

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library  
Digital Library Collections

---

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

---

**Collection:** McFarlane, Robert C. “Bud”: Files, 1982-1985

**SERIES:** I: SUBJECT FILE

**Folder Title:** Debate Materials October 1984  
(2 of 7)

**Box:** RAC Box 1

---

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](mailto:reagan.library@nara.gov)

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

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

*Last Updated: 10/02/2024*

*McFarlane*

RCM HAS SEEN

THEME I

Gaining Friends and Allies for America

Came into office convinced that one of the most important things was to build the confidence of America's friends that the U.S. is a reliable partner.

During the 1970s, and particularly during the Carter-Mondale years, the U.S. got a reputation of working harder to curry favor with left-wing dictators than to help its friends.

President Carter's decision to jerk U.S. troops out of Korea, his on-again/off-again policies toward NATO, left all of our friends and allies in Europe and Asia confused and uncertain.

People began saying that, "When the U.S. treats its enemies well and its friends poorly, it shouldn't be surprised if it has more enemies than friends."

Well, we've turned that around. We've stood with our NATO allies in resisting Soviet intimidation on the INF issue and today the NATO alliance is in better shape than it's been for a long time. Our European allies know that we're solidly with them in the common effort to achieve security, peace and real arms control.

For the first time we're treating Israel the way we should have all along -- a strategic ally in the vital Middle East -- and building a strategic partnership that serves the interests of both our countries. We've also got important friends among the moderate Arabs, but we can't let the fear of Arab reaction veto our strategic cooperation with Israel, the way the Carter-Mondale Administration did.

We've restored confidence in the U.S. commitment to South Korea -- and that's had a good effect throughout Asia. Japan, with the second largest economy in the free world, is vital to American interests and we've worked to make that relationship the best it's ever been.

We've strengthened our important relationship with the People's Republic of China -- and without sacrificing our old friends on Taiwan. In fact, the Chinese, like others throughout Asia, are saying that under the Reagan Administration the U.S. has returned to the Pacific.

Well, I'm proud of that. I'm proud that America is back in Europe as well. I'm proud that our vital alliances and our relations with friendly countries are in better shape now than they've been for a decade.

Themes should be (in my opinion): 2

- ① America is stronger today (defenses restored)
- ② America is more respected in the world by friend and foe alike (no longer a whipping boy for two-bit dictators)
- ③ America is at peace because of ① and ②
- ④ We'll continue as we have: to build a foundation of peace for our children  
(“Are we safer”; “will we be safer” are the keys in a foreign policy debate)

3

THEME II

Preventing Crises

- Our policy has been one of great steadiness. Steadiness is essential in reassuring friends and preventing miscalculation by our foes.
- We're proud of the crises we've contained, and proud of those that we've prevented. It's worth talking tonight about one crisis we've prevented, a crisis none of us wants to see replayed.
- Many of you will remember the cold mornings of four years ago, mornings of waking up at 6:00 a.m. on odd or even numbered days to wait for gas. This was result of conflict in oil rich region of the Persian Gulf.
- Today such gas lines do not happen. Why? Is it because the conflict has gone away? Hardly. Iran and Iraq are still at war with one another and facilities are damaged.
- But the war has not spilled over to the other key producers because of our presence. [ AWACS is there. ] Our energy reserves were rebuilt. And, most important, others have confidence we won't let the situation adversely affect Western interests. Confidence can make or break the world energy market, and our crisis management has clearly inspired confidence.
- Likewise, U.S. minesweepers are today on their way home from the Suez Canal where -- without incident -- they helped restore traffic on that vital waterway. We did our job without fanfare and without increasing risks.
- Similarly, we have made clear to Qadhafi that our friends in the region are no longer his vulnerable prey. We have, again without direct American involvement or escalation, helped the Sudanese when Qadhafi bombed them; and Chad when that country was threatened. Here we helped to prevent a sequence of instability that could have undercut moderate forces throughout the world.
- We don't believe that the Qadhafis of the world can be sweet-talked by U.N. Ambassadors. We believe that if radical subversion is not contained, no friend will value their relationship with us, nor respect our interests. We believe that small problems should not be allowed to grow until they become larger ones. And, most important, we believe that regional insecurity is the greatest obstacle to peace.

- The key to handling crises, like the Iran-Iraq war, and the threat to our own hemisphere -- is to deal with them while the problems are still manageable, to be persistent and steady. \_
  
- Mr. Mondale has not shown that he understands this. The Administration in which he served created crises of confidence unnecessarily by, for example, threatening to pull American peacekeeping troops out of Korea. Yes, here too they eventually changed their minds, just as Mr. Mondale says he has changed his mind on Grenada. But preventing crises means acting in time.
  
- Mr. Mondale's idea about a quarantine in the hemisphere makes this point even more emphatically. Rather than steadiness, he suggests a policy of impulsive overreaction.

5

THEME III

Defending and Promoting Democracy

Throughout the world, brave and dedicated men and women are fighting to build and protect democracy in their own lands. We have been helping them, helping defend and promote democracy -- because they need our help, because it is morally right to lend it, and because it is in America's interest to help build a world of peace-loving free nations.

In this Western Hemisphere where we live, democracy has made impressive advances in the last four years -- from Argentina to El Salvador, from Honduras to Grenada. Election after election in country after country has helped replace dictators with democratic leaders. We have urged and aided this move toward democracy here and throughout the world, part of a vigorous and effective human rights policy.

But liberty has enemies, and liberty's friends will often fail if we fail them.

In El Salvador, we are helping a newly elected reforming president get a new democracy started. We have given President Duarte the tools and he is doing the job -- with just 55 U.S. advisers to help his army resist communist guerrillas launched from Nicaragua. In Nicaragua, we are resisting the betrayal of a democratic revolution by a communist junta which is trying to crush its opposition. In Grenada, we stepped in to save American students and to save the chance of democracy for a people who will be eternally grateful we did so.

Democracy's friends seek peaceful change, but democracy's enemies will fight to stop the spread of freedom. Will we send them our best wishes, or will we meet our responsibilities and provide security assistance to those who face these threats? Whether it's the Salvadoran guerrillas or the PLO or the Sandinistas or Cuba or the Soviet Union which is the threat, our friends and allies need our help if they are to defend their interests and ours. It has been my policy to give them that help.

All Americans agree we should support democracy. But when it has been threatened and when its defenders needed our help, Mr. Mondale has turned away. Our security and our faith in democracy require more of us than this -- require that we stand solidly with people seeking liberty in their lands.

6

THEME IV

Rebuilding Our Strength to Protect the Peace

Four years ago, we found that our military strength had been dangerously neglected: our planes could not fly, our ships could not sail, the men and women in the armed forces were underpaid and had low morale, and the Soviets were building new weapons for the future to which we did not have an answer.

The readiness of our forces has vastly improved. We have beefed up training, got the equipment back in shape, and provided more adequate munitions.

- But the biggest improvement since 1980 has not been in terms of people. I have made the All Volunteer Force succeed. I have restored adequate pay and -- what is just as important -- we restored a sense of pride in serving our country. Our men and women in the armed forces are proud to serve again, we have achieved a 55 percent increase in reenlistments in only three years, the percentage of high school graduates among recruits has increased from 68 percent to 91 percent since 1980, drug addiction is way down, discipline and performance are up.
- Mr. Mondale promises to cut the defense budget. That is consistent. As Senator he has almost always voted for cutting defense. His voting record shows that [fill in]. Mr. Mondale ignores the fact that the largest part of our defense budget is for people and for conventional forces.

Mr. Mondale wants to cut back on our nuclear deterrent, even though less than one-fifth of the defense budget is for nuclear arms. Over four-fifths of the budget is for conventional defense.

- I also have the responsibility to think about the future, so that my successors in the next decade will be able to deter aggression. The Soviet Union is doing nearly twice as much military research as we do. And yet, Mr. Mondale would impose moratoria on many of our test programs so that the Soviets could move ahead with their future weapons. We cannot deter all these new Soviet weapons tomorrow with our equipment of yesteryear. But Mr. Mondale doesn't agree. Consistent with his anti-defense record as a Senator, Mr. Mondale would cancel our only new intercontinental missile, our only new bomber. Today, our Strategic Air Command has to deter nuclear attack with bombers that are older than their pilots. I will not cancel the deterrent forces on which my successor in the 1990s must rely. I promise I will not steal from the security of the next generation to impose some cuts on the defense budget today.

7

-

Specific Issues

The Middle East

Military Crisis in Central America

Arms Control and The Freeze

Lebanon

"Star Wars," Extending Arms Race "Into the Heavens"

"Evil Empire" and the Failure in U.S.-Soviet Relations

Human Rights Neglect

Cheap Foreign Imports

9  
Question:

Was Mondale present  
at Camp David during  
the talks?

## The Middle East

### Charges:

- We have no Middle East policy.
- Disorder in the Middle East is growing, and the picture there is bleaker than ever.
- This Administration has secured no agreement like Camp David, and the Reagan plan has undercut Camp David.

### Responses:

- We have a strategy for the Middle East: It is a strategy of strengthening moderate forces and helping them resist radical elements. That's what our opposition to Qadhafi is all about. It's a strategy of expanding our relations with Israel. That's why we are the first Administration to have the political courage to treat Israel as a strategic partner. U.S. relations with Israel are better than they have ever been. And it's a strategy of reducing the prospects for another Middle East war as we work with others to help create conditions for peace.
- Let me say a word, too, about Camp David. First, it is a noble agreement. But it is vital to understand that the Middle East is subject to ebbs and flows. Peace cannot be imposed. Those who believe it can are those who would hand Israel over to its adversaries on a plate. There are times then for crystalizing agreements, and times when one simply must do the hard and thankless work of laying the foundation for future progress. The most important provision of Camp David is the unwritten provision -- that it all works only if the U.S. is strong and active and engaged. Stability really depends on us.
- I'm perfectly prepared to give Mr. Mondale credit for Camp David. But why is he so unwilling to not give us credit for preserving it against the forces that tried to tear it down. Or does he forget that it was my decision to commit peace forces to the Sinai -- a decision greatly debated in the closing days of his Administration -- that made the agreement stick.

-- Transition Back to Central Theme --

I'm amazed, too, at Mr. Mondale's effort to deliberately obscure our central achievements in the region and particularly our work crisis management. We have prevented the Iran-Iraq war from spilling over and affecting our access to oil, thus creating gas lines and economic hardship throughout the Western world.

The real answer as to the effectiveness of our policy can be found not in my words, or Mr. Mondale's attacks: it can be found in the fact that the moderate forces in the region continue to act on the belief that the U.S. is a partner they can trust: that's why our diplomacy is still at work in Lebanon; why our security cooperation with Egypt and moderates continues; why our help was sought in clearing mines from Suez; and why we are working to help Israel in its hour of greatest economic need.

Didn't Carter restore  
military aid to El Salv?

Why not say that, and  
imply that Mondale is  
flip-flopping again?

12

## Military Crisis in Central America

### Charges:

- Militarizing the region.
- Not taking diplomacy seriously.
- Violating international law (contras, mining the harbors).

### Responses

- A. Our policy in Central America is democracy. That's why we are supporting President Duarte, newly elected in El Salvador, and his reforms; that's why we want democracy in Nicaragua. That's all we want. We aren't to blame for the troubles of that region and Mr. Mondale should stop blaming America.
- B. We haven't militarized anything. Three-fourths of our aid is economic. The fact is that Nicaragua -- starting back when the Carter-Mondale Administration was announcing \$175 million in aid for them -- has used Soviet and Cuban help to build the largest military machine in the history of Central America. Their armed forces are larger than those of all other Central American countries put together. That's militarizing! So when their neighbors become scared and ask us for help, do we turn away -- or do we help? Nicaragua has 9,000 Cubans and we have 55 advisers in El Salvador and Mr. Mondale blames America for militarizing!
- C. The Sandinistas have betrayed international law and reneged on every promise they made to us and to their Latin neighbors. International law recognizes the fundamental right of self-defense. They attack their neighbors and now they hide behind law books to obscure this. I have no apologies for helping people fight Sandinista subversion and oppression to secure their freedom. Let's stop blaming America again for resisting a bunch of thugs. Mr. Mondale has changed his mind on Grenada and I think he'll change it here too -- but by then will it be too late to salvage freedom in Nicaragua?
- D. In El Salvador we are staying the course. Mr. Mondale has criticized our effort but I am proud of it. We are helping a young democracy get started under President Duarte, who was chosen El Salvador's president this year in a free election. Human rights violations are in a steady and welcome decline. The communist guerrillas are on the run. We have given President Duarte the tools and he is doing the job. We have not exceeded our self-imposed limit of 55 advisers and no American combat troops -- but the Salvadoran people want to know if we will give them the tools they need to defend their country from communist guerrillas armed by

Cuba and Nicaragua. We will -- for their sakes and for ours.

E. In Grenada, a band of Marxist murderers executed the highest government officials and started to impose a brutal communist dictatorship. At risk were the lives of Americans studying on the island, freedom of all Grenadans, and the security of all neighboring countries if another island fell to communist aggression. Fearful for their futures, leaders of the nearby islands came to us and I acted -- and I believe most Americans share my pride that our nation stood up to defend liberty and security in our hemisphere. Mr. Mondale would not have acted and at the time he blamed America -- not the murderers -- for creating trouble in Grenada. Now he said recently he was wrong and I was right. (Although as late as last week it still wasn't clear where his running mate stood on this issue.) That's 20-20 hindsight; if he'd been President that little island would have been hijacked by communist thugs -- and our students with it. A President needs to act -- not to come around to seeing clearly one year too late.

F. In Nicaragua, a revolution was betrayed by communist guerrillas who have stolen the government. More and more Nicaraguans now oppose the repressive Sandinista regime, and they support efforts to build democracy in Nicaragua, guarantee religious freedom and stop repression of the Catholic Church, and break the Cuban and Soviet hammerlock. They are struggling for their nation's freedom and we should be proud to be on their side.

G. There were two revolutions in 1979 -- one in El Salvador and one in Nicaragua. The Salvadoran revolution is being fulfilled, by guilding democracy; the Nicaraguan revolution has been betrayed by communists. We are helping the Salvadorans with their democratic reforms and resisting the Sandinistas' efforts to spread subversion from Nicaragua. And I'm proud of that record.

H. Mr. Mondale has called for a "quarantine" of Nicaragua. What does that mean? How many U.S. ships? Does he want to confront Soviet warships? Has he thought it through? Isn't that a dangerous form of militarization?

We have avoided any use of U.S. combat forces and Mr. Mondale's first suggestion to abandon that policy and put U.S. naval forces into a combat situation. Now that's what I call militarization of the problem, and it's a dangerous, half-baked idea.

-- Transition Back to Central Themes --

Our Central American policy needs to be understood against three of the broader themes I have been emphasizing tonight: the need for reliability, the need to manage crises before they overwhelm us, and the need to help democracies succeed.

We want arms agreements that are fair, and can work; not an agreement that is so advantageous to the Soviets that Carter had to withdraw it without even a vote on it by the Senate.

That failure didn't advance arms control, it made it more difficult.

16

## Arms Control and The Freeze

### Charges:

- This Administration has achieved nothing on arms control and opposes arms control.
- The President opposes a freeze and wants a new arms race.

### Responses:

#### A. Nuclear Freeze

Are you talking about a unilateral freeze, or one the Soviets observe also. When people say that a freeze would be an easy thing to achieve, they must be talking about a unilateral freeze. Well, that's a dangerous thing which the American people don't want. To get the Russians to agree to a freeze with the specific details needed to make it meaningful would take lengthy negotiations. It would require enormous verification efforts to be sure the Soviets weren't improving and enlarging their forces in some way. If we're going to go to all that effort, let's go after something better than a freeze -- let's negotiate real reductions.

#### B. Arms Control

For 15 years we have had a series of arms control agreements. I'm glad Mr. Mondale reminds us of this. And let me also remind you that in those 15 years the Soviets have had the largest military buildup in world history -- including a more than 500 percent increase in missile warheads. Now something's wrong -- indeed very wrong -- with those so-called "arms control" agreements, and that's what I want to turn around. The Democratic Senate knew there was something wrong, too, because they refused to ratify the agreement the Carter-Mondale team brought back from the table.

I want arms control agreements that actually reduce armaments and make us all safer. That's the question I ask about any arms control agreements and any defense program -- will it make us safer. That's why I want to try new technology to protect us from Soviet missiles, and new negotiations to reduce arms on both sides: to make us safer. Mr. Mondale wants more of the same kind of agreements we've had, and I say that we can do better, and be safer.

It does us no good to sign agreements allowing more and bigger missiles, or that can be violated with impunity, or that we can't check up on. That's the kind the Carter-Mondale Administration signed in 1979, and Senate Democrats like John Glenn and the late Scoop Jackson opposed it. I don't want more of the same -- I want to turn things around and get agreements that really make us safer. We may have to negotiate harder and longer, but it's worth it.

This is really weak; and  
it's a key area. 18

Why not point out fact that  
US troops helped get a dis-  
engagement of Israel & Syrian  
forces. Also, today there is a  
govt in Lebanon that has a  
chance of success, at keeping  
the country from again plunging  
into civil war. Working  
for Israeli withdrawal ...  
(note recent meetings)

## Lebanon

### Charges:

- Terrorist attacks are repeated and repeated and we are never ready.
- Sending troops to Lebanon was a major error, cost hundreds of lives, and gained us nothing. Typical of Reagan to resort to a military solution that won't work.
- This isn't standing tall -- it's sacrificing American lives for no purpose.

### Responses:

Of course Lebanon was a setback. The forces we were trying to help were unable to hold together in the midst of great internal political turmoil.

But let's not miss the central point. Our country's strategy for promoting peace is based on helping others -- giving them the best possible chance. This is only common sense. We can't impose peace. And we can't do for others what they are unable to do for themselves.

I understood the difficulties when we went in; and I understood when the time had come to change our approach. If we are unwilling to try to help, how can Israel or the other countries have confidence in our support for a broader peace agreement. Because we tried, our diplomacy is still valued; and let's not forget the PLO was removed.

If Mr. Mondale can't see the connection between the importance of trying, and our continuing credibility in the region, then his understanding is flawed indeed.

### -- Transition Back to Central Theme --

Standing tall means being engaged in the world, trying to help others achieve noble ends. Not as a policeman, but as a concerned partner. My Administration faces up to problems, realizing that setbacks are inevitable in the course of promoting stability and peace.

## "Star Wars," Extending Arms Race "Into the Heavens"

### Charges:

- RR wants to extend arms race into the heavens.
- This "Star Wars" will destroy the only remaining major arms agreement (the 1972 ABM Treaty).
- This "Star Wars" won't work, but will be terribly expensive.

### Responses

Mr. Mondale argues I want to extend the arms race "into the heavens." Well, he hasn't noticed that the Soviets have had an arms race in the heavens for some 25 years. They have tested intercontinental missiles in space ever since the late 1950s (and so have we, of course). More recently, despite the SALT agreement negotiated in Mr. Mondale's administration -- and in many cases in violation of that agreement -- the Soviets have tested through outer space one new missile after another.

In opposing my program on strategic defenses against missiles, Mr. Mondale and his party reveal their inbred opposition to new ideas. Mr. Mondale charges that I do not understand that missile defense can't work. As always, he is defending every old idea and knocking down every new one.

I want our best scientists to work on new technology that can turn around this missile threat. I want my successors to have alternatives. Right now, we have no defenses against any nuclear attack, only the threat of revenge. Mr. Mondale wants us to remain forever totally undefended against any nuclear missiles -- even an accidental attack. I have a different vision of the future: I want us through new defensive technology and through agreed reductions in offensive forces to make nuclear missiles obsolete.

This section is weak.

on (C), should note  
outrageous Soviet rhetoric  
against US, daily, since  
1917.

21

## "Evil Empire" and the Failure in U.S.-Soviet Relations

### Charges:

- President has failed to handle Soviets.
- Excessive rhetoric has damaged relations.
- No constructive relationship, no agreements, no summits.

### Responses:

- A. It's easy to have an agreement with the Soviets -- just give them what they want. But when you do you don't enhance peace and stability, you threaten it. Jimmy Carter held a summit in Vienna with Brezhnev -- remember that picture of the two of them embracing? Well, that kiss was followed X months later by their invasion of Afghanistan. I've avoided the kiss and I've avoided any more Afghanistans. The signals they get from me are clear -- we're always ready to deal, but always on fair terms only.
- B. I met with Gromyko, but why not sooner? Turbulence in Moscow -- Brezhnev was dying when I was elected, then Andropov pushed to the top but he proved to be in and out of hospitals and died, now Chernenko is reported ill too. They've had no leader and therefore no one to negotiate with -- who could really make a deal and make it stick.
- C. Some people attacked the phrase "evil empire" but no one disputes the facts -- they just say I shouldn't state the facts. Soviet control of Afghanistan, Poland, etc., is clearly an empire; and when I see their treatment of men like Scharansky and Sakharov: Yes, that's evil. I have made abundantly clear to them my desire for a constructive relationship, but I also know that the only way to have one is to get the Soviets know you know fact from fiction. We get no respect from them if we hid from the truth.
- D. The Soviets walked out of our Geneva arms talks and some people agree that we ought to make a better offer to bring them back. That's not negotiating with the Soviets; that's negotiating with ourselves. Every time they walk out we're not going to make another concession. We are going to hold firm and protect our interests and negotiate with them -- not ourselves.

Mondale will play on  
S. Africa for blacks <sup>23</sup>  
and libe. This  
response must be stronger.

- ① Condemn apartheid
- ② Pushing SAPs toward reform
- ③ Have no leverage to help end that system if we cut off relations = we have leverage solely because of our economic ties, etc

Human Rights Neglect

22

Charges:

- Abandonment of Human Rights.
- Cozying up dictators.
- Double standards for judging friends and foes.
- South Africa

Responses:

- A. You don't judge a human rights policy by its decibel level; we are not as noisy, and twice as effective.
- B. The U.S. does more now in human rights than we have ever done before. The Human Rights Bureau is larger, the level of activity is much greater, and we see real success. In Latin America, country after country is turning to democracy -- from Argentina to El Salvador to Honduras. More Latin Americans have voted in more free elections in the last four years than ever before in their history. The only country in the last four years almost stolen away by communist dictators was Grenada -- and we stopped them.
- C. South Africa: The U.S. is more active now in helping people bring justice than we have ever been. We have many new programs. We have made our moral opposition to apartheid clear -- but you don't solve problems by walking away from them or by giving people lectures; you solve them by getting in there and working.

-- Transition to Central Themes --

Our policy is to give effective support to democracies throughout the world. And in these four years we and our democratic allies have indeed become stronger and more united than ever.

## Cheap Foreign Imports

24

### Charges:

- Americans are losing jobs and their government is not protecting them.
- Cheap imports are causing unemployment.

### Responses:

We have gone after imports that are dumped on our market or unfairly subsidized, and we'll keep doing that.

But imports aren't bad for us. The surge of imports is one of the things that has helped to keep prices down during a period of strong recovery.

The answer is not to fight imports but to make our own industry competitive. That's what our economic recovery has done. And it's done a lot more for America besides. . . .

### -- Transition Back to Central Theme --

To a general statement on economic recovery and rebuilding strength.

Let's not defend the surge in imports.  
Unless they're buying a TV, most people equate that w/ a loss of US jobs.

25

Closing Statement

We've seen tonight and throughout this campaign that Mr. Mondale and I have significant differences over foreign policy. His approach is wedded to the failed ideas of the last few years. His approach is being rejected by the American people not because of him -- he is a conscientious and dedicated spokesman -- but because his ideas have been tried and they have failed. They will produce, if we try them again, what they produced in the Carter-Mondale years -- drift and, yes, danger.

There is a great tradition in American foreign policy, the bipartisan tradition of Truman and Eisenhower and John Kennedy, which taught us to build our strength and meet our responsibilities; to support our friends and be strong enough to deter our foes. In recent years some leaders have abandoned these great lessons, as Mr. Mondale has. In the Carter-Mondale years some old discredited ideas -- like telling our friends to sink or swim; like thinking that our strength could threaten the peace; like thinking problems will go away if we just turn away -- were tried again. And what that produced was four years of failure, crises and risk.

In 1980 I pledged to rebuild our strength and our alliances and help build a safer, more stable world. And we have done it. In those four years, there has been no new Soviet aggression as in Afghanistan, no new loss of a friend and ally as in Iran, no new economic crises that have all Americans up at dawn to sit in gas lines.

Two weeks ago I asked, Is America better off than it was four years ago? Yes, we are -- we are stronger, we are more confident, we are more respected, we are closer to our friends, we are more successful in protecting our interests and -- above all -- we are safer. These are not slogans. These are cold truths that can be confirmed by looking around the world today.

Now we must stay the course. Through challenges that test our courage, and negotiations that test our patience, we must be strong enough to stay with our principles, to keep the peace, and to build a safer world. We will seek arms negotiations that truly reduce weapons on all sides. We will help democratic allies survive and prosper and continue to strengthen our alliances with Europe, Japan, Israel, and all those who join us in searching for stability and peace.

We have ended that brief, sad period of American decline and "malaise" among our leaders. We have built the foundation of renewed military, economic and moral strength, and with this strength we know, as Americans have known for two centuries, that the future is ours.

DECLASSIFIED

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

*has seen*  
27

Authority CRS/NCR-362-21-3-2  
BY SW NARA DATE 12/1/17

Oct 7, 84

John -

This is what I provided  
Duke Darman last night -  
it's an update on the material  
I provided Bud.

Larry Speakes has a copy on  
this trip. I've suggested he consider  
how the President would handle  
a Beirut (or other foreign policy)  
question tonight. There is a  
Beirut issue paper in this  
package.

Don Fortier also has a copy,  
with request for his review by  
Tuesday.

Bob

DECLASSIFIED

Authority CRST NLR-362-1-21-3-2  
BY SW DATE 12/1/17

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

October 7, 1984

SENSITIVE - DO NOT COPY

MEMORANDUM FOR: RICHARD DARMAN  
FROM: ~~Bob~~  
BOB SIMS  
SUBJECT: Foreign Policy Debate

The next debate will be different in some respects -- new subject matter, different set of substantive experts. But one thing is certain: it is Mondale's last desperate hope, and it brings to the forefront the issues where his strategists have felt we are most vulnerable: war and peace; and the President's knowledge/responsibility/leadership in foreign affairs.

Bud McFarlane, who is on a working holiday with George Shultz this weekend, is looking over materials I've prepared. Don Fortier of NSC is also reviewing the material. Spencer Warren, who works for Ken Khachigian, has the material for comment. McFarlane is eager to get the first draft of the foreign policy debate book done, as I'm sure you are. He has told Fortier and me to review all material and aim for something you can submit no later than COB Tuesday, October 9, so that the Vice President may review our material in connection with his debate preps.

Between now and the 21st, Bud will include in the President's Daily Briefing educational material that could be generally helpful to the President as he moves toward the debate.

I'm providing herewith a draft memo to the President and briefing book for your consideration. The issue papers are the ones McFarlane and Fortier are reviewing. I'll incorporate their changes and any you wish to make on Tuesday and give you completed papers. The "Mondale style" tab is out, since the President should know it well by now.

I suggest a slightly different approach to the book for this debate, utilizing the format of the domestic debate book, but also concentrating on all-purpose set-piece answers for use in response to questions that fall in specific areas, like U.S.-Soviet relations, Central America, etc.

Set-piece answers, plus a carefully crafted closing statement, should utilize the President's limited debate time to make positive points and get his message across. I think Khachigian's

skills could be channelled to draft these, based on our issue papers and anticipated questions. They could succinctly lay out the themes the President has articulated in his speeches -- most of which have not been heard in complete form by the national television audience.

On related matters:

-- I've discussed with Bud the ancillary debate press activities. He's giving thought to which substantive people he'd recommend we mix with political experts in pre and post debate press activities.

-- Bud also volunteered to round up some cooperative surrogates (including some Democrats) to help us make the case to the press that RR's foreign policy is working, and that he will win (has won) the debate.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 7, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: RICHARD G. DARMAN

SUBJECT: FOREIGN POLICY DEBATE

This memo forwards the first draft of the October 21 foreign policy debate briefing material. We are forwarding this book now so that the Vice President may have it for his October 11 debate.

We will revise, update, and add to this book next week. In particular, we want to provide you draft set-piece answers for use when the predictable subject areas (U.S.-Soviet relations, Middle East, Central America, etc.) are raised by panelists' questions. We will also provide a draft closing statement for your view.

Bud McFarlane will be providing, as part of the PDB, other factual material that could be helpful as you prepare.

As the debate approaches, we can discuss strategy and tactics. We know Mondale will be making a last desperate effort to turn the tide in this debate, which brings to the forefront those issues his strategists have long felt are our greatest vulnerabilities: war and peace, and your personal knowledge/responsibility/leadership in foreign affairs.

On the contrary, we know that the restoration of our national defense and a foreign policy marked by American leadership can be our strongest suit if the case is presented positively.

This debate gives you your best opportunity short of a televised address to the nation for unfiltered communication to the American people. You can go over the heads of the panelists and your opponent to reach the people who count. It provides you the opportunity not only to nail down this election, but also to gain national and international public opinion momentum to support your second term foreign policy goals.

I. OVERVIEW

This memo will deal principally with debate strategy and tactics. It will be provided after the Vice Presidential debate.

## II. MONDALE "ZINGERS"

Mondale quotes are included in the attack lines in individual issues papers in this book. These are cogent examples of what to expect:

- o The American people want to know who's in charge here, Mr. President.
- o After four years of sounding like Ronald Reagan, you're beginning to sound like Walter Mondale.
- o How can the American people tell which Reagan -- the old Reagan or the new one -- would be President if he's reelected?
- o Why is this President moving our country down the slippery slope toward war in Central America?
- o This President has opposed every arms control agreement this country has ever entered into with the Soviet Union.
- o This election is not about slogans, like "standing tall", it is about specifics, like the nuclear freeze -- because if those weapons go off, no one will be left standing at all.
- o I don't doubt the President is for peace. But he has not mastered what he must know to command his own government and lead.
- o This President has finally accepted responsibility for the deaths of hundreds of Americans in Lebanon. The question is: How many more lives will be sacrificed to his foreign policy in a second term, unfettered by any thought of reelection?
- o The President's first thought is to call in the Marines. Mine is to call in the diplomats.

### III. MAJOR VULNERABILITIES

The following are briefing papers on selected topics that your senior advisers judge to be, either for you or Mondale, "major vulnerabilities." Where appropriate, the briefing papers include possible Mondale lines of argument, suggested points for you to draw upon, and possible rebuttal points for your use as necessary.

The selected topics are:

U.S.-SOVIET RELATIONS

WAR AND PEACE: NUCLEAR THREAT/ARMS CONTROL

KNOWLEDGE/RESPONSIBILITY/LEADERSHIP: ARMS CONTROL

WAR AND PEACE: MILITARY VS. DIPLOMATIC SOLUTIONS

CENTRAL AMERICA

KNOWLEDGE/RESPONSIBILITY/LEADERSHIP: BEIRUT

DEFENSE SPENDING LEVELS/PROCUREMENT/WASTE

RESTORED AMERICAN STRENGTH (MONDALE VULNERABILITY)

10/2/84

U.S.-SOVIET RELATIONS

Possible Mondale Attack Lines/Rebuttal Points

- o WM supported RR by telling Mr. Gromyko we have only one President, and all Americans believe the Soviets must accept a large share of the burden for the poor relations that exist between our countries. But our policies should have been aimed at easing tensions. They were not, and they did not.
- o The President should tell us what really happened in his meeting with Gromyko -- what was said, what proposals were made, what effort was made to improve relations. We've seen no concrete results -- where are they?
- o Does RR still believe they are the evil empire? Headed for the ash heap of history? Why does he use that kind of inflammatory rhetoric?
- o In WM's own words:
- o "This is the first President who has just grossly mismanaged US-Soviet relations. We know it is difficult to deal with the Soviet leaders, but there is nothing going on except a continuation of the arms race."
- o "Gone is the talk of nuclear warning shots. Gone is winnable nuclear war. Gone is the evil empire. After four years of sounding like Ronald Reagan, six weeks before the election, he's sounding like Walter Mondale."
- o "The new Reagan proposes regular consultation with Soviet experts, the old Reagan is the first American President since Hoover not to meet with his Soviet counterpart."
- o "The new Reagan says we can remove the political suspicions that feed the arms race. The old Reagan told us the Soviet buildup stems from their inherent drive for world domination."

### RR Points to Make

- o Soviets place great value on what they call the "correlation of forces" in the world -- meaning economic, military and psychological forces.
- o So let's ask the Soviets: Are you better off now than you were four years ago?
  - Which country had weak leadership at home four years ago? Which has vigorous leadership now?
  - Which had a struggling economy then? Which has prosperity at home and is spearheading world recovery now?
  - Which had a military in decline then? Which is restoring its strength now?
  - Which had difficulty with its allies then? Which now leads an alliance that is alive and well?
  - Which was unable to support people struggling for individual liberty? Which is now helping those who prefer democracy to repression?
- o There are significant differences in our systems. We like our system better. It works better. Won't seek to change their system, nor should they seek to change ours.
- o Our steady, consistent and patient strategy will bring stable relations over the long haul, reductions in arms on both sides, dialogue on regional and bilateral issues, and peaceful solution of problems that separate us.

### RR Rebuttal Points

- o "Evil empire", "ash heap of history" statements? No reason to disguise the facts as we see them. Soviets don't conduct international relations on the basis of rhetoric. If they did, they'd win -- their rhetoric against the U.S. can't be topped.
- o Americans have for too long been told by people (like WM) that the Soviets are just like we are. WM said earlier this year, "I cannot understand -- it just baffles me -- why the Soviets these last few years have behaved as they have."
- o WM is naive. He consistently calls for unilateral concessions, saying he is "challenging" the Soviets to match them.
- o Soviets understand that kind of challenge -- but they don't match them, they pocket them.
- o WM lacks the constancy of purpose a President has to have to deal with the Soviets. He knows it, the American people know it, and he knows they know it.

10/1/84

WAR AND PEACE: NUCLEAR THREAT/ARMS CONTROL

Possible Mondale Attack Lines and/or Rebuttals

- o The issue of war and peace is the foremost in this election; all others pale by comparison.
- o Americans are afraid that RR will get this country into a nuclear war. He jokes about it. I don't think its funny.
- o RR never met an arms control agreement he liked. Opposed arms control all his life; has concluded no agreements as President.
- o I've supported arms control my entire career. Arms control can make the difference between a safer and a more dangerous world. RR doesn't seem to realize that.
- o RR is first President since Herbert Hoover not to meet his Soviet counterpart. Didn't even go to their funerals and meet their successors. Let the conference tables collect dust.
- o Now has had a "deathbed conversion" in last six weeks of a four year term. I'd have met Gromyko in first six weeks.
- o Anti-arms control thought pattern in this Administration has contributed to a breakdown in talks. It thinks it can "prevail" in a nuclear war.
- o As President, will propose annual summit conferences with the head of the Soviet Union. Have no illusions; but we have to deal with Soviets by combining a strong defense with negotiations.
- o I'd get on the phone on my first day in office and challenge the Soviet Union to a six month moratorium on nuclear weapon testing and space weapons while we negotiate a verifiable mutual freeze.
- o Americans don't feel safer than they were four years ago. Their question: Will this President, unrestrained by the need for reelection, heighten the risk of war?
- o I would use American strength to lead us to a safer world.

10/1/84

WAR AND PEACE: NUCLEAR THREAT/ARMS CONTROL

Key Points for RR to Make

- o Must preserve peace. Nuclear war cannot be won; must never be fought. Must reduce nuclear weapons.
- o Country safer than it was four years ago. America stronger and more confident. Strength, not weakness, deters war.
- o Understandable if Americans are uneasy about the enormous growth of Soviet power. Greatly expanded their influence between 1975 and 1980 (Ethiopia, South Yemen, Cambodia, Afghanistan, Nicaragua). Expansion has stopped; we are now deterring.
- o Why have Soviets resisted our arms control initiatives? One reason: they've watched us reverse the steady decline of the 70's. Have probably said to themselves, "Let's see if the U.S. can sustain it -- how long will it be before they go back to unilateral disarmament?"
- o Conclusions about our foreign policy should be based on answers to two questions: Are US interests better assured now than four years ago? Is world more stable and more promising now than four years ago? Answer to both is yes.
- o RR ready, willing and able to meet with and to negotiate with the Soviets. Prepared for peace.

RR Rebuttal Points

- o Opposed to arms control? No agreements? Summits?. RR favors realistic agreements where interests of both sides are served. Believes in high level contacts. Remember: Carter-Mondale failed to get any meaningful arms control agreements. Never established annual summits. Never had a truly substantive summit.
- o Joke: Nuclear war isn't funny. But neither is it funny when the Soviet Union compares an American President to Hitler, or says he's trigger happy. Better to joke about such ludicrous things than take them seriously.
- o Moratorium on testing? Soviets would be delighted to get what they want merely by agreeing to a meeting. In fact, we are willing to discuss mutual restraints after we get to the table -- but not to make a unilateral concession just to get the Soviets to join us in talks that they proposed in the first place.
- o Nuclear Freeze: Would lock the US into a strategic disadvantage. Unverifiable. Would remove any incentive for Russians to negotiate. Why should they when they enjoy 10-1 advantage (in INF)? Freeze would exempt Soviet defensive systems. Undercut NATO. We can do better than a freeze -- can go for reductions.

10/4/84

KNOWLEDGE/RESPONSIBILITY/LEADERSHIP: ARMS CONTROL

Mondale Attack Lines/Rebuttal Points

- o WM's disagreement with RR on arms control and the nuclear freeze could make the difference between a safer and a more dangerous world.
  - In Mondale's own words: "This election is not about slogans, like 'standing tall'. It is about specifics, like the nuclear freeze -- because if those weapons go off, no one will be left standing at all."
- o RR has a capacity only to dream of arms control initiatives. They are doomed because of his ignorance of the issues.
  - In Mondale's words: "When the fate of the earth is at stake, good intentions are all that we have today."
- o RR didn't bother to learn such crucial points as the fact that nuclear missiles cannot be recalled once they are launched, that submarines can be sunk. He was surprised to learn that the Soviet nuclear force is concentrated in land based missiles. That's why his original START proposal was a non-starter.
  - In Mondale's own words: "I don't doubt the President is for peace. But he has not mastered what he must know to command his own Government and lead."
- o RR even had to hide his plans for meeting Gromyko from hard liners in his Administration. How could he possibly decide on a realistic arms control initiative and carry it through to success?
- o If a President doesn't know, if he doesn't decide, a President can't lead. When a President is not vigorously involved, things just don't happen.
  - In Mondale's own words: "There is no reason to doubt Mr. Reagan's desire for peace. He dreams the same dreams that we do. But a President also must master, command, learn and lead."

## RR Rebuttal Points

- o Pleased WM has given RR credit as "well-meaning." Hasn't given credit for anything else, even command of basic facts.
  - RR won't call a press conference to deny he's dumb (FYI, a Senator from Virginia did in the 70's) -- but give him a break!
- o WM must know the vague "reports" he cites are inaccurate and were obviously timed to discredit RR during campaign. WM shouldn't discredit his own intellect by accepting and repeating such unfounded assertions.
- o RR never said submarines can't sink, or that missiles once launched can be recalled.
  - What RR understands -- and WM should know -- is that submarines and aircraft are platforms that can be moved from place to place. Therefore, they have a special role in our strategy, different from land based missiles.
  - Sea and air based missiles are stabilizing elements in our deterrent Triad: they can be moved around, held in reserve. Or, in case of missiles on bombers, started toward their target and then recalled.
  - Land based missiles are quite different, and that's why we place greatest emphasis on reducing them to equal levels.
- o And let's take the accusation that there was something unfair or intellectually deficient about our original START proposal. It focused on the centrality of the Soviets' land based missiles, the most frightening weapons ever invented.
  - WM says because the Soviets have so many, we'd be unreasonable to ask them to reduce. That kind of soft thinking rewards the Soviets for a buildup of the weapons that are the most destabilizing.
  - It also presumes that we are unwilling to be flexible in negotiations. In fact, we changed our position several times as we negotiated, and the Soviets have changed theirs. That's what negotiations are all about.
  - We've told the Soviets that we believe equality is a fair basis for agreement, and that everything is on the table.
- o Arms control is serious business. RR's effort to reduce nuclear weapons is the most important issue of our time.
- o It is irresponsible to undermine our efforts to reach an agreement with the Soviet Union by reciting unfounded allegations. Unfairly attack RR, and also discredit the efforts of many dedicated people in our government -- all of whom want peace just as much as WM does.

10/1/84

WAR AND PEACE: MILITARY VS. DIPLOMATIC SOLUTIONS

Possible Mondale Attack Lines and/or Rebuttals

- o RR's first thought is to call in the Marines. Mine is to call in the diplomats.
- o Can America afford the recklessness of a President who exposed American Marines to mortal danger and sacrificed over 260 of them in a bungled mission in Lebanon against the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and brought upon us the worst military disaster since the Vietnam War?
- o Was Grenada really necessary? Or was RR just looking for an excuse to use military power in a place where he could hide deaths from the American people by keeping the press out? Will he tempt fate with more military adventures?
- o RR waging a secret war in Central America. Unrestrained, in a second term, that war would be no secret because our sons and daughters would be fighting it. I'll stop the illegal war in Central America, and we'll give negotiations first priority.
- o In competition for third world, need to stop talking about the evils of communism and start talking about the evils of hunger and disease. We ought to be confident in the full range of America's strengths. Military power should be our weapon of last resort. For RR, its the weapon of first resort.

10/1/84

WAR AND PEACE: MILITARY VS. DIPLOMATIC SOLUTIONS

Key Points for RR to Make

- o Any President will choose diplomatic solutions if he can -- must have strength back of his diplomacy.
- o We seek to negotiate and bridge differences. Solutions through dialogue and constructive cooperation are first priority -- but can't negotiate from weakness; can't always turn the other cheek.
- o Ask medical students from Grenada, ask people of Grenada, and people of Eastern Caribbean, they'll tell you: we got there just in time. Students were home before Democratic candidate could decide whether we should rescue them or not.
- o Democratic candidate, as a Senator, voted to delay or kill virtually every major new system designed to strengthen our country. Today he'd kill B-1 bomber, MX missile, and stop research that might some day give us the ability to eliminate threat of intercontinental ballistic missiles. Wants to cut \$25 to \$40 billion a year out of the defense budget. What kind of diplomacy will that support?
- o Question is whether Americans want diplomacy based on weakness. RR intends to use diplomacy as our first resort -- diplomacy with the strength to back it up.

RR Rebuttal Points

- o RR's record shows he is not impulsive or given to confrontation. Compare Carter-Mondale reaction to Afghanistan with RR's handling of the KAL tragedy. Carter imposed U.S. sanctions like the grain embargo that hurt farmers more than the Soviets. RR's firm actions after KAL led world condemnation, and translated outrage into a stronger and steadier NATO alliance.
- o Central America: Tide is turning. Our policies promote democracy, economic renewal, negotiated settlements, an end to aggression. No intention to use American combat power. Sandinistas isolated in the world, unpopular at home, moving rapidly toward totalitarianism, continuing aggression against neighbors with Soviet arms. We support bipartisan Kissinger Commission recommendations to deal with problem now, not when it is too late.
- o Middle East: We and British, French and Italian allies aided in the removal of the 15,000 PLO from Beirut and gave the Lebanese government breathing space. Objective was to avoid a war between Syria and Israel and get the PLO out. Fact that terrorism had such tragic results means we should work on terrorism, not give up our friends in the Middle East.

*aid ratio  
# of mtgs.*

42  
10/4/84

CENTRAL AMERICA

Mondale Attack Lines/Rebuttal Points

- o RR's massive transfusions of military aid to El Salvador are no substitute for the social and economic reforms that are necessary to undermine the appeal the guerrillas hold for many Salvadorans.
- o The solution lies with a new policy that fosters social, economic and political reforms that are compatible with our legitimate vital interests while accommodating the equally legitimate forces of change.
- o Instead of widening, militarizing and Americanizing the conflict, WM's immediate objective will be to stop the violence and pursue a negotiated political solution in concern with our democratic allies in the Contadora group.
- o There must be a commitment on the part of the US to reduce tensions in the region -- we must terminate our support for the contras in Nicaragua.
- o The American people have a choice -- a very significant choice -- between war and peace in Central America.
- o In Mondale's own words:
  - "The new Reagan calls for peace in Central America. The old Reagan launched an illegal war in Nicaragua."
  - "This election is not about my standing in the polls. It is about my stand against the illegal war in Nicaragua."
  - "The new Reagan praises international law. The old Reagan jumped bail from the World Court."
  - "In Central America, our country is sliding toward war."
  - "Do you really want to get us deeper into war in Central America?"
  - "As President, I will reassert American values. I'll press for human rights in Central America, and for the removal of all foreign forces from the region. And in any first hundred days, I will stop the illegal war in Nicaragua."

10/4/84

RR Points to Make

- o We are promoting democracy, economic renewal, negotiated settlements, an end to aggression. El Salvador has elected a constitutional, civilian government committed to reform. Human rights abuses down to the lowest level in five years.
  - Elections also held in Honduras, Costa Rica, Guatemala.
  - When WM left office 50% of Central American countries were democracies; now 80% are.
- o Sandinistas under increasing pressure to halt subversive activities, reduce armaments, liberalize. No wonder opposition gaining in Nicaragua. Sandinistas are:
  - Isolated in world,
  - Unpopular at home,
  - Moving rapidly toward totalitarianism,
  - Running drugs,
  - Expelling priests,
  - Continuing aggression against neighbors.
- o As bipartisan Kissinger Commission said, consequences of Central America dominated by a Soviet/Cuban surrogate should be considered and dealt with now, not when it is too late.
- o We have no intention to use American combat power in Central America. No need to if Congress supports our programs.
- o The tide is turning in Central America because of consistent American policy in support of friends in the region. Let's continue to stand for something in this hemisphere. Not revert to bad policies, then blame U.S. for failure.

RR Rebuttal Points

- o WM's policies would bring to all of Central America what Carter-Mondale brought to Nicaragua. WM's approach has been tried, and failed.
- o Aspirations of resistance forces -- the freedom fighters -- deserve our support. They are causing Nicaragua to move toward compromise, and toward leaving their neighbors alone.
  - Adolfo Colero, head of one of the resistance groups, said three weeks ago when asked about a "phase-out" of U.S. assistance:

"Perhaps you don't understand -- we are not going to quit.... Could someone have paid George Washington or Thomas Jefferson or Benjamin Franklin not to fight tyranny in your country 208 years ago?"

KNOWLEDGE/RESPONSIBILITY/LEADERSHIP: BEIRUTMondale Attack Lines/Rebuttal Points

- o RR is responsible for the central policies of his administration in Lebanon. It is a matter of Presidential responsibility.
  - In Mondale's own words: "Mr. Reagan acts as though terrorism is like an earthquake -- a force of nature that can only be endured and not controlled. I can understand why that argument might attract him -- if it were true, it would absolve him of responsibility.
- o There was clear warning, not once, but several times, that an attack might be made on a US facility. The Administration's response was lax to this perceived threat. Security precautions recommended by the Long Commission and others after the previous Beirut tragedies were not taken.
  - In Mondale's own words: "This tragedy indicates a serious failure of security and it suggests that few lessons have been learned and applied from the massacre of our Marines and our Embassy in West Beirut."
- o RR first blamed Jimmy Carter. Then explained that he was really blaming Carter, Ford, Nixon and Congress. Then let his Secretary of State take responsibility, then -- finally, thirteen days after the tragedy -- accepted responsibility himself, which he should have done in the first place.
  - In Mondale's own words: "Harry Truman said the buck stops here, but for Mr. Reagan the buck stops everywhere but here.... What we have today is a President who gives us alibis."

RR Rebuttal Points

- o As Commander in Chief, RR accepts responsibility for the safety and security of our embassies overseas.
- o Attacks on our facilities in Beirut by suicidal terrorists confirm our view that the world must deal more effectively with international terrorism. We're working on that.
- o In the latest tragedy, investigation indicated that we were doing the right things: had moved the embassy from West to East Beirut, reduced the number of US personnel, completed most work on defensive structures around the building.
- o No reason to second-guess what appears to be the very best efforts of our people on the scene to protect themselves and our embassy.
- o Would those who criticize prefer that we close our embassies around the world and give up on our friends like those in Lebanon and Israel? Surely no one is suggesting such a shortsighted approach.

10/1/84

DEFENSE SPENDING LEVELS/PROCUREMENT/WASTE

Possible Mondale Attack Lines and/or Rebuttals

- o RR measures military might by dollars spent, rather than by sound planning and a realistic assessment of threats.
- o Four-year record of waste, fraud, conflicts of interest, and indications of 3 that have cost the taxpayer billions of dollars.
- o Horror stories such as \$1,100 paid for a plastic stool cap indicate mismanagement that comes from the feeling that anything Pentagon buys is OK. There's too much loose change over there.
- o Spending for weapons we don't need contributes to budget deficit.
- o Don't need M-X missiles, B-1 bombers or new two new large, expensive aircraft carriers that are sitting ducks.
- o Do need an increased defense budget, but not one bloated with gold-plated weapons.

DEFENSE SPENDING LEVELS/PROCUREMENT/WASTE

Key Points for RR to Make

- o First priority of federal government is to protect its people. Our goal is to spend what we need to spend to protect America.
- o Defense has declined as a percentage of both federal expenditures and Gross National Product in the past two decades. Defense share of the nation's output of goods and services (GNP) will be only 6.8% in FY 1985. This is less than in John F. Kennedy's Presidency, a quarter of a century ago.
- o Both candidates support increased defense spending -- so the real issue is what to procure, and how to do it best. The people charged with defending America recommended the programs we have sent to Congress -- I trust their judgment, not those who are looking for easy solutions so that they can spend more on giveaway programs.

RR Rebuttal Points

- o On waste at Pentagon: We didn't invent problems. Did discover them. Had the courage and foresight to look for skeletons in the defense closet. When you look for waste, you will find it. We are looking, and getting results. In three years, we have:
  - Hired hundreds of new auditors, inspectors and investigators. Meaner than junkyard dogs. Completed 59,000 internal audits, the most far-reaching in Defense history. Our more than 100,000 corrective actions have already saved billions.
  - Created a special unit to prosecute fraud and waste. Opened nearly 39,000 cases. Of these, 17,000 referred for prosecution or administrative action. Over 1,300 convictions. Trend is up: convictions increased 70% in FY 83 over the previous year.
  - Debarred or suspended individuals or companies who abuse procurement process. Used this powerful tool 1,000 times since 1980, 323 times in 1983 alone -- an increase of 80% over previous year. Trend is up: 467 suspensions or debarments in first 9 months of FY 84.
  - Provided a Hotline for whistleblowers to challenge questionable practices. Encouraged people like the Air Force Sergeant who noticed that a stool cap had a \$1100 price tag. Now buying the same cap for 31 cents each. Got full refund from the contractor. Sergeant got a \$1100 cash reward. We want more whistle blowers like that Sergeant.

10/1/84

RESTORED AMERICAN STRENGTH

Possible Mondale Attack Lines and/or Rebuttals

- o Believe in a strong America, and would continue increased defense spending -- but not at the same levels. Would eliminate unnecessary weapons.
- o Must have strong, conventional forces, second to none, must spend more on training, readiness and equipment to get our forces to the scene of potential conflicts.

Key Points for RR to Make

- o Administration inherited acute defense problems.  
Carter-Mondale:
  - Cut \$38 billion in three years from President Ford's projected defense budget.
  - Delayed the MX missile by at least three years.
  - Cancelled the B-1 bomber, and got no Russian cut in return.
  - Slowed down Trident submarine and missile.
  - Cut shipbuilding in half. Vetoed new nuclear aircraft carrier.
  - Kept military pay so low many servicemen had to go on food stamps to make ends meet.
  - Encouraged Russian building and expansions from Afghanistan to Nicaragua by unilateral disarmament.
- o Our objectives: Keep the peace by improving deterrence. Improve training and readiness, modernize strategic forces, increase conventional capability. We've made steady progress.
- o Never thought all the problems we inherited could be solved within four years. Have shown that it is possible to set defense priorities and move ahead. America is safer, stronger, more secure and more confident than four years ago -- we want to stay that way.

IV. SOFTBALLS

1A

10/4/84

BETTER OFF NOW THAN FOUR YEARS AGO?

RR Points to Make

- o Carter/Mondale years raised doubts, around the world and at home, about basic questions: military security, alliance cohesion, domestic and international economy, and our ability to get fair arms control agreements.
- o The American people asked us to rebuild, and make the world a safer place. This is precisely what we've done.
  - We've rebuilt America's military strength, and let our servicemen and women know their country is proud of them.
  - In Europe we and our allies stood up to the most intense campaign of Soviet intimidation in 25 years.
  - On arms control we've made comprehensive and fair proposals.
  - We've helped revive the international economy, without resorting to trade-war tactics.
  - No longer fear energy shortages. Oil imports are way down. Our reserves are high. We've forged effective emergency energy agreements with our allies.
  - In the Middle East, presented the most far-reaching peace plan ever put forward by anyone. Improved relations with the moderate Arabs, while expanding cooperation with Israel.
  - In Central America, met the challenge of military subversion and expansionism. Helped the first democratic government of El Salvador in years protect itself. Returned the government of Grenada to its people.
  - In Africa, diplomatic mediators helped bring about the first non-aggression agreements ever between South Africa and her neighbors. We're using our influence to seek solutions to problems rather than confrontation.
  - United the free world against repression in Poland and the Soviet war of conquest in Afghanistan.
  - Built the best relations our country has ever had with Japan and China.
  - Reached out to all friendly nations of the Pacific Basin, to enhance economic and security ties with this dynamic region so vital to America's future.
- o In summary, America is safer, stronger, prouder, better off today than four years ago. As we look to the future, we want to continue the policies that have turned this country around.

## FOREIGN POLICY GOALS FOR THE FUTURE?

### RR Talking Points

- o Peace. Our people are entitled to peace and security. We plan to do more in the next four years to assure peace without endangering our security. Key goals:
  - Conduct relations with the Soviet Union based on strict reciprocity and true restraint. Seek and achieve agreements based on real reductions in nuclear forces.
  - Affirm our long-term commitment to reduce the world's terrible reliance on nuclear weapons -- by exploring the technology of strategic defense, and by improving the conventional capabilities of this country and our allies.
  - Seek breakthroughs in key areas: preventing proliferation of nuclear weapons to new countries, turning back international terrorism, resolving regional wars.
- o Prosperity. The international economy reflects our own vibrant recovery. We plan to assure continued world recovery as we:
  - Keep pursuing the policies at home that have put us back on our feet. Discipline we showed in attacking problems has increased confidence in America worldwide.
  - Reach and implement a world consensus on free market policies to assure an enduring economic recovery. We'll focus on liberalized trade and financial stability.
  - Put the protectionist temptation behind us. An open world economy is the best -- only -- way to sustain a recovery in which the whole world participates.
  - Solve the international debt problem in a way that treats the disease, not just the symptoms.
- o Democracy. America believes in a future of democratic possibilities. Democracy is the best peace program we have to offer.
  - We will give top priority to making the Americas the hemisphere of democracy in this decade. Recommendations of the bipartisan Kissinger Commission on Central America are key to our steady policy for the 80's.
  - We'll also issue the challenge of democracy to nations around the world, encouraging trends toward democracy. We'll help others whose formula for government is democracy instead of repression.
  - Similarly, will show the viability of the democratic, free enterprise alternative to countries that have in the past looked to the Soviet Union as a model.

V. SECONDARY ISSUES

The following are one-page briefs on each of these "secondary" issues (i.e., issues thought not to be "major vulnerabilities" or "softballs" for either side):

AFRICA

ARMS CONTROL: SALT II

ARMS CONTROL: "WALK IN THE WOODS"

STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE

DEFENSE READINESS

NUCLEAR VS. CONVENTIONAL DEFENSE SPENDING

M-X MISSILE

B-1 BOMBER

AFRICAPossible Mondale Attack Lines/Rebuttal Points

- o Will propose bold new initiatives to alleviate hunger, drought, famine, that have brought untold suffering to millions in Africa and the Third World.
- o Will reverse failed policy of "constructive engagement" and oppose the apartheid regime in South Africa.

Will exert maximum pressure on South Africa;  
 enforce UN arms embargo;  
 bar new U.S. business loans until there is progress;  
 condemn harassment of political prisoners;  
 demand action on Namibian independence;  
 impose sanctions on South Africa unless and until it  
 frees Namibia and abolishes apartheid.

- o In Mondale's own words: "The new Reagan criticizes South Africa. The old Reagan cozied up to apartheid."

RR Points to Make

- Emergency aid initiatives program \$500M*
- o In three years we have doubled the quantity of emergency foodstuffs shipped to fight famine in Africa. We'll do more.
  - o Have led complex diplomatic effort to give Namibia independence. Achieved agreement by all parties on the UN plan for Namibia, pending only Cuban troop withdrawal from Angola.
  - o In southern Africa, there's been an increase in dialogue between neighboring states. Real progress, with the U.S. acting as an honest broker and catalyst, has been made:
    - Landmark South Africa/Angola disengagement agreement.
    - Non-aggression pact between South Africa/Mozambique.
  - o Africa needs:
    - more private enterprise, less government control of economies.
    - less exploitation by the Soviets and Cubans.
    - peaceful progress toward ending apartheid.

RR Rebuttal Points

- o Apartheid is abhorrent. We have played a quiet but significant role in encouraging South Africa to take the path of peaceful, positive change away from racial segregation, separation and discrimination. There is a growing dynamic for change: black trade unions; increased education expenditures for blacks; the beginnings of black local self-government.

10/4/84

ARMS CONTROL: SALT II

Mondale Attack Lines/Rebuttal Points

- o This was a good agreement. RR should have supported it.
- o If it was a bad agreement, why has RR continued to observe it? Obviously, because it contributes to our security.

RR Rebuttal

- o SALT II was not a good agreement. It was fatally flawed, and the Senate Armed Services Committee said it was not in the national interest.
- o Carter withdrew it from the Senate.
- o Prior to 1981 both nations were obligated under international law not to take actions that would "defeat the object and purpose" of the signed but unratified treaty.
- o Since 1981 the US has observed a political commitment to refrain from actions that undercut SALT II as long as the Soviet Union does likewise.
- o We believe that our policy of not undercutting this or the SALT I agreement can create an atmosphere of stability while we attempt to achieve a more meaningful agreement that will reduce the number of weapons and enhance our national security.
- o The Soviets have violated their obligations under the Treaty (encryption of telemetry impeded verification), and are testing and deploying weapons in probable violation of it.
- o The SALT II agreement is not a sound foundation for long-term arms control -- it is unequal, codifies a buildup rather than reductions, is not verifiable. We need a better agreement, and that's what RR is trying to get.

10/4/84

ARMS CONTROL: "WALK IN THE WOODS"

Mondale Attack Lines/Rebuttal Points

- o We had a potential breakthrough in the INF talks when our negotiator and his Soviet counterpart worked out a proposal in July 1982.
- o What happened? Our arms control director was fired; our negotiator reprimanded.

RR Rebuttal

- o Ambassador Nitze and his Soviet counterpart discussed ideas on an informal, exploratory basis. They presented their formula for consideration in both capitals.
- o Although the US had several problems with the program as it stood (for example, verification measures were not defined), we were interested in keeping this informal channel open.
- o The Soviet reaction, on the other hand, was completely negative, both to the proposal itself and to further use of this informal channel.
- o Paul Nitze and Gene Rostow, both Democrats and both distinguished Americans, have served their country well. They should not be used by anyone to make a point in a political debate.

10/2/84

## STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE

### Mondale Attack Lines/Rebuttal Points

- o WM will actively pursue a ban on weapons in space.
- o Would immediately propose a six-month moratorium on all testing of anti-satellite and space weapons, as John F. Kennedy did with atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons. Would challenge the Soviets to respond.
- o In Mondale's own words: "For four years, they failed to reach a single arms control agreement with the Soviets. They proposed to extend the arms race into the heavens!"

### RR Talking Points

- o The issue is: How can the United States ultimately make ballistic missiles obsolete?
- o The so-called "Star Wars" initiative does not constitute a decision to deploy a defensive system. Rather, it is a research program.
- o What we are doing is exploring advanced technologies that might enable the U.S. to develop an effective defense against missiles that threaten the world. What's wrong with that?
- o If there is hope that we can find a way to peace that does not rest on the threat of nuclear devastation, we should look for it.
- o Defenses may be able to reduce the value of ballistic missiles, and thus increase the likelihood of negotiated reductions that would benefit us all.
- o This is one race that we'd like the Soviets to join. Why is WM against technology that could potentially protect us -- and the Soviets -- from nuclear weapons, and maybe even allow us to eliminate them?

### RR Rebuttal Points

- o ABM Treaty? We are not violating the ABM Treaty with our research. No need to make a deployment decision for years.
- o Besides, the Soviet Union has the world's only active ballistic missile defense system. For well over a decade, they have had a vigorous research program that includes upgrading this system, seeking a rapidly-deployable ABM system. They are actively investigating advanced defensive technologies.
- o If for no other reason, the U.S. program is a prudent hedge against possible Soviet gains that would adversely affect U.S. and Allied security.

10/1/84

## DEFENSE READINESS

### Possible Mondale Attack Lines and/or Rebuttals

- o Need improved military readiness. GAO has shown that our military readiness is decreasing despite vast expenditures on the Pentagon.

### Key Points for RR to Make

- o We've come a long way toward restoring our margin of safety: our military forces have better people, who are better armed, better equipped, better trained and with better support behind them than in 1980.
- o For example, we can now deliver 25 percent more tonnage by air to Europe in case of a crisis, and we've improved our air sortie rate by 60 percent.
- o We've added tanks, fighting vehicles, combat aircraft, and we've added some 70 ships to our Navy.
- o Strong national defense is vital to our country's future. Security, readiness of our forces, efficiency can continue to improve -- or we can go back to four years ago.

### RR Rebuttal Points

- o Readiness decline? Absolutely not. House Report suggesting that is based on data two years old -- it confirms what we've been saying, that the neglect of the 1970's seriously undermined readiness. That's changed. Now our uniformed military commanders say by every measure of common sense their forces are more ready than they were four years ago.

10/1/84

NUCLEAR VS. CONVENTIONAL DEFENSE SPENDING

Possible Mondale Attack Lines and/or Rebuttals

- o RR's program has a strong tilt toward nuclear weapons and away from conventional preparedness.

Key Points for RR to Make

- o Spending far more on conventional forces than on strategic forces.
- o In the Reagan program, funding for conventional preparedness grew considerably faster than they would have under the Carter-Mondale program.

RR Rebuttal Points

- o Nuclear forces represent less than 15% of the defense budget and in fact this percentage will decrease in future RR budgets.
- o Between FY 81 and FY 85, the total defense budget grew \$76.8B, the nuclear portion was only 25% of this increase. The tilt is toward conventional preparedness.

10/1/84

M-X MISSILE

Mondale Attack Lines/Rebuttal Points

- o Don't need M-X missiles sitting in vulnerable silos in our heartland inviting a first strike against our country, or leading us to a use-em-or-lose-em strategy. We already have improved Minuteman missiles in those silos.

RR Points to Make

- o Strategic triad has maintained the peace for 40 years. ICBMs are securely based on U.S. soil; have direct communications with National Command authority.
- o Minuteman missiles are aging (Minuteman II first deployed in 1966, Minuteman III in 1970). Titan missiles -- even older than Minuteman -- are being dismantled because they are difficult to maintain safely.
- o Soviets are hardening their missile sites and command systems. They have, since 1970, modernized their ICBM force, deploying over 800 SS-17, SS-18 and SS-19 missiles comparable to M-X. We've deployed no new ICBMs during this period.
- o M-X is ready now. Outstanding technical success. Six highly successful test flights. First unit will be fully operational in five years.
- o RR endorsed bipartisan Scowcroft Commission Report recommendation to deploy 100 M-X as soon as possible, develop a small ICBM, and vigorously pursue arms control.

RR Rebuttal Points

- o Vulnerable? M-X combined with bombers and submarines assures survivability and deterrence. Any single leg of the triad can become vulnerable if it faces attack alone. The Soviets have a triad also.
- o Basing M-X in existing silos gives us a deterrent without seriously disrupting the environment. It is the most cost-effective basing mode.
- o Soviets know (and WM should, too) that M-X is not a credible first strike weapon: 100 missiles far too small a force for that.
- o Upgrade Minuteman? Would cost about the same as finishing M-X. Wouldn't be available until three years after M-X.
- o The "small missile" ICBM ("Midgetman"), with single warhead as opposed to M-X's 10 warheads, can't be accelerated without high cost and technical risk. Likely to be very expensive; more so if we don't build M-X. (Would need very large numbers if not combined with M-X deployment).
- o Without M-X, it will be virtually impossible to negotiate

10/1/84

B-1 BOMBER

Mondale Attack Lines/Rebuttal Points

- o Don't need new B-1 bomber that will be obsolete almost as soon as it's built. Should push ahead with the Stealth aircraft instead.
- o B-52's already in inventory can carry cruise missiles and perform the same mission as the B-1.

RR Points to Make

- o Strategic triad of bombers, land-based ICBMs, and sea-based ICBMs, has maintained the nuclear peace for nearly 40 years. Bombers are very stable portion of the triad because they take hours to reach their targets, and can be recalled.
- o B-52 was designed in the late 1940's and first deployed in the mid-1950's. Older than pilots who fly them. Increasingly difficult to maintain. Vulnerable radar cross section is huge and cannot be reduced.
- o Carter-Mondale killed replacement aircraft and left us with promises about the future but no first-rate bomber now. In response to this unilateral gesture, Soviets kept right on building the Blackjack bomber. Mondale still wants to turn back the clock to unilateral disarmament.
- o B-1 can take off far more quickly in the face of a Soviet missile attack. Can penetrate Soviet air defenses better (radar signature is one one-hundredth of the B-52).
- o B-1 is ready now. First production aircraft has been delivered. First squadron will be operational in less than two years. Stealth will not be ready until early 1990's.

RR Rebuttal Points

- o. Stealth aircraft will require the Soviets to change to costly new systems for air defense. However, acceleration of the program would be costly and would present dangerous technical risks.
- o The two bombers taken together represent an evolutionary program to modernize our force at a prudent pace and at minimum costs.

## VI PITFALLS

This subject will be discussed in the debate preparations sessions.

## VII. RR WINNERS

A selection of suggested Presidential lines -- analogous to the Mondale "zingers" will be provided here in the final briefing book. For example:

- "Evil Empire" --

Are you suggesting that the Soviet empire is a good empire?

- WM's "Challenging" Soviets to Match Unilateral Concessions

The Soviets understand that kind of "challenge." But they won't match it, they pocket it, and move on the next concession.

VIII. SAMPLE QUESTIONS AND  
DRAFT ALL-PURPOSE ANSWERS

The following is a first installment of sample questions. Additional questions and draft statements to be made will be provided next week.

10/4/84

POSSIBLE QUESTIONS

- Better off? -- Is America better off now than four years ago in foreign affairs?
- Leadership -- Who can lead this country better and why?
- Goals -- what will you try to achieve in foreign policy the next four years?
- U.S.-Soviet relations -- Who'd handle them better and why? How can we bridge our differences?
- Arms control -- What's wrong with challenging Soviets to a mutual moratorium on testing? Or with a mutual and verifiable nuclear freeze?
- Nuclear proliferation -- what can be done to limit the proliferation of nuclear weapons technology to additional countries?
- Central America -- How will you seek to protect US interests there?
- Nicaragua -- Should we stop covert activities that support the resistance forces? Negotiate a settlement? Wait for a seemingly endless Contadora process?
- Grenada -- Was this a correct use of US military force?
- Middle East -- Can the US play a constructive role in bringing peace there and how?
- Terrorism -- What can be done?
- Lebanon -- What went wrong there, and could we have gone about achieving our goal of a free and independent Lebanon more effectively? Could we, in particular, have avoided the tremendous loss of life there?
- Lebanon Retaliation -- How should we respond if we learn exactly who is responsible for the bombings of our embassy there, whether it be a small group in Lebanon or a conspiracy involving other countries?
- Democracy -- We say we are for it, but what should be do in countries like the Philippines where traditional allies are not following the path most people see as either democratic or in the best traditions of human rights.

- Southeast Asia -- What is the prospect for resolution of problems, like Kampuchea and the POW/MIA issue, in Southeast Asia, and how do you propose to deal with this region?
- Africa -- Your plans for dealing with the situation in southern Africa and with the misery caused by drought and famine?
- Defense -- What level of spending should we incur, and what can we do about Pentagon mismanagement.
- Military Readiness -- Are our armed forces ready for combat now, or do we need to do more to achieve readiness? If so, what should we do?
- Space -- What emphasis should be placed on space in the next four years? In particular, what are the pros and cons of the militarization of space?
- Star Wars -- What is your position on development of space-based systems to defend against ballistic missiles? How do you see our current research affecting our commitments under the ABM Treaty?
- International Economics -- What should be done about international debt? How serious is this issue for Americans?
- International Trade -- What measures will you take to restore a balance in foreign trade? What are your views on the strong dollar and protectionism?
- Pope Assassination -- Do you believe the attempt on the Pope's life was orchestrated by the Soviet Union and Bulgaria? Have we done enough to find out? And if there was culpability, what would the implications be?
- Intelligence -- How good is ours? Was there a decline, and if so, are we restoring our capabilities?

IX. CLOSING STATEMENT

Suggested closing statement will be provided next week.