Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Reagan, Ronald: 1980 Campaign Papers 1965-80

Folder Title: [Transcript – 1980 Presidential Forum, Midwest Region Republicans, 03/13/1980] (1 of 2)

Box: 247

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/

1980 PRESIDENTIAL FORUM

MIDWEST REGION

REPUBLICANS

g

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS had at the

1980 Presidential Forum, Midwest Region, sponsored

by the League of Women Voters, held at The Continental

Plaza Hotel, Wellington Ballroom, Chicago, Illinois,

on the 13th day of March 1980, commencing at

8:00 o'clock p.m.

INVITED CANDIDATES:

John B. Anderson

George Bush

Philip Crane

Ronald Reagan

MODERATOR:

Howard K. Smith

MS. RUTH HINERFELD: Good evening. I'm Ruth Hinerfeld, National President of the League of Women Voters.

Tonight here in Chicago where the League was founded 60 years ago, we're continuing our tradition of providing the public with nonpartisan information about candidates and about issues by presenting this, the second event, in our series of 1980 presidential forums. Our moderator is the distinguished news correspondent, Howard K. Smith.

MODERATOR SMITH: Thank you, Mrs. Hinerfeld.

Good evening. We're pleased to have with us tonight four candidates for the nomination for the presidency of the United States by the Republican Party. They are Congressman Philip Crane of Illinois, former Ambassador George Bush of Texas, former Governor Ronald Reagan of California, and Congressman John Anderson of Illinois.

Gentlemen, the format for this forum will be rather different from those of past forums. The campaign has now gone a fair ways, and there are fewer candidates, and your views are known generally on most issues to most of the public. So we hope to turn this into a kind of an informal discussion,

possibly even a kind of a debate among you.

The forum will last for 90 minutes. It will be divided into three segments, the first, domestic affairs, second, foreign affairs, and the third, the presidency and politics. Towards the end of the forum we will take some questions from the audience and then at the end you will have your time to sum up in your closing statements.

Before we go down to issues of substance,

I would like to tell you that I've had an assurance
that former President Gerald Ford is watching us
tonight, and I wonder, are there any messages?

Mr. Crane?

PHILIP CRANE: I think Governor Reagan said it, you know, break out the long johns and come join the fray if he's so inclined. He missed all of the cold weather, though, up there in New Hampshire and Massachusetts.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Bush?

GEORGE BUSH: No, I have nothing to add on that particular question. I served under President Ford, have great respect for him, and come on in, the water's fine. It's going to be very competitive right on down to Detroit. I think everybody knows

that, and there's another room up here, so come on, let's go.

MODERATOR SMITH: Governor Reagan?

RONALD REAGAN: Well, I go along with all this that's been said, but I think at least someone here ought to point out if he's sitting in Palm Springs, it's snowing here.

JOHN ANDERSON: All I was going to say for myself, Howard, that as that brooding omnipresence watches us from Palm Springs, I would at least like to send him greetings. And like the others, I have known the former president for some 20 years, served with him in the leadership of the U. S. House for a number of years, I respect and admire him greatly. But I, for one, would not want to see him disturb his well-deserved retirement. I think we have plenty of candidates in the field.

MODERATOR SMITH: Gentlemen, certainly the topic of most concern to the American public remains that awful topic of inflation. Tomorrow President Carter will announce his plans to fight inflation. You can almost guess what's in it.

Very simply, there are going to be cuts in Government expenditures, highway programs, jobs

programs and other things, going to be additional Federal revenue from an import on oil, all of this designed to fulfill the pledge which he has made and which you have made to balance the Federal budget.

Now, I would like to ask you a question about balancing the Federal budget. Every Republican presidential candidate that I know of for the past-since World War II has made a pledge to balance the budget. None has yet succeeded.

matter of faith almost, accumulated the biggest eightyear deficit of any president we'd had up to that
time. In six years President Nixon, Republican, got
a bigger deficit. And President Ford presided over
the biggest one year deficit in American history,
60 billion dollar deficit in one year.

Now, why should voters believe that if those men, who are strong men and who intended to do what they said, fail, that you will succeed in your pledge to balance the Federal budget?

Mr. Anderson?

JOHN ANDERSON: Mr. Smith, I think because the motivation this time is quite different. No president in many, many years, possibly since the Great Depression,

has faced the situation confronting the country today. We have conservative financial advisors around the country speaking in very apocalyptic terms about a national emergency, even about the prospect of national bankruptcy.

had advanced once more to the highest point I think in a hundred years perhaps. And given that situation and given the impact that I think it's having, not simply on our domestic affairs, but the very obvious effect that that has on the ability of this country to discharge its burden of responsibility as a world leader.

I think the next president of the United States, whoever he be, and indeed the current president, Mr. Carter, will have my support in any reasonable effort that he makes to that end.

I proposed on Thursday of this past week,
I proposed about 11.3 billion dollars in cuts and
some revenue adjustments that would total up to about
22 billion dollars in all in an effort to bring down
what otherwise was projected as a 25 or 30 billion
dollar deficit for the coming fiscal year.

And I think the situation today is simply

so critical that this president and undoubtedly his successor is going to have to call on the American people, and yes, on the Congress, unwilling as they may be, to make the kind of sacrifices that are needed to bring down that deficit.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Crane?

PHILIP CRANE: Well, the point I think needs to be stressed is that the Republican Party has historically been committed to balanced budgets, and our Democratic friends have told us for years that we don't have to worry about debt. They came up with all kinds of convenient cliches like, "We only owed it to ourselves." They're the party that has never worried about inflation until most recently because they said that a little bit of inflation was not like a little bit of pregnancy; it didn't have to go to term. They are the same party that has controlled the Congress in my 49 years for all but four years, and the Congress alone has the responsibility for appropriating and spending the public money.

And so whether you have a Republican president or you don't have a Republican president, until the American people realize that it is Democratic controlled Congresses by overwhelming margins,

in fact, in two to one, three to one margins, it's democratic Congresses that run up the national debt from under 16 billion dollars the year I was born, 1930, to almost 1 trillion dollars in terms of our conventional national debt by the end of this next fiscal year.

Frankly I question seriously whether

President Carter even has an understanding of how

to get at a balanced budget when he's got that Congress

to cope with.

The only other thing I'd add is, John, with all due respect, you know, we've got a lot of fiscal conservatives now suddenly who ran for Congress in 1978. But I would argue that those fiscal conservatives are not being properly monitored, and unless the voters pay attention to how much money those members of Congress are spending, and this means looking to guides like the National Taxpayer's Union which provides an ample one, and your record doesn't come up all that well, John--

JOHN ANDERSON: Well, Phil, if I can interject at this point. I voted -- I don't know how you voted. I voted in May of last year for the substitute budget resolution that was submitted by the party in the

House that would have called for an 18 billion dollar deficit instead of a 29 billion dollar deficit that was proposed by the Democratic majority.

PHILIP CRANE: John, I've always voted for balanced budgets. But my point is if you check the National Taxpayer's Union's record, you'll find that you voted for more than a 48 billion dollar deficit in fiscal 1978.

JOHN ANDERSON: Well, I don't think the National Taxpayer's Union, Phil, is the only record on which we rely as to whether or not--

PHILIP CRANE: It tells you how much you voted for fiscal--

GEORGE BUSH: Mr. Smith, I didn't pay for this mike, but I'd like a little of the action, I'll tell you.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Bush?

GEORGE BUSH: The Congress, you mentioned history. Let's face it. Democratic Congress, 44 out of the last 48 years. That's part of it.

We do need a balanced budget. But it's not balance, per se, it's how you get there. I disagree with John. Cutting back on social security benefits.

JOHN ANDERSON: Now, wait a minute, George. 1 Wait a minute, wait a minute. 2 3 GEORGE BUSH: I'm sorry, I do not -- I will stay with what I supported in '68. 4 I did not interrupt you. 5 JOHN ANDERSON: I did not propose to cut back 6 in social security benefits. That's not true. 7 have to interrupt you when you do not tell the truth. 8 That is not true. GEORGE BUSH: Let's be calm. Let's calm down. 10 Well, I saw what you said. 11 JOHN ANDERSON: That is not true. 12 GEORGE BUSH: I saw what you said. 13 JOHN ANDERSON: That is not true. 14 Mr. Moderator, if I may be recognized --15 MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Smith, I promise you you 16 will have an opportunity to rebut following Mr. Bush 17 to correct that statement. 18 JOHN ANDERSON: If I may be recognized then 19 following Mr. Bush to correct that statement? 20 MODERATOR SMITH: All right. 21 GEORGE BUSH: I voted to increase social security 22

benefits to have them keep pace with inflation in '68.

I do not want to see this be brought into balance

24

by treating lightly those that need it the most.

. 22

Veterans' benefits, you're going to have to cut somewhere, but I'd be very, very careful about cutting there much to the opposition of what some have been saying. I have put forward specific cuts that I would adhere to.

I do not favor -- you talk about "the difference," a 50 cent a gallon gasoline tax that would wipe out every working person in order to try to get this budget in balance.

JOHN ANDERSON: Do you favor a 50 percent reduction in social security taxes? Will you mention that as part of your program?

GEORGE BUSH: I would say it when we get in balance. And when-- yes, I would.

PHILIP CRANE: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Moderator -MODERATOR SMITH: I think that Mr. Reagan has
not had a chance to say anything. Governor?

RONALD REAGAN: Thanks, Howard. I thought that not having bought the mike myself I couldn't talk.

I have to go along with what Congressman Crane said here and what George has said about the number of years. This is the thing that I think most people have forgotten.

It's very easy for the other party to point to the man in the White House. And we've had occasional Republican presidents and they-- it's easier to get people upset at one man than it is at 500.

And so we forget that Congress is the one that's been responsible for most of those programs.

But I also believe that when we mentioned the debts under President Eisenhower, if you go back about a half-- quarter of a century, he had one of the two year periods in which there was a Republican Congress. And if you look at that one two years, when there was a Republican president and a Republican Congress, there was virtually no deficit and no inflation.

We tend to forget that the Democrats about three or four decades ago started the idea that a budget deficit and a little inflation was good for us. That it was the alternative to recession and unemployment. And there were many of us back there for years ago out of the mashed potato circuit saying that you couldn't control inflation; that you couldn't keep it at one and a half or two or two and a half percent; that one day, like radioactivity, it's cumulative, it gets out of control. And it has gotten

out of control.

versions. And, therefore, I don't have much faith in the president. I know he's going to announce tomorrow that he's going to— he's asked all the department heads to cut back on spending. But if they can cut back in the spending in his proposed budget that goes into effect next October, why was that spending in the budget to begin with? Why did they put it in there if it was so easily eliminated? And I think that there are layers of fat in Government.

When we're talking about whether we have to cut back on someone in need or not, all we have to recognize is the combination of fraud and waste that is so implicit in everything done in the Federal Government, the administrative overhead. And that's why I have proposed that you not balance the budget by increasing taxes, as he's going to do.

And, John, I have to tell you that when you talk about, well, we're going to raise one tax but it's to cut another tax over here, the Government always seems to come away with more money and the people end up with less.

I, therefore, and I'll quit on this. I think there are a number of programs, and I've been

-

saying it all over the country, that the Federal Government has usurped, which it is attempting to run, and which in a planned and orderly manner should be transferred back to the states and local communities with the tax sources to pay for them, and we wouldn't find that much waste.

MODERATOR SMITH: Ladies and gentlemen, may I beg you not to applaud or otherwise react, because that has an influence and we're trying to let these gentlemen settle it among themselves.

Congressman Anderson, you wanted to say something.

JOHN ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Smith. I certainly want to welcome Mr. Bush and his campaign to the State of Illinois. And I want this to be a warm and friendly evening together.

But I have to tell him that a half truth is as dangerous and deceptive as a lie. And two of the comments that were made this evening I learned just two hours before coming to this platform are being aired in last minute commercials in the last four or five days of this campaign charging that John Anderson is for reducing social security benefits.

What John Anderson said on Thursday in

Naperville, Illinois, of last week was that in computing the cost of living adjustment for social security beneficiaries, one of the-- you use the Consumer Price Index. One of the components of that Consumer Price Index is home ownership cost. Monthly that, therefore, reflects the advancing median price of cost of a new home in this country which is about \$73,000 at the present time. And home interest rates in Illinois just went up to sixteen and a quarter percent.

What I said was that people who are over 65 and retired are not buying new homes, they are not paying sixteen and a quarter percent interest on home mortgages, and, therefore, there ought to be a change in the calculation that is made in the Consumer Price Index.

GEORGE BUSH: Do they get less money or more money?

JOHN ANDERSON: Well, let me complete my statement, Mr. Bush, and then I will be very glad to reply.

That miscalculation is costing the Federal Treasury, which you profess to be so concerned about, 5 to 7 billion dollars a year. And a very respected

member of the House Budget Committee, Paul Simon of Illinois, whom I talked with just the other day, he has said that that figure is absolutely sound and that you could save about three and a half billion dollars a year if you revised that Consumer Price Index.

Now there are many economists that have been saying that for a long time. It doesn't mean that social security benefits are going to be reduced. It means that come July 1 they will be increased, but they might not be increased by 13.2 percent. They might be increased by something like 10 percent. That is not a reduction.

MODERATOR SMITH: Congressman, we have no time limits except my own judgment.

JOHN ANDERSON: Could I just reply to the 50 cent briefly?

MODERATOR SMITH: Briefly.

JOHN ANDERSON: Because that again is a half truth when you say that we are going to wipe out the working people of this country by assessing them a 50 cent tax.

I'm going to give them under that program, and Governor Reagan, you have a right to be skeptical,

I appreciate your concern in that regard. But this is one legislative package and it was introduced in one bill. And what it provides is that there would be a 50 percent reduction in social security taxes. That would be the largest tax cut in history, 46 billion dollars, and the purpose—the purpose is to bring down the consumption of imported oil, because we believe that when that median wage—

MODERATOR SMITH: I think you've made your point, Congressman. I think Mr. Bush should have an opportunity to talk.

RONALD REAGAN: You know, we may never get past this first question.

MODERATOR SMITH: This happens to be the most important question tonight.

GEORGE BUSH: The person who is already retired is not paying the tax. He would get hurt by the gasoline tax. This idea of taking it in, we're going to raise a great more revenue and then pay it out the other way doesn't work that way. And I am against that 50 cent gasoline tax. I'm strongly opposed to it, because it never works if we pay it in one— take it in one hand and pay it out.

I was on the Ways and Means Committee,

you've been in the Congress. We both know that it doesn't work that way. And I am opposed to it, and that's it period. That's the Anderson difference; that's the Bush difference.

JOHN ANDERSON: I don't mind your opposition.

Just state the case correctly.

MODERATOR SMITH: Let's let Mr. Crane speak now.

PHILIP CRANE: If I could address this question of that 50 cent a gallon tax on gasoline, and my understanding is that this is designed to try and reduce social security taxes. What I think that overlooks, John, is the fact that there are 10.2 million car owners age 65 and over. Now, those people have qualified for those retirement benefits. They paid into the social security program up to 65, and if you're imposing that tax on them, what you're asking those people to do is to, in effect, pay the taxes for their own benefits.

JOHN ANDERSON: Well, I just would simply want to repeat, and very quickly, we have accounted for that by providing for a 4 percent increase. That would enable the retired person to drive about a hundred miles a week, 400 miles a month, and that

would come out of the revenues of the gasoline tax.

That would cost about 4 percent.

MODERATOR SMITH: All right, I think that's clear now.

Governor Reagan?

RONALD REAGAN: Well, and I hope we get on to the next carbon. I just have to say one thing.

We've been talking here about tax increases of various kinds. I happen to believe there's a new school of economics and it's a sound school. In four times in this century we have done what I'm going to suggest, and it has worked every time and even the Government has gotten more revenue.

I think we have come to a point in this country where it is Government that is the problem. It's Government that is a drag on the economy, and the time has come for us to have the courage to cut the income tax rates across the board for everyone in such a heavy manner that we increase incentive and, as a result, increase productivity in this land and get back to the thing that made this country great, which is to be an industrial giant, able to out produce anyone else. And we need the incentives to do it, and I think the graduated tax coming up against inflation

is probably the thing that is making everyone in this country poorer every year, not richer.

The standard of living in the United States is going down four and a half percent a year.

MODERATOR SMITH: Gentlemen, if we cut taxes
the way you say and if we increase defense expenditures
and then balance the budget, something has to go.

And we have 26 million people in this richest country
in the world living below the poverty line.

Won't they be effected? Can we in all conscience do that?

RONALD REAGAN: Howard, let me just, if I may say something about this. The last president, and I hate to have to admit he was a Democrat, the last president who tried this across the board tax cut was John F. Kennedy. His economic advisors, and some of them are still advising the Democratic leaders, his economic advisors told him that if he cut the taxes across the board the Government would lose 89 billion dollars in revenue. The economists were 143 billion dollars wrong. He went ahead and cut the taxes, the last time it's been done, and the Government got 54 billion dollars more in revenue at the lower rate than they'd been getting before,

and that makes the total of 143.

MODERATOR SMITH:

There's a funny thing about the dollars out there in the people's hands that have a multiplier effect, and it stimulates the economy far more than Government spending.

This administration is still pledged-- and maybe some of the gentlemen here, John, maybe you are, or still believe in the idea that it is Government spending and Government fine tuning that can cure the problems and it is that that has caused the problems.

Congressman Anderson?

JOHN ANDERSON: No, I don't feel that way,

Governor. But very quickly, you see where I disagree
with you is that the revenue impact in the first year
of your proposal, which is the Roth-Kemp Proposal,
30 percent in three years. The revenue impact in
the first year, I believe, would be almost 20 billion
dollars. It would be about 36 or almost 50 billion
dollars in the second year, and 95 billion dollars
in the third year. What I'm worried about is you're
comparing the success of the Kennedy tax cut, which
was about 12 billion dollars in an economy that was
less than a quarter of the size of our economy today,

and at a time when the inflation rate was about 2 percent. And I just think that the conditions today are so different.

I'm so worried about inflation that I think in the long run, sure we want to cut taxes, but the immediate impact, I think, would be to make that inflation even more variable, because it would increase the inbalance.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Bush, would you-- Mr. Bush wants to say something.

GEORGE BUSH: I'm interested, John. I thought you were on that airplane espousing the Kemp-Roth tax cut in 1978.

JOHN ANDERSON: In 1978--

GEORGE BUSH: Let me finish, please.

What I favor is, and as a goal, I agree with Ron. As a goal I believe that that theory would work. We're in a tough time today. What I want to see is a tax cut divided between increasing savings—say to a person trying to buy a home with interest rates at their what, 15, 16 percent, put it into a savings account, leave it there, but you begin to form savings that immediately stimulates investment in housing or to a business.

Go into the ghetto area. Take some job training credits or rapid depreciation. Put your plant there. Help people. And that 20 billion cut of that nature is what I'm proposing. I think it will stimulate investment. I think it won't risk the lag effect that I believe would be on Kemp-Roth, and I couldn't agree more. The thing I disagree with John's recent plan is more and more taxes. We don't want that. We need a 20 billion dollar tax cut, and that's what I support.

MODERATOR SMITH: Gentlemen, I'm sorry that we've run out of time just on this first question about inflation and your differing views.

We have to talk about foreign affairs now, and I would suggest to you as a first question, with Russia taking over Afghanistan, with Pakistan too intimidated even to accept arms from the United States, Saudi Arabia keeping a distance from us, we need friends in a Muslim country down in southern Asia. And many people have suggested that the whole Arab world would become friendly if we could secure an agreement on Palestinian autonomy.

Now, what would you do as president to bring about this change?

23

1

2

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

PHILIP CRANE: First of all I think with respect to any resolution of the Middle East problem one should respect the Israeli position. The Israeli position is face-to-face negotiations between the parties involved. Secondly, no prior conditions to sitting down at the negotiating table. And thirdly, no externally imposed solutions either by the United States, the Soviet Union or any supra-national body like the United Nations.

I think as far as the Palestinian problem goes, it means observing the Israeli insistence on no participation by the PLO. And I think rightly so. The PLO does not speak for any identifiable constituency. The PLO is engaged in acts of terrorism, murders committed against women and children, and I think the PLO to date still has not disavowed its commitment to the extermination of the State of Israel.

The Israelis have indicated that they recognize that there are Palestinian problems within Jordan and that Palestinians participating in any Jordanian negotiating team would not meet the resistence of the Israelis so long as they were not PLO spokesmen. And I think further one must recognize

Jordanian citizens. So, you know, even if Israel pulled back behind the borders, the pre-'67 borders, that there is still presumably a Palestinian problem to be negotiated with King Hussein. And, therefore, in my judgment the United States must maintain an evenhanded and neutral posture encouraging both sides to participate in negotiations but that in no way, in my judgment, involves any recognition of the PLO.

MODERATOR SMITH: Governor Reagan, by May the 20th they're supposed to settle this problem with Egypt and Israel. They are not close to it now. What would you suggest?

RONALD REAGAN: Well, I have to go along with what Phil said there. The Israelis, I think, for many years, the Palestinian problem has been imposed as if it is-- the refugees are all from Israel and, therefore, they're Israel's problem.

Palestine was never a country. It was a territory, an area, and it was a British mandate.

And it was the British Government that, simply by signing a paper, created the Kingdom of Jordan which is 80 percent of what used to be Palestine. The

Israelis have less than 20 percent of what was

Palestine. The Palestinian refugee problem, it seems
to me then, is an 80 percent 20 percent problem of

Jordan and Israel. But I think they could also-- you
could extend it to the other Arab nations.

I go along with this, that I think that there's been too much effort on the part of this administration to mandate terms in the settlement there. I think that we should stand by ready to help in any way we can recognizing this also.

In Israel we have a moral obligation that we assumed and we should never forget, the State of Israel and to guarantee its existence. But it is not a one way street in which we are simply being generous. Israel is the only stable democratic government left in the Middle East with a combat trained and indeed combat experienced military as a deterrent to further aggression on the part of the Soviet Union. If they weren't there paying their way to us in this alliance between the two of us, we'd have to be there.

And I agree also that the PLO is one of the contributing problems to all of this. No one elected the PLO, and I don't believe that anyone should be asked to negotiate looking down the barrel of a terrorist gun.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Bush, let me add this to that same question before you speak. Three presidents, two of them Republicans, have now regarded Israeli settlements in occupied Arab territories to be illegal and have opposed them. Is that a major obstacle to a settlement? How do you feel about those settlements?

GEORGE BUSH: I don't think they should go
forward with more settlements, but I don't think
they should pull back off all settlements. A lot of
those settlements have very legitimate security of
provisions with them.

I support the Begin-Sadat agreement. I think before there should be any discussion with PLO they must revise the '68 Convention that equated Zionism with illegality and Israel as the agent of Zionism. This area, having wrestled with that problem at the United Nations, did not lend itself to a comprehensive settlement which would, in my view, bring the Soviets back into the equation. I think this administration was absolutely outrageous what they did in terms of this U. N. resolution. It undermined what confidence Israel had left, and it

made the Arabs and everybody else think that this administration was absolutely ridiculous in the process.

. 2

And so I would favor going forward as best you can. You mentioned the time limit with the Begin-Sadat agreement, recognizing you're not going to impose a settlement, and that the strategic and moral commitment to Israel must be kept. And there's nothing in that that precludes improvement of relations with some of these shiekdoms or with Jordan. That's the folly of some of the argument that is has to be one way.

And lastly, do not trade off even inferentially the security of an ally for hoped for economic gain. Our problem is credibility in foreign affairs, and we must not add further to our problem.

JOHN ANDERSON: Mr. Smith, it's nice that we've finally found something on which we all seem to agree. I don't think that there's much in what has been said with which I would disagree, if anything.

I would make the further point that I think the mistake that the administration has made, and it's already been alluded to, is that when they do the kind of thing that occurred a week ago Saturday

in the United Nations, when they vote for a resolution condemning Israel, and, of course, folding in the Jerusalem question with the whole West Bank Gaza District, that's a separable question. I've talked many times about Mr. Henry Kissinger. He makes the point and, I think, quite correctly, that that is going to be the most difficult problem of all to solve, and it certainly ought not to be just folded in as that resolution did with the whole question of the West Bank and the Gaza District.

when the administration undertakes in public to condemn the Israelis rather than to use the channels of quiet diplomacy to register any dissent that we may have, and we may dissent. There isn't everything that the Israeli Government does that we're going to agree with. But I'm told in my talks with leaders in that country that when we make a public declaration such as that, that unites Israel in an absolutely inflexible position. Then even the Labor Party, which has disagreed with the settlement policy of the Begin Government, finds itself locked in in a position of national solidarity to stand against the enemies of Israel and the world.

So I think the administration has got to learn the bitter lesson that hopefully that they now have absorbed that we do this by quiet, patient diplomacy. And I think as far as the whole Middle East settlement is concerned to establish arbitrary deadlines, I don't believe that policy is going to

work.

MODERATOR SMITH: Let's get away from this area of agreement as fast as we possibly can.

In Iran we've had new disappointment about the hostages.

Mr. Reagan, in South Carolina you indicated you thought that President Carter has handled the Iranian situation badly. Senator Goldwater on television the night after that, I think, disagreed with you. He said he's thought Carter had done it very well. You said that we should take, in South Carolina, appropriate action. Does that possibly mean force that might cost the lives of the hostages or force Iran into the arms of the Russians?

RONALD RAAGAN: No, Howard, and none of us

here and none who have been candidates on our side,

we've all kind of observed a kind of a rule of not

making a suggestion as to what actually should be done

for fear we might endanger the hostages further or that we might unwittingly touch upon something that may be being negotiated.

1

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I have felt free, however, after we're going into the fifth month of their captivity and we've been humiliated throughout the world by this rag tag mob, that it is -- there's no objection to criticizing what we think has been done. Now, everything that's been done so far has been through the diplomatic channels, the United Nations and all of this. And they have, in turn, the other -- the captors have been using the salami tactic on us. As soon as we suggest that we would agree to something such as this U. N. Commission if the hostages are released, and then the understanding is given to us that, well, if they set up that Commission, the hostages come home and then the Commission will go forth with its work. But, oh, no, that's changed and then another demand.

As long as they can continue to get another slice of that salami from us, as long as this administration negotiates, and when refused on one point, or they turn their backs on one point on the other side, we're willing to negotiate the next

demand that they make, then it's to their advantage to hang onto those hostages.

1

2

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I believe, and what I said in South Carolina was, that in the first 48 to 72 hours you do all the things diplomatically, and I think they would include everything the president has done so far over all these months, all the diplomatic channels. And if there is no way diplomatically to get release of the hostages, then, and I will admit that only a president has the knowledge of the options that are open to him when you speak of action, so none of us have the information that you would have in that position. But then privately, not publically, privately you communicate with the captors once you've failed diplomatically and you tell them that as of a date certain those hostages will be turned over to a neutral country or an action will be taken that they will find decidedly unpleasant. That does not necessarily mean force of arms. But whatever you've decided will be the most unpleasant for them, you say to them that will happen as of that date. And when you let it go on this long, this is a failure of foreign policy and a failure of our Government to carry out its responsibility to its own citizens.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Bush, some people have the impression that by waiting patiently we've gained some allies inside Iran who are beginning to articulate themselves like the new president, Bani-Sadr, and the foreign minister. Do you believe that?

GEORGE BUSH: No, I don't. And I believe that you hear some -- you see some division. But frankly I'm getting tired of it. The American people have had it with this thing. There are more people coming in now, apparently there's a higher level of students from Iran in this country than there were when this all started. There's spare parts we're still shipping to Iran, and I've supported the president. And I do believe the president, in my experience in foreign affairs, sometimes has much more information.

But he hasn't leveled with us. I felt when that Commission went there that the fix was on. The hostages are coming out. And yet we haven't heard a word as to what happened. I'm inclined to feel that the time has come to tighten up economically, to shut down that embassy, and to really start looking like we're serious about this.

We've tried conciliation for a long, long time. I'm not sure I agree with you, Ron, on drawing

the line in the sand on the date certain. But there are things the United States can do and should be doing. And I think we have been awfully patient in the country, and I believe we ought to start taking some of these actions, including increasing strong economic pressure on Iran.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Crane?

PHILIP CRANE: First of all, the president,
Howard, has to assume total responsibility, it seems
to me, for those people being held hostage in the
first place, and that's a point that I think all of
us can agree upon and should be driven home forcefully.
He had better than six months warning, the details
spelled out to him as to exactly what was going to
happen over there as a result of admitting the Shah
into this country. And repeated warnings. So it
wasn't something that should have caught him by
surprise.

The first question then is why were those people there, they never should have been there, and the president is the one that must assume personal and total responsibility for our people being held hostage.

Having said that I have abstained from

second guessing him in a public way, but I would simply remind everyone of a period in recent history when we had a man in the White House who wasn't of our party, had that sign on his desk that said, "The buck stops here." And I'm talking about Harry Truman. And when you think about things that might have been done, one thing I think all of us would concede, Democrats and Republicans alike, is Harry Truman didn't have trouble making decisions. And forceful decisions, and often times unpopular decisions.

Can you honestly imagine if Harry Truman had been in the White House during this period that we would be at this impasse today? So obviously there are better ways.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Anderson, every president would like to begin his career as president writing on a fresh page, but he's forced, as Woodrow Wilson says, to write between the lines of what was there before him written by the last president. So we have to assume that the situation is where it is now, what would you do about it?

JOHN ANDERSON: You're referring still to the situation in Iran. Well, of course there will be some developments conceivably starting tomorrow in

those elections for the parliament, and there will unfold perhaps, whether or not Bani-Sadr who is supposed to be a relative moderate, who is supposed to be interested in the settlement of this problem, can best the clerics, the so-called Islamic Republican-- I'm a little bit embarrassed that that happens to be the name of the party, but I guess it is. The Islamic Republican Party to whom the clerics belong, or to which the clerics belong, and whether or not he can sort out of the chaos and all of these competing power centers, you have the militants who are holding the embassy, you have the Ayatollah Beheshti (phonetic) and the revolutionary tribunal, then you have Bani-Sadr.

a moment ago that this has been a test, I think, of restraint, not only on the part of the president, but of presidential candidates. And when you have no really solid clear alternative it's very difficult to be terribly critical, except that I have felt that the timetable of the administration has been somewhat leisurely. A whole month went by, for example, the 4th of November the hostages were seized, and it wasn't until the 4th of December that that unanimous

resolution condemning the seizure was finally adopted in the Security Council of the United Nations. And I do believe that some more expedition could have been practiced on the part of the administration.

But I do believe that we have to continue to show some restraint. I don't know the military option myself that would be available to guarantee the safe rescue of those hostages. But it may be that we can diplomatically isolate them as time goes on.

MODERATOR SMITH: Let's get away from this agreement. We're too close to agreement.

PHILIP CRANE: John-- well, could I just inject just one thing here?

I think something, John, that everyone has got to realize is that there is the possibility that no one is going to come out of this alive anyway. And there's where I think the man who is President of the United States and Commander in Chief has to be prepared to make, at some point, some very strong decisions and be prepared to take the heat for it. Because, you know, all of this anguish and this torment and the, at least, psychological torture being inflicted on those people, and for all we know,

physical torture, too. They haven't even let the Red Cross come in and actually see each and every one of those 50 hostages.

But that, to me, is an ingredient of leadership, and I'm not going to spell out what the particulars are. All I'm saying is that at some point a President of the United States has to face up to the same kind of hard decision that, say, General Eisenhower made when he was planning the invasion of Normandy.

Now, you know, it's not a pleasant thing. Anyone who has been in combat will vouchsafe for the fact it's not a pleasant decision to make. But I think the president has demonstrated no policy, vacillation, weakness, indecision, and it's been compounded by his seeming capitulation to conditions that we said were totally inacceptable. Even that U. N. Commission, totally unacceptable. There's no basis for any linkage whatsoever between the Shah, the Shah's regime, our identification with the Shah and their holding those people hostage. They are outlaws by definition in the whole community of nations.

RONALD REAGAN: Howard, could I just add one

thing here to what has been said?

Has anyone stopped to think that the policies of this administration in this situation have endangered Americans wherever they may be in the world? There isn't an embassy any longer that is safe when once upon a time an embassy could stand there with a war going on around it and it was sovereign territory of another nation and wouldn't be touched.

But they are all endangered now as they see this country unable to cope with this kind of a problem. And I would add one thing to what Phil has said about the president's responsibility. It began even earlier than the capture. It began when he pulled the rug out from under our ally of 30-some odd years standing, Iran, the Iranian Government. All he had to do was stand up and stand beside the Shah's Government and there wouldn't have been a successful revolution. That we betrayed an ally as we betrayed Taiwan, as we betrayed others.

MODERATOR SMITH: I want to see if I can stir up some more dissent. Mr. Anderson, you opposed some plans to beef up defense, especially around the Persian Gulf, saying, "There aren't many Americans

who want our young to die defending oil that we could learn to live without."

Well, if the oil which we've not yet learned to live without were cut off, it is our allies, Japan and West Europe, who suffer most.

John Roach, the columnist, called your statement, "vintage isolationism and America firstism." What do you--

JOHN ANDERSON: Not at all, not at all. Mr.

Roach is wrong. Because what I have criticized,

Mr. Smith, is the unilateralism of the administration's approach to this problem. I feel that Mr. Carter was so anxious to enhance his quagging aura of leadership that what he did on the 23rd of January was to rush into the House of Representatives and deliver a State of the Union message in which he unilaterally proclaimed the doctrine, the so-called Carter Doctrine, in which he said we would defend by military force, if necessary, this vital interest. And then one week later he met with news editors and admitted that, of course, we can't do this without the cooperation of our friends and allies.

What he should have done, and where he made his fundamental error, he should have been

patiently, carefully, quietly, diplomatically stitching together the fabric of western unity, telling the Japanese, you import 75 percent of your oil from that region; telling the West Germans and the French, you get more than 60 percent of your oil from that region. Join us in designing a set of collective security measures by which we will assert the vital interests of the west.

I'm not an isolationist. I'm not a neoisolationist. But I do not want to see the United States simply become the protector of the Persian Gulf when other nations with equally vital interest in that area ought to be willing to cooperate with us. And that's where I think Mr. Carter has been wrong on this particular occasion.

And I also have to disagree with my friend on my right who says that we made a fundamental mistake when we didn't stand tall in the saddle and defend the Shah of Iran as the protector of the Persian Gulf. I think we made a fundamental error back in 1970 when we submitted to his megalomania and said that we were going to sell them 18 to 20 billion dollars worth of arms and make him the protector, and look what happened.

We cannot base a solid foreign policy of this Government on propping up the kind of autocratic regimes that do not enjoy the popular support of their people. We do. We are building a foreign policy upon shifting sands.

PHILIP CRANE: Would you yield for a question on that point?

JOHN ANDERSON: Of course.

21.

PHILIP CRANE: Would you have supported General Zia?

JOHN ANDERSON: General Zia?

PHILIP CRANE: Right, in Pakistan.

JOHN ANDERSON: To what extent?

PHILIP CRANE: Well, I mean would you have given him the military and economic assistance as the president proposed?

JOHN ANDERSON: I would certainly have not suffered the humiliation I hope that this administration has suffered.

PHILIP CRANE: Well, I know that. I mean,
John, the question — the question I asked you is
did you or did you not favor providing assistance
to Pakistan?

JOHN ANDERSON: Short term.

PHILIP CRANE: Short term, all right.

JOHN ANDERSON: Short term, not a long term military relationship as we had with the Shah.

there is no evidence whatsoever that President Zia's record on human rights is any better than the Shah's was. And even the Washington Post, which no one can accuse of being a conservative journal, engaged in a discussion of what to do over there in that region. And the president, of course, had recommended giving all kinds of aid to Pakistan, and the Indians were upset over that. And the bottom line, and the Washington Post editorial was we should recognize President Zia for what he is, the man who runs Pakistan. And just because the decision is not an easy and clear cut one to make, we should nevertheless give the aid to Pakistan.

Now, I happen to rarely agree with the editorial positions of the Washington Post, but there's one time they spoke a truth. Now, that same truth with respect to General Zia, they should have articulated about the Shah. Because the fact of the matter is, this administration scuttled the Shah's Government. They're the ones that sent General Heiser

over there to tell the generals not to back him up when he had internal problems. And, you know, the Ayatollah Shariat-Madari, who is Khomeini's competitor, said in a blistering sermon a couple of months ago conditions in Iran today are no better than they were under the Shah. That may be for Iranians. I tell you for the rest of the world conditions are infinitely worse. We've got the potential threat, because of the foolishness of this administration, of a nuclear confrontation over there because of their own actions and the perversity of all of this is the president enjoys a wave of popularity because of it.

MODERATOR SMITH: All right. We've got to move away from foreign affairs.

Please don't applaud. Before we move away from foreign affairs, Mr. Bush wants to say something and Governor Reagan wants to say something.

Mr. Bush?

GEORGE BUSH: Well, in my view, when you see
the world as it is and not as you wish it were, you
have to sometimes make tough choices. You're not
dealing with perfection on human rights or no human
rights at all. And I will not engage in a revisionistic

view of the Shah of Iran. Yes, there was some brutality. But is human rights better off today? America held hostage, revolutionary tribunals with no legal procedures at all, lining up people and shooting them? And you have to consider your human rights. I would have a foreign policy that was moral and steeped in the tradition of human rights. But I also would consider the strategic interests of the United States.

apologize for people that we've supported around the world. Let's look at the whole record. And, yes, there was some brutality. But at least there was some adherence to international law.

RONALD REAGAN: It's along this same line. I feel that I have to defend myself against appearing as if I am one who would support any kind of monster because of my inordinate fear of communism, which the president told us we got rid of in Notre Dame University in his first five months in office.

MODERATOR SMITH: All right. Governor?

I was in Iran less than two years ago.

There's been a great deal of demagoguery about that regime. But this man, whatever faults we may find

in their treatment of criminals or their treatment of dissidents or whatever, is typical perhaps of the whole area and many countries in the world. It would not meet our test of human rights.

But at the same time, this man was trying to lift his people up to the level that we enjoy. Those women today are not allowed to be educated. They're back in the 15th century. They weren't allowed to be educated in Iran until he came in. When I was there, young women were in the university learning to be doctors and lawyers, studying for the professions. He had created a land reform program, and the first land that he put into it was his own personal land holdings to be divided up among the peasants in farms. Maybe the reason he's in trouble with the Mullas was because they were the next biggest landholders, and he took their land and gave it away to the individual farmers, and they all got mad.

But I saw the low cost housing that he was building. I saw the streets teeming with automobiles and traffic, and he was really-- maybe he moved too fast. Maybe that was one of his problems.

But, believe me, this was a progressive regime. And the funny thing is, every president back

to Harry Truman, every one of them, Democrat and Republican and up to and including Jimmy Carter, every one of them is on record with a statement endorsing the humanitarianism of the Shah's regime and what they found there that was desirable and acceptable and that we could approve of, and that was—Jimmy Carter did it in a New Year's toast, probably with ginger ale, but said the most grandiloquent things about it. But a few months later was doing just what Phil Crane said, scuttling that administration.

Now, we send a human rights group over there from the United Nations, a Commission, and one representative from Algeria, a representative from Libya. Don't tell me that they're observing human rights. My complaint with the hypocrisy of this administration is simply this, that we seem only able to find human rights violations among our allies. At the same time that we want to cozy up to and hug and kiss, as he did Brezhnev, the Soviet Union where there are no human rights existing at all. If we're going to really mean it about human rights, then let's thumb our nose at the Soviet Union and stop sending them all that technology and all the things that we're