

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
(4 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

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name MCFARLANE, ROBERT C. (BUD): FILES

Withdrawer

SJW 12/1/2017

File Folder DEBATE MATERIALS OCTOBER 1984 (4)

FOIA

F03-007/02

Box Number 001

SKINNER

23

ID Doc Type	Document Description	No of Pages	Doc Date	Restrictions
214831 MEMO	MCFARLANE TO DARMAN RE DEBATE	1	10/13/1984	B1
214832 CABLE	130428Z OCT 84	2	10/13/1984	B1
<i>P</i>	<i>12/1/2017 NLR-362-1-23-9-4</i>			

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- B-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- B-2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- B-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- B-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- B-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- B-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- B-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- B-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

DFP:

10/11

Bud typed part of the following last night. Had me send to Deaver, Darman, Baker & Sims.

Not sure where you are keeping record of DEBATE material.

KMS

Also would you add to chron?

DJP -

10/11

*Attached pls handle carefully.
Both attachments are debate
material.*

2

*RCM has seen & directed
me to dispatch #1, not sure
what to do w/ #2.*

KMS

THEME I

KEEPING THE PEACE

Keeping the peace -- deterring aggression requires quiet steady strength and will.

4 Years ago we had no strength and no will.

- o Strategic systems were old and defense spending at the lowest point in 40 years.
- o Ships couldn't leave port and airplanes couldn't fly.
- o Service morale was low and readiness was poor.
- o Result was Soviet/Cuban expansionism into Ethiopia, South Yemen, Afghanistan and Nicaragua.
- o "Unacceptable" Soviet brigades became "acceptable."
- o We had no bargaining leverage for arms control.

But now:

- o We are deterring -- not one square inch of territory has been lost to Soviet aggression -- some (Grenada) has even been recovered.
- o Modernization is working.
- o Armed Forces now more ready than ever.
 - Better trained, equipped and educated than ever before
 - Reenlistments up
 - Morale sky-high
- o We have something to bargain with in arms control.

Mondale prefers weakness.

- o Cut the B-1 and the MX -- This would remove any incentive for Soviets to bargain. Any hope for arms reductions would be shattered. Why should they negotiate if we cut unilaterally?
- o Go back to underfunded conventional forces -- This would encourage renewed expansionism from the Persian Gulf to Central America.

Keeping the peace requires quiet steady strength and will, not weakness and vacillation.

THEME II

LEADING THE FREE WORLD TOWARD A BETTER FUTURE

The United States needs friends. But followers expect certain things of leaders.

- o Reliability -- will you be there if the crunch comes?
- o Solutions to problems.

4 years ago we saw:

- o Unreliability
 - Threats to pull troops out of Korea
 - On again--off again neutron bombs in Europe
 - Friends going under from Iran to Ethiopia
- o No solutions to big problems
 - Our own economy in a mess
 - Dragging others down with us
 - Soviets and Cubans running all over Africa and Central America
 - Oil disruptions lead to gas lines and inflation

But now:

- o Reliability is back -- when 6 East Caribbean countries called, we hauled
- o Our economy is lifting the world out of depression
- o Oil disruptions, gas lines and inflation prevented by preparedness
- o Suez mining resolved quickly and vital waterway kept open
- o Massive debt problems met with timely aid -- international banking system saved
- o Nuclear suppliers organized to check proliferation

- o Relations with Asian allies and PRC better than ever
- o Europe withstands severest Soviet intimidation in post-war history and comes out stronger.
- o Grenada is free and Americans rescued

The result is an entirely new climate of confidence and optimism:

- o South Korea feels confident enough to talk to North Korea
- o West Germany expanding ties to East Germany
- o Rumania comes to the Olympics
- o Western resolve leads to easing of pressure in Poland
- o Jordan recognizes Egypt
- o South Africa makes accommodation with Mozambique and moves toward compromise with Angola
- o El Salvador turns the tide against opposition and offers to negotiate

Do you want to go back to more Irans, Afghanistans and allied bickering or stick with steady, reliable, peaceful leadership?

THEME III

PREVENTING CRISES

An even greater test of leadership than coping with crises is preventing them from happening at all.

Have you ever stopped to wonder why you haven't had to wake up at 5:00am to go get in a line for gasoline? The war is even more intense between Iran and Iraq. Why has that not happened?

Why did it happen before?

- o Because the industrial nations didn't have any reserves to fall back on in an emergency.
- o That led them to rush to the spot market driving up prices
- o Lack of reserves led to shortages and long lines

How did we prevent this from happening again?

- o By building up our reserves--we have quadrupled them since 1980.
- o By making clear to Gulf states that we would not let matters get out of control and giving them the means to defend themselves against attack
- o That firmness gave Gulf states the courage to act and to prevent escalation.
- o Well in advance, we briefed our allies so as to calm fears and establish confidence that we could handle the problem.
- o The result is that you get an extra hour's sleep and don't worry about gas shortages.

And what about the sewing of mines in the Red Sea which could have closed one of the world's strategic trade arteries. Did it close? No. Why not.

- o Because the US Navy was on the scene immediately with our friends to clear the mines and establish calm in the international market.

To deal with crises you must think in advance about what might happen and be ready to deal with it. Because we have done that confidence in the United States has risen and our leadership is respected--and followed around the world.

Or, let's consider another kind of crisis which could have occurred. While non-violent, it would have been no less threatening to our national security. It concerns the international debt situation which could have led to the collapse of the international banking system. It didn't. Why? Let's review the history.

- o Two years ago Mexico notified us of the difficulty they would have in meeting payments on their foreign debt.

- o Together with Brazil, Argentina and Venezuela, the debt totaled over \$200 billion. If any one or more of these countries had defaulted, it could have had a very harmful effect on the international financial system, including a number of private US banks.

- o Of course, private deposits of Americans would have been guaranteed by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, but still there would have been substantial turmoil and loss within the banking community.

- o But today I can report that none of these countries has defaulted.

- o The reason is that when the problem arose, my Secretary of the Treasury went to work quietly with the leaders of the international financial institutions to solve the problem. And working quietly but heroically they solved the problem.

- o A separate but important outcome of this effort has been to strengthen our relations with each of these countries and to preserve democracy in them.

- o Quiet steady solutions to problems -- that's what Americans expect of their government. And that's what they are getting.

THEME IV

DEFENDING AND PROMOTING DEMOCRACY

20 years from now will there be fewer or more democracies? Will the United States be the last bastion, acting alone in a sea of totalitarian turmoil? 4 years ago, that's where we were heading with states going under from Ethiopia to Nicaragua. Nurturing of this big picture issue is an important part of being President.

What has happened in the last 4 years?

- o Democracy has had a renaissance.
- o Consider this hemisphere--elections have been held in Argentina, El Salvador, Honduras, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Panama and soon they will be held in Grenada.
- o Dictators are being replaced by popular leaders.
- o The United States has assisted this process and supported the fledgling democracies with aid and security assistance.

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

- o In El Salvador we are helping to restore the economic foundation which must be the engine which overcomes unemployment and hunger--the breeding ground of foreign subversion. It is working President Duarte has turned the tide and is trying to bring the rebels into the democratic process.
- o In Nicaragua we are resisting the betrayal of a revolution which is trying to crush its opposition.
- o In Grenada we stepped in to save American students to to save democracy (The opponent took over a year to decide whether or not that was the right thing to do. That would have been too late.)
- o Whether it is the Sandinistas, the PLO, Cuba or the Soviet Union our friends and allies need our help if they are to withstand pressure and subversion. It has been my policy to give them that help.
- o We all support Democracy. But at the moment of truth, Mr Mondale hasn't been so sure. That's not leadership; that's weakness and vacillation.

THEME V

MIDDLE EAST POLICY/BEIRUT/TERRORISM

The opponents have charged that my Middle East policy has been wrong and, in particular, that we ought to have been able to prevent last month's bombing. What is the truth?

First, why did we send Marines to Lebanon? Two reasons -- to prevent another war between Israel and Lebanon, and to try to relieve the root cause of attacks against Israel from Lebanon -- the presence of the PLO. Both objectives were accomplished.

o 15,000 PLOs were removed from Lebanon as a result of Phil Habib's skillful diplomacy. That has fundamentally improved Israel's security.

o But when the decision became whether or not we were willing to go to war with Syria to force them from Lebanon, my decision was no. What about the larger issue of terrorism? Several facts are important.

- Terrorism is not unique to Lebanon -- it is a global problem.

- In the last 30 days, there have been 37 terrorist attacks by 13 groups against 20 different countries.

- Thus, to stop terrorism we must gain the agreement of all countries that all are threatened and that all must agree not to harbor them and work together to identify, track and apprehend them.

o This is how we dealt with the skyjacking problem in the 60's. Only when all of us agreed not to harbor skyjackers did we curtail it.

o That's why I have sought, and gained the agreement of all our major allies last June, to start working together better and to share our intelligence so as to begin to deal effectively with this problem.

o That's why I submitted a package of legislation to the Congress earlier this year, including the ability to offer rewards for information leading to the arrest of terrorist and sever other measures.

o I have also sought additional funds to better protect our diplomats overseas.

o We can lick this menace if we work together with our friends and don't back away or adopt a bunker mentality as some would have us do. Our diplomats don't feel that way and neither do I.

DID MARINES "DIE IN SHAME"?

Bud -
given to
Dorman
Bob

//

RCM HAS SEEN

Possible Mondale Attack Lines/Rebuttal Points

- o VP said in his debate that WM and Ferraro said Marines at Beirut died in shame. WM asked for an apology. Didn't get one. Demand one from RR.
- o Only shame was that RR left them unprotected.

RR Rebuttal Points

- o Will let WM speak for himself on that. He's taken so many different positions on Lebanon it's hard to keep track.
- o Making a political issue out of the loss of these brave young Americans is in and of itself shameful. They did not die in vain. They gave Lebanon everything they had.
- o As to WM on Lebanon:
 - first he supported the peacekeeping force:

"I think the President did the right thing." (September 1982)
 - then he began to waffle:

"The time has come for us to review the status of our troops here..." (August 1983)
 - then he criticized RR:

"We have to resolve them (questions on Lebanon) in a way in which both the President and the Congress can agree." (September 1983)
 - then he said we should stand up to Syria:

"The Administration should state clearly that the United States will not accept Lebanon under the control of the Syrians or their radical allies." (late September 1983)
 - then, after the tragedy and as polls began to change, he called for an arbitrary withdrawal deadline:

"as soon as possible..." (October 1983)
 - finally, he called for immediate removal:

"he has called for the withdrawal...immediately" (Wall Street Journal, January 1984)

The next debate:

Foreign policy is Reagan turf

As Walter Mondale well knows, not only his best but his last chance to overtake Ronald Reagan in their race for the White House comes a week from Sunday (Oct. 21), when they meet for a final televised "debate" in Kansas City.

To overcome the president's huge lead, Mr. Mondale needs a knockout. He didn't get one in last Sunday's "debate" on the social issues — although he did win on points — and he is unlikely to do so in their final encounter.

Last night's confrontation between the vice presidential hopefuls, Geraldine Ferraro and George Bush, was entertaining but largely devoid of substance: nobody votes for a presidential candidate — or votes for his opponent — because of how he feels about the candidate's running mate.

Mr. Mondale was virtually guaranteed he'd go up in the polls after his first "debate" with Mr. Reagan, if only because it was almost impossible for him to drop any lower without falling off the chart. Simply by walking onto the stage in Louisville, the Minnesotan proved he was alive, well, and running for the

Smith Hempstone is editor-in-chief of The Washington Times.

presidency, which many Americans — given his previous performance — might be forgiven for doubting.

But beyond that, the former vice president did well. He was gracious to Mr. Reagan (which was smart of him, since most Americans like Mr. Reagan and respect the office of the presidency), he knew his stuff and, compared to the president, he was reasonably decisive.

Mr. Reagan, sitting on a huge lead, did exactly what many a football team does to its ultimate regret

when it gets far ahead: he became overly cautious, which made him appear unsure of himself and

almost befuddled. As a consequence, he lost the first "debate" to Mr. Mondale, whose suit, after all, was just as blue as his.

In the Kansas City foreign policy debate, Mr. Reagan has two advantages over Mr. Mondale: the Reagan-Bush administration's record compares favorably to that of the Carter-Mondale administration, and the president has an insider's knowledge of what has really taken place these past four years.

There will be those in the president's entourage who, knowing Mr. Reagan can lose only if he is knocked out, will counsel him once again to play it cautiously, to accept another defeat on points rather than risk a free-for-all.

The president would be well advised to reject such advice. With

the exception of the Beirut embassy bombings — for which he ought to accept full responsibility — the administration has a good record in foreign policy and the president ought to defend it vigorously.

If there is no peace in the Middle East, neither is there war. Nowhere in the world are American troops engaged in combat. The president has vigorously defended American interests in Central America. He has talked to the representatives of the Soviet Union but conceded nothing to them. Morale in the services is as high as it has been in recent years, and patriotism is back in vogue with the American people.

A strong, rearmed America is trusted once again by its friends and respected by its foes. The mar-

12 OCT 1984 Wash Times

velous gang who gave us the Iranian hostage crisis can offer nothing to match that.

The problem, of course, is that the presidential debates stress form over content. What is important is not the substance of what is said but how the candidate looks and sounds when he is saying it. In this theater of the absurd, in which a Barbara Walters feels free alternately to chide or praise the candidates for the highest office in the land, demeanor is all.

Mr. Reagan should not, of course, fall into the trap of attacking Mr. Mondale personally: Americans sympathize too much with an underdog for that to be anything but a disaster. What he has to do and do vigorously is show that in foreign policy — as in domestic affairs —

Mr. Mondale is peddling secondhand goods that are both shabby and out of date.

Democratic foreign policy since the collapse of the Jackson (Henry, not Jesse) wing of the party has been one of appeasement. Mr. Reagan's policy — which Mr. Mondale will try to portray as dangerously confrontational — has been one of peace through strength.

There is a difference between the two, and the American people have indicated they are capable of understanding that difference. All that is required of the president in Kansas City is that he articulate that difference with vigor and confidence.

If indeed he is the Great Communicator, a week from Sunday will be the time to show it.

*Bud McFarlane
good reading.
from Sims*

Bud:

10/12

How should we handle debate matters?

Should this be forwarded to:

Sims

Fortier

OTHER

Dick Darman

Dona

NEWT GINGRICH
SIXTH DISTRICT, GEORGIA

COMMITTEES:
PUBLIC WORKS AND
TRANSPORTATION
HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

WASHINGTON OFFICE:
1005 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BLDG.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515
(202) 225-4501



Congress of the United States

House of Representatives
October 10, 1984

SUITE 5, PHOENIX CENTER
1657 PHOENIX BOULEVARD
COLLEGE PARK, GEORGIA 30349
(404) 221-3854

POST OFFICE BOX 848
GRIFFIN FEDERAL BUILDING
GRIFFIN, GEORGIA 30224
(404) 228-0389

CARROLL COUNTY COURTHOUSE
CARROLLTON, GEORGIA 30117
(404) 834-6398

COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING
22 EAST BROAD STREET
NEWNAN, GEORGIA 30263
(404) 253-8355

Honorable Bud McFarlane
National Security Council
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Bud:

Attached is the core statement of the choice facing
Americans in November 1984 as seen by Republicans. I think
you will find it useful.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Newt', written over a horizontal line.

Newt Gingrich

NG/pg
Enclosure

How GOP Members Can Help With the 1984 Strategy

Attached are two papers that outline the House GOP strategy for the closing days of the campaign.

You can help implement this strategy by:

1. Using the 3 key terms:
 - a. \$157/month Democratic tax increase;
 - b. There are 2 teams: the Democratic tax increase team and the GOP take-home pay team;
 - c. We are now the Grassroots Opportunity Party.
2. Holding a press conference back home to show the 5-minute film and explain the campaign strategy to your news media;
3. Briefing the major editorial boards in your district on the 5-minute film and strategy (a background book of data will be available as a handout to the editorial boards);
4. Design and run commercials for your own campaign that stress this theme;
5. Use this strategy and these ideas in as many speeches as possible.

For further information,

Contact: Janis Kerrigan-Roberts in
Newt Gingrich's office, x54501

The \$157 a Month Election: Party Politics and the Reagan-Mondale Teams in the 1984 election.

The 1984 election offers the American people an unusually clear choice between two teams and two visions of the American future.

The Democratic Presidential candidate, platform, House Speaker, and the vast majority of elected Democrats in Washington are committed to solving America's problems through higher taxes.

The Republican Presidential candidate, platform, House leadership, and the vast majority of elected Republicans are committed to solving America's problems through a new ideas, grassroots, effective compassion approach.

The Democrats support the failed ideas of the past. They and their welfare state, bureaucratic, Washington-oriented allies need \$157 a month from your family to prop up their inefficient, wasteful programs. They know you won't give them money to subsidize their failures. That is why they try to make you feel bad about your country and yourself

so that out of guilt you will give them your money. In fact their Presidential candidate began his campaign with a promise to take \$157 from your family every month.

President Reagan and the Republicans know better. We know higher taxes kill jobs and increases government spending. We know that less people working and more government spending will not reduce the deficit. We know that higher taxes produces more inflation as everybody raises the cost of living. We know the key to solving the deficits is to create jobs and prosperity, not more taxes for the federal government.

Republicans are committed to making Mondale's Washington Democratic allies live frugally. Mondale and the Democrats are committed to making you and your family live frugally.

We are building a new GOP. A Grassroots Opportunity Party that seeks effective compassion through new ideas, new opportunities, new solutions. We believe that if you have that extra \$157 in your family's take home pay then you can decide to save or invest, you can decide to buy a new home or a new car or go on a vacation, you can decide to give to your church or synagogue, you can decide to spend on your favorite charities or philanthropies, you can decide to spend through your city, county or state government. But you only have these choices if you have the take home pay.

In Washington our two teams are clear. The Democrats' tax increase team is led by Walter Mondale. The Democrats' tax increase team will elect a pro-tax increase Speaker of the House. The Democrats' tax increase team will put tax increasers in charge of the tax raising committee, the Budget Committee, the Rules committee and the calendar of House legislation. The Democrats' allies in Washington are committed to higher taxes to pay for the programs that only they benefit from.

Democratic incumbent members belong to the tax increase team because they vote for all the leaders who favor more taxes.

The Democratic incumbent is by definition a member of the \$157 a month tax increase team that will enrich Walter Mondale's allies and make your family poorer.

Our Republican challenger is by definition a member of the pro-jobs and growth, pro-take home pay, pro-new ideas effective grassroots compassion team led by President Reagan that will fight to help you keep the \$157 a month for your family.

When you vote, you must choose. You can vote for the team that kicked off its campaign with a pledge to take \$157 a month from your family. If you vote Democratic you may pay an extra \$157 every month for your mistake.

17

Or you can vote for the new Grassroots Opportunity Team that wants to work with you to help solve problems while keeping the \$157 a month in your family budget. Come join our team. Together we will continue to go forward with the necessary changes which President Reagan and the Republicans have been developing. Together we will build a better future.

20

The Coattails Package: Building a link between President Reagan and the Republican candidates on our side and between Walter Mondale and the Democrats on their side.

Since World War II Republican Presidential candidates have done very well at winning landslide re-elections to the White House but they have had very short coattails. Eisenhower actually lost two Republican seats in 1956 and Nixon only carried 12 House GOP candidates into office in 1972.

Democratic Presidential re-election candidates have done far better at helping their candidates. Truman drew in 75 House Democrats in 1948 (or they helped him) while Johnson carried 36 members into the House.

The challenge to Republicans in 1984 is to build a coattail package which ties Democrats to the Mondale anchor and Republicans to the Reagan landslide. If this package works the Republican challengers will tend to have smooth sailing as part of a national tide and the Democratic candidates including incumbents will tend to sink as a result of their party's national anchor.

The attached package includes a theme to build the final choice around a \$157 a month difference in family budgets between the Democratic tax increases and the Republican fight for take-home pay. The package also includes a set of delivery systems including national advertising and a basic research book that outlines the two-team nature of congressional politics and firmly ties the Democrats to tax increase policies and to their national ticket.

A coordinated effort to get our major spokesman, our major advertising, and our final push across the country to explain and emphasize this two team, \$157 a month choice will maximize our possibilities of electing Republicans to the House and Senate.

72
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

October 12, 1984

TO: JIM BAKER
MIKE DEEVER
DICK DARMAN
BOB SIMS

FROM: BUD MCFARLANE

FYI: Debate Material

THEME V

MIDDLE EAST POLICY/BEIRUT/TERRORISM

The opponents have charged that my Middle East policy has been wrong and, in particular, that we ought to have been able to prevent last month's bombing. What is the truth?

First, why did we send Marines to Lebanon? Two reasons -- to prevent another war between Israel and Lebanon, and to try to relieve the root cause of attacks against Israel from Lebanon -- the presence of the PLO. Both objectives were accomplished.

o 15,000 PLOs were removed from Lebanon as a result of Phil Habib's skillful diplomacy. That has fundamentally improved Israel's security.

o But when the decision became whether or not we were willing to go to war with Syria to force them from Lebanon, my decision was no. What about the larger issue of terrorism? Several facts are important.

- Terrorism is not unique to Lebanon -- it is a global problem.

- In the last 30 days, there have been 37 terrorist attacks by 13 groups against 20 different countries.

- Thus, to stop terrorism we must gain the agreement of all countries that all are threatened and that all must agree not to harbor them and work together to identify, track and apprehend them.

o This is how we dealt with the skyjacking problem in the 60's. Only when all of us agreed not to harbor skyjackers did we curtail it.

o That's why I have sought, and gained the agreement of all our major allies last June, to start working together better and to share our intelligence so as to begin to deal effectively with this problem.

o That's why I submitted a package of legislation to the Congress earlier this year, including the ability to offer rewards for information leading to the arrest of terrorist and sever other measures.

o I have also sought additional funds to better protect our diplomats overseas.

o We can lick this menace if we work together with our friends and don't back away or adopt a bunker mentality as some would have us do. Our diplomats don't feel that way and neither do I.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 12, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR EDWIN MEESE III
JAMES A. BAKER III
MICHAEL DEEVER
RICHARD DARMAN
ROBERT SIMS

FROM:

BUD MCFARLANE 

SUBJECT:

Page Two of THEME III -- Crisis Prevention

If you think it worthwhile, you might add the attached page 2 to the theme paper distributed earlier on Crisis Prevention. I drew from material provided by Leo Cherne to put this together.

cc: NSJMP

Or, let's consider another kind of crisis which could have occurred. While non-violent, it would have been no less threatening to our national security. It concerns the international debt situation which could have led to the collapse of the international banking system. It didn't. Why? Let's review the history.

- o Two years ago Mexico notified us of the difficulty they would have in meeting payments on their foreign debt.

- o Together with Brazil, Argentina and Venezuela, the debt totaled over \$200 billion. If any one or more of these countries had defaulted, it could have had a very harmful effect on the international financial system, including a number of private US banks.

- o Of course, private deposits of Americans would have been guaranteed by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, but still there would have been substantial turmoil and loss within the banking community.

- o But today I can report that none of these countries has defaulted.

- o The reason is that when the problem arose, my Secretary of the Treasury went to work quietly with the leaders of the international financial institutions to solve the problem. And working quietly but heroically they solved the problem.

- o A separate but important outcome of this effort has been to strengthen our relations with each of these countries and to preserve democracy in them.

- o Quiet steady solutions to problems -- that's what Americans expect of their government. And that's what they are getting.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

28

October 12, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR EDWIN MEESE III
JAMES A. BAKER III
MICHAEL DEEVER
RICHARD DARMAN
ROBERT SIMS

FROM:

BUD MCFARLANE *BM*

SUBJECT:

Page Two of THEME III -- Crisis Prevention

If you think it worthwhile, you might add the attached page 2 to the theme paper distributed earlier on Crisis Prevention. I drew from material provided by Leo Cherne to put this together.

✓ CC: NSJMP

JP
Attached is what KCM sent
out re Debate material -
Do you want this stuff or no?

Kms

10/12

Or, let's consider another kind of crisis which could have occurred. While non-violent, it would have been no less threatening to our national security. It concerns the international debt situation which could have led to the collapse of the international banking system. It didn't. Why? Let's review the history.

- o Two years ago Mexico notified us of the difficulty they would have in meeting payments on their foreign debt.

- o Together with Brazil, Argentina and Venezuela, the debt totaled over \$200 billion. If any one or more of these countries had defaulted, it could have had a very harmful effect on the international financial system, including a number of private US banks.

- o Of course, private deposits of Americans would have been guaranteed by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, but still there would have been substantial turmoil and loss within the banking community.

- o But today I can report that none of these countries has defaulted.

- o The reason is that when the problem arose, my Secretary of the Treasury went to work quietly with the leaders of the international financial institutions to solve the problem. And working quietly but heroically they solved the problem.

- o A separate but important outcome of this effort has been to strengthen our relations with each of these countries and to preserve democracy in them.

- o Quiet steady solutions to problems -- that's what Americans expect of their government. And that's what they are getting.

Imp 30
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

October 12, 1984

TO:

Ed Meese
JIM BAKER
MIKE DEEVER
DICK DARMAN
BOB SIMS

FROM: BUD MCFARLANE

FYI: Debate Material

THEME V

MIDDLE EAST POLICY/BEIRUT/TERRORISM

The opponents have charged that my Middle East policy has been wrong and, in particular, that we ought to have been able to prevent last month's bombing. What is the truth?

First, why did we send Marines to Lebanon? Two reasons -- to prevent another war between Israel and Lebanon, and to try to relieve the root cause of attacks against Israel from Lebanon -- the presence of the PLO. Both objectives were accomplished.

o 15,000 PLOs were removed from Lebanon as a result of Phil Habib's skillful diplomacy. That has fundamentally improved Israel's security.

o But when the decision became whether or not we were willing to go to war with Syria to force them from Lebanon, my decision was no. What about the larger issue of terrorism? Several facts are important.

- Terrorism is not unique to Lebanon -- it is a global problem.

- In the last 30 days, there have been 37 terrorist attacks by 13 groups against 20 different countries.

- Thus, to stop terrorism we must gain the agreement of all countries that all are threatened and that all must agree not to harbor them and work together to identify, track and apprehend them.

o This is how we dealt with the skyjacking problem in the 60's. Only when all of us agreed not to harbor skyjackers did we curtail it.

o That's why I have sought, and gained the agreement of all our major allies last June, to start working together better and to share our intelligence so as to begin to deal effectively with this problem.

o That's why I submitted a package of legislation to the Congress earlier this year, including the ability to offer rewards for information leading to the arrest of terrorist and sever~~o~~ther measures.

o I have also sought additional funds to better protect our diplomats overseas.

o We can lick this menace if we work together with our friends and don't back away or adopt a bunker mentality as some would have us do. Our diplomats don't feel that way and neither do I.

Basic Themes

The Tide of History Has Turned In America's Favor

-- We are leading the world in the most important development of our times, the revolution in high technology, and our friends and our foes know and acknowledge it.

-- Our relations with our main Allies, Japan, Great Britain, France, and West Germany are excellent. Because we and they stood firm against the peace movements and the nuclear freeze movement, our security and that of our Allies is now assured. We can and will now negotiate with the Soviets to try to reduce these and all other nuclear weapons, on the basis of verifiable parity.

Record of Peace and Prosperity to be Proud Of

-- Past 4 years have brought U.S. and key friends and allies renewed confidence, economic growth, and peace

-- Past 4 years have been at a time of major confrontations

-- Past 4 years have not been the occasion for setbacks; doubt the Soviets could say the same thing.

Optimism for the Future

-- The U.S. has made the necessary "investments" in rebuilding our economic, political and military strength from where it was in the late 1970's

-- the "returns" on these investments will increasingly come in over the next 4 years if we stay the course

-- future is bright for the democracies and free enterprise

U.S. Wants Improved ties with Moscow, but...

-- we are open to better relations with the USSR

-- similarly, we would like to see real progress on arms control and steps towards making this a safer world; as I have often said, a nuclear war can never be won and must never be fought

-- it is thus fitting that the proposals on the table in all the key negotiations are made in America

-- unfortunately, Soviets not yet willing to meet us, whether because of their leadership turmoil or out of the belief that we in the West will not be able to sustain our strength

-- we will not give up, and the Soviets will find us a ready and willing partner when they accept this reality.

Realism

-- we all want a better world, but unfortunately in this world wanting is rarely enough

-- we live in a dangerous world of terrorists, states with values and goals far from ours, and nuclear weapons

-- there are unlikely to be any swift or simple solutions to these troubles

-- but what we have to preserve is so valuable, and the stakes so high, that we must never stop trying to bridge our differences

-- success in this endeavor will require an America that is strong, patient, wise, and above all united.

3

Vienna Summit

o Dtg h

o Cuban Bole

etc will it make
similar / safe

In the Middle East

-- our support of Israel is greater, and Israeli-US relations are better than ever before. Our relations with the moderate Arab states are also good. I look forward to pursuing with Israel and with them the search for what we all want; peace and security in the Middle East.

Southern Africa

-- our policy of constructive engagement in Southern Africa has lowered Soviet and Cuban influence there and helps South Africa to move toward representation and non-whites. We are doing much, and will do more, to feed the millions of Africans threatened by starvation and malnutrition.

Central America

-- I enthusiastically applaud President Duarte's statesman-like initiative and dialogue with his guerrilla opponents in El Salvador, on his platform, and ours; ballots, not bullets. I want Nicaragua to return to what its rulers promised; freedom, democracy, and the end of foreign presence and end of its support of Cuban-sponsored guerrilla warfare. I welcome and support the Contadora initiative toward these goals.

Final Themes

-- America wants peace, freedom, and prosperity for itself and for the world. We menace no one and now no one can menace us. The America I want, and I know you want, is peaceful and strong, merciful to the hungry, proud of its history and its democracy, setting an example, not ruling an empire, and prayerfully humble before the Creator of all mankind.

THEME VI
US-SOVIET RELATIONS-----ARMS CONTROL

We seek a stable relations with the Soviet Union based on Reciprocity and Restraint. We can succeed if we proceed with steady, bipartisan support. But we must learn from history and understand what works and what does not. First let's deal with some popular myths:

- o Some say that just having meetings makes things better.
 - President Carter's meeting with Brezhnev in Vienna was followed by the invasion of Afghanistan, an unacceptable brigade in Cuba and aggression in El Salvador--that meeting did not make things better.
- o Any arms control agreement makes things better.
 - SALT II authorized more building on both sides--since it was signed, the Soviets have added over 3800 warheads --is that making things better?
 - The record of Soviet violations makes clear that trust is not enough.
- o The absence of agreements makes things worse--is that true?
 - Without any agreement, the US has reduced its nuclear arsenal by one third since 1967.
 - Our total megatonnage is less than half what it was under President Kennedy.
 - Since 1979 we have removed 1000 warheads from Europe--we are in the process of removing 1400 more. This came without any arms control agreement.
- o Unilateral disarmament will lead the Russians to do the same thing. Is that true?
 - Did President Carter's cancellation of the B-1 lead the Soviets to reduce anything--No, they kept right on building.
 - Mondale wants to cut the MX and B-1--here we go again. What are the lessons from all this?
- o Getting an agreement is not the issue--we could simply agree to the Soviet position as in SALT II. But both sides were allowed to keep building. The issue is getting a good agreement.
- o Getting a good agreement requires that you have something to bargain with. Cutting our own programs as Mondale wants, will remove any incentive for the Russians to come back to talks.
- o We must bargain seriously. I have spent the last year reviewing all our positions. We are ready now with flexible positions.

Mar, Oct. 13, 1984

30

THEME VI
US-SOVIET RELATIONS-----ARMS CONTROL

We seek a stable relations with the Soviet Union based on Reciprocity and Restraint. We can succeed if we proceed with steady, bipartisan support. But we must learn from history and understand what works and what does not. First let's deal with some popular myths:

- o Some say that just having meetings makes things better.
 - President Carter's meeting with Brezhnev in Vienna was followed by the invasion of Afghanistan, an unacceptable brigade in Cuba and aggression in El Salvador--that meeting did not make things better.
- o Any arms control agreement makes things better.
 - SALT II authorized more building on both sides--since it was signed, the Soviets have added over 3800 warheads--is that making things better?
 - The record of Soviet violations makes clear that trust is not enough.
- o The absence of agreements makes things worse--is that true?
 - Without any agreement, the US has reduced its nuclear arsenal by one third since 1967.
 - Our total megatonnage is less than half what it was under President Kennedy.
 - Since 1979 we have removed 1000 warheads from Europe--we are in the process of removing 1400 more. This came without any arms control agreement.
- o Unilateral disarmament will lead the Russians to do the same thing. Is that true?
 - Did President Carter's cancellation of the B-1 lead the Soviets to reduce anything--No, they kept right on building.
 - Mondale wants to cut the MX and B-1--here we go again. What are the lessons from all this?
- o Getting an agreement is not the issue--we could simply agree to the Soviet position as in SALT II. But both sides were allowed to keep building. The issue is getting a good agreement.
- o Getting a good agreement requires that you have something to bargain with. Cutting our own programs as Mondale wants, will remove any incentive for the Russians to come back to talks.
- o We must bargain seriously. I have spent the last year reviewing all our positions. We are ready now with flexible positions.

10/13

RCM:

Do you want this run on plain
paper or memo?

Also do you want a standard
memo format and today's date?

1. Yes____, memo is fine.
2. Run on plain paper-no date____.

*Send it
as is pls.*

Rosie

WITHDRAWAL SHEET

Ronald Reagan Library

Collection Name

McFARLANE, ROBERT C. (BUD): FILES

Withdrawer

SJW 12/1/2017

File Folder

DEBATE MATERIALS OCTOBER 1984 (4)

FOIA

F03-007/02

SKINNER

Box Number

001

23

<i>ID</i>	<i>Document Type</i> <i>Document Description</i>	<i>No of</i> <i>pages</i>	<i>Doc Date</i>	<i>Restric-</i> <i>tions</i>
214831	MEMO McFARLANE TO DARMAN RE DEBATE	1	10/13/1984	B1

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

B-1 National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]

B-2 Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]

B-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]

B-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]

B-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]

B-7 Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]

B-8 Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]

B-9 Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

NNNN/7CZCK0A6R9EHR512

ARTMENT OF STATE

OCT 84 05 58z

ZNY MMNSH
P 130428Z OCT 84 ZFF-1/4
FM AMEMBASSY BANGKOK
TO STATE/RCI
ZEN

ON-FILE NSC RELEASE
INSTRUCTIONS APPLY

25X1

39

SECRET-130428Z OCT 84 PRIVACY CHANNELS

FROM: AMEMBASSY BANGKOK JOHN GUNTHER DEAN - AMEMBASSY BANGKOK 7202

TO: DEPARTMENT OF STATE - EYES ONLY FOR DEPUTY SECRETARY
KENNETH V. DAN.

SUBJECT: MESSAGE FOR DEPUTY SECRETARY DAN

1. WHEN I LISTENED TO THE OCTOBER 7 PRESIDENTIAL DEBATE, I WAS STRUCK BY THE REPEATED EFFORTS OF MR. MONDALE TO BLAME THE CURRENT ADMINISTRATION FOR FAILURE TO COPE WITH TERRORIST ATTACKS AGAINST OUR ESTABLISHMENT AND PEOPLE IN LEBANON. AS YOU KNOW, I SERVED FOR NEARLY THREE YEARS AS AMBASSADOR TO LEBANON DURING THE CARTER-MONDALE ADMINISTRATION. I AM DISTURBED BY THE CRITICISM LEVIED AGAINST THE REAGAN ADMINISTRATION FOR HOW WE HAVE DEALT WITH TERRORISM IN LEBANON. THESE ATTACKS HAVE POLITICIZED AN ISSUE WHICH SHOULD BE APPROACHED IN A BIPARTISAN MANNER. THE LATEST INCIDENT IN BEIRUT IS UNFORTUNATELY LIKELY, THEREFORE, TO COME UP IN THE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES' FOREIGN POLICY DEBATE. I THINK IT MAY BE HELPFUL, IF THE PRESIDENT, IN RESPONDING, PLACED THE ISSUE OF TERRORISM IN LEBANON SINCE 1975 IN A MORE HISTORIC PERSPECTIVE. THIS ISSUE IS AFTER ALL NOT PECULIAR TO HIS ADMINISTRATION, BUT HAS PLAGUED DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS ALIKE FOR THE LAST NINE YEARS. IF YOU SEE MERIT IN THE ARGUMENTS BELOW, PERHAPS YOU CAN SHOW THIS CABLE TO SECRETARY SHULTZ WITH THE IDEA THAT SOME OF THESE THOUGHTS MIGHT BE INCORPORATED IN THE PRESIDENT'S PREPARATION FOR THE OCTOBER 21 DEBATE.

2.

- (1) TERRORISM AGAINST THE U. S. IN LEBANON (AND WORLDWIDE) IS NOT CONFINED TO THE CURRENT ADMINISTRATION. IN THE SPRING OF 1976 DURING THE FORD ADMINISTRATION THE AMERICAN AMBASSADOR AND ONE OF HIS TOP AIDES WERE ASSASSINATED IN BEIRUT.

State Dept. review completed

DECLASSIFIED

BY CRST
DATE 12/1/17

PAGE 2 BANGKOK 7202 S E C R E T

- (2) THE CARTER ADMINISTRATION COULD NOT HALT TERRORIST ATTACKS AGAINST THE AMERICAN AMBASSADOR TO LEBANON. UNDER PRESIDENT CARTER, THE AMERICAN AMBASSADOR WAS AMBUSHED TWICE. THE CAR HE WAS RIDING IN WAS HIT BY 21 BULLETS AND WAS THE TARGET OF A LIGHT ANTI-TANK WEAPON. THE CHANCERY RECEIVED ROCKET HITS THREE TIMES AND THE AMBASSADOR'S RESIDENCE RECEIVED MORTAR FIRE WHILE THE AMBASSADOR WAS IN THE RESIDENCE.

- (3) THE BREAKDOWN OF THE LEBANESE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT HAS MADE IT PRACTICALLY IMPOSSIBLE FOR IT TO DEAL WITH TERRORISM EVER SINCE 1975. ALTHOUGH WORSE THAN EVER, THIS IS NOT A NEW SITUATION. ACTS OF TERRORISM HAVE BEEN COMMITTED AGAINST AMERICANS IN LEBANON EVER SINCE 1975 AND WITHOUT A STABLE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT AND A MEASURE OF LAW AND ORDER, NO ADMINISTRATION IS ABLE TO COPE EFFECTIVELY WITH TERRORIST GROUPS.

- (4) THIS DOES NOT MEAN WE WILL NOT TRY TO CORRECT EVERY SHORTCOMING IN SECURITY WHICH HAS BEEN FOUND. WE WILL. BUT TERRORISM AGAINST AMERICANS IN LEBANON AND ELSEWHERE SHOULD NOT BE MADE A POLITICAL FOOTBALL. IT IS A TRAGIC REALITY OF MODERN INTERNATIONAL LIFE. EFFORTS TO FOIL TERRORISM AGAINST US DESERVE BIPARTISAN SUPPORT. THE EFFORTS WHICH WE HAVE BEEN MAKING TO MAKE OUR EMBASSIES IN BEIRUT AND AROUND THE WORLD MORE SECURE SHOULD RECEIVE WHOLEHEARTED ENDORSEMENT BY ALL AMERICANS--
~~REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS ALIKE.~~

- (5) REPRESENTING THE UNITED STATES ABROAD TODAY IN MANY PARTS OF THE WORLD IS A DIFFICULT AND OFTEN DANGEROUS JOB. MORE AMBASSADORS HAVE UNFORTUNATELY BEEN KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY SINCE THE END OF THE VIETNAM WAR THAN GENERALS OR ADMIRALS OF OUR ARMED FORCES. OVER THE LAST FEW YEARS OUR FOREIGN SERVICE PEOPLE SERVING ABROAD HAVE SUFFERED CASUALTIES OF THE KIND NORMALLY ONLY ASSOCIATED WITH OUR ARMED FORCES. OUR FOREIGN SERVICE IS "OUR FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE." OUR PEOPLE SERVING ABROAD ARE HIGHLY EXPOSED; THEY KNOW THE RISKS OF SERVICE OVERSEAS TODAY. THEIR PATRIOTISM AND DEDICATION TO PUBLIC SERVICE ARE THINGS OF WHICH WE CAN BE PROUD. WE WILL CONTINUE TO DO ALL WE CAN TO GIVE OUR PEOPLE SERVING ABROAD IN DANGEROUS PLACES ALL THE PROTECTION WE CAN. REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS ALIKE WILL WISH TO SUPPORT THESE EFFORTS.

S E C R E T

#7202

NNNN

41

Debate Questions

1. Mr President, you have often said that peace is best achieved through maintaining strength and firmness. You have also said that your opponent takes a fundamentally different approach based upon weakness and vacillation. Could you tell us more about why your approach is more likely to enhance peace than Mr Mondale's?

2. Mr President, you have said that an important part of keeping the peace is having good relations with allies. Mr Mondale would probably agree with that. What makes you think US relations with allies are so good now or that they would be any different under Mr Mondale. Didn't the Carter administration have pretty good relations with allies?

3. Mr President, you have made the promotion of democracy a major theme of your administration. Isn't that pretty much "motherhood?" Is there really any difference between you and what can you really do anyway toward such an intangible goal?

4. Mr President, there haven't been any Cuban missile crises in the last four years or any alerts of US and Soviet forces. To what do you ascribe this? Have you had a conscious policy and approach toward preventing crises?

5. Mr President, most of what you say deals with the past. Is it not fair to ask where you intend to lead us in the years ahead? What is your agenda? What are your priorities. Is the world going to be better off four years from now than it is today? What are you going to do about arms reduction, terrorism, non-proliferation, the Middle East and Central America?

6. Mr President, Mr Mondale points out that you are the first President in recent years who has not met with a Soviet leader and who does not have an arms control agreement. How do you answer that charge? Don't meetings make things better and aren't arms control agreement in everyone's interest?

7. Mr President, your opponent points out that you have a failed Middle East policy which has included the tragedy of the Beirut bombing? Do you have a Middle East policy. Didn't you fail in Lebanon? Do you have a counter terrorist policy? Is it going to happen again?

8. Mr President, what makes you think the Soviets will suddenly change their tune and be reasonable with you next year? What is the core of your policy toward the Soviet Union?

Rice's
Decon
file

10/15 44

Bud,

1
 Jane asked me
 to deliver attached
 to you - - for the
 debate.

Jackie

ТМР,

10/15 43

Per Jackie Gillman - PCM
is expecting the attached -

OK to DACOM? yes f
no

Also send copy to Don Fortin.

UNCLASSIFIED

CLASSIFICATION

CIRCLE ONE BELOW

IMMEDIATE

PRIORITY

ROUTINE

MODE

DACOM #

DEX #

TTY #

PAGES 6

RELEASER WHC

DTG 151628Z OCT 84

FROM/LOCATION/

1. THE SITUATION ROOM/RADM JOHN POINDEXTER

TO/LOCATION/TIME OF RECEIPT

1. ROBERT C. MCFARLANE/MACON, GA/TOR: 151639Z OCT 84

2. 8m

3.

4.

INFORMATION ADDRESSEES/LOCATION/TIME OF RECEIPT

1.

2.

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS/REMARKS:

CLASSIFICATION

66

PROPOSED CLOSING STATEMENT

There is only one reliable way by which the American people can judge the claims and counterclaims put forward in this debate and this campaign: it is to look at the record --- to look at how the Carter/Mondale Administration governed, look at the consequences of their policies, look at what they are promising us now.

Then look at our policies of the last four years and see what we accomplished.

The record shows that Carter/Mondale lived in the past, off old ideas that have failed every time they have been tried.

Trusting the power of government more than the creativity of free people, the Carter/Mondale Administration left our economy in shambles...with interest rates at 21%, unemployment at %, inflation at %, economic growth at a mere %. The American people remember how bad things were.

There is quite a contrast between our economic record and theirs.

In the last three and three quarters years our economy has made a strong recovery. Inflation and unemployment are down; productivity and economic growth are up. We once again have a strong economy on which to base a strong America.

In foreign affairs, Carter/Mondale policies reflected the same tendency to live in the past and distrust the American people.

Traumatized by their interpretation of the Vietnam war, the Carter/Mondale team imagined that American power was a threat to world peace. So they dissipated our strength in a policy of unilateral risk.

For the first time ever the Soviet Union achieved military advantages over the United States and the West in important areas.

-- They installed missiles that created new vulnerabilities in Europe and put new strains on the Alliance. They developed missiles that put our deterrent at risk.

-- During those years the Soviet Union expanded its influence in Africa, Asia, the Middle East and here in this hemisphere.

--They negotiated an arms control agreement so weak they decided not to submit it to a Senate controlled by their own Party.

They like to talk about their years as a period of relaxed tension. The fact is --- Carter/Mondale relaxed, but the Soviets didn't.

They didn't realize there was an arms race going on and that we were losing it, and losing our own security in the process.

During the Reagan Administration real progress has been made in rebuilding our defenses, halting the spread of Soviet power over other governments, preserving and extending freedom in the world.

With our NATO allies we have deployed Euromissiles and strengthened the Alliance.

We have cooperated with other nations -- in the Gulf region, in Central America, Grenada, Southeast Asia, Africa -- to help contain violence and maintain peace. Those cooperative efforts have strengthened regional cooperation and reinforced our ties with others.

Comparing the Carter/Mondale record with ours makes clear whose approach failed, and whose is succeeding. The whole world knows the difference.

But is it fair to fault Mr. Mondale with policies of an Administration in which he was only vice-president?

To find the answer to that question it is only necessary to look at Mr. Mondale's record in the Senate where again and again he voted against American strength. He voted

-- against the cruise missile, the B-1 Bomber, the Trident submarine and missile system, against salary increases for the military.

He voted

-- for cutting U.S. troops in Europe, cutting our military manpower and defense budgets, even in the face of a massive Soviet military buildup.

But hasn't Mr. Mondale learned since those days? Read his speeches, read his party platform. You will see that they are still at it -- still confused about the morality of liberating Grenada, still ready to give everyone but the United States the

benefit of the doubt; still advocating unilateral cuts in important weapons systems --- the B-1 bomber, the MX; still arguing for a freeze that Mr. Carter's own National Security Adviser described as "a hoax", "not achievable", ... "not verifiable". They are proposing once again to play Russian roulette with the security of our country and our civilization.

Apparently they still think that American weakness is the recipe for peace.

Apparently they still think that American weakness is the key to successful arms control negotiations.

Apparently they still think American weaknesses will make the world safer not more dangerous.

But they are wrong ... seriously wrong.

We cannot buy peace and security with weakness.

In the past three-and-a-quarter years my Administration has demonstrated the relations between strength and confidence and democracy and peace.

We have restored the American economy. We have begun to restore American military strength and the balance of power.

We have made America and our allies stronger and the world safer.

We have discouraged Soviet expansion by helping other countries help themselves. We have encouraged freedom. New democracies have emerged -- in El Salvador, Honduras, Grenada, Bolivia, and Argentina. We have maintained peace.

And we have begun a new dialogue with the Soviets.

We look forward now to that dialogue. We are ready to go back to the table to discuss arms control and other problems with the Soviet leaders -- with no preconditions and no unilateral concessions.

We can talk and negotiate in confidence because we can negotiate from strength.

We seek not just agreements but good agreements... agreements that will reduce the level of danger in the world, relieve the economic burdens of defense, and free resources for great constructive enterprises in science, medicine, economic development.

In a second Reagan Administration we will do everything possible and prudent to strengthen and extend peace, to preserve and expand freedom. We hope Mr. Mondale and his associates will join in the pursuit of these goals.

Lebanon: RESPONSE:

The bombing of our Marines, our Embassy, our diplomats was tragic and outrageous.

Terrorism is tragic and outrageous. Terrorism has claimed many victims in Lebanon. Terrorists murdered Lebanon's president, Bashir Gemayal. A year ago they carried out almost identical suicide bombings on U.S. Marine headquarters, and on a French barracks in Beirut, and only ten days later on Israeli military headquarters in Southern Lebanon. Similar attacks have been carried out throughout the Middle East, in London and elsewhere.

So far no one has been able to definitively prevent such attacks. The Israelis have had the most experience. They believe in swift, sure retaliation and in a very, very tight security.

No one, except for their own families, feels the death of the Marines and diplomats more deeply than I

I am ready to take any effective, legal action to counteract the terrorist menace.

To that end I formally invite Mr. Mondale and his party to join me in a bipartisan effort to devise a bipartisan policy to fight terrorism and protect Americans against violence.