

# Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

---

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

---

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

**Series:** XV: Speech Files (Robert Garrick and Bill Gavin)

**Subseries:** A: Bob Garrick File

**Folder Title:** 10/20/1980, Cincinnati, OH  
Catholic Educators (2 of 2)

**Box:** 435

---

To see more digitized collections visit:

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

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Inventories, visit:

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

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

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

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

14 October

TO: Jeanne

This was cancelled. So just  
file.

Garrick

FROM: BOB GARRICK

OUT AT: 4:00 p.m.

Senator Paul Laxalt

October 14, 1980

Ambassador Anne Armstrong

Bill Casey

Ed Meese

Jim Baker

Bill Brock

Dean Burch  
(For Ambassador Bush)

Peter Dailey

Mike Deaver

Drew Lewis

Lyn Nofziger

Verne Orr

~~Bill Timmons~~

Dick Wirthlin

Congressman Tom Evans

INFORMATION

Enclosed is the speech RR will  
give on Thurs., 16 Oct. at St.  
Demetrius Church, Chicago at  
4:30 p.m. Please return com-  
ments by 12:00 Noon tomorrow,  
Oct. 15. Thank you.

Richard Allen

Martin Anderson

Jim Brady

Ed Gray

Others

Ray Bell  
Bob Gray  
Bill Morris  
Jerry Carmine

GARY BAUER

RR INSERT, ST DEMETRIUS CHURCH, CHICAGO 10/17 JMc #1 10/14

I know that Americans of Greek descent are deeply concerned today about the future of the land of their forefathers. For Greece today is in some peril. Its dispute with Turkey continues unabated. There are questions having to do with Greece's role in NATO. The Cyprus problem continues without apparent solution, with great suffering for many Greek Cypriots. The continental shelf of the Aegean, with its possible oil wealth, has been the subject of conflicting claims. These contentious matters must be resolved satisfactorily, if the security and confidence of Greece can be fully restored. And they must be resolved because of the importance of a friendly relationship between Greece and Turkey to the security of NATO's southeastern flank. These are not new problems. They were evident four years ago, and my opponent Jimmy Carter took pains to speak out about them.

He said, in 1976, that "we would be negligent of the moral issues and courting longer range disaster if we fail to couple the improvement in relations with Turkey with increased fair progress on the Cyprus issue." And in a news release dated September 16, 1976, Mr. Carter declared "the impasse on Cyprus must be broken. The United States must be prepared to work with others, including the United Nations, to insure the independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty of Cyprus...If and when I am elected President, I intend to enforce and carry out the provisions of the statement."

That's what Jimmy Carter pledged to you four years ago. You would by now expect to see at least the beginning of

real progress toward a just settlement.

But today the impasse on Cyprus is not broken,  
There is still misery and suffering and displacement  
on that ancient island.

Families have been uprooted, torn from their homes by  
the cruel acts of civil war. Men have been denied the right to  
return to the gravesites of their forefathers. Death is never  
far away, and may come suddenly.

Is life on Cyprus today appreciably better than in  
1976, when Jimmy Carter favored us with his promises ?

Many of you would say that it is not, and one reason  
the impasse has not been broken is that the man who made those  
promises four years ago has had very little success in  
keeping them.

As a candidate for President, I owe it to you to make  
my position clear on these issues of such great importance to  
you.

Greece must be reintegrated into NATO's military  
command structure. This is essential for the security of the  
entire Western world in an age characterized by relentless  
expansion of an imperialist Soviet Union.

The Supreme Commander of NATO proposed a formula for  
reintegration in July 1978. Every member of NATO except Turkey  
expressed support of that formula . The next President should  
make every effort to gain acceptance of that formula or one  
very like it. With an aggressive adversary right across  
Greece's border, the West cannot afford the luxury of  
squabbling about a command structure. We have to design one  
and put it into operation.

The reintegration of Greece into the NATO military  
command structure is vital to the security interests of NATO  
and the United States. If Greece were to leave NATO , Turkey  
already unstable politically, would be isolated . Her defense

position would be placed in serious jeopardy. Such a turn of events would threaten the security of Italy and all of the Eastern Mediterranean.

The tragic situation in Cyprus has lasted six years. That is long enough - long enough for injustice, long enough for displacement, long enough for hardship and anguish.

The foreign military forces on Cyprus should be substantially reduced and ultimately withdrawn. All refugees, whether Greek or Turkish, should be allowed to return to their homes and land.

In November 1974, at the height of the Cyprus crisis, the United Nations adopted a resolution which---  
"Calls upon all states to respect the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and non-alignment of the Republic of Cyprus and to refrain from all acts and interventions directed against it; urges the speedy withdrawal of all foreign armed forces and foreign military presence and personnel from the Republic of Cyprus, and the cessation of all foreign interference in its affairs."

I support the full implementation of this resolution. As to the disputed territorial claims on the Aegean continental shelf, the best course seems to me to be submission of the claims to binding arbitration by an international tribunal, as has been done by other nations in similar situations.

These are my positions on the issues of particular concern to Greek Americans. And when I am your President, you can count on my administration to act on these positions, not forget them as soon as the votes are counted.

*Send Garriol  
15 Oct 6:15 PM  
EDT*

Oct.15,1980

Memo to :Martin Anderson, Mike Deaver, Jim Brady, Lynn Nofziger

From: Bill Gavin

Re: Catholic Educators Speech

*Fav'd to R plane  
3/3 - 941-5850  
10/16, 1500 Bill Hart*

The terms "subsidiarity" and "distributive justice" are, in this gathering "terms of the art". Len DeFiore, our Catholic expert says we should use them and I agree.

On the issue of when we will call for tuition tax credits: since the Republican Platform says we will do it "Next year" we should not be hedging our bets. Thus, the call for tax credits in the 97th. Congress. This audience knows what the platform contains and any appearance of backing off would only raise questions. (By the way, is it true that Jody Powell is saying that tax credits will cost "5 to 6 billion dollars"? Not true.)

This speech is slightly longer than most of our talks. This audience is prepared to hear one of this length. Besides there are things we want to say to a wider audience through distribution of the speech. Thus, the length.

On page 2, that "pledge" to involve non-public education in forming national education policy is an indirect reference to the fact that a Carter policy board was formed with little advice (and no participation) asked from the Catholics.

The figures on Catholic schools are verifiable from Catholic sources in education. Note the documentation for figures on pp 8-9 is contained on a fact sheet, last page.

TO: Jim Brady, Marty Anderson, Ken Khachigian, Lyn Nofziger, Mike Deaver

FROM: Bob Garrick

- 1 -

*Send.  
Garrick  
15 Oct 6 20  
PM  
EDT*

DRAFT - 10/15/80 - WFG

CHIEF ADMINISTRATORS OF CATHOLIC EDUCATION:  
CINCINNATI, OHIO,  
October 20, 1980

I am grateful for the opportunity to address this distinguished body of American educators and publicly express my thanks to Monsignor John Meyers, Monsignor Frank Barrett, and Father John Hanley for making it possible.

I think it is fitting that we meet here in the Archdiocese of Cincinnati. This is one of the oldest dioceses west of the Alleghenies, founded in 1821. At one time all of Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan were served by the dedicated priests and nuns of this diocese. Today, the same spirit of dedication serves the needs of families in this area.

The young, the poor, and the aged all benefit from the works of mercy and love performed on a daily basis. They know--and God knows--what a great service Catholic social and educational programs do for our nation, not only here in Cincinnati, but all across the country.

You, the Chief Administrators of Catholic Education, represent that spirit of dedication. You have my admiration and, what's more, you have the respect of millions of hard-pressed parents whose freedom to choose the education of their children is being threatened by taxes and inflation.



My deep respect for your dedication and professionalism is based on something more than knowledge of your record, since I am fortunate to have one of your colleagues as a member of my advisory staff. I know all of you are familiar with Dr. Leonard DeFiore who has taken a temporary leave of absence from his duties as Superintendent of Schools in the Archdiocese of Washington.

I admire your highly professional administration of the largest group of nongovernmental schools in the nation--10,000 institutions which enroll 3.2 million students served by 145,000 teachers. Your expertise in achieving exceptional educational results while working with a wide range of students of every ethnic, social and economic segment of the population has been truly outstanding. I applaud this accomplishment which is being achieved at about one-third of public school per-pupil costs.

In recognition of these achievements, I pledge an increased role for non-public schools in formulation of national educational policy.

As members of the Council of American Private Education (CAPE), you are part of a coalition of 15 national organizations including both religiously-affiliated and other education organizations involving approximately 20,000 institutions with 4.5 million students, with an enrollment representing 90 percent of all non-public school students.

It is clear that the vast majority of non-public schools serve all creeds, races, and economic classes as the varied membership of the Council demonstrates.

I also wish to acknowledge another of your achievements, that of providing out-of-school religious instruction and guidance for several million more young people who are not attending Catholic schools. I congratulate the hundreds of thousands of volunteer teachers who are helping parents to mold good citizens for a strong and moral American life. This is a type of volunteer effort which has contributed to and strengthened our American way of life.

And it is precisely the non-governmental and voluntary aspect of your great work that I wish to speak of today. In addressing you, I speak not only to educational experts, but to representatives of America's greatest strength: volunteerism in the private sector. You are not only educational leaders in your communities--you are national leaders. What you do influences the lives of children who will someday lead our nation, not only in government but in the arts and sciences, in business and education.

Leaders of today, you are instructing the leaders of tomorrow not only with the skills they need, but the values that can guide and inspire those skills.

Leadership in America is not now and never has been synonymous with elected or appointed public office. There are leaders in neighborhoods and communities and schools, and factories and businesses who have never been elected to any public office, but

who serve as spokesmen for the places where they live and work: men and women, like you, whose contribution to America is priceless.

My vision of government is one in which presidential leadership complements but does not overshadow these other forms of leadership. In those areas where he has the constitutional responsibility, a president must be bold, vigorous, prudent, and willing to use the powers granted him. But, at the same time, he should take care that his powers and those of government in general don't become so strong and widespread as to smother the natural capacity for leadership in our society that has long been America's strength and hope.

So, when we talk about the need to cut back on Big Government, it is not that we love our governmental institutions less; it's that we love the American ideal of leadership by the people as much as we revere the constitutional need for a president to provide it for the people.

It is no exaggeration to say that Catholic educators and others who provide a non-public system of education for children are at the very heart of this traditional concept of American leadership.

I know you are all familiar with that theory of effective social action embodied in the "principle of subsidiarity." This principle advocates the resolution of social problems at the most basic possible competent level. This principle has long been

proclaimed by Catholic church leaders as the most effective way to manage a complex organization.

I have long believed that this principle should underlie sound national educational policy. I know that you will agree that the most competent level in educational decision making is the family: parents--not the government--are the ones who should make educational decisions about their children.

This is just not Catholic social doctrine or my belief--it is an integral part of the American system.

In the historic Pierce decision, the Supreme Court affirmed that "the child is no mere creature of the State," and that parental rights are central to any American concept of education.

For its welfare, the state may require minimal education of all its citizens and it has the right, as well as the duty, to maintain adequately funded public schools. However, the state does not have the right to monopolize education and ignore the rights of parents.

But with increasing taxes and high inflation, high interest and high unemployment, the opportunity to exercise those sacred and inviolable rights have been attacked and, in many cases, practically destroyed.

When basic rights of parents and the family are threatened, it is not only one religious or educational group that suffers--it is the entire nation. We have to put an end to the myth that the survival of Catholic and private schools is a sectarian problem and

start seeing it for what it really is: a national problem, involving all Americans. If we allow this absolutely vital part of our private, voluntary national leadership to be destroyed through government indifference or hostility, the unique American system of leadership and progress itself is endangered.

The defense of parental rights in education is a responsibility of every American, for those rights know no boundaries of creed or race or class.

I believe in and have always supported a dual system of public and non-public education. They should not be viewed as adversaries but rather as complementary parts of the American educational enterprise. I believe a free pluralistic society needs both. And I believe it is time the government stopped paying lip service to that idea and started doing something about it.

What the federal government needs is not more bureaucratic structures, such as the newly created Department of Education, but a restoration of the traditional, progressive American philosophy of education that is based on strong public and non-public schools.

We have to have each and each has to be healthy if American education in general is to flourish. If one part of our educational community is weakened--or lost--every parent, every child, every teacher, every taxpayer is the eventual loser.

Federal policy in education must be shaped by the needs of parents, children, and classroom teachers working together in

public and non-public schools and not by the whims of bureaucratic empires within the federal system.

How, then, do we see to it that the federal government helps local communities and parents meet the needs of public and non-public education?

The first thing we do is to find out exactly what the current labyrinth of federal programs is achieving. There are so many programs with so many complexities, it is impossible to determine success in many areas. Last week, in Wheaton College, I said that as President I will appoint a task force which, you can be certain, will include representatives of public and non-public education, to study all current federal programs dealing with education. Using the recommendations of that task force, I will see to it those federal programs and bureaucratic structures in education that work for parents and children are kept and those that do not are terminated.

I will also ask the 97th Congress to pass tuition tax credit legislation to aid parents who send their children to non-public elementary, secondary, and post-secondary schools--and when such legislation comes before the Congress for debate, I will wholeheartedly and openly support it, doing all I can to see it is passed and signed into law.

I support a system of tuition tax credits because I believe such a system is the best way to strengthen the right of parents to decide the education of their children.

In light of promises made to you in other campaigns, I realize that some of you may harbor some scepticism on this issue. I do know that you had received several promises from President Carter including a telegram to this very group in October 1976.

I don't have to tell the members of this audience that what Candidate Carter promised and what President Carter later did is, to put it in the most charitable terms, contradictory. Not only did Mr. Carter refuse to help parents, he played a major role in defeating the tuition tax credit bill when it was before the Senate.

So that there be no misunderstanding about it, let me restate my position by quoting the 1980 Republican Party Platform:

"Next year, a Republican White House will assist not sabotage Congressional efforts to enact tuition tax relief into law."

Mr. Carter stood silent during the debate over tuition tax credits when accusations were made that tuition tax credits discriminate against minorities.

As that great American, Al Smith--a product of St. James Parish School in New York City--used to say: let's look at the record:

In Manhattan, minorities are 79 percent of the Catholic elementary school (1979-80) enrollment.

In the District of Columbia, minorities are also 79 percent of the Catholic elementary school enrollment, and 44 percent are not Catholics.

In the State of California, non-public schools enroll a higher percentage of minority students than the public schools.

While 60 percent of the families in the nation's non-public schools are below \$20,000 in income, a survey of families with children in inner-city non-public schools shows that 72 percent have incomes less than \$15,000.

In the face of such overwhelming evidence, the truth is clear: non-public education is one of the best friends American minorities and Cities have today.

Some take issue with the tuition tax credit concept on the erroneous grounds that it is a "church-state" issue. Rather, tuition tax credits is an issue of distributive justice involving government and parent, not government and church. The tuition tax credit is based on the God-given, constitutionally-protected right of any parents of any religion or no religion to choose the kind of education their children should receive. That government should assist parents, especially low- and middle-income families, in exercising this right by allowing them to keep a little more of their hard-earned income is both proper and just.

As if the effects of the Carter administration's broken promises and failed economic policies have not been destructive enough, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) has further harassed the non-public school system.

I know you are all familiar with rules recently proposed by IRS. These rules could deny parents the deductions of contribu-



tions to churches if they enroll their children in a church school subsidized by the parish. And, of course, there was the attempt by the same IRS in 1978 to impose regulations that would have jeopardized a non-public school's tax exempt status by imposing an impossible quota system for students and teachers. Non-public education was found by the IRS to be guilty until proven innocent. This move was especially insulting to Catholics whose schools are doing such a fine job of helping minority children.

If this were not such a tragic problem, it would be almost comic in its grotesque reordering of the priorities of government. Government should do all it can to aid non-public education, but the last three and one-half years have seen this fundamental duty forgotten, as if it is the duty of Americans to prove to the IRS that they are not guilty of crimes in order to claim their basic rights.

I can tell you that under a Reagan administration, the IRS and every other agency and department of government are going to get out of the business of harrassing parents and children and start once again to serve them.

Private, non-governmental education and all other private, non-governmental sources of strength are not something added on to our nation--they are, in a very great degree, the very heart of our nation. They are what makes us different.

Allow me to illustrate that point:

A few years ago, a gymnastic team from the Soviet Union was making an appearance in the United States. An American television commentator was interviewing one of the young gymnasts with the aid of an official Soviet interpreter. The commentator asked the gymnast, "You are a member of your nation's team. Do you belong to any private gymnast teams?" And the Soviet interpreter didn't ever bother to interpret the question. The interpreter quickly said, "There are no voluntary associations in the Soviet Union."

That is perhaps one of the most chilling sentences I have ever heard.

Think of it: from the borders of Eastern Europe, across the Urals, to the unimaginably vast spaces of Siberia, across more than ten time zones, to the shores of the Bering Straits--in all that awesome, immense space there is not a single organization that exists without the implicit or explicit forbearance of the states.

That's the essential difference between the United States and the Soviet Union. Not weaponry, not gross national product, not production, not standard of living. The central difference is that all that we have has been built through freedom at work. It is the exercise of this God-given freedom that is the mainspring of human progress.

Are we going to just walk away from that great source of security and growth and leadership? Are we going to gradually, over the next decade, forget that great tradition of

non-governmental leadership until it is only a dream in the minds of a few who remember, vaguely, what freedom can do?

Before the American people and before God, I pledge that this great power of leadership and dedication, and, yes, of love, of which you are so important a part, will not be forgotten, but, rather, that it will be the central energizing force of the next administration and of American life for years to come.

But I can't do it alone. I especially need the help of every family currently supporting non-public schools.

This year parents must vote for their values, not for political labels. I am reminded of an old saying: our allegiance must be not to the forms of the past but to its virtues. Nowhere is this more true than in this election.

If the families you serve don't take effective political action, is there anyone who seriously believes that non-public education can flourish--or even survive--given the trends already apparent in the Carter administration?

In recent months, I have visited many neighborhoods all across America. And in those neighborhoods where there is a sense of pride and a sense of family unity and hope for a better future, there is always a good school. Quite often it is a Catholic school.

You, as Catholic educators, are at the very center of leadership in the American tradition because you not only help

parents exercise their educational rights, but contribute to the community as a whole.

The center of all education, in fact, of the American way of life, is the family.

When John Paul II visited our country, he said: "When the value of the family is threatened because of social and economic pressures, we will stand up and reaffirm that the family is necessary not only for the private good of every person, but also for the common good of every society, nation and state."

And that is what we are talking about when we talk about the kind of education you provide: the common good of every family of our entire nation, whether they go to your schools or not.

The decisions we make this year will determine what the future of education in the United States will be like--whether it will remain under family control at the local level or whether it will evolve into a centralized operation dominated by Big Government.

We need a new beginning for American leadership, and with your help--and the help of God--we will get that new beginning.

(end of draft)

Background for figures on pp8-9

Manhattan - Source: Archdiocesan School Office Data--quoted p. 5 in Vitullo-Martin How Federal Policies Discourage the Racial and Economic Integration of Private Schools, July 24, 1980.

District of Columbia - Source: Arch of Washington School Data, 1979-80.

California - Source: Dr. Joseph McElligott, Director of Education, California Catholic Conference (916) 443-4851.

4th fact - Source: 1976 Census Bureau Data quoted in Common Sense article by Senator Packwood - Summer 1978.

5th fact - Source: 1980 Report on Innercity Private Schools, by Catholic League for Civil and Religious Rights.

TO: Bill Gavin

MEMORANDUM FROM: Bob Garrick -- Please call me on this when you get time or we can discuss Sunday if you are coming in the office. Has this speech for Cincinnati been approved?

OCTOBER 17, 1980

TO: ~~ED MESE~~  
~~WILLIAM CASEY~~  
~~BILL TIMMONS~~  
~~STAN ANDERSON~~  
~~ELIZABETH DOLE~~  
~~BILL GAVIN~~  
~~MAX HUGEL~~

FROM: ~~PATRICK~~ GEARY

I have reviewed the draft of the October 20 speech to be given before the Cace meeting in Cincinnati. I have strong objection to the narrow focus of the speech given the fact that this is the only forum which Governor Reagan will have to speak directly to the Catholic community in the U. S.

The speech as it stands is very well done and will no doubt have the desired impact upon the Catholic educational community. However, this subcommunity is not the only target.

It is my considered judgement that the focus of the speech is too narrow to carry the burden of solitifying the Catholic voter into the Reagan column. My objection is in essence to the strategy involved in placing the entire pitch on tuition tax credit.

My analysis of the situation is that there is no strong anti Regan feeling in the Catholic community which needs to be overcome. There is, rather, an "uneasiness". Most Catholic voters are traditionally Democratic. The Governor must overcome the force of inertia. As long as this uneasiness persists, I feel that the inertia will obtain. Moreover, it is my view that the uneasiness is rooted more in communal attitude rather than knowlege of issues. If I am right, then the Governor's speech in Cincinnati should be thematically attuned to reach a symbolic chord with "Catholic feeling" rather than specific issues. Tone and approach and context of speech are probably more important than what he actually says. I strongly suggest this speech be broadened, <sup>not</sup> only in <sup>the</sup> sense by adding more issues but also in the sense that the speech provide more of the Governor's general philosophies toward the government.

Frankly, I see nothing to lose by broadening the speech to a wider Catholic audience, especially in light of the fact that this is the one and only event that will reach the Catholic community as a news item.

If it is a strategic descision of the appropriate campaign officials to deliberately place the entire burden of the effort on the T.T.C. issue, then I have no objection and in fact, only praise for the speech as presented.

Filed to RR plane  
10/17 4:12 PM  
P

HOLD

Re  
CATHOLIC  
Speech

HOLD  
for  
material  
being  
1st page 1st page

memo to  
GAVIN re  
this meeting

# Reagan Bush Committee

## memorandum

17 October 1980

*COST  
estimate*

TO: Jeanne

Can I have the small owners ~~XXXX~~  
royalties paper that Kevin did  
that we sent to the RR Tour 2 days  
again.

directed to Martin Anderson



From: Patrick F. Geary

Re: Draft of Reagan Speech Oct. 20th, CACE Meeting,  
Cincinnati, Ohio

---

Our society is presently faced with a number of complex, interrelated and seemingly intractable difficulties, both at home and abroad. The three "E's" — energy, environment and the economy — are a good example. Each of these areas involve matters of the highest priority. Each is an area of great complexity. Moreover, each of these has a continual impact upon the other two areas. All of these difficulties proceed simultaneously, interacting with each other, each interaction changing the configuration of the problems themselves.

I look at these fast-changing situations and ask how to deal with the issues fully. Government is hampered by its very nature. Government action must by definition be structured, proceeding in a linear fashion. Whether one argues that we need quicker responses or more and better planning, the real problem which faces this nation is that government cannot act fast enough or efficiently enough to deal with the difficulties we face.

The objection which I have raised throughout this campaign to the expanded role of the federal government is not simple a negativism.

Rather, it springs from the affirmative belief that resolution of the difficulties which lie before us requires a creativity, an intuitive dimension which government, by its very nature, cannot provide.

If I am correct in the analysis that a wholly structured solution to many of these problems is simply not possible, then the question remains -- how does this nation marshal that creativity, that intuition necessary to meet these challenges. I am convinced that we must move to allow the American people to interact more directly with the problems which confront them. I am optimistic about the creative talent which can be mustered to meet the demands of the time.

I do not propose to do away with the federal government. I do however propose to utilize the single greatest resource we have in this nation -- our people. Government can, acting as a catalyst, effect a greater role for the private sector. It should act to bring about the possibility that the latent creativity which abounds among our people can be tapped and harnessed.

What can the president do to facilitate this? The president's role is twofold. The first aspect flows from the "physics" of the situation. In order for the private sector to have more of an opportunity to deal directly with these problems, it must first have a presence before them. This "presence" cannot take place when government displaces all other channels of activity. In short, the presence of government must diminish if the role of the private

sector is to grow. As chief executive, the president must move to diminish the role of government and thereby create the possibility of private sector interaction with these difficulties. "Diminish" does not mean "disappear." I am well aware that the size and complexity of our society requires a substantial role for the federal government in the conduct of our national affairs. The preservation of the democratic nature of our institutions requires an accountability which only government can provide.

The second function of the presidency in this situation is to provide leadership in marshalling and strengthening the elements of the private sector. Assuring the possibility of private sector presence in the resolution of ongoing difficulties is not enough. The mere "presence" of the private sector does not mean that its action will be beneficial. I do not propose to replace government regulation with magic. We must work hard to see that the role that the private sector plays is affirmative. There are several prerequisites which are crucial.

First is the intangible yet vital element of attitude. If the American people are to successfully play a major role they must attack these problems with an attitude of hopefulness. No president can insure that a nation's people will address their work with optimism. Nevertheless, the president can recognize and speak out when they are not doing so. There are many signs today that our society is fixated on discouragement. I cannot myself change that, but I can tell you, and will continue to tell you during the course of my

administration, that being upset by difficulties will not in itself work a solution.

There are some telltale signs that this society at present has allowed this discouragement to get the better of it. The willingness of Americans to accept the destruction of innocent human life rather than face the difficulties which might surround that life signals the abandonment of what I believe to be the most fundamental operative principle of human society. "Where there is life, there is hope." If we are willing to preserve life in the face of difficulties, we do so out of hope. Hope is a communal value — hopelessness is never a private matter. If we are not bound together by our hopes, we will be bound together in hopelessness.

We cannot accept a hopelessness which permits chronic unemployment. We cannot accept a hopelessness which permits deteriorating educational standards. We cannot accept a hopelessness which permits crime. We cannot accept a hopelessness which permits the destruction of millions of unborn children.

Another prerequisite for the successful participation by the private sector is the strength of mediating institutions which stand between the individual citizen and formal government. If the creative impulses and intuitions needed in this time come from individuals, they are transmitted to the body politic through mediating institutions, beginning with the family, including schools and churches. Human activity cannot be compartmentalized. The private citizen whose help and talent we seek is not interchangeably an economic person, a religious person, an artistic person, a sexual person, all at different times. Rather, this citizen engages in all of these

activities simultaneously. This person does not speak with one vocabulary, but with many. The mediating institutions which stand between this person and formal government provide sounding boards for these many voices. When these sounding boards are not present, government cannot hear. It is imperative that these institutions, these sounding boards maintain a healthy and vital presence in our society.

We cannot have a pluralistic society without these institutions. The creative and intuitive forces which we seek to avail ourselves of as a nation do not come to us pre-packaged. We must be open to them, and, in order to do that we must be open and supportive of the mediating institutions which bring us differing viewpoints.

My support for the concept of tuition tax credit is rooted ultimately in the belief that a healthy, viable pluralism in education cannot help but promote a healthy, viable pluralism in the body politic. How can we hope to bring the creative forces latent in our society to bear upon the many complex problems which confront us if we lock ourselves into the position that there is only one desirable approach to education?

My view of the importance of these mediating institutions is rooted in my conviction that the human person is never an isolated integer. All of us have a past, a family, and important relationships with people with whom we interact. These qualities of human life are not related to any political or constitutional system, and may rightly

be said to "preexist" such systems. In order for there to be a successful employment of the private sector, the government must work with these mediating institutions rather than attempt to manipulate them.

I am not a Marxist. I really don't believe that economics alone determines a nation's viability. In fact, I believe that the strength of mediating institutions such as family, churches, schools, to name only a few, have a profound impact on the nation's economy. Frankly, I am of the opinion that the character, self-discipline, intellectual and spiritual development which these institutions foster ultimately produce a people able to cope successfully with their problems. While it is true that adverse economic conditions do a violence to the family, I think it is also true that strong families produce the kind of people needed to give stability to the economy.

FROM: BOB GARRICK

OUT AT: October 16

8:00 a.m.

Senator Paul Laxalt

Ambassador Anne Armstrong

Bill Casey

Ed Meese

Jim Baker

Bill Brock

Dean Burch  
(For Ambassador Bush)

Peter Dailey

Mike Deaver

Drew Lewis

~~Lyn~~ Nofziger

Verne Orr

Bill Timmons

Dick Wirthlin

Congressman Tom Evans

INFORMATION

Enclosed is the speech RR will  
give in Cincinnati, OH. at 1:00 p.m.  
on Mon., Oct. 20 Please return  
comments by 12:00 Noon on Friday,  
Oct. 17. Thank you.

---

Richard Allen

Martin Anderson

Jim Brady

Ed Gray

---

Others

*Ray Bell*  
*Bob Gray*  
*Bill Morris*

*Terry Carmel*  
*Gary Bauer*

DRAFT - 10/15/80 - WFG

CHIEF ADMINISTRATORS OF CATHOLIC EDUCATION:  
CINCINNATI, OHIO,  
October 20, 1980

I am grateful for the opportunity to address this distinguished body of American educators and publicly express my thanks to Monsignor John Meyers, Monsignor Frank Barrett, and Father John Hanley for making it possible.

I think it is fitting that we meet here in the Archdiocese of Cincinnati. This is one of the oldest dioceses west of the Alleghenies, founded in 1821. At one time all of Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan were served by the dedicated priests and nuns of this diocese. Today, the same spirit of dedication serves the needs of families in this area.

The young, the poor, and the aged all benefit from the works of mercy and love performed on a daily basis. They know--and God knows--what a great service Catholic social and educational programs do for our nation, not only here in Cincinnati, but all across the country.

You, the Chief Administrators of Catholic Education, represent that spirit of dedication. You have my admiration and, what's more, you have the respect of millions of hard-pressed parents whose freedom to choose the education of their children is being threatened by taxes and inflation.



My deep respect for your dedication and professionalism is based on something more than knowledge of your record, since I am fortunate to have one of your colleagues as a member of my advisory staff. I know all of you are familiar with Dr. Leonard DeFiore who has taken a temporary leave of absence from his duties as Superintendent of Schools in the Archdiocese of Washington.

I admire your highly professional administration of the largest group of nongovernmental schools in the nation--10,000 institutions which enroll 3.2 million students served by 145,000 teachers. Your expertise in achieving exceptional educational results while working with a wide range of students of every ethnic, social and economic segment of the population has been truly outstanding. I applaud this accomplishment which is being achieved at about one-third of public school per-pupil costs.

In recognition of these achievements, I pledge an increased role for non-public schools in formulation of national educational policy.

As members of the Council of American Private Education (CAPE), you are part of a coalition of 15 national organizations including both religiously-affiliated and other education organizations involving approximately 20,000 institutions with 4.5 million students, with an enrollment representing 90 percent of all non-public school students.

It is clear that the vast majority of non-public schools serve all creeds, races, and economic classes as the varied membership of the Council demonstrates.

I also wish to acknowledge another of your achievements, that of providing out-of-school religious instruction and guidance for several million more young people who are not attending Catholic schools. I congratulate the hundreds of thousands of volunteer teachers who are helping parents to mold good citizens for a strong and moral American life. This is a type of volunteer effort which has contributed to and strengthened our American way of life.

And it is precisely the non-governmental and voluntary aspect of your great work that I wish to speak of today. In addressing you, I speak not only to educational experts, but to representatives of America's greatest strength: volunteerism in the private sector. You are not only educational leaders in your communities--you are national leaders. What you do influences the lives of children who will someday lead our nation, not only in government but in the arts and sciences, in business and education.

Leaders of today, you are instructing the leaders of tomorrow not only with the skills they need, but the values that can guide and inspire those skills.

Leadership in America is not now and never has been synonymous with elected or appointed public office. There are leaders in neighborhoods and communities and schools, and factories and businesses who have never been elected to any public office, but

who serve as spokesmen for the places where they live and work: men and women, like you, whose contribution to America is priceless.

My vision of government is one in which presidential leadership complements but does not overshadow these other forms of leadership. In those areas where he has the constitutional responsibility, a president must be bold, vigorous, prudent, and willing to use the powers granted him. But, at the same time, he should take care that his powers and those of government in general don't become so strong and widespread as to smother the natural capacity for leadership in our society that has long been America's strength and hope.

So, when we talk about the need to cut back on Big Government, it is not that we love our governmental institutions less; it's that we love the American ideal of leadership by the people as much as we revere the constitutional need for a president to provide it for the people.

It is no exaggeration to say that Catholic educators and others who provide a non-public system of education for children are at the very heart of this traditional concept of American leadership.

I know you are all familiar with that theory of effective social action embodied in the "principle of subsidiarity." This principle advocates the resolution of social problems at the most basic possible competent level. This principle has long been

proclaimed by Catholic church leaders as the most effective way to manage a complex organization.

I have long believed that this principle should underlie sound national educational policy. I know that you will agree that the most competent level in educational decision making is the family: parents--not the government--are the ones who should make educational decisions about their children.

This is just not Catholic social doctrine or my belief--it is an integral part of the American system.

In the historic Pierce decision, the Supreme Court affirmed that "the child is no mere creature of the State," and that parental rights are central to any American concept of education.

For its welfare, the state may require minimal education of all its citizens and it has the right, as well as the duty, to maintain adequately funded public schools. However, the state does not have the right to monopolize education and ignore the rights of parents.

But with increasing taxes and high inflation, high interest and high unemployment, the opportunity to exercise those sacred and inviolable rights have been attacked and, in many cases, practically destroyed.

When basic rights of parents and the family are threatened, it is not only one religious or educational group that suffers--it is the entire nation. We have to put an end to the myth that the survival of Catholic and private schools is a sectarian problem and

start seeing it for what it really is: a national problem, involving all Americans. If we allow this absolutely vital part of our private, voluntary national leadership to be destroyed through government indifference or hostility, the unique American system of leadership and progress itself is endangered.

The defense of parental rights in education is a responsibility of every American, for those rights know no boundaries of creed or race or class.

I believe in and have always supported a dual system of public and non-public education. They should not be viewed as adversaries but rather as complementary parts of the American educational enterprise. I believe a free pluralistic society needs both. And I believe it is time the government stopped paying lip service to that idea and started doing something about it.

What the federal government needs is not more bureaucratic structures, such as the newly created Department of Education, but a restoration of the traditional, progressive American philosophy of education that is based on strong public and non-public schools.

We have to have each and each has to be healthy if American education in general is to flourish. If one part of our educational community is weakened--or lost--every parent, every child, every teacher, every taxpayer is the eventual loser.

Federal policy in education must be shaped by the needs of parents, children, and classroom teachers working together in

public and non-public schools and not by the whims of bureaucratic empires within the federal system.

How, then, do we see to it that the federal government helps local communities and parents meet the needs of public and non-public education?

The first thing we do is to find out exactly what the current labyrinth of federal programs is achieving. There are so many programs with so many complexities, it is impossible to determine success in many areas. Last week, in Wheaton College, I said that as President I will appoint a task force which, you can be certain, will include representatives of public and non-public education, to study all current federal programs dealing with education. Using the recommendations of that task force, I will see to it those federal programs and bureaucratic structures in education that work for parents and children are kept and those that do not are terminated.

I will also ask the 97th Congress to pass tuition tax credit legislation to aid parents who send their children to non-public elementary, secondary, and post-secondary schools--and when such legislation comes before the Congress for debate, I will wholeheartedly and openly support it, doing all I can to see it is passed and signed into law.

I support a system of tuition tax credits because I believe such a system is the best way to strengthen the right of parents to decide the education of their children.

In light of promises made to you in other campaigns, I realize that some of you may harbor some scepticism on this issue. I do know that you had received several promises from President Carter including a telegram to this very group in October 1976.

I don't have to tell the members of this audience that what Candidate Carter promised and what President Carter later did is, to put it in the most charitable terms, contradictory. Not only did Mr. Carter refuse to help parents, he played a major role in defeating the tuition tax credit bill when it was before the Senate.

So that there be no misunderstanding about it, let me restate my position by quoting the 1980 Republican Party Platform:

"Next year, a Republican White House will assist not sabotage Congressional efforts to enact tuition tax relief into law."

Mr. Carter stood silent during the debate over tuition tax credits when accusations were made that tuition tax credits discriminate against minorities.

As that great American, Al Smith--a product of St. James Parish School in New York City--used to say: let's look at the record:

In Manhattan, minorities are 79 percent of the Catholic elementary school (1979-80) enrollment.

In the District of Columbia, minorities are also 79 percent of the Catholic elementary school enrollment, and 44 percent are not Catholics.

In the State of California, non-public schools enroll a higher percentage of minority students than the public schools.

While 60 percent of the families in the nation's non-public schools are below \$20,000 in income, a survey of families with children in inner-city non-public schools shows that 72 percent have incomes less than \$15,000.

In the face of such overwhelming evidence, the truth is clear: non-public education is one of the best friends American minorities and Cities have today.

Some take issue with the tuition tax credit concept on the erroneous grounds that it is a "church-state" issue. Rather, tuition tax credits is an issue of distributive justice involving government and parent, not government and church. The tuition tax credit is based on the God-given, constitutionally-protected right of any parents of any religion or no religion to choose the kind of education their children should receive. That government should assist parents, especially low- and middle-income families, in exercising this right by allowing them to keep a little more of their hard-earned income is both proper and just.

As if the effects of the Carter administration's broken promises and failed economic policies have not been destructive enough, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) has further harassed the non-public school system.

I know you are all familiar with rules recently proposed by IRS. These rules could deny parents the deductions of contribu-



tions to churches if they enroll their children in a church school subsidized by the parish. And, of course, there was the attempt by the same IRS in 1978 to impose regulations that would have jeopardized a non-public school's tax exempt status by imposing an impossible quota system for students and teachers. Non-public education was found by the IRS to be guilty until proven innocent. This move was especially insulting to Catholics whose schools are doing such a fine job of helping minority children.

If this were not such a tragic problem, it would be almost comic in its grotesque reordering of the priorities of government. Government should do all it can to aid non-public education, but the last three and one-half years have seen this fundamental duty forgotten, as if it is the duty of Americans to prove to the IRS that they are not guilty of crimes in order to claim their basic rights.

I can tell you that under a Reagan administration, the IRS and every other agency and department of government are going to get out of the business of harrassing parents and children and start once again to serve them.

Private, non-governmental education and all other private, non-governmental sources of strength are not something added on to our nation--they are, in a very great degree, the very heart of our nation. They are what makes us different.

Allow me to illustrate that point:

A few years ago, a gymnastic team from the Soviet Union was making an appearance in the United States. An American television commentator was interviewing one of the young gymnasts with the aid of an official Soviet interpreter. The commentator asked the gymnast, "You are a member of your nation's team. Do you belong to any private gymnast teams?" And the Soviet interpreter didn't ever bother to interpret the question. The interpreter quickly said, "There are no voluntary associations in the Soviet Union."

That is perhaps one of the most chilling sentences I have ever heard.

Think of it: from the borders of Eastern Europe, across the Urals, to the unimaginably vast spaces of Siberia, across more than ten time zones, to the shores of the Bering Straits--in all that awesome, immense space there is not a single organization that exists without the implicit or explicit forbearance of the states.

That's the essential difference between the United States and the Soviet Union. Not weaponry, not gross national product, not production, not standard of living. The central difference is that all that we have has been built through freedom at work. It is the exercise of this God-given freedom that is the mainspring of human progress.

Are we going to just walk away from that great source of security and growth and leadership? Are we going to gradually, over the next decade, forget that great tradition of

non-governmental leadership until it is only a dream in the minds of a few who remember, vaguely, what freedom can do?

Before the American people and before God, I pledge that this great power of leadership and dedication, and, yes, of love, of which you are so important a part, will not be forgotten, but, rather, that it will be the central energizing force of the next administration and of American life for years to come.

But I can't do it alone. I especially need the help of every family currently supporting non-public schools.

This year parents must vote for their values, not for political labels. I am reminded of an old saying: our allegiance must be not to the forms of the past but to its virtues. Nowhere is this more true than in this election.

If the families you serve don't take effective political action, is there anyone who seriously believes that non-public education can flourish--or even survive--given the trends already apparent in the Carter administration?

In recent months, I have visited many neighborhoods all across America. And in those neighborhoods where there is a sense of pride and a sense of family unity and hope for a better future, there is always a good school. Quite often it is a Catholic school.

You, as Catholic educators, are at the very center of leadership in the American tradition because you not only help

parents exercise their educational rights, but contribute to the community as a whole.

The center of all education, in fact, of the American way of life, is the family.

When John Paul II visited our country, he said: "When the value of the family is threatened because of social and economic pressures, we will stand up and reaffirm that the family is necessary not only for the private good of every person, but also for the common good of every society, nation and state."

And that is what we are talking about when we talk about the kind of education you provide: the common good of every family of our entire nation, whether they go to your schools or not.

The decisions we make this year will determine what the future of education in the United States will be like--whether it will remain under family control at the local level or whether it will evolve into a centralized operation dominated by Big Government.

We need a new beginning for American leadership, and with your help--and the help of God--we will get that new beginning.

(end of draft)

Background for figures on pp8-9

Manhattan - Source: Archdiocesan School Office Data--quoted p. 5 in Vitullo-Martin How Federal Policies Discourage the Racial and Economic Integration of Private Schools, July 24, 1980.

District of Columbia - Source: Arch of Washington School Data, 1979-80.

California - Source: Dr. Joseph McElligott, Director of Education, California Catholic Conference (916) 443-4851.

4th fact - Source: 1976 Census Bureau Data quoted in Common Sense article by Senator Packwood - Summer 1978.

5th fact - Source: 1980 Report on Innercity Private Schools, by Catholic League for Civil and Religious Rights.