

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: Peace Statement (1 of 3)

Box: 436

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/>

Last Updated: 10/11/2023

Reagan & Bush

Reagan Bush Committee

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

NEWS RELEASE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

Sunday, October 19, 1980

CONTACT:

Lyn Nofziger or
Ken Towery
703-685-3630

TELEVISION ADDRESS AS DELIVERED BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

A STRATEGY OF PEACE FOR THE 80's

Good evening.

Three months ago, in accepting the nomination of my party to be its presidential candidate, I said: "Of all the objectives we seek, first and foremost is the establishment of lasting world peace."

Since I spoke those words, I have had the chance to visit with Americans like you, all across the nation. I have brought that same message of peace as our primary goal.

But it hasn't all been one-sided. I have had the chance not only to talk with you but also to listen to you about the course you believe our country should take. We have, in a way, been holding a national conversation together on the future of our country.

Tonight, I want to continue my part of that ongoing conversation, and offer what I believe are ways in which peace can be assured for every American family and for the world.

- MORE -

But before I do, I'd like to speak to you for a few moments now, not as a candidate for the presidency, but as a citizen, a parent--in fact, a grandparent--who shares with you the deep and abiding hope for peace.

I revere, as I know you do, the American tradition of free and reasoned discussion of our complex issues. That is why I have participated in six debates since I became a candidate for President. And that is why I have stated my willingness to engage President Carter in his first debate.

The great tradition of reasoned exchange of views has not exactly characterized all the rhetoric of this campaign. My own views have been distorted in what I can only conclude is an effort to scare people through innuendoes and misstatements of my positions.

Possibly Mr. Carter is gambling that his long litany of fear will somehow influence enough voters to save him from the inevitable consequences of the policies of his administration which have brought so much human misery.

I am confident he will lose that gamble. I think the American people know--to paraphrase Franklin Roosevelt--that the only thing the cause of peace has to fear is fear itself.

Let us base our decisions about peace and security on the facts, on what we need to know and not on what we are told we must fear.

There can be no doubt about what is the major issue in this campaign concerning the question of peace.

It is whether you believe Mr. Carter's words and deeds have brought the United States closer to or further away from the goal of peace based on confidence in the strength of our nation.

As a presidential candidate four years ago, he said: "...it is imperative that the world know that we will meet obligations and commitments to our allies and that we will keep our nation strong."

Did he keep his promise? That's the real peace issue in 1980. And that's an issue for you to decide. Has he kept our nation strong? Are you willing to risk four more years of what we have now? Has the registration and the possible draft of your sons and daughters contributed to your peace of mind? Is the world safer for you and your family?

Whatever else history may say about my candidacy, I hope it will be recorded that I appealed to our best hopes, not our worst fears, to our confidence rather than our doubts, to the facts, and not to fantasies.

And these three--hope, confidence, and facts--are at the heart of my vision of peace.

We have heard the phrase "peace through strength" so often, its meaning has become blurred through overuse.

The time has come for America to recall once more the basic truths behind the familiar words.

Peace is made by the fact of strength--economic, military, and strategic.

Peace is lost when such strength disappears or--just as bad--is seen by an adversary as disappearing.

We must build peace upon strength. There is no other way. And the cold, hard fact of the matter is that our economic, military, and strategic strength under President Carter is eroding.

Only if we are strong will peace be strong.

Throughout Scripture, we see reference to peace-makers--those who through their actions--not just their words--take the material of this imperfect world and, with hard work and God's help, fashion from that material peace for the world.

In recent weeks you've been hearing from a lot of other people as to what they say I believe about peace. Well, tonight let me tell you what I believe.

Understanding of how peace is obtained--through competence, and hard work, confidence, and patience--must guide and inspire this nation in the years ahead.

And at the center of such peace-making is the need to restore our historic American tradition of bipartisanship.

The cause of peace knows no party. The cause of peace transcends personal ambition. The cause of peace demands appeals for unity, not appeals to divisiveness.

These are truisms--which Mr. Carter has forgotten--or chosen to ignore.

Senator Ted Kennedy said earlier this year, in reference to him, that "no president should be reelected because he happened to be standing there when his foreign policy collapsed around him."

I cannot believe this administration's defense policies reflect the thinking of millions of rank-and-file Democrat party members. The Carter administration, dominated as it is by the McGovernite wing of the party, has broken sharply with the views and policies of Harry Truman, John Kennedy, and many contemporary Democratic leaders.

A great American tradition of bipartisanship--where domestic political differences end at the water's edge--has been lost at a time when we are faced with growing instability and crisis abroad. I believe the bipartisan tradition is too deep and sound to be destroyed by one man in the space of four years, but still, damage has been done and it will take a determined effort to repair it.

I pledge, if elected President, to take every step necessary to restore the bipartisan tradition in American national security and foreign policy; to work with congressional leaders of both parties to design and conduct a truly bipartisan tradition in American national security and foreign policy. And, I intend to have this bipartisan spirit reflected during my presidency in key foreign and defense policy appointive positions. As in the past, our domestic differences will end at the water's edge.

In the next few minutes, I would like to outline for you nine specific steps that I will take to put America on a sound, secure footing in the international arena. Working closely with the

Congress, I propose to accomplish these steps with the support of an informed American public. Here are the steps:

1. An improved policy-making structure;
2. A clear approach to East-West relations;
3. A realistic policy toward our own Hemisphere;
4. A plan to assist African and Third World development;
5. A plan to send our message abroad;
6. A realistic strategic arms reduction policy;
7. A determined effort to strengthen the quality of our armed services;
8. Combatting international terrorism;
9. Restoration of a margin of safety in our defense planning.

Reorganizing the Policy-Making Structure

The present administration has been unable to speak with one voice in foreign policy. This must change. My administration will restore leadership to U.S. foreign policy by organizing it in a more coherent way.

An early priority will be to make structural changes in the foreign policy-making machinery so that the Secretary of State will be the President's principal spokesman and adviser.

The National Security Council will once again be the coordinator of the policy process. Its mission will be to assure that the President receives an orderly, balanced flow of information and analysis. The National Security Adviser will work closely in teamwork with the Secretary of State and the other members of the Council.

My goal also will be to build and utilize a diplomatic corps with language proficiency, and organizational and professional skills, and to insure the safety of our representatives on duty overseas. We can restore pride and effectiveness in our foreign policy establishment by putting an end to the kidnapping and murder of our public servants in service abroad.

Relations with Friends and Adversaries

With effective machinery in place, we must first address the conduct of our relations with our allies, with the Soviet Union, and with the People's Republic of China.

Confidence and trust in the United States has fallen to an all-time low. This must be reversed. The United States has an important leadership role, and this role can be effective only if our alliances are cemented by unity of purpose and mutual respect.

Worldwide, our allies are stronger, most are robust and healthy. But the challenge of the 1980s is to assemble that strength in a manner which allows us to pursue the objective of peace together. If our alliances are divided, only our adversaries benefit.

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.

Our relationship with the People's Republic of China is in its beginning stages. It is one that can and will grow, and I repeat my intention to assist its rapid growth. 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.

A Realistic Policy for the Western Hemisphere

No area of the world should have a higher priority than the place where we live, the Western Hemisphere. My administration will forge a new, more realistic policy toward our own Hemisphere as an integral part of my program for peace.

In four years, Mr. Carter's administration has managed to alienate our friends in the Hemisphere, to encourage the destabilization of governments, and to permit Cuban and Soviet influence to grow.

We must take steps to change the Carter administration's sorry record of vacillation, alienation, and neglect in the region.

Our relations must be solidly based on shared economic and security interests, not upon mutual recrimination and insult.

We will initiate a program of intensive economic development with cooperating countries in the Caribbean. Many of these countries were given their independence and then promptly forgotten. In their natural resentment, some have turned to

extremist models--fertile ground for Cuban meddling. Our programs will assist them both financially and technically to make the best use of their resources in agriculture, industry, and tourism.

Closer to home, I have spoken before of my belief that we should work toward a North American Accord with our immediate neighbors, Mexico and Canada. This would take the form of broadened, more open lines of communication between us to seek ways in which we can strengthen our traditional friendship. If Canada and Mexico are stronger, our entire Hemisphere benefits.

A Policy to Assist African and Third World Development

Our relationship with what is often called the "Third World" must form an important part of any program for peace. A strong American economy and the spirit of our free enterprise system have a great deal to offer the poorer, less developed nations of the world. Africans, for example, look to us and our industrial allies for the dominant share of their export markets, for their investment capital, for official aid, and for technical know-how.

Yet, the flow of American investment to Africa continues at only a trickle, and our export promotion has been neglected.

My administration will recognize that investment from the private sector--know-how, technology, and marketing assistance--is the key to African development. Government will help promote this, not intervene to make it more difficult.

Sending the American Message

Proclaiming the American message is a vital step in the program for peace.

I will strengthen the United States International Communication Agency, including the Voice of America. We will also strengthen Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. Compared with other costs of our national security, the dollar amounts involved in this are small. What is needed most is a sense of conviction, the conviction that by carrying the American message abroad we strengthen the foundations of peace.

The current administration has permitted these vital efforts to decline.

For instance, the United States has been unable to broadcast to a majority of the Afghan people during these critical years, yet all the while Soviet-sponsored broadcasts were stirring up hatred toward America throughout the Islamic world.

For our long-term strategy, the communication of our ideals must become part of our strategy for peace.

We have a story to tell about the differences between the two systems now competing for the hearts and minds of mankind. There is the poverty and despair in the emerging nations who adopt Marxist totalitarianism and, by contrast, the freedom and prosperity of free market countries like Taiwan, South Korea, and Singapore.

A Realistic Strategic Arms Reduction Policy

As the next requirement for a program for peace, I would assign a high priority to strategic arms reduction. I have repeatedly said in this campaign that I will sit down with the Soviet Union for as long as it takes to negotiate a balanced and

equitable arms limitation agreement, designed to improve the prospects for peace. To succeed at arms control, however, we must first be honest with ourselves so that we can be convincing with the Soviets.

We must honestly face the facts of the arms competition in which we are caught. And, we must have a view of the world that is consistent with these facts and that does not change to suit different audiences. The Carter administration told Congress that the Soviet Union has long been investing about three times as much as we have in strategic arms and is expected to continue doing so, with or without SALT II--the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, controlled by a Democratic majority, in a narrow vote came out for the Treaty, but only after more than 20 changes had been made. Then, on December 20, 1979, the Senate Armed Services Committee, also controlled by a Democratic majority, voted 10 - 0 with seven abstentions to adopt a report which concluded--and I urge you to listen closely to these words: "that the SALT II Treaty as it now stands, is not in the national security interests of the United States of America." Finally, Mr. Carter could not even muster the necessary votes to pass his SALT Treaty in the United States Senate--yes, controlled by a Democratic majority--even before the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan.

It would appear that members of his own party are trying to tell Mr. Carter something is flawed in his approach to arms limitation.

Please listen to the following statement:

"I must admit that I am not at all pleased that those of us expressing reservations and concern regarding the Treaty are characterized by some as warmongers."

Ladies and gentlemen, that statement was made by a Democratic Senator, a Marine veteran, a former astronaut, and a man who, in 1976, Jimmy Carter considered for his vice-presidential running mate-- John Glenn of Ohio.

I think it's time that you, the American people, heard some straight talk about Mr. Carter's SALT II Treaty. The real truth about that Treaty is that Mr. Carter himself doomed its fate from the moment it was negotiated. It has been effectively blocked, not by Ronald Reagan, but by the United States Senate--your elected representatives from all over the nation, fulfilling their constitutional obligation to advise and consent on treaties. It has been critically denounced by dozens of the most eminent scholars and knowledgeable analysts, Democrat as well as Republican.

As President, I will make immediate preparation for negotiations on a SALT III Treaty. My goal is to begin arms reductions. My energies will be directed at reducing destructive nuclear weaponry in the world--and doing it in such a way as to protect fully the critical security requirements of our nation.

The way to avoid an arms race is not simply to let the Soviets race ahead. We need to remove their incentive to race ahead by making it clear to them that we can and will compete if

need be, at the same time we tell them that we prefer to halt this competition and reduce the nuclear arsenals by patient negotiation.

Restoring 'the Quality of our Armed Forces

Restoring a sense of pride in their careers for the men and women in our armed services is another important element of my program for peace. We must direct our attention to the urgent manpower needs of our services. In defense matters, we hear much about hardware and not enough about people. The most important part of our military strength is the people involved--their quality, their training, and their welfare. We must do all in our power to make sure they are well-trained and well-equipped, that they feel proud and secure in their jobs and that their economic sacrifice is not out of proportion to what we ask of them. The economic policies of the Carter administration have made life especially difficult for our men and women in uniform and for their families.

We can reverse this situation. We can implement a program of compensation and benefits for military personnel that is comparable to what is available in the private sector. I will ask Congress to reinstate the G.I. Bill, a program which was directly responsible for the most rapid advance ever in the educational level of our population. Our country must provide our service personnel and their families with the security, the incentives, and the quality of life to compensate for the sacrifices they make on our behalf.

Combatting International Terrorism

Let us turn now to the need for the United States to assume a leadership role in curbing the spread of international terrorism. In sharing the outrage against terrorism, I will direct the resources of my administration against this scourge of civilization and toward expansion of our cooperation with other nations in combatting terrorism in its many forms.

Terrorists seek to undermine, paralyze and, finally, destroy democratic governments. Israel has long been the victim of the most wanton acts of terrorism. Our allies in Europe and elsewhere have experienced terrorism with increasing frequency.

Terrorist organizations have enjoyed the support--covert and open--of the Soviet Union. In Iran, terrorism has been elevated to the level of national policy in the assault on the U.S. Embassy and the year-long captivity of our fellow-citizens. The tactics and philosophy of the Palestine Liberation Organization are also based on terrorism.

We must restore the ability of the C.I.A. and other intelligence agencies to keep us informed and forewarned about terrorist activities and we must take the lead in forging an international consensus that firmness and refusal to concede or to pay ransom are ultimately the only effective deterrents to terrorism.

Restoring Our Margin of Safety for Peace

An important step--perhaps the most important of all--in a systematic program for peace is to restore the margin of safety for peace in our defense program by working closely with the

Congress on a long-term program designed to meet our needs throughout this critical decade.

We must ask ourselves, is America more secure? Are we more confident of peace in the world than we were just four years ago? You know the answer to those questions, it is "no."

President Ford left a long-range defense program designed to keep America strong throughout the 80s. He recognized that, after years of negotiation, the Soviet Union was still bent upon surpassing the United States in overall strategic strength.

Wisely, he did not give up on arms control negotiations, but sought to provide us with an "insurance policy" in the form of a balanced program to keep us from falling behind.

But, the Carter administration, in its haste to make good on a reckless campaign promise to cut defense spending by billions of dollars, insisted on a policy of systematic concessions in defense and in arms control negotiations.

I have criticized the President, I will admit, for not having kept his campaign promises. But in this case, I'm sorry to say, he did keep his promise. He has weakened our defense capability and wiped out our margin of safety.

My task as President will be to strengthen our defenses and to lead our allies in a sustained and prudent effort to keep us, and the entire world, secure from confrontation. The preservation of peace will require the best resources we can marshal in this precarious decade. We can marshal them by reaffirming our

national purpose, by reasserting our will and determination, and by regaining our economic vitality.

But each of these approaches to establishing a real peace must rest on the firm underpinning of a strong American economy.

Tragically, the weakened state of America's economy has significantly affected our ability to have the strongest possible foreign and defense policies. Maintaining our strength requires having our people in productive jobs not in unemployment lines. It requires having our citizens confident that their future will not continue to be eroded away by incredibly high inflation and interest rates. It demands a strong dollar that encourages other nations to trust us.

Our inflation has especially undermined the dollar and has upset world markets. Our trading partners now question our reliability. And when they question our economic reliability, they begin to question our reliability as a strong ally.

Our failed energy policies have caused many of our allies to blame the United States for the world's energy problem as much as OPEC. Neglect of energy realities diminishes our diplomatic strength. But worse, our dependence on imported oil also weakens our strategic position.

We can indeed make peace. We can have the peace we want for ourselves and for our children. We are going to have to work hard and think hard and act with competence and with confidence--but it can be done.

And, as we work, we will have to be inspired by the vision of what our country means to us and to the world.

In recent weeks, I have had that vision of our nation's meaning brought to my attention in a very personal way.

The home in which Nancy and I are temporarily living in the Virginia countryside during this campaign is only a relatively short distance away from the home of a great American President, Thomas Jefferson.

In his first Inaugural Address, Jefferson spoke of "the preservation of the general government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet-anchor of our peace at home and our safety abroad." He knew that peace in the world depended on the strength of our nation in its "whole constitutional vigor."

Jefferson loved America and the cause of peace too--loved them too much to ever give in or appeal to fear and doubt.

I have known four wars in my lifetime--I don't want to see a fifth. I pray that never again will we bleed a generation of young Americans into the sands of island beachheads or the mire of the battlefield, the jungles or the rice paddies of Asia.

Whether we like it or not, it is our responsibility to preserve world peace because no one else can do it. We cannot continue letting events and crises get out of control, we must--through sound management and planning--be in control so as to prevent being confronted by a crisis. This requires a sound economy, a strong national defense, and the will and determination to preserve peace and freedom.

Recently, I was on the campaign trail in the state where I was born and raised, Illinois.

Nancy and I travelled by bus and car in a motorcade down through the central and southern part of the state stopping at lovely towns; we visited a coal mine which is typical of our industrial capacity; saw for the first time the tomb of Abraham Lincoln in Springfield, Illinois; toured a productive family farm, and that was something surprising to see, the technology of American farmers and why they can produce so much and relieve so much hunger in the world; and, then, at the end of the day we stood on the banks of the Mississippi under that great silver arch there in St. Louis, Missouri.

It was a beautiful, crisp autumn day and thousands of families had come out to see us at every stop. It was a moving experience, but I was most moved, as I always am, by the youngsters--from the little ones perched on their fathers shoulders to the teenagers. You get a rebirth of optimism about our nation's future when you see their young faces.

They are what this campaign is all about. Renewing our spirit, securing their future in a world at peace is the legacy I want to leave for them.

One of the signers of the Declaration of Independence said it isn't important that we leave wealth to our children, it is important that we leave them liberty.

Thank you and good evening.

* * * * *

A STRATEGY OF PEACE FOR THE 80s

Good evening.

Three months ago, in accepting the nomination of my party to be its presidential candidate, I said: "Of all the objectives we seek, first and foremost is the establishment of lasting world peace."

Since I spoke those words, I have had the chance to visit with Americans like you, all across the nation. I have brought that same message of peace as our primary goal.

But it hasn't all been one-sided. I have had the chance not only to talk with you but also to listen to you about the course you believe our country should take. We have, in a way, been holding a national conversation together on the future of our country.

Tonight, I want to continue my part of that ongoing conversation, and offer what I believe are ways in which peace can be assured for every American family and for the world.

But before I do, I'd like to speak to you for a few moments, not as a candidate for the presidency, but as a citizen, a parent -- in fact, a grandparent -- who shares with you the deep and abiding hope for peace.

I revere, as I know you do, the American tradition of free, and reasoned discussion of complex issues. That is why I have participated in six debates since I became a candidate for president. and that is why I have stated my willingness to engage President Carter in his first debate.

The great tradition of reasoned exchange of views has not exactly characterized all the rhetoric of this campaign. My own views have been distorted in what I can only conclude is an effort to scare people through innuendoes and misstatements of my positions.

Possibly Mr. Carter is gambling that his long litany of fear will somehow influence enough voters to save him from the inevitable consequences of the policies of his administration which have brought so much human misery.

I am confident he will lose that gamble. I think the American people know -- to paraphrase Franklin Roosevelt -- that the only thing the cause of peace has to fear is fear itself.

Let us base our decisions about peace and security on the facts, on what we need to know and not on what we are told we must fear.

There can be no doubt about what is the major issues in this campaign concerning the question of peace.

It is whether you believe Mr. Carter's words and deeds have brought the United States closer to or further away from the goal of peace based on confidence in the strength of our nation.

As a presidential candidate four years ago, he said: "...it is imperative that the world know that we will meet obligations and commitments to our allies and that we will keep our nation strong."

Did he keep his promise? That's the real peace issue in 1980. And that's an issue for you to decide. Has he kept our nation strong? Are you willing to risk four more years of what we have now? Has the registration and the possible draft of your sons and daughters contributed to your peace of mind? Is the world safer for you and your family?

Whatever else history may say about my candidacy, I hope it will be recorded that I appealed to our best hopes not our worst fears, to our confidence rather than our doubts, to the facts, not to fantasies.

And these three -- hope, confidence, and facts -- are at the heart of my vision of peace.

We have heard the phrase "peace through strength" so often, its meaning has become blurred through overuse.

The time has come for America to recall once more the basic truths behind the familiar words.

Peace is made by the fact of strength -- economic, military and strategic.

Peace is lost when such strength disappears of -- just as bad -- is seen by an adversary as disappearing.

We must build peace upon strength. There is no other way. And the cold, hard fact of the matter is that our economic, military and strategic strength under President Carter is eroding.

Only if we are strong will peace be strong.

Throughout Scripture we see reference to peace-makers -- those who through their actions -- not just their words -- take the material of this imperfect world and, with hard work and God's help, fashion from that material peace for the world.

In recent weeks you've been hearing from a lot of other people, to what they say I believe about peace. Well, tonight let me tell you what I believe.

Understanding of how peace is obtained -- through competence, and hard work, confidence and patience -- must guide and inspire this nation in the years ahead.

And at the center of such peace-making is the need to restore our historic American tradition of bi-partisanship.

The cause of peace knows no party. The cause of peace transcends personal ambition. The cause of peace demands appeals for unity, not appeals to divisiveness.

These are truisms -- which Mr. Carter has forgotten -- or chosen to ignore.

Senator Ted Kennedy said earlier this year, in reference to him that "no President should be reelected because he happened to be standing there when his foreign policy collapsed around him." I can not believe this administration's defense policies reflect the thinking of millions of rank-and-file Democrat party members. The Carter administration, dominated as it is by the McGovernite wing of the party, has broken sharply with the views and policies of Harry Truman, John Kennedy, and many contemporary Democratic leaders.

A great American tradition of bipartisanship -- where domestic political differences end at the water's edge -- has been lost at a time when we are faced with growing instability and crisis abroad. I believe the bipartisan tradition is too deep and sound to be destroyed by one man in the space of four years, but, still, damage has been done and it will take a determined effort to repair it.

I pledge, if elected President, to take every step necessary to restore the bipartisan tradition in American national security and foreign policy; to work with congressional leaders of both parties to design and conduct a truly bipartisan tradition in American national security and foreign policy. And, I intend to have this bipartisan spirit reflected during my presidency in key foreign and defense policy appointive positions. As in the past our domestic differences will end at the waters edge.

In the next few minutes I would like to outline for you nine specific steps that I will take to put American on a sound, secure footing in the international arena. Working closely with the Congress, I propose to accomplish these steps with the support of an informed American public. Here are the steps:

- 1 - An improved policy-making structure;
- 2 - A clear approach to East-West relations;
- 3 - A realistic policy toward our own Hemisphere;
- 4 - A plan to assist African and Third World development;
- 5 - A plan to send our message abroad;
- 6 - A realistic strategic arms reduction policy;
- 7 - A determined effort to strengthen the quality of our armed services;
- 8 - Combatting international terrorism;
- 9 - Restoration of a margin of safety in our defense planning.

The present administration has been unable to speak with one voice in foreign policy. This must change. My administration will restore leadership to U.S. foreign policy by organizing it in a more coherent way.

An early priority will be to make structural changes in the foreign policy-making machinery so that the Secretary of State will be the President's principal spokesman and adviser.

The National Security Council will once again be the coordinator of the policy process. Its mission will be to assure that the President receives an orderly, balanced flow of information and analysis. The National Security Adviser will work closely in teamwork,

with the Secretary of State and the other members of the Council.

My goal also will be to build and utilize a diplomatic corps with language proficiency, and organizational and professional skills, and to insure the safety of our representatives on duty overseas. We can restore pride and effectiveness in our foreign policy establishment by putting an end to the kidnapping and murder of our public servants in service abroad.

With effective machinery in place, we must first address the conduct of our relations with our allies, with the Soviet Union and with the People's Republic of China.

Confidence and trust in the United States has fallen to an all-time low. This must be reversed. The United States has an important leadership role, and this role can be effective only if our alliances are cemented by unity of purpose and mutual respect.

World-wide, our Allies are stronger, most are robust and healthy. But the challenge of the 1980s is to assemble that strength in a manner which allows us to pursue the objective of peace together. If our alliances are divided, only our adversaries benefit.

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.

Our relationship with the People's Republic of China is in its beginning stages. It is one that can and will grow, and I repeat my intention to assist its rapid growth. There is an historic bond of freindship 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.

No area of the world should have a higher priority than the place where we live, the Western Hemisphere. My administration will forge a new, more realistic policy toward our own hemisphere as an integral part of my program for peace.

In four years, Mr. Carter's administration has managed to alienate our friends in the Hemisphere, to encourage the destabilization of governments, and to permit Cuban and Soviet influence to grow.

We must take steps to change the Carter administration's sorry record of vacillation, alienation, and neglect in the region.

Our relations must be solidly based on shared economic and security interests, not upon mutual recrimination and insult.

We will initiate a program of intensive economic development with cooperating countries in the Caribbean. Many of these countries were given their independence and then promptly forgotten. In their natural resentment, some have turned to extremist models -- fertile ground for Cuban meddling. Our programs will assist them both financially and technically to make the best use of their sources in agriculture, industry and tourism.

Closer to home, I have spoken before of my belief that we should work toward a North American Accord with our immediate neighbors, Mexico and Canada. This would take the form of broadened, more open lines of communication between us to seek ways in which we can strengthen our traditional friendship. If Canada and Mexico are stronger our entire Hemisphere benefits.

Our relationship with what is often called the "Third World" must form an important part of any program for peace. A strong American economy and the spirit of our free enterprise system have a great deal to offer the poorer, less developed nations of the world. Africans, for example, look to us and our industrial allies for the dominant share of their export markets, for their investment capital; for official aid and for technical know-how.

Yet, the flow of American investment to Africa continues at only a trickle, and our export promotion has been neglected.

My administration will recognize that investment from the private sector - know-how, technology and marketing assistance -- is the key to African development. Government will help promote this, not intervene to make it more difficult.

Proclaiming the American message is a vital step in the program for peace.

I will strengthen the United States International Communication Agency, including the Voice of America. We will also strengthen Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. Compared with other costs of our national security, the dollar amounts involved in this are

small. What is needed most is a sense of conviction, the conviction that by carrying the American message abroad we strengthen the foundations of peace.

The current administration has permitted these vital efforts to decline.

For instance, the United States has been unable to broadcast to a majority of the Afghan people during these critical years, yet all the while Soviet-sponsored broadcasts were stirring up hatred toward America throughout the Islamic world.

For our long-term strategy, the communication of our ideals must become part of our strategy for peace

We have a story to tell about the difference between the two systems now competing for the heart and minds of mankind. There is the poverty and despair in the emerging nations who adopt Marxism totalitarianism and by contrast the freedom and prosperity of free market countries like Taiwan, South Korea and Singapore.

As the next requirement for a program for peace, I would assign a high priority to strategic arms reduction. I have repeatedly said in this campaign that I will sit down with the Soviet Union for as long as it takes to negotiate a balanced and equitable arms limitation agreement designed to improve the prospects for peace. To succeed at arms control, however, we must first be honest with ourselves so that we can be convincing with the Soviets.

We must honestly face the facts of the arms competition in which we are caught. And, we must have a view of the world that is consistent with these facts and that does not change to suit different audiences. The Carter administration told Congress that the Soviet Union has long been investing about three times as much as we have in strategic arms and is expected to continue doing so, with or without SALT II -- the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, controlled by a Democratic majority, in a narrow vote came out for the Treaty, but only after more than 20 changes had been made. Then, on December 20, 1979, the Senate Armed Services Committee, also controlled by a Democratic majority, voted ten to zero with seven abstentions to adopt a report which concluded -- and I urge you to listen closely to these words: "that the SALT II Treaty as it now stands, is not in the national security interests of the United States of America." Finally, Mr. Carter could not even muster the necessary votes to pass his SALT Treaty in the U.S. Senate -- yes, controlled by a Democratic majority -- even before the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan.

It would appear that members of his own party are trying to tell Mr. Carter something is flawed in his approach to arms limitation.

Please listen to the following statement:

"I must admit that I am not at all pleased that those of us expressing reservations and concern regarding the Treaty are characterized by some as warmongers."

Ladies and gentlemen, that statement was made by a Democratic Senator, a Marine veteran, astronaut and a man who in 1976 Jimmy Carter considered for his vice-presidential running mate -- John Glenn of Ohio.

I think it's time that you, the American people, heard some straight talk about Mr. Carter's SALT II Treaty. The real truth about that treaty is that Mr. Carter himself doomed its fate from the moment it was negotiated. It has been effectively blocked, not by Ronald Reagan, but by the United States Senate -- your elected representatives from all over the nation, fulfilling their constitutional obligation to advise and consent on treaties. It has been critically denounced by dozens of the most eminent scholars and knowledgeable analysts, Democrat as well as Republican.

As President I will immediately open negotiations on a SALT III Treaty. My goal is to begin arms reductions. My energies will be directed at reducing destructive nuclear weaponry in the world -- and doing it in such a way as to protect fully the critical security requirements of our nation.

The way to avoid an arms race is not to simply let the Soviets race ahead. We need to remove their incentive to race ahead by making it clear to them that we can and will compete if need be, at the same time we tell them that we prefer to halt this competition and reduce the nuclear arsenals by patient negotiation.

Restoring a sense of pride in their careers for the men and women in our armed services is another important element of my program for peace. We must direct our attention to the urgent manpower needs of our services. In defense matters we hear much about hardware and not enough about people. The most important part of our military strength is the people involved -- their quality, their training and their welfare. We must do all in our power to make sure they are well-trained and well-equipped, that they feel proud and secure in their jobs and that their economic sacrifice is not out of proportion to what we ask of them. The economic policies of the Carter administration have made life especially difficult for our men and women in uniform and for their families.

We can reverse this situation. We can implement a program of compensation and benefits for military personnel that is comparable to what is available in the private sector. I will ask Congress to reinstate the G.I. Bill, a program which was directly responsible for the most rapid advance ever in the educational level of our population. Our country must provide our service personnel and their families with the security, the incentives and the quality of life to compensate for the sacrifices they make on our behalf.

Let us turn now to the need for the United States to assume a leadership role in curbing the spread of international terrorism. In sharing the outrage against terrorism, I will direct the resources of my administration against this scourge of civilization and toward expansion of our cooperation with other nations in combatting terrorism in its many forms.

Terrorists seek to undermine, paralyze and, finally, destroy democratic governments. Israel has long been the victim of the most

wanton acts of terrorism. Our allies in Europe and elsewhere have experienced terrorism with increasing frequency.

Terrorist organizations have enjoyed the support -- covert and open -- of the Soviet Union. In Iran, terrorism has been elevated to the level of national policy in the assault on the U.S. embassy and the year-long captivity of our fellow-citizens. The tactics and philosophy of the Palestine Liberation Organization are also based on terrorism.

We must restore the ability of the C.I.A. and other intelligence agencies to keep us informed and forewarned about terrorist activities and we must take the lead in forging an international consensus that firmness and refusal to concede or to pay ransom are ultimately the only effective deterrents to terrorism.

An important step -- perhaps the most important of all -- in a systematic program for peace is to restore the margin of safety for peace in our defense program by working closely with the Congress on a long-term program designed to meet our needs throughout this critical decade.

We must ask ourselves, is America more secure? Are we more confident of peace in the world than we were just four years ago? You know the answer to those questions is, "no".

President Ford left a long-range defense program designed to keep America strong throughout the 80s. He recognized that, after years of negotiation, the Soviet Union was still bent upon surpassing the United States in overall strategic strength.

Wisely, he did not give up on arms control negotiations, but sought to provide us with an "insurance policy" in the form of a balanced program to keep us from falling behind.

But, the Carter administration in its haste to make good on a reckless campaign promise to cut defense spending by billions of dollars, insisted on a policy of systematic concessions in defense and in arms control negotiations. I have criticized the President, I will admit, for not having kept his campaign promises. But in this case I'm sorry to say he did keep his promise. He has weakened our defense capability and wiped out our margin of safety.

My task as President will be to strengthen our defenses and to lead our allies in a sustained and prudent effort to keep us — and the entire world secure from confrontation. The preservation of peace will require the best resources we can marshal in this precarious decade. We can marshal them by reaffirming our national purpose, by reasserting our will and determination, and by regaining our economic vitality.

We can indeed make peace. We can have the peace we want for ourselves and for our children. We are going to have to work hard and think hard and act with competence and with confidence -- but it can be done.

And, as we work, we will have to be inspired by the vision of what our country means to us and to the world.

In recent weeks, I have had that vision of our nation's meaning brought to my attention in a very personal way.

The home in which Nancy and I are temporarily living in the Virginia countryside during this campaign is only a relatively short distance away from the home of a great American President, Thomas Jefferson.

In his first Inaugural Address, Jefferson spoke of "the preservation of the general government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the general government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet-anchor of our peace at home and our safety abroad". He knew that peace in the world depended on the strength of our nation in its "whole constitutional vigor."

Jefferson loved America and the cause of peace too much ever to give in or appeal to fear and doubt.

I have known 4 wars in my lifetime. I don't want to see a 5th. I pray that never again will we bleed a generation of young Americans into the sands of beachheads or the mire of the battlefields.

Whether we like it or not it is our responsibility to preserve world peace because no one else can do it. We cannot continue letting events and crises get out of control. We must through sound management and planning be in control so as to prevent being confronted by a crisis. This requires a sound economy, a strong national defense and the will and determination to preserve peace and freedom.

FROM: BOB GARRICK
OUT AT: 5:00 p.m.

16 October

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 that
RR will give on the Peace
Theme. Please return your
comments immediately. This
is a limited distribution.

Richard Allen

Martin Anderson

Jim Brady

Ed Gray

Others

Ray Bell
Bob Gray

(PH/RV. 45)
30-11-03
TO: ~~Jim Brady~~, Marty Anderson, Ken Khachigian, Lyn Nofziger, Mike Deaver

FROM: Bob Garrick

1 - DRAFT - NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

Facilitator
313-441-5212
1405, 1406, 1407
Lynn Hunt

Good evening.

Three months ago, in accepting the nomination of my party to be its presidential candidate, I said: "Of all the objectives we seek, first and foremost is the establishment of lasting world peace."

Since I spoke those words, I have had the chance to visit with Americans like you, all across our great and beautiful country. I have brought that same message of the primacy of peace as our goal and it has been greeted by warmth and enthusiasm everywhere.

I will be forever grateful to you, my fellow citizens, for giving me this chance to share with you my beliefs on the issues that concern us most deeply.

But it hasn't all been one-sided. I have had the chance not only to talk with you but to listen to you about the course you believe our country should take. We have, in a way, been holding a national conversation together on the future of our country.

Tonight, I want to continue my part of that ongoing conversation, and offer what I believe are ways in which peace can be assured for every American family and for the world.

But before I do, I'd like to speak to you for a few moments, not as a candidate for the presidency, but as a fellow American, a

2 - DRAFT - NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

citizen, a parent--in fact, a grandparent--who shares with you the deep and abiding hope for peace.

I revere, as I know you do, the American tradition of free, open, and reasoned discussion of complex issues. Unfortunately, this great tradition has been abandoned by Mr. Carter.

Finding he cannot lead the people, he has been determined to try to scare them by innuendoes, misstatements, and distortions of my positions concerning peace.

The path to peace cannot be found in the fever swamps of emotionalism. That path must be traced, however long and laboriously, along the uplands of reason and fact and free exchange of views.

Mr. Carter is gambling that his long litany of fear will somehow influence enough voters to save him from the inevitable consequences of his own dismal record.

I think he will lose that gamble. I think the American people know--to paraphrase Franklin Roosevelt--that the only thing the cause of peace has to fear is fear itself.

Let us base our decisions about peace on the facts, on what we need to know and not on what we are told to fear.

There can be no doubt about what precisely is the major issue concerning the question of peace in this campaign.

It is whether you believe Mr. Carter's record--his words and his deeds--has placed the United States closer to or further away

3 - DRAFT - NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

from the goal of peace based on confidence in the strength of our nation.

On August 24, 1976, Candidate Jimmy Carter said: "...it is imperative that the world know that we will meet obligations and commitments to our allies and that we will keep our nation strong."

Did Mr. Carter keep his promise? That's the peace issue in 1980. Do you believe Mr. Carter has met his obligations and commitments? Do you believe he has kept our nation strong? Is your family willing to risk four more years of what he has given us? ^{sliding from crisis to crisis} ~~Has his desire to register and eventually draft your sons and daughters contributed to your peace of mind?~~

New
chg
Oct.18

Those are clear, precise, factual questions. And they demand clear, precise, factual answers.

Whatever else history may say about my candidacy, I know that it will be recorded that I made my appeal to our best hopes instead of our worst fears, to our confidence rather than our doubts, to the facts, and not to ^{distortions} ~~fears~~ and fantasies.

And these three--hope, confidence, and facts--are at the heart of my vision of peace.

I am reminded that throughout Scripture we see reference to peace-makers--those who through their actions--not just their words--take the material of this imperfect world and, with hard work and God's help, fashion from that recalcitrant material peace for the world.

4 - DRAFT - NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

I am convinced this understanding of how peace is gained--through competence and hard work and confidence and patience--must guide and inspire this nation in the years ahead.

And at the center of such peace-making is the need to restore the historic American tradition of bi-partisanship on the question of peace.

The cause of peace knows no party. The cause of peace transcends personal ambition. The cause of peace demands appeals for unity, not appeals to divisiveness.

These are truisms--but Mr. Carter has forgotten--or chosen to ignore--them.

Senator Kennedy was correct when he said earlier this year, in reference to Mr. Carter, that "no President should be reelected because he happened to be standing there when his foreign policy collapsed around him."

What Mr. Carter has created is a highly partisan foreign policy that demands that his Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense become political partisans rather than representatives of the entire nation. This partisanship does not just separate Republicans and Democrats; it is so partisan that it divides even Democrats. The great tradition of the Democrat party, as the Republican, has been one of bipartisanship in foreign policy. Mr.

5 - DRAFT - NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

Carter has broken with that tradition and is unable to muster full support for his policies among members of his own party.

I do not believe this administration's defense policies reflect the thinking of millions of rank-and-file Democrat party members. The Carter administration, dominated as it is by the McGovernite wing of the party, has broken sharply with the views and policies of Harry Truman, John Kennedy, and many contemporary party leaders.

A great American tradition of bipartisanship--where domestic political differences end at the water's edge--has been lost at a time when we are faced with growing instability and crisis abroad. I believe the bipartisan tradition is too deep and sound to be destroyed by one man in the space of four years, but damage has been done and it will take a determined effort to repair it.

I pledge, if elected President, to take the steps necessary to restore the bipartisan tradition in American national security and foreign policy. I pledge to work with congressional leaders of both parties to design and conduct a truly bipartisan foreign policy. I pledge to consult immediately with those of the Democrat party who have supported the concept of bipartisanship. And, I intend to have this bipartisan spirit reflected during my presidency in key foreign and defense policy appointive positions.

In the next few minutes I would like to outline for you nine specific steps that I will take to put America on a sound, secure

6 - DRAFT - NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

footing in the international arena. Working closely with the Congress, I propose to accomplish these steps with the support of an informed American public. Here are the steps:

- An improved policy-making structure;
- a realistic arms control policy;
- strengthening the quality of our armed services;
- combatting international terrorism;
- assisting African and ^{other less} ~~Third World~~ ^{ed} /development/ countries;
- a realistic policy toward our own Hemisphere;
- a plan to send our message abroad;
- restoration of a margin of safety in our defense planning;
- and a ^{steady} clear approach to East-West relations.

Reorganizing the Policy-making Structure

The present administration seems unable to speak with one voice in foreign policy. This must change. My administration will restore leadership to U.S. foreign policy by organizing it in a more ^{coherent} ~~logical~~ way.

In my administration, an early priority will be to make structural changes in the foreign policy-making machinery so that the Secretary of State will be the President's principal spokesman and adviser. It does not serve our national interest to tolerate a situation in which the National Security Adviser and the Secretary of State are at cross purposes on crucial issues.

7 - DRAFT - NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

In my administration the National Security Council will once again become the coordinator of the policy process. Its mission will be to assure that the President receives an orderly, balanced flow of information and ^{recommendations} analysis. The National Security Adviser will work closely in teamwork with the Secretary of State and the other members of the Council.

~~My goal also will be to build and utilize a diplomatic corps~~ ^{our} ~~enhancing~~ ^{New} ~~with language proficiency, organizational and professional skills.~~ ^{delet.} ^{Oct.18}
I will do everything I can
to ensure the safety of our representatives on duty overseas.
It is not just an obligation to our people, it is a matter of national honor
~~so we can restore our pride in our foreign policy establishment.~~
that our diplomats must not be insulted, taken hostage or attacked while abroad.
A Realistic Arms Control Policy (See 7A attached)

As the next requirement for a program for peace, I would assign a high priority to arms control. To succeed at arms control, we must first be honest with ourselves, so that we can be convincing with the Soviets.

We must honestly face the facts of the arms competition we are caught in. And, we must have a view of the world that is consistent with these facts and that does not change to suit different audiences. The Carter administration told Congress that the Soviet Union has long been investing about three times as much as we have in strategic arms and is expected to continue doing so, with or without SALT--the Strategic Arms Limitation Agreement. Yet, those who say that the administration's SALT treaty is not good enough are accused of wanting an "arms race."

~~Realistic~~
An Honest Arms Control Policy

As the next requirement in my program for peace, I would want a fresh approach to arms control. Let me explain to you how my views on arms control differ from those of Jimmy Carter.

o ~~Mr. Jimmy~~ Carter's SALT treaty lets the Soviets add three nuclear warheads each day. Even the official estimates of the Carter Administration concede that, with or without this treaty, the Soviets will invest about three times as much in strategic arms as the United States.

o ~~Mr. Jimmy~~ Carter wants a new SALT treaty that is not verifiable. Yet, over the past few months, evidence has come to light that the Soviets have been violating existing arms agreements on nuclear testing, biological weapons, poison gas, as well as SALT. Does Jimmy Carter now want us to trust the Soviets to abide by limitations we can't even verify?

o Mr. Carter's new SALT treaty would give the Soviets important and explicit advantages which would make our next step in SALT more difficult ~~and dangerous~~.
 by requiring us to make dangerous compromises which would affect our security.

o Mr. Carter tried to sell this treaty to the Senate last year. Yet, even before the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, and despite its Democratic majority, the United States Senate would ~~not~~ ^{approve} ~~buy~~ it. Evidently, the arguments of the Carter Administration ~~did not deceive~~ ^{could persuade} the Senate. Is ~~Jimmy~~ ^{Mr.} Carter now trying to deceive the American public?

The Carter Administration argues that without this treaty, the Soviet nuclear buildup would be even worse. That's like saying we have to be grateful that the present rate of inflation isn't even higher.

If elected, I will bend every effort to get an agreement that puts an end to this one-sided arms race and leads to genuine arms reductions.

The way to avoid an arms race is not simply to let the Soviets race ahead. We need to create the incentives for the Soviet leaders to halt their buildup.

8 - DRAFT - NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

Mr. Garter never mustered the necessary votes there to pass his SALT treaty in the U.S. Senate, controlled by a Democrat majority, even before the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan. The Senate Armed Forces Committee, also controlled by a Democrat majority, after lengthy hearings, rejected the treaty as not being in the security interests of the United States. The Foreign Relations Committee--yes, controlled by a Democrat majority--in a narrow vote, came out for the treaty, but only after more than 20 important changes had been made. Could members of his own party be trying to tell Mr. Garter something is flawed in his approach to arms limitation? It would appear so.

The way to avoid an arms race is not simply to let the Soviets race ahead. We need to remove their incentive to race ahead by making it clear to them that we can and will compete if need be, at the same time we tell them that we prefer to halt this competition and reduce the nuclear arsenals.

Restoring the Quality of our Armed Forces

Restoring a sense of pride in their careers for the men and women in our armed services is another important element of my program for peace. We must direct our attention to the urgent manpower needs of our services. In defense matters we hear much about hardware and not enough about hard work. The most important part of our military strength is the people involved--their quality, their training and their welfare. We must do all in our power to make sure they are well-trained and well-equipped, that

they feel proud and secure in their jobs and that their economic sacrifice is not out of proportion to what we ask of them. The economic policies of the Carter administration have made life especially difficult for our men and women in uniform and for their families.

I believe we can reverse this situation. My administration will implement a program of compensation and benefits for military personnel that is comparable to what is available in the private sector. I will ask Congress to reinstate the G.I. Bill, a program which was directly responsible for the most rapid advance ever in the educational level of our population. Our country must provide our service personnel and their families with the incentives and quality of life to compensate for the sacrifices they make on our behalf.

Combatting International Terrorism

Let us turn now to the need for the United States to assume a leadership role in curbing the spread of international terrorism. In sharing the outrage against terrorism, I will direct the resources of my administration against this scourge of civilization and toward expansion of our cooperation with other nations in combatting terrorism in its many forms.

Terrorists seek to undermine, paralyze and, finally, destroy democratic governments. Israel has long been the victim of the most wanton acts of terrorism. Our allies in Europe and elsewhere have experienced terrorism with increasing frequency.

~~Terrorist organizations have enjoyed the support--though~~
~~generally covert--of the Soviet Union.~~ In Iran, terrorism has
 been elevated to the level of national policy in the assault on
 the U.S. embassy and the year-long captivity of our fellow-citizens.
 The tactics and philosophy of the Palestine Liberation Organization
 are based on terrorism, too.

New
 delet.
 Oct. 18

The United States must provide the leadership to forge an
 international consensus that firmness and refusal to concede or to
 pay ransom are ultimately the only effective deterrents to terrorism.

A Policy to Assist African and ^{Other Developing Countries} Third World Development

Our relationship with what is often called the ^{developing countries} "Third World"
 forms an important part of my program for peace. I see little
 gain, however, from lumping all these proud and different nations
 together, only to let ourselves be maneuvered into needless
 confrontations with the so-called "Third World". To ^{deal with these} lump the
 diverse nations of that "Third World" together, as if they ^{had} were
 identical ^{aspirations and problems} to one another, not only belies the facts, it also
 plays into the hands of Fidel Castro and sundry other dictators
 who seek to appoint themselves as spokesmen for the "Third World" and want to
 vilify the United States largely for the purpose of concealing
 the dismal failures of their own policies at home.

A strong American economy and the spirit of our free enterprise
 system have a great deal to offer the poorer, less developed nations
 of the world. Africans, for example, look to us

and our industrial allies for the dominant share of their export markets, for their investment capital; for official aid and for technical know-how. If the nations of Africa and we are to work together in advancing our mutual interests, we must recognize the role our economy and our industrial and agricultural know-how must contribute to play in the relationships. Yet, the flow of American investment to Africa continues at only a trickle, and our export promotion has been neglected.

My administration will recognize that ^{the participation of} ~~investment from the~~ ^{Imp new change} ~~private sector~~ ^{Oct. 18} ~~is the key to African development.~~ ^{—especially the minority and small business sector -- can be} In addition to growing economic interests, America has historic ties with this continent to which black Americans trace their heritage.

Clearly, we cannot cause other nations to grow by economic assistance alone. We must offer know-how, technology and marketing assistance, and I will support policies which support these goals.

A Realistic Policy for The Western Hemisphere

No area of the world should have a higher priority than the place where we live, the Western Hemisphere. My administration will forge a new, more realistic policy toward our own Hemisphere as an integral part of my program for peace.

In four short years, Mr. Carter's administration has managed to alienate our friends in the Hemisphere, to encourage the destabilization of governments, and to permit Cuban and Soviet influence to grow.

We must take steps to change the Carter administration's sorry record of vacillation, alienation, and neglect in the region.

I pledge that our policies towards our neighbors will be changed in the following ways:

--Our relations will be solidly based on shared economic and security interests, not upon mutual recrimination and insult.

--We shall initiate a program of intensive economic development with cooperating countries in the Caribbean, including a Western Hemisphere Venture Capital Corporation to promote the growth and development of the private sector in the Americas.

--Closer to home, I have spoken before of my belief that we should work toward a North American Accord with our immediate neighbors, Mexico and Canada. This would take the form of broadened, more open lines of communication between us to seek ways in which we can strengthen our traditional friendship. If Canada and Mexico are stronger our entire Hemisphere benefits.

Other than strengthening our own nation, there is no task of greater importance than the security and prosperity of the entire Western Hemisphere.

Sending the American Message

I have referred to the need to tell the American story of freedom and enterprise. Proclaiming the American message is a vital part of step in the program for peace. This message must be

Essential
change!

13 - DRAFT - NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

sent around the world in our information programs, through our diplomacy and by the words and convictions of the President.

I would strengthen the Voice of America and other radio broadcasting programs. I would put men and women in charge of our worldwide information efforts who believe in promoting American principles of democracy, freedom, and justice. Compared with other costs of our national security, the dollar amounts involved in this are small. What is needed most is a sense of conviction, the conviction that by carrying the American message abroad we strengthen the foundations for peace.

Mr. Carter's administration, instead of strengthening and expanding our overseas broadcast and information programs, has permitted these vital efforts to decline.

~~During the turmoil in Iran,~~ ^F for instance, the United States has been ~~was~~ unable to broadcast to the Afghan ~~Iranian~~ people ~~in their own~~ during these critical years, ~~language,~~ yet all the while Soviet-sponsored broadcasts were stirring up hatred toward America throughout the Islamic world.

Most
imp
chg
Oct. 18

For our long-term strategy, the cause and promotion of liberty and the cause and promotion of peace are inseparable. If we remain proud of our basic principles, defend them against the propaganda attacks of totalitarians, and communicate them worldwide, we will not only promote justice and liberty, we will also promote world peace.

Restoring Our Margin of Safety for Peace

An important

The final step--but perhaps the most important of all--in a systematic program for peace is to restore the "margin of safety for peace" in our defense program, by working closely with the Congress on a long-term program designed to meet our needs throughout this critical decade.

We must ask ourselves, are we better off today, in 1980? Are we more secure in the world than we were just four years ago? The answer, of course, is "no."

President Ford, on leaving office, left a long-range defense program designed to keep America strong throughout the 80s. But, in its haste to make good on a reckless campaign promise to cut defense spending by billions of dollars, the Carter administration insisted on a policy of systematic concessions in defense and in arms control negotiations. As a result, today we are in the position of having neither the margin of safety we need nor ^{an acceptable} a SALT treaty. a Senate controlled by members of Mr. Carter's own party

Import.
Insert
Oct.18

My task as President will be to fix what is wrong with our defenses and to lead our allies in a sustained and prudent effort to keep us, them and the entire world secure from confrontation. The preservation of peace will require the best resources we can marshal in this precarious decade. I am convinced we can marshal them by reaffirming our national purpose, by reasserting our will and determination, and by regaining our economic vitality.

14-A- (Insert)

Relations with Allies and Adversaries

To these eight steps we must add another effort, (perhaps the most important one,) to strengthen the foundations of peace. We have to work with our allies to create the conditions for a new relationship with the Soviet Union -- a more stable and peaceful relationship.

NOTE: repeats from pg.14 top

With our Allies we need to practice frequent and honest consultation. We must ^{cuss} dismiss common policies beforehand, and once we are agreed, the United States must keep its word. It is part of the greatness of our country that we belong to a larger community of free and independent nations. If we reestablish truthst and leadership in this community, we gain immeasurably ~~immemorably~~, not only in security and economic strength, but also in moral strength. And together with our allies we can best establish a solid and expanding relationship with China.

What is it that we want of our relationship with the Soviet Union? We have to find a third road between the cheerless prospect of a never-ending accumulation of armaments, and the illusion of faulty arms control agreements that serve merely as a cover-up for a one-sided Soviet buildup. We have to ^{take courage from the fact the forces of freedom are} recognize that evolutionary change is on our side, provided ^{recognize and maintain our strengths.} we support the dynamic forces that work for us. Our sources of strength are spiritual; our military power is merely a shield, it is never meant for offensive purposes.

*

The Soviet regime would like to be seen as the wave of the future; in fact, it is the ebb of the past. It reflects a more primitive stage in history: compulsion in place of free initiative, coercion in place of law, militarism in place of trade, empire building in place of self-determination. This system is certain, in time, to wither. While we maintain our defensive margin of safety, we must create a world environment in which this obsolete system shrinks and wanes from its own internal contradictions.

We can indeed make peace. We can have the peace we want for ourselves and for our children. We are going to have to work hard and think hard and act with competence and with confidence--but it can be done.

And, as we work, we will have to be inspired by the vision of what our country means to us and to the world.

In recent weeks, I have had that vision of our nation's meaning brought to my attention in a very personal way.

The home in which I am now living in the Virginia countryside once was owned by John F. Kennedy. And a relatively short distance away is the home of another great American President, Thomas Jefferson.

Two great Presidents--divided by time but united in spirit--Kennedy and Jefferson, have, in essence, helped us to define what it is to be an American.

It strikes me that among their many accomplishments, both men left us a legacy of a deep commitment to peace.

In his first Inaugural Address, Jefferson spoke of "the preservation of the general government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet-anchor of our peace at home and our safety abroad." He knew that peace in the world depended on the strength of our nation in its "whole constitutional vigor."

And, one hundred sixty years later, John F. Kennedy in his Inaugural Address, called to "begin anew the quest for

16 - DRAFT - NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

peace"--reminded us that peace must be built by each generation in its own way, out of its own special needs and special gifts.

Jefferson and Kennedy loved America and the cause of peace too much ever to give in or appeal to fear and doubt. It is that same love that has inspired my campaign for peace and, with God's help and yours, will continue to guide our quest for a just, lasting peace during my presidency.

14B

~~REC 17A-Z~~

IF THE SOVIET LEADERSHIP WISHES PEACE, IT CAN HAVE IT BY
TAKING STEPS TO REDUCE TENSION IN THE WORLD. ^{With our policies, we must be able} ~~If it is genuine~~
to convince them that they can have
PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE WITH US AND WITH OTHER NATIONS ~~THAT THEY TRULY~~
~~WANT, THEY CAN HAVE IT~~ BY REDUCING THEIR ~~CONSTANT~~ DRIVE TO EXPAND AND
TO DOMINATE.

*New
chg.
Oct.18

AS PRESIDENT, I WILL STAND READY TO NEGOTIATE WITH THE
SOVIET UNION ON A WIDE RANGE OF TOPICS DESIGNED TO ENHANCE PEACE,
INCLUDING, OF COURSE, NEGOTIATIONS ON BALANCED AND VERIFIABLE ARMS
LIMITATION AGREEMENTS. BUT WE MUST NOT LET OUR DESIRE FOR PEACE LEAD
US TO ACCEPT A ^{Soviet} POLICY OF UNREMITTING HOSTILITY TOWARD OUR COUNTRY; OUR
RELATIONSHIP IS, AND WILL REMAIN, A TWO-WAY STREET, WITH NEITHER SIDE
SEEKING TO BENEFIT AT THE EXPENSE OF THE OTHER.

OUR RELATIONSHIP WITH CHINA IS IN ITS BEGINNING STAGES. IT
IS ONE THAT CAN AND WILL GROW, AND I REPEAT MY INTENTION TO ASSIST ITS
RAPID GROWTH. THERE IS AN HISTORIC BOND OF FRIENDSHIP BETWEEN THE
AMERICAN AND CHINESE PEOPLES, AND I WOULD 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.