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

June 28, 1983

TO: FRED FIELDING

FROM: DAVID A. STOCKMAN

SUBJECT: CARTER CAMPAIGN MATERIALS

I have reviewed the documents designated #1 - #6. The following are my recollections and observations.

Document #1-A. "Debate Briefing Materials"

To the best of my recollection, I have not previously seen this document. The only section of this document that appears to be similar to the material I received and described in my letter to Chairman Albosta is Part I(3) entitled "Carter Questions and Answers" on "Economy", "Energy and Environment" "Overview", "Government" and "Human Needs". While this section appears to be in a different format, more tightly written and organized, and more addressed to specific debating points than I recall, I would conclude that the substantive content of Section 3 of Document 1-A is similar to material made available to me prior to the debate rehearsals.

The remainder of the document consists of numerous succinct lists of "Key Lines" "Accomplishments", "Promises", "Challenges", "Rebuttals", "Platform Comparisons", "Quotes", and related matters. To the best of my recollection, this type of material was not included in the large volume of xeroxed pages made available to me by the Reagan campaign.

Thus, while my recollection of specific sections and headings is necessarily limited after two and one-half years, it is my strong impression that the material in Part I (1) - (2), and (4) - (9), as well as all of the material in Part II, was not among that which I received on October 23, 1980.

Document #1-B: "Presidential Debate Briefing Papers: Foreign Policy and National Security Material"

This document consists of policy issue materials relating to a variety of foreign policy and defense topics. To the best of my recollection, I have not previously seen this document. However, the individual policy sections are quite similar to the materials I recall having received from the Reagan campaign, described in my letter to Chairman Albosta. This document appears to contain fewer topics, less redundancy and better editing and organization than I recall, but its content is otherwise consistent with my recollections.

Document #2: "Presidential Debates: Foreign Policy and National Security Issues"

This document is consistent - both as to content and format - with my best recollection of the material delivered to me on October 23, 1980. I specifically recall two features of this document:

1) the absence of page numbers in the table of contents, which made it difficult to find specific topics;

2) the extreme redundancy and overlap among the issue briefs, as contained, for example, in the half-dozen specific papers on different aspects of U.S. - NATO relations.

While it is difficult to be absolutely certain about document identity after two and one-half years, it is my strong impression that this document was among the material delivered to me by the Reagan campaign.

Document #3: Miscellaneous Fact Sheets and Quotations

I do not have a distinct recollection of the vast bulk of material contained in this document -- particularly the extensive quotations from vice presidential candidate Bush or the reproduced documents such as the House Armed Services Committee hearing transcript and the Reagan-Bush Committee news release.

However, I note that the document resembles the kind of loosely organized issue compendium material that was contained in the large package of xeroxed pages delivered to me by the Reagan campaign. I would conclude that part or all of this document could have been included in the material delivered to me by the Reagan campaign.

Document #4: Handwritten Note from Myles Martel and Attachment

I have no recollection of seeing this document at any time prior to June 25, 1983.

Document #5: Note from Wayne Valis to David Gergen

I have no recollection of seeing this document at any time prior to June 27, 1983.

Document #6: Debate Briefing Book

My best recollection is that substantial parts of this document were among the materials delivered to me from the Reagan campaign on October 23, 1980.

The Director of Central Intelligence

Washington, D.C. 20505

28 June 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR: The Honorable Fred Fielding
Counsel to the President

SUBJECT: The Carter Briefing Book

1. I have examined the handwritten note from Myles Martel to Frank Hodsoll and the handwritten note from Wayne Vales to David Gergen and the one-page typewritten note attached. I have no recollection of ever seeing any of this before.

2. I have also examined the pile of papers provided to the White House Counsel's office by Francis Hodsoll and David Gergen. I do not recognize them as anything I have seen before. A great many papers came to my desk during September and October of 1980. Any pile of papers two inches high would almost certainly have been set aside to be passed passed along to others in the campaign. However, if papers headed "Presidential Debates, Foreign Policy and National Security Issues" came in, I believe they would have caught my eye or would have been brought to my attention and I would not have forgotten, nor would I have forgotten if anyone came in and handed them to me. Until recent disclosures, I did not know that the campaign had any material from the Carter camp that was not publicly available.

3. As I have already written to Congressman Albosta, the campaign management never contemplated, directed or authorized seeking any inside information from the Carter camp.

William J. Casey

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 28, 1983

MEMORANDUM TO: FRED FIELDING

FROM: JAMES A. BAKER, III

Today the White House is releasing documents from the Carter and Reagan campaigns relating to preparations for the debate between the two of them. My comments on these documents are as follows:

(1)(a) I never saw this book before June 27, 1983. As to the information therein, I specifically do not recall having seen the strategic and tactical information. Some of the policy issue briefing material could have been drawn from the issue material that was in the book I briefly saw, as mentioned in my letter to Congressman Albosta.

(1)(b) I never saw this document before June 27, 1983. As to the information in it, it appears that some of it was derived from items (2) and (3).

(2) These approximately 275 pages of material could have been in the book which I saw briefly and which I referred to in my letter to Congressman Albosta. I think this material is consistent with my description of what I remember seeing, as set forth in my letter to Congressman Albosta, and, indeed, I think the cover sheets support that, (e.g. "Useful for general campaign purposes"; "Responses drawn from speeches, press conferences and other policy statements by the President and senior administration officials").

(3) These approximately 250 pages of material likewise could have been what I remember seeing briefly. I think they too are consistent with my description of what I saw, as set forth in my letter to Congressman Albosta.

(4) I never saw this note or any of the attachments before June 25, 1983.

(5) The cover note is not addressed to me, and I don't recall having seen it before June 27, 1983. By the same token, I have no specific recollection of having received a copy of the one page attachment. I did not solicit a copy, but it is of course possible that one was given to me.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 28, 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR: FRED F. FIELDING
Counsel to the President

FROM: DAVID R. GERGEN DG

SUBJECT: Materials Relating to the 1980 Campaign

In response to your request, I would like to provide you with my best recollections of the materials that the White House is publicly releasing today relating to the 1980 Reagan-Carter debate.

As I have acknowledged on previous occasions, I do not have a precise memory of everything that occurred during the weeks preceding the debate. In the case of events and documents of keen significance at the time, I can generally remember them well (e.g., the briefing book prepared for Governor Reagan). In the case of events and documents that made less of an impression, I am afraid it is difficult for me to reconstruct with certainty.

(1) Letter of transmittal from Patrick Caddell to Richard Hauser

(a) I have no memory whatever of the briefing book submitted to President Carter and provided to the White House yesterday. I can say without hesitation that I did not use that briefing book to prepare debate materials for President Reagan. I am not aware of anyone else on the debate preparation team having such a document.

I cannot attest to whether or not we had an early draft of the question and answer materials relating to domestic policy (similar to the early draft of Q&A which we had relating to foreign policy). I cannot remember it, but if it were there, I must assume that I saw it. I am of the view that if it were present, it was not a significant part of the preparations of the briefing book for Governor Reagan. I have no reason to believe that the strategic or tactical materials, the lines of rebuttal, etc., that are in the Carter briefing book were in the hands of the Reagan campaign.

(b) As to the supplementary foreign policy questions, please see item 2 below.

(2) "Presidential Debates: Foreign Policy and National Security Issues"

This material was found by Frank Hodsoll in his files on Saturday, June 25, 1983; I found the same materials (absent the first two pages) in my files on Monday, June 27, 1983. Frank Hodsoll and I worked together on the debate preparations and the two of us shared an office in the campaign headquarters (I was working there on a part-time basis until October 15, 1980 and on a full-time basis thereafter). I do not remember how I obtained the material, and in fact, did not even remember I had it until undertaking a thorough search of my files. It is probable that one of us obtained it first, and gave the other a xerox. Upon seeing the material again, I do have a recollection of looking through it. I do not remember studying it closely. I can only assume I did not review it carefully because it didn't seem especially helpful. While it does bear a title of "briefing book", the accompanying cover document that was in Mr. Hodsoll's files makes it clear that it was also for general campaign use and that it was drawn from public statements of the Carter administration. It hardly seemed the kind of tightly-drawn, highly sensitive material that would be submitted to the President in the crunch before a major debate. Upon inspection, it is apparent to me that this material (dated variously from September 10 through September 29, 1980) did serve as an early draft of the more condensed and refined materials, dated October 20, 1980, that were prepared for President Carter (item 1(b) above).

(3) Miscellaneous Foreign Affairs and Defense Issue Materials

Frank Hodsoll found this material in his files on June 25; I did not find it in my files. I do not remember it, and thus I cannot say whether I reviewed it during the campaign.

(4) Handwritten note from Martel to Hodsoll

Martel's note says that he sent copies to "Dave G.", an obvious reference to me. I did not find a copy of the materials in my files, but upon seeing them again, I do remember the "balloon popping" memo — mostly because of its catchy phrase. I have to assume I also read the second Popkin memo. I do not remember when I first saw these items. To the best of my recollection, these items had no standing in our campaign effort.

(5) Valis Memo to Gergen, 10-21-80

This was an unsolicited memo that I found in my files on June 27, 1983. While I had forgotten it until then, I do remember reading it during the campaign. I do not know who produced it or how Mr. Valis obtained it. To the best of my knowledge, I took no action on the basis of it.

By its own account, it contains information from a mid-level Carter debate staff member (whether White House or campaign is unclear) and it appears to be a second or third-hand account. The part referring to the debate makes points that were obvious during the campaign (e.g., it was conventional wisdom that President Carter would attack Governor Reagan for so-called flip-flops); the rest of the document refers to campaign advertising.

(6) Reagan Briefing Book

As you can imagine, a great many hours went into the preparation of this book. It derives from many different papers, ideas, drafts, news clippings, etc., and many different people contributed to it. An objective evaluation of this book will show, I believe, that it does not bear a significant relationship to the materials from the Carter camp. To be sure, some of the same issues and the same points appear in both -- but that's because those were the major issues of the campaign and it was obvious they might arise in the debate. Clearly, we were interested in anticipating Carter attack points, but we were far more interested in honing Reagan attack points (not something found in Carter camp materials) and even more important, setting forth Ronald Reagan's positive vision and program for the country -- and that was something the candidate himself had developed over many years.

* * *

I am attaching to this memorandum a copy of a letter I am sending today to Congressman Albosta.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 28, 1983

Dear Congressman Albosta:

Since responding to your letter last week, I have found that I made a mistake, and I want to correct the record with you and to convey to you my personal apology.

In my letter to you of June 22, I said in part:

"It is possible that I did see some pages of 'Carter material' for a brief period, but I do not recall it.

"I do recall hearing that some material from the Carter campaign was present in the Reagan campaign...

"As you can well understand, the passage of nearly three years' time leaves me a little hazy about all the many details of the debate preparations."

Mr. Chairman, that letter was written to you in good faith, based upon my best recollections plus those of a few other close colleagues with whom I consulted. Unfortunately, I wrote that letter to you before completing a thorough search of all of my files. I just didn't think I had anything there of relevance. That was a mistake I very much regret. In completing that search with the help of a member of my staff, I found yesterday two items that should properly and promptly be brought to your attention:

-- A set of materials clearly prepared by the Carter camp relating to foreign policy and national security issues. These materials have various dates ranging from September 10 through September 29, 1980, several weeks before the debate was formally scheduled. It appears they were an early draft of materials that were later summarized, refined and included in many parts of the final briefing materials on this subject, dated October 20, 1980. (A copy of materials being released by the White House today shows that the pages in my files are a subset of those that another member of the campaign team found in his files over the weekend.)

-- Second, I found an unsolicited note sent to me on October 21, 1980 by a Mr. Wayne Valis with a one-page attachment. Valis describes the attachment as "notes ... based on a Carter debate staff brainstorming session -- middle level types -- nothing spectacular, but interesting -- from a source intimately connected to a Carter debate staff member..." After seeing this material again, I can remember that I read it at the time

received. I cannot remember my reaction, but it strikes me now as a second or third-hand account of what was already well known (e.g., Carter planned to attack Reagan on so-called flip-flops) and some random notes on Carter advertising plans.

(Both of these materials, as well as others, are being forwarded to you today by the Counsel to the President.)

There were no other items in my files that appear to have come from the Carter camp. I definitely read the second item noted above, though I did nothing with the information provided. Having my memory refreshed, I can now advise you that I still do not recall studying or spending any time with the materials in the first item above, but clearly I must have looked through these materials sometime prior to the debate in October.

If I might, I would once again like to emphasize that my memory of these events has been dimmed by the passage of nearly three years' time. In searching my files, I also found several hundreds of pages of material generated within the Reagan campaign that I did not recall until I saw them again. I can only say that, like others in this Administration, I am trying to make a good faith effort to reconstruct events of that period. After reviewing the briefing book submitted on our side, it remains my view that while materials received from the Carter camp were of interest, to my knowledge, they did not play any significant role in the preparation of materials for Governor Reagan.

As noted in my letter of June 22, I am eager to be fully cooperative with you in this matter, and regret any inconvenience caused you by my failure to review all of my files before tendering my previous response.

Sincerely,

David R. Gergen

David R. Gergen
Assistant to the President
for Communications

The Honorable Donald Albosta
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

OA-501-A 10-66 COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

SUBJECT: Items from the Carter Camp -

TO: Frank

FROM:

Thought you'd enjoy seeing these.
Please do not circulate. Have
sent a set to Dave H.

Love to all,

Myles

TO: Patrick Caddell

FR: Sam Popkin

RE: Balloon Popping

Whether it is in the debates, or in the last minute final appeals to voters, there are a number of lines Ronald Reagan is certain to use. Indeed, these lines are used so often that anyone who spends a few days reading his transcripts soon finds that the same basic lines are being used today that were used in '76. The lines are excellent demagoguery and if allowed to stand on their own are very effective. But there are some extremely effective ways for President Carter to deflate these lines, to calmly, and quietly pop Ronnie's rhetorical balloons. And the balloon popping can be done in ways that make it obvious to all that Reagan is superficial and lightweight, and has old-fashioned trite ideas which are risky in the real world.

<u>These are not finished "worded-for-the-President" replies</u> but outlines of the themes which deflate the Reagan standbys. The President must have an answer to each of these ready in case there is a debate. There should also be answers ready because some of these answers, particularly about the hostages, must be ready if Reagan, as is very likely given his press record, demagogues on hostages at the end of October.

Indeed, might not the best way for the President to have basic answers ready for debates be for the President to cut some spots to have ready for the last minute contingencies?

Reagan refrain #1:

"There was a time, when I was a younger man, when it was just commonplace that an American caught in a war or revolution in any other country could walk through that war and that revolution with no finger being laid upon him if he just put a little American flag on his lapel. When the people knew that he was an American, they knew that he had the protection of the United States. And, were that respected. I would like to see that again."

There are of course many variants to this refrain: "There was a time when we were the respected leaders of the free world. Now...". And there is a simple, effective way to counter this. Talk about all the places where this President is welcome and other, recent Presidents have not been welcome.

President Eisenhower was forced to cancel a trip to Japan, today Carter is welcomed with open arms. Richard Nixon was booed and stoned in Venezuela, today, open arms. For years no American President could go to China; today, we have normalization! In every part of the world there are countries that have warm strong relations with the USA, where there were hostile relations in past years. Henry Kissinger could not even land his plane in Nigeria, Egypt was once Russia's base in Middle East.

Reagan refrain #2:

"We have been timid and vaccillating and that's why....." Whatever happens, Reagan likes to say it is happening because "We have been timid and vaccillating."

Reply: Only the trigger happy confuse our steadiness and flexibility for timidity and vaccillation.

In 1956 the Hungarian people demanded more freedom, and Russia crushed them. In 1968 the Czech people demanded more freedom and the Russians crushed them. In 1980 the Polish people demanded more freedom and they won!!!!

Some critics laughed at our human rights campaign, they said nothing mattered but weapons. They were wrong. Human rights is one of our most important accomplishments. Anyone who thinks that human rights is not important, anyone who thinks that human rights does not scare Russia...let them tell that to the people of Poland.

Some critics said that the grain embargo wouldn't hurt the Russians. Some critics said that the Olympic boycott wouldn't hurt. They were all wrong.

Better to think twice than not at all.

Reagan refrain #3:

The President might believe concessions are necessary because we're no longer #1. My own view is that we become again #1 (so that concessions will no longer be necessary.) This line has been used on SALT I, SALT II, Panama and numerous others.

Reply: We are still #1 and our allies are 3,4,5,6,7, etc. Russia has lost China, that's a billion people, Russia has no friends or influence left in the Middle East, Russia can't count on any support from East Europe, Russia has energy problems, inflation and food shortage. She is a flailing giant with no respect anywhere. Even when communist countries have a chance they break away from Russia, i.e. China, Rumania.

Now Russia is still dangerous, after all she knows ~~is~~ that she is in trouble, losing allies and respect everywhere. So we have to keep up our military strength but we also, in the decade ahead, have to try and encourage the Russian rulers to change their ways.

And the sports metaphor is useful here. When you're number one, a lot of people take shots at you; but we're still number one. The way to stay #1 is by preparation and hard work, you don't stay number one by counting on long bombs as your whole game plan.

I'm not panicking about being #1, I'm just making sure that we stay strong.

Reagan refrain #4:

"If we were #1 no one would dare take our hostages." or "No man who lets a ragtag mob humiliate us deserves to be re-elected." or

"Everything that is now being done should have been done sooner."

"No man who can't get back our hostages deserves a second term."

Reply: There is a terrorist problem in the world today and everywhere you go there is respect for the self-control we have shown.

There is no honor in rash action. I know that some Americans are frustrated and they are itching, for military action. I know that some Americans would applaud any show of force I make. But the important thing is that the hostages are alive. Every day I ask myself if I have done everything that I could for those heroic Americans. The easy way would be to show force and get all the Monday morning quarterbacks off my back. But my responsibility to those brave hostages comes first.

It is not true that all the things we are doing now could have been done earlier. You must let passions cool, you don't commit all your chips on the first hand, you don't use all your formations in the first half.

Reagan refrain #5:

We face economic disaster. We have lost our capacity to be a great producing giant and, we have lost it through regulation and punitive taxes.

The answer is to get government off our backs and out of our pockets.

Reply: Talk about computers, agriculture, OSHA, and Love Canal. The most basic industry is agriculture. We're the most productive agricultural nation in the world and everyone knows that it comes from farmers assisted by government research and development distributed to farmers by the world's best extension service. The most glamorous industry in the world is computers and again we dominate the world markets. And so much of the basic development in these areas comes from government assisted research or as direct spinoffs of space programs. And as for getting government off our backs, Governor Reagan has been attacking Occupational Safety and Health legislation for years....

carter-reagan debates

Once again it must be stressed that we want to win votes,not debates, and that there is a great deal of difference between the two.Debating skill,unlike integrity,intelligence,vision etc. is not seen as a skill necessary for a President. That means that persons can easily stay with a poor debater. And it means that any focus on winners or losers detracts from our chance to raise the salience of the themes and issues which we want to dominate the last week of the ~~debate~~ campaign.

The Reagan camp has taken a major risk by agreeing to meet us in a debate. Debates can have major impacts on reassuring voters and they can have major impacts on the salience of different issues. Given the major reservoirs of potential optimism in the populace about Pres. Carter—specifically the number of persons who believe he would be better next term—there is a good chance for the President to remind people of his high points and put all the focus on the next four years. There is also a substantial risk to the Reagan camp that they can win the battle on "war and peace" and lose the war. That is, if the debate results in higher salience on issues of war, peace,nuclear arms,etc. Reagan can be a loser even if he narrows the President's lead in these areas. In 1976,contrary to conventional wisdom, the foreign policy debate did not really hurt Ford despite the Poland gaffe. The debate lowered his edge over carter on issues of crisis management and foreign policy,but it increased the salience of the issues enough to increase the edge that international issues were giving him. So Reagan can decrease our gap on international issues and still lose votes by getting more attention in the voting booth onto these issues.

We are not debating Ronald Reagan! We are letting the American people compare our responses to similar questions. We are speaking for the audience not for our opponent. Furthermore,the part of the audience which will be attentive and which will be most influenced by what is said are college educated and women!!! Past debate research shows these two groups most influenced by the content of the debate.

We want to maximize incumbency advantage. We want persons to walk into the voting booth wondering about the next four years under a seasoned,tried under fire carter,a man who has kept us on course through perilous times and who has the intelligence and energy for the job——— versus the next four years under a man with dangerous tendencies, dubious judgment and who doesn't understand the 80s.

HOW REAGAN CAN WIN THE DEBATE

I.Turn issues of war and peace into issues of character. If he can get away with the approach that he is using in his daytime TV ads,"How could a grandfather like me want war?" He can defuse the war and peace issues. This should be rather difficult for him to do however,as the only issue area where he has lost subatantial ground since Labor Day is

the international area, keeping [illegible]
handling foreign policy. We want to be sure that we make the difference as clear as can be between nice people and nice policies. You have to work hard for peace; you have to think twice before you shoot; you must worry about proliferation (what if Iraq or Iran had the bomb?) Any character attack hurts us doubly; it removes our Presidential edge and it deflects attention from issues of life and death.

II. SPend the Debate Avoiding Pins and Slipping Punches

The road is littered with smart clever politicians who thought that because Reagan isn't too intelligent, and because Ronald Reagan isn't too substantive they could pin him down. Ronald Reagan may not be a genius and he certainly has no deep grasp of substance but he is very hard to pin down and he is, to quote Marty Franks, superb at slipping punches. It is impossible both to look Presidential and to chase Reagan. No one looks dignified chasing after butterflies and no one looks in command when their punches are missing. (Remember how good the young Mohammed Ali looked leaning back against the ropes while assorted heavies exhausted themselves trying to make contact.) We do not need to catch Reagan, and we couldn't if we wanted to. Better that we point out, over and over, that you can't avoid the tough decisions in the White House, that the buck stops with the President, that it is the President who has to decide among conflicting experts, that the President can't turn things over to the experts.

III. Focus on Four Years of Economic Failure

If the debate talks about four years of inflation and unemployment the election becomes a referendum on the Carter Presidency. We want a vote between two futures not a vote of approval or disapproval on the last four years. That means we want the focus on how we have come to grips through developing an energy program, devising means to revitalize Detroit and leading the way in breaking OPEC. A healthy economy first of all requires an energy policy and a balanced program. Does anyone really believe that we would be better off today if we turned our energy problems over to the oil companies? In a world of working women and two job families who is fighting for economic justice, Carter or

Reagan? In a world of dangerous technologies who understands that it takes government action to prevent Love Canal and regulate dangerous technology.

How Carter Can Win

A Carter victory depends upon raising doubts about Ronald Reagan and increasing the feeling that Jimmy Carter is safe. To wit, since there is a basic reservoir of optimism about Carter we need to work on the group who feel that he has learned and grown in office and will be better next term.

Increasing the risk in RR means focusing on his pronouncements and policies, prticularly pronouncements and policies he has made while a candidate for office. RR loves to say that he will look it up or find

out or assemble the experts;if he has already sounded off on a subject it needs to be brought up.(and of course that turns it into one more time when he shot from the hip).

To increase the sense of simplicity behind Reagan we need to point out over and over that Presidents can't duck the hard ones,that the buck stops in the Oval Office. We cannot call RR old and simple, but we can emphasize the triteness and simplicity of his approach with lines like!

You make it sound easy but there is more to it.

You make it sound as easy as 1,2,3

you make it sound as easy as apple pie

You make it easy to believe in the happy ending,but

That is nice but it doesn't come to grips

that sounds good but it is dangerous to surrender to illusions.

That sounds good but nostalgia won't solve ourproblems.

Everywhere we want to continuously make the point that Ronald Reagan doesn't understand the future. That he doesn't understand weapons, technology or science.(Can you imagine RR in front of a computer?)

To increase the sense of a strong Carter we must continually leave personal and policy footprints,a record to which we can refer.

I strongly believe

I have always stood for

I have always had a firm commitment to

As I said again and again.

And again it is valuable to take the bonus along with the onus. Take a policy like wheat embargo(and we will never carry a wheat farmer anyway) and defend the policy to the hilt to show that you are tough n enough to lead the fight. The convention line on RR doesn't know if he wants to feed them,play with them or fight them was terrific. Or energy policy. Where is RR going to get the 227 Billion he wants to give back to oil companies?

And what could show better the rightness of the direction we are now going then RR's failure to spell out any policies of his own any detail at all. I think there is real possibility for gain in hitting at RR's ducking the inflationary impact of Kemp- Roth,it is worth referring to the claims made in previous debate and to Jane Bryant Quinn's retort that he either didn't know what his own people were up to or he was lying. "I challenge my opponent to explain why he didn't keep the promise made in front of 50 million americans. the government

economists say..."

On defense it is worth hitting hard at RR for not having any critical approach to new weapons. Jimmy has a science background and is willing to make the hard choices among systems. All we need is one weapon RR pushed which we didn't build and is already outmoded.

Don't ever say we made a mistake. We tried policy mixes which were not ideal but they were the best policies to try first.

When RR goes on and on about red tape and bureaucracy and getting government off our backs, talk about the cheap programs which make a complex economy possible. People have faith in our banks due to FDIC, they get their pensions due to pension reform laws, they get safe airplanes due to FAA, medicines that work due to FDA.

Enclosed as an appendix is an earlier memo "popping balloons" which contains typical reagan refrains with lines which can be used to deflate them and show him up as silly.

Sam Popkin

OK,

#5

Memo

From: WAYNE VALIS Wayne
To: Dave Gergen
Date: 10-21-80

These notes are based on a Carter debate staff brain storming session -- middle level types -- nothing spectacular, but interesting -- from a source intimately connected to a Carter debate staff member. Reliable.

I gave a copy to Jim Baker. — WV

10/20/8

Proposed Carter Tactics for Debate and Campaign Advertising.

1.) Carter plans to expose Reagan flip-flops.
E.g. Reagan's positions on tax breaks for private education:
Before: in favor of tax credits for high school and college.
After: in favor of credits only for college.
E.g. Reagan's politions on bilingual education
E.g. Reagan's polition on OSHA
Where Reagan has not flip-flopped, Carter plans to portray him as having blurred or dangerous positions.
Where Reagan has changed his position, Carter plans to portray Reagan as indecisive, as a political opportunist, or as opposed to an enlightened set of policies (especially on such questions as ERA and Minimum Wage)

2.) Carter is hoping to be portrayed as the underdog in the debate. But in the week preceding the debate, he hopes to come across as having momentum.

3.) Carter plans to brand Reagan-Kemp-Roth as an "Alice-in-Wonderland" medicine.

4.) Carter is pleased with the recent statistics showing an economic upturn. But he is very concerned about the high interest rates. He plans to blame the Fed for these, but he fears that the people won't be able to distinguish between the Fed and his own administration.

5.) He plans to continue to harp on the warmonger issue.

6.) He plans to raise the age issue again. He plans to point out that when Bush was a congressman, he proposed a bill that would require mandatory retirement for congressmen at age 70. Carter hopes to point out the incongruity of the situation.

7.) Carter may have ads which interview Reagan's old classmates in order to highlight how old they are.

8.) Carter is trying to get a hold of film-clips of Reagan filming campaign ads. (He may already have such film-clips.) These clips apparently show Reagan being corrected time and again for various mistakes by voices of aides who are saying: "No, Governor, the figure is 75% and not 10%".... "No, Governor, the head of the USSR is Brezhnev not Khrushchev" and similar such corrections.

9.) Carter may use a film-clip of Reagan asking "Who is that?" when reference in conversation is made to Giscard d'Estaing.

10.) Carter's people are afraid of the effectiveness of the Reagan ads which use the bar graphs showing the inflation rates and the ads which show the grocery carts.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Reagan & Bush

Reagan Bush Committee

901 South Highland Street, Arlington, Virginia 22204 (703) 685-3400

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Ronald Reagan

FROM: Richard B. Wirthlin

DATE: October 24, 1980

RE: Summary of the Debate Strategy*

1. Be yourself. Don't hesitate, however, to attack Carter strongly on his record or to diffuse with disarming humor his personal charges when they become overblown.

2. Focus the thrust of each answer on Carter's incompetence and weak record.

3. In the presentation of your public policies show how they will impact people.

4. Cite the specific steps in your strategies for peace and economic growth.

5. Millions of voters are frustrated and disillusioned; they are looking for a competent, compassionate leader capable of giving them hope about the prospects for the future.

6. The key to the debate is to motivate Republicans and ticket-splitters to turnout on election day.

7. Our advantage lies in the fact that you are the best electronic media candidate in history.

8. Regardless of Carter's challenges, it is critical that you demonstrate constraint, firmness, moderation and compassion.

9. Use selected examples of Carter's mismanagement of government, his misstatements and flip-flops.

*Attached is a longer memo for your perusal.

Reagan & Bush

Reagan Bush Committee

901 South Highland Street, Arlington, Virginia 22204 (703) 685-3400

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Reagan/Bush Campaign

FROM: Richard B. Wirthlin, Richard S. Beal & Myles Martel

DATE: October 21, 1980

RE: Reagan-Carter Debate Strategy

Campaign and Debate Axiom

If the Governor succeeds Tuesday in making Jimmy Carter's record the major issue of the debate and the campaign, we will succeed in the debate and win the general election.

If, however, Carter makes Ronald Reagan the issue of the debate and the campaign, we will lose both.

The above axiom holds because the major debate task turns on enhancing Ronald Reagan's perceived trustworthiness.

- Simply, if voters believe Ronald Reagan is more worthy of their trust after the debate than they did before, his vote support will expand and strengthen.

- This can be accomplished if the debate focuses on Carter's incompetence and weak record in office, and Reagan's compassion. Neither position can be reinforced when the Governor defends past positions.

Target Audience and the Voter Turnout Objective

The target audience consists of a key segment of the American vote--Republicans and ticket-splitters. It is these voters, not the panel and certainly not Carter the Governor is addressing.

- The Governor has already built a coalition large enough to win the presidential election, and hence, we want to use this debate to re-inforce our base and motivate them to turn out on election day.

- Our empirical studies show that if we increase the turnout of our voters by 2% over Carter's, it increases our electoral margin by 30 electoral votes.

The campaign strategy has been to deal initially to our Republican and conservative base, then to broaden our appeal, and finally to return to the base during these last two weeks of the campaign.

- The surveys show that we need, at this juncture, to increase our appeal among Republicans and ideologically moderate ticket-splitters who need to be reinforced through the Governor's debate performance.

- In answering the questions during the debate, the Governor must remember that ticket-splitters are solution oriented, somewhat skeptical and more interested in the issues and public policy than the image traits of the candidates.

  These voters will respond to references to the "Nine Steps" in the Governor's peace strategy with the three critical elements of the "Strategy for Economic Growth." It is extremely important to avoid references to "Republicans and Democrats" or "I am a conservative" because ticket-splitters are non-partisans who are put-off by these words.

The Anderson debate helped, generally, to broaden our political base. Today the Reagan vote is larger, more committed and includes more segments of the voting population than does Carter's. Carter's base remains very fluid and uncertain.

The debate should help to solidify further the Reagan base and motivate them to turn out on election day. Only 22% of the electorate are self-identified Republicans, hence without the support of these ticket-splitters the Governor could not be elected.

Major Advantages

The principal advantages the Governor maintains going into this debate are:

- He has already debated six times before in this campaign and is more accustomed to such events.

- He is the best electronic media candidate in history.

- He will appear robust and vigorous by comparison to Carter who will likely appear bleached out and tense.

Principal Strategic Objectives

Televised political debates focus on image attributes more than issue positions. The image attributes we need to reinforce are:

- Competence
- Compassion
- Reasonableness, moderation, and thoughtfulness
- Strength

Essentially, the debate objective is:

> Present Ronald Reagan as a reasonable and compassionate man with a vision of America and the competence to take us from simply providing the hope that vision conveys to its actualization.

How is this objective achieved?

Carter's attack strategy will undoubtedly try to represent Reagan's policies as "naive, unrealistic, anachronistic, and Alice-in-Wonderlandish." In response to this attack, the Governor has an excellent opportunity to show constraint, thoughtfulness and strength. And, when the attack becomes overblown, he should use disarming humor which will build both rapport and trust with the electorate.

It is essential for the Governor to use his answers to show that he is aware of different sides of the issues, that they are complex and that only after thoughtful consideration has he settled on a particular policy orientation. In response to the Carter attacks that "he has flip-flopped," the Governor can use such attacks to demonstrate reasonableness and the lack of policy rigidity.

Carter's Attack Strategy	Reagan's Response Strategy
Exploit Reagan's flip-flops.	Use changes to show reasonableness; defend public policy changes because circumstances have changed.
Make extensive use of Reagan quotes, e.g. during Democratic Convention.	Counter with Carter and Kennedy quotes; avoid unnecessarily strident reactions; bring the discussion back to the Carter record.
Attack the Reagan California record and how Reagan has "distorted it."	Defend with confidence and indignation moving as quickly as possible back to the Carter record as the real issue; avoid unnecessary stridency; counter with "when Governor Carter approached this problem in his state, the record shows..." but the real issue of this is the Carter record which show he still hasn't been able to solve the

Carter's Attack Strategy	Reagan's Response Strategy
	problems and maintain presidential tone and demeanor; act humored by Carter California record attacks--he doesn't understand the problems of California anymore than of the nation.
Attack Reagan's ideas as "quick fixes" that are unrealistic and even unworkable.	Given the Carter record, the Carter Administration is incapable of evaluating what would work or not work; argue most Carter policies are in place for such a short time before Mr. Carter changes his mind that their only impact is a quick fix.
Suggest Reagan would be a dangerous man in the White House.	Respond with righteous indignation; no one wants peace more than I, after all, what reasonable person would not; the difference between Mr. Carter and I is my commitment to deter conflict by being economically and militarily strong, and pursuing a consistent foreign policy; uncertainty in our foreign policy is more apt to cause an international crisis that would result in war, than to have a strong economy and military.

Several general points should be followed in the Governor's response strategy during the debate.

- It is not necessary to answer or respond to each of Carter's charges.

- It is especially important that the Governor be prepared for Carter's distortions of the California record. A good response to much of what Carter will say in this regard is something the Governor has already said: "You know, it's one thing when the Carter Administration jimmies its own economic figures to make its record look good, but when Mr. Carter starts jimmying my figures, that's going too far."

- The bottom line on the California record is that Californians were better off after the Governor's two terms of office, than this country is after four years of Jimmy Carter.

- The Governor's responses must appear confident and strong, not strident.

Reagan Attack Strategy

The Governor should use his answers to remind the public of:

- Carter, instead of leading the people to greater peace and prosperity, was content to declare there was a malaise in the country and that it would not matter who was President the economy would be just as bad.

- Carter has failed to provide a steady hand at the helm, especially in foreign policy. We have very little support from our allies and largely undeveloped and fragmented policies toward our adversaries.

- Carter has been indecisive, and unwilling to pursue vigorously domestic and international policies.

- More than any previous administration, the Carter Administration has politicized the cabinet and compromised the non-partisan functions of the Departments of State and Defense.

Tactics and Special Considerations

- Emphasize strength and decisiveness while avoiding stridency. Anderson's stridency hurt him in the previous debate.

- Use of a combination of "Mr. Carter" and "President Carter" with more frequent use of "Mr. Carter."

- Remember the debate is between Ronald Reagan the candidate for President, and Jimmy Carter the candidate for the same office. When making references to the 1976 campaign, use "Jimmy Carter."

- Compassion is most easily communicated by referring to situations during the course of campaign experiences.

- Make use of the voter appeal of George Bush by referencing consultations and policy discussions with him.

- Avoid unnecessary references to "the past" and buzz words that alienate blocs of voters, e.g. "detente."

Reagan: Competence and Compassion

The man who will be the President of the United States for the next four years is:

> The man who correctly identifies the nation's most pressing problems, and has the drive and ability to resolve them compassionately.

- What the American people want most is leadership in the White House that will give them hope that the country is heading in a direction that will mean greater security and prosperity.

- They are tired of pessimism and the acquiescence to mediocrity. But they are equally wary of political promises by office seekers who are not truly committed to the welfare of the people.

- Americans are looking for specific policy options such as those enumerated in the two speeches--"Strategy for Peace" and "Strategy for Economic Growth," which will already be given by the time of the debate. The Governor should not hesitate to repeat the steps outlined in each.

The Governor must communicate to the American people through his answers that it is the people's interests he intends to serve. The people say the thing that is killing them is inflation, and a weak economy. What will restore this country to its proper bearings is a President committed to reducing inflation and improving the economy.

MEMO TO: Governor Reagan
FROM: James A. Baker III/Myles Martel
RE: 10/28/80 Cleveland Debate Strategy
DATE: October 24, 1980

---

1. When responding to a question or being attacked, turn to Carter's record, proposals, campaign style, or a faulty logic as soon as possible.

   Attack him harder on domestic matters than on international matters. Even anger may be appropriate on economic issues.

   Meet offensive with offensive. Don't feel obligated to defend particulars of your positions.

   Teddy Kennedy quotes and verbatim 1976 Carter promises can be most useful in waging the anti-Carter attack.

2. Let Carter set the attack tone of the debate. Attempt to equal -- but not surpass -- his tone. He will probably -- but not definitely -- attack you hard on most fronts: California record, misstatements, flip-flops, positions, programs.

3. You are debating "Carter the candidate" more than "Carter the President".

4. Show righteous indignation in responding to:

   a. Carter's attacks or innuendos that you are dangerous
   b. Attacks directed at your California credentials

   Looking directly at Carter in such instances may be very effective. This not only causes Carter's strategy to backfire, but also makes you appear strong and in control.

5. Humor or a confident smile can also disarm Carter when he thinks he's got you where he wants you.

6. Avoid appearing too defensive when responding to a sharp attack. Remaining in control -- composed -- Presidential is an absolute must.

7. When Carter is speaking -- especially when he is attacking you -- look at him or take notes. Avoid looking downward (Baltimore).

8. Wherever possible, weave your major theme into responses.

   "Jimmy Carter has had his chance and has blown it (relate to examples that fit question); you offer promise -- hope."

9. When referring to Presidential actions, call Carter "Mr. Carter". When referring to Carter's 1976 campaign promises -- as you should -- refer to him as "Jimmy Carter".

10. When answering a question about a "people problem", identify with the problem (compassion), then state your position.

11. Conclude your responses with an attack line against Carter or a people-oriented line based on your proposals. Try to balance negative and positive endings of responses.

12. Avoid unnecessary references to the past and buzz words that alienate voters, e.g. detente.

13. Work George Bush into your responses.

14. Show compassion by drawing from experiences on the campaign trail as you do so well (anecdotal references).

Reagan and Carter Advisers Work on Debate Strategies

By HEDRICK SMITH
Special to The New York Times

THE NEW YORK TIMES, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1980

WASHINGTON, Oct. 23 — In next Tuesday's Presidential debate in Cleveland, which both sides regard as the potentially decisive event of the campaign, Ronald Reagan and President Carter are aiming toward several collisions on the issues as well as contrasts of style.

The Republican challenger has said that he sees the debate as an opportunity to come off the defensive on foreign policy and to press Mr. Carter on his record, especially his handling of the economy. "It's a unique opportunity to point out the failures of the Carter record," said Edward Meese 3d, Mr. Reagan's chief of staff.

Mr. Reagan's advisers have set up three days of briefings to prepare their candidate so that he comes across to voters as knowledgeable and reasonable and to reassure the still considerable body of undecided voters that he is neither rash nor risky.

The Carter side sought to structure the debate for a maximum amount of exchange and rebuttals between the two men, to give the President a chance to show his expertise as well as to confront Mr. Reagan on his specific positions.

'Smell of Political Expediency'

"Reagan is vulnerable on both last-minute positions that have the smell of political expediency and in terms of other positions that aren't workable," said Jody Powell, the White House press secretary. "We're going to have at that in pretty direct fashion."

"We expect Carter to come on pretty hard," acknowledged Mr. Meese. "But it's going to be a lot harder for Carter to engage in low blows with someone there facing him."

Some Presidential strategists are already counseling that he should soften what some have criticized as the shrill tone of some of his attacks on Mr. Reagan. "We wouldn't want him to look too tough," said one senior Carter aide.

A few Reagan aides hope the President will have a sharp edge, expecting to gain from a backlash among viewers. But most believe that Mr. Carter will deliver a cool and polished performance.

Appearance, Not Facts

The Reagan camp does not want its man to try to make debating points against the President or match Mr. Carter fact for fact, on the ground that the Californian's great strength is in conveying reassurance to viewers with his calm, telegenic manner, his soothing voice and his easy smiles and folksy nods.

"I think appearance is more important than a whole bunch of facts — how you look, how you act, and how you present yourself," said William E. Timmons, Mr. Reagan's deputy campaign manager. "Reagan will be calm, cool and collected and the President will be tense, just as he was at the Al Smith dinner in New York the other night."

Right now each side is seeking to lower expectations and talk up the other man's skill. Reagan aides contend that the President, as incumbent, has an advantage because of his detailed knowledge of the day-to-day workings of the Government. But Carter lieutenants say that their man has more to lose because the public expects more of him.

For the Carter side, the ideal result would be for Mr. Reagan to make a gaffe that would leave him on the defensive. For the Reagan team, the best outcome would be for the President to come across as tense and shrill.

Neither Side Taking Chances

Each side has laid on extensive preparations and slowed its pace so its candidate can catch his breath and aides can focus on this one event.

The Reagan camp, following techniques used for the earlier debate with John B. Anderson, is making plans to set up mock panels of questioners over the weekend to run Mr. Reagan through live rehearsals of likely questions.

Getting ready for the Anderson debate, Mr. Reagan was put through his paces by Senators Howard H. Baker Jr. of Tennessee and John G. Tower of Texas, former Treasury Secretary William E. Simon and Representative Margaret Heckler of Massachusetts, who acted as questioning reporters. David Stockman, a former Anderson aide who joined the Reagan campaign, was a stand-in for Mr. Anderson.

James A. Baker 3d, the Reagan debate manager, refuses to say who will stand in for President Carter in the rehearsals.

Movies and Briefing Books

Although Mr. Reagan will probably be shown movies of the 1976 Presidential debates to study Mr. Carter's debating style, Mr. Carter's aides said that the President had already watched Mr. Reagan debate several times this year. Mr. Carter will use the extensive question-and-answer briefing books that he normally employs for news conferences.

The Carter team initially proposed that the two men debate each other with only a moderator and no questioners. But the Reagan side objected, Mr. Meese said, on the ground that Mr. Carter would be evasive and that a structured format with follow-up questions would "make it easiest to call him into account."

Mr. Powell said the Carter side was particularly pleased that the debate, which will be held in Cleveland Convention Center, would permit reporters to follow up questions and the candidates to rebut and counter-rebut each other.

"I don't think anyone's counting on getting Reagan rattled," he said. "What we've got to do is make sure he gets called on inconsistencies and implausibilities in his positions."

Other Carter aides disclosed that memorandums had been prepared detailing shifts in Mr. Reagan's positions on tuition tax credits, the Iranian hostage issue, relations with Moscow, Social Security and the selection of judges.

Reagan aides said their man would welcome the chance to talk more about war and peace issues as well as the economy. They said that he would be ready to discuss the hostage issue but would not raise it. "That's a hand grenade for both sides," said one Reagan aide.

LIKELY CARTER ATTACK LINES

- Carter Attacks
- RR Flip-Flops

CARTER ATTACK LINES

Economy

1. RR economic proposals are wildly inflationary.

2. RR can't cut taxes, raise defense spending, and balance the budget -- unless he uses mirrors or drastically cuts social programs.

3. RR plan is Robin Hood in reverse -- take from the poor and give to the rich. More GOP trickle down.

Energy

RR claims of massive domestic oil and gas supplies are exaggerated.

RR's plans would greatly enrich big oil.

Environment

RR believes pollution is caused by elements of our own environment -- trees, volcanoes, etc. RR thinks pollution under control; yet, there is a long way to go.

Urban - Housing

RR proposal to turn urban problems over to cities means abandoning urban areas to further decay. Fed must help because local governments don't have resources to help themselves.

Labor

RR pretends to be a friend of labor, but opposes decent minimum wage, Davis-Bacon wage protection.

Health

RR at one time opposed Medicare and Medicaid, and now opposes comprehensive national health insurance, yet there are so many individuals who can't afford private care.

Education - Welfare

RR opposes Department of Education which will provide co-ordinated, comprehensive policy of education for this country.

Women's Issues

RR doesn't support keystone of women's rights campaign. Supreme Court suggestion is sellig seat for votes.

Minorities and Civil Rights

RR has been insensitive to the needs of blacks and other minorities. Would divide nation.

Defense

RR has habit of calling for use of military force in every tense international situation. A dangerous habit.

Defense -- Arms Control

RR would scrap SALT II treaty, leaving no arms control policy in place and no basis for SALT III. This would encourage arms race.

Nonproliferation

RR states nonproliferation is "none of our business." This simplistic policy leads to dangerous potential for expansion of nuclear club and nuclear holocaust.

China

RR would disrupt the U.S. friendship with China over Taiwan issue, a policy which has been prompted by 3 Presidents and has provided for increased trade opportunities, as in the case of grain sales, and is helpful in counterbalancing the power of USSR.

Overall

RR has been flip-flopping on issues just to win votes. Who is the real Ronald Reagan?

DEFENSE ON REAGAN "FLIP-FLOPS"

Carter and Mondale have been charging that RR is shifting his position on many issues (e.g., OSHA NYC bailout, Chrysler, etc.) in order to win votes.

Points to be Made:

1. Amazed that Mr. Carter would dare to raise that issue -- given his performance. Since 1976, he's changed his position so many times that State Dept. may have to stop giving policy briefings every day -- and make them every hour.

-- 5 economic policies, 3 in past 8 months
-- Changed his mind on defense, natural gas deregulation, UN resolution on Jerusalem, etc., etc.

2. With regard to RR's position, his philosophy has not changed -- basically believes that we must get America moving again and that instead of a weak America, we must have a strong America.

3. On some issues, RR has indeed modified his stance but these have been for good reasons:

-- On some issues, circumstances have changed. Example: Mayor Koch has done an excellent job in NYC that RR believes Washington should continue to support the city. Anyone running for President must know enough to take changing circumstances into account.

-- RR also knows that a President -- to be a good President -- must represent all the people -- rich and poor, white and black, hardhats and shopkeepers -- and that's what he intends to do.

4. So, there may have been some changes and no doubt, if elected, RR may occasionally make changes in the future. But there is one thing that unfortunately cannot be changed today -- and that is the record of the Carter administration over the past 4 years and the misery, suffering it has caused. That is the heart of this campaign -- and that is what we must address in this debate.

RR ATTACK/CARTER VULNERABILITIES

- Broken Promises from 1976 Debates
- Selected Quotes from 1976 Debates
- Carter Flip-Flops
- Carter Misstatements
- From Friends of Carter
- What Foreigners Think of Carter

BROKEN PROMISES FROM THE 1976 DEBATES

1. Never raise taxes

> "I would never do anything that would increase the taxes for those who work for a living, or who are presently required to list all their income." (1st debate)

2. Reduce unemployment to 4½%

3. Control inflation

4. Balanced budget by end of 1st term

5. High economic growth; 5-5½% a year

6. Increased development and use of coal

7. No food embargoes

> "I would never single out food...as a trade embargo item." (2nd debate)

DO NOT USE

8. Stand by Taiwan

> "I would never let that friendship with the People's Republic of China stand in the way of the preservation of the independence and freedom of the people on Taiwan." (2nd debate)

9. Strong and respected overseas.

10. Less sacrifice than under a Ford Presidency

> "We'll never have a balanced budget, we'll never meet the needs of our people, we'll never control the inflationary spiral, as long as we have seven and a half or eight million people out of work, who are looking for jobs. And we probably got two-and-a-half more million people who are not looking for jobs anymore, because they've given up hope. That is a very serious indictment of this administration. It's probably the worst one of all." (3rd debate)

Other Promises: reduce White House staff and budget. . .reorganize the federal government. . .merit selection of judges. . .government do nothing to encourage abortions. . .good health care. . ..

Total Broken Promises From 1976 Campaign

667	Total Promises Made
130	Kept
227	Broken
238	Unkept, Unkeepable, Unverifiable

(Source: RNC, January 1980)

SELECTED JIMMY CARTER QUOTES FROM THE 1976 DEBATES

Balanced Budget, Economy

"I believe by the end of the first four years of the next term we could have the unemployment rate down to 3 percent,...a controlled inflation rate and have a balanced growth of...about 5%, which would give us a balanced budget..."

9/23/76

"We'll never have a balanced budget, we'll never meet the needs of our people, we'll never control the inflationary spiral, as long as we have seven and a half or eight million people out of work, who are looking for jobs. And we probably got two-and-a-half more million people who are not looking for jobs anymore, because they've given up hope. That is a very serious indictment of this administration. It's probably the worst one of all."

10/22/76

Foreign Policy, Defense

"I think the Republican Administration has been almost all style and spectacular,...not substance...the Ford Administration has failed...Our country is not strong any more. We are not respected any more. We can only be strong overseas if we are strong at home. And when I become President, I will not only be strong in those areas but also in defense."

10/6/76

"We also want to revert back to the stature of and the respect that our country had in previous Administrations...it will come if I am elected."

10/6/76

"The number one responsibility of any President, above all else, is to guarantee the security of our Nation, an ability to be free of the threat of attack or blackmail, and to carry out our obligations to our allies and friends,..."

10/6/76

"With our economy in such terrible disarray, and getting worse by the month...this kind of deterioration in our economic strength is bound to weaken us around the world."

10/6/76

CARTER FLIP-FLOPS

Natural Gas Policy

'76 Campaign -- promised deregulation of natural gas. Sent letter to governors of 3 states (Okla., La., Miss.) to win critical votes.

'77 -- came out for continued regulation and expanded regulation. Called decontrol a rip-off.

'78 -- signed decontrol legislation.

Economy

5 Economic programs in 3½ years.

National Defense

'76 Campaign -- promised to cut military spending by $5-7 billion.

'77 through December '79 fights Congressional attempts to increase defense budget, delays MX, cancels B-1.

'80 Campaign -- claims to be increasing military spending (Democratic Senators say "hypocrisy".)

Government

'76 Campaign -- promised to reduce size of government

'80 Campaign -- created Departments of Energy and Education.

Military

Convinced Helmut Schmidt to accept neutron bomb deployment in West Germany.

Then left Schmidt open to attack by left-wing faction when decided not to deploy; pulled rug out from under Schmidt 2 days after Schmidt public announcement.

Foreign Policy

9/7/79 -- Said of Soviet brigade in Cuba "unacceptable"

Three weeks later, accepted Soviet brigade.

On Cuban Refugees

Anounced "open heart and open arms."

Ten days after, ordered halt.

CARTER MISSTATEMENTS

Senator Henry Jackson

--Carter said Senator Jackson has a habitually "warlike attitude" toward other nations. March 31, 1976-New York Times.

--Carter accused Jackson of "making deliberately false statements about me" and "consistently telling falsehoods."

--He also accused Jackson of exploiting the busing issue and its "racial connotations" in Massachusetts.

President Lyndon Johnson

LBJ: A LIAR

--Carter in his Playboy interview said of Richard Nixon and and Lyndon Johnson, "But I don't think I would ever take on the same frame of mind that Nixon or Johnson did-lying, cheating and distorting the truth." November 1976-Playboy Interview.

Senator Hubert Humphrey

--Carter apologized for having said Hubert Humphrey was "too old" to be President. March 31, 1976-New York Times.

DO NOT USE [redacted]

Vietnam

--U.S. bombing of Vietnamese villages reflected "racial discrimination." By May on the campaign trail he was calling the war "racist" and condemning the U.S. decision to "firebomb villages." July 7, 1976-Washington Post. (Reappearance-Democratic Issues-November 23, 1975.)

"Killer Rabbit"

"I was by myself in the boat, and I saw this animal swimming... toward me...When it got close enough that I could see the rabbit was going to come in the boat with me, I took the boat paddle and hit the water at the rabbit, and he eventually and reluctantly turned away and went to the shore...the rabbit I don't think was trying to attack me...it was a fairly robust looking rabbit." April 29, 1979-Washington Post. Repeated-August 29, 1979.

"Temporary Inconveniences"

In response to a question about inability to solve problems of inflation and unemployment, Carter responded (in part):

"you know people tend to dwell on the temporary inconveniences and the transient problems that our nation faces." October 20, 1980. Appearance in Youngstown, Ohio-Washington Star-Repeated October 21, 1980.

FROM THE "FRIENDS" OF JIMMY CARTER

- Senator Edward Kennedy

  -- "You really have to be sniffing the roses in the Rose Garden to think there is no suffering in the steel industry."
  -- April 4, 1980 Washington Star

  -- "We have an administration that believes in throwing people out of work to fight inflation. That is an administration without heart. . ."
  -- April 1, 1980 Washington Post

  -- On the UN vote blunder: ". . . makes American foreign policy the laughingstock of nations throughout the world."
  -- New York Press Conference

  -- Asked about Carter's view that the economy was looking up. "What Carter is saying is that the country is getting better because it's getting sicker at a slower rate."
  -- May 24, 1980 Washington Post

  -- "The only environment he (Carter) wants to save is his own rose garden."
  -- May 31, 1980 LA Times

- State Senator Julian Bond (Georgia) (on Black issues)

  -- "In 1976, this nation turned to a man who clearly knew the words to our hymns, but who in less than a year had forgotten the numbers on our paychecks."
  -- July 19, 1980 Washington Post

- Senator Daniel P. Moynihan

  -- "I will go up and down the state of New York and say that the Administration broke its word. I am tired of people lying to us on this first subject. . ."
  -- January, 1980 hearings on tuition tax credits

  -- "President Carter's likening of the 'Palestinian cause' to 'the civil rights movement here in the United States' has properly evoked utter disbelief."
  -- August 2, 1979

- Senator Henry Jackson

  -- "'We appear to be going from one crisis to another.'"
  -- May 13, 1980 Wall Street Journal

- Senator Ernest P. Hollings (Senate Budget Committee Chairman) (Democrat, S.C.)
  -- Accused President Carter yesterday of the "height of hypocrisy" and "outrageous, deplorable conduct" for assailing a compromise congresisonal budget plan as too defense heavy.
     -- May 29, 1980 Washington Post re FY 81 defense spending plan.

- Representative John E. Moss (Demo

  -- "President Carter has been the least effective president since he (Rep. Moss) came to Capitol Hill."
     -- February 8, 1978 Washington Star (on retiring after 26 years in Congress)

FOREIGN COMMENTS TOWARDS CARTER

Helmut Schmidt sought repeatedly to determine U.S. plans only to "read about it, with newspapers." (Time reports Schmidt broke into tears over Carter's failure to understand his responsibility as leader of the U.S.)

Singapore's P.M. Lee Kuan Yew: "a sorry admission of the limits of America's power", refering to Carter's vision of U.S. role.
-- Time, August 18, 1980

High-level British policymaker: "Consultation by the Americans with their European allies has been at its lowest ebb since Suez."
-- Time, June 30, 1980

The prestigious London "Economist" says in its 10/18/80 edition: "The conviction that Mr. Carter is a dangerously second-rate president rests upon the observation that his first term has been marked more by failure than by success, and the fear that there is something in the man which makes it unlikely that the pattern would change in a second term.

The following quotes were taken from the Chicago Tribune, August 21, 1979:

"The American presidency is experiencing its most serious crisis in 50 years, in many respects more serious than Watergate."
-- Il Giornale, Milan

"Placing a 34-year-old imagemaker, Hamilton Jordan, at that power level of the Western world leaves some people uneasy. The members of Carter's young team are the most expensive apprentices in the world."
-- Handelsblatt, Dusseldorf

"Jimmy Carter's difficulties are the result of his ambiguous relationship with the traditional political groups that dominate Congress."
-- Le Matin, Paris

"After 30 months in office, Carter appears to be more a preacher than a statesman, with many exhortations but little action."
-- Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung

Memorandum To: Governor Reagan

Subject: Carter's Welfare Record in Georgia
From: Caspar W. Weinberger
Copies to: Ed Meese
Martin Anderson

October 20, 1980

The Governor and Carter were both governors during the period 1970-1974.

Under Carter: Welfare rolls rose in Georgia by 19.3%. The average benefit declined by $1 per month (from already very low levels)

Under Governor Reagan: Welfare rolls in California declined 8%. (If you use the period 1971-1974, they declined 23%) The average monthly benefit rose $67 a month (or 34%).

State Employees: During the same period, State Employees increased 8% in California, 34% in Georgia. The average increase for all states was 16%.

Spending: In Georgia, 1971-1975, all state spending rose 35%. In California, same period, state spending rose only 9%.

The national average state spending increase during this period was 25%, so state spending was held well below the national average in California during these 4 years; ~~but in Georgia it rose more than twice the national average.~~

The above figures came from Warren Brooks of the Boston Herald. I checked with him, and he confirms those figures. His sources were: HEW for the Welfare figures (based on reports from the states); the U.S. Statistical Abstract, published by the Census Bureau, for the years 1974-79. The spending figures are in constant 1971 $, measured by the GNP deflation.

Caspar W. Weinberger

CWW:pl

REAGAN'S CALIFORNIA RECORD ON THE TOUGH ISSUES

Spending

- Between 1967 and 1975, California's rate of per capita spending growth was the lowest among the ten most populous states, and was lower than in 45 of the other 49 states.

- Reagan reduced the real (inflation-adjusted) rate of spending growth by two-thirds of what it had been under Pat Brown.

- Reagan vetoed 994 bills in his two terms, which prevented an estimated $15½ billion in spending. Only 1 veto overridden.

- Between 1971 and 1975, when both Reagan and Carter were governors, real per capita spending grew by three percent in California versus 14 percent in Georgia.

Taxes

- Between Reagan's first full fiscal year in office (FY 1968) and the end of his second term (FY 1975) per capita state taxes in California grew at a lower rate than in 47 of the other 49 states.

- Per capita state and local taxes combined grew at a lower rate than in 45 of the other 49 states between fiscal years 1968 and 1975.

- There were some tax increases during Reagan's terms, but they helped to turn a million dollar a day deficit when he took office to a $554 million surplus when he left.

- Prudent fiscal practice paid off. When Reagan was Governor, California's bonds were upgraded to the highest possible bond rating, Moody's Triple-A, for the first time in 31 years.

State Government Employment

- The civil service work force under RR's control grew as much in RR's entire eight years as it did in only one year under his predecessor. Based on State Personnel Board figures, California's full-time civil service work force grew by only 6000 employees (5.8%) in 8 years, or an average only 750 employees a year (less than one percent annually).

- State employment, relative to population, grew at less than one-third the national state average (10% versus 33%) between 1966 and 1974.

- Between 1970 and 1974, the approriate benchmarks for comparing Carter's and Reagan's records as Governor, California state employment, relative to population, grew at one-sixth the rate of Georgia's (4% versus 26%).

Welfare

Reagan's welfare reform program began in January, 1971 through administrative means, and was incorporated into legislation in October, 1971. The results were:

- The California welfare rolls were growing at the rate of about 40,000 per month as 1971 began. But between April and November of 1971, as the reform program began to take effect, 175,000 people left the rolls. The decline continued through the end of 1974.

- From the time the welfare reforms started to take effect in 1971 until late 1974, the close of the Reagan Administration, there were over 850,000 fewer persons on family welfare and general assistance programs than had been projected by legislative and other experts prior to the 1971 reforms.

- Between fiscal years 1967 and 1975, real per capita welfare spending in California grew 42% versus a national state average growth of 131%.
- Benefits to truly needy increased by an average of more than 40%.

Consumer Protection

- Reagan reorganized the various consumer protection bureaucracies into a single Department of Consumer Affairs, thereby giving consumers a single department with which to deal.

- Reagan supported the establishment of a Division of Auto Repairs to crack down on unscrupulous practices, signed legislation protecting the public against unordered merchandise, and approved legislation giving consumers the power to sue for damages and injunctions in deceptive practices cases.

Environmental Protection

- Reagan created an Air Resources Board which greatly strengthened the state's powers to control air pollution.
- Reagan implemented a program that outfitted cars with the most sophisticated smog control devices available, reducing hydrocarbon emissions by 90%. Nader group later said Calif. had toughest anti-smog laws in the U.S.
- Reagan played a major role in enacting the California Water Quality Quality Act of 1969--the strongest water pollution control law in U.S. history.

Occupational Safety

- Reagan presided over the 1973 creation of Cal/OSHA, California's safety agency. None of Cal/OSHA's standards have been challenged in court since the agency's inception.

OHIO: Facts

When Carter proclaims economic revival, RR can partly rebut by telling him to look around at some of the economic misery in Ohio:

Unemployment: Ohio -- 10.2% (July, 1980)
9.1% (Aug., 1980)
Cleveland (city) -- 12.7% (July, 1980)

Youngstown: 10/8 trip by RR

- RR spoke at largely abandoned Jones and Laughlin plant in Mahoning Valley, where 13,000 jobs have been lost in last 3 years . . . and buildings were "shells of what once were busy rolling mills and blast furnaces.

Cleveland:

- Ford Motor Company -- out of 8500 workers, 7000 have now been laid off.

- City economy: City defaulted on $15 million in municipal notes in 1978. Has embarked on 3-year recovery plan, now has first balanced budget in long time. Much of progress due to new Republican mayor, George V. Voinovich. But for complete recovery, city needs healthy national economy.

- Mortgage rates for 30-year mortgage, now 12.7%.

- Housing costs (medium priced new/old home sales average)

1976	$43,200
1980	$64,300
1984	$95,800 (projected under Carter inflation)

For the Cleveland, Akron and Lorain areas.

ECONOMY

- The Economy
- A Bright Economic Future Under Carter?
- Attack Points on Carter Reindustrialization Program (RIP)
- Reagan's 5-Point Strategy for Economic Growth
- Responding to Carter's Attacks on RR's Economic Plan

THE ECONOMY

The Carter Record--Worst of any President in 50 years.
His "Seven Deadly Sins:"

1. Created the worst inflation since WWII
   --As high as 18% this spring
2. 8 million unemployed now--highest since Great Depression
   --If all the men and women out of work stood in line (2 feet apart), the line would stretch from New York to Los Angeles.
3. Nearly doubled the level of taxation.
   --The average family of 4, pays $5,000 more in taxes a year.
4. Increased federal spending by more than 50%.
5. Four year deficit is biggest of any President in history.
   --Last year's deficit (including off budget) single largest in history ---$77 billion.
6. Increased national debt by over 40%.
7. Highest interest rates since the Civil War.

	When Carter Elected	Today
Inflation	4.8%	12%+
Unemployment	7.3	7.5
Misery Index	12	20
Mortgage Interest Rates	9	14

Carter in 1976 debates promised that by end of 1st term, would reduce unemployment to 4½%, inflation would be controlled, budget would be balanced. Also promised in debates never to raise taxes for working people.

What 4 More Years of Carter Will Be Like:

-- Another four years of Carter inflation will mean that goods will cost twice as much as when he was elected. In the September '80 figures released last Friday, the cost of groceries was escalating at the annual rate of 25.3%. Examples of 1984 prices with continued Carter inflation:

Milk	$3.60/half gallon
Bread	1.85/loaf
Hamburger	2.17/pound

Senate budget committee estimates that with Carter programs, federal taxes will double once again by 1985 (to $1.1 trillion).

Under Carter economic programs, Washington scheduled to take 30 cents out of every new dollar earned in the economy. Washington already taxing at war-time levels.

Carter Blames Everyone But Himself

1. Has blamed OPEC
2. Has blamed American people (their malaise)
3. Has blamed Federal Reserve most recently (even though he appointed 5 of 7 members, including the chairman).

Symbol administration: Finger pointed the other way.

Carter Still Fails to Recognize the Source of the Problem

September 12, 1979 speech: "Government cannot... reduce inflation."

Oct. 14, 1980 speech. Listed as first cause of inflation "The failure to raise adequate revenues at a time of greatly increase public spending."

Carter Also Fails to Appreciate the Suffering

Oct. 20, 1980, speech, when asked about inflation and unemployment, told audience in Youngstown, Ohio: American people shouldn't dwell on "temporary inconveniences." --Not temporary inconvenience to elderly and poor.

Under Carter, "real spendable median income" (after taxes and inflation) has dropped about 10% since 1977. (NOTE: some other measurements show slight increase since 1977, but all show that upward escalator has stalled for personal income in U.S. The pie has just stopped growing.)

A BRIGHT ECONOMIC FUTURE UNDER CARTER?

The nation's economy is "well on the way to a full recovery...I think the future looks very bright for us."

Jimmy Carter
Youngstown, Ohio
October 20, 1980

Points to be Made:

1. Inflation may choke recovery: There is a widespread concern among economists that high interest rates and high inflation will cause the fragile recovery to stall out within a matter of weeks.

> "As we look ahead, after several months of improving real activity, the recovery is likely to suffer a setback around the turn of the year...The recent run-up in interest rates reduces the likelihood that the summer economic rebound will initiate a sustained recovery."
>
> Walter Heller
> John Kennedy's chief economic advisor
> October 17, 1980

2. Can anyone trust Carter this time? Last time, he promised us less inflation, less unemployment, a balanced budget -- and look what we got. Why should we trust him again?

> Example of Carter's lousy forecasting: At beginning of 1978, he forecast a 6% inflation over next 12 months. Turned out to be 13%. Jimmy Carter's license as a forecaster ought to be revoked.

3. Even Carter's own men don't believe him: Consider recent comments from some of those closest to him:

> "We're not going to see any quick progress for inflation...it will take seven or eight years for the rate to drop" to an acceptable level.
>
> Treasury Secretary
> William Miller
> New York Daily News
> October 23, 1980

On that same day, Alfred Kahn, Carter's chief inflation fighter, warned that consumer food prices will rise sharply for the remainder of the year -- nearly 12% in months ahead.

Washington Post
October 23, 1980

4. A Reagan Dare: If Jimmy Carter believes the economy is so bright, I agree with what Ted Kennedy said some months ago -- he's been so busy sniffing roses in the rose garden that he's lost touch with America. I dare him to come with me tomorrow morning -- and I'll take him on my own plane -- to see the real America of 1980:

South Bronx
Youngstown (Jones & Laughlin)
Detroit (where auto sales announced last week were sharply below a year ago)

ATTACK POINTS ON CARTER REINDUSTRIALIZATION PROGRAM (RIP)

- Carter revitalization program is fifth program in this administration and the third economic program in last eight months.
- Program jeopardizes pension funds by using them to bail out firms in financial trouble. Very troublesome for union members.
- Many observers believe this plan is election-year window dressing. Has never been sent to Hill and there is little evidence that serious work is being done on it.
- Federal tax burden would rise more than $80 billion next year.
- Carter plan does not significantly impact unemployment. Administration's own spokesmen say that even with the plan unemployment would run at 8.5% a year.
- Credit against Social Security tax is meager, a bandaid for largest peace-time tax increase (Carter social security tax); barely offsets inflation of last 4 years.
- Economic Revitalization Board designed to create a working partnership for business and industry, has potential for further government interference. We don't need another agency. Federal welfare for business. Parallels British economic sickness.

REAGAN'S FIVE-POINT STRATEGY FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH

1. REDUCE GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Reagan Proposed Percentage Reduction in Senate Budget Committee Projected Spending

	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985
Expected Reductions	2%	4%	5%	6%	7%
Reductions Goal	3%	6%	8%	10%	10%

--Carter projects annual federal spending will increase from $563.6 billion in FY 80 to over $900 billion in 1985.

--RR expects to cut the FY 85 amount by $64 billion ($13 billion in FY 81)

- Through comprehensive assault on waste and inefficiency, including:
  - Appointments of men and women who want spending control.
  - Immediate freeze on level federal employment (note: partial freeze now in effect).
  - National Citizens' Task Forces to rigorously examine every department, agency (as RR did in California).
  - Spending Control Task Force (chaired by Weinberger, former OMB director) to submit detailed report during transition on elimination of waste, extravagance.
  - RR plan will carefully preserve necessary entitlements already in place -- e.g., Social Security. But RR will restrain Congressional desire for "add ons" and will make administrative savings.

2. REDUCE TAXES

--Senate Budget Committee estimates federal tax revenues will more than double by FY 85 to $1.1 trillion a year (rise of about $117 billion a year, total of $584 billion). Taxes next year will rise by $86 billion under Carter.

--RR proposes a three-part program:
(1) Across-the-board reduction of 10% a year in individual income tax rates, 1981, 1982, and 1983.
(2) Indexation for personal income tax brackets thereafter.
(3) Accelerated depreciation to stimulate job-creating investments.

-- Revenue effects
- Estimated loss in taxes: $172 billion in 1985.
- Cuts would stimulate an additional 1% in annual economic growth by FY 85. Conservative Senate Budget Committee estimates are that such growth will produce an additional $39 billion in revenue in FY 85. RR, as a supply sider, has confidence that more revenues will be generated.
- Federal budget would move into balance in FY 83 -- the first time since 1969 -- and would show surplus of $93 billion in FY 85. (Source: U.S. Budget FY 81).

--Federal share of GNP
- Under Carter, Federal share of GNP rising steadily:
  1976 18.5% (Source: U.S. Budget FY 81)
  1981 21.7% (projected)
  1985 24.4% (projected) Highest rate in history
- Under RR plan, federal share of GNP in 1985 would be 20.4%.
  - 16% lower than Carter and much closer to historical average. (Source: Sen. Budget Committee Minority)
  - Note that under Carter, Washington's projected share of economic growth through 1985 expected to be stunning 31%.

-- Note RR still in favor of repealing destructive elements windfall profits tax, estate and inheritance taxes, and providing tuition tax credits. But these not included in above estimates. Would be phased in when fiscally possible.

3. DEREGULATION

-- Thorough and systematic review pledged; RR to see how regulation has contributed to economic deterioration without backing away from general goals.

-- Steps to implement include:
- Effective economic impact statements re future regs -- weighing cost against benefit.
- Working with Congress to tighten the reins on regulators -- too much discretion today.
- Priority analysis of every current regulation to see if needed -- like sunset review.
- Special task force (headed by Dr. Murray Weidenbaum, one of nation's foremost authorities on subject) to submit detailed recommendations in November.

4. SOUND MONETARY POLICY

-- Independent Federal Reserve; but RR appointees would be men and women who share commitment to restoring value of US dollar and believe in sound, stable, and predictable monetary policy.

5. RESTORE PUBLIC CONFIDENCE

-- Carter has announced 5 new economic policies, 3 in the past 8 months. Uncertainty has created mass confusion, undermined credibility of his policies (only Carter certainty: more taxes, more hardship, more confusion).

-- RR plans to establish and implement economic policy early -- within first 90 days -- and then stick to essentials of this policy.

-- Policy wil be oriented toward the long-term; no sudden or capricious change of "rules of the game."

RESPONDING TO CARTER ATTACKS ON RR'S ECONOMIC PLAN

I. Carter: RR economic proposals are wildly inflationary.

1. Would never take advice on inflation from economists in the Carter administration. They have been about as helpful to the economy as the iceberg was to the Titanic.

-- Gave us the worst inflation in peactime history.

-- Act as if no one can cure. But Gerald Ford cut inflation in half in less than 2 years. And Germany and Japan, even though they are more dependent on oil than U.S., last year had inflation rates less than half our own. Inflation can be controlled.

-- Finally, they misunderstand the cause of inflation. Carter said last year that "government cannot..... reduce inflation" (Washington Star 9/12/79). Absolutely wrong: government is the chief cause of inflation.

2. RR would cut to the heart of problem by cutting the growth of govt spending. Would cut at least 7% -- goal of 10% -- from projected Carter spending. Comprehensive assault on waste and fraud, begin to return some responsibilities to the states. Would balance the budget by 1983.

3. Cuts would be joined by reduction in tax rates designed to spur economic growth, increase productivity of our workers.

-- By producing more goods, we will finally end the inflationary cycle of too much money chasing too few goods.

-- Disagree with Carter economists that it is not inflationary for government to spend your money but is inflationary for you to spend it. That's the kind of elitist thinking that has gotten us in such a mess.

4. The projections in my proposal are very conservative -- project inflation rate of about 7.5%, but convinced that if we finally jolt the economy out of stagnation, we can do much, much better.

Ford -- with his strong use of veto power -- actually brought the inflation rate down 20% faster in 1975 than his advisers predicted.

-- RR in California also brought down inflation. Veto a powerful weapon there too.

So it can be done.

II. Carter: RR can't cut taxes, raise defense spending and balance the budget -- unless he uses mirrors or drastically cuts social programs.

1. Accept the fact that Mr. Carter sincerely believes this -- because the way he intends to balance the budget over the next four years is to raise taxes by over a trillion dollars. Under Carter, Washington alone will take better than 30 cents out of every dollar in the economy over next four years.

2. But the Carter economists are living in the past with ideas that no longer work. They still cling to the notion that the answer to our economic and social problems is for Washington to spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect. That may have worked 40 years ago, but it is bleeding us dry today.

-- RR puts his faith in new and more powerful idea: economic growth through a revival of the supply side of the economy. Inject new life into the private sector.

3. RR has been working with some of best economists in country -- two former chairmen of the Council of Economic Advisers (Greenspan and Burns), a Nobel laureate (Milton Friedman), former secretary of the Treasury (Simon) and others -- to build an economic program based on hope -- not despair.

4. Because Carter has built so much inflation into the economy, tax revenues will be growing faster than Washington will be able to effectively use. Carter wants to have Washington spend most of that extra revenue; RR wants to give some of it back to the taxpayers.

5. Cuts in tax rates will then allow both consumers and business to expand their buying power, will increase overall growth. Start up the economic engine again -- while also keeping all of Washington's social commitments and still balancing the budget.

6. One point often overlooked: the underground economy. Professor Edgar Feige of University of Wisconsin has recently estimated that underground economy may be as high as 27% of GNP and it is growing at roughly triple the rate of the rest of the economy. (WS Journal, Oct. 20, 1980)

-- Most Americans want to live within the law. If taxes can be lowered, RR believes that a good deal of this underground economy will go above ground -- becoming tax-supporting again. Carter economics is just driving them below ground.

-- Also noteworthy that in underground economy -- where there are no real taxes -- prices may be as much as 20-40% lower than above ground. Shows what can be done in a more tax-free environment.

7. But the key point is this: RR is putting his faith in private enterprise and economic growth. Carter is putting his faith in more government -- and economic stagnation.

III. Carter: RR plan is Robin Hood in reverse -- take from the poor and give to the rich. More GOP trickle-down.

1. When Mr. Carter came back from Texas last week, he brought some of that horse manure with him. He's absolutely wrong about these tax cuts -- everyone in America gets the same cut in tax rates over the next three years.

2. Proposal is heavily weighted toward middle income people, because they are the backbone of the American economy. Under RR plan, those who make under $30,000 each year would get more than half of the tax benefits -- even though they pay less than half of the taxes today. (Joint Committee on Taxation)

3. As for the rich, just recall the tax cuts of Jack Kennedy that were so successful in the 1960s and ignited one of the strongest periods of economic growth in 40 years. RR plan very similar to Kennedy's. After Kennedy cut taxes across the board like this, the taxes paid by millionaires doubled within two years.

ENERGY

- Conservation desirable, but key is higher production. It can be done:
  -- US has 47 year supply of oil (including shale)
  -- 27 years of natural gas
  -- 321 years of coal. (1980 report from DOE & reports from US Geological Survey)

- Carter talks about more production, but his actions discourage it:

  -- His Dept of Energy ($12 billion, 35,000 pages of regs) has increased red tape, bureaucracy.
  -- Oil:
     - His "windfall profits tax" will reduce production by 500,000 barrels/day by 1990 (enough for 250,000 cars/year).
     - Burdensome restrictions on offshore leasing. Only 4% of Outer Continental Shelf offered for lease; no off-shore leasing in Alaska, and Carter has locked up nearly 100 million square miles of Alaskan land.
  -- Coal: 1,000 new pages of regs has contributed to one of worst slumps in history (22,000 miners out of work)
  -- Natural gas: His opposition to dereg and then signature on faulty bill (creating 23 pricing categories, extending controls to intrastate natural gas) holding production down.
  -- Nuclear: Under JC, net of 4 new plants ordered, 36 orders cancelled. Net loss of 32 plants equivalent to 900,000 barrels/day of oil.

- Result of Carter policies: production far below potential

  -- Oil: In lower 48 states, production has fallen each year under JC; overall, down 12% (Total US production has gone up slightly because of new inflow from Alaska -- but that's only because of Alaskan pipeline, built over objections of many Democrats in Congress & long before Carter).
  -- Natural gas: production up only 2% in JC's first 3 years.
  -- Coal: Carter promised in 1979 to double production by 1985, but it has been increasing only 4% a year under JC so far.
  -- Nuclear: no new orders in 2 years.

- American consumers also paying high price for Carter policies:

  -- Gasoline prices have doubled under JC; frequent long lines.
  -- Home heating oil also up sharply. US average has increased from 41¢ per gallon in 1976 to $1.00 per gallon in 1980.
  -- Oil import bill has also doubled, creating worst trade deficits in US history, weak dollar.

- Reagan 4-Point Energy Policy

  1. Greatly accelerate production
     -- Dereg oil and natural gas ASAP.
     -- Accelerate federal leasing for oil, eliminate unnecessary regs on coal (consistent with good environment)
     -- Streamline nuclear licensing, upgrade nuclear safety standards, accelerate solutions for waste.

2. Encourage greater conservation, relying primarily on market.

   -- Between 1973-78, industry on own produced 12% more goods with 6% less energy.
   -- Continue tax credits, faster depreciation to encourage greater energy investment.

3. Accelerate development of national petroleum reserves

   -- 4 year old program is now 3½ years behind schedule. Designed to have 6 month supply, has only 2 weeks. Carter vulnerable in light of unsettled situation in Middle East.

4. For long term future, provide research funds to stimulate new technologies such as solar, fusion.

Other Notes

1. Abolition of DOE: Carter will criticize as simplistic. RR would transfer necessary functions such as defense research to other departments. Reduce reg/related programs now costing $2 billion a year.

2. Synthetic Fuel: RR has opposed Carter call for $88 billion Syn Fuels Corporation which commmits government to subsidize syn fuels. More big government; could create white elephants. Better to support research on new technologies, let private enterprise develop the most promising.

3. Windfall profits: Carter will assert RR trying to enrich big oil. But the tax actually hits small independents who drill 80-90% of exploratory wells essential to new oil finds. Tax also makes US most expensive place to search for oil.

4. 55 mph speed limit: RR does not reject -- wants to leave to states.

5. Other Carter attack lines:

   -- RR statement about more oil in Alaska. Some estimates do show potential in Alaska greater than Saudi reserves, but critical point is Alaska shouldn't be locked up.
   -- RR statement that US could be energy self-sufficient in 5 years. Critical point again is to move consistently in right direction. Not like Carter.
   -- RR statement that conservation only means running out more slowly. If Carter raises, point out pure conservation/anti-production will lead there. Critical point is to achieve balance.

6. US dependence on OPEC. Carter may claim it is down from 1979. But reason is the recession in 1980 and skyrocketing prices. If we get economy back on track, will discover that we are still excessively dependent on OPEC.

NUCLEAR POWER

- In next several years, U.S. has no choice but to rely upon more nuclear power and increased production of coal.

- Carter agrees, but his ineffective leadership has jeopardized nuclear industry:

  -- JC unable to prevent Democrats from adopting platform calling for phase-out of nuclear plants.

  -- Since 1977, plans for 32 nuclear plants (net total) have been cancelled. Will mean loss of nearly 900,000 barrels of oil/day.

  -- Cancellations due in large part to public concern about safety, unresolved issue of nuclear waste disposal.
     - Carter Administration apathetic about safety until Three Mile Island. Then appointed Kemeny Commission to review safety efforts of Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Safety recommendations welcomed -- and we should proceed on them; give us a safer foundation on which to build.
     - Administration and Congress also slow to address problem of nuclear waste. Technology has been largely developed, per experts, but hard political decisions still must be made on waste. Carter hasn't shown enough leadership here.

- Reagan Approach: Move ahead with safe program.

  1. Accelerate development of nuclear power through technologies that have been proven safe, efficient.

  2. Streamline licensing process through consolidation of present review process and through standardization of reactor design (outrageous that U.S., once the pioneer in nuclear power, now takes more than twice as long to plan and build new plant as Japan, many nations of Europe).

  3. Accelerate safety effort along lines of Kemeny report.

  4. Demonstrate waste disposal alternatives and try to solve difficult siting problems (no one wants in his backyard).

ENVIRONMENT

- Healthy environment not a luxury but a necessity. RR bows to no one in commitment.

- As Governor of California
  -- Clean air program left California with "toughest anti-smog laws in the country," according to Nader group.
  -- 1st major revision of water quality laws in 2 decades.
  -- Added 145,000 acres of park land.

- RR concerned that federal government going overboard. In the name of environmental purity, many regulations bring little environmental gain but have devastating impact on the economy.

  Example: Steel industry subject to 5,600 regulations, terrible unemployment, failing to compete. Carter election-year conversion not believable.

- As President, would carefully balance environmental and economic needs.
  -- Move positively on urgent environmental problems -- toxic and nuclear wastes. Must be no more Love Canals, and we must solve the nuclear waste problem.
     - Carter response has been weak on both; extraordinary that 1976 Toxic Wastes Act insufficiently funded until FY 81 budget; that little progress made on nuclear waste disposal
  -- Comprehensive review of all regulations, modifying those that are inadequate, streamlining the burdensome, and eliminating the unnecessary.
  -- Re-evaluate goals and standards set by legislation passed nearly a decade ago (e.g., Clean Air Act up for review, renewal in 1981), using updated scientific evidence.
  -- Permit greater flexibility in meeting federal standards. Set standards but let individuals and companies find best way to meet.
  -- Open up more federal land to exploration for energy and minerals. Example: Alaska.

- Summary: Make no mistake. RR will not permit the safety of our people or our environmental heritage to be jeopardized, but RR reaffirms that economic prosperity of our people is a fundamental part of our environment.

- Other Notes on Environment

1. Carter may attack RR on:
   a. Recent press statement that air pollution "substantially under control." Carter misunderstands RR's point: namely, that U.S. has made great deal of progress in cleaning up air pollution, but cost of achieving absolute purity (as some extremists want) could be extremely high in terms of lost jobs, weak economy. Carter's own Council on Environmental Quality, in latest report (Dec. 1979, pg. ix) said that "overall, the nation's air quality is improving."
   b. Idea that pollution comes from trees, Mt. St. Helens. The general point is that pollution comes from many sources; some are more dangerous than others; what the nation needs is a balanced program to preserve environment while also bringing economic growth.
   c. Carter may also charge that RR as governor defied Clean Air Act of 1970, proposing air pollution control program rejected by EPA on 5 counts. RR rebuttal: that was draconian plan for state, would have included gas rationing, parking restrictions, land use control, restrictions on 70-80% LA auto traffic. CA and other states rejected such plans. RR vindicated in 1977 when Congress revised Clean Air Act, preventing EPA from carrying out such impractical measures.

2. Acid Rain: current issue in North East, Great Lakes (including Ohio), and eastern Canada. Acid rain believed by many to come from weak sulfuric and nitric acid precipitation resulting from power plants (coal esp.). CEQ has said that cause and impact of acid rain still not clear. RR recognizes that problem needs further study.

3. Toxic wastes: Hot issue. Public aroused by Love Canal in NY where 263 families evacuated. CEQ estimates 1200-2000 U.S. disposal sites may pose risks; but 76 law (enacted under Ford) insufficiently funded under Carter. FY 81 budget finally requests increases. Costs estimated for clean-up range from hundreds of millions to billions of dollars (Love Canal alone as high as $150 million). Controversy continues, especially regarding $4-5 billion Superfund which Congress now debating. Two issues involved: (1) Coverage -- should oil spills be covered, for example? (2) Who should pay -- industry, government, combination?

URBAN & HOUSING POLICIES

URBAN

- The Carter Record: Carter proclaims his "Comprehensive Urban Policy"; the only thing comprehensive about it is its comprehensive failure. Examples:
  -- South Bronx: promises cruelly broken.
  -- Cleveland: out of 8500 workers in Ford plant, 7000 laid off now.
  -- Detroit: unemployment this summer hit 18% (for minorities, 56%).
  -- Miami: riots showed unrest seething below the surface.
  -- New York: over past 5 years, has lost 73,000 manufacturing jobs (problem afflicting other cities).
  -- Mayor Koch has hands tied by Federal regulations in trying to solve problem.
  -- Overall, number of large cities operating in the red has doubled over last two years (over half of cities of over 100,000 now in red according to Joint Economic Committee report).

  Note: Carter claims big progress on legislation, but all three of his major bills abandoned by Congress because too complex. Carter's own 1980 National Urban Policy Report documents continued pattern of decline in central cities.

- Reagan Agenda for the Cities

  1. Economic growth -- single most important solution.

  2. Private enterprise zones: in depressed urban areas, taxes and regulations would be reduced, encouraging new investment, job creation. Idea from England and now being tried there.

  MORE COMPREHENSIVE

  3. Urban Homesteading: initiated by Ford in 1975, scaled down by Carter to bare minimum. Part of effort to revitalize neighborhoods.

  4. Give cities greater discretion over federal aid (block grants).

  5. Reduce federal regulatory requirements that increase local tax burdens or skew expenditures.

HOUSING

- Carter Record: As RR saw in housing development in Kansas City, Carter economic policies have been devastating for American housing:
  -- Under Carter, cost of new housing has doubled; housing starts (while showing temporary improvement) are half the level when JC took office; rental construction down 12%.
  -- Under Carter, interest rates have been highest since Civil War (prime rate recently raised to 14% by major banks; mortgage rates now at 14%).

-- In 1976, Carter attacked Ford on basis that only 25% of families could afford new home; today, less than 10% can afford. Median monthly payment on new house up to $556.
-- Total loss to economy of housing slump est. at $125 billion in lost jobs, income equivalent of bankruptcy of 5 Chryslers.

- Reagan Agenda for Housing

1. Economic growth -- again the solution.

2. Encourage new savings through tax provisions (saving rate at lowest level in 30 years).

3. Reduce regulatory maze (Seidel study for Rutgers est. that local, state, federal regs add 20% to cost of new house).

4. Expand home ownership thru alternative mortgage instuments for new homebuyers, older Americans, middle income Americans.

5. Place greater emphasis upon rehabilitation of existing stock (thru local initiatives for neighborhoods).

REAGAN AS FRIEND OF LABOR

RR happy to run as friend of working men and women:

-- 1st Presidential candidate in history who is former union president.

-- Solid labor record in California.

-- Welcome endorsements of Teamsters, Maritime unions.

-- Basic goal is that shared by working men and women: economic growth with lower inflation.

-- Also firmly support:
  -- Open door in Oval Office for everyone - including labor.
  -- Safety and health in workplace; no retreat;
  -- Adequately funded unemployment relief programs
  -- Fair trade as well as free trade - make US exports competitive again.

How can 4 more years of Carter economics help working people? Look at 1st 4 years:

-- 8 million people out of work (highest since Great Depression)
-- Hourly wages going down for past 2 years (real terms)
-- Taxes are nearly doubled.
-- Inflation has tripled.
-- And industries like steel, autos fighting for their lives against ever-increasing imports.

New Carter economic plan -- in curious reversal of roles for parties -- tilts more heavily toward business. Carter forgetting the working man and woman.

Note: During campaign, RR has spoken out on several key labor issues that show he is friend of working men and women. Among them:

Agree with Labor on
Don't repeal Davis-Bacon -- seek administrative improvements
Don't dismantle OSHA -- reform it.
Don't apply anti-trust laws to labor.
Support collective bargaining in public sector.
Support for Polish workers.

Disagree with Labor on
Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment Bill (RR does not support)
Labor law reform bill (RR does not support)

KNOW GENERALLY

HEALTH CARE

Carter Record abysmal on 3 counts:

1. Soaring costs of health care
   -- Cost of hospital bed in NY up 36% under Carter -- from $169 a day in '76 to $230 in '79 (Hospital Assn. of NY).
   -- Prescription drug expenditures up 33%.
   -- Nursing home expenditures up 56%.

2. Has created legislative merry-go-round
   -- His mandatory, national health insurance program never moved in Congress.
   -- Now pressing cost containment proposal that has twice been rejected by House as regulatory nightmare.

3. Failed to curb fraud/waste in Medicare & Medicaid
   -- In '76, claimed Medicaid "a national scandal", claimed as much as $7.5 billion wasted/stolen each year.
   -- In '77, set up special unit in HEW to attack but only has 54 inspectors, has managed only 21 indictments.
   -- When Sec. Joe Califano resigned last year, said massive fraud still plagues federal health, welfare.

Reagan sees 4 critical problems to address in 80s:

1. Cost of health care
   -- Must cut general rate of inflation (that accounts for over half of health care increases in 80s).
   -- Reduce regulatory burden (NY Hospital Assn. has estimated that 25% of cost of daily hospital bed due to federal, state, local regulations).
   -- Encourage "Voluntary Effort" already underway in hospitals. Has shown promising results over past 2½ years; since late '78, health care rising more slowly than CPI; Congress endorsed idea in 1979. Better than cost containment.

2. Access to health care
   -- Instead of federally directed systems (favored by JC), RR favors tax incentives, loan programs to encourage physicians to work in underserved areas. (U.S. moving toward a physician surplus by mid-80s per experts)

3. Insurance coverage
   -- Key problem the working poor. Middle income/upper income mostly covered through private plans (180 million Americans now enrolled in private plans); poor mostly covered by Medicare, Medicaid. Working poor -- 11-18 million strong -- have the serious problem.
   -- RR would stimulate private system (through tax incentives) to broaden coverage to these, also has supported catastrophic coverage during campaign.

4. Root out fraud and waste in health/welfare programs

EDUCATION - WELFARE

SCHOOLS

- Carter taking country down wrong track:
  --Only accomplishment is creation of new bureaucracy, the Dept. of Education ($15 billion, 17,000 employees). Will create more paperwork, more federal intrusion. Parents, local governments losing control of education.
  --Carter also broke 1976 campaign promise, working against tuition tax credits.
  --Meanwhile, test scores on college boards falling; lack of discipline continues to plague many schools.
  --A report released this month by the White House entitled "Science and Engineering Education for the 1980s and Beyond" concluded that most Americans are headed toward "virtual scientific and technological illiteracy."

- Reagan Alternative
  --Reduce federal intrusion, paperwork -- 5,000 man-years devoted by principals, teachers on federal forms annually.
  --Encourage local leadership -- that's the key to quality education.
    - convert 70 categorical grant programs to block funding for elementary-secondary education.
    - tuition tax credits: strengthen parental freedom over children's education.

WELFARE

- Carter Failures
  --Has failed to make much of a dent. Some 18 million now on welfare rolls; in NYC, one out of 6 on some form of welfare. In some families, beginning 2nd generation of welfare.
  --Carter 1st proposed massive federalization (cost est. from $20-60 billion: Sen. Long put $60 billion price tag on it). Plan failed in Congress. More recently, Carter has proposed scaled down program ($3-5 billion) but points in direction of guaranteed income, reduced work requirements. (Moynihan terms abandonment of reform in exchange for tireless tinkering of bureaucrats).
  --Democratic platform of 1980 calls for federalization.

- Reagan Alternative
  --Build on CA record, where trends reversed, number on welfare rolls reduced by 350,000 while benefits to truly needy up 40%. Proved good state leadership could solve much of problem.
  --Would decentralize through states; free states from wasteful federal rules (savings could help truly needy); orderly transfer of authority and financial resources to states.
  --Economic growth -- as in other areas, that again will take sting out of welfare problem.

WOMEN'S ISSUES

General

- Ronald Reagan firmly committed to equal rights; but interested in results, not rhetoric: legislative and Executive action rather than Constitutional amendment.

- As President, Ronald Reagan proposes:

  -- At the Federal Level: To follow President Ford's suggestion for legislation to make effective the intent of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 re sex discrimination in federal programs.
  -- At the State Level: To set up a liaison with Governors of the 50 states to seek out and change laws which continue to discriminate against women.
  -- Appointments: To appoint qualified women to important positions throughout the government; to make one of his first appointments to Supreme Court a woman.
  -- Programs: Tax credit policy for locally-based dependent care programs (children, elderly, disabled).
  -- Correct inequities in social security and pension systems.
  -- Eliminate (not reduce -- Carter) discriminatory marriage tax.
  -- Explore alternate work schedules (including part-time, flex-time, job sharing).

- Carter has substituted rhetoric for results.

  -- Under Carter median average income of women has remained 59.4% of that of men.
  -- Carter has ignored suggestions of his own Justice Dept. to attack sex discrimination in federally assisted programs.
  -- Despite '76 endorsement ERA, no state ratified since he was inaugurated as President (Democrats control 13 out of 15 state legislatures that have not ratified ERA).

- Staff Notes

  -- Avoid references to supporting "protective laws" for women (e.g., maximum hour limits); these laws are invalid under Civil Rights Act of '64, and EEOC administrative rulings.
  -- Stress link with President Ford.
  -- Do not reiterate abortion position.
  -- California Record. Established credit and improved property rights for women; signed laws prohibiting sex discrimination (employment, real property, insurance, business); initiated programs to develop and improve child care centers.

MINORITIES AND CIVIL RIGHTS

Carter has been tremendous disappointment for Blacks, other minorities:

- Minority groups (Blacks, Hispanics and Indians) hardest hit by inflation and unemployment. Minority unemployment today 13.6%. Unemployment among black youths 40%+. After previous gains, black family income as a percentage of white family income has fallen under Carter to 57%.

- Carter Administration has not met its minority goals: Example: South Bronx (which Carter promised would be showpiece of his urban development program) remains in poverty, with 1/3 on welfare.

Reagan Approach

- Sound economic policies to reduce inflation and provide permanent, not makework, jobs (including tax cuts and accelerated depreciation to encourage investment for jobs).

- Enterprise zones to bring new businesses and jobs into urban communities.

- Put life into Urban Homesteading program started under Ford.

- Reduce government spending and regulation to stimulate private jobs.

- Vigorous enforcement of laws protecting minorities in marketplace.

- In area of education, tuition tax credits to give minority parents a choice in their children's education.

- Temporary youth differential minimum wage to help minority youth.

- Will work with Congress to improve enforcement provisions of Fair Housing Act.

Other Notes:

- Endorsements by Ralph Abernathy/Hosea Williams/Charles Evers.

- RR has good record of minority appointments in California.

FOREIGN POLICY AND DEFENSE OVERVIEW

- Carter inheritance; As with the economy at home, Carter inherited an international situation that was greatly improving:

  -- Ford was healing wounds of Vietnam, and America was at peace.
  -- A supportable SALT II treaty was 90% complete.

  -- After decade of Congressional cuts in defense budgets, Ford in 1976 and 1977 achieved a turnaround of about 5% real budget authority increases per year; he put in place a sound defense budget for the future.
  -- Alliances were solid (leaders of Germany, Japan, Israel all publicly agreed on that).
  -- Soviet ambitions held in check in places like Persian Gulf, Afghanistan.

- Carter has squandered that inheritance thru policies that are inconsistent, incoherent, inept.

  -- Inconsistencies

  e.g.,
  - In Sept. 1979, said Russian troops in Cuba "not acceptable"; three weeks later, he humbly accepted them.
  - In March, 1980, administration failed to veto UN resolution condemning Israel's policy on Jerusalem; 2 days later, reversed course.
  - In summer, 1980, announced "open heart and open arms" to Cuban refugees; 10 days later, doors shut.
  - Many other examples: Korean troop withdrawal, support for Shah, etc.

  -- Incoherence

  e.g.,
  - In June, 1978, Carter asserted his "deep belief" that Brezhnev "wants peace and wants to have a better friendship"; on New Year's Eve, 1979 (3 years into Presidency), admitted Afghan invasion made him realize "what the Soviets' ultimate goals are."
  - For 3 years, hacked away at defense budget; cut Ford's budgets by $38 billion, delaying or cancelling vitally needed programs like MX, B-1; now campaigning for military build-up, MX, etc.
  - Human rights policy has stuck it to U.S. friends (e.g., Argentina) while turning blind eye to genocide in S.E. Asia (some 4 million have died there) and repression in Soviet bloc.

-- Ineptness

e.g., Failures hastened downfall of Shah, allowed old friendship with Iran to be destroyed, contributed to seizure of hostages, outbreak of war in area.
Emasculation of CIA (fired 816 personnel, including top experts on Iran, China, USSR, Middle East) left U.S. blind in a dangerous world.
Negotiated defective SALT II treaty that has been blocked by his own party in the Senate.

- Carter's tragic legacy; Decline of U.S. respect & power; Soviet threat growing; rising tide of violence and warfare; many fear that world is slipping toward chaos.

-- Under Carter, a number of countries have fallen under totalitarian Marxist rule for 1st time; Ethiopia, Afghanistan, Nicaraugua, South Yemen.

-- American embassies have been stormed or burned in Libya, Pakistan, Iran, Afghanistan; an American Ambassador has been murdered in Afghanistan. (When was last time Soviet embassy or ambassador was hit?)
-- On single day that shall live in infamy(2/14/79) U.S. ambassador killed in Afghanistan, U.S. embassy stormed in Iran, U.S. President publicly insulted in Mexico.

-- Soviets invaded Afghanistan (1st direct military intervention outside Warsaw Pact since WW II) and military influence has grown in Persian Gulf, Asia, Africa, Carribean

-- Massive Soviet military buildup and weak U.S. response has allowed them to open "window of maximum danger" for U.S. in early 80s; our land-based missiles vulnerable to pre-emptive strike.

-- Number of Cuban troops overseas has doubled -- from 20,000 to 40,000.

-- War in Gulf area between Iran, Iraq. Chaos in Iran may turn out to be most critical event of postwar period.

-- At time of growing danger for U.S. our alliances are frayed;
-- Schmidt and Giscard much less inclined to follow U.S. lead.
-- Latin nations like Argentina, Brazil, Mexico have expressed anger, frustration with U.S. human rights, nuclear policies (Argentina openly defied U.S. call

for grain embargo).
-- Pakistan, once one of staunchest friends, openly refused U.S. aid after Soviet troops marched into Afghanistan
-- Saudis, other moderate Arabs worry about U.S. sticking power.
-- Other friends (like Israel) privately worry about U.S. tendency to dump old allies (e.g., Taiwan)
-- As detente falls apart, new areas of world (e.g. Caribbean) began to appeal to Soviet appetite.

- Stark symbol of U.S. impotence; Hostages (debate marks 359th day).

THE REAGAN 9 STEP STRATEGY FOR PEACE

1. Improved policy-making structure for State, NSC.
2. Clear approach to East-West relations (seek balanced, realistic relationship)
3. More realistic policy toward hemisphere (intensive economic development in Caribbean, North American Accord with Canada and Mexico)
4. Plan to assist African and other Third World development (promote more private investment overseas)
5. Send U.S. message abroad (strengthen Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, etc.)
6. Realistic policy for strategic arms reduction (move directly to Salt III)
7. Strengthen armed services (better compensation, benefits; reinstate GI bill)
8. Take leadership role concerning international terrorism; beef up CIA.
9. Restore margin of safety for peace.

SEND IN THE MARINES

Carter likely to charge this is RR's instinctive reaction.

Points to be Made:

1. Quoted out of Context: Mr. Carter has distorted many old quotes, blown them way out of proportion. Let's set record straight.

2. There are rare occasions when America must show its strength in order to keep the peace.

   Examples:
   a. Dwight Eisenhower sent the marines into Lebanon in 1957, preserved freedom there, permitted elections to be held.

   b. John Kennedy stood up to Russians and their Cuban missiles in 1962.

   c. Even Mr. Carter sent troops into Iran to rescue hostages from their humiliating captivity. The mission was badly bungled, but all Americans supported it in spirit.

   No American President has ever totally renounced the use of force -- nor can he.

3. But force must always, always be a last resort.
   For America to stay at peace -- as we must -- there must be two bulwarks:

   First, we must have an effective foreign policy -- one that is bipartisan in nature, closely coordinated with our allies, principled and consistent. That is lacking today, and I intend to rebuild such a policy.

   Second, history shows that America has never gone to war when America has been strong. I intend to rebuild the strength of America so that we can keep the peace for the rest of this century. As a parent -- as a grandparent -- my deepest wish is that my children and my grandson may grow up in a stable, peaceful world.

DEFENSE

- RR's purpose is peace. Peace is best assured by strength and preparedness; it is risked by weakness and vacillation.

- Peace is in jeopardy. The margin of safety enjoyed for more than 30 years has eroded, as Soviets have engaged in most massive military buildup in history (outspending U.S. by over $200 billion over the past decade), while the American defense effort has relatively declined.

  1) Armed Services readiness has badly deteriorated
     --Six of the Army divisions in the U.S. not combat ready.
     --Six of thirteen carriers not combat ready.
     --All services suffer severe shortages of key personnel, both NCOs and officers.

     --$40 billion backlog of needed operations and maintenance funding.

  2) Ammunition and spare parts shortages critical

  3) Navy cut in half; Chief of Naval Operation says 1½ ocean navy for 3 ocean world. Navy can't meet basic requirements Ford 157 ship 5-year construction program has been slashed to 97.

  4) Army Chief of Staff (Gen. Meyer) says "we have a hollow army"; "inadequate fudns to provide the type of Army we need."
     --Commander of Army in Europe says we have an "obsolete" Army in Europe.

  5) Warsaw Pact outnumbers NATO on Central Front in Germany by 3-1 in tanks (Soviet tank armor a generation more advanced than any Western tank), 3-1 in artillery (generally better than ours), 2-1 in aircraft; and has more rapidly modernized than NATO. (Soviets and strategis advantages, large advantage in theater nuclear forces.)

  6) U.S. airborne divisions too heavy to move, too light to fight; to date, rapid deployment force has not really proceeded beyond 250-man staff in Florida.

  Note: Carter has attempted to paper over our problems; Services ordered recently to "emphasize the positive in evaluation reports.

- Carter Administration bears prime responsibility-Ford was seeking to reverse U.S. decline, but Carter--fulfilling campaign pledges --sought to gut Ford program.
  -- Since taking office, has cut $38 billion from projected Ford budget, and is underfunding his own inadequate program.

--Has cancelled or delayed many key systems; B-1, TRIDENT, naval buildup, Minuteman III, etc., and has failed to provide needed improvements.
--Carter now talking tougher, but after 4 years of him, can't afford another 4 of indecision, uncertainty and continued delay.
--Not until 1980, did Carter call for real increases; his first two years had real decreases in budget authority; he rejected Senate call for 5% real increase in September.
--Consistently opposed funding increases supported by Congress. In May, his Secretary of Defense said increased funding not needed. Joint Chiefs, testifying before the House Armed Services Committee, unanimously disagreed and testified they were not even consulted. Each specifically said, "I do not agree" with the President and Secretary of Defense.

- My concern, as any President's should be, is not based on partisan consideration.
--Distinguished Democratic Senators (Sam Nunn, Fritz Hollings, Scoop Jackson) have deplored record, in particular his budgets:
--"height of hypocrisy"--Hollings (Chairman, Senate Budget Committee)
--Carter programs are "business as usual" when need is urgent-1990 "solutions" to 1980 problems.
--Carter Administration coming up with invisible aircraft (Stealth) to go along with its invisible army and invisible navy.

- A Reagan Administration will seek to restore the margin of safety --to put U.S. in a new peace posture that will ensure world stability.
--Would make volunteer force more attractive; more respected.
--Would restore fleet to 600 ships.
--Would build a new, modernized bomber.
--Would ensure that weapons systems are made to work, modernized; improved acquisition.
--Would take immediate steps to erase critical vulnerabilities in deterent forces and deficiencies in all forces in a timely fashion.
--Would close window of vulnerability as quickly as possible.
--In short, would put into place a plan that would convince our adversaries they dare not seek conflict with us.

With that plan underway, can then turn to larger task: negotiating for arms control. Can achieve peace only when strong. As John F. Kennedy said in his inaugural address, "Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate."

- Staff Notes:

Make sure audience asks itself: Why did Carter try to cut defense budgets, oppose Congressional pressures to increase defense until the Presidential campaign

- Carter claims RR position on military superiority will lead to all out arms race, skimping on conventional forces.

Response:

Not so. The Russians need to be contained not accommodated until they give up their idea of being top dog. Second to none must not become second to one. U.S. determination to increase its military strength is more likely than anything else to bring the Soviets to the bargaining table, and thus reduce the risk of an all out nuclear confrontation.

- Carter will also claim RR inaccurate re Ford defense record and Carter accomplishments. In 1977 he claims no program for a mobile ICBM, no final decision on MX or how to deploy it, no cruise missile program, no plans to deploy additional Minuteman III, TRIDENT bogged down in contracts disputes, lame duck naval shipbuilding program.
  --Carter says he resolved TRIDENT disputes, cancelled B-1 because doubtful it could penetrate Soviet defenses, favored a workable basing system for MX, signed into law 11.7% military pay increase effective 10/1.

Response:

Carter is wrong in each instance: While no final decision (prudently so) on MX basing in 1977, MX program was scheduled for initial deployment in 1983 and basing choices were reduced to two.

--Carter indecisively delayed the decision, flirting with some half a dozen different schemes, before choosing one agreed by all to be sub-optimum.
--Cruise missile program was begun in mid-1970s, before Carter, and has, in fact, been delayed under Carter.
--Sea launched cruise missile program, in particular, is encountering serious delay.
--Ford decided to keep Minuteman III production line open in 1976 to produce more MMIII in order ot have SALT-hedge option of additional deployment. Carter closed the line, so that now U.S. has no active ICBM production line while Soviets have four very active ones. (Note: SALT II would permit production and stockpile of as amny additional ICBMs as wished and Soviets are doing it.)
--TRIDENT submarine has been further delayed under Carter, and most recently announced slippage must now be slipped again by several months. Carter has also made plans either to delay the TRIDENT II missile or to cut it altogether.
--Carter mistakenly cancelled B-1, as Chairman of Joint Chiefs recently acknowledged and as Congress also knows in calling for Administration to decide on a bomber program by early next year. His "workable basing mode" for MX is subject to much uncertainty and opposition; and is a 1990s solution for 1980s problems--MX program will not be fully operational until 1990 optimistically. Need more rapid, effective, streamlined solution to problem of immediate ICBM vulnerability.
--Yes, Carter signed 11.7% military pay increase, but only after he had strongly opposed it and Congress voted it over his opposition.

KNOW GENERALLY

ARMS CONTROL/SALT

- Objective for strategic arms negotiations on reductions in Soviet weapons. Will sit down with Soviets for as long as it takes.

- President Carter would like the public to forget about what happened during the 1979 Senate SALT debate.

  --Dem-controlled Senate Foreign Relations Committee only reported treaty out of Committee(9-6 vote) with more than 20 recommended changes. Other Senators would have offered amendments from the floor. Senate Armed Services Committee voted 10-0 (with 7 abstentions) declaring SALT II not in our national interest.

  --Dem-Chairman Senate Budget Committee Fritz Hollings thinks the Administration is "wrong as can be about SALT II." Senator Henry Jackson, the ranking Democrat on the Armed Services Committee, said that "to enter into a treaty that favors the Soviets, as this one does, on the ground that we will be in a worse position without it is...appeasement in its purest form."

  --Senator Glenn (D-Ohio; former astronaut) also opposes SALT II, rightly "not at all pleased that those of us expressing reservations and concern regarding the Treaty are characterized by some as warmongers?" As to the warmonger charge, Senator Sam Nunn, Democrat form Carter's own state of Georgia, advised Jimmy Carter to let the Russians invent their own propaganda; they shouldn't play back ours.

- RR regrets the Carter record on arms control has been mostly rhetoric

  --Why should the Russians agree to arms reductions when the American President continues to fight a strong consensus in Congress that we need to strengthen American defenses?

- RR approach: immediate preparations for negotiations on a SALT III Treaty. SALT II is fatally flawed and would not gain Senate consent. Goal of beginning meaningful arms reductions that are equitable, verifiable, and set a good precedent for future negotiations at significantly lower levels.

  -- When Carter became President, he sought a new approach with his Spring 77 "Comprehensive" proposal. I would - also - as perhaps any new President would - invent a new approach - only I would not be so clumsy in proposing it to the Soviets publicly and so willing to fall back and concede to Soviets as Carter has.

- If asked: SALT III should include a variety of provisions aimed at actually reducing weaponry equally, e.g.,

-- Reductions should be not only in numbers but in capabilities (It does no good to limit and reduce numbers and then allow Soviets to continue to expand capabilities).

-- Missiles and warheads should be limited, not just "launchers"

-- Urgently reduce or eliminate heavy ICBM's.

-- Count the Backfire bomber as part of SALT.

But RR does not want to negotiate in public. It was a mistake of Carter Administration to rush in with public proposal.

NOTE

- Carter will claim SALT II is in our interest:

  -- No reductions in U.S. strategic systems while Soviets will have to reduce 250.

  -- U.S. will be able to carry out modernization programs.

  -- Soviets limited to one new land-based missile instead of four.

  -- U.S. would be required to spend $30 billion more over 10 year period.

Response

The claims made on behalf of the treaty were thoroughly debunked during SALT debate. If it is such a good treaty, why didn't the Senate pass it? If SALT is the centerpiece of our foreign policy, and the votes were there, why didn't Mr. Carter bring it up for a vote last year? Why is he playing politics with SALT II now in his faltering campaign? In politics, there is an old adage, "if the issue is important and the votes are there, vote it."

- Carter may also claim he tried SALT III approach in 1977 and failed, therefore went for modest SALT II approach.

Response

Carter presented Soviet Union with two proposals. Just like saying, here, we can't decide, you decide for us. Why present the fallback position at the same time we present a proposal for reductions? And then he caved in on his "SALT III" approach at the first Soviet Nyet. In addition to being a better negotiator than Jimmy Carter, I will take steps to assure the survivability of our strategic deterrent and I will move to reverse the adverse trends in the strategic balance, trends which are due to Mr. Carter's failure to keep our forces strong and modernized. He's been too late, with too little.

- Carter may say RR stance on SALT contrary to RR stance on developing closer relations with allies; Germans in particular counting on SALT II.

Response

RR would keep commitment to allies on jointly agreed arms control approaches. Allies will see his approach to SALT far more in their interest than Carter's approach.

George F. Will

On Honorable Disagreement

MEMORANDUM TO: Ohioans and others who, like me, admire Sen. John Glenn.

RE: Carter's improvident use of SALT II as an issue.

Three years ago this week, at a Democratic rally in Des Moines, Carter, as is his wont, got carried away. He declared that within "a few weeks" he would produce a SALT agreement. The fact that he was revealing to the Russians his hunger for an agreement, and was pressuring his negotiators, guaranteed that the Russians would wait for concessions that his negotiators were, anyway, all-too-ready-to-offer. I said then that he would get an agreement, not in weeks but before the 1980 elections, and that it would be so weak it would be unratifiable.

Even the dovish Senate Foreign Relations Committee approved it only 9-6, less than the two-thirds margin required in the full Senate. The Senate Armed Services Committee, which unlike Foreign Relations is expert about armaments, voted 10-0 for the report opposing ratification. The committee said, *inter alia*:

"In our judgment the SALT II Treaty . . . fails to meet the criteria laid down in 1972 when the Congress adopted an amendment to the resolution authorizing the interim agreement that called for equa[illegible]n any future SALT Treaty.

"The Treaty is unequal because it confers on the Soviet Union the right to deploy modern large ballistic missiles with multiple warheads, a right denied to the United States.

"It is unequal because it permits the continued deployment, outside the Treaty ceiling, of a Soviet bomber [the Backfire] that has the capability to operate over intercontinental distances against targets in the United States.

"It is unequal because it permits the Soviets to deploy more warheads on their strategic missiles than we are able to deploy on ours.

"The SALT II Treaty constraints on the growing Soviet threat are not militarily significant. . . . Within the Treaty the Soviet Union could deploy about as many warheads as is believed they would reasonably wish to do if there were no Treaty."

When the committee said SALT II "is unequal in favor of the Soviet Union and, thus, is inconsistent with Public Law 92-448," it was referring to standards enacted in response to SALT I, principally because of Sen. Henry Jackson (D-Wash.). Carter, early in his term, sent Jackson a handwritten note pledging to achieve a SALT II agreement that satisfied eight criteria. The agreement Carter accepted does not satisfy even one.

Now, in desperation, Carter wraps himself in the mantle of his predecessor. He implies that in producing SALT II he merely dotted the i's and crossed the t's on what President Ford had negotiated. Ford emphatically disagrees. Ford, like Reagan and many Democratic senators, supports the SALT process, deplores Carter's incompetent participation in it and opposes ratification of SALT II as negotiated. Carter's attempt to implicate Ford in Carter's SALT II fiasco is one reason Ford, normally the least angry of men, today burns with a hard, gem-like flame of determination to see Carter defeated.

Carter, in his new-found "moderation," has taken to putting distance between himself and his surrogates when they say, as Andrew Young just did, things like: the election of Reagan would signal that "killing niggers" is acceptable. And he sits placidly while Leonard Bernstein (who is as good a musician and political thinker as Ezra Pound was a poet and political thinker) libels Reagan as the candidate of (among other people) anti-Semites. But Carter reserves for himself the pleasure of the accusation that because Reagan opposes SALT II as negotiated, Reagan threatens peace.

Such calumny is threadbare by now. Last year Sen. John Glenn (D-Ohio) declared:

"I am not at all pleased when those of us expressing reservations and concern regarding the treaty are characterized by some as 'warmongers.' . . . Such a charge is unfounded and does a disservice to the constitutional principle of 'advice and consent.' It is tantamount to giving the Senate an ultimatum to pass the treaty without amendments or face a barrage of criticisms by the administration's 'heavy hitters,' including the charge that the treaty's opponents are advocating war over peace."

Glenn opposed SALT II in the Foreign Relations Committee. Had Carter pushed for a vote on the

'Stress' Seen in Hostage-Taker

CHARLESTON, W.Va. — A Yale psychiatrist

KNOW GENERALLY

RELATIONS WITH THE SOVIET UNION

"With our allies, we can conduct a realistic and balanced policy toward the Soviet Union. I am convinced that the careful management of our relationship with the Soviet Union depends on a principled, consistent American foreign policy. We seek neither confrontation nor conflict but to avoid both we must remain strong and determined to protect our interests."

RR TV Adress, 10/19/80

- Carter Presidency marked by naive view of Soviets:

  -- Early in term, in 1977 address at Notre Dame, Carter warned Americans against "inordinate fear of communism;" 18 months into presidency expressed "deep belief" that Brezhnev "wants peace and wants to have a better friendship..." Only the Afghan invasion 3 years into term, by his own confession, made him realize "what the Soviets' ultimate goals are." And even now, that is open to doubt.

  -- Approach to arms negotiations has reflected this same naive view. Began with ambitious proposal, immediately backed down, and wound up with badly flawed SALT II treaty.

  -- Similarly, backed away from his early, tough stance on human rights in USSR, and, more recently, backed down on Soviet troops in Cuba.

  -- Also slashed away at Ford defense budget despite Soviet buildup.

- In face of U.S. weakness, Soviets have become more aggressive over past 4 years.

  -- Invasion of Afghanistan first direct Soviet military intervention outside Warsaw Pact since WW II.

  -- Soviet military involvement has also increased in Africa (the Horn, Mozambique & Angola); Persian Gulf (South Yemen); Asia (Vietnam); and Latin America (influence growing in Carribbean).

  -- Soviets have also encouraged a doubling of Cuban troops (from 20-40,000) for use outside Cuba.

  -- Soviets continue most massive military buildup in peacetime history.

REAGAN SOLUTIONS:

-- Rebuild U.S. defense capabilities.

-- Restore reliability of commitments to allies and friends.

-- Negotiate genuine arms limitations (SALT III)

-- Work with allies on common approaches to East-West trade; minimize technology transfer of help to Soviet military capability. (No more grain embargoes unless made effective; call off current one.)

-- Support Helsinki Accords on human rights (U.S. should take vigorous human rights stance at Madrid conference starting in mid-November where 35 nation signatories review the Helsinki Accords).

RELATIONS WITH CHINA

"There is an historic bond of friendship between the American and Chinese peoples, and I will work to amplify it wherever possible. Expanded trade, cultural contact and other arrangements will all serve the cause of preserving and extending the ties between our two countries." RR TV Address 10/19/80.

- RR Approach

  -- Strengthen and extend relationship with PRC; welcome close cooperation on areas of mutual interest, while safeguarding Taiwan's interest.

  -- Continue to supply military equipment to meet Taiwan's defense needs.

  --Agrees China and U.S. have mutual interests in deterring expansion of Soviet powers.

  --Favor economic relations, with prudent precautions on high-level technology. Does not preclude limited and prudent arms sales to PRC.

- RR's Disagreement with Carter over China

  In eagerness to normalize relations with PRC, Carter abandoned old, valued friend.

  -- First time in history that U.S. unilaterally terminated such a treaty.

  -- Friendship with Taiwan stretched back 30 years--upheld from Truman on.

  -- In negotiations, Carter conceded on all PRC demands but backed down on U.S. demand--Peking guarantee not to use force against Taiwan.

- RR belief: can carry out Taiwan Relations Act (i.e., he would of course not turn back clock) and still enjoy expanding friendship with People's Republic of China.

  Deng Xiaoping (1st deputy) is key Chinese leader today. (DŬNG SHĂU PĂNG) for pronunciation.

PERSIAN GULF

- Gulf area vital to Western security:

  -- Provides 40% of oil to non-communist world; 19% of U.S. oil.

  -- Currently only a 100-day supply of oil in non-communist world.

- In past 4 years, dramatic increase in instability & Soviet threat to Gulf area. Most serious threat to world peace today.
  -- Iran, once a bulwark of peace in region, now totters under tyrannical regime.
  -Shah fell in January, 1979; a year earlier, Carter had called him an island of "stability." U.S. probably could not have saved Shah, but Carter vacillation hastened his downfall, led to radical regime, planted further doubts about strength of U.S. friendships (Saudis shaken).

  -- Area now aflame with Iran-Iraq war (five weeks old).
  -Iraq has nearly taken over oil-rich province of Khuzestan.

  -- In past 4 years, Soviets tightened pincer movement on the Gulf, moving troops into Afghanistan, setting up puppet regimes and arsenals in South Yemen, Ethiopia.
  -Before Afghanistan, Soviet fighter planes were 700 miles from Straits of Hormuz; today, there are only 300 miles away -- within easy striking distance.

- Carter response has been dangerous.

  -- First pursued arms agreement with the Soviets for Indian Ocean which had Soviets accepted would have prohibited our present naval deployment there.

  -- This January in State of Union Address, asserted "Carter Doctrine" -- assault on Gulf will be repelled, if necessary by force. Six days later, administration admitted it didn't have military strength to enforce.

  -- Carter's Rapid Development Force still an empty shell.

  -- Hostage humiliation a stark symbol of declining U.S. capability in region.

- RR APPROACH

  -- Strengthen U.S. defense forces.

  -- Work more effectively with Allies on coordinated approaches to Gulf.

  -- Develop secure and defensible U.S. presence. (Carter trying for military facilities in unstable Somalia; should explore more secure bases, perhaps in Sinai.)

THE MIDDLE EAST

1. The Carter Record: A Violation of Commitments

- In October 77, Carter agreed to joint approach with Soviets for Geneva talks, calling for "comprehensive" settlement and recommending joint Soviet-American "guarantees". This approach was incompatible with UN Security Council resolutions 242 and 338.

- Then Carter prejudged the final outcome and threw 'monkey wrench' into autonomy negotiations by aligning himself with Arab positions. Proclaimed in news conference "settlements in occupied territories are illegal and an obstacle to peace".

- 1978 sale of 60 F-15's to Saudi Arabia destabilized the balance of power, causing increased arms purchases by both sides.

- Carter failed to veto UN resolution condemning Israel's presence in Jerusalem; 2 days later, reacting to public outcry, Carter reversed position, blamed Secretary Vance, yet the Vote on Record in UN was never amended as it should have been.

- Carter Administration has even courted the PLO: Andrew Young, U.S. Ambassador in Vienna.

- This August, Muskie gave a long speech publicly denouncing pernicious U.N. resolution on Jerusalem, then abstained when time came to vote.

2. Reagan Approach

- Peace Making and Camp David

  -- Peace between Israel and her neighbors should be governed by Resolutions 242 and 338; RR will not tolerate any effort to supersede or be divorced from these resolutions.

  -- Camp David started as a repudiation by Sadat and Begin of Carter's comprehensive peace plan (including Soviets).

  -- But, since Camp David accords derive from Resolutions 242 and 338, we will continue the Camp David process as long as there is utility in it.

  -- RR will not try to force the hand of either Israel or Egypt at the negotiating table. RR will support the agreements made between Israel and Egypt as long as no outside pressures.

- Jerusalem

  -- Jerusalem is central to religious faiths throughout the world. Thus, Jerusalem must remain one city (Optional: under Israeli sovereignty) undivided and with continued free access for all faiths to its holy places. Thankfully, Jerusalem today -- unlike the time prior to 1967 -- enjoys freedoms.

- Arms Sales

  -- RR would avoid shipment of massive quantities of sophisticated armaments to so-called "moderate" Arab states who might directly threaten Israel's existence once in possession of such arms. These sales could promote dangerous arms races.

- UN

  -- Defeat any U.N. resolution to expel Israel; if necessary, use threat to stop U.S. funding.

Africa, Third World

- Carter Record

  --During Carter years, Cuban and Soviet presence in Africa increased, adding to the refugee misery.
  --Carter Administration claims success in relations with Africa and other "Third World" nations. Yet, its policies have led to needless confrontation, encouraged radicalization, and enabled Castro to posture as leader of Third World. Carter claims to have improved relations with Nigeria, opposing racial discrimination.

- RR Approach

  --Not lump so-called "Third World" nations together. Deal with these nations on bilateral basis.
  --Opposed to racial discrimination in any form. Continue progress towards peaceful solution of problems in Southern Africa. Put political pressure on Castro to reduce his mercenary forces in Africa.
  --Reduce large U.S. trade deficit with Africa by encouraging U.S. exports--enhance private investment.

REFUGEES & HUMAN RIGHTS

REFUGEES

- Carter's poor handling of Cuban refugees.
  - -- Inconsistent, uncoordinated policy based on crisis planning. Over 10 thousand Cubans now locked up on U.S. bases.
  - -- No effective effort to develop real consensus. No one country can carry full burden, provide resources; international solution needed.
  - -- Trying to dump 1200 refugees on Puerto Rico (no electoral votes).

- RR Approach
  - -- Need to distinguish between refugees from oppression and refugees from want.
    - economic problems of other nations should be addressed through development and investment.
    - political problems through coordinated international effort to encourage both political improvements and provide humanitarian relief and resettlement. Note that largest number of refugees flee from communist countries.
  - -- Sustain long-standing American value of openness to immigrants and refugees.
    - must recognize impact on U.S. labor markets.
    - protect basic civil liberties and human rights of citizens and immigrants.
  - -- Most important: Develop worldwide consensus on a strategy to deal with refugee problem. RR would make this a priority because worldwide there are estimated to be more than 15 million refugees (U.S. Commission for Refugees).

HUMAN RIGHTS

- Carter policy very inconsistent.
  - -- In Inaugural Address: "Our commitment to human rights must be absolute."
  - -- But applied it selectively -- most strongly against those least able to resist (usually pro-Western governments) as opposed to regimes, such as Cambodia, engaged in genocide.
    - in Argentina, Brazil, South Korea.
    - and not in Poland: in Poland Carter praised human rights situation in 1977, and now Muskie tells Polish people to be sensitive to Soviet pressure.

- Carter Administration in U.N. gave support to Pol Pot whose regime killed 3 million of his people (Cambodia).

- RR Approach
  -- Support human rights; has long been U.S. objective.
  -- Develop refugee policy.
  -- Vigorously use Helsinki Accord to improve human rights in Eastern Europe and Soviet Union.
  -- Convey to the world the value and strength of American principles of freedom, justice, equal protection. Carter Administration failed to use our moral resources; instead retreated in front of totalitarian propaganda.