom.

"During the last 50 years, you and your comrades have been in the front line of the defense of not only the freedom of West Berlin but the freedom of Europe and people's right to self-determination," Mayor Eberhard Diepgen told the troops in a brief ceremony. "Without your commitment, Berlin would not be free and Germany would probably not be united."

Some spectators expressed feelings of nostalgia and regret as the troops filed past in a cool, intermittent drizzle.

"They've been here so long. Somehow it's strange to see them go," said Christa Vogel, wiping away tears. "We haven't had much contact with them personally, but they're part of the landscape."

"It's an odd sensation," added her husband, Alfred Vogel. "There was a feeling of security with them here and now that will be gone. We'll have to
count on the politicians to find something to replace it. And it’s important to always be grateful, to never forget."

Russian troops were absent from the ranks, an issue that generated months of controversy. Despite requests by Russian political and military leaders to have the four occupying powers march together, the proposal was rejected as hypocritical by German and Allied officials. The 17th of June Avenue, for example, commemorates the bloody 1953 uprising by East German workers, who were suppressed with help from Soviet tanks.

Spectators at today’s festivities were divided over whether a joint farewell should have been held.

A group of eastern German visitors, for example, who drove from the industrial city of Eisenhuettenstadt to see the parade, was split on the issue. While Ricardo Brockmann suggested that it was appropriate to keep the former adversaries separated, his friend Silvio Grabow said: "The Russians should be marching here too. It’s a historic event, and it would demonstrate unity."

Western forces remaining in Berlin are but a shadow of the 12,000 stationed here during the Cold War. Although the U.S. military presence in the city will soon end, about 70,000 American troops will remain in western Germany. In the past five years, the Pentagon has closed or reduced nearly 900 installations overseas and brought home 174,000 troops.

Although Germans often express deep gratitude for the American military commitment to their country, the Bonn government has balked at congressional demands for greater financial support. Defense Minister Volker Ruehe this week rejected a U.S. House of Representatives amendment calling for European host countries to pay up to 75 percent of non-salary costs, compared with 5 percent now.

"We won’t pay," Ruehe told reporters in Bonn, adding, "I am firmly convinced that those responsible in American politics will see how important for America the presence is."

GRAPHIC: PHOTO, A UNIT OF THE 2,000 FRENCH, BRITISH AND U.S. TROOPS MARCHING IN BERLIN FILES PAST SOME OF THE 100,000 PEOPLE WHO WATCHED THE WESTERN ALLIES’ LAST JOINT PARADE BEFORE LEAVING THE ONCE-DIVIDED CITY BY SEPT. 8. RUSSIAN TROOPS, DESPITE ASKING TO TAKE PART, WERE NOT INVITED. REUTER
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FOREWORD

It is difficult to write an account of Checkpoint CHARLIE in the context of the Berlin-Wall crisis that created it, without giving an impression of trying to revive the cold war. However, the grim reality of the Wall-crisis era has been somewhat obscured by the passage of time. The underlying issues involved are still very much with us. But in many cases, it appears that Checkpoint CHARLIE's cold-war symbolism has been detached from its factual roots, making it difficult to keep events in perspective. Historical perspective is needed to keep a firm grasp on the significance of what is happening now.

Evidently it is part of Soviet-East German tactics in the post-Quadripartite Agreement era to obscure the significance of the past 19 years. Presumably, they would like the world at large to believe that it is not international law and a measure of self-determination for two million Berliners, but merely Western wrong-headedness that prompts the Allies to preserve the status of the city and oppose arbitrary and unilateral changes which affect it. In this situation, it is hoped that a brief, factual account of Checkpoint CHARLIE in historical context will shed some light on current events in a way that supports the peacetime missions of the United States Command, Berlin.

K. MARTIN JOHNSON
Berlin Command Historian
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CHECKPOINT CHARLIE
(Friedrichstrasse Crossing Point)

1. Introduction

In the 19 years since Checkpoint CHARLIE came into being, virtually overnight, events have endowed the area with a dramatic mystique. It has been the scene of historical events and continues, in fact, to have a high potential for incidents. However, like the Wall itself, the drab physical reality of the Checkpoint area is in striking contrast with the dramatic situations of the Wall-crisis era. The Checkpoint itself, and the evolution of its operations, were an integral part of Allied responses to events. Basically, it is the mission of the Checkpoint, and the personnel of the Berlin Brigade's 287th Military Police Company who man it, to support the exercise of Allied rights in Greater Berlin. On a daily basis, they enforce U.S. regulations governing official travel to the Soviet (East) Sector of Berlin. They brief individual travelers and generally carry out policies intended to minimize the possibility of involvement by U.S. personnel in incidents, such as might have political repercussions.

The history of Checkpoint CHARLIE is the history of events which, in the first place gave rise to a U.S. Army facility in the middle of Friedrichstrasse. An account of the facility alone would be of technical interest only, like a description of a bare stage when no performance is in progress. The Checkpoint facilities came into being in response to a crisis situation so grave that the course of events largely overshadowed the implementing details.

The following account is intentionally brief. It aims to keep the Checkpoint, insofar as possible, in the center of events. Excepting basic points relevant to the narrative, Checkpoint procedures and regulations governing travel to East Berlin have been omitted. These are dealt with principally in U.S. Army, Europe and U.S. Command, Berlin Regulations 550-180. Under these regulations,
it is the responsibility of commanders, supervisors, sponsors and the individuals concerned to ensure that Berlin-based personnel and persons traveling to Berlin are fully informed before they enter the Soviet Sector.

2. Free Circulation - The Allied Legal Position

The wartime London Protocols (1944-45) provided for the joint military occupation of Greater Berlin. The agreed geographic and jurisdictional bases for the Protocols were the boundaries of Greater Berlin as defined by German Law in 1920. The right of free circulation for members of the respective forces, in all four Sectors, was inherent in the concept of joint occupation. In the early years of the occupation it had been repeatedly confirmed by Four-Power agreements, and by implementing arrangements and precedents having the force of Four-Power agreements. The significance of the Wall, then, was twofold. The human tragedy of the Wall, which, as it snaked across the city, walled up houses and stores and separated families, is well known. Its legal significance to the Allies, constrained to maintain their rights in order to fulfill their guarantees of continued freedom and democratic process to the people of Berlin, is less well known. The legal significance of the Wall was that it imposed, or sought to impose, among other things, a unilateral limitation on the Allied right of free circulation. In general, the Allied response to Soviet efforts to force them out of Berlin was to insist on their legal rights. This meant that the situation created by Four-Power agreements could not be changed except by the same means, agreement of all Four Powers. The Soviet Union (or its "agents", i.e. the East Germans) could not legally impose new restrictions on the exercise of Allied rights in Berlin unless the Western Allies agreed. Thus it was Allied policy to oppose as illegal Soviet-East German attempts to do so. The Wall -- that is, the sealing of the Sector-Sector (S/S) boundary and the beginning of construction of the Wall -- was a major unilateral change which, had it not been vigorously opposed, would have significantly restricted the Allied right of access to East Berlin. This threat to Allied rights, combined as it was with a significant worsening of conditions for the people of Berlin, was correctly understood as a further peril to the continued democratic existence of the Western Sectors of Berlin.

3. The Friedrichstrasse Crossing Point

The boundary between the Western Sectors and the Soviet Sector is some 28.5 miles long, the so-called S/S border. From July 1945 to mid-August 1961, "free circulation" closely approximated what the term implies. For occupation purposes, the division of the city among the World War II Allies had been by administrative district (Bezirk). Thus the S/S border wound its way in a generally north-westerly direction, following the jurisdictional lines laid down in 1920. Near the center of this boundary the heart of the old city, "Berlin-Mitte", formed a westward salient of the Soviet Sector, which included the Brandenburg Gate. "Crossing Points" followed the main streets, the arteries of traffic. Before the war, more than 120 streets crossed the imaginary line drawn in the London Protocols. In early August 1961 some 80 crossing points
remained open and passable in both directions. They were (relatively) lightly manned by East Germans and largely unfortified. Included in the 80 open crossing points were the Brandenburg Gate/Unter den Linden (east-west) and the Friedrichstrasse (north-south).

In the pre-dawn hours of 13 August 1961, the East Germans sealed the S/S border and, during the ensuing days, began construction of the Wall. Initially, 13 of the 80 pre-Wall crossing points were to have remained open. During the ensuing ten days, mass demonstrations by West Berliners at the Brandenburg Gate gave the East Germans a pretext for closing it and five more pre-Wall crossing points. Only seven remained "open", subject to severe restrictions. Friedrichstrasse was one of them. After some initial uncertainties, the East Germans announced that Friedrichstrasse would be the only crossing point open to "foreigners", including West Germans, the Diplomatic Corps in East Berlin, and personnel of the Allied Garrisons. It was also to be an authorized crossing point for pedestrian traffic.

Before the Wall, Friedrichstrasse did not differ significantly from other major crossing points. The street itself was rich in historic associations. It had been a main Berlin thoroughfare since the time of Friedrich Wilhelm (1713-1740), when troops of the Berlin garrison first marched along it to their training ground in Tempelhof. Under the German Empire (1871-1918) it had also been a main shopping street. It is probable, however, that purely practical considerations dictated the selection of principal crossing points. (Based on the sequence of events, it is possible that the East Germans first intended to keep the Brandenburg Gate open as a major crossing point, and changed their minds after the West Berliners had shown how suitable its broad approaches were for mass demonstrations.) Certainly there were several practical considerations which favored Friedrichstrasse as a main crossing point.

Friedrichstrasse is a main North-South artery and the longest street in central Berlin. Absolutely straight and some two miles in length, it bisects the Unter den Linden, running from Mehringplatz in the U.S. Sector's Kreuzberg District to the Oranienburg Gate in Berlin-Mitte. In addition, the restored Friedrichstrasse Bahnhof, pre-war Berlin's main rail terminal, is barely a mile north of the S/S border and affords access to both the U-Bahn (subway) and the S-Bahn (elevated rail system), the city's main public transportation systems. The Intention to make the Friedrichstrasse station the only point of entry into East Berlin for persons using the public transportation systems was announced the same day the border was sealed. The intent to restrict Allied traffic to the Friedrichstrasse crossing point was not announced until 22 August 1961, by which time, as noted above, the number of crossing points had been further reduced from 13 to 7.

4. Pre-Wall Controls

Some controls on civil traffic existed before the Wall. The political division of the city occurred late in 1948. Apparently the Soviet authorities established, or provided for the establishment of the first control points on
the S/S border at that time. In December of 1948, the Communist rump of the Magistrat (or city council) in East Berlin ordered that commercial vehicles from the Western Sectors would be required to enter East Berlin at these control points. By 1953, the number of crossing points passable in both directions had been reduced to about 80. Although information is spotty, there is no evidence of overt attempts to impose controls on traffic of the Allied garrisons. (In the absence of evidence to the contrary, we can only speculate on whether the Allies had, prior to the Wall, accepted some minor restriction of free circulation; where neither political fanfare nor systematic threat to the principle of Allied rights was involved, some local arrangements may have gained a kind of pragmatic sanction. Prior to 1961, the main arena appears to have been the surface access routes, not East Berlin.) Since pre-Wall controls were aimed at civil traffic, it is likely that the early control points were manned by East Germans. In September 1960, the East German regime introduced selective controls at the S/S border, restricting West Germans to the use of five specified crossing points. These early precedents, however, were of marginal significance when compared to the Wall, which marked a major turning point.

5. Significance of the Wall

As tensions in Berlin mounted in the summer of 1961, so did the flow of escapees from East Germany and the Soviet Sector. In July and early August, the number of persons escaping into the Western Sectors averaged 1,800 per day; reportedly the high for a single day exceeded 3,000. From the standpoint of the Communist leadership in East German, the German Democratic Republic (G.D.R.) was, through massive losses of manpower, bleeding to death. West Berlin was the escape hatch, an open wound that had to be closed. The Wall was a Draconian measure to keep East Germans in. In a Four-Power context, however, it also marked a turning point. Prior to the Wall, Soviet authorities had often been uncooperative, themselves describing East Berlin as "the capital of the G.D.R.". In the days immediately preceding the Wall, the Soviet Government loudly repeated the long-standing (since 1958) demand for the withdrawal of the Allies and the conversion of the Western Sectors to a "free city". (The Soviets did not offer convincing proposals to guarantee West Berlin's continued existence as a democratic city.) In permitting the East Germans to seal the S/S border, and to attempt to impose controls upon the Allies, the Soviets added physical separation to the other means employed against the Allies, to force their assent to unilateral Soviet changes in the Four Power status of Greater Berlin.

Despite steady Soviet-East German harassment, the Allies continued to exercise their rights in Berlin including the right of access to the Soviet Sector. The dramatic turning point in the dispute occurred in late October 1961.

Intensified surveillance of the S/S border began on 13 August when it was sealed. The decision to restrict Allied traffic to a single crossing point
quickly focused attention on the Friedrichstrasse area. Paralleling rising tensions and movement toward the U.S.-Soviet confrontation that almost immediately made it famous, the physical dimension of Checkpoint CHARLIE began to take shape.

6. Checkpoint CHARLIE

The events of August 1961 dictated a requirement for a continuous U.S. military presence in the Friedrichstrasse area, where none had been before. The new situation at the S/S border was comparable to that which had long existed on the Berlin-Helmstedt autobahn, where single points of entry (or exit) gave access to the only route used by Allied motor-vehicle traffic. Allied Checkpoints at Helmstedt-Marienburg (between East and West Germany) and Dreilinden-Babelsburg (between the U.S. Sector and East Germany) supported Allied access and the exercise of Allied access right.* In the jargon of Army voice-communications, these autobahn checkpoint had long been called ALFA (Helmstedt) and BRAVO (Berlin). When the Wall created a new situation in the middle of Berlin and a third designated access point for the Allies, it immediately entered the Berlin vocabulary as Checkpoint CHARLIE. (Apparently, this was a logical and spontaneous extension of existing usage. At any rate, there is no known written record of a formal decision on what to call the new Checkpoint.) Unlike ALFA and BRAVO, intensive press coverage of events in the area gave "Checkpoint CHARLIE" an enduring place in the world's cold-war vocabulary.

The East German measure to make Friedrichstrasse the only crossing point for foreigners, including the members of the forces in Berlin, went into effect at midnight on 22 August. During the ensuing days, combat troop of the three Allies screened the S/S border in their respective Sectors. Because of its location in the U.S. Sector, sole responsibility for Friedrichstrasse was initially exercised by U. S. forces. An ad hoc detachment of U. S. Military Police began checkpoint operations in Friedrichstrasse on 23 August, in connection with the deployment of combat forces along the demarcation line. By 26 September, when heavier screening forces were withdrawn and thrice-daily patrols along the S/S border instituted, Checkpoint CHARLIE had become operational.

On 1 September, U.S. authorities formally requisitioned space in the buildings on the West side of Friedrichstrasse in the block between Kochstrasse and Zimmerstrasse (which paralleled the actual demarcation line at that point). Number 207 Friedrichstrasse -- where travelers to East Berlin are still briefed -- and two rooms in the corner building at 19a Zimmerstrasse were allocated for use by U. S. Forces. According to a verified account, the first checkpoint operations were conducted from a desk in a U. S. Army

*In 1969, a new link at the Berlin end of the autobahn was completed and the Soviet Allied Checkpoints were moved to their present location near Drewitz.
A semi-trailer placed in the middle of Friedrichstrasse in front of Number 207.* Probably the familiar white ("barracks style") structure had been set up in the middle of the street by mid-September. A rough-hewn, disproportionately large flag pole bracketed to the north end of the "shack" served to fly the colors unmistakably near the Soviet Sector line. Although refinements were gradually added, the physical layout of the checkpoint area changed very little during the ensuing years.**

During the first year of operations, official reports referred to the Friedrichstrasse crossing point or checkpoint, carefully avoiding local jargon in reports to higher headquarters. But the Checkpoint came into being literally overnight. During its first ten weeks in operation the level of greatpower tensions underlying the events that swirled around it was the highest in Berlin's post-war history. The news media gave intensive coverage to these events; in reporting them the press took their cue from the sign the Army put up over the door at No. 207 Friedrichstrasse. By 1965 the Friedrichstrasse area was in the guide books and, literally, on the map as Checkpoint CHARLIE.

7. Historical Highlights

a. U. S.-Soviet Confrontation. The events of October 1961 catapulted Checkpoint CHARLIE into world prominence. The deepening crisis over the Four-Power status of Berlin endowed it with the lingering cold-war symbolism its name still evokes. Of the many dramatic events which occurred at or near the Checkpoint, the direct confrontation between U.S. and Soviet forces across the S/S border was probably the tensest moment in Berlin's post-war history. At issue was an East German attempt to deny free, uncontrolled entry into the Soviet Sector to civilian members of the forces in Berlin. They demanded that persons not actually in uniform identify themselves. Since status as members of the forces in Berlin derived from Allied laws agreed to by the Four Powers, and confirmed by long-standing precedents, the attempt to exclude civilian officials directly affected Allied rights. Then as now, "members of the forces", including military personnel, civilian employees and their dependents were prohibited from submitting to East German controls. The issues involved were complex and were not fully resolved until 1966. However, U.S. authorities in

*British and French detachments were not continuously stationed at Checkpoint CHARLIE until 1962, as a result of efforts to harmonize Allied procedures and practices. (Intvw, Mr. K.M. Johnson, Berlin Command Historian with LTC Verner N. Pike, Cdr, 385th MP Bn, 27 Jan 77.)

**Although an extension to the south end provided working space for the British and French detachments, the original guard shack was in continuous use for nearly 15 years. The outward appearance of the Checkpoint was changed very little by the prefabricated structure which replaced the original shack in May 1976.
Berlin supported by General Lucius D. Clay* were convinced that East German attempts to actually deny entry into East Berlin could not go unchallenged. As a result, U.S. forces in the Checkpoint area were reinforced with tanks and armored personnel carriers (APCs); one of the APCs and two tanks were positioned north of the Checkpoint building right at the S/S demarcation line.

Beginning on 26 October, U.S. forces registered vehicles denied entry into East Berlin because non-uniformed personnel refused to identify themselves, were given an armed escort of jeep-mounted Military Police and sent back through the crossing point. Neither Soviet authorities nor East German police attempted to stop the escorted vehicles. By 1700 hours the next day, however, Soviet troops and armor had moved into position on their side of the S/S line. During the ensuing 24 hours, foreign and diplomatic travelers continued to move unmolested through the checkpoint. Until approximately 1100 hours on 28 October, Soviet and U.S. troops and tanks faced each other across the Friedrichstrasse boundary. At that time, both Soviet and U.S. forces withdrew into nearby staging areas on their respective sides. Inherent in the civilian-identification issue was the Four-Power status of Greater Berlin. The Western Allies insisted, in the face of Soviet disclaimers, that the Soviet Union remain responsible for its Sector. The firm U.S. position on the issue led to a Soviet demonstration, documented world-wide by the news media, of its ultimate responsibility for events in East Berlin. While the confrontation was in progress, General Clay called a news conference and pointedly announced the significance of the events then taking place: "The fiction that it was the East Germans who were responsible for trying to prevent Allied access to East Berlin is now destroyed. The fact that Soviet tanks appeared on the scene proves that the harassments... taking place at Friedrichstrasse were not those of the self-styled East German government but ordered by its Soviet masters".

b. Subsequent Events. Although the tense situation of 1961 was not repeated, Checkpoint CHARLIE continued to make news. Incidents related to the identification issue continued sporadically until 1966 when the present U.S. Forces Berlin identity document came into general use.

Three days after the first anniversary of the Wall (17 Aug 62), the death of Peter Fechter some 100 meters east of the Checkpoint triggered mass

*The former U.S. Military Governor for Germany (1947-49), GEN Clay returned to Berlin in September 1961 as President Kennedy's personal representative with ambassadorial rank.
CONFRONTATION
BERLIN, 26-28 OCTOBER 1961


SANDBAGGED AND DWARFED BY U.S. TANKS, CHECKPOINT CHARLIE CAME TO SYMBOLIZE THE MOST TENSE 16 HOURS OF THE COLD WAR, AND U.S. DETERMINATION TO PRESERVE FREEDOM IN THE WESTERN SECTORS. OPPOSITE, SOVIET TANKS "DESTROY THE FICTION" OF EAST GERMAN RESPONSIBILITY. (PHOTOS COURTESY OF ARMY MAGAZINE)
demonstrations of West Berliners against the brutality of the East German Regime. \* In the days that followed, crowds of West Berliners stoned Soviet buses as they brought their guard relief through Checkpoint CHARLIE enroute to the Soviet War Memorial in the Tiergarten (British Sector). In retaliation, the Soviets tried to bring their guard mount in with APCs. Ultimately, after a long series of incidents, Allied authorities prevailed upon them to discontinue the use of APCs, and to use the Sandkrug-Bridge crossing point, nearest their destination.

The gradual decline of cold-war tensions in Berlin greatly reduced the number and severity of incidents at the Checkpoint. As recently as 1973, however, East German border guards opened fire with automatic weapons, hitting the Checkpoint building in several places. From the number and position of rounds that hit it, some going through windows and impacting in the inside walls, it was clear that only random chance had prevented injury to U. S. personnel.

8. Epilogue

At the Berlin end of the Helmstedt autobahn (Dreilinden, U.S. Sector), a permanent modern Checkpoint building was completed in 1970, Allied Checkpoint BRAVO. On October 5, 1979, a comparably permanent structure was formally opened at Helmstedt, Checkpoint ALFA. But Checkpoint CHARLIE remains, symbolically, a temporary structure. The first, rough-hewn shack was in continuous use for 15 years. In outward appearance, the prefabricated Checkpoint that replaced it in May 1976 seems little changed, retaining a look of substantial impermanence. Symbolically, the Allies have never built a permanent structure in the Friedrichstrasse, because they believe that Checkpoint CHARLIE and the Wall which produced it cannot last forever. Someday Berlin must again be one city.

In signing the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, U.S. authorities took the position that its area of applicability, like the earlier Four-Power agreements, was Greater Berlin. In January 1977, however, the Soviet news media (PRAVDA) again offered a lengthy and twisted interpretation of the 1971 Agreement, by which they claimed to show that now Four-Power agreements apply only to the Western Sectors. This issue is, of course, the key to understanding Berlin's post-war history. It was also the main issue in the events which led to the creation and continuing missions of Checkpoint CHARLIE.

\*An East Berliner in his late teens, Fechter was trying to escape when he was shot and wounded by East German guards. They left him unattended at the base of the Wall, where he died some time later. His cries for help were clearly heard on the West Berlin side, but no one could get to him. He is probably the best known symbol of East German brutality at the Wall.
Since 1961, the level of international tensions which marked the cold-war era has been significantly reduced. Berlin is no longer the main arena of East-West confrontations. In this situation, the majority of events at the Checkpoint are adequately reflected in its statistics. However, so long as one power continues to dispute the Four-Power status of the city, no one can be certain of writing the last word on Checkpoint CHARLIE.
President Clinton
Brandenburg Gate Speech
revised 6/17/94

Chancellor Kohl, Governing Mayor Diepgen, citizens of free and united Berlin:

Thank you for this profoundly moving—this unforgettable welcome. I accept it—but not for myself. I accept it for Americans everywhere who have had a special relationship with this extraordinary city.

I accept it on behalf of Captain Frank Bennett, who is here today, and the other American pilots who flew around the clock to bring you food, fuel and hope during the Berlin airlift in 1948 and 1949;

on behalf of Sergeant (name of person at Checkpoint Charlie the fall of 1961), Private (__________) and all the men of Checkpoint Charlie, who looked directly into the guns of Soviet tanks in the fall of 1961;

on behalf of Major Arthur Nicholson, who gave his life guarding freedom's frontier, and on behalf of all 12 million American soldiers who protected Germany during the Cold War.

I accept it on behalf of the ______ men and women of
our armed forces who are still here, working now with Germany and our other NATO allies to protect and preserve freedom.

I accept it on behalf of John F. Kennedy, who 31 years ago inspired the world with words that will live forever: "In the world of freedom, the proudest boast is 'Ich bin ein Berliner.'"

And on behalf of Ronald Reagan, who seven years ago stood just a few yards from here (POINT)—yet at that time it seemed so far away—and called on the Soviet leader to "tear down this wall."

I accept your welcome on behalf of Americans everywhere who cherish the blessings of liberty.

We were all Berliners during the Airlift. We were all Berliners the day the hated Wall was constructed, and we were all Berliners November 9, 1989, the night it died. Few moments in our lives can compare with that night—the night Berlin shared with the world—as we watched the breathtaking images of a people coming together again, of a country growing together again, of a continent no longer divided.

I salute especially those of you from the East who suffered for so long. While one half of this city lived encircled, the other half lived enslaved. On June 17, 1953, and on countless other days, you showed your spirit and inspired the world.

Even then, there were always voices for freedom in East Germany. You, the people of the East—the heroes of Leipzig,
of Dresden, of thousands of towns and villages--You who
chanted "We are the People--Wir sind das Volk!"--You showed
that walls can not forever contain the human spirit.

And so I salute you, the citizens of united and free
Berlin. Buerger und Buergerinnen des vereinten und freien
Berlin! The true triumph belongs to you--Der wahre Triumph
gehört Ihnen.

The night the Wall fell, Berlin reminded us of our common
heritage--a revolutionary stake in the success of democracy, a
revolutionary tradition based on respect for individual human
rights.

Two hundred and eighteen years ago American colonists
launched our revolution. Many of those early American
revolutionaries were sons and daughters of German lands. They
spoke German as their mother tongue. In recognition of their
dedication to America's revolution, American patriots
published the German language text of our Declaration of
Independence immediately after its adoption.

This document is a priceless symbol of our common
struggles to advance democracy at home. But perhaps most
importantly, it is a standing reminder that our revolution
remains unfinished until people on all continents, of all
creeds and colors enjoy that which we hold to be self
evident: the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of
happiness. Today I am proud to present one of the two
remaining originals to the German people, to be housed at the
German Historical Museum in Berlin.
A few minutes ago—in one of the proudest but most humbling moments of my life, with the greatest pride in my own nation and the greatest respect for yours—I walked across what was once known as the death strip together with my friend Helmut Kohl, who was Chancellor when the Wall came down, the first American President to visit united and free Berlin. Today, for the first time, an American President can talk with equal freedom to the equal people on both sides of this gate. Today, I have seen first hand that freedom, as your country, is indivisible.—Freiheit ist unteilbar, wie auch Ihr Land.

Men and women of free and united Berlin: Freedom is a precondition for life. Now that it is achieved, we have different challenges to meet, new problems to solve. The Berlin Wall is gone. But invisible walls remain.

The defining challenge of our generation is to knock down the invisible walls that divide us. The ones in people's hearts. The ones in people's minds and memories.

We have been left an important legacy: a world without the Berlin Wall. Our task is to leave to our children a world without walls altogether—"eine Welt ohne Mauern."

Such a goal is ambitious; it may never be achieved. But the journey is as important as the destination.

Making that journey, as I said to the French National Assembly last month, means seizing a momentous opportunity: to extend what we have come to know as the "West" as far eastward as possible, to secure the peace and prosperity of a broader Europe.
I have just come from Naples, where Chancellor Kohl and I discussed with President Yeltsin ways to work together for these common goals in Russia. (Possible added sentence here on Ukraine.)

This is equally necessary for the other great and ancient lands that lie in central and eastern Europe. They suffered immensely from the twin evils of Fascism and Communism, from War and Cold War. Today they are free—but they need our help.

We have taken some important steps here. This morning Chancellor Kohl, European Commission President Jacques Delors, and I met in the historic Reichstag, only a few meters from here. We discussed the need for the nations of the Atlantic community to reach out to their neighbors in central and eastern Europe. We agreed we must accelerate our efforts to sweep away the last remnants of the barriers that once divided the continent. (possible point on NATO strategic role)

I reported to Chancellor Kohl and President Delors on my recent visit to Poland and Latvia, where I met with the leaders of the three Baltic nations. I reported on the dramatic progress these nations have made, but I also cautioned that the road ahead will be long and difficult—and that these nations will need our continuous help.

There are those who ask why what happens in these seemingly distant lands still matters to us. There are those who say that once tyranny had been eliminated, our goals in Europe were fulfilled, and we could turn away.
agrees. What happens in this vast area will make a difference to everyone, everywhere. Without democracy, stability, and free market economies, the lands of central and eastern Europe will remain vulnerable to many of these ancient problems—ethnic strife, territorial disputes, false nationalism, racial prejudice, and institutionalized corruption. If any of these malignacies triumph—as they have already in parts of the Balkans—there is again a risk to general European stability. Three times in this century Europe has seen what such instability costs—and each time the United States was needed to help redress the balance.

In this spirit I want to talk to the people of Germany and all of Europe about our commitment to your security in the post Cold War world.

A united Germany is just as important to us as was divided Germany—but in very different ways. After a tumultuous and often destructive century, Germany finally stands united and democratic, playing a vital role in embedding democracy, freedom, and economic progress throughout Europe.

A few minutes from now, I shall decommission America's legendary Berlin Brigade. I will pay them that highest respect which their 49 years of continuous service on the front lines of freedom so fully merits. My friends, do not mourn their departure. Rather, let us celebrate their success.

My friends, when those troops leave Berlin this September let me assure you that nothing fundamental will change between the people of Germany and the United States. Our commitment to NATO remains firm. One hundred thousand American troops
will remain in Europe, the bulk of them here in Germany.

In this city, our departing troops are already being replaced by thousands of Americans from all walks of life who are coming here to work or study. Our Embassy, already functioning a few blocks from here, will move to Berlin in its entirety within a few years. (wait for applause) The fundamental friendship between Berliners and Americans will continue to flourish.

For forty years the defense of democracy in Berlin anchored the defense of democracy worldwide. Now, we have the opportunity to stand up for other people's freedom just as we stood up for Berlin.

As you do so, you can be assured that America will stand by your side. For decades Americans served as trustees of unity. Now we can serve together as stewards of freedom.

And so, my friends let us recommit ourselves today, on this very spot whose history reflects both the tragedies and the triumphs of this century, to a joint effort with our other European partners, so that we can all say, with pride in our new partnership: Ich glaube an Europa— I believe in Europe.
FEW sensations can compare with the ecstasy of resistance. Anyone who has faced a wall of policemen at midnight or stood vigil at a barricade of toppled buses when rumors spread that the tanks are rolling has known the rare elation of righteous rage.

And all who have celebrated the fall of tyranny have known the thrill of victory, the incomparable satisfaction of pulling down the monuments of the vanquished order and the unifying grief of the march behind the casket of a fallen comrade draped in national colors.

These are the indelible and almost interchangeable memories in two years spent among people who rose against a Communist system that had tried to shackle not only their lives but their souls. Utterly diverse in their cultures and heritage, the Poles, Germans, Hungarians, Romanians and Bulgars, and the Russians, Balts and other nations of the Soviet Union seemed to follow a timeless script as they turned on their jailers.

But for all the romance of the revolution, there is its harsh aftermath, when the hangover of the heady days is felt, as East Europeans have already discovered.

For each people, those glorious days were crucibles of national myths and national heroes: Lech Walesa at confession outside the Lenin shipyard, Germans dancing atop the wall, euphoric Czechoslovaks carpeting Wenceslas Square under swirling snowflakes in their "velvet revolution," Boris N. Yeltsin astride a neutralized tank, the statue of Felix Dzherzhinsky dangling from a crane -- he perhaps the purest embodiment of the evil of Communism as the architect of the political police that was the signature of the system.

Images of Upheaval

For those of us who have moved from place to place in these two years, some images merge: the mounds of candle wax and wreaths where blood was shed in Prague or in Timisoara, the national flags with Communist emblems gouged out in Budapest or East Berlin, the remarkably similar mugs of fallen Politburos, the interchangeable thugs of the Stasi, Zomo, Omon, Securitate, K.G.B., the chanting of forbidden hymns and the restoration of faiths and cultures that had been twisted or repressed.
Other images seem forever fixed to a time and place. Hospital No. 2 in Timisoara where John Tagliabue, a New York Times correspondent, lay among the wounded, the room in Solidarity headquarters marked "Centre des Beaux Arts" where artists prepared the marvelous posters of the Polish revolution, the drum of thousands of chisels against the Berlin wall.

Yet if all these captive nations shared the euphoria and the symbols of rebellion, the aftermath has reasserted all the profound differences, feuds, traditions and accumulated problems of each country. Massive unemployment in eastern Germany, the ethnic division of Czechoslovakia, the economic travails of Poland, the chaos in Romania and the uncertainty in Bulgaria all testify to the legacy of individual histories and the huge dislocation of Communism.

It is all there again in these awesome days in Moscow, the euphoria and the knowledge of hardships to come, familiar and yet somehow far more powerful and complex. This, after all, was the source of the tyranny, the epicenter of the utopian ideology in whose name freedoms were crushed and economies were crippled on two continents.

It is also different in that the victory over the coup was not the start, but the culmination of a six-year revolution begun by Mikhail S. Gorbachev to reshape a system that had worked its way far deeper into the fabric and consciousness of the nation than in any of the East European states.

If the East Europeans were overthrowing regimes and ideologies imposed by an alien power only 40 years earlier, the Soviets -- with the exception of the Balts -- were fighting a system that had been introduced by their own ancestors through a popular revolution more potent than any now under way.

This is a nation in many ways undoing its own work. For all the rhetoric of captivity, the people at the barricades around Mr. Yeltsin’s headquarters were fighting a faith in which three generations had been reared and on which they themselves had been nurtured. They were reviving the symbols their own forefathers had rejected, searching for roots their nation had tried to sever.

It was central to Mr. Yeltsin’s role that he arrived as a pillar of the old order, a classic party boss with a Communist lineage. The commissars he now confronts are men very much like him, and there are few among his supporters who could claim no linkage to the old order.

It is this patricidal aspect, this struggle of a nation against its own past, that has ultimately made the Russian upheavals more poignant, more awe-inspiring and fateful than the East European rebellions. The struggle had seesawed for six years, until finally the line was inexorably drawn and the battle was set.

In the end it was remarkably brief, a three-day spurt by an old guard that quickly proved toothless, demoralized, disorganized and leaderless.

In its aftermath, the funeral for three victims yesterday became a funeral for a trampled dream. The sonorous Russian Orthodox choirs, the mournful Jewish violin and the strains of Albinioni and Beethoven at the parallel funerals seemed to sound a dirge for an order that had promised to shape a perfect world and ended up stealing the lives of three generations, killing millions outright and bequeathing the rest a future of poverty, chaos and pain.
Even more grave, though for the moment concealed by the outpouring of fervor, were the scars left by Communism on the nation.

It was the patriarch of the Russian Orthodox church, Patriarch Alexei II, who best expressed the real challenge of the future when he spoke at the inauguration of Mr. Yeltsin as Russian President last June.

"You have assumed responsibility for a country that is gravely ill," he declared as he blessed Mr. Yeltsin for the role he was to assert so boldly last week. "Three generations grew up under conditions killing any inclination or enthusiasm for work," the patriarch said. "At first people were dissuaded from spiritual labor, from prayer, then they were dissuaded from thought, from yearning to independently discern the truth. And finally, deliberately or accidentally, people were dissuaded from work, diligence and initiative."

Yet what made this past week so extraordinary for many Russians, as for those of us who had lived here under the old order, was the demonstration of the degree to which the nation had already overcome its infirmities.

Lives of Compromise

I spent several years here under the old regime, and it always seemed that the greatest evils were not the overt persecution of dissidents or the silly newspack of Communist propaganda, nor even the pervasive controls of the political police, but the habits of the average Soviet citizen -- the innate caution, the quickness to inform, the lack of initiative, the constant compromises.

The pillars of the regime derived less from its muscle than from its corrupting control of all benefits, services, pleasures and their distribution according to the loyalty of the citizenry. Many of his friends and fellow scientists failed to support Andrei D. Sakharov not so much because they feared direct retaliation, but because they stood to lose the comforts and privileges of their office, and especially the trips abroad.

The relatively minuscule proportion of dissidents was the reflection not of conviction but of a habit of collaboration nurtured from infancy. It began with the cult of Lenin in kindergarten and developed through the constant small tokens of fealty required of every citizen: the May Day parades, the rote denunciations of imperialism, the silence in the face of obvious lies. On this depended your health care, your apartment, your career.

Clinging to the Old

It worked: returning from kindergarten one day, my youngest daughter explained that Lenin was "the greatest man who ever lived." For my part, there were always "friends" who quickly turned away whenever the press caused officials particular discomfort. Most disastrously, it worked in the work place: at every level of the Soviet economy, it became far more practical to meet the absurd quotas than to show initiative or seek efficiency.

As Mr. Gorbachev pointed out on his rescue from the coup last week, it was obviously these habits that the crude commissars counted on when they launched their plot. A few years earlier, the smallest show of force would have curbed the slightest rebellion, and even last Monday there were many Russians who
were not sure which way the people would go.

The long parade of officials and institutions now accused of wavering, from the fired Foreign Minister, Aleksandr A. Bessmertnykh, through Pravda and Tass, testified to an inbred readiness in rallying to whatever line the Kremlin emitted.

Largely lost in the exultation was that it was Mr. Gorbachev who first challenged these habits, urging openness and initiative. His miscalculation was in failing to see that the revolution could not always be controlled from on high, that at some point it would have to assume its own life. Clinging too long to the pillars of the old order even as he tried to whittle them down, he became the victim of his own perestroika, a danger to the old order and an obstacle to the new.

His greater miscalculation, perhaps, was that the system could survive once its myths and lies were opened to scrutiny. Long before the attempted coup, the taboos, lies and myths had been dismantled: Stalin was a butcher after all, the West was good, and even Lenin was little more than a demagogue with a lisp. In July, Mr. Gorbachev himself blessed a new Communist charter that abandoned hallowed principles of the old faith, right down to the infallibility of Marxism-Leninism.

Yet on his return from captivity Mr. Gorbachev still tried to defend the party and something he called "socialist choice." When he gave up the leadership of the party yesterday, it seemed as though he had been pried loose.

It was a testament to the grip of the old faith, to the lingering suspicion that the evils of the Soviet experiment lay in specific "mistakes" and in "Stalinism," as Mr. Gorbachev said, and were not inherent in its very illusions.

The principle illusion, as Patriarch Alexei had said, was that it is possible to "fabricate new 'human material,'" to perfect man through the artificial manipulation of social organization. The contrasting strength of democracy and free market, it could be argued, lay in recognizing that for all his failings, man functioned best when left to his own devices.

In all the anti-Communist uprisings, what triumphed ultimately was not an alternate system, as the Communists would have it, but a profoundly human resistance to manipulation.

That, in the end, is the dominant image of all the revolutions: the vast crowds of people -- intellectuals, workers, soldiers, writers, peasants -- in Moscow, or Berlin, Warsaw, Budapest, Prague, Bucharest or Sofia united by the goal of unloading an entirely unnatural order.

There is no guarantee that any will quickly find peace or prosperity. The very diversity of the opposition rallied behind Mr. Yeltsin, ranging from liberal intellectuals to chanting Hare Krishnas, promises a long and potentially bitter search for identity and a new order.

East Europe showed that the first instinct of liberated people is to rediscover their roots, and these can be poignant or unsavory. Alongside the tears shed for the remains of Frederick the Great as they were returned to Potsdam were the anti-Semitic slogans of Berlin skinheads, and the pattern
has hardly been limited to Germany.

To shed a dictatorship is not to guarantee democracy. The replacement of the old hammers-and-sickles by old Imperial flags seems both a moving reaffirmation of severed roots and an alarming foretaste of national wrangles to come; the declarations of independence in the Ukraine and Estonia in the last few days were both a triumph of national aspirations and the opening shot of new tribulations.

Yet to have been at a nighttime march in Leipzig, to have witnessed the proclamation of a republic in Budapest, to have sensed the pride of those who faced guns in Timisoara, to have wandered among the barricades in Moscow, is to have known moments when doubts and differences are suspended and people come together in a single-minded quest. It may sound mawkish, but call it freedom.

GRAPHIC: Photo: Power to the people: A Moscow crowd rallying against the coup last week. (Associated Press)
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Among the personnel of the Berlin Brigade during its 33-year history were many who personified the dedication to liberty that was the Brigade's mission. One such person was Sid Shacknow, a Hungarian freedom fighter who escaped the crushing of the 1956 popular rebellion in his country to reach the United States. There, under a program specifically for courageous opponents of Communism such as himself, known as the Lodge Act, he accepted induction into the U.S. Army with the promise of gaining American citizenship. He became a citizen and made the Army his career, serving in the Berlin Brigade in the early 1970s and returning in the late 1980s as Brigadier General Shacknow, Brigade Commander. A man who fought tyranny in the East and defended this outpost of the democratic West, he witnessed the fall of the Berlin Wall and the triumph of liberty from this side.
Memo

To: Carolyn Curiel
From: Delia
Re: Notes and quotes on the Berlin Brigade

The pages seem to be copied from a briefing manual for service personnel stationed in Europe. Some of the information pertained generally to Germany and Berlin's recent history but not necessarily to the Berlin's Brigade's role in it. Some of the major points:

* The various American troops stationed in Berlin where christened the Berlin Brigades in 1961. Troops had been present in Berlin since 1945.

* From 1945 to 1961 the troops had various names ranging from: 2nd armored division to 82nd airborne division and the "78th Lighting Infantry" division and Berlin Command and U.S. Army carriers.
* Since 1945 when it was first established it has never had to fire a shot in anger.
* "Probably no force of its size and history has contributed more to peace, stability and freedom in the world".

* Soon after the occupation, the first permanent units of the Berlin military were charged with restoring order in the American Sector. (the first permanent units were the 16th Constabulary Square and 759th Military police battalion.)

* Battalion contributed to the state Departments Humanitarians programs:
  -- relighted gas-fueled street lamps through out Berlin on March 2, 1946 (this was symbolic and significant)
  -- during the airlift the Berlin garrison devised off-loading systems, and served as guards and checkers.
  --since the blockade the allied have viewed by Berliners as protective powers NOT as occupiers.

*In 1949 following the merging of the US, U.K. and French quarters and the creation of the Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany), the US military also reorganized the Berlin garrison and put them directly under the HQ of the US army in Europe
  -- "By 1950 the Berlin Brigade primary mission had been defined roughly as they are at present to deter aggression, counter any widespread civil disturbance and defend the city."
  -- Through out the '50's and 60's Berlin remained a crisis center and "Exercizing allied rights brunteof the new Soviet
"tactics and policies."

* Berlin wall is built on August 13, 1961
  -- JFK ordered reinforcement of Berlin Garrison
  -- Dec. 1661 reorganized and redesignated as the U.S. Army
  Berlin Brigade
  -- men of the Berlin Brigade went on patrol along the wall
  and into East Berlin (they maintained that right)
  -- rather than sacrifice enclave of Steinsfueckan (sp??)
  Brigade (287th M.P.) rotated troopers in and out of the town via
  helicopter.

* JFK "Berliner" speech June 28, 1993

* "The Brigade has fulfilled is professional role with a
  relatively small 'symbolic' force. This was also part of the
  Brigade's wider role in guaranteeing stability. Just as the
  Brigade maintained its war fighting, deterrence, and confidence
  building capability. It was important that the other side
  realize the totally defensive role of the U.S. and other Western
  Allied forces in Berlin. The force had to be large enough to
  deter and to fight if necessary, but small enough to be
  nonthreatening. The success the Brigade enjoyed in maintain the
  freedom of Berlin throughout the post-war period with the
  numerous crises and in preserving the special status of the city
  through the opening of the Berlin Wall and the reunification of
  the two Germanys are ample proof that the right balance was
  found."

* Last pages pertain to the personal-professional benefits of
  serving in the Brigade and tips on keeping harmonious relations
  with Germans.
MC NAIR BARRACKS: Site surveyed for ceremony to end the Brigade's role has been the place for nearly every major ceremonial event held by the U.S. Army in Berlin. Ceremony would be on broad paved avenue (perhaps 50 feet across) where there is a permanent tri-level shelter some 150 feet long for VIP ceremony-watchers on one side of the street which will be lined with state and territory flags. On the other side are 19 permanent flagpoles on which red and white bunting is normally arrayed. This time, however, the reviewing stand -- which normally is in front of the permanent VIP stand -- may be across the street with its back to a hedge that shields a cemetery. Col. Al Baker, an Airborne kind of guy, suggested a large crowd would be on hand and some 10,000 tiny flags would be distributed among them. Public will be in bleachers and SRO areas at both ends of the street.

Clinton will arrive to usual musical honors and 21-gun salute. Commander in Chief then will "troop the line" in a specially outfitted Jeep. It is Patton-style jeep painted a bit more specially and chromed wherever. After German and U.S. anthems are played he will affix a ribbon unit citation to the service flag (like the ones in White House Roosevelt Room) and the colors will be cased in canvas containers ("rolling the colors" or "retiring the colors"), symbolically taking down the military's stars and stripes in Berlin for the last time. The commanding general then will speak followed by Clinton. Troops will march in review (936 soldiers, of whom 720 plus the band will march) while three helicopters do a fly-by.

This will be the big American farewell although a few token American troops will be in Berlin with French and German forces for Sept. 8 formalities. (Boris Yeltsin is scheduled to attend Aug. 31 ceremony for departure of last 50,000 Russian troops.) Approximately 1,000 U.S. troops will remain at time of president's visit, down from 7,000 in 1990.

Within a couple of days of the ceremony, virtually all remaining uniformed U.S. troops will leave Berlin which they first occupied formally on July 4, 1945. The last president to visit the U.S. troops at their base here was President Truman who arrived on July 20, 1945 (cq), bringing a flag that had flown over the U.S. Capitol on Dec. 7, 1941 (which later was taken to Tokyo as well). Of course, Reagan spoke in 1987 at the wall site closest to Brandenburg and Kennedy spoke at the West Berlin City Hall, a temporary Cold War location about 4 miles or so from the Wall (the real City Hall in East Berlin is intended to be a presidential visit site).

The barracks has 54 beige buildings on 90 acres in southwestern section of Berlin. It is home to 4th, 5th and Combat Support Battalions of the 502nd Infantry and 320th Field Artillery. During the war the site was a Telefunken anti-aircraft gun factory bombed by a U.S. Army Air Corps raid in 1944 that hit storage facilities but not the weapons plant. Barracks named for Gen. Leslie James McNair (of D.C.'s Fort McNair), a 1904 West Point grad killed in France in 1944 by "friendly fire" when bombs fell short.

BERLIN CITY HALL: Not to be confused with interim West Berlin City Hall where Kennedy spoke, which is miles away. This was THE pre-war city hall and wound up behind the wall. It returned to use by a reunified city government in 1990. Building renovated since then and
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