

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library

Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Fielding, Fred F.: Files, 1981-1986

Folder Title: [Debate Material Release
06/28/1983 – Version 1 –
Carter Foreign Policy and National Security] (6 of 10)

Box: 44F

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/>

Central America and the Caribbean

Q: Perhaps the most volatile region in the world today is Central America. No country seems immune from the revolutionary fervor sweeping the region. The Republicans have sharply criticized your policy there. They state you have stood by while Castro's Cuba--assisted by the Soviet Union--arms, trains and supports revolutionary forces throughout the region. They further state: "We deplore the Marxist Sandinista takeover of Nicaragua and the Marxist attempts to destabilize El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras. We do not support United States assistance to any Marxist government in this hemisphere, and we oppose the Carter Administration's aid program for the government of Nicaragua."

On few foreign policy issues are the lines so tightly drawn between your policies and those of the Republicans. How do you account for this sharp policy difference? Do you believe, as the Republicans charge, that your Administration "has actively worked to undermine governments and parties opposed to the expansion of Soviet power?" Do you believe the Cubans and Soviets are responsible for the turmoil in Central America? How best can the United States influence the direction of the change sweeping through the region?

Response

Under my Administration, the United States will not sit by on the sidelines and abandon its friends in Central America to Cuba and its radical Marxist allies. Those who say that Nicaragua is already "lost" are the same people who said Portugal was lost five years ago. We do not agree with them, and we are encouraged that Nicaraguan moderates and businessmen have chosen to stay in Nicaragua and help work to make it a more democratic country. They have asked for our help, and we will not abandon them. They are struggling to preserve individual freedoms and political and economic

pluralism, and they have asked for our economic aid. We have provided it, most recently in the form of a \$75 million economic package to Nicaragua. We cannot guarantee that democracy will take hold in Nicaragua. But if we turn our backs on that country, as Governor Reagan and the Republicans would do, we can help guarantee that democracy will fail.

Our challenge in El Salvador is similar. If reform fails, that country will become a battle ground between radical left and radical right. A moderate solution is still possible and we intend to help.

Those who are most concerned about the potential for radical revolution in Central America and growing Cuban influence in the region should be the strongest supporters of our efforts to help Nicaragua and El Salvador. But the Republicans are not. They seem to believe that Cuba is the cause of all the problems in the region. There is no question that Castro is assisting subversive efforts and we must deal with this. But we must also understand -- as Governor Reagan does not -- that the root problems in the region are extreme poverty, social injustice and repression and we must direct our efforts to address these problems as well.

The US was once identified with dictatorships and injustice in the region. Now we can be proud of our efforts to play a constructive role, assisting moderate and peaceful change. Now we are better positioned to keep the extremists isolated and on the defensive.

I might note, in closing, that while a lot of attention has been given by the Republicans to the Caribbean and the tiny island of Grenada, the winds of political change in that area are clearly blowing in a different direction. Recent elections in Dominica, St. Vincent, St. Lucia, Antigua and St. Kitts have resulted in victories by moderate leaders friendly to the United States, and resounding defeats by leftists who are friendly to Cuba.

Gov. Reagan on Central America and the Caribbean

"Totalitarian Marxists are in control of the Caribbean Island of Grenada, where Cuban advisors are now training guerrillas for subversive action against other countries such as Trinidad-Tobago, Grenada's democratic neighbor. In El Salvador, Marxist totalitarian revolutionaries, supported by Havana and Moscow, are preventing the construction of a democratic government.

Must we let Grenada, Nicaragua, El Salvador, all become additional "Cubas", new outposts for Soviet combat brigades? Will the next push of the Moscow-Havana axis be northward to Guatemala and thence to Mexico, and south to Costa Rica and Panama?"

Chicago Council on Foreign Relations
March 17, 1980

US Policy Toward Cuba

Q: Early in your Administration a US Interest Section was established in Havana. Better US-Cuban relations appeared to be just around the corner. That, of course, is no longer the case. Fidel Castro is, once again, the subject of harsh US criticism. His troops remain in Africa. He is assisting revolutionary forces in Central America. And, most recently, thousands of his citizens fled Cuba for the United States. Added to this is the charge by your opponents that you have done nothing about the Soviet combat brigade in Cuba nor about the transfer of new Soviet offensive weapons to the island, such as modern MIG aircraft and submarines.

How do you account for this reversal in your initial policy toward Cuba? Did you misjudge Castro? How do you intend to deal with him in the future?

With respect to Soviet activities on the island, why did you reverse your position that the Soviet combat brigade was "unacceptable?"

Response

Over the past three years we have taken a number of steps to open lines of communication between Cuba and the United States. Our dialogue with Cuba has cost us little and has yielded some significant benefits. Ask the families of the 4,000 political prisoners who have been released from Castro's prisons if they agree. Ask the Cuban-Americans who, for the first time since the 1960s, are now allowed to return to the island for family visits if they agree.

While the Cubans have taken some encouraging steps, this has not been matched by any change in their foreign policy. While I have been disappointed in this, I have not been surprised. As a result, we have told the Cubans that there will be no further progress toward normalization.

until Cuba is prepared to accept the norms of peace and human rights of the international community. Cuba still has thousands of troops in Africa, serving as a vanguard for Soviet imperialism. It is exploiting for its own purposes the revolutionary climate in Central America and the Caribbean. It has refused to respect other nations' immigration laws. Until these practices stop, it is difficult to conceive of normal relations.

At the same time, the close Cuban-Soviet relationship continues. For the past several years the Soviet Union has been upgrading the equipment of the Cuban military. Unlike other Soviet military clients, Cuba pays nothing for this. It gets a free ride.

Several developments over the past two years have caused us concern:

-- In 1978, the Soviets delivered MIG-23s to Cuba. Certain types of MIG-23s can carry nuclear weapons. The ones delivered to Cuba cannot. They do not constitute an offensive threat to the United States.

-- We have been monitoring the construction of a new naval facility at Cienfuegos. We have no evidence that the Soviets are involved in the construction of this facility or intend to use it as a base.

-- And, last year, we confirmed the presence in Cuba of a 2,600-3,000 Soviet combat brigade. While the unit may have been in Cuba for some time, here again we were confronted with a matter of serious concern to us.

We have taken steps to insure that none of these activities constitute a threat to the United States or the region. I have increased surveillance of Cuba, expanded military maneuvers in the region and established a full-time Caribbean Joint Task Force at Key West.

As I have said before, we do not accept these activities. We have responded to them -- and will respond to any future activities -- in an appropriate manner. Castro knows this and so does the Soviet Union.

Gov. Reagan on Cuba

Reagan has long held that Cuba is a mere proxy of the Soviet Union, and is behind most revolutionary movements in Africa, and Latin America.

"Despite the power the Soviet Union is able to exert over Castro, the Cuban dictator still fancies himself as a revolutionary leader who aids and inspires revolts in Africa, Latin America and the Middle East. The Russians aren't bothered by Castro's delusions of grandeur because much of his international interference fits nicely into their own foreign policy designs.

Jefferson City Post
October 26, 1979

In 1977, when the Administration was considering relaxing relations with Cuba, Reagan wrote:

"...(t)he U.S. decision on Cuban trade must rest on broader considerations. Our trade embargo of Cuba is a little like a long-running advertising campaign. Just as its full effects are being felt, the sponsor may get tired of it."

Jefferson City Post
October 26, 1979

Impact of Human Rights Policy

Q: The Republicans have charged that your policies toward Latin America "have encouraged a precipitous decline in United States relations with virtually every country in the region." The policy most singled out for criticism is your human rights policy. Brazil, Argentina and Chile are often cited as examples of countries which have turned away from the United States due to your policy on human rights.

Do you believe our bilateral relations in Latin America have suffered as a result of your human rights policy? What, in your view, have been the benefits of this policy? How do you respond to the Republican platform statement that: "We will return to the fundamental principle of treating a friend as a friend and self-proclaimed enemies as enemies, without apology"?

Response

Since my inauguration, I have worked hard to forge a new relationship with the nations of Latin America and the Caribbean -- one resting on a firm commitment to human rights, democracy, economic development and nonintervention. For too long, the United States was associated with dictatorships which trampled on human rights and with the status quo even when that meant poverty, political repression, and social injustice. I do not believe, as the Republicans apparently do, that we should return to that association.

The trend toward democracy in Latin America is gaining strength. Ecuador and now Peru have returned to freely elected democratic governments. Brazil has maintained a steady course toward democracy. Uruguay will have national elections next year. The new nations in the Caribbean, with the exception of Grenada, remain models of democracy despite severe economic hardship. The only setback has come in

Bolivia, but even in Bolivia, where military coups are a tradition, one is encouraged by the strong new force of democratic groups.

The trend toward a greater regard for human rights is also gaining strength. Human rights violations have substantially declined in a number of countries. There are fewer reports of disappearances; political prisoners have been released in substantial numbers; the use of torture has declined sharply.

I do not believe, as the Republicans apparently do, that the pursuit of human rights is incompatible with our national security interests. We pursue our human rights objectives not only because they are right, but because we have a stake in the stability that comes when people can express their hopes and find their futures freely.

Panama Canal Treaties

Q: The controversy over the Panama Canal Treaties has abated. The issue now appears to be holding Panama to a strict interpretation of the language of the treaties rather than trying to somehow overturn them.

Despite this, the Republicans have stated that although you assured the American taxpayers that the treaties would not cost them "one thin dime," they claim that implementing the treaties will cost them \$4.2 billion.

Is this true?

Response:

The Panama Canal Treaties went into force on October 1, 1979. Today, almost a year later, the Panama Canal is working just as efficiently and safely as it did over the previous 65 years. The fears of those who so strongly opposed the treaties, including Governor Reagan, have not been realized.

I consider the Panama Canal Treaties a major accomplishment of my Administration. The treaties eliminated a serious irritant in our relations with Panama and with the nations of the Hemisphere. By returning this territory to Panamanian control, the treaties have established the basis for a new, cooperative relationship between our two countries. This would not have been the case if we had followed Governor Reagan's advice. At the same time our national security interests have been protected. The United States has the right to operate and defend the Canal until the year 2000 and, thereafter, the permanent right to defend the Canal against any threat to its open and secure operation. Our warships will continue to have priority passage.

There have been some differences of opinion over the implementation of the treaties, but these have been resolved -- and are being resolved -- in a non-controversial way. As I wrote to President Royo on the day the treaties went into force, "The United States is as committed to making these treaties work as we were to building the Canal itself." Panama shares this goal.

As for the Republican charge that the implementation of the treaties is costing the American taxpayer billions of dollars, this is patently false. Transfer expenses associated with the treaties are comparable with the expenses we incur throughout the world with our important foreign base operations. And, if there are any deficits associated with the operation of the Canal, these will be met by higher tolls. Such increases will involve no charge against the U.S. Treasury.

marine and light infantry forces, along with additional air power, which could move into action in the Persian Gulf in a matter of days. We have recently concluded agreements with Oman, Kenya and Somalia on access to additional air and naval facilities in the region.

Enhancing the security of the Persian Gulf region and the Middle East will require a sustained, long-term commitment. We are prepared to make such a commitment. We want to work with all of the countries in the region to achieve it. The present conflict between Iraq and Iran underscores the vital importance of this task.

Gov. Reagan on Panama

Reagan has been at the forefront of those opposed to the Panama Canal Treaties. As negotiations were underway, Reagan stated his strong objection to the proposed Treaty.

"As I talk to you tonight, negotiations with another dictator go forward, negotiations aimed at giving up our ownership of the Panama Canal Zone...The Canal Zone is not a colonial possession. It is not a long-term lease. It is sovereign U.S. territory, every bit the same as Alaska and all the states that were carved from the Louisiana Purchase. We should end those negotiations and tell the (Panamanian head of state): 'We bought it, we paid for it, we built it and we intend to keep it.'"

Los Angeles Times
August 12, 1977

During the 1980 campaign Reagan has raised the issue of abrogating the Treaties on several occasions.

"If there is any possibility of keeping the Panama Canal, believe me I would do it because I believe it was one of the great mistakes we have made so far."

Bangor News
January 18, 1980

Majority Rule and Southern Africa

Q: Rhodesia is now Zimbabwe. A former guerrilla leader, Robert Mugabe, is now Prime Minister of that independent nation. Despite this change, the struggle for majority rule in southern Africa continues. The settlement on Namibia is stalled. Apartheid is still in place in South Africa.

What role do you believe the United States should take in pressing for majority rule in southern Africa. Should full economic sanctions be levied against South Africa? And, what assistance should we provide the new government of Zimbabwe?

Response

I am very proud of our record on Africa. In 1977 our relations were at their lowest point in decades. Secretary Kissinger had recently been refused permission to visit Nigeria. The United States had little credibility in black Africa. As a consequence, our attempts to bring an end to the war in Rhodesia were ineffective. We were becoming, in African eyes, irrelevant -- even antagonistic -- to African aspirations. All that has changed. My trip to Africa and subsequent trips by the Vice President and others have demonstrated that. The United States is once again welcome in Africa.

Our diplomatic efforts in Southern Africa and our support for British initiatives on Zimbabwe helped bring about a peaceful settlement to the Rhodesian war -- without further Soviet/Cuban expansion. We will assist in the reconstruction and development of an independent Zimbabwe. That assistance will be as much in our interests as theirs. So far, we have committed \$100 million for this effort.

I want to be sure the importance of this event is understood. We have a wide range of interests in Africa -- security interests, economic interests, an interest in political cooperation on all global issues. In my judgment no policy could have served those interests better than our strong support for the principle of majority rule, with minority rights, in Zimbabwe. And nothing could have weakened us more than to waver in this crucial effort. Strong Republican opposition in Congress did not help in this regard.

Although we have made a good beginning, much work remains to be done:

-- There has been very little progress on Namibia in recent months. We expect that the successful example of Zimbabwe should be helpful in setting a general precedent for Namibia. I believe the proposals set forth by the UN offer a reasonable basis for a settlement which would include UN-supervised elections. We are now awaiting South Africa's reply to Secretary General Waldheim's most recent proposals.

-- On South Africa, we continue to exert our influence to encourage peaceful -- but rapid -- change and an end to the racist system of apartheid. The South African government has a choice: to follow the difficult and courageous course of seeking cooperation with the forces for change, both internally and within the region, or to face the prospect of further conflict and violence. I hope they choose the former. We will do all we can to assist them in this.

A peaceful transition to majority rule in Southern Africa is a major goal of my Administration. Our active support for self-determination and racial equality in Southern Africa has enabled the United States to develop a continuing and effective dialogue with governments throughout the continent. We will continue to participate in their first priority -- economic development -- and to help Africans resolve their political problems and maintain stability in their continent.

September 18, 1980

Soviet-Cuban Influence in Africa

Q: The Republicans have charged that the Soviet Union and its surrogates--Cuban and Nicaraguan troops and East German secret police--are attempting to impose the "Marxist, totalitarian model" on Africa.

Do you believe this is an accurate statement? Have the Soviets and their surrogates expanded their influence in Africa during your term in office? Is there any evidence that Nicaraguan troops are now in Africa?

Response

Since the massive infusion of Soviet military equipment and advisers and Cuban combat troops into Angola in early 1976, and the subsequent similar movement into Ethiopia in 1977, there has not been a further direct expansion of Soviet-Cuban presence in Africa.

* * *

-- We worked very hard, and successfully, in cooperation with the UK and several African states to bring about the peaceful settlement in Zimbabwe that has precluded any role for the Soviets and Cubans in that country.

-- Similarly, in Namibia, we have been pursuing a policy that we hope can lead to independence, with no room for Soviet or Cuban meddling.

-- Presently, there are no other African nations which appear to be immediately threatened by Soviet-Cuban expansion.

-- During the past year, the Soviets have seen the removal of one of their clients, Idi Amin in Uganda, and the Cubans have witnessed the passing of one of their friends, Macias, in Equatorial Guinea.

-- There seems to be a growing awareness among the OAU States that Soviet-Cuban adventurism does not serve the best interests of Africa.

-- Finally, there is no evidence that Nicaraguan troops are now in Africa and I do not expect any. This is simply another example of Republican exaggeration.

Horn of Africa

Q: Once again the conflict between Ethiopia and Somalia over the Ogaden region is in the news, as it was in 1977. Just recently your Administration signed an agreement with Somalia for the use of the naval base at Berbera in exchange for increased US military and economic assistance.

Doesn't this new relationship with Somalia have the potential for drawing the United States into the on-going conflict between Somalia and Ethiopia? Do you have any confidence in Somalia's assurances that they are withdrawing their military forces from the Ogaden? Will the United States come to Somalia's assistance if they are attacked by the Ethiopians?

Response: Our agreement with Somalia is a limited one. It is one of three we recently signed in the region. The other two were with Oman and Kenya. Each of these agreements will help us maintain a better military balance in that part of the world and therefore to protect our security interests and those of the states of the region.

We do not intend to involve ourselves in purely local conflicts of long standing, such as the Ogaden. We have made it clear that we favor political settlement of such conflicts; this policy has also been expressly stated by the Government of Somalia. We have also made it clear that we oppose military activity by any state in the region that jeopardizes the territorial integrity and legitimate security interests of its neighbors.

Our relationship with Somalia is not directed against Ethiopia. That country's security is being most directly jeopardized from within, by an authoritarian regime which is increasingly dependent on the USSR, to which it has granted extensive military rights.

-- We have provided nearly \$100 million annually in economic aid to Southern African countries which helped pave the way for the peaceful settlement in Rhodesia.

-- Our aid is being used to support the efforts of the Governments of Nicaragua and El Salvador to bring peace and stability to their countries.

-- Our Food for Peace has been the difference between life and death for refugees in Southeast Asia and Africa.

-- U.S. technical assistance has helped farmers in developing countries grow more food and has contributed to a reduction in the rate of population growth.

Some argue that U.S. aid to foreign countries is a waste, that we receive nothing in return. This is a false, and dangerous, view. Our stake in developing nations has deepened. They supply us with essential materials. They are also our fastest growing markets.

Aid programs do not yield instant results. Success or failure is difficult to measure in any one four-year period. But I believe that our programs have helped people in developing countries and have contributed to the maintenance of peace in the world. By helping poorer nations and people in need to build a better future, we are both strengthening the world economy and enhancing the political stability which comes with economic, social, and political justice.

Foreign Assistance and Security Assistance

Q: During your Administration the U.S. has provided about \$40 billion in foreign aid. Yet, as you look around the Middle East, Asia, Africa, and Latin America, both turmoil and poverty appear to be increasing -- not decreasing. What do we have to show for the billions we have spent for foreign aid?

Response:

First, let me say that the aid figures you cite are less than two percent of the Federal Budget for those years. We spend much less for aid than many people believe. We rank 13th of the 17 major aid donors in percentage of GNP provided for official development assistance.

More importantly, I believe that the aid we have provided has helped our friends defend themselves against aggression and has helped alleviate the poverty which affects the lives of most people in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

-- We provide more than \$3 billion each year to Israel and Egypt to help support military and economic stability as these two countries work to find a lasting solution to the Middle East conflict.

-- We have provided Thailand with military assistance to secure her borders against Vietnamese military incursions and have helped the Thai to feed the hundreds of thousands of Kampuchean refugees who came into Thailand.

Global Issues: Good Intentions/Few Accomplishments

Q: Your Administration began with a list of "global" issues on which it was going to make progress: human rights, nuclear proliferation and conventional arms transfers. After four years, there have been few positive accomplishments. US foreign policy interests have, in many cases, been damaged by overemphasis on a "global" approach to these issues which ignores the complexities of US interests in different parts of the world.

In a second Carter Administration, will you deemphasize these "global" issues and balance them against other, sometimes more pressing US foreign policy, security and economic interests? What has your Administration achieved in any of these "global" issues?

RESPONSE

Progress on the global issues of human rights, non-proliferation and conventional arms transfers remain in the forefront of my Administration's policy objectives. I do not deny that progress has been difficult or that there have been many problems in implementing our policies. But, in spite of the difficulties, we must persevere in pursuing our objectives in each of these areas. They are in our national interest.

I disagree with those who charge, as the Republicans have, that there have been no accomplishments. On the contrary, we have taken major steps in each of these pressing concerns:

On non-proliferation, we have, working closely with Congress, developed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act, which conditions U.S. nuclear cooperation on acceptance of key non-proliferation standards by our nuclear trading partners. We have successfully completed the two-year

International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation, with more than 60 nations participating in an effort to develop a common understanding of nuclear energy and non-proliferation. We have just concluded the Second Review Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

I believe that more progress will be made in the non-proliferation area when the SALT Treaty is ratified and SALT III negotiations begin, and when we conclude negotiations for a Comprehensive Test Ban. Governor Reagan is opposed to these arms control efforts. He should understand that non-proliferation and progress in nuclear arms limitations are linked.

On human rights, progress has also been made. I regard making human rights an essential element of American foreign policy and an item on the agenda of every major international organization a major accomplishment of my Administration.

-- Just in the past several years, we have seen the drive for a fuller voice in economic and political life achieve new expression ... in Portugal and Spain and Greece ... in Nigeria and Ghana and Upper Volta ... in Ecuador, Peru and the Dominican Republic ... and elsewhere.

These countries make a compelling case for the proposition that the tide in the world is running toward human rights and that it is in our interest to support it.

The United States cannot claim credit for these developments. But we can find proof in them that our policy of furthering human rights is not only consistent with American ideals. It is consistent with the aspirations of others.

-- I have worked to strengthen international organizations to promote human rights and, in the last two years, the UN and OAS human rights commissions have been improved. The Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) has also proved to be an effective vehicle for pursuing human rights concerns.

-- I have signed and submitted for ratification four important human rights treaties: The Convention on Racial Discrimination; the International UN Covenants on Economic and Social Rights, and on Political and Civil Rights; and the Inter-American Convention on Human Rights.

On arms transfer restraint, progress has been slower and the problems even more intractable. Other nations have not responded cooperatively to our efforts to negotiate international restraints in arms transfer. This is deeply disappointing. Nevertheless, we have devised and put into place a coordinated, overall policy governing U.S. arms transfers. This policy makes arms transfers an instrument of U.S. security and foreign

policy interests, not of profit. In the name of anti-
communism, Governor Reagan seems to be willing to
provide U.S. arms to any regime, however oppressive,
however unpopular with its own people, however shaky.
I am not. Change, the demand of peoples everywhere for
their basic rights, cannot be suppressed by selling arms
to dictators. We have vividly seen this in Central
America.

U.S. national interests are best served by a
careful policy of restraint, in which arms transfers
must be justified by U.S. security or foreign policy
interests. I believe we are doing this.

September 22, 1980

Global Issues: Human Rights Policy

Q: Your Administration has made espousal of human rights a central theme of your foreign policy. Some argue that you have persisted in advocating human rights even when it has damaged other US interests and weakened regimes friendly to the United States. The Republicans charge that you have pressed hardest on our friends and little on Marxist regimes with the worst human rights records, such as the Soviet Union, Vietnam and Cuba.

You have contrasted your pursuit of human rights and "morality" in foreign affairs with the supposed indifference to these considerations by the previous Administration. In view of the harm to US interests in key areas, such as Iran, Central America and Africa, of your pursuit of human rights, do you intend to continue to assert this as a global, universal US objective? Are you now ready to show discrimination and weigh other US objectives as well, before attacking a regime for alleged abuses?

More generally, what do you believe is the role of "morality" or idealism in international relations? Do you believe nations act idealistically, or do they pursue their national self-interest?

Response

When I became President, I emphasized our commitment as a nation to human rights as a fundamental tenet on which our foreign policy was based. The commitment of mine is as deep and as important to me today as it was then. It is as central to America's interests now as when our nation was first born. Then, as now, our commitment to human rights persists in our own country and also worldwide. Beyond Europe, we have sought in Africa, Asia, Latin America, to stand behind basic principles of respect for the individual, for fair trials, for political liberty, and for economic and social justice.

We have made it clear the the United States believes that torture cannot be tolerated under any circumstances, and that

officially sanctioned so-called "disappearances" are abhorrent in any society. We have insisted on the right of free movement everywhere. So we have worked hard to give aid to the world's refugees, compelled to flee from oppression and hardship.

As we have maintained these policies as a government, sometimes they have been criticized as being incompatible with our national security interests. The Republican Party has stated that it will return to the fundamental principle of treating a friend as a friend, without apology. I do not believe that we should simply drop our human rights concerns because a country is anti-communist. Not when that country imprisons and tortures its citizens. Throughout my Administration, we have maintained our opposition to such activities and we will continue to do so. We pursue these policies because we recognize that both our country and our world are more secure when basic human rights are respected internationally. In pursuing our values, we enhance our own security.

Let no one doubt that our words and actions have left their mark on the rest of the world. Many governments have released their political prisoners. Others have lifted states of seige, curtailed indiscriminate arrests, and reduced the use of torture. We have seen several dictatorships, some of them in this hemisphere change into democracies. And, because of our leadership, the defense of human rights now has its rightful place on the world agenda for everyone to see.

My own faith in the ultimate outcome of this struggle is undimmed. Our nation's role must be in doubt. One of the best ways to express this commitment is to quote from the words of Archibald MacLeish, "There are those who will say that the liberation of humanity, the freedom of man and mind, is nothing but a dream. They are right. It is. It's the American dream."

Gov. Reagan on Human Rights

Reagan's attitude toward human rights stems from the belief that while the Soviet Union drives for world dominion, we confuse our friends and allies with the selective application of our policy of human rights, making it that much easier for the Soviets to attain their goals:

"While the Soviets arrogantly warn us to stay out of their way, we occupy ourselves by looking for human rights violations in those countries which have historically been our friends and allies."

Chicago Council on
Foreign Relations
March 17, 1980

Latin America

Reagan's disregard for the basic precepts of human rights is obvious in the admiring way he speaks on Argentina after three years of rule by a military dictatorship. Reagan quoted an economic advisor to the junta.

"...in the process of bringing stability to a terrorized nation of 25 million, a small number (of people) were caught in the cross fire, among them a few innocents."

Radio Transcript
August, 1979

African - Southern Africa

As for South Africa, Reagan favors a hands-off policy:

"Isn't it time we laid off South Africa for awhile?...As for letting South Africans work at solving their problems while we solve our own, all in favor say 'Aye.'"

Radio Transcript
October 22, 1976

Gov. Reagan on Non-proliferation

A Reagan Administration might not be concerned with pursuing a non-proliferation strategy:

"I just don't think it's (non-proliferation) any of our business."

Washington Post
January 31, 1980

Reagan clarified his assertion by adding:

"I think that all of us would like to see non-proliferation, but I don't think that any of us are succeeding in that. We are the only one in the world that's trying to stop it. The result is we have increased our problems would be eased if this government would allow the reprocessing of nuclear waste into plutonium..."

Monterey, Peninsula Herald
February 3, 1980

September 18, 1980

Global Issues: Non-Proliferation Policy

Q: Your Administration seems to be retreating from its strong commitment to pursue tough nuclear non-proliferation policies. Many say the technological genie is out of the bottle, and that this is why your policy of denying US technology is a failure. How do you assess proliferation dangers now, after four years in office, and what actions do you intend to take to slow the spread of nuclear weapons in a second term?

Response

Non-proliferation has been a key objective of my Administration. It will continue to be. American leadership in stopping the spread of nuclear weapons and explosive technology is essential. Governor Reagan has stated that he does not believe non-proliferation is "any of our business." I could not disagree more. Non-proliferation is a vital American security interest. The spread of nuclear weapons could create or exacerbate regional instabilities. It multiplies the chances that nuclear weapons will be used.

Progress in non-proliferation is difficult. Nations are being asked to accept international inspection of their nuclear activities, and to forego the option of nuclear weapons. This is a great deal to ask of sovereign nations. That the vast majority have done this -- 114 nations have signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty -- indicates widespread agreement that the spread of nuclear weapons or explosive technology adds to no one's security. But in return for this limitation, non-nuclear-weapon-states demand -- rightly, in my judgment -- that the nuclear-

weapon states make progress in curbing the nuclear arms race. Nonproliferation and nuclear arms control are inter-related, and I intend to continue to press forward on both fronts. Apparently Governor Reagan would not.

Important progress has been made toward U.S. non-proliferation objectives in the last four years.

-- Working with Congress, we have developed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act, which requires that nations working to enjoy the benefits of U.S. nuclear cooperation must accept controls on their nuclear activities.

-- We are renegotiating existing bilateral nuclear cooperation agreements to bring them into conformity with the strong non-proliferation policies contained in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act.

-- The International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation, which I initiated in 1977, successfully concluded in March 1980. It demonstrated that nuclear suppliers and recipients can work together, and it heightened international understanding of the technology, risks and economies of the nuclear fuel cycle.

-- We have concluded the Second Review Conference of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The conference reaffirmed the continuing value and importance of the NPT, and their determination to strengthen it. There was considerable dissatisfaction, which we share, with the pace of nuclear arms control negotiations. But progress was made on a number of issues, and I am convinced that the NPT regime remains fundamentally sound and healthy.

Global Issues: Arms Transfer Policy

Q: As a candidate in 1976 you stated that the United States should cease being the arms merchant of the world. Soon after you took office, a restrictive policy on conventional arms transfers was applied.

What has become of your goal of limiting conventional arms transfers? Haven't you abandoned this effort after it caused serious problems with friendly governments and lost US defense industry sales markets to European arms producers? What is present US policy on arms transfers? Are you going to take a more pragmatic approach to US arms transfers, giving arms to regimes which support US interests, even if they are not as democratic as we would like?

Response

I remain committed to a policy of restraint on arms transfers. This has been a principal objective of my Administration and it will remain so.

From the outset of my Administration, I have tried to make US arms transfer serve two basic goals:

-- To facilitate those transfers that clearly serve the security interests of the United States, our allies and friends;

-- To restrain transfers which are clearly in excess of legitimate security needs, which could promote regional arms races or increase instability.

In short, our purpose in supplying arms is security, not profit.

Frankly, I have been disappointed at the failure of other major arms suppliers to respond to our efforts to promote international restraint. Based on this lack of multilateral cooperation, this year I directed that the

ceiling on the dollar value of US arms transfers outside NATO, Japan, Australia and New Zealand not be reduced; it will remain at last year's level. In addition, I have approved the development and production of the FX export fighter. This exception to my policy of not producing weapons solely for export was justified by the need by our allies and friends for a sophisticated aircraft to replace the F-5E, but who do not need aircraft as advanced as the F-16.

I emphasize that these actions do not mean that our policy of restraint has ended. The basic guidelines for US arms transfers that I established in 1977 remain in effect, and I intend to continue to apply them.

-- We are working to encourage regional cooperation and restraint. I have sent to the Senate Protocol I of the Treaty of Tlatelolco which will contribute to the lessening of nuclear dangers for our Latin American neighbors. I urge its ratification by the Senate.

-- The Senate has ratified the Treaty with the International Atomic Energy Agency to permit limited inspection of U.S. peaceful nuclear facilities, though not nuclear facilities with a national security significance. This action will help us strengthen the IAEA's inspections capabilities. It will also help us to argue to other states that the Non-Proliferation Treaty and safeguards are not discriminatory and that we, along with Britain and France, also accept them.

More countries will approach the nuclear weapons threshold in the decade ahead, some with uncertain intentions in regions of tension and conflict. The time remaining to reduce the appeal of nuclear weapons and to develop safer ways to address legitimate energy needs is slipping away. Our non-proliferation efforts are more vital now than every before.

Persian Gulf Oil

Q: In the energy field we import, as you know, 50 percent of our domestic petroleum requirements. The economics forced upon us are clear: we need to reduce demand and increase supplies. The hard part is doing this. How successful has the Carter Administration been?

What would happen to the U.S. economy if the Persian Gulf oil was cut off? What would happen to Europe's economy if its Persian Gulf oil was cut off?

Response:

The current hostilities between Iran and Iraq -- and the threat this conflict poses for world oil resources -- clearly demonstrates the need for stability in the Persian Gulf. This region supplies 60 percent of world oil imports, which is equivalent to:

- 40 percent of world oil consumption
- 15 percent of U.S. oil consumption
- 60 percent of Western Europe's oil consumption
- 85 percent of Japan's oil consumption.

The conflict between Iran and Iraq has caused considerable concern that world oil supplies might be severely reduced, therefore driving up oil prices and endangering the economic security of the consuming nations. This concern is not justified by the present situation. It is true that oil companies and shipments directly to Iran and Iraq have been interrupted or suspended during the outbreak of

the hostilities. But even if this suspension of Iran and Iraqi shipments should persist for an extended period of time, the consuming nation's can compensate for this shortfall.

Oil inventories in the world's major oil-consuming nations are now at an all time high. The world's margin of oil supply security is much greater today than in the winter of 1978 and 1979, when the Iranian revolution reduced oil supplies at a time when reserve oil supplies were very low.

Our greater security today is due in part to energy conservation and also to the substitution of other fuels for oil, both in the United States and in other consuming nations.

This has facilitated the building up of reserve stocks to much more satisfactory levels than in 1979. Hence, there is no reason for a repetition of the shortages or the price escalation that resulted in 1979. Of course, a total suspension of oil exports from the other nations who ship through the Persian Gulf region would create a serious threat to the world's oil supplies and consequently, a threat to the economic health of all nations.

It is for this reason that we must continue to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. We have been aware of this need for some time, since the 1973 oil embargo. Only within the last three years, however, have we as a nation taken action. Today, the United States is importing 20 percent less oil than the day I took office. That amounts to one-and-a-half million barrels of oil less every day. We cannot, however, rest on this accomplishment. We must do more. Our national security requires it.

September 29, 1980

North/South: Helping the Poor Nations

Q: Recent reports on the state of the world (the Brandt Report, e.g.) are bleak indeed, pointing to a growing gap between the rich and the poor countries, hinting at the inevitability of mass famine, and raising the spectre of wars of redistribution.

Is there any cause for optimism about the future of North/South relations? What, specifically, can the United States do to assist the world's poor? Has the United States moved toward meeting its part of the Bonn Summit commitment to increase development assistance?

Response:

The conditions in the Brandt report and other reports are not inevitable. The projections should be seen as timely warnings that will alert the nations of the world to the need for vigorous, determined action, at both the national and international levels.

To avert global disaster, I believe the United States must assist the developing world to:

- slow the rate of unchecked population growth;
- combat world hunger;
- increase energy production and conservation.

To do this, my Administration has taken the following steps:

- U.S. bilateral programs administered by A.I.D. for agricultural and nutrition have increased from \$474 million in 1977 to \$758 million planned for 1981;

-- U.S. bilateral assistance to increase energy production in developing nations has doubled in the past two years.

We have also assisted the World Bank in its efforts to meet these problems:

-- World Bank lending for agriculture and rural development during the 1977-1979 period exceeded \$8 billion;

-- World Bank lending for fossil fuel development in poor countries is projected to reach \$5.6 billion over the next five years;

The problems that the Brandt report points to are of concern to every American. They can be solved only through cooperation among the developed and developing nations of the world. Let me give you an example of some successes we could have in the area of world food production. By the mid-1980's we could help Thailand export an additional five million tons of grain, bring four million acres under irrigation in Bangladesh, double cereal production in Peru, and bring a number of African countries to food self-sufficiency. I might add that in India, through the "green revolution" and the work of the International Rice Research Institute, agriculture has been built up sufficiently so that the country can now feed its hugh population.

The United States, of course, cannot assure a world without poverty, disease, and deprivation. But we can be certain that without technical and financial assistance from us, these aims will become immeasurably more difficult to attain.

Trade: Disincentives

Q: Are there too many government "disincentives" in the trade area and, if so, which ones do you propose to curtail?

A: There may be disincentives that need to be pruned out of our laws and regulations to allow the United States a competitive opportunity in the world marketplace. My Administration has already overturned hindersome government regulations in the automobile industry and is presently reviewing other industries to see if outdated, unfair, or unreasonable regulations exist.

In a report I sent to Congress last month, I outlined several new initiatives in the export area. I have set in motion plans to provide tax relief for Americans working abroad for U.S. companies; we will work to remove ambiguities in the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act; and, we are determined to improve Eximbank financing. I have also taken steps to ensure that the Government stops issuing separate U.S. re-export licenses in cases where we already approved re-export of the same product as part of COCOM.

But, disincentives are only the tip of the iceberg; our trade problems are much more broadly based, and require a truly major effort on several fronts if we are to be successful in meeting this challenge.

In the auto industry, for example, we need a new tax policy, with major changes in depreciation and investment opportunities (including a refundable investment tax credit)

to spur the modernization of our nation's factories. We need more attention to research and development to stimulate the great American genius for technological innovation in the private sector, especially toward more fuel-efficient automobiles. Greater investment in R&D may lead to breakthroughs in battery technology which would make the electric car more competitive. We need increased attention to export promotion, using the Export-Import Bank, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, and other agencies more energetically in this field. The formation of trading companies, on the Japanese model, is also an intriguing possibility.

In a word, we need a new U.S. industrial policy, consisting of a unified effort by government, industry, and labor to restore the United States once more to its preeminent position as a world trader. One of the most hopeful signs I have seen in this regard are the recent efforts of management and labor in the auto industry to seek together new ways to work as a team, each dedicated to enhancing the quality of the product and the morale of the working man and woman.

Trade: Access to Foreign Markets

Q: Trade, ideally, is a two way street; yet, Japan exports in large volume to the United States but seems reluctant to open her market equally to our products.

Is this an accurate assessment and, if so, what would you do about it if reelected?

A: From 1950 through the early 1970s, Japan was a highly protectionist country. Lately, though, the Japanese have opened their market considerably in response to pressures from the United States and the Third World. Despite this encouraging sign, I intend to press upon the Japanese, through negotiations, the importance of prompt removal of residual barriers to imported automobiles and spare parts from the United States, as well as other products, including telecommunications equipment, processed foods, cosmetics, medical devices, and cigarettes. The trade barriers against U.S. agricultural products are particularly notorious. Japan must open its market more fully and do more to facilitate imports from our country if we are to continue our liberal trade relationship with the Japanese.

Nowhere could the Japanese demonstrate goodwill better than by a decision to adhere to the Government Procurement Code negotiated in Geneva -- including a decision to make all procurement of the Nippon Telephone and Telegraph Company subject to the obligations of the Code. The Japanese auto companies must also overcome their reluctance to pursue actively opportunities for marketing American cars in Japan and purchasing American-made new and replacement parts -- efforts which could help to reduce protectionist pressures against Japanese autos.

At the invitation of my Administration, a Japanese Auto Components Buying Mission visited the United States in September. The full benefit of this mission will not, of course, be realized overnight. With U.S. parts-making capacity readily available, however, it should be possible soon to see tangible results in the form of contracts in some cases, and in other cases, concrete steps toward contracts. I regard concrete results from this mission to be an extremely important contribution by Japanese firms to improving the present climate, creating jobs, and improving the prospects of the depressed U.S. auto parts industry.

A second mission from Japan also visited the United States in September to explore opportunities to license U.S. production of official Japanese auto parts, and to explore joint ventures or other forms of investment opportunities in the United States. This mission provided another opportunity for positive steps to restore better balance to automobile trade through economically viable production arrangements and investments in the United States.

The Japanese Government has agreed on the need for significant and lasting results from the auto parts buying and investment missions. Our two governments will monitor closely the missions' results.

The U.S. automobile industry must meet its responsibilities, too, by manufacturing automobiles

suitable for mass sales in foreign markets and adopting a more aggressive and intelligent marketing approach. As former Special Trade Representative Bob Strauss has noted, there are 1,250 to 1,500 representatives of Japanese firms in New York today and every one of them speaks English well and presents his products and sales arguments effectively. They are selling Japanese merchandise, and this is in New York City alone. In Tokyo, there are probably 20 or 25 -- certainly less than 100 -- Americans selling American products, and scarcely any of them speaks Japanese. We can do better than this.

With government, industry, and labor working more imaginatively together, we can compete with the best here and abroad.

September 29, 1980

Trade: Export Promotion

Q: The GOP Platform paints a dark portrait of the Carter Administration's competence -- and sheer interest -- in matters of export promotion. What has your Administration done to help U.S. trade performance?

Response:

The truth of the matter is that there has been almost twenty years of neglect in our export program, crossing party lines and the public and private sectors. Since the Kennedy Round in 1963, we have been slipping backwards.

We have had an accumulation of complacency, of ignoring the problem. There is enough blame to go around to industry, labor, various administrations and the Congress. We have had the luxury of a large market right here in the United States, and we have relied on it. Too heavily.

My Administration has begun to reverse these years of neglect. Under the direction of my Special Trade Representative, we brought to a successful conclusion the multilateral trade negotiations, the most ambitious set of negotiations to reduce barriers to international trade in a decade.

The reorganization of the Federal government trade agencies which I directed will assure more effective and prompt governmental action to exploit the export opportunities afforded by the MTN agreements.

On another front, the Administration and the United States coal industry are launching joint marketing efforts to make this country a major exporter of steam coal. With assurance of a reliable United States coal supply at competitive prices, many of the electric power plants to be built in the 1980's and 1990's can be coal-fired rather than oil-burning. Coal exports will help us pay for our declining but costly oil imports.

I have also directed the Export-Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation to give special emphasis to export promotion in all of their new projects.

In this connection, it is important for us to keep in mind that American exports have been increasing more rapidly to Third World countries than any other nations except Japan. This new market means jobs for Americans. It also demonstrates why we must continue to work with the Third World and to assist these financial institutions, such as the World Bank, in their efforts to provide help to the developing nations.

Trade: Increasing Productivity

Q: There is a good deal of talk these days about the lack of investment and productivity by American industry. Certainly we lag behind our major competitors, especially the Japanese. What can the Federal Government do to increase investment and worker productivity, or is this a problem for industry alone to resolve?

Response: I am very pleased to see that in the United States there is a growing consensus in favor of developing a new industrial policy designed to rebuild our factories, regain a competitive edge in the world marketplace, and restore the reputation of our country as a place where high-quality products are manufactured.

Specifically, my Administration will accelerate its efforts to pass new investment tax policies in the Congress (such as a refundable investment tax credit), direct expenditures toward innovative research and development, and encourage new avenues of export promotion.

We need a new vision of our industrial future, a new partnership of labor, management, and Government working together to promote U.S. business abroad. We can no longer afford the antagonisms that have plagued industry for so long. Toward this end, industry and labor can do its part to enhance worker morale and the quality of the product; and the Government can help with needed tax provisions, increased R&D expenditures, export promotion, clarification of antitrust policy, and the elimination of unnecessary regulatory burdens.

Trade: Japanese Autos

Q: Does the Carter Administration support a temporary Orderly Marketing Agreement to curb Japanese auto imports?

Response: Trade Adjustment Actions

My Administration has sought to facilitate the retooling of our industry to permit production of small, fuel-efficient, competitive autos. We have also sought to reduce the burdens borne by workers during this transitional period. In cooperation with the Congress, We have provided special financial assistance to the beleaguered Chrysler Corporation and are developing, through tax policy, capital formation incentives.

In July, I announced a number of specific actions including relaxation of some regulatory requirements; new adjustment assistance benefits to aid communities severely affected by the changes in the auto industry; tax relief proposals; and, a package of loan programs to aid automobile dealers. I also called for a joint industry, labor, and government Automobile Industry Committee to undertake a continuing dialogue on industry concerns. Members of this committee met in Detroit this September to organize and set their agenda. I have also encouraged Japanese investment in the United States in automotive manufacturing facilities. To date, Honda and Nissan have announced plans to produce cars and trucks in the United States. Nissan has yet to definitively pick a plant site. Toyota, the largest Japanese exporter to this market, continues to study investment possibilities here.

To promote an increase in our exports to Japan, we have reached an agreement with the Japanese Government on a number of measures designed to increase access to the Japanese market for U.S. made automobiles, parts and components. In May, the Japanese Government agreed to eliminate import duties next spring on most automobile parts, ameliorate the impact of certain Japanese standards, and send automobile parts buying and investment missions to the United States. These missions visited our country in September and the tangible results of these visits will be seen in the form of contracts and other arrangements to restore better balance to automobile trade.

Request for Import Relief

In spite of the adjustment actions taken by the Administration, the Congress, and most importantly, the industry itself, many Americans continue to be concerned that the unprecedented Japanese shipments during this transitional period will permanently alter the structure of our automobile market to the disadvantage of American companies and workers.

This situation has led to calls in our country for import restrictions. The United Auto Workers and Ford Motor Company have petitioned the U.S. International Trade Commission for temporary import relief under the provisions of Section 201 of the Trade Act of 1974. At my request, the ITC has accelerated the schedule for its decision. If the U.S. International Trade Commission finds that imports of automobiles are a substantial cause of injury, or threat thereof, and recommends import

relief, then I will be authorized under our domestic law to restrict auto imports by means of tariffs, quotas, tariff-rate quotas, or orderly marketing agreements.

So the framework created by law to examine claims for import relief is presently engaged. This process should be allowed to operate. While that investigation is in progress, U.S. efforts to obtain restraints on Japanese imports would be inconsistent with the procedures set forth in the Trade Act of 1974.

Decline of the Dollar

Q: What is your response to the GOP charge that "the economic policy of the Carter Administration has led to the most serious decline in the value of the dollar in history"?

Response: When I took office in 1977, we had just experienced a long recession which had put a great strain on the world economy and on the international financial system. The origins of that recession were in a tangle of complicated economic decisions made by both parties over the last two decades. By late 1976, the world economy was in a very precarious situation. To put it bluntly, I had inherited a mess.

My Administration immediately undertook a program of economic expansion to end the recession. I recognized at the time that vigorous economic expansion in this country, without expansion in other countries, could worsen the U.S. trade position. I also understood that the resulting trade imbalance could lead to the depreciation of the dollar relative to some other currencies

It was necessary, however, for the United States to go ahead alone. Not to have done so would have courted far graver dangers for the world economy -- extreme financial difficulties for a number of countries and increasing protectionist actions in most of the industrialized countries.

Today the dollar has regained its strength, despite
Republican exaggerations to the contrary. The dollar
will be the world's leading currency for a long time
to come. The United States current account deficit,
which was \$16 billion in 1978, is near balance this year.
We have achieved a fundamental redirection.

September 18, 1980

Intelligence Reform

Q: The Republican Platform states that "ill-considered restrictions sponsored by the Democrats" have "debilitated US intelligence capabilities..."

Are the CIA and other intelligence agencies hobbled by restrictions imposed by Democrats?

What changes do you recommend to improve our intelligence capabilities?

RESPONSE

The charge made by Governor Reagan that our intelligence agencies no longer function effectively is dead wrong. We have the best intelligence services in the world and I intend to keep them that way.

In addition, over the past four years, I have worked for intelligence reform. It was a part of my campaign for the presidency in 1976, a part of the Democratic Platform that year, and a part of my legislative package each year. In 1978 we achieved the passage of a sensible statute on wire-tap authorization. This year we should have legislation -- long over-due -- to protect the identities of intelligence employees, and an oversight bill for foreign intelligence operations. In each of these measures, great care has been taken to ensure that no restraints are placed on the intelligence agencies that would interfere with their authorized duties.

Gov. Reagan on Intelligence Reform

Foreign Intelligence

Reagan believes the decline of America's intelligence capabilities is due to Congress and the President.

"...a Democratic Congress, aided and abetted by the Carter Administration, has succeeded in shackling and demoralizing our intelligence services to the point that they no longer function effectively as a part of our defenses."

Speech to Chicago Council on
Foreign Relations
March 17, 1980

The Republican Platform calls for:

"A Republican Administration will seek to improve U.S. intelligence capabilities for technical clandestine collection, cogent analysis, coordinated counterintelligence, and covert action.

"We will reestablish the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board...

"Republicans will undertake an urgent effort to rebuild the intelligence agencies...We will propose legislation to enable intelligence officers and their agents to operate safely and efficiently abroad.

"We will provide our government with the capability to help influence international events vital to our national security interests..."

1980 Republican Platform

Domestic Intelligence

Reagan would appear not to preclude the using of the intelligence agencies to spy on American citizens.

"...in insuring the security of the people and the nation, there may come times you have to spy on your own people.

Los Angeles Times
March 21, 1975

Gov. Reagan on Intelligence Reform

Reagan has also stated:

"I have commented before about what I think is the Justice Department's foolishness in rendering our FBI and CIA impotent, all in the name of privacy."

Reagan Radio Broadcast
February, 1979

September 21, 1980

Refugees

Q: Recently we have witnessed the spectacle of thousands of Cubans pouring into the United States illegally, some of them apparently criminal elements. What have you done to control this situation and, more generally, how can the US aid desperate refugees in the future?

Response

The problem of refugees and displaced persons is serious, widespread, and -- I regret to say -- growing. More than 15 million inhabitants of our planet have fled their homes in recent years because of wars, civil disturbances, persecution, or hostile government policies. The past year alone has witnessed the flight of more than 1.2 million Afghans, 1 million Somalis, and hundreds of thousands of Kampucheans and others who remain homeless and miserable. Ours is becoming an epoch of refugees.

Since 1975, the United States has welcomed over 600,000 refugees for permanent resettlement. In the past year alone, we have taken in well over 230,000 refugees; and this total does not include the over 150,000 Cubans and Haitians now in the United States, seeking to settle here. We are doing everything we can to assist refugees from around the world who look to us for help. For example, I remain deeply committed to the support of the massive relief program undertaken by the international community through ICRC/UNICEF for relief of the Khmer people inside Kampuchea and along the Thai border. We also fully support the UNHCR program to help the many Khmer in Thai holding centers.

But we need help if we are to help them. The massive burdens that are imposed when thousands of people migrate, as with the chaotic flow of Cubans into our country, require attention that transcends national boundaries. The task of resettlement must be shared on an equitable basis so that no single nation or group of nations is faced with the entire refugee burden. I am encouraging regional associations to work closely with international agencies like the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees and the Inter-governmental Committee for Refugee Migration to develop procedures for coping with these complex problems.

And, despite the refusal of Cuba to cooperate in devising orderly, legal arrangements for dealing with the migration of Cuban refugees to this country, we are working tirelessly to resettle and accommodate these individuals as quickly and safely as their large numbers will allow.

I recently announced a new three-point plan to improve our response to this challenge. This plan acknowledges the federal responsibility for the refugee burden placed upon state and local government; strengthens law enforcement efforts to bar additional illegal immigrants; and, establishes a new and more efficient resettlement center, allowing the closure of some refugee sites.

Gov. Reagan on Refugees .

Reagan supported a "Berlin airlift--massive and swift" to rescue those Cuban residents seeking political asylum from Castro. (Dallas Times Herald, April 10, 1980)

The United Nations

Q: The United Nations has a league of critics, Governor Reagan among them. There are those who dismiss it as a drain on our resources, an impediment to our bilateral diplomatic relations, a theater of the absurd. More recently a special session of the UN spent several days attacking Israel. Critics say the UN is anti-American and anti-democratic. Many Americans have grown weary of handing out foreign aid to so-called friendly nations around the world only to see them vote against us on the floor of the General Assembly.

To what extent are these conclusions valid, and why should the United States continue to honor its legal obligations to the UN?

Response: My Administration supports the United Nations and will continue to do so. I strongly oppose the view Governor Reagan once expressed that we should serve notice that we are going home to sit for a while.

Despite the myths surrounding the UN, many of which Governor Reagan seems to have accepted, the fact is the United States is not now, nor has it ever been, the outvoted victim of most United Nations resolutions.

In the area of human rights for example, what for some appeared to have been a lonely American concern, the United Nations today is a major forum for improving the standards of human rights and in promoting actions to protect them.

We don't always get our way, of course. The United Nations has almost a hundred new nations, each free of colonial bondage and fiercely independent. We are no

longer in the position of dictating our will. And,
sometimes we strongly oppose actions taken by the
UN. The 1975 UN condemnation of Zionism as racism was
deplorable. The recent special session on the Middle
East was totally one-sided and inexcusable.

Despite this, those who still think of the
United Nations as an unfriendly and dangerous place
should remember some of its recent acts, such as the
decision of the International Courts of Justice on the
hostages in Iran and the overwhelming condemnation of
the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Our country needs
the UN as much as it needs us.

Gov. Reagan on the U.N.

In the past, Reagan has, on special occasions, implied that the United States should withdraw from the United Nations. The first occasion arose in 1971 when the issue of admitting China to the United Nations was being discussed.

"I was also disgusted and very frankly I think that it confirms the moral bankruptcy of that international organization..I don't know whether to withdraw totally from the adjuncts of the United Nations. You know the service organizations surrounding it are doing good work."

Press Conference
October 26, 1971

In 1975, when the United Nations condemned Zionism as racism, Reagan suggested that if the U.N. continues its present conduct, the United States should serve notice "we're going to go home and sit a while."

Los Angeles Times
November 17, 1975

Reagan has also attacked various organs of the United Nations including UNESCO. In 1977 when the head of UNESCO, Sean MacBride, attacked the capitalist system, Reagan gave his reply.

"...UNESCO--the United Nationsl Educational, Scientific and cultural organization...May actually be a base for communist espionage."

Jefferson City Post
December 15, 1977

Reagan Themes:
Foreign Policy and National Security

1. The Soviet Union surpasses us in virtually every category of military strength.
2. The only place we search for human rights violations is among our historically friends and allies.
3. We have been dishonored (by Soviet and Cuban adventurism, murdered US diplomats, captive hostages); we have lost our pride.
4. We have been apologetic at best about American capitalism as a model for economic development.
5. Our government taxes industry too heavily and undermines our international competitiveness.
6. Our antitrust laws harm US competitiveness and benefit foreign competitors.
7. The Democrats have neglected our military strength and only after Afghanistan have awakened to the Soviet threat.
8. Even after Afghanistan, Carter's military budget leaves us totally unable to match Soviet buildup (three times ours in strategic arms, nearly twice ours in conventional arms).
9. Our defense posture must be invigorated across the board.
10. We must have a faster remedy to our land-based missile vulnerability than Carter's complex and costly new missile system.
11. We need higher pay and better management of the all-volunteer force, not hundreds of new bureaucrats to administer or draft registration.
12. We have to maintain a superior Navy.
13. We must restore our intelligence agencies, shackled and demoralized by Democrats in Congress and the Carter Administration.
14. Carter meekly accepted a Soviet buildup in Cuba -- after saying it was "unacceptable."

15. We stand by idly as Marxists topple the dominoes in Latin America, one after the other, leading toward Mexico in one direction and Panama in the other.

16. We pay the lion's share of a bloated UN budget only to see its members criticize us while gazing benignly on Soviet colonialism. (The recent UN condemnation of the invasion into Afghanistan failed even to mention the Soviet Union by name.)

17. We apologize, compromise, withdraw, and retreat, fall silent when insulted and pay ransom when we are victimized.

18. We must regain the reputation of reliability toward our allies.

19. We must rid ourselves of the "Vietnam Syndrome."

20. Detente is largely an illusion.

21. We must above all have a grand strategy.*

* These themes come from the March 17, 1980, Chicago speech. The last one, like many others, remains vague but mainly Reagan seems to mean by this that we must stand tough against Soviet and Cuban military ventures.

Most Notable Reagan Quotes

On Foreign Policy

"In the case of foreign policy, I am equally unimpressed with all this talk about our problems being too complex, too intricate, to allow timely decision and action. The fetish of complexity, the trick of making hard decisions harder to make; the art, finally, of rationalizing the non-decision, have made a ruin of American foreign policy."

Reagan Speech
May 21, 1968

On Military Superiority

"Since when has it been wrong for America to aim to be first in military strength? How is American military superiority "dangerous?"

American Legion
August 20, 1980

On SALT II

"I cannot, however, agree to any treaty, including the SALT II treaty, which, in effect, legitimizes the continuation of a one-sided nuclear arms buildup."

Veterans of Foreign Wars
August 18, 1980

On the Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan

"One option might well be that we surround the island of Cuba and stop all traffic in and out."

New York Times
January 29, 1980

"So when they invaded Afghanistan, maybe that was the time for us to have said, 'Look, don't talk to us about trade. There will be none. Don't talk to us about treaties, like SALT II. We are not going to have any communication with you until (those forces in Afghanistan) are back in the Soviet Union.'"

Time
June 30, 1980

On the Soviet Union

"Let's not delude ourselves, the Soviet Union underlies all the unrest that is going on. If they weren't engaged in the game of dominoes, there wouldn't be any hot spots in the world."

Wall Street Journal
June 3, 1980

"When did the Cold War end?"

Wall Street Journal
June 30, 1980

On CSCE

"Frankly, I have an uneasy feeling that going to Madrid is negating what we thought we could accomplish by boycotting the Olympics. If the athletes can't go, why should the diplomats go?"

Time
June 30, 1980

On Iran

"But some place along the line there had to be an ultimatum. Here again, because we have lost so much influence with freinds and allies, we were not in a position to go to the rest of the world and say, look, this is a violation of international law, and present to them the idea of the world literally quarantining Iran."

Time
June 30, 1980

On US Allies

"I think there is every indication that some of our European friends are beginning to wonder if they shouldn't look more toward -- or have a rapprochement with -- the Soviet Union, because they are not sure whether we are dependable or not."

Time
June 30, 1980

On China and Taiwan

"I would not pretend, as Carter does, that the relationship we now have with Taiwan, enacted by our Congress, is not official."

Associated Press
August 25, 1980

Republican Platform Charges Against the Carter Administration

General

Without a Coherent Strategic Concept
Failure of Leadership, Incompetence
Foreign Policy of Chaos, Confusion, and Failure
Neglect of America's Defense Posture Without Parallel since 1930s
Reduced the Size and Capability of our Nuclear Forces
Defense Programs Cancelled or Delayed
On the Road to a Military Catastrophe
Danger Without Parallel since December 7, 1941
Oblivious to the Scope and Magnitude of the Threat
Lack of Meaningful Response to Use of Soviet Power
Losing the Respect of the World and our Honor
Endangered Energy and Raw Material Lifelines of Western World
Lack of Meaningful Response to Terrorists

National Security

Massive Cuts in U.S. Defense Spending; Reduced Budget by over
\$38 Billion from Ford's last Five-Year Defense Plan
Cut Back Cancelled, or Delayed Every Strategic Initiative Pro-
posed by Ford (Minuteman Missile Production Line, B-1 Bomber,
All Cruise Missiles, M-X, Trident Submarine, Trident II
Missile)
Soviets are Achieving Military Superiority; Moved from Essential
Equivalence to Inferiority in Strategic Nuclear Forces
Failure to Challenge Soviet Use of Surrogate Cuban Forces in
Africa and the Later Soviet Presence in Angola, Ethiopia,
and South Yemen
Mismanagement of Personnel Policy; Shambles of All-volunteer Army
Failure to Maintain Combat Readiness; U.S. Armed Forces at
Lowest State of Preparedness since 1950
Failure to Fund Fully the Space Shuttle Program, As Well As
Advanced Exploration Programs
Ill-informed, Capricious Intrusions of OMB and DOD Office of
Program Analysis and Evaluation have Brought Defense Plan-
ning Full Circle to the Worst Faults of the McNamara Years;
Inefficiency and Paralysis has Led to Huge Cost Overruns
and Protected Delays

Morale of National Intelligence Has Been Eroded; Along with
Public Confidence; National Intelligence Has Underestimated
the Size and Purpose of the Soviet Union's Military Efforts
Fundamentally flawed SALT II Treaty; Cover-up of Soviet Non-
Compliance, Including BW Convention (Sverdlovsk)
Misguided Intentions to Deliver Nuclear Material to India

Foreign Policy

US-Soviet Relations

Present Danger is Greater Than Ever Before in the 200-year
History of the United States
Carter has Encouraged the Most Extensive Raid on American
Technology by the Soviet Bloc since World War II
Partial and Incompetently Managed Grain Embargo
Human Rights in the USSR Ignored
Misleading American People About Soviet Policies and Behavior

NATO and Western Europe

Erosion of Alliance Security and Confidence in the US
Vulnerability of US Increased by Carter's Unilateral Cancellations, Reductions, and Long Delays in the B-1, Trident, M-X, Cruise Missile, and Ship-building Programs, as Has
Fundamentally Flawed SALT II
Alliance Security Decreased by Reversals on Neutron Bomb, Treatment of Future Theater Nuclear Force Modernization, and Manner of Dealing with Terrorist Actions Against Americans Abroad
Caused Disunity in the Alliance; Lack of Close Coordination Regarding Iran, the Middle East, Afghanistan, the Olympic Boycott, Nuclear Proliferation, East-West Trade, Human Rights, North-South Issues

Middle East, Persian Gulf

Carter Administration Involvement with the PLO

The Americas

Precipitous Decline in US Relations with Virtually Every Country in the Region
Undifferentiated Charges of Human Rights Violations
Stands by While Castro Supports Forces of Warfare and Revolution Throughout the Western Hemisphere

Dangerous and Incomprehensible Policies Toward Cuba
 Implementing the Panama Canal Treaties will Cost US Taxpayer
 \$4.2 Billion

Asia and the Pacific

Balance on the Korean Peninsula has Sifted Dangerously Toward
 the North

Africa

Soviet Bases, Tens of Thousands of Cuban Troops, and Soviet-
 Bloc Subversion Unacceptable

Foreign Assistance and Regional Security

Carter Administration has Diminished the Role of American
 Military Assistance and Foreign Military Sales in our
 Foreign Policy

International Economic Policy

International Trade and Economic Policy

Largely Ignored the Role of International Economics

Most Serious Decline in the Value of the Dollar in History

Placed Exporting at the Bottom of its Priority List

Passive Approach to Trade

Failure to Pursue Negotiations Designed to Improve the Access
 of American Exports to Foreign Markets has Contributed, in
 part, to Protectionist Sentiment

Over-burdensome Government Regulations, Excessive Taxation,
 Inflationary Monetary Policy, Unstable Economy

The Security of Energy and Raw Materials Access

Too much Concern has been Lavished on Nations Unable to Carry
 out Sea-bed Mining, with Insufficient Attention Paid to
 Gaining Early American Access to it

Key Proposals in the 1980 Republican Platform

National Security

Will seek military superiority

Earliest possible deployment of the M-X missile

New manned strategic penetrating bomber

Deployment of an air defense system

Accelerate deployment of cruise missiles on aircraft, land, ships, and submarines

Research and development of an effective anti-ballistic missile system

Early modernization of our theater nuclear forces

Deployment in Europe of medium-range cruise missiles, ballistic missiles, enhanced radiation warheads, and the modernization of nuclear artillery

A permanent fleet in the Indian Ocean

Restoration of tactical aircraft development; increase in stocks of ammunition, spare parts, and supplies

Increase airlift capability; increase our aerial tanker fleet

Restore Navy fleet to 600 ships at a rate equal to or exceeding that planned by Ford

Improve all-volunteer force; no draft (or draft registration)

Correct the great inequities in pay and benefits of career military personnel

Increase funding for R&D

Support a vigorous space research program

Improve U.S. intelligence capabilities for collection, analysis, counterintelligence, and covert action

Support legislation to invoke criminal sanctions against anyone who discloses the identities of U.S. intelligence officers abroad; support amendment to the FOIA and Privacy Act

Repeal ill-considered restrictions sponsored by Democrats, which have debilitated U.S. intelligence capabilities while easing the subversion efforts of our adversaries

Foreign Policy

U.S.-Soviet Relations

Oppose the transfer of high technology to the Soviet Union and its Eastern European satellites

Call for the immediate lifting of the grain embargo

Insist on full Soviet compliance with the humanitarian provisions of the Helsinki agreement

Publicize to the world the fundamental differences in the two systems through RFE/RL

End the cover-up of Soviet violations of SALT I and II

NATO and Western Europe

Categorically reject unilateral moratoria on the deployment by the U.S. and NATO of theater nuclear weapons; oppose arms control agreements that interfere with the transfer of military technology to our Allies

Call for the integration of Spain into the North Atlantic Alliance

Middle East, Persian Gulf

Reject any call for involvement with the PLO

Keep Jerusalem an undivided city

The Americas

Oppose the aid program for Nicaragua

Return to the fundamental principle of treating a friend as a friend and self-proclaimed enemies as enemies, without apology; make it clear to the Soviet Union and Cuba that their subversion and their build-up of offensive military forces is unacceptable

Admit Puerto Rico to the Union

Seek a North America Accord between the U.S., Canada
and Mexico

Asia and the Pacific

Strongly support a substantially increased Japanese
national defense effort

Provide full economic aid and military material to assist
Thailand in repelling Vietnamese aggression

No expanded relations with Vietnam

Press for full accounting of Americans still listed
as missing in action

Regard any attempt to alter Taiwan's status by force
as a threat to peace in the region; give priority
consideration to Taiwan's defense requirements

Africa

Devote major resources to development on a bilateral
basis

Rebuild U.S. military assistance and foreign arms sales

International Economic Policy

Adopt an aggressive export policy

Will not stand idly by as the jobs of millions of Americans
in domestic industries, such as automobiles, textiles,
steel, and electronics are jeopardized and lost

Elimination of disincentives for exporters, including
inhibitive statutes and regulations

Work with trading partners to eliminate subsidies to
exports and dumping

Eliminate excessive taxation of Americans working abroad

Revitalize merchant marine

Domestic economic and regulatory policy must be adjusted
to remove impediments to greater development of our
own energy and raw materials resources

Anderson, Themes:
Foreign Policy and National Security

1. Maintain a stable balance by preserving essential equivalence with the Soviet Union.
2. US must put its economic house in order; rebuilding economy is starting point for international recovery.
3. US must restore historic alliances; rely heavily on collective security arrangements with our principle allies in NATO and Japan.
4. Must modernize and diversify our strategic arsenal.
5. No MX -- "American ingenuity can devise a more flexible and more cost-effective solution."
6. Will take steps to complete SALT II process; invigorate the international quest for arms control.
7. Superpower relationship cannot be allowed to degenerate further; must maintain "active communications" with the Soviets, particularly when tensions are high.
8. Emphasize versatile and usable forces to counter any conventional attack on our vital interests.
9. Establish and maintain peace in the Middle East; oppose Palestinian state; move US Embassy to Jerusalem.
10. Carefully nurture new relationship with China.
11. No more important partner than Mexico.
12. Providing economic aid to Nicaragua promotes an atmosphere of moderation.
13. Open a wider window to India.
14. Cooperate with the developing nations in ways which respect their individuality and independence, and which serve our mutual interests in trade and development.
15. Urges Japan to expand its foreign aid and its security role; encourages Japan to build more plants in US, and remove curbs on US goods (especially in telecommunications, computers, semiconductors).

16. Would continue present informal military and economic relations with Taiwan.

17. Greater IMF help for LDC's energy development.

18. Discourages US investments in South Africa "whenever possible in cooperation with our allies;" encourages compliance with UN arms embargo.

19. Strong human rights stance; urges continued denial of foreign aid to governments violating human rights; criticizes US banks and corporations for underwriting US policy by providing loans and investments to nations ineligible for government aid.

20. Linkage of trade with Soviet bloc to emigration flows.

21. Urges that foreign assistance be channeled through multilateral agencies wherever possible.

22. Claims "benign neglect" has characterized export administration, and proposes various remedies including:

- expanded Eximbank financing;
- reduced taxes on Americans abroad "engaged in export activities;"
- support for export trading companies to help small and medium-sized firms enter export markets.

KEY FOREIGN POLICY AND NATIONAL SECURITY ISSUES:

CONTRASTS AMONG THE CANDIDATES

<u>ISSUE</u>	<u>Carter</u>	<u>Reagan</u>	<u>Anderson</u>
M-X	Yes	Yes	No
Aid to Nicaragua	Yes	No	Yes
SALT II	Yes	No	Yes
Comprehensive Test Ban	Yes	No	Yes
Draft Registration	Yes	No	No
Military Superiority	No	Yes	No
Neutron Bomb in Europe	No	Yes	No
Permanent Indian Ocean Fleet	No	Yes	No
600 Ship Navy	No	Yes	No
More Large Aircraft Carriers	No	Yes	No
Lift Grain Embargo	No	Yes	No
Bilateral Over Multilateral Aid	No	Yes	No
Nuclear Materials to India	Yes	No	No

Key Proposals in the Anderson Platform, 1980

National Security

- Essential Equivalence
- Improve Command, Control, and Communications
- Improve Warning Systems
- Trident, Air-launched Cruise Missiles
- R & D on New Bomber
- Reject M-X ("American ingenuity can devise a more flexible and cost-effective solution. . .")
- Redress Grave Personnel Problems
- Pre-position Equipment Overseas
- Increase Air and Sealift Capability
- Allocate More Resources to Naval Forces
- Complete SALT II Process
- R & D on an Anti-satellite Capability
- Greater Defense Role for Japan

Foreign Policy

- Reinforce NATO
- Stabilize US-USSR Relations
- Support Camp David Accords
- Strengthen Ties to Japan
- Nurture Relations with PRC
- Joint American/Mexican Commission
- No Cuban Military Involvement in Hemisphere
- Economic Aid to Nicaragua
- Wider Window to India
- Anti-apartheid Measures Toward South Africa

Economic Policy

- Work Toward a More Equitable International Economic Order

Gov. Reagan on Foreign Policy

"In the case of foreign policy, I am equally unimpressed with all this talk about our problems being too complex, too intricate, to allow timely decision and action. The fetish of complexity, the trick of making hard decisions harder to make; the art, finally, of rationalizing the non-decision, have made a ruin of American foreign policy."

Reagan Speech
May 21, 1968

Gov. Reagan on Intervention

Reagan's record is filled with examples of suggestions -- some explicit, some implied -- that U.S. intervention be used to resolve international disturbances.

Angola

In response to Soviet involvement in the Angolan civil war, Reagan said the U.S. should have told the Russians:

"Out. We'll let them (Angola) do the fighting, or you're going to have to deal with us."

New York Times
January 6, 1976

Cuba

In response to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, Reagan said:

"One option might well be that we surround the island of Cuba and stop all traffic in and out."

New York Times
January 29, 1980

Cyprus

Reagan has said that, in a manner similar to Eisenhower's deployment of troops to Lebanon, as President he would have favored sending a "token (U.S.) military force" to Cyprus during the 1975 crisis on the island.

New York Times
June 4, 1976

Ecuador

In response to the Ecuadorians' seizure of U.S. tuna boats in 1975, Reagan suggested:

"(T)he U.S. government next winter should send along a destroyer with the tuna boats to cruise, say, 13 miles off the shore of Ecuador in an updated version of Teddy Roosevelt's dictum to "talk softly, but carry a big stick."

Gov. Reagan on Intervention

Lebanon

In the same vein as Eisenhower's deployment of troops to Lebanon, Reagan has said that, as President, he would have sent troops to Lebanon during the 1976 civil war.

New York Times
June 4, 1976

Middle East

Responding to a question on whether the U.S. should establish a military presence in the Sinai to counter the Soviets, Reagan said:

"I think this might be a very, very good time for the United States to show a presence in the Middle East. I don't think it would be provocative and I don't think it looks like anyone bullying..."

Boston Globe
January 13, 1980

North Korea

In response to the North Korean seizure of the U.S.S. Pueblo, Reagan said:

"I cannot for the life of me understand why someone in the United States government, particularly the President, has not said, 'That ship had better come out of that harbor in 24 hours or we are coming in after it.'"

Los Angeles Times
January 25, 1968

Pakistan

After the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, Reagan advocated sending advisers into Pakistan.

"I think the most logical thing is that they (the advisers) would go to the country we have a treaty with, Pakistan, and that training could be provided there, with U.S. and Pakistan where we have a legitimate reason and right to be."

St. Louis Globe-Democrat
January 11, 1980

Reagan also proposed sending "a squadron of planes" to

Gov. Reagan on InterventionPortugal

To prevent a Communist takeover of Portugal in 1975, Reagan said the United States should have acted "in any way to prevent or discourage" the Communists, adding "It was clearly in our interest to do so." But he refused to be more specific.

Los Angeles Times
June 1, 1975

Rhodesia

To ensure an orderly transition in Rhodesia between a minority-white to a black-majority rule, Reagan said:

"Whether it will be enough to have simply a show of strength, a promise that we would (supply) troops or whether you'd have to go in with occupation forces or not I don't know."

New York Times
June 4, 1976

North Vietnam

The Los Angeles Times reported that in a speech to the National Headliners Club Reagan stated that the United States should have met North Vietnam's final thrust in South Vietnam with B-52 bombers.

Los Angeles Times
June 1, 1975