

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:** 1984 Presidential Debates  
(1 of 3)

**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: 10/01/2024*

4. ROBERT C. MCFARLANE

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

February 1, 1985

Kathleen,

Please keep this notebook on RCM's files shelf -- and let me know which one.

I would like for this book plus all the loose papers to be kept "intact" for RCM -- I am sure he will want to refer back to this over the coming months.

Many thanks.

Wilma



*Dinner*

**Sensitive: Do Not Reproduce**

# **1984 Presidential Debates**

**Briefing Materials For:** ROBERT C. MCFARLANE

Please return to Richard G. Darman

**Sensitive: Do Not Reproduce**

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

October 13, 1984

MR. PRESIDENT:

Attached is background material -- prepared principally by Bud McFarlane and Bob Sims, in coordination with NSC staff. The material is not in the form of suggested answers -- but will, I hope, be of use as you develop your own formulations.

Next week, we will also forward a compilation of possible one-liners and "winners" -- along with material for you to consider in the development of a closing statement.



Richard G. Darman



OVERVIEW

Attached are outlines with respect to the following key substantive themes of your national security policy.

- I. Keeping the Peace
- II. Leading the Free World Toward a Better Future
- III. Preventing Crises
- IV. Defending and Promoting Democracy
- V. Middle East Policy/Beirut/Terrorism
- VI. U.S.-Soviet Relations -- Arms Control

THEME I

KEEPING THE PEACE

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

Four 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.

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.

Four 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 5:00 am 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 sowing of mines in the Red Sea which could have closed one the world's strategic trade arteries? Did it close? No. Why not?

- o Because the U.S. 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 U.S. 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

Twenty 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? Four 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 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 terrorists and several 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.

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.



II. MONDALE ATTACK LINES

MONDALE ZINGERS

GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY SPEECH

17

## MONDALE ZINGERS

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

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

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

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

WASHINGTON, DC, September 25, 1984 -- Following is the advance text of Walter F. Mondale's speech at George Washington University today:

Yesterday in New York, Mr. Reagan addressed the United Nations General Assembly on the subject of foreign policy.

We all welcome the soothing new tone.

Gone is the talk of nuclear warning shots. Gone is winnable nuclear war. Gone is the evil empire. After four years of sounding like Ronald Reagan, six weeks before the election he's trying to sound like -- Walter Mondale.

The new Reagan supports economic aid to the developing world. The old Reagan slashed it.

The new Reagan wants to help settle regional conflicts. The old Reagan ignored them, or made them worse.

The new Reagan praises international law. The old Reagan jumped bail from the World Court.

The new Reagan criticizes South Africa. The old Reagan cozied up to apartheid.

The new Reagan calls for peace in Central America. The old Reagan launched an illegal war in Nicaragua.

The new Reagan talks about the Camp David process. The old Reagan torpedoed it with the Reagan Plan.

The new Reagan worries about soaring arms sales. The old Reagan sold almost anything to nearly everyone.

The new Reagan warns about nuclear proliferation. The old Reagan said it was none of our business, and opened the sluice-gates on materials to make the bomb.

The new Reagan proposes regular consultation with Soviet experts. The old Reagan is the first American President since Hoover not to meet with his Soviet counterpart.

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.

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.

This Presidential sea-change raises a crucial question: How can the American people tell which Reagan would be President if he's re-elected?

To those who-welcome the new Reagan, I say this: My Dad was a Methodist minister, and he once told me, "Son, be skeptical of deathbed conversions." I asked why. And he said, "Because sometimes they get well."

Nineteen months ago, I announced my candidacy for President. Six weeks from today, the voters will make their decision.

It is no secret that I'm the underdog in this race. And when a candidate is behind, he gets a lot of advice.

I have been told to attack Mr. Reagan personally. My answer is no. I did not enter this race to tear down a person. I entered it to fight for our future.

I have been advised to ignore issues -- to choose slogans over substance. My answer is no. There is a big distance between Pennsylvania Avenue and Madison Avenue. And there ought to be a big difference between a Presidential election and a pep rally.

I have been counseled to cut loose from my history -- to desert the forgotten Americans I have always fought for. My answer is no. I would rather lose a race about decency than win one about self-interest. I would rather fight for the heart and soul of America -- than fight for the bonuses of the Fortune 500.

When the true story of this election is written, I suspect it will not be about me, or about Mr. Reagan -- but about you.

Your generation will decide this race. You will live with its consequences. And you will shape the American landscape for the rest of the century.

You have probably heard the conventional wisdom about your generation.

You are said to be self-content, materialistic, and devoid of social commitment.

You are supposed to have no sense of history.

You are accused of having an attention span no longer than a television commercial.

That's quite an indictment. I don't believe it. But suppose some people did.

Imagine a Presidential campaign based on those assumptions about your generation.

Believing you to be selfish, they would pander to your supposed greed.

Their message would be: Be glad for what you have -- and be kind to those who have little.

Believing you to have no memory, they would exploit your alleged amnesia.

Their message would be: History is bunk. Republicans are Democrats. And in 1984, the year of Orwell and doublespeak, the MX missile is renamed the "Peacekeeper."

Believing you to be shallow, they would manipulate your rumored gullibility.

Their message would be all sizzle, and no substance; all happy-talk, and no straight talk; all blue skies, and no blue print; all television, and no vision.

I do not know which is worse -- the emptiness of such a campaign, or the cynicism about the American people that it implies.

I do not know which is more damning -- their contempt for the issues, or their condescension toward our people.

They underestimate you. They're betting that Americans are not smart. That's a bad bet.

Watch them maneuver.

For four years, they failed to reach a single arms control agreement with the Soviets. They proposed to extend the arms race into the heavens.

But now, six weeks before the election, they talk of arms control, they dust the conference table -- and they brag about blunting an issue.

For four years, they failed to make the world safer. The Soviets have reached into Lebanon. Kadafi has reached into Morocco. Human rights is losing in the Philippines. In Central America, our country is sliding toward war.

But now, six weeks before the election, they talk of peace, they bow toward diplomacy -- and they boast about changing an image.

For four years, they racked up the biggest deficit in world history. They let us be routed in international trade. They watched basic industry decline. They put our farmers through the worst recession since the Depression.

21

But now, six weeks before the election, they reel out a few band-aids; they phony up their deficit numbers; they're silent on budget and tax plans; they gloat about this temporary recovery -- and they crow about ducking an issue.

For a generation, my opponent fought Democrats tooth and nail. He campaigned for Richard Nixon in 1960. He fought Kennedy on arms control. He fought Johnson on civil rights. He fought Humphrey on Medicare.

But now, six weeks before the election, he lards his speeches with Roosevelt quotes. He gives a medal to Hubert Humphrey. He invokes Truman in Missouri. He invokes Kennedy in Connecticut. And he asks Democrats to become Republicans -- as if it didn't matter.

But it does. Take a second look at the Republican home you're being sold, and the platform it's built on.

Do you really want to join a party that intends to put government between you and the most private choices of your life?

Do you really want women to be paid less than men for the same work?

Do you really want politicians to choose prayers for your children?

Do you really want to get us deeper into war in Central America?

Do you really believe there are winners in a nuclear war?

Now some people have declared this election over. They've announced a Republican landslide. In other words, they're telling you, your vote won't count. Your voice doesn't matter.

This crowd doesn't want you to think about the stakes in this contest. They want to trivialize it.

That is arrogance. We are in an American Presidential election. This is a season for passion and principle.

This election is not about jelly-beans and pen pals. It is about toxic dumps that give cancer to our children.

This election is not about country music and birthday cakes. It is about old people who can't pay for medicine.

This election is not about the Olympic torch. It is about the civil rights laws that opened athletics to women and minorities who won those gold medals.

This election is not about sending a teacher into space. It

is about improving teaching and learning here on earth.

This election is not about the size of my opponent's crowds. It is about the size of his deficits.

This election is not about Republicans sending hecklers to my rallies. It is about Jerry Falwell picking Justices for the Supreme Court.

This election is not about my standing in the polls. It is about my stand against the illegal war in Nicaragua.

This election is not about slogans, like "standing tall." It is about specifics, like the nuclear freeze -- because if those weapons go off, no one will be left standing at all.

This election is about our values.

Today, millions of American children are born in poverty. Many go to school hungry. Many don't learn to read, and don't learn to hope. And nearly everything we've done as a nation to help those children has been cut back by this Administration.

Today, there are Americans roaming the streets and sleeping on grates, bag women and broken men -- and thousands of them plunged into that tragedy because this Administration threw them off the disability rolls.

Today, our country is peddling guns around the world. The African drought has brought massive starvation -- but this Administration is shipping them less food, and more weapons.

The Republicans say they're for family values. But families don't disown their weaker children. What would we think of parents who taught their kids to think only of themselves, and not to care for their brothers and sisters? What would we say about parents who lived in high style -- and left their children in debt as a result?

In this campaign, I will do everything I can to focus our nation on these questions -- whatever the political consequences. It must never be said that in 1984, we did not know what we were doing.

I won't permit this crowd to steal the future from our children without a fight. I won't let them put ice in our soul without a struggle. They have a right to ask for your vote. But I'll be damned if I'll let them take away our conscience.

The other week, Mr. Reagan and I both spoke at the Italian-American Foundation dinner here in Washington.

He told a moving story about an Italian immigrant who came to

27  
America with nothing. One of his children was a milkman. One of his children, in turn, became a surgeon. And one day, the surgeon saved the life of a President of the United States who had been shot.

It was a fitting tribute to Dr. Joseph Giordano -- head of the trauma team here at George Washington University Hospital.

The other day, Dr. Giordano wrote an article you may have seen. In it, he said: Mr. President, you only told us part of the story.

Yes, my parents sacrificed for me. But I was also helped through college by low-interest federal student loans.

Yes, I saved your life, and I was proud to do it. But the medical technology I used wouldn't have existed without years of federally-funded research.

And yes, my parents worked hard all their lives. But now they rely on Social Security, and more than once my father has benefitted from Medicare.

Mr. President, there are millions of Americans making it on their own. But there are millions of others who need some help once in a while -- just as you needed some help the day Dr. Giordano saved your life.

That's the kind of people we are. That's the fight I'm waging. That's what's more important than the polls. That's what this election must be about. And that's why I ask for your help.

Thank you very much.

\* \* \*



### III. MAJOR VULNERABILITIES

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

The selected topics are:

U.S.-SOVIET RELATIONS

NUCLEAR THREAT

ARMS CONTROL

ARMS CONTROL: STRATEGIC DEFENSE INITIATIVE

MILITARY VS. DIPLOMATIC SOLUTIONS

CENTRAL AMERICA

MIDDLE EAST

BEIRUT

DEFENSE SPENDING

GRENADA (MONDALE VULNERABILITY)

RESTORED AMERICAN STRENGTH (MONDALE VULNERABILITY)

"WHAT IT WOULD BE LIKE" (MONDALE VULNERABILITY)

## U.S.-SOVIET RELATIONS

### Possible Mondale Attack Lines/Rebuttal Points

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

U.S.-SOVIET RELATIONS

RR Points to Make

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

RR Rebuttal Points

- o "Evil empire", "ash heap of history" statements? No reason to disguise the facts as we see them. Soviets don't conduct international relations on the basis of rhetoric. If they did, they'd win -- their rhetoric against the U.S. can't be topped.
- o Americans have for too long been told by people (like WM) that the Soviets are just like we are. WM said earlier this year, "I cannot understand -- it just baffles me -- why the Soviets these last few years have behaved as they have."
- o WM is naive. He consistently calls for unilateral concessions, saying he is "challenging" the Soviets to match them.
- o Soviets understand that kind of challenge -- but they don't match them, they pocket them. Carter-Mondale cancelled B-1 and got nothing in return.
- o WM lacks the constancy of purpose a President has to have to deal with the Soviets. He knows it, the American people know it, and he knows they know it.

## NUCLEAR THREAT

### Possible Mondale Attack Lines and/or Rebuttals

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

## NUCLEAR THREAT

### Key Points for RR to Make

- o Must preserve peace. Nuclear war cannot be won; must never be fought. Must reduce nuclear weapons.
- o We are doing so:
  - 1/3 fewer strategic warheads than in 1967; total nuclear explosive power (megatonnage) less than half what it was under President Kennedy.
  - Have pulled 1000 nuclear warheads out of Europe since 1979; have agreed to pull 1400 more out.
- o Country safer than it was four years ago. America stronger and more confident. Strength, not weakness, deters war.
- o Understandable if Americans are uneasy about the enormous growth of Soviet power. Greatly expanded their influence between 1975 and 1980 (Ethiopia, South Yemen, Cambodia, Afghanistan, Nicaragua). Expansion has stopped; we are now deterring.
- o Why have Soviets resisted our arms control initiatives? One reason: they've watched us reverse the steady decline of the 70's. Have probably said to themselves, "Let's see if the U.S. can sustain it -- how long will it be before they go back to unilateral disarmament, before they again tie their own hands behind their back."
- o Conclusions about our foreign policy should be based on answers to two questions: Are US interests better assured now than four years ago? Is world more stable and more promising now than four years ago? Answer to both is yes.
- o RR ready, willing and able to meet with and to negotiate with the Soviets. 4 years ago, freedom was at risk and peace was not secure. Today, there is a rising tide of freedom and America is stronger, and we're prepared for peace.

### RR Rebuttal Points

- o Opposed to arms control? No agreements? Summits?. RR favors realistic agreements where interests of both sides are served. Believes in high level contacts. Remember: Carter-Mondale signed an agreement to increase nuclear weapons! Never established annual summits. Never had a truly substantive summit.
- o Joke: Nuclear war isn't funny. "Of course, it isn't. Neither is it funny when news media broadcast what was clearly an off-the-record joke!"
- o Moratorium on testing? Soviets would be delighted to get what they want merely by agreeing to a meeting. In fact, we are willing to discuss mutual restraints after we get to the table -- but not to make a unilateral concession just to get the Soviets to join us in talks that they proposed in the first place.