

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library

Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Press Secretary, Office of the: Press Releases and Briefings: Records

Folder Title: 07/08/1985 (#1485)

Box: 37-Press Briefings

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

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

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/research-support/citation-guide>

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

THE WHITE HOUSE
Office of the Press Secretary

PRESS BRIEFING
BY
LARRY SPEAKES

July 8, 1985

The Briefing Room

1:30 P.M. EDT

INDEX

SUBJECT

PAGE

ANNOUNCEMENTS

President's Letter to Soviet Union Presidium Chairman.....1
National Defense Stockpile of Strategic Materials.....1-4

DOMESTIC

Budget.....16

FOREIGN

Terrorism.....4-15
Nicaragua.....15
Yamamoto Quote in ABA Speech.....16

1:55 P.M. EDT

#1485-7/8

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary

PRESS BRIEFINGS
BY
LARRY SPEAKES

July 8, 1985

The Briefing Room

1:30 P.M. EDT

MR. SPEAKES: We're making available a copy of the letter the President wrote to the new Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union.

Q Did he use the word in the letter?

MR. SPEAKES: "Please accept my congratulations upon your election as Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Even though the differences between our nations are many and complex, as I made clear when we met last year, we can and must resolve these differences without threat or use of force through discussion, patient effort and determination. I wish you well in the high responsibilities you've now assumed, and I hope that we can cooperate to reduce tensions between our countries."

Q How do you pronounce the name of your successor?

Q When did he send it?

MR. SPEAKES: July 5 -- yes, July 5.

Q It went to "Grom," did it?

MR. SPEAKES: Grom. The President -- and we're putting out a background sheet on this -- the President decided to propose a modernization of the national defense stockpile of strategic materials. The proposal comes after two years of inter-agency study at 12 different agencies. The administration will continue to consult with Congress on this important national security program. The stockpile is a reserve of non-fuel materials that the United States would require in a conflict.

In 1979, the previous administration calculated that the stockpile needs of the United States would be about \$16.3 billion. Of this goal, the stockpile now contains \$6.6 billion in materials.

On the basis of our new study, the President has decided the stockpile will now contain \$6.7 billion in materials. The review concluded that a number of basic errors and unrealistic assumptions were used in the '79 study to calculate stockpile needs. The present study relied on more realistic assumptions regarding oil availability, essential civilian requirements and domestic materials production.

The new stockpile, unlike the one proposed in '79, does not reflect a stockpiling of materials to insure nonessential consumer production in a military conflict. These changes, the correction of errors and the use of more plausible assumptions are the primary reason for the revised goals.

Q Larry --

Q Does this have anything to do with the tax --

MR. SPEAKES: Norm?

MORE

#1485-07/08

MR. SPEAKES: Norm?

Q Under this -- if this goes through, is this all that the administration believes is needed in the stockpile at this time or in the future, or what?

MR. SPEAKES: That's correct.

MR. LEVINE: Yes, for the materials we studied, that is correct, we might be -- we will be, actually -- studying new high technology materials being planned for weapon systems in the 1990's. And if we find goals for any of these new materials that were never in the stockpile before, then it will grow some. But for the materials presently in the stockpile, \$6.7 billion is the number.

Q Dick Levine --

MR. SPEAKES: Dick Levine, National Security Council staff.

Q Does this have anything to do with the Dave Packard defense management initiatives review?

MR. LEVINE: No, it does not. This study was really begun two years ago.

Q Larry, has this had any implication insofar as deficit reduction for '86?

MR. SPEAKES: Yes. There is a line in there that indicates -- is it '86, Dick, that it will apply to, or when it's sold?

MR. LEVINE: Exactly. We have to buy a few -- likely one commodity presently. But after we purchase that, the money will go to help reduce the deficit. Of course, if we find goals for any new high-technology materials, we'd buy those as well. So it's those two purposes, buying any materials we need and helping to reduce the deficit.

Q Is there a dollar figure we can use for that?

MR. SPEAKES: Page 2 there, Lou, is a --

MR. LEVINE: Yes, page 2, \$2.5 billion.

MR. SPEAKES: About your third paragraph down.

Q Excuse me --

MR. SPEAKES: The President decided to sell a portion 2.5 out of the 3.2 over the next 5 years.

Q Isn't this one of those phony numbers in the Senate --

MR. SPEAKES: Budget.

Q -- in the Senate budget?

MR. SPEAKES: I don't think so.

MR. LEVINE: No.

MR. SPEAKES: No.

MR. LEVINE: No, it's not in it.

Q It's not?

Q Are any of the materials that we are selling going to distress any of the supplier nations, such as those that supply aluminum, tin, etc.?

MR. LEVINE: All disposals are going to be handled in a very careful manner with interagency review and consultations with countries that produce such materials before the disposals are actually made to help reduce the effect of any disposal program.

Q And what is the one material we'd have to acquire?

MR. LEVINE: That's germanium.

Q Germanium?

MR. LEVINE: Yes. It's listed on the first page of your package.

MR. SPEAKES: You got any?

Q No, I haven't got any. What would I do with it if I had --

Q I have beautiful geraniums -- (laughter.)

Q Is that a nuclear fuel or --

MR. LEVINE: No. It's being used more and more in missiles and aircraft and other high-technology --

Q You know all this stuff?

MR. LEVINE: I've spent two years of my life on it.

Q -- sorry.

MR. SPEAKES: That's basically all I have. Questions?

Q Yes. What does the President mean that -- that this is an act -- terrorism is an act of war? What is the law he is citing?

MR. SPEAKES: We're citing international law. We're citing the recent U.S. anti-terrorism laws that give him the authority to say this.

Q Do they say that it's an act of war?

MR. SPEAKES: -- they'd use that as an act of war, but I think it's a phrase that does not fall short of the actual facts.

Q Well, is he saying --

MR. SPEAKES: Drake.

Q Go ahead. Is he saying that if we strike back, that's an act of self defense, then, under international law?

MR. SPEAKES: Whatever we would do would be under international law, yes.

Q Whatever we do, we'll claim to be an act of self defense under international law, is that what he's saying?

MR. SPEAKES: Whatever he'd do will be within the jurisdiction of international law.

Q When the President -- in the reference to the Sandinistas where the President said the Sandinistas not only sponsored terror but that terror led recently to the murder of the four Marines, etc., was he trying to suggest a direct link between the Sandinistas in planning that? Or was he just saying that they have contributed --

MR. SPEAKES: No.

Q -- to a climate of terror?

MR. SPEAKES: The latter.

Q Why was Syria left out --

Q Is there --

Q Go ahead, Lou.

Q Actually, that's the same question. What is the --

MR. SPEAKES: Took the words right out of your mouth, huh?

Q Why is the -- Why is Syria omitted from this speech, when Syria was -- has been named by the State Department in previous statements as a sponsor of terrorism?

MR. SPEAKES: This is not an all-inclusive list of countries that are involved in terrorism, but it is an example of some of the more recent occurrences.

Q But that's not what he says.

Q Do we consider Syria to be a country that sponsors terrorism?

MR. SPEAKES: I would have to direct you back to our previous statements on it.

Q But that's not what he says in his speech. He says these countries have -- we've directly linked them. And he says there are others, but he says that they are not as directly linked as these. So, Syria surely in his mind must be in a different category? Is that a fair interpretation?

MR. SPEAKES: Well, as I indicated to Lou, back to the previous statements on this matter, and that this is not an all-inclusive list but one that cites a number of recent examples.

Q So we're free to take those statements --

Q Forgive me. That's not what he's -- you are saying something different from what the President said. You are suggesting this is not an inclusive list, but others may be just as culpable, which he just didn't mention this morning because he wanted to give some examples. But that's not what he says in his speech.

MR. SPEAKES: Well, it is.

Q He says, "Those which I have described are simply the ones that can be most directly implicated," suggesting those he did not describe cannot be so directly implicated.

MR. SPEAKES: If that suits you, it suits me.

Q As a follow-up to Sam --

MR. SPEAKES: Go ahead, Mike.

Q -- I just called the State Department, and their list of the countries that sponsor terror are Cuba, Iran, Libya, South Yemen and Syria -- still the current list. South Yemen and Syria are not mentioned by the President, but North Korea and Nicaragua are. Is there any sort of conflict here as far as the -- you know -- why isn't North Korea and Nicaragua on the -- or Nicaragua or both on the State Department list?

MR. SPEAKES: I don't know how the State Department list is done. Is it an annual list? Maybe these fellows hadn't had time to make it, Mike.

Q I don't know. Iraq was just dropped, I was told. So, they keep it pretty much up to date.

MR. LEVINE: It's reviewed periodically. But there's no definite connection between the President's statements and what happens to be our basic list.

Q There's no connection?

MR. LEVINE: The -- no connection -- no basic connection in terms the President was giving examples of those countries --

MR. SPEAKES: The President was not -- yes.

MR. LEVINE: -- most directly involved in -- recently -- in international terrorism.

Q Well, let me ask then: Do you think that South Yemen might be dropped from the list -- and Syria -- and be replaced by North Korea and Nicaragua, or North Korea and Nicaragua simply added to the State Department list?

MR. LEVINE: I'm not going to comment --

MR. SPEAKES: You'd have to wait and see until they review it. It's what they --

Q Well, if you're referring us back to the President's previous statements, then --

MR. SPEAKES: No, previous --

Q -- you're telling us it's all right --

MR. SPEAKES: -- previous statements by the government, including most recent statements by the State Department regarding those that are on the list, which he just cited for you.

Q Then, it's okay for us to assume that Syria is still on the --

MR. SPEAKES: He just cited the State Department --

Q But that's what the current list --

MR. SPEAKES: Well, you'd have to look back to what we've said.

Chris?

Q The President just overlooked --

Q Was Syria omitted at all because of its helpful role in this last case?

MR. SPEAKES: We just don't have any comment on it.

Q Your previous statements include, a couple of days ago,

a statement that Syria's role was being assessed, and all the rest. Coming back again to what Chris was saying, is it then your assessment that Syria was helpful and that it has changed its policy or its attitude toward terrorists?

MR. SPEAKES: I don't have a specific comment. Our statements stand as they've been previously made, and that's where they are.

Helen?

Q Does the President -- if, as you say -- and I'm not sure it's quite accurate -- that U.S. terrorist -- anti-terrorist laws involve an act of war, per se, does that mean the President will not seek any legislation further to deal with the problem?

MR. SPEAKES: At the moment, no. We have -- a lot of new legislation is being utilized in this area specifically and the Vice President, as you know, is chairing a task force which, at the conclusion of his study, may or may not recommend new legislation as required.

Q Well, what about the --

Q The State Department --

Q -- his speech --

Q What about the new legislation that you said you're going to seek to remove some of the restraints from the CIA, intelligence-gathering?

MR. SPEAKES: That -- certainly, yes, that. But --

Q I mean, that's new legislation that you're seeking.

Q The President said in his speech --

MR. SPEAKES: That's true. But I mean the anti-terrorist legislation. That's intelligence-gathering legislation.

Q Well, was that what he meant when he asked the lawyers to help him craft -- when legislation must be crafted to allow appropriate authorities to act? What does he mean, "appropriate authorities to act"?

MR. SPEAKES: To allow governments to respond to terrorism.

Q Well, does he have new terrorism legislation in mind? Because he asked them to do something to help him on it?

MR. SPEAKES: But he says when it is crafted.

Q Did Vice President Bush make any specific recommendations at lunch today?

MR. SPEAKES: No, not anything we want to talk about, no.

Q Is there any --

MR. SPEAKES: Larry.

Q Do you expect any other foreign governments, NATO governments to support the move to isolate Beirut Airport or is Britain it?

MR. SPEAKES: At the present, we're in consultations with another -- a number of governments on the Beirut Airport and we're continuing these discussions. It should be clearly understood that

the objectives in bringing the problem of the Beirut Airport to the attention of the international community is to not to try to punish Lebanon or Middle East airlines. It is rather an urgent appeal to all who have a stake in the safety of international civil aviation to find an effective way to deal with the severe and persistent security problem at Beirut Airport.

The airport has now undeniably become a haven for hijackers attacking planes of many nations, not only of the U.S. This year alone, there have been six hijackings involving Beirut Airport and five of these were on non-American planes, including Arab planes. Beirut is not a problem just for the United States; it is a problem for the rest of the world.

The Beirut Airport is unique in that nowhere else have air pirates enjoyed such a permissive attitude, allowing them to come and go and get reinforcements as they wish. For example, in the case of the Jordanian airliner hijacked on June 11th, the hijackers and their accomplices were able to take Jordanian security guards off the plane and out of the airport. The terrorists, themselves, moved back and forth between the aircraft and surrounding community a number of times, and finally disappeared into the suburbs near the airport.

On June 12th, following the hijacking of the Jordanian airliner and despite supposedly enhanced security measures, a lone hijacker

was able to board a plane in Beirut and seize it when it landed in Cyprus.

Last February a Druze airport worker hijacked a plane in protest against pay and working conditions and ended up having a joint press conference with the Lebanese Minister of Transportation, who supported the hijacker's demands. That is Walid Jumblatt, the Druze leader.

These are examples to underscore the nature of the problem at Beirut airport. We and the others concerned about airport safety -- airline safety -- want these problems resolved. If the Lebanese authorities can do a sustained job of preventing the airport from being used by air pirates, fine. To date they have not been able to do so, and this is why we undertook an international effort to deal with the airport.

Q Apparently I have touched a nerve there, but to get back to the original question, is there -- what about the cooperation from other allied governments? Only one has spoken up.

MR. SPEAKES: We are consulting with other countries about the situation in Beirut and we are continuing these discussions, and I don't have anything on our diplomatic discussions.

Q Do you have prints of that long --

MR. SPEAKES: We can, if you would like it. Yes.

Q I would like it.

MR. SPEAKES: So, Andrea.

Q Well, what about --

Q He already read it to the State Department.

Q -- to follow up Larry, what about the fact that even Margaret Thatcher spoke of being supportive but not going as far as Bush wanted her to go?

MR. SPEAKES: What about it?

Q Well, isn't the administration's policy on the Beirut airport not succeeding?

MR. SPEAKES: We are continuing our consultations.

Q Are we committed to closing down the Beirut airport, or are we committed to do only what we can get our allies to help us do?

MR. SPEAKES: We are certainly committed to what we can get our allies to help us to do. We want the airport -- the mess surrounding the airport -- cleaned up. Simple as that.

Q Well, at various times the President -- and again this morning -- seemed to suggest that he is committed to closing the airport, not just to make an attempt to do so.

MR. SPEAKES: We are committed to improving the safety and stopping it as -- closing it as a safe haven for hijackers.

Q What are the steps taken --

Q Larry, without taking issue with the fact that it has been a safe haven, did the airport -- Beirut airport -- have any alternative at the time when the captain was begging to land?

MR. SPEAKES: You mean to allow him to land? No, but it

MORE

was not -- it was the hijackers on the airplane who knew that it was a safe haven, and that is why they had to put the airplane in there. They knew once they landed, they were in territory where they could come and go.

Q Do you think it should have been denied them?

MR. SPEAKES: I cannot pass judgment on that. That is not what I am saying. I am saying that if it was not a safe haven for terrorists -- or for terrorists to be resupplied or to come and go into friendly areas and back and forth, then it -- that is what we are after.

Lou.

Q Is there some timetable to this campaign? In other words, is the President going to make any more speeches on it? Is there a particular time you expect the Vice President to make recommendations? It is hard to figure out from just the speeches what -- exactly what he has in mind.

MR. SPEAKES: I would say that this is part of the continuing effort of the United States government to speak out on terrorism in the world today. It goes back to speeches by Secretary Shultz and Secretary Weinberger last fall, and it includes statements made by the President -- radio broadcast and this statement, too. There may be others, but right now, Lou, I don't have anything specific on the schedule -- anything scheduled.

Andrea.

Q Do you have any response to the developments over the weekend where apparently they claimed that they were putting in earthen barriers at the airport? Do you view this as any -- attempts by the Lebanese to correct the problem?

MR. SPEAKES: Whatever attempts that they are making to improve security at the airport are welcome, but they are not yet sufficient.

Q And do you have anything at all for us on the weekend meetings between Assad and the various Lebanese factions?

MR. SPEAKES: We -- let me find it right here. The U.S. supports the Lebanese to strengthen the central government's authority -- the efforts by the Lebanese to strengthen the central government's authority to rebuild national institutions, to restore stability to their country and to extend central government authority over all Lebanese territory.

To this extent, the meeting in Damascus -- to the extent that the meeting in Damascus fosters these objectives, we welcome it.

So --

Q Larry, has the administration any plan to try the two original hijackers --

MR. SPEAKES: I just don't have any comment. We're exploring a number of legal steps as a result of the Beirut hijacking, and we don't have anything specific.

Terry?

Q Is there anything that distinguishes the President's remarks today from the many other times that he's said that the United States is not going to tolerate terrorism and terrorist attacks?

MR. SPEAKES: Well, I think that remains to be seen.

Pat?

Q Does the President believe that existing international law does not give him sufficient latitude to deal with terrorists?

MR. SPEAKES: Well, I think that would be part of the things that we would look at, Pat, to see if there are changes that we would propose to our allies. We recognize it is an international problem and not a problem that one country alone can conquer, so it's something that we've got to consult with our allies and see if there are other changes necessary.

Leo?

Q Larry, I had thought we had a two-step strategy in terms of the Beirut Airport, that if consultations with allies don't produce the requisite results, that we would deny landing rights to countries that don't follow our example. Are we still prepared, for instance, to deny landing rights to Air France or British Airways --

MR. SPEAKES: Who are continuing to fly into Beirut?

Q Yes.

MR. SPEAKES: Leo, I don't know the answer to that. That was part of our discussions on it, but whether we are -- whether we've moved in that area, I don't know.

Q Are we still holding that out as a possibility?

MR. SPEAKES: Well, I would think it's a possibility, yes. Let me consult with Transportation and see exactly where they stand on that, so -- yes.

Q Billy Dale?

Q Two weeks ago when you first announced that this is one of the options, along with an economic close-down of Lebanon, syou said that the United States would act unilaterally if necessary to close down the Beirut Airport, and I think it was Sam asked you earlier today about that. You didn't come across with that answer.

MR. SPEAKES: Well, we've taken certain unilateral steps already -- we have.

Q Well, I mean, unilaterally to close down the airport. Now, I mean, denying landing rights is one thing, but closing down the airport is something different, and when you first suggested those options two weeks ago, you were specific in saying -- using the phrase "close down the airport." Was that just a turn of the phrase, were you not meaning that then, or --

MR. SPEAKES: Our goal is to eliminate it as a safe haven for hijackers, and if you want to use that as closing down or whatever, you can, but that's our goal.

Andrea?

Q Can you give us a sense of the meeting with the Vice President? Was the whole meeting devoted to this issue and the Vice President's report?

MR. SPEAKES: No. It was a fairly extensive report on his trip to Europe. I really don't have any particulars on it.

Q Were there other domestic issues such as budget and things that came up, or was it all foreign policy?

MR. SPEAKES: It was all his trip.

Frank?

Q When the U.S. requested the extradition of these terrorists in Beirut who were implicated with the hijacking, itself, was a timetable given of when they should be extradicted by or anything like that? Was there any timetable given?

MR. SPEAKES: Give me the first part of that question again.

Q When the U. S. requested -- appealed to the Justice Minister to extradict or prosecute the two guilty of the TWA hijacking --

MR. SPEAKES: I don't believe there was a timetable, no.

Q Has the U.S. requested extradition? I hadn't realized you'd formally done that.

MR. SPEAKES: I don't think extradition. He said -- changed it to say prosecution. We have --

Q I thought it was an either, or. Maybe I'm --

MR. SPEAKES: I don't recall that statement, Frank.

Q What are you doing now to win the release of the other seven hostages?

MR. SPEAKES: We continue to do everything that we can to win them and we're --

Q Can you say anything specific or --

Q No, can't discuss it.

MR. SPEAKES: No, I really can't.

Q Are you in touch with Assad?

MR. SPEAKES: I really don't want to go into that.

Q Berri?

MR. SPEAKES: Once again, I don't want to go into it.

Q Who is managing it for the administration?

MR. SPEAKES: The State Department.

Q And no one in the White House? NSC is not involved?

MR. SPEAKES: Oh, yes, NSC is closely involved, as they always are with most State Department matters.

Yes?

Q Last year, the FBI asked for \$11 million for counter-terrorism programs and they were turned down. This year, they asked for something like \$20 or so more million for that and they were turned down again by the OMB. Is there any consideration being given by the White House to perhaps reconsider that?

MR. SPEAKES: I don't know of any specific plans to increase the funding. I think the decision taken at the time was

that it was sufficient -- it was the correct amount for -- that could be sufficiently spent -- efficiently spent.

Q Senator Bentsen is considering asking for that money to be put back in. Would you support him on that?

MR. SPEAKES: We will look at his proposal and make a judgment on it. Right now, I don't have any specific guidance either way.

Q Other subject?

MR. SPEAKES: Other subject.

Q Before you go --

MR. SPEAKES: Ain't going nowhere.

Q What about posting of the award? Where are we on that?

MR. SPEAKES: It's still a contingency that the Secretary of State has and I don't have anything specifically about it. I think the way it would work is he could certainly announce it. On the other hand, it's there and if there is apprehension, conviction, and so forth, then the Secretary of State could decide as to award the reward.

Q It would be effective --

Q He said he'd basically take his cue from the President. Do you have any ideas as to how --

MR. SPEAKES: Well, I think if there was a satisfactory legal conclusion to this, then the President -- the Secretary of State would certainly consult with the President and the two would decide whether the reward was -- should be presented.

Q To be effective as an inducement to get people to aid, don't you have to post it? In other words, don't you have to say to people, ah-hah, help us out and you may get a reward?

MR. SPEAKES: It exists and I'm just not prepared to --

Q How are you supposed to find out about it?

MR. SPEAKES: Well, you know, go door to door like they told you to do.

Q Oh, well, fine.

MR. SPEAKES: I really don't have anything specifically on the reward as directed to the Beirut hijacking.

Q The Prime Minister of Nicaragua has decided to go on a hunger strike to protest against State terrorism by the U.S. against his country. Do you have anything on that?

MR. SPEAKES: No. (Laughter.)

Q Well, except he -- if -- he could go several days without really missing much --

MR. SPEAKES: Okay. (Laughter.)

Q Forgive me -- going over well trod grounds.

MR. SPEAKES: That's all right.

Q I don't understand if there is a list at the State Department of states the United States considers support international terrorism, why there would be two that the President would include in a list, specifically pointing at them as states that support terrorism, that aren't on the list now. Would -- should we anticipate that they will be added to the list shortly? Should they be added?

MR. SPEAKES: I can't say, except that all of this will be reviewed as a list is prepared and updated, but I can't be specific on it. I think the President was -- while the list in an official document, that the President was citing other countries that are involved in state-supported terrorism. Now, whether they'll be added to the list remains to be seen.

Q -- on that same question, does the President believe Syria, although he didn't mention it by name, is one of the states that practice terrorism?

MR. SPEAKES: I could only refer you back to our previous statements on it.

Q Do you have any other speeches there for us that we didn't ask you about?

MR. SPEAKES: Speeches?

Q Lone statements?

MR. SPEAKES: Oh, I've got a lot of stuff, but you have to guess. (Laughter.)

Q Larry, is --

Q -- favorite --

Q Anything on Madonna?

MR. SPEAKES: No, I got nothing on -- A lot of news in here.

Q Is the President going to --

MR. SPEAKES: Had enough?

Q Wait.

MR. SPEAKES: I think that was the last question.

Q Is the President going to propose some new budget formulation tomorrow or the next day when he meets with Congressional leaders?

MR. SPEAKES: I don't anticipate it, no.

Q What was the question?

MR. SPEAKES: New budget formulation. Don't anticipate it.

Q To resolve anticipated skepticism, do you have a citation for Admiral Yamamoto's quote -- (laughter) -- "We have only awakened a sleeping giant" in his reaction --

MR. SPEAKES: Ronald Reagan, July 8, 19 --

Q No. Actually, it's in "Tora, Tora, Tora." I got the Beta version. I see it every six months.

Q Is it "Tora, Tora, Tora" or is it from a book.

Q It's in the movie.

Q You can find it in the movie -- "Tora, Tora, Tora." I swear to God.

Q I don't watch "Tora, Tora, Tora." I watch --

Q -- movie you like.

Q It's not a bad movie. It's the best action scene of Pearl Harbor.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END

1:56 P.M. EDT
#1485-07/08