

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
(6 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



Republican
National
Committee

MA

TO: MAUREEN REAGAN
THROUGH: WILLIAM I. GREENER, III
Director of Communications
FROM: MICHAEL J. BAYER *u*
DATE: October 16, 1984
SUBJECT: Second Presidential Debate

As you know, the RNC Opposition Research Group prepared materials for the first Reagan-Mondale debate and the Bush-Ferraro debate. Before each debate, we prepared detailed projections of the Democrats' likely debate strategies.

This memorandum reviews our earlier projections of Mondale's objectives in the first Presidential debate and analyzes his success or failure to achieve them. It then develops Mondale's strategic objectives for the final debate.

First Debate Objective (summarized from earlier memoranda)

Walter Mondale approached the first debate with little to lose. He was running far behind the President. His campaign was disorganized and lacked energy or enthusiasm. If he lost the first debate, the press would have pronounced him dead; the second debate would have become irrelevant; and Geraldine Ferraro might have used her debate to launch her campaign for the U.S. Senate in 1986.

In that debate, Mondale had to accomplish one or more of the following objectives:

1. Cause voters to rethink their opinions of Walter Mondale.

This objective forced Mondale to inoculate against his vulnerabilities (e.g. wimp, whiner, malaise, promises too much, Carter connection, taxes).

2. Encourage voters to rethink their support of the President.

This strategy required Mondale to hammer at the President's perceived "vulnerabilities" (e.g. deficits, fairness, Social Security, out of touch, religion in politics).

3. Cause a shift in voter support away from Reagan and toward Mondale.

This strategy required Mondale to draw the President away from his prepared remarks and become an "accomplice" in Mondale's debate plan. Within the rules, Mondale had to engage the President directly and put him on the defensive. The goal was a Presidential "misstatement" or brief confrontation which could play to Mondale's advantage in subsequent television news stories.

4. Achieve a significant breakthrough.

This strategy could not be achieved under the "parallel press conference" rules negotiated by the White House. To achieve some type of breakthrough, Mondale had to change the terms of the debate. He had to get the President and the moderator to acquiesce in, at least briefly, a new debate format which provided for direct questioning and confrontation between the two candidates. Only by being in charge of the entire situation could Mondale score a breakthrough.

The above objectives are ranked in ascending order of risk to Mondale and, if successful, payoff for Mondale. The first objective, which required inoculation against Mondale vulnerabilities, carried little risk and correspondingly little gain. While at the other extreme, and least likely, a failed attempt to break the rules and recharacterize the debate would have been the end of Mondale; conversely, a real breakthrough might have blown the race wide open. They are also ranked in descending order of Mondale control; objectives three and four required the President's cooperation ("Let Reagan beat Reagan") and forced Mondale to seize the opportunity in order to achieve success.

Mondale's Scorecard

Walter Mondale appears to have been successful in achieving some of these debate objectives.

Objective #1

Mondale successfully inoculated himself against many of his key vulnerabilities. He benefitted from low public expectations: Mondale caused a number of voters to reconsider their previous impressions of him. He generally refrained from whining. He used humor and attempted to be "a nice guy." And he generally ignored the Carter-Mondale record, speaking instead about the future.

Objective #2

Mondale successfully encouraged a few voters to rethink their opinions of Ronald Reagan (but not switch to Mondale). Mondale's success, however short-lived, came by emphasizing the deficit and Social Security. With the expression "it just ain't so," Mondale effectively challenged the President's truthfulness without appearing caustic or disrespectful.

Objective # 3

Mondale was able under the rules to engage the President directly at several points in the debate. When the President said, "There you go again," Mondale turned directly to him and posed a few questions before delivering his prepared come-back.

This brief confrontation was one of several planned by Mondale and, once used, provided fodder for evening news programs over the next 48 hours.

In addition, Mondale was able to draw the President away from his prepared answers and into discussions of Social Security and the Vice President's tax returns.

Objective #4

Mondale made no attempt to pursue this objective in the first debate.

Mondale's Objectives for the Second Debate

Mondale's first debate performance produced temporary gains in the polls and drew some voters out of the "undecided" column into his camp. Although the debate provided no breakthrough or sustained gains in voter opinion, Mondale laid a groundwork which may pay off in the final debate. This Democrat theme has surfaced in the press. Haynes Johnson assessed Mondale's opportunity this way:

"[It] doesn't mean Reagan is headed for defeat. It does mean doubts about his capacity, his knowledge, his ability to handle adversity, have fully surfaced among the public. They've been there all along, but for the most part have been suppressed."

--- Washington Post, 10/14/84

Thus Mondale may believe that a direct assault on the President, if appropriately set up, may entail less risk of backlash than at any time in the campaign.

Additionally, the rules have been increasingly ignored over the last two debates. The tight rules governing questions, for example, were slightly bent in the Reagan-Mondale debate and completely disregarded in the Bush-Ferraro debate.

Mondale enters the second debate about 15 points behind the President, nearly his margin prior to the first debate. However, Mondale's confidence has been buoyed by good crowds and favorable media coverage. He believes the momentum is his to develop.

Mondale realizes this is his last chance. A strong showing by the President would mark the end of the campaign. But if the President should falter and Mondale perform extremely well, the race might continue for the remaining two weeks.

The following strategies are open to Mondale in the second Presidential debate:

1. Inoculate against Mondale vulnerabilities.
2. Hammer at Reagan "vulnerabilities."
3. Engage the President directly, within the rules, and hope for a confrontation or the sustained impression that the President is on the defensive.
4. Break the rules and force the President into a one-on-one debate for a sustained confrontation that allows Mondale to interrupt, question, and attack the President in detail.

Each of these objectives is developed below.

1. Inoculate against Mondale vulnerabilities

Even though Mondale "negatives" will be reestablished by the President and the Vice President's attacks and Reagan-Bush paid media, Mondale appears largely to have achieved this objective in the first debate.

2. Hammer at Reagan "vulnerabilities"

Mondale is a normally cautious politician who may wish only to repeat his performance from the first Presidential debate. If he believes he opened wounds in the President during a debate

on the President's "strong suit" -- domestic and economic policy -- then he may expect sufficient rewards from a similar attack on Reagan "vulnerabilities" in defense and foreign policy.

Mondale may believe that the "Teflon Presidency" was eliminated during the first debate and that direct attacks this Sunday on the President will yield positive results. Mondale may also believe that his attacks on the President's record, when paired with Democrat surrogates' resurrection of the "age" issue, will add to his momentum.

3. Engage the President Directly

Mondale may believe that he benefitted by keeping the President on the defensive. Mondale may throw numerous barbs and hope that the President will take the bait and engage in lengthy rebuttals. He may also plan several five-minute "newsworthy" engagements with the President similar to the "there you go again" episode from the first debate or the Mondale-Hart confrontations from the New York and California primary debates.

Tactically, Mondale may use his one-minute follow-up or rebuttal opportunities to pose direct questions to the President. Mondale may also play on the President's integrity and loyalty by repeatedly misstating facts or criticizing the President's appointees.

During the first debate, Mondale found the President in full command of the facts. For the past week, the press has reported that the President will not emphasize facts and details in his preparation for the second debate. If Mondale plans to challenge the President's knowledge of the facts, the next debate would be the time to do it. Rapid-fire questioning between the candidates would play to Mondale's advantage if the President took the bait and didn't have the answers.

4. Break the Rules

It is possible that Mondale will try to break the rules. While this may be considered less likely than the other options, it is important that the President be prepared for any and all reasonable possibilities.

Mondale appears to have already laid the groundwork for this option. First, he now must realize that the negotiated debate format prevents a lasting breakthrough for him; prior to the first debate, Mondale advisors complained of a "non-debate" and stated that the only rules that applied were the rules of "fair play."

This highest-risk/highest-reward strategy has been fully charted on a separate document by posing each of the possible points of entry for Mondale, the range of reactions by the President and the moderator, and the likely counter-moves and strategies. Each event is then assessed as a success (in achieving a breakthrough) or failure.

This is a very high-risk strategy for Mondale. He may go into the debate believing that he has enough momentum behind him that he can get what he needs from the debate without breaking the rules. Still, Mondale has been capable of a gamble at critical periods of this campaign: the nomination of Geraldine Ferraro and the convention-night call for higher taxes, for example. The above mentioned document shows that this strategy does not require extensive preparation or a special focus on issues; it is a matter of understanding the options and, as in karate, using the opponent's force against him.

Conclusion

Most importantly, the President must be flexible so as to detect Mondale's strategies and respond effectively. The President should anticipate a Mondale attempt to stage a direct confrontation: Both Mondale's "there you go again" rebuttal and Ferraro's "patronizing" come-back were carefully planned. Finally, the President should be prepared for the lesser possibility of a Mondale breach of the rules.

The Opposition Research Group is preparing a series of responses to each Mondale debate strategy.



Republican
National
Committee

TO: MAUREEN REAGAN

THROUGH: WILLIAM I. GREENER, III
Director of Communications

FROM: MICHAEL J. BAYER *u*

DATE: October 17, 1984

SUBJECT: Responses to Mondale Debate Strategies

Our memorandum of October 16 projected Mondale's objectives for the final Presidential debate. The following strategies were developed:

1. Inoculate against Mondale vulnerabilities.
2. Hammer at Reagan "vulnerabilities."
3. Engage the President directly, within the rules, and hope for a confrontation or the sustained impression that the President is on the defensive.
4. Break the rules and force the President into a sustained one-on-one debate that allows Mondale to interrupt, question, and attack the President in detail.

This memorandum presents a series of options for the President in response to objectives 3 and 4.

Objective #3: Confrontation

We expect Walter Mondale to plan several confrontations with the President in order to appear combative -- and victorious -- in subsequent television news summaries. The "there you go again" episode was carefully rehearsed by Walter Mondale, as were Mondale-Hart confrontations in the New York and California primary debates.

Mondale may seize upon one of the President's thematic statements and respond with a harsh canned attack. We have projected Mondale's possible responses to recent statements by the President. For each Mondale reply, we have also suggested a range of responses the President may use in order to win the confrontation (attachment A).

In addition, we have reviewed our database of the past two months and developed a list of Mondale's one-liners with which he seems most comfortable and might use during the debate. For each Mondale line, we have prepared several responses which the President may use to his advantage (attachment B).

Objective #4: Breakthrough

Walter Mondale may attempt to breach the rules and engage the President in a sustained one-on-one confrontation. While this is a high risk strategy for Mondale -- and therefore one that is the least likely -- the President must be prepared for any and all circumstances.

We have developed Mondale's possible justification for interrupting the President; his likely technique for breaking the rules; and a series of techniques for the President to use in reasserting control of the debate (attachment C).

October 17, 1984

17
page 3

Reagan Initiatives

Finally, we have reviewed our 40-minute Mondale video analysis, the 1976 Dole-Mondale debate, and the first Reagan-Mondale debate to identify ways in which the President could unnerve his opponent. The product of this review is a series of techniques which would capitalize on certain Mondale characteristics (attachment D).

These materials were prepared by Susan Carleson, Susan Hopkins, Joseph Rodota, Candace Strother and Don Todd.

11

REAGAN ONE-LINERS

REAGAN:

- o "You ain't seen nothing yet."

POSSIBLE MONDALE RESPONSE:

- o You're right. We ain't seen nothing yet. In arms control, we ain't seen nothing at all (actual prepared response).
- o Maybe we've seen too much, Mr. Reagan. We've seen our Marines killed by terrorists in Lebanon. We've seen a growing American presence in Central America. How much more do you want us to see, Mr. President?

POSSIBLE REAGAN COUNTER-RESPONSE:

- o We have seen enough, Mr. Mondale. We have seen enough of you blaming America and apologizing for her greatness. We have seen enough of your program for a weakened America. We've seen enough of taxes -- and we've seen enough of your plan to raise them.

REAGAN:

- o "I think there's a new feeling of patriotism in our land."

POSSIBLE MONDALE RESPONSE:

- o The manufactured symbols of patriotism that you have used in your commercials is not what patriotism is all about. Sending young men out to die without protection is not patriotic.

POSSIBLE REAGAN COUNTER-RESPONSE:

- o There is a real feeling of patriotism, and you're trying to manufacture envy.
- o There is a real feeling of pride in this Nation again, and you're trying to to manufacture fear about the future.

REAGAN:

- o "When we came into office, some of our planes were older than the pilots who were flying them, and we had ships that couldn't go out to sea..."

POSSIBLE MONDALE RESPONSE:

- o And they still can't -- even after spending almost a trillion dollars on defense! Just how much better prepared are we? Not a bit. How much closer are we to getting an arms agreement with the Soviets? Not at all.

POSSIBLE REAGAN COUNTER-RESPONSE:

- o When has my opponent prepared us for anything but decline -- or even surrender?
- o Even the Carter-Mondale Administration couldn't prepare us for what we saw: The invasion of Afghanistan and the taking of hostages in Iran.
- o I, for one, am not prepared to let it happen again.

REAGAN:

- o "So much baffles him."

POSSIBLE MONDALE RESPONSE:

- o If you want to debate about who's confused and who's baffled, let's start now. At least I know that missiles once launched can't be recalled. At least I know that even your first Secretary of State, Alexander Haig said that "as far as leadership goes in this Administration, the White House is a 'ghost ship.'" What does baffle me is why this Administration opposes a mutual verifiable nuclear freeze with the Soviets.

POSSIBLE REAGAN COUNTER-RESPONSE:

- o The only thing that baffles me is how you can stand here and say you're for a strong defense -- when your entire public record tells the opposite story.

REAGAN:

- o "The United States had unilaterally disarmed in the face of a Soviet arms buildup before we took office."

POSSIBLE MONDALE RESPONSE:

- o I don't know how anybody who understands military spending can say that our last defense budget request of over \$200 billion was unilateral disarmament.
- o For more than a generation, you have been going around saying that everyone in power would weaken America. Everyone from John Kennedy on down the line has been characterized by you as being weak.
- o I guess your idea of strength is to station Marines in Beirut in a vulnerable spot against the advice of your own Joint Chiefs of Staff.

POSSIBLE REAGAN COUNTER-RESPONSE:

- o If you'll pardon the expression, Mr. Mondale, I find you a very disarming fellow. Your debate style, in fact, is very much like your defense strategy -- disarming.

- o Let's ask the American people what makes us strong:
 - Does it strengthen us to always blame America first for whatever's wrong in the world?
 - Does it strengthen us to always degrade American for supporting Democracy?
 - Does it strengthen us to pit group against group in our country, inspiring envy and division?
 - Does it strengthen us to give the Soviets everything they demand, before even sitting down with them?

REAGAN:

- o We see an America in which every day is the Fourth of July. But to Walter Mondale, every day is April 15.

MONDALE RESPONSE:

- o Mr. President, your friends get April 15 off, but many Americans have to work on July 4." (actual prepared response.)

POSSIBLE REAGAN COUNTER-RESPONSE:

- o It's funny that you should bring up "days off," because every American works more than four months just to keep the Government running. Under your plan, not only will they have to work a month longer, but they won't have any money left over for a vacation when they do get the time off.

Prepared by RNC Opposition Research: Susan Carleson, Susan Hopkins, Lindey Fitzgerald, Patrick McGurn, Joseph Rodota, Candace Strother, and Don Todd.

MONDALE "ONE LINER" ATTACK THEMES

"It Just Ain't So."

Mondale Line:

- o Mr. Reagan, you may think you can recall nuclear weapons after they've been fired, but it just ain't so.
- o You may think that submarines and bombers don't have nuclear weapons, but it just ain't so.
- o You may think that two-thirds of our defense budget goes for pay and pensions, but it just ain't so.
- o You may tell the American people you're ready to negotiate with the Soviets, but they know that just ain't so.
- o You may say the world hasn't become more dangerous in the last four years, but we know that ain't so, either.

Reagan Responses:

- o I know you think you've found a catchy phrase, Mr. Mondale. But let me tell you what "just ain't so:"
- You suggested that the Grenada rescue mission could be compared with the brutal Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Well, Mr. Mondale, that just ain't so.
- You say that we broke off arms talks with the Soviets -- but that just ain't so.
- You say you share no responsibility for Carter-Mondale Administration failures. But the American people know that just ain't so, either.

"New" vs. "Old" Reagan

Mondale Line:

- 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.
- o The new Reagan says there is no sane alternative to negotiations on arms control. The old Reagan called for a margin of nuclear superiority and for prevailing in a nuclear war.
- o For four years, Mr. Reagan, you talked like Curtis LeMay. Now, you're trying to talk like Walter Mondale. What are we to believe, Mr. President?
- o How can the American people tell which Reagan would be President if you're re-elected? Why this change now, 17 days before the election? Have you really been born again, Mr. Reagan? Have you been converted?

Reagan Responses:

- o Mr. Mondale, my record is clear. It is you who have some explaining to do. So, Mr. Mondale, tell the American people:
 - Which Mondale are we to believe? The new Mondale, who says he would have sent Marines into Grenada, or the old Mondale, who complained that that rescue mission "eroded our moral authority" to criticize the Soviet Union?
 - Which Mondale should we believe? The new Mondale, who talks about maintaining a strong military deterrent, or the old Mondale, who voted against every defense program he now says he supports?
 - Which Mondale should we believe? The new Mondale, who declared that we should not abandon our commitment to protect Europe, or the old Mondale, who voted three times to reduce our military personnel stationed in Europe?

- Which Mondale should we believe? The new Mondale, who's waving the flag and talking about patriotism, or the old Mondale, whose first instinct has been to blame America for the world's problems -- and who once said our nation's priorities are "obscene"?
- Which Mondale should we believe? The new Mondale, who's running commercials showing himself with F-14s and aircraft carriers, or the old Mondale, who voted against both of them?

Quoting John F. Kennedy

Mondale Line:

- o President Kennedy was right when he said: "We must never negotiate out of fear. But we must never fear to negotiate." For the sake of civilization, we must negotiate a mutual, verifiable nuclear freeze before these weapons destroy us all.

Reagan Responses:

- o When President Kennedy made that statement, he surely didn't think his words would be perverted to support a step championed by the Soviet Union and based entirely on fear.
- o And let me remind you: President Kennedy also said, "For only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed." (Inaugural Address, 1/20/61)
- o And: "Communist domination in this Hemisphere can never be negotiated." (State of the Union Address, 1/30/61).
- o Also: "On the one hand are those who urge upon us what I regard to be the pathway to surrender -- appeasing our enemies, compromising our commitments, purchasing peace at any price, disavowing our arms, our friends, our obligations. If their view had prevailed, the world of free choice would be smaller today." (Address at the University of Washington, 11/16/61).

- o I believe President Kennedy would be ashamed to see what has happened to his party's leadership.

Failure of Leadership

Mondale Line:

- o The terrorist bombings in Lebanon are just another example of your failure of leadership. Mr. Reagan, the world is not as simple and rosy as you seem to believe. There are real problems that must be confronted and can only be ignored at great risk.
- o When a President doesn't know what he must, he cannot command. When a President is not vigorously involved, things just don't happen.
- o A President must be in touch and in charge. A President must learn. He must listen. He must master. He must command. And he must lead. But that's not what we have today.
- o President Reagan would rather shoot first and ask questions later.

Reagan Response:

- o The American people aren't going to accept Mr. Mondale's judgement on leadership, because time and time again, he has shown us his kind of leadership:
 - He ducks first -- and points his finger later.
 - He hides under a rock first -- and holds a press conference later.
 - And he runs off at the mouth first -- and demands apologies later.
- o Ducks, rocks, and wisecracks don't add up to a hill of beans -- and they certainly don't add up to leadership

Tough Talk, But No Action

Mondale Line:

- o Mr. President, you are the one that called the Soviet Union an "evil empire," yet for all your tough talk, when you could do something, you didn't, did you?
- o For all your tough talk about Central America, there is more Soviet and Cuban involvement there than ever before.
- o Mr. President, when the hostages were released, you said that never again would terrorists be able to act against the United States without the assurance of swift and sure retaliation. But that really is not the case, is it? It wasn't the case in Lebanon, was it? It wasn't the case when the Korean Air Liner was shot down, was it?
- o Why did you accuse me of being a threat to our nation's security when it is your Administration that has been all talk and no action?

Reagan Responses:

- o Yes, Mr. Mondale, I do believe you represent a threat to our national security -- a very serious threat. You are "baffled" by the Soviets. You don't see the difference between the American rescue of Grenada and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Forgive me, but you're "all talk" -- and what you say is 'way off base.
- o In response to the Korean Air Liner, Mr. Mondale, yes, I could have gotten us into a war with the Soviets over that. Is that what you would have done? And yes, I could have punished American farmers and American athletes as your Administration did, but I don't think that's what Americans wanted. We responded, but we responded responsibly, and I don't think America believes I am too easy on the Soviets.
- o Perhaps, Mr. Mondale, you would also like to explain why the Carter-Mondale Administration's U.N. Ambassador was so accommodating to the P.L.O., an avowed terrorist organization.

No Foreign Policy Success

Mondale Line:

- o Mr. President, you go around talking about how we've gained our respect back, but you know as well as I that you can't count one single significant foreign policy success in your Administration.

Reagan Responses:

- o We've got the names of at least 1,000 American students and their families who would heartily disagree with you, Mr. Mondale.
- o The Soviet Union has not added one square inch to their empire during my Administration. You've already retreated from longstanding bipartisan commitments to Europe and Central America.
- o You point to SALT II as your administration's crowning achievement. But what was the result? President Carter may have come home with SALT II, but the Soviets came home with Afghanistan. There's an important difference, though. The Soviets are keeping Afghanistan.

"Every President Since Hoover"

Mondale Line:

- o Mr. President, you say you're for peace and I believe you, but you haven't negotiated with the Russians have you? You are the first president since Hoover to have failed to do this, aren't you?

Reagan Response:

- o No, and I haven't negotiated away any American canals either. Nor have I spent a year negotiating to get Americans held by terrorists out of Iran. As a matter of fact, when the Americans in Grenada were in danger,

we went in and got them out of that danger. This is the first Administration that has had three Soviet dictators to deal with in three years. This is the first Administration since Hoover that has not either witnessed an expansion of the Soviet orbit or been drawn into a shooting war with Soviet proxies.

"Not in Charge"

Mondale Line:

- o Mr. President, you had it in your power to order those barricades put up right away, didn't you, and what did you do when Americans were killed in Lebanon? Nothing! Now do you call that being in charge? Is that what you call standing tall?
- o When an American plane got into a dogfight over Lybian claimed waters, your people didn't even bother to wake you up did they? You weren't in charge then, were you? Who was in charge?

Reagan Response:

- o Mr. Mondale, while you were out giving speeches about American boys dying in humiliation, I was calling the parents of those boys. Now, if you want to call those parents and tell them their sons died for no purpose, we'll get a phone out here right now and you can start calling.
- o Knowing Mr. Mondale, with his reputation for taking naps at the White House, I am sure he wouldn't mean to criticize someone for catching a needed night's rest.
- o Those pilots had their orders, which they followed -- fire if fired upon. That hasn't always been the case has it, Mr. Mondale? American planes are not being used for target practice any more any anyone, are they? As long as this Administration is in office, they won't be.

Prepared by Opposition Analysts: Susan Carleson,
Susan Hopkins, Joseph Rodota, Candace Strother, and
Don Todd.

MONDALE JUSTIFICATION
FOR INTERRUPTION

IF REAGAN DUCKS THE QUESTION:

Deceit

- o I answer my questions.
- o He thinks people don't know what he's up to -- he's arrogant.
- o Tell the truth -- answer the question.
- o He's an actor and he knows it.
- o You picked these rules so you could duck them.
- o What is he afraid of -- a real debate?
- o These cooked rules -- their Hollywood rules are indecent.
- o He doesn't have an answer so he will simply lie.
- o This is a new Ronald Reagan -- he is hiding the real record of the old one.

Incompetence

- o I know the issues.
- o He's an actor and doesn't know it.
- o He is programmed by his advisors and his answers are canned.
- o He reads off a script provided by his staff on cue cards (caution: under the rules there are no notes).
- o He doesn't have an answer -- because he doesn't know the answer.
- o Your people picked these rules because they know you're incompetent.
- o If you're not incompetent, let's talk man-to-man.

This Is Not A Debate

- o He's reading from a script.
- o This is nothing but a Presidential photo opportunity -- a 90 minute paid commercial.
- o If you want to continue this debate, let's do it fairly.
- o The American people want, and more importantly deserve a real debate.
- o Why are you afraid of a free exchange of ideas?
- o These rules show a callous disregard for fairness.
- o You said that this would be a debate -- your answer indicates you want to prevent a debate.
- o I debated my primary opponents.
- o Debates are supposed to be about issues -- and that's what I'm talking about.

ERRS IN ANSWERING

Gross Incompetence

- o I was in the White House and I know what I am talking about -- he is wrong.
- o That is wrong -- and he is wrong.
- o We need a President who knows what he's doing.
- o We cannot afford confusion in the White House, not only because it is wrong, but because it is dangerous.
- o The incompetence of this Administration must be exposed.

Befuddled

- o I know what I'm talking about.
- o This is an Administration that is living in the past -- and a President who is not up to the job. (age factor)

- o Not only are their answers simple, they are wrong.
- o He simply does not know what he is talking about.
- o He is confused and that is not only disappointing, it is dangerous.

Ronald Reagan Is Lying About The Facts

- o I would never lie to the American people.
- o He is lying to the American people.
- o He is using the rules of the debate as an ally in hiding the truth from the American people.
- o He has been lying to the American people for 4 years and I think that it is outrageous and un-Presidential.
- o That is a malicious distortion of his record and the facts -- the American people deserve better.
- o He defends the rules, I defend the right of the American people to hear the truth.

Ronald Reagan Is Lying About Walter Mondale

- o I don't lie about you.
- o Point of personal privilege.
- o This phony debate puts me at a disadvantage, it is unfair.
- o I deserve the right to clear my name from the outrageous charges that have been made.

Ronald Reagan Lies About Himself

- o I don't lie about myself.
- o Only a head-to-head debate will bring out the truth about his record.
- o He is deceitful and this format allows him to hide his record from the people.
- o I didn't know which Reagan would show up tonight -- the new or the old -- and under this format I can't debate either one.

FUZZES THE ISSUES

Rose Garden

- o I've been around this country more than any living American -- I don't hide.
- This is nothing but Madison Avenue fluff.
- o They picked this format to protect him -- he doesn't know what he is doing so they have to protect him from a real debate.
- o I'll debate him -- I'll debate his entire staff if he wants to but we must take away the banner that they have erected to prohibit debate.

Out-of-Touch

- o I'm in touch.
- o He doesn't understand the issues.
- o He is living in the past -- and he is no longer up to the job.
- o He is insensitive to America as it exists today -- his Norman Rockwell view is a relic of yesterday.

Flim-Flam

- o I don't fuzz the issues, I know what I am talking about.
- o His failure to debate these issues in a meaningful way shows his contempt for America.
- o He is lying to the American people and he knows it -- and the American people must be allowed to hear the truth.
- o He is arrogant -- and he thinks that he and his staff can hide the truth from the American people with their "Hollywood rules."

20

DECLARING VICTORY AND
SUSTAINING THE ARGUMENT

Once Mondale has broken through the rules it is essential to inform the audience of what they have just seen: There is a now new set of rules. He has won but he still has to take command. Mondale should take off his coat, roll up his sleeves. He then makes the new rules change stick and launches into an interrogation of the President.

- o Now finally after three and a half years we're going to have a real debate.
- o I want to thank President Reagan for realizing the American people deserve a real debate, not a Rose Garden type of appearance.
- o If the moderator will keep the times we can get started.
- o After three and one-half years of hiding, the President is finally out in the open.

If there is an attempt to reinstate the old rules, Mondale must resist that and continue to sustain the new rules.

- o No, no, no, we have already settled that. This is between me and Mr. Reagan. This is Lincoln-Douglas format. If it was good enough for them, it is good enough for us."
- o Mr. Reagan, you've agreed to do this now, don't go back on that promise, too.
- o I am willing to be fair. I want us both to have equal time. You have agreed. If you don't think you have agreed, then let's go back and look at the tape. The tape doesn't lie. The tape is not a fraud.

27

WHITE HOUSE STAFF INTERVENES

Mondale breaches the rules, backs down the moderator, and begins firing questions at the President. Order has been lost. Larry Speakes attempts to intercept Mondale and steps in camera's view, claiming foul play. Mondale responds:

- o I thought Mr. Reagan was a grown man. Who's President here? If Mr. Reagan would just step aside, I'd be more than happy to debate Larry Speakes on the issues of this campaign. Why don't you come up here, too, Mr. Baker? Mr. Deaver? I'll debate all of you!
- o Well, here they go again, trying to shield Mr. Reagan from the scrutiny of the American people. This is the first time in months anyone's been able to come within ten feet of him, and he clearly can't handle it.
- o Is it any wonder this man has incoherent policies? He lets his employees push him around. How can anyone expect him to stand up for America in a crisis? He simply is not capable of leading.
- o This man is so out of touch with the issues that he can only handle canned questions. That is why his staff is rushing in. They are afraid he will reveal that he doesn't know the answers to my questions.
- o The American people will not stand for this game-playing. They deserve to know where you stand, Mr. President. Why are you afraid of them? Why are you hiding from them? Come out and debate the issues with me -- with the American people -- fair and square!

JUSTIFICATION FOR RULES CHANGE

Once Mondale has made his interruption he must present his case for why the rules must be changed. To accomplish this, he must appeal to a higher rule of truth and challenge the President to abide by the same rule.

- o You and I agreed, Mr. Reagan, to one thing, and that is that we would tell the truth. If you're not going to tell the truth, all the other rules are off. If you won't discuss the issues under the rule of truth then this whole exercise is a sham.
- o I tried to get fair rules, but they were rigged. I was blackmailed.
- o In a democracy, the only rules that matter are the rules of fairness and decency.
- o For four years, you haven't played by the fundamental rule of leadership -- honesty. The American people demand more and I'm going to see they get it.
- o This Administration has broken every rule of compassion and I demand that the rules of this debate are fair.
- o This is not the Soviet Union. You have condemned their closed system, you have relentlessly attacked their way of life, yet you refuse to demonstrate the same openness with the American people.
- o There is one rule that reigns supreme in this land and that is the rule of the Constitution. This is a nation that was born precisely because there was a free exchange of ideas. That is the only rule that I know. This country will remain free only as long as people are informed and the only way they will be informed is if they hear the truth.

- o Our Founding Fathers wrote: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States.
- o Mr. Reagan, On January 20, 1981, you took this oath: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the office of the President, and will, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.
- o Ladies and gentlemen, this man has failed to preserve Justice, he has failed to protect the most needy of this land and he now is failing to defend and secure that most sacred of our blessings, the liberty we have to discuss issues.
- o Yes, there are rules that we as Americans live by, and I challenge this man to abide by the rules he accepted when he took the oath of office to become President. If he cannot do that, not only is this debate a joke, but this presidency is a fraud.

BACKING DOWN THE MODERATOR

It is essential that the moderator or the panelists be backed down and the heat be placed on Reagan. Mondale can't afford, at any costs, to be backed down by Barbara Walters. Mondale must deflect the moderator's attempts to break into the conversation to the President.

- o Wait a minute! Just a minute! This isn't Hollywood. This isn't the Rose Garden. This is between the President and me.
- o Hold it! Hold it! We are talking about the future of the Universe here and I won't be interrupted. This is between the President of United States and Walter Mondale. No advisors, no highly paid media consultants to twist the truth, no dictatorial, faceless White House advisers this time, just me and him. Right, Mr. Reagan?
- o Now just a minute. I'm mad. For four years this man has hidden in the Rose Garden. Now we have a chance to see what kind of man we have as a President and I am not going to allow that to happen because of some rules that aren't relevant now.
- o I'm a lawyer and a good one. Contracts made under threat of blackmail aren't legal and aren't moral, either. Now Mr. Reagan, let's have a debate. (Risks sounding weak).

Attachment D

BREAKTHROUGH

It is possible that Walter Mondale will try to break the rules next Sunday and engage the President in a sustained one-on-one debate. While this option may be considered less likely than others, Mondale must realize that the negotiated debate format precludes a significant triumph for either side.

In order to breach the rules and effectively seize control of the debate, Mondale must achieve each of the following tactical objectives:

1. Mondale must take everyone -- especially the President and the moderator -- by surprise.
2. Mondale must force a discussion of the legitimacy of the rules and get the President to acquiesce in an altered format.
3. Mondale must heat up the debate environment, thereby diminishing the control each individual has over the situation.
4. Mondale must attract the camera's eye, perhaps by the use of gestures or otherwise being physical.

Mondale will score a "breakthrough" if he quickly achieves each of the above objectives. He cannot suddenly seek new debate rules without "provokation." He cannot accomplish it over the objection of the audience, the moderator, or the President. It is possible, therefore, to set roadblocks for Mondale at each juncture.

The President's debate preparation process does not need to be altered in any way to meet this possible Mondale strategy. All that is necessary is for the President and his team to be aware of the possibility and familiar with the game plan. Once it is understood, the counterstrategies come naturally.

1. Surprise

First, Mondale must not have the element of surprise to his advantage.

- o The President must be made aware of the possibility, however remote, that Mondale may try to break the rules.
- o The White House staff must be similarly apprised. Under no circumstances should a member of the White House staff or campaign intervene on or off camera. This would provide Mondale with a golden opportunity to question the President's authority.
- o A few Republican guests in the Kansas City audience should be instructed to start a round of booing if Mondale makes his move.
- o Prior to the debate, a high-ranking campaign or White House official should leak the expectation that "a desperate Mondale will try to break the rules." This would draw attention to the rules -- and may help to dissuade Mondale from attempting this strategy.

2. New Rules

Mondale must move the confrontation from issues to rules. If the President acquiesces in a new debate format, Mondale must then return the discussion to the issues.

The President's objective must be to stop Mondale at the discussion of the rules. Under no circumstances should the President allow Mondale to determine new rules of the debate.

3. Heat up the Environment

Mondale may attempt to stage a confrontation by clearing the decks and interrupting all participants. He was successful in backing down his opponents in this manner during the primary debate; any attempt by his opponents (especially Gary Hart) to speak was used by Mondale to heighten the appearance of a confrontation and increase tension on the stage.

Mondale should be allowed to say his piece, which will be rehearsed, without interruption. When he has finished (and not before, as Gary Hart found, and only added to Mondale's advantage), the President should allow Mondale and the audience to cool down. The President may do this by standing confidently at the podium, visually communicating to the camera his disdain of Mondale's behavior.

Once the environment has cooled down, the President may then reply with a mix of scolding, sharp criticism, and humor.

Scolding. By attempting to break the rules, Mondale has surrendered his status as an adult. The President may forcefully and authoritatively remind his opponent of the importance of dignified, adult behavior in public.

Sharp Criticism. The President may use Mondale's abortive attempt at rule-breaking to question his opponent's capacity to govern. A comparison between this debate and negotiations with the Soviets could be drawn: If Mondale cannot function like an adult, how would he behave with the Soviets? What would he do to America's reputation if he carried on in this manner at the United Nations? What would he give away to the Soviets during one of his "fits"?

Humor. The President should use humor in order to eliminate any audience rapport with or sympathy for Mondale. The President may note that, since the Democrats have raised the health issue in this campaign, he is concerned that Mondale might have a stroke. The President may also remind voters of Mondale's professed affection for him and ask: "Is this how you behave with your friends? How do you have any left?"

4. Visuals

Mondale may get physical during the debate -- by waving his arms or taking off his jacket -- in order to attract the camera and play to his side of the audience.

The President can best respond by subtly dominating the room. He may firmly grasp the podium, stand tall and, with a firm but scornful expression, wait until Mondale is finished.

As the President concludes his reply to Mondale and signals a return to the original debate, he may wish to use strong gestures to his advantage. One option would be for the President to point to each participant in the debate -- the moderator, each panelist, and finally Mondale -- and tell each of them what they should do next. The television shots of the President ordering everyone to get back to work would be a strong alternative to a loudmouthed Mondale waving fists in the air.

Conclusion

As mentioned in the October 16 memorandum, this "breakthrough" strategy has been fully charted on a separate document.

THE REAGAN BREAKTHROUGH

Mondale Debate Techniques That Provide Opportunity

A review of the tapes of past Mondale debates, reveals several Mondale debate techniques that, if watched for, should provide the opportunity for a Reagan breakthrough this Sunday.

MONDALE DEBATE TECHNIQUE:

- o Mondale is constantly using superlatives and hyperbole. "All my life," "in the history of the world," etc.

OPPORTUNITY PRESENTED:

- o While Mondale gets away with this in the context of his remarks, these superlatives sound stupid when isolated from his general remarks. For instance, are Americans really having nightmares over nuclear war or is it just Walter who is having nightmares over losing? Is the world going to blow up any minute? Does Walter really believe that? Maybe that's why he is hypertensive.

MONDALE DEBATE TECHNIQUE:

- o Mondale always stretches his facts. He can't resist taking a good attack theme and making it a little better by exaggeration. For example, the idea that we are close to getting involved in another Vietnam in Central America, or the idea that relations are worse with the PRC or the Soviet Union than they have ever been.

OPPORTUNITY PRESENTED:

- o The approach here is to attack the exaggeration in such a way so as to discredit the entire point. Anyone who believes that relations are worse than they have ever been with the Communist nations doesn't remember the Korean or Vietnam wars. Anyone who doesn't remember those shouldn't be talking about foreign policy.

MONDALE DEBATE TECHNIQUE:

- o Mondale has a habit of making outrageous comparisons; Grenada to Afghanistan, the Nicaraguan Revolution to the dawn of democracy.

OPPORTUNITY PRESENTED:

- o Such comparisons appear silly when they are repeated. America is not the Soviet Union and Grenada is not Afghanistan. Nicaragua is not a Democracy. The more times they are repeated by his opponent the sillier they sound.

MONDALE DEBATE TECHNIQUE:

- o Walter has a habit of smiling at his opponent in order to intimidate him. Consequently, Mondale often ends up grinning during the discussion of some very serious matters, such as nuclear war and relations with the Soviets.

OPPORTUNITY PRESENTED:

- o It only needs to be pointed out. CAUTION: Mondale will be looking for a way to bring up the "bombing the Russians joke."

MONDALE DEBATE TECHNIQUE:

- o When Mondale wants to make a point or feels he is losing, he tends to get louder in his presentation.

OPPORTUNITY PRESENTED:

- o Some people think that you can make something true just by saying it louder. Evidently Mondale is one of them. This needs to be pointed out. Some concern could be expressed for the Vice President's high blood pressure if he were to get too excited.

MONDALE DEBATE TECHINQUE:

- o A vital part of the Mondale approach is the name calling insult. In the past he has refered to the President, his administration, and his campaign, in the following terms: a cuttlefish, a figurehead, a cheerleader, arrogant, all happy talk, and intoxicated. (This list is incomplete. We have prepared a full two page list of such Mondale insults.)

OPPORTUNITY PRESENTED

- o During the last debate Mondale said, "I like President Reagan." Mondale should be asked what he calls people he doesn't like.

10/17

Wilma:

Bailey called in a
connection to memo he
sent Bud yesterday.
Copy of connection
attached.

38

Pat

October 16, 1984

To: Robert C. McFarlane, Assistant to the President for
National Security Affairs

From: Norman A. Bailey

Subject: Trade Issue in October 21 Presidential Campaign Debate

Walter Mondale is sure to stress the issue of "cheap imports" in the debate on the 21st. He already mentioned it several times in the "domestic" debate. In my opinion, the President should not be defensive on this or any other issue. I suggest he take the following line: "those who refuse to learn from history are doomed to repeat it. In the 1930's we tried to improve the economic situation by adopting a highly restrictive trade bill -- the Smoot-Hawley Tariff bill. The result is that all our trading partners retaliated against us and in the subsequent 22 months we lost 50 percent of our exports. Within 24 months 60 percent of world trade disappeared. As a result of this disastrous experience the United States has led the fight for freer trade since the second world war and we have benefitted the most by it. If we take a protectionist stance we will see our exports and jobs dry up and our farmers will be hit worst of all. Mr. Mondale, legislation such as the domestic content bill and the 15 percent steel quota bill do not represent job creation legislation -- they are job destruction bills, as demonstrated by the ~~Congressional Budget Office~~ *Commerce* study on the subject."

You will note that there are few figures that have to be remembered in these passages.

cc: ✓ Roger W. Robinson, Jr., NSC
William F. Martin, NSC
Douglas C. McMinn, NSC
Richard V. Allen

47

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

BRIEFING MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

SUBJECT: DEBATE REHEARSAL

Wednesday, October 17, 1984
2:00 p.m. (2 hours)
Room 450

FROM: RICHARD G. DARMAN

Don

I. PURPOSE

This is another rehearsal -- in the form of a mock debate.

II. AGENDA

The questions from which the panel will draw are attached.

III. PARTICIPANTS

The President
Paul Laxalt
David A. Stockman ("Mondale")
Jeane Kirkpatrick (Panelist)
Edwin Meese III
James A. Baker III
Michael K. Deaver
Robert C. McFarlane
Richard G. Darman (Moderator)

Larry M. Speakes (Panelist)
Bently T. Elliott
Robert B. Sims (Panelist)
Margaret D. Tutwiler
Stu Spencer
Edward J. Rollins
Richard B. Wirthlin (Panelist)
Robert Teeter
Kenneth L. Khachigian
Frank J. Donatelli

GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. Value of Arms Control?: You have basic disagreements on strategic weapons systems and on SALT II. Can you give us your personal view on the value of arms control agreements generally?
2. 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?
3. Defense: With deficits as large as they are, what level of defense spending should we incur, and what can we do about Pentagon mismanagement?
4. Central America:: Explain your solution to the problems of Central America.
5. Middle East: Isn't your peace plan dead? How can a lasting peace be brought to the Middle East -- and why is your approach better than your opponent's?
6. Human Rights: What are you doing about human rights around the world? As a case in point, 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?
7. International Trade: What measures will you take to restore a balance in foreign trade -- and how serious do you consider this problem?
8. Lebanon/Terrorism: Why have you backed up your Vice President's claim that the Democrats said the Marines died in shame -- isn't this another effort to shift attention and shift the blame for your failed policy in Lebanon? What can you do about terrorism?
9. U.S.-Soviet Relationship: You have used the strongest of rhetoric in describing the Soviets and joked about bombing them. Now you talk about being ready for negotiations. Why should the Soviets think this is anything other than election year politics?
10. If You Could Ask Your Opponent a Question: What is the most important thing wrong with your opponent's approach to national security?

SECONDARY QUESTIONS THAT MAY COME AS FOLLOW-UPS

Is it true that you've never favored an arms control agreement?

Why not go for a mutual and verifiable nuclear freeze?

How great is the danger of nuclear war today and what are you doing to reduce it?

Your proposal for a defensive shield to protect the U.S. against nuclear attack takes the arms race into the heavens, and will require abrogation of the ABM treaty. Why do you believe this Star Wars initiative adds to U.S. security?

Why do we need a vulnerable heavy missile (M-X) and an expensive bomber (B-1) that will be obsolete almost as soon as it's operational?

The U.S. complained about mines in the Red Sea near the Suez Canal. But we did that in Nicaragua. Isn't that act characteristic of an aggressive Central American policy based on military muscle that does not have the support of the American people?

Why haven't you taken a more decisive stand with Israel on West Bank settlements?

Your Vice President thinks that President Marcos is a great democrat. Do you endorse his view?

What question would you most like to ask your opponent?

COPY

43

CABINET AFFAIRS STAFFING MEMORANDUM

*Sent to
12-1-84*

Date: October 17, 1984 Number: 244536CA Due By: --

Subject: Debate Materials provided by Department of Energy

	Action	FYI		Action	FYI
ALL CABINET MEMBERS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	CEA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vice President	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	CEQ	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
State	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	OSTP	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Treasury	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Defense	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Attorney General	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Interior	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
Agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Baker	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Commerce	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Deaver	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Labor	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Darman (For WH Staffing)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HHS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	McFarlane	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
HUD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Svahn	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Energy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Counsellor	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OMB	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CIA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
UN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
USTR	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
			Executive Secretary for:		
GSA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	CCCT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
EPA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	CCEA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
NASA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	CCFA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OPM	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	CCHR	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	CCLP	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SBA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	CCMA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
			CCNRE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS:

DOE provided the attached for debate preparation. Use as appropriate.

Thanks.

RETURN TO:

☒ Craig L. Fuller
Assistant to the President
for Cabinet Affairs
456-2823 (White House)

☐ Don Clarey ☐ Tom Gibson ☐ Larry Herbolsheimer
Associate Director
Office of Cabinet Affairs
456-2800 (Room 129, OEOB)

POSSIBLE DISRUPTION OF PERSIAN GULF OIL SUPPLIES

Possible Areas of Inquiry:

- ° What would your response be to "a disruption" of Persian Gulf oil supplies?
- ° Would U.S. intervene militarily? Is U.S. prepared to "go-it-alone" to keep Strait of Hormuz open?
- ° Would you give our allies our Strategic Petroleum Reserve oil in case of emergency?

Note: These subjects covered at President's press conference on May 22, 1984. Excerpts attached.

Possible Concepts:

- ° U.S. not as vulnerable now to cut-off of oil supplies as it was during 1973 and 1979-80 disruptions.
 - World oil supply situation much better because of large excess production capability that did not exist before.
 - U.S. net oil imports down substantially [by almost 50%] from the highs of the late 1970's.
 - My Administration encouraged U.S. oil production by decontrolling price of oil (yet retail gasoline prices are now 25% lower in real terms than they were before decontrol).
 - Much of our imports now come from more secure sources (Mexico, United Kingdom).
 - Our Strategic Petroleum Reserve (433 million barrels) is 4 times larger than it was four years ago.
- ° Although Persian Gulf imports now account for only about 3% of U.S. oil consumption, about 20% of free world oil supplies come from there; so we and our allies have to be concerned about potential disruption.
- ° As of today, complete shut-off of Persian Gulf oil is rather unlikely, especially for prolonged time.
 - Militarily, a difficult thing to accomplish.
 - The more than 25 attacks on tankers this year have not resulted in any loss of oil supplies (nor an increase in world oil prices).

- ° Most importantly, perhaps there has been no attempt to shut-off Persian Gulf oil because those who might be tempted know from my statements (and President Carter's) that U.S. and its allies will not stand by and allow it to happen.
- ° We have consulted closely with our allies and with friendly Gulf states. There is no reason to contemplate need for unilateral U.S. action.
- ° We publicly have announced our intention to draw down our Strategic Petroleum Reserve in event of a major world oil supply disruption.
 - As an outgrowth of this summer's London Economic Summit, we obtained agreement of our major allies (June 11, 1984) that coordinated, allied drawdown is a very valuable tool in coping with a major disruption.
 - Such coordinated action means our allies would be sharing with us the burden of dealing with a major oil supply disruption.

REAGAN PRESS CONF. 5/22/84

COMMISSION. BUT IF THE CONGRESS OFFERS TOO LITTLE SUPPORT, IT WILL BE WORSE THAN DOING NOTHING AT ALL. THIS EXCESSIVE COMMUNISM IN CENTRAL AMERICA POSES THE THREAT THAT 100 MILLION PEOPLE FROM PANAMA TO THE OPEN BORDER ON OUR SOUTH COULD COME UNDER THE CONTROL OF PRO-SOVIET REGIMES. WE COULD FACE A MASSIVE EXODUS OF REFUGEES TO THE UNITED STATES.

THE CONGRESS HAS THE OPPORTUNITY TO REAFFIRM OUR COMMITMENT TO BRAVE PEOPLE RISKING THEIR LIVES FOR THE CAUSE OF LIBERTY AND DEMOCRACY IN CENTRAL AMERICA. THE CONGRESS ALSO HAS THE OPPORTUNITY TO REAFFIRM OUR BIPARTISAN TRADITION WHICH WILL TELL THE WORLD THAT WE'RE UNITED WHEN OUR VITAL INTERESTS ARE AT STAKE. I'M ASKING THE MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS TO MAKE THAT COMMITMENT.

QUESTION: IT'S BEEN REPORTED THAT YOU ARE WILLING TO PROVIDE U.S. AIR POWER TO KEEP OIL TANKERS MOVING THROUGH THE PERSIAN GULF. COULD YOU TELL US WHAT THE SAUDI RESPONSE HAS BEEN TO YOUR PROPOSAL AND UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES THE UNITED STATES COULD BECOME MILITARILY INVOLVED IN THAT REGION?

ANSWER: I'VE SEEN ALL THE STORIES AND A LOT OF THEM BASED ON SPECULATION ALREADY -- NO, WE HAVE KEPT IN TOUCH AND ARE KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH THE GULF STATES AND WITH OUR OWN ALLIES. BUT WE HAVE NOT VOLUNTEERED TO ENTER THE -- NOR HAVE WE BEEN ASKED TO INTERVENE. AND WE'VE COMMUNICATED WITH THEM REGARDING THAT AND SO FAR IT SEEMS AS IF THE GULF STATES WANT TO TAKE CARE OF THEMSELVES. THEY'RE CONCERNED, AS I THINK WE ALL SHOULD BE, ABOUT NOT ENLARGING THE WAR.

Q: DO WE HAVE A CONTINGENCY PLAN FOR DOING SO IF THEY CAN'T TAKE CARE OF THEMSELVES?

A: IF THEY ASK US FOR HELP, WE HAVE -- OBVIOUSLY WE'VE THOUGHT IN TERMS OF WHAT WE MIGHT DO. BUT I DON'T THINK THAT'S SOMETHING I SHOULD TALK ABOUT.

Q: SENATOR BYRD SAID THAT OUR RELATIONS WITH THE SOVIET UNION HAVE REACHED THE LOWEST POINT IN 22 YEARS. DID YOU MISJUDGE THE RUSSIANS? ARE YOUR HARD-LINE POLICIES RESPONSIBLE FOR THE BOYCOTT OF THE OLYMPICS, THE BREAK OFF OF THE ARMS NEGOTIATIONS, STEPPED-UP OFFENSIVE IN AFGHANISTAN, MORE MISSILES OFF OUR COAST?

A: NO, I DON'T THINK I'M RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY OF THOSE THINGS. AND IF THESE ARE THE LOWEST STATE WE'VE HAD FOR 22 YEARS -- NOT TOO LONG AGO, JUST A MATTER OF DAYS AGO, I GAVE TO GEORGE SHULTZ ONE OF OUR VERY EMINENT NATIONAL NEWS MAGAZINES FOR HIM TO SEE AN ARTICLE ON THIS VERY SUBJECT.

AND THE ARTICLE -- IT WAS AN APRIL ISSUE -- AND THE ARTICLE CITED THAT WE HAD THE LOWEST RELATIONS WE'D EVER HAD AND THE PRESIDENT WAS TO BLAME FOR THAT -- HIS VACILLATION AND SO FORTH AND SO ON. EXCEPT THAT IT WAS APRIL OF 1982 WHEN THEY WERE SAYING THAT ABOUT OUR RELATIONS WITH RUSSIA.

AND I HAVE TO SAY THAT TODAY, NO, WE DIDN'T WALK AWAY FROM THE NEGOTIATING TABLE. WE MADE EVERY EFFORT TO PROVE THAT WE WERE READY TO BE FLEXIBLE IN TRYING TO NEGOTIATE A REDUCTION OF WEAPONS. AND, AS FOR THE OLYMPICS, THE ONLY THING AS A GOVERNMENT THAT WE DID IN THE OLYMPICS WAS ENSURE THEM AND MEET VIRTUALLY EVERY REQUEST THAT THEY MADE WITH REGARD TO THEIR PEOPLE THERE AND ALLOWING THEIR CRUISE SHIP

Q: ON THE PERSIAN GULF AGAIN, IS IT TRUE THAT YOU HAVE
 ATTEN TO THE SAUDIS SAYING THAT SHOULD THEY ASK THE UNITED
 STATES FOR AID, THAT WE ARE WILLING TO SUPPLY AIR COVER TO
 PROTECT THE OIL --

A: WE HAVEN'T SPECIFIED WHAT WE WOULD DO BUT WE HAVE
 TOLD THEM. BECAUSE I MADE A STATEMENT EARLIER THAT NEITHER
 WE NOR THE WESTERN WORLD AS SUCH WOULD STAND BY AND SEE THE
 STRAITS OR THE PERSIAN GULF CLOSED TO INTERNATIONAL TRAFFIC.

Q: THEN, IN YOUR JUDGMENT, WHAT IS THE LIKELIHOOD OF
 AMERICAN SERVICEMEN BEING INVOLVED IN SOME KIND OF SHOOTING
 WAR SHORTLY OR IN THE NEAR FUTURE IN THE MIDDLE EAST?

A: I THINK VERY SLIGHT. I CAN'T FORESEE THAT
 HAPPENING.

Q: YOU CANNOT FORESEE THAT HAPPENING?

A: AS THINGS STAND NOW, NO, I DON'T THINK SO.

Q: YOU'VE SAID AMERICAN VITAL INTERESTS ARE AT STAKE
 IN CENTRAL AMERICA. WHAT WILL WE HAVE TO DO IF THE CONGRESS
 DOES DENY THAT SECURITY ASSISTANCE TO STOP THIS THREAT OF
 SOVIET-SPONSORED REGIMES TAKING OVER ALL THE COUNTRIES RIGHT
 UP TO OUR SOUTHERN BORDERS?

A: YOU SAY WHAT DO WE HAVE TO DO TO --

Q: YES. SUPPOSE THE CONGRESS DID NOT VOTE THE MONEY
 THAT YOU NEED FOR THE FREEDOM FIGHTERS. AS YOU CALL THEM?
 WHAT, THEN, WOULD WE BE REQUIRED TO DO TO PREVENT THIS
 SCENARIO FROM DEVELOPING?

A: WE'D BE IN A VERY DIFFICULT SITUATION AND SO WOULD
 THEY. BUT I HAVE GREAT HOPES THAT AFTER PRESIDENT DUARTE'S
 VISIT HERE AND MEETING WITH AS MANY OF THE CONGRESS AS HE
 DID THAT THERE'S SOME REASON FOR OPTIMISM.

Q: THERE ARE REPORTS THAT THE ADMINISTRATION HAS GONE
 AROUND CONGRESS AND CONTINUED TO INCREASE MILITARY AND
 INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES IN CENTRAL AMERICA BY CHANNELING
 MONEY THROUGH ACCOUNTING TACTICS, TRICKS OF ACCOUNTING
 THROUGH THE PENTAGON TO THE CIA. WHILE YOU CAN'T DISCUSS
 COVERT ACTIVITIES, CAN YOU AT LEAST ASSURE THE AMERICAN
 PEOPLE THAT YOU HAVE NOT HAD THIS ADMINISTRATION GO BEYOND
 THE WILL OF CONGRESS, BY INCREASING THE SPENDING FOR
 MILITARY ACTIVITIES IN CENTRAL AMERICA?

A: WE'VE FOLLOWED NO PROCEDURES THAT ARE ANY DIFFERENT
 FROM WHAT HAS BEEN DONE IN PAST ADMINISTRATIONS, NOR HAVE WE
 DONE ANYTHING WITHOUT THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE CONGRESS.

Q: SO, CAN YOU EXPLAIN THEN, WE WERE TOLD, CONGRESS
 WAS TOLD ABOUT A MONTH AGO THAT IF CONGRESS DIDN'T
 APPROPRIATE THE MONEY, THE CIA-SUPPORTED CONTRAS WOULD RUN
 OUT OF MONEY BY NOW. NOW, CONGRESS HAS BEEN TOLD THAT THE
 CIA HAS ENOUGH MONEY TO GET THROUGH THE REST OF THE SUMMER.
 HOW IS THAT POSSIBLE WITHOUT THEIR GETTING SECRET FUNDS?

A: UNLESS THEY GUESSED WRONG ON THE FIRST STATEMENT --
 I THOUGHT THAT THEY WERE CLOSER TO BEING OUT OF MONEY THEN
 THEY APPARENTLY ARE. BUT I DON'T THINK ANY -- WELL, NOTHING
 OF THAT KIND COULD TAKE PLACE WITHOUT THE KNOWLEDGE OF
 CONGRESS.

Q: INTEREST RATES ARE GOING UP. THE STOCK MARKET IS
 GOING DOWN AND SOME ECONOMISTS SAY WE'RE GOING TO BE INTO A
 RECESSION PERHAPS THIS FALL. DO YOU THINK WE'RE HEADED FOR
 A RECESSION?

47

YOU BE PREPARED TO OFFER SOME GESTURE, TO MAKE SOME OVERTURE THAT WOULD BE THAT POSITIVE SIGN THAT THEY ASKED FOR IN ORDER TO COME TO THE TABLE WITHOUT A LOSS OF FACE?

A: I DON'T THINK IT WOULD BE PROPER FOR US TO DO SOMETHING, SOME CONCESSION THAT WOULD MAKE IT LOOK THAT WE REWARDED THEIR INTRANSIGENCE AND THEIR WALKING OUT OF THE MEETINGS. BUT WE HAVE PURSUED, AND WE TOOK THE LEAD IN THIS -- NEGOTIATIONS ON A NUMBER OF OTHER MATTERS BETWEEN OUR TWO COUNTRIES THAT HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH STRATEGIC WEAPONS. AND WE'VE BEEN MAKING SOME PROGRESS IN A NUMBER OF THOSE NEGOTIATIONS. SO I DON'T THINK THINGS ARE AS BAD AS THEY'RE BEING PAINTED.

Q: THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1984 IS EXPECTED TO GO TO HOUSE COMMITTEES TOMORROW. BECAUSE OF THE SUPREME COURT'S DECISION IN THE GROVE CITY COLLEGE CASE, THE BILL RESTORES ALL INCLUSIVE PROHIBITIONS AGAINST SEX, RACE, HANDICAP, CR AGE DISCRIMINATION AT INSTITUTIONS WITH FEDERALLY ASSISTED PROGRAMS. DO YOU SUPPORT THIS MEASURE?

A: THERE ARE SOME THAT ARE WATCHING THIS LEGISLATION VERY CLOSELY. THE COURT DECISION WAS BASED ON THE WAY ARTICLE IX WAS WRITTEN BY CONGRESS AND IT WAS THE WAY WE INTERPRETED IT ALSO. NOW, IF THERE IS LEGISLATION TO REVERSE THE COURT DECISION WITH REGARD TO TITLE IX -- I SAID ARTICLE -- TITLE IX THAT WILL PREVENT DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN IN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS THAT ARE GETTING FUNDS FROM THE GOVERNMENT, WE SUPPORT THAT.

THERE IS LEGISLATION THAT HAS BEEN PROPOSED -- AND I DON'T KNOW JUST WHICH THEY'RE GOING TO TAKE UP TOMORROW -- THERE IS LEGISLATION WHICH IS SO BROAD THAT ACTUALLY IT WOULD OPEN THE DOOR TO FEDERAL INTRUSION IN LOCAL AND STATE GOVERNMENTS AND IN ANY MANNER OF WAYS BEYOND ANYTHING THAT HAS EVER BEEN INTENDED BY THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT. THAT KIND OF LEGISLATION WE WOULD OPPOSE.

Q: YOU SAID EARLIER THAT IF ASKED, THE UNITED STATES WOULD ASSIST PERSIAN GULF STATES IN KEEPING THE STRAIT OF FORMUZ OPEN. ARE THERE ANY CIRCUMSTANCES WHERE AMERICAN INTERESTS COULD BE SO THREATENED THAT THE UNITED STATES WOULD ACT UNILATERALLY OR WITHOUT A REQUEST FROM THOSE STATES?

A: AGAIN, I CAN'T FORESEE THAT. WE PROBABLY WOULD BE, AMONG ALL THE IMPORTING OF OIL NATIONS, WE WOULD BE THE LEAST HURT BY ANY SHUTDOWN. IT IS OUR ALLIES -- IT IS JAPAN. IT IS OUR FRIENDS IN WESTERN EUROPE WHO WOULD REALLY BE IN TROUBLE IF THERE WAS ANY STOP TO THE MIDDLE EAST OIL.

ACTUALLY, ONLY THREE PERCENT OF OUR OIL SUPPLY NOW -- THANKS TO DECONTROLLING OIL AND INCREASING DOMESTIC PRODUCTION -- ONLY THREE PERCENT IS INVOLVED IN THE PERSIAN GULF FOR US. AND WE HAVE INCREASED OUR STOCKPILE OF OIL TO FOUR TIMES WHAT IT WAS WHEN WE CAME HERE. SO I CAN'T SEE A KIND OF EMERGENCY THAT WOULD DO THIS.

BUT ALSO REMEMBER, WE ARE IN CONSULTATION ALSO WITH OUR ALLIES WITH THOSE NATIONS THAT WOULD BE AFFECTED BECAUSE WE'RE NOT CONTEMPLATING ANYTHING UNILATERALLY HERE. THIS PROBLEM IS ONE THAT AFFECTS ALL OF US.

Q: WHAT WOULD THE UNITED STATES DO TO HELP ITS ALLIES IN THE EVENT OF AN OIL CUT-OFF? WOULD WE GIVE THEM OIL FROM THE STRATEGIC RESERVE?

49 ✓
A: WE HAVE HAD PEOPLE IN CONSULTATIONS WITH OUR ALLIES AND THEY'VE BEEN HOLDING MEETINGS ON DISCUSSION CONTINGENCIES OF THIS KIND. WE WOULD NOT HOLD BACK ON IMMEDIATELY TURNING TO OUR RESERVE BUT I'M NOT PREPARED TO SAY WE'VE MADE ANY SPECIFIC PLANS.

Q: SOME OF YOUR TOP ADVISERS SUGGEST THAT THE INTEREST-RATE QUESTION COULD BE THE CUTTING EDGE IN NOVEMBER FOR THE ELECTION, WITH SOME OF YOUR PEOPLE SAYING THAT THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD HAS HAD TOO MUCH CONTROL OF THE INTEREST RATES, OTHERS SAYING THAT THEY HAVEN'T HAD, THAT THEY'VE BEEN TOO HARSH, THE CRITICISM HAS BEEN TOO HARSH OF THE FEDS. WHAT IS YOUR POSITION? DO YOU THINK THE FEDS SHOULD LOOSEN UP ON THE MONEY SUPPLY?

A: NO. AS I INDICATED EARLIER, I THINK THEY'RE RIGHT ON TARGET WITH IT NOW. IT IS TRUE THAT A SHORT TIME AGO THERE WAS A DIP BELOW THEIR REGULAR LINE AND I THINK THIS WAS ONE OF THE THINGS THAT CAUSED SOME PANIC OUT THERE IN THE MONEY MARKETS, BECAUSE USUALLY, OR IN THE PAST, ON A NUMBER OF OCCASIONS, SUCH AS BACK AROUND '79 AND '80, THAT - SUCH A DIP WAS THEN FOLLOWED BY A REAL LOOSENING OF THE STRINGS, SUCH A FLOOD OF MONEY, THAT THAT'S WHEN WE WENT TO
BT

#3774

NNNN

RCM HAS SEEN

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

October 17, 1984

copy to
Bud McF.
pls.

MEMORANDUM FOR DICK DARMAN

FROM: M.B. OGLESBY, JR.

SUBJECT: Possible Issue in Sunday's Debate

Senator Cohen's (R-Maine) office called to advise the White House of a possible issue in Sunday's debate involving the U.S. fishing industry in its continuing struggle with the Canadian industry over fishing rights off the coast of North America. The World Court ruled late last week on a case brought by the U.S. on this issue. The U.S. industry feels the Court decision is more favorable to Canadian interests. Cohen has been advising the industry that he hopes the State Department will consult with the domestic industry before beginning the negotiations with Canada mandated by the World Court's decision.

The domestic industry has a Section 332 case pending before the International Trade Commission. No decision has yet been reached by the ITC. Cohen's office indicates that the nature of this case reflects the desire by the domestic industry for some trade protection. They also seek access to Canadian waters.

U.S. fishing industry officials have indicated that they hope to persuade the Mondale campaign to have their issue raised in the debate Sunday night. In light of this, it might be helpful to have the President briefed on this issue of considerable importance to the New England area. Both State Department and USTR are fully aware of this issue. Cohen's office, however, volunteered any additional assistance we might seek.

RCM HAS SEEN

Bud -
This is in the noise
level.
J