

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
(3 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**

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

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

Last Updated: 10/02/2024

1

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 9, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR BUD McFARLANE

FROM *Bob* BOB SIMS

NOT HAS SEEN

SUBJECT: FOREIGN POLICY DEBATE

Issues that need to be involved, preferably in a meeting today with Baker, Deaver, Darman, Speakes, yourself and me:

Preparations

- o Briefing book. Who puts it together? Format? When does RR get it?
 - Recommendations: Darman (or Darman/McFarlane) sign off on book. Use format and material already provided by Sims, with McFarlane edits. Get it done today. Update/add to daily--but discipline the process so that the President is dealing with one book only. McFarlane provide individual item briefings in PDB and National Security briefing time.
- o All purpose set-piece answers in key subject areas, and closing statement. Should someone draft these for the President? Who? How will signoff process work? When do they go to the President?
 - Recommendations: Draft 8-12 set-piece answers and closing statement. Include as update to the President's briefing book. (The format and forwarding memo I recommended to Darman envisions this approach and encourages the President to edit them, and commit them to memory.) Assign specific writing to specific individuals--Khachigan? Elliott? Have writers key off talking points in briefing book. Fortier work closely with writers, incorporating creative ideas he may get from his meeting today with Ikle and Wolfowitz. Final signoff on this material by Darman/McFarlane. Complete the drafting and forward to the President by COB Friday, as update to his book, so that he can begin work on it this weekend, after Ohio train trip.

Rehearsal sessions

- o Is format same as for domestic? If so, who plays WM? Who are panelists? Who else attends? Schedule?
 - Recommendations: Use rehearsal format as in domestic preps. Decide now who plays WM (Stockman again? Whoever does it should prepare for the roles of "Walter the Statesman" and "Walter the Aggressor" since WM is likely to use both approaches during the 90 minutes.) Decide now on panelists: Speakes, Fortier, Sims, Tutweiler are candidates. Decide now who attends: VP, Baker, Deaver, McFarlane, Darman, Speakes, Forter, Tutweiler, Sims, Werthlin could be core group. What about campaign people? Decide now on prep schedule: Al Smith dinner in New York Thursday night before the debate complicates the week; need adequate rehearsal prep and private time for RR.

Ancillary Media Activity

- o Who goes on TV before/after the debate? What press briefings in Kansas City. Who does on the record and background talking? What campaign activities are scheduled for the following day, and how can we tie into the debate themes?

--Recommendations: McFarlane/Jim Baker do key TV opportunities, along with surrogates McFarlane lines up from foreign policy community. McFarlane/Baker get key members of Congress to follow up. Coordinate TV with networks through Speakes office, as in domestic debate. Sims/Speakes develop a comprehensive media plan, to include backgrounders. Campaign coordinate its media activities, if any, with White House. McFarlane encourage outside foreign policy experts (Kissinger, Scowcroft, Zbig, etc.) to be available to media to discuss RR foreign policy achievements and debate performance. Consider what role, if any, Vice President should play: perhaps a followup network interview. Consider what role national security officials (Shultz, Rick Burt, John Hughes, Weinberger, Ikle) could appropriately play, and make arrangements for their participation (or suggest they not).

3

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

October 10, 1984

Good morning

MEMORANDUM FOR BUD MCFARLANE

FROM: ~~Bob~~
BOB SIMS

SUBJECT: Foreign Policy Debate

Attached are additional debate issue papers for your review.

*would see
material not on special int.
that is one of*

Dona -

*This was in XCMout -
- do you think we should keep up
XCM material for debate or
too.*

*- I'm not sure how Wil is handling
all this. I'm sure she has
a folder somewhere. We may just
want to keep until debate is
over.*

HMS

4

I. OVERVIEW

This memo will deal principally with debate strategy and tactics. It will be updated as we get closer to the debate.

Central Themes of Reagan National Security Policy

- Establish stable relations with the Soviet Union -- reciprocity and restraint.
- Bargain for deep reductions in nuclear arms -- and their ultimate elimination.
- Maintain strong relations with allies in Europe, Asia and our own hemisphere.
- Help developing countries to preserve freedom and build their economies.
- Vigorously apply U.S. diplomacy in peacemaking -- Southern Africa, Central America and the Middle East.

6
10/10/84

DEFENSE SPENDING

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

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

to deter attack.
We are doing that.
Not one square inch of territory in last 4 years

10/10/84

Since 1980, virtually every major system tank ship & aircraft has been produced ahead of schedule & under cost.

10/10/84

DEFENSE SPENDING: NUCLEAR VS. CONVENTIONAL

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.

10/10/84

DEFENSE SPENDING: 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
10/10/84

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).

10/10/84

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.

12

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

RCM HAS SEEN

October 11, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR BUD MCFARLANE

FROM: ^{*Bob*} BOB SIMS

SUBJECT: Debate

Attached is all the material I've done for the book.
Part I (Themes) would be replaced by your input.

Could you review this material? I'm providing to Darman also.

I. OVERVIEW

This memo will deal principally with debate strategy and tactics. It will be updated as we get closer to the debate.

Central Themes of Reagan National Security Policy

- Establish stable relations with the Soviet Union -- reciprocity and restraint.
- Bargain for deep reductions in nuclear arms -- and their ultimate elimination.
- Maintain strong relations with allies in Europe, Asia and our own hemisphere.
- Help developing countries to preserve freedom and build their economies.
- Vigorously apply U.S. diplomacy in peacemaking -- Southern Africa, Central America and the Middle East.

II. MONDALE ATTACK LINES

MONDALE ZINGERS

GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY SPEECH

15
10/10/84

MONDALE ZINGERS

The following are typical examples of what Mondale has been saying:

- 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."

Attached is Mondale's Georgetown University speech -- "Old Reagan vs. New Reagan" -- which you have already seen, and which deals heavily with foreign policy.

NOTE: Other Mondale "Zingers" and lines of attack are included in individual issue papers.

12

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

NUCLEAR THREAT

ARMS CONTROL

ARMS CONTROL: STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE

MILITARY VS. DIPLOMATIC SOLUTIONS

CENTRAL AMERICA

MIDDLE EAST

BEIRUT

DEFENSE SPENDING

GRENADA (MONDALE VULNERABILITY)

RESTORED AMERICAN STRENGTH (MONDALE VULNERABILITY)

"WHAT IT WOULD BE LIKE" (MONDALE VULNERABILITY)

10/10/84

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 the U.S. 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."

U.S.-SOVIET RELATIONSRR Points to Make

- o Then and Now -- Four years ago the Soviets saw the U.S. in decline: political chaos in our alliances; economic chaos here at home; and military weakness with the balance shifting dramatically in their favor.
- o Now the political cohesion of our alliances has never been stronger; our economic miracle is lifting the world out of recession; and the military balance is being restored.
- o Four years ago we were not detering (as people from Angola to Afghanistan testify) NOW WE ARE!
- o There are significant differences in our systems. Don't seek to change their system.
- o As superpowers we both have responsibility to assure that competition is peaceful.
- 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.
- o One-way detente didn't work. Constructive cooperation based on realism, mutual restraint, and mutual benefit can.

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. Carter-Mondale cancelled B-1 and got nothing in return.
- 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.

10/10/84

NUCLEAR THREAT

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.

NUCLEAR THREAT

Key Points for RR to Make

- o Must preserve peace. Nuclear war cannot be won; must never be fought. Must reduce nuclear weapons.
- o We are doing so:
 - 1/3 fewer strategic warheads than in 1967; total nuclear explosive power (megatonnage) less than half what it was under President Kennedy.
 - Have pulled 1000 nuclear warheads out of Europe since 1979; have agreed to pull 1400 more out.
- 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, before they again tie their own hands behind their back."
- 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. 4 years ago, freedom was at risk and peace was not secure. Today, there is a rising tide of freedom and America is stronger, and we're 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 signed an agreement to increase nuclear weapons! Never established annual summits. Never had a truly substantive summit.
- o Joke: Nuclear war isn't funny. "Of course, it isn't. Neither is it funny when news media broadcast what was clearly an off-the-record joke!"
- 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.

ARMS CONTROL: STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVEMondale 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 Mondale MAD strategy relies upon continuing nuclear terror.
- o Isn't it better to protect our people than to avenge them?
- o The so-called "Star Wars" initiative does not constitute a decision to deploy a defensive system. Rather, it is a research program. Future President will decide.
- 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.

10/10/84

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.

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 Not a question of first/last resort. Under Carter-Mondale there was no resort at all. Ask people of Iran, Afghanistan, Cambodia, Ethiopia, and Nicaragua. What about Mexico and Canada, Walter? Will you draw the line at Minnesota?
- o Democratic candidate, as a Senator, voted to delay or kill virtually every major new system designed to strengthen peace. 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? Why should Soviets negotiate with a man who will cut unilaterally?
- 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.

10/10/84

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."

CENTRAL AMERICA

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 troops 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?"

10/10/84

MIDDLE EAST

Possible Mondale Attack Lines and/or Rebuttals

- o WM would go back to the Camp David process, become personally involved, and not put pressure on Israel.
- o It has been two years since the President launched his September 1 initiative. The initiative is dead, it's been rejected by the Israelis and the Arabs, and a new approach will have to be found.
- o In WM's own words:
 - "The United States influence in the Middle East is waning, the President has not been personally involved in any of the negotiations and what we need now is a new policy, an energetic policy of personal intervention to move forward."
 - "There has been vacillation, inconsistency, differing policies that rise and disappear, an unwise and unsure-footed arms supply policy towards Israel's neighbors, a lack of direct personal involvement by the President in this most dangerous of areas."
 - "If the United States can provide its good offices to encourage Syria to take those steps that will permit Israel to withdraw under conditions that secure the northern borders of Israel, everyone's interest is served."

MIDDLE EAST

RR Talking Points

- o RR thought, when former Prime Minister Shamir said our relations with Israel had "never been better," it couldn't be topped. But Prime Minister Peres, who visited here some 10 days ago, went further: he said we had reached a "new level of harmony" in our relationship. We must always stand by the State of Israel, and RR will.
- o The September 1 initiative remains as valid today as when it was presented.
- o It is fair and balanced on key issues which the negotiating parties will have to resolve.
- o Acceptance of our positions by the parties is not necessary in advance of negotiations and is not a prerequisite for a U.S. mediating role. We expect the parties to bring their own ideas to the table.
- o We intend to continue to pursue our goals throughout the region, foremost among which is a just and lasting peace between Israel and all its neighbors. We therefore remain committed to a speedy resumption of negotiations based on Security Council Resolution 242, and we remain committed as well to the Camp David framework.
- o We are convinced that our initiative, which is based squarely on both Resolution 242 and the Camp David framework, can point the way to a lasting agreement acceptable to all the parties.

RR Rebuttal Points Re Lebanon

- o We and our British, French and Italian allies aided in the removal of the 15,000 PLO from Beirut, prevented another war between Israel and Syria, and gave the Lebanese government breathing space.
 - Objective was to avoid a war between Syria and Israel and get the PLO out.
 - Policy was working. Promised to bring peace to Lebanon while securing the northern border of Israel.
 - Because policy was working, terrorists attacked U.S. and our allies.
 - Fact that terrorism had such tragic results means we should work on terrorism, not give up our friends in the Middle East.

10/10/84

BEIRUT

Mondale 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.

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 Terrorists say they struck our Embassy because we support Israel. Would Mondale urge us to stop that?
- 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.

10/10/84

DEFENSE SPENDING

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.

10/10/84

DEFENSE SPENDING

Key Points for RR to Make

- o First priority of federal government is to protect its people -- to deter attack. We are doing that. Not one square inch of territory in last 4 years. Morale high.
- 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) 6.8% in FY 1985 is less than in John F. Kennedy's Presidency (9.5%), a quarter of a century ago.
- o Since 1980 virtually every major system, tank, ship and aircraft has been produced ahead of schedule and under cost.
- o For 12 years in Senate Mondale voted to reduce defense spending, not to increase it.

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 Air Force Staff Sergeant Charles J. Kessler 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 Kessler got a \$1100 cash reward. We want more whistle blowers like him.

10/10/84

GRENADA

Possible Mondale Attack Lines and/or Rebuttals

- o I don't fault the President if he knew that American lives were at risk. But the way Grenada was handled suggests a pattern that we've also seen in the Middle East: Go for a military solution, not a diplomatic one; and don't tell the public the truth.
 - We had no way of evaluating the situation because of the total blackout of information.

RR Talking Points

- o Democrats (including WM) compared our rescue mission in Grenada to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Let me remind them of a few important differences:
 - U.S. intervened in Grenada to rescue threatened American citizens, at request of the governor-general and Grenada's neighbors. Soviets invaded Afghanistan in a war of conquest, after having the country's leader murdered in a coup d'etat.
 - U.S. delivered the Grenadian people from a Marxist reign of terror, and our servicemen were greeted as liberators. Soviets have terrorized the Afghan people, and driven millions out of the country as refugees.
 - U.S. has withdrawn from Grenada, having restored a legitimate government which is preparing for democratic elections. Soviets have over 100,000 men waging war in Afghanistan -- five years after the invasion.
- o Rescue mission in Grenada spared us another hostage drama.
- o Did more to advance human rights in a week than Carter-Mondale did in four years.
- o After vacillating, WM finally said he'd have used American power in Grenada. But party platform disagrees.
 - Ms. Ferraro said she "would not have jumped into that situation militarily."
- o WM and Ferraro and the San Francisco Convention Democrats were still trying to decide what to do when the medical students were in the Rose Garden of the White House hugging the young military heroes who had rescued them.

10/10/84

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.

10/10/84

WHAT IT WOULD BE LIKE UNDER MONDALE

Key Points for RR to Make

- o We must look at the Carter-Mondale record and project it into the future. Ask yourself if you want:
 - Unilateral disarmament -- cancelling B-1 and other things without getting anything in return from the Soviets.
 - Another Soviet rampage a la Iran, Afghanistan, Cambodia, Nicaragua, Ethiopia, S. Yemen.
 - More negotiations with the PLO by his UN Ambassador; more bug-outs on key friends like the Shah.
 - Elimination of our intelligence assets -- Mondale was a member of the Church Committee that decimated our intelligence community.
 - A return to the "hollow army" with low pay, low morale, low education and low readiness.
 - The U.S. saying "no" to helpless Americans and desperate friends such as those in Grenada.
 - Letting Central America go down the drain, with all the refugees and violence that implies.
 - Allowing our alliances to decline once more.
 - Inviting the Soviets to engage in more Afghanistans.
 - Permitting the Soviet arms buildup go unchecked.
- o That isn't what Americans want. But that's what the record says the future would be like under Walter Mondale.

IV. SOFTBALLS

THE OLD WALTER MONDALE VS. THE NEW WALTER MONDALE

BETTER OFF NOW THAN FOUR YEARS AGO?

FOREIGN POLICY GOALS FOR THE FUTURE?

THE OLD WALTER MONDALE vs THE NEW WALTER MONDALE

- o The old Walter Mondale supported the deployment of the MX.
The new Walter Mondale would halt production of the MX.
- o The old Walter Mondale supported the development of the B-1 bomber.
The new Walter Mondale would scrap the B-1.
- o The old Walter Mondale had one of the lowest defense ratings in the Senate.
The new Walter Mondale says he is for a strong defense.
- o The old Walter Mondale said Cuban troops in Nicaragua were no big deal.
The new Walter Mondale would quarantine Nicaragua if Cuba or the Soviet Union established military bases there.
- o The old Walter Mondale was flabbergasted and baffled by the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.
The new Walter Mondale says he is on to our enemies.
- o The old Walter Mondale said the "winds of democratic progress [were] stirring" when the Sandinistas seized power in Nicaragua.
The new Walter Mondale condemns the Sandinista regime.
- o The old Walter Mondale called peace through strength an illusion.
The new Walter Mondale says he will achieve peace from strength.
- o The old Walter Mondale voted to pull most U.S. troops out of NATO.
The new Walter Mondale says he would strengthen NATO conventional forces.
- o The old Walter Mondale said freeing Grenada eroded American moral authority.
The new Walter Mondale says he supports the Grenadan liberation.

10/10/84

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 or gas lines. 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.
 - Maintain strong alliances in Europe and Asia.
 - Join with other suppliers to prevent nuclear proliferation.
 - Seek breakthroughs in key areas: 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: NUCLEAR FREEZE

ARMS CONTROL: SALT II

ARMS CONTROL: "WALK IN THE WOODS"

DEFENSE SPENDING: NUCLEAR VS. CONVENTIONAL

DEFENSE SPENDING: READINESS

DEFENSE SPENDING: M-X MISSILE

DEFENSE SPENDING: B-1 BOMBER

STRONG DOLLAR

TRADE DEFICIT

DEBTOR NATION?

PROTECTIONISM

THIRD WORLD DEBT

AID TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

NICARAGUA: WORLD COURT

10/10/84

AFRICA

Possible 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

- 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.

10/10/84

ARMS CONTROL: NUCLEAR FREEZE

Possible Mondale Attack Lines/Rebuttal Points

- o I will negotiate a mutual, equitable, verifiable freeze on the testing, production and deployment of all nuclear weapons.

Key Points for RR to Make

- o On the surface, a nuclear freeze may be an appealing idea at first glance. However, a President has to look at the issue in all its complexity -- we cannot have arms control by bumper sticker. A freeze would:
 - Lock the U.S. into a strategic disadvantage.
 - Be largely unverifiable.
 - Remove any incentive for Soviets to negotiate.
(Why should they when they enjoy a 10-1 advantage in INF, for example?)
 - Exempt Soviet defensive systems.
 - Undercut NATO. We'd be freezing them into insecurity.
- o We can do better than a freeze -- can go for reductions.

RR Rebuttal Points

- o Freeze fails to take account of the relatively greater age of our nuclear forces:
 - In ballistic missile submarines, 31 of our 35 were built before 1967, and will become obsolete in the 1990's. By contrast, the Soviets have deployed more than 60 new such submarines in the same period. A freeze would virtually eliminate the sea-based element of the U.S. deterrent, leaving intact the more modern Soviet submarine force.
 - As to our bomber force, we have just started to build the B-1, which is needed to replace our B-52's, which date from the 1950's. The freeze would eliminate the bomber element of our deterrent, and the Soviets would still have about 200 modern Backfire bombers capable of striking our country, with their new Blackjack bomber coming along.

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 It legitimized building more weapons. Soviets have added 3800 warheads since it was signed.
- o Carter withdrew it from Senate consideration.
- 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 Some of its rules (e.g., once a missile is tested as a MIRV all of that class must be counted as a MIRV) are good, so we should keep them. But legitimizing growth is bad. We must reduce.
- 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. (Testing two new missiles; only one authorized by SALT II.)
- 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.

10/10/84

DEFENSE SPENDING: NUCLEAR VS. CONVENTIONAL

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.

10/10/84

DEFENSE SPENDING: 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.

10/10/84

DEFENSE SPENDING - 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 reductions in Soviet nuclear forces. They'd have no incentive.

10/10/84

DEFENSE SPENDING - 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.

10/11/84

STRONG DOLLARPossible Mondale Attack Lines and/or Rebuttals

- o The dollar has gone from record lows to record highs. Everyone agrees on the desirability of less volatility of international currencies.
- o Your party's platform suggests that a return to the gold standard may be useful. Do you agree?
- o What are you going to do to create a more orderly and stable international monetary system?

RR Talking Points

- o Clearly an orderly and stable international monetary system is in everyone's interest.
- o Surge in the value of the dollar reflects the United States' economy itself becoming more prosperous with the outlook for sustainable growth, with low inflation, better than it's been in years.
- o Other economies have failed to match our improvements in growth, employment and inflation.
- o Stable monetary system which we all desire can only be achieved as our major trading partners get their own economic houses in order and thereby increase the relative attractiveness of their economies and currencies as investment opportunities.

10/10/84

TRADE DEFICIT

Possible Mondale Attack Lines and/or Rebuttals

- o The trade deficit is a looming disaster for the economy.
- o Huge RR budget deficits have pushed up real interest rates, attracting foreign funds and driving up the value of the dollar.
- o This has devastated American businesses that export or compete with imports at home. One in six manufacturing jobs now depends on exports, and they are in jeopardy because of the trade deficit.

RR Talking Points

- o Increasing value of the dollar reflects far more than interest rates. In fact, interest rates have fallen by some 50 percent since RR took office, yet the dollar continues to rise.
- o Rest of the world recognizes that America is once again truly the land of opportunity. We slashed inflation, cut our taxes, deregulated some of our industries and will do more. We brought back something that few in the world have seen in many years -- sustainable growth without inflation.
- o Far cry from four years ago -- when we exported stagflation and people shunned our dollar.
- o Trade deficit, while a serious concern, has to be put in perspective. U.S. exports in 1984 are expected to be higher than 1983, which in turn were higher than 1982. A recent study by the New York Stock Exchange concluded that U.S. industry is just as competitive now as it was ten years ago.
- o What has happened is that there has been a big increase in imports. This has occurred for several reasons:
 - Our economy recovered earlier and more strongly than the economies of our trading partners, and our demand for their goods increased. We have acted as a catalyst for their recovery.
 - Developing countries, burdened by heavy debt, have increased their exports to us in order to pay off their creditors.
- o It's fortunate for both the industrial countries and the developing world that we have kept our markets open for their goods. It's been good for our consumers too -- keeping our prices down!
- o As our trading partners continue their economic recovery, they will be in a position to buy more of our goods, and exports should increase more rapidly.

10/11/84

PROTECTIONISM

Possible Mondale Attack Lines and/or Rebuttals

- o RR constantly espouses the principles of free trade. Yet under his Administration, textiles, steel, agricultural products and other sectors have received protection.
- o Our trading partners view us as an increasing bastion of protectionism -- and somehow we still manage to lose jobs overseas.

RR Talking Points

- o This Administration not only espouses, it practices free trade.
 - Even in this election year, all five industries which have sought protection from trade from all sources (fair and unfair) have been turned down.
 - Compare our record on free trade with that of any of our major trading partners.
 - Have called on other participants in the international economic community to match our commitment by launching a new round of trade negotiations to reduce barriers.
- o Draw the line is unfair trade.
 - Where countries subsidize their industries or dump their products in the U.S., we have taken, and will continue to take, strong action to counter these practices.
 - This Administration has initiated a record number of investigations of foreign unfair trading practices and has been a leading force in international efforts to do away with subsidized export credits.
- o You can hardly call a nation with a \$100 billion-plus trade deficit protectionist, and our trading partners know and respect this.

10/11/84

AID TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Possible Mondale Attack Lines and/or Rebuttals

- o In the previous Administration, the U.S. contributed to international organizations.
- o Under RR, the amount has been sharply reduced.
- o Friends around the world accuse us of shirking our international responsibilities, especially to the less unfortunate countries. This will come back to haunt us.

RR Talking Points

- o Under this Administration the United States has continued to meet our international responsibilities to the less fortunate. We have continued our leadership role in all the major international organizations.
- o We have also demanded better accountability and more efficient allocation of taxpayers' money in these programs. Assistance abroad, as at home, should be focused on the less fortunate and those who are willing to help themselves.
- o Our assistance programs are not handout programs. Our own needs at home are too great to allow us squander American taxpayers' money abroad.
- o That doesn't mean we won't pay our fair share. It does mean that nations large and small around the world can no longer look to us to pay their share as well.

10/11/84

NICARAGUA: WORLD COURT

Possible Mondale Attack Lines and/or Rebuttals

- o The U.S. doesn't want the International Court of Justice to take up the case of mining of Nicaragua's harbors -- and refused in advance to accept the judgment of this respected world court.

RR Rebuttal

- o We agree with El Salvador's views:
 - Putting a small part of the complex political, social, economic and security situation in Central America before the court, out of context, will only disrupt the Contadora negotiating process.
 - This was a propaganda ploy by Nicaragua, pure and simple.
 - We believe the International Court lacks jurisdiction in this case. We've appeared before the court to make our legal case, as anyone would in a civil suit if they felt their case should be handled elsewhere.
- o El Salvador also says that it is a victim of a Nicaraguan armed attack and has sought U.S. assistance in accordance with its inherent right of individual and collective self-defense.
- o Splitting the problems of Central America into a series of controversies being decided in different arenas will inevitably make resolution of these problems more difficult.
- o We have placed great weight on a comprehensive solution of the problems of all the Central American countries through the Contadora process.

VI. PITFALLS

This subject will be discussed in the debate preparations sessions.

VII. RR WINNERS

A selection of suggested possible 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.

- Mr. Mondale: Eight years ago you were a major participant in the Carter Administration decision to withdraw all American ground forces from the Republic of Korea. I'm told you personally delivered the troop withdrawal decision to the Japanese government. Given that eight years have passed in which the United States has significantly aided the South Korean government in rebuilding its defenses and given the recent gestures of reconciliation from North Korea, do you believe that we should proceed again to withdraw our troops from Korea?

VIII. SAMPLE QUESTIONS

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

NOTE: By Wednesday, October 17, we will provide a selection of the major expected questions -- and suggested responses for each.

10/11/84

QUESTIONS

1. Arms Control: Leadership: Observers say we can't make progress on arms control until you master the process. Why haven't you done so, and cracked heads within the Administration?
2. Arms Control: Agreements: Arms control negotiations with the Soviet Union have collapsed, and relations between the two superpowers have been at their worse point since the height of the Cold War. How do you propose to achieve an arms control agreement in the next four years?
3. M-X - B-1: Two controversial elements of President Reagan's strategic modernization program are the M-X missile and the B-1 bomber. Do you believe these add to or detract from our security, and please explain why?
4. "Star Wars:" President Reagan's proposal for a defense shield to protect the U.S. against nuclear attack marks a revolution in U.S. defense policy, which for many years has been based on the mutual hostage relationship between the populations of the two superpowers. Do you believe this so-called Star Wars initiative adds to or detracts from U.S. security?
5. Sea Launched Cruise Missiles: Critics say President Reagan's decision to deploy nuclear cruise missiles aboard submarines constitutes an escalation of the arms race. Do you believe the deployment adds to or detracts from U.S. security?
6. SALT II: The SALT II treaty, negotiated by President Carter in 1979, remains unratified, though both superpowers have pledged to abide by its terms. The treaty expires next year. As President, would you continue to abide by its terms, provided the Soviets agree to do the same? If you would not, please explain why.
7. Soviet Treaty Violations: Last January, the Administration submitted a report to Congress charging serious Soviet violations of arms control agreements. Another report has just been submitted to Congress. Yet another is due in December. What is the nature of the problem, and what, as President, will you do about it?
8. Terrorism: We have suffered three deadly terrorist attacks in Lebanon during the past 18 months. As President, what will you do to guard against more such attacks, in Lebanon or elsewhere?
9. Use of Military Force: A major subject of debate concerns the circumstances under which we should use force abroad.

What is your view of the proper balance between diplomacy and force in American policy, and under what circumstances, if any, would you authorize the use of U.S. military forces in Central America?

10. Central America: How would you define U.S. interests in the troubled Central American region, and what policies would you follow during the next four years to advance those interests?
11. JCS Reorganization: Some have argued that our system of military command, particularly the Joint Chiefs of Staff system, ought to be overhauled. Does the system need to be changed, and, if so, how and why?
12. Nuclear Freeze: Explain your position on the nuclear freeze.
13. Nuclear Proliferation: The prospect of an atomic weapon in the hands of a terrorist group or a country like Libya is very troublesome. Pakistan's apparent development of an atomic weapon has been a sore point in relations with the U.S. What is your view of the proliferation problem, and what policies would you pursue against it?
14. Moratorium: The Soviet Union has proposed negotiations to ban anti-satellite weapons from outer space, and a moratorium on the further development of such weapons during the negotiations. Should we agree to the moratorium and to a full-fledged ban?
15. U.S.-Soviet Relations: The Soviet Union and the United States recently ended a week of intense diplomacy about critical issues. The only agreement seemed to be to keep talking, without saying how or when. What do you see as the prospect for improved U.S.-Soviet relations?
16. Election Year Policy?: Your Administration has a record for indulging in some of the strongest rhetoric in describing the Soviets. Now you talk about being ready for negotiations. Why should they -- or for that matter, the American people -- think this is not simply a part of election year politics?
17. Value of Arms Control?: Can you give us your personal view on the value of arms control, and tell what you think has been helpful, or harmful, about such agreements as SALT II and the nuclear threshold Test Ban Treaty?
18. Summit: Would you hold a summit conference with your Soviet counterpart? If so, what would you hope to achieve in such a meeting?
19. Nuclear Threat: In the last few years there has arisen greater public concern about the danger of nuclear war, and its threat to the future of life on earth. How great is the danger of nuclear war today and what would you do to reduce

the danger?

20. Foreign Policy Consensus: From the Second World War until the Vietnam War, America enjoyed the benefits of a broad, bipartisan consensus on foreign policy. What would you do to restore the old consensus, and what should be the principles of that consensus?
21. NATO/Japan Defense Burden: Do you believe our NATO allies and Japan shoulder a fair share of our common defense burden? If your answer is that our allies are not paying their fair share, what will you do to rectify the imbalance?
22. Better Off Than Four Years Ago?: Is America better off now than four years ago?
23. Leadership: Who can lead this country better and why?
24. Goals: What will you try to achieve in foreign policy the next four years?
25. Central America - Nicaragua: Should we stop covert activities that support the resistance forces? Negotiate a settlement? Wait for a seemingly endless Contadora process?
26. Grenada: Was this a correct use of U.S. military force?
27. 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?
28. Lebanon Retaliation: Intelligence has pinpointed the attackers of our embassy in Beirut. Why haven't you retaliated?
29. Democracy: We say we are for it, but what should we 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?
30. Southeast Asia: What are the prospects for resolution of Southeast Asia problems? The POW/MIA issue?
31. Africa: What are your plans for dealing with the situation in southern Africa and with the misery caused by drought and famine?
32. Defense: What level of spending should we incur, and what can we do about Pentagon mismanagement?
33. 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?

34. Space: What emphasis should be placed on space in the next four years?
35. International Economics: What should be done about international debt? How serious is this issue for Americans?
36. International Trade: What measures will you take to restore a balance in foreign trade? What are your views on the strong dollar and protectionism?
37. Attempted 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?
38. Intelligence: How good is ours? Was there a decline, and if so, are we restoring our capabilities?
39. Arms Control: Concessions?: Are you prepared to make a significant concession to the Soviets on arms control, such as agreeing to a moratorium in testing of anti-satellite weapons, in order to move the arms control process forward?
40. Arms Control: The President is reported to have had difficulty in getting his arms control advisors to agree on arms control. Is that because you can't master these complex matters? Or are you unwilling to get involved, make decisions, and tell people to get in line?
41. Beirut: Why did you take the Marines out of Lebanon before the embassy was safe?
42. Israel: Why haven't you taken a more decisive stand with Israel on West Bank settlements?
43. South Africa: We don't see that your fraternization with South Africa has moderated their apartheid policy. Wouldn't you have done better to have taken a hard line with South Africa?
44. Central America; Mining: The U.S. complained when Libya dropped mines in the Gulf. But we did that in Nicaragua. Isn't that the most infamous act of your Administration?
45. Bush View on Philippines: Your Vice President, George Bush, thinks that President Marcos is a great democrat. Do you endorse the Vice President's view?

IX. CLOSING STATEMENT

A suggested closing statement will be provided by October 17.