

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Reagan, Ronald: 1980 Campaign Papers,
1965-80

Folder Title: Cleveland OH, 10/28/1980 (Reagan – Carter)
(3 of 3)

Box: 140

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/>

Reagan Bush Committee

memorandum

October 24, 1980

For: Ed Meese
From: Stef Halper *SAH*
Subj: Debate/ Hostage Issue

The attached may be of use to you in the Debate preparation process:

- 1) language on the hostages - if they are home/ and if they are still in Iran;
- 2) a chronology of the hostage issue;
- 3) Carter's use of the hostage issue before key primaries;
- 4) attack points on Carter; and
- 5) Carter's claim of accomplishment;
- 6) What the hostages will discover on their return.

HOSTAGES

BACKGROUND:

The 52 American hostages will have been in Iran 360 days on the day of the debate. Carter was warned by the Embassy several times there would be trouble if he admitted the Shah to the U.S. Nonetheless, even after the Embassy was violated by the Tehran mob, he maintained a full staff (the British Embassy had a skeleton staff; the Israeli Embassy closed in this period). It took Carter over 2 weeks to order the Carrier Kitty Hawk and 5 support ships to the Indian Ocean. The Desert I fiasco occurred April 24, 1980.

IF THE HOSTAGES ARE HOME: *

RR should open with an expression of relief that they are at last free. He should express his sympathy for the families and the hope and expectation that the hostages will all receive the very best medical and other assistance our nation can provide. RR should go on to say that now that our nation has, at last put this nightmare behind us, we would do well to examine how it came about in the first place. How did the United States find itself in a situation where its ally, the preeminent power in the Persian Gulf, was toppled by radicals. There are important lessons in this for the future conduct of our foreign policy. RR should call for a full-scale Congressional investigation of the situation and call for the full cooperation of the State and Defense Departments and the Central Intelligence Agency.

RR should point out that mixed with our joy is the haunting fear that we may not know the full extent of the commitment made by Mr. Carter to secure the release at this time. Secret deals are as inappropriate now as they were in 1976 when Candidate Carter campaigned against them.

In particular, we must ensure that we are not dragged into the "quagmire" of a Middle East war. A commitment to support Ayatullah Khomeini and his radical friends Quodaffi, Syria and North Korea -- against the moderates of the region (Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Egypt) may be short term relief and long term disaster. We must remain neutral. To support the

* Note: Bringing the hostages home now is an indictment of President Carter's leadership. If he can get them home now when it is crucial to his reelection, why couldn't he bring them home earlier?

"rejectionist Front States" undermines the foundation of 3 decades of Middle East policy. Egypt, Saudi, Jordan, Morocco are the key to peace in the region. To oppose them is to further remove the prospect of peace between Israel and her neighbors.

Finally, we are now down 3 million barrels a day as a result of the Middle East conflict. If we oppose Saudi and the moderates we could be down 16 million with disastrous consequences for our industrial base, our economy and the prospects of maintaining a strong America--not to mention the impact on our European allies and Japan.

IF THE HOSTAGES HAVE NOT BEEN FREED:

RR should open with an expression of sympathy for the hostages and their families - their year-long ordeal, their purgatory, has shattered the lives and dreams of everyone its touched. Further, our national humiliation, before the eyes of the world, has been unbearable.

In a week our countrymen will have been held hostage in Iran for 1 year. We must do nothing to endanger the prospects for their early release, but once they are home we would do well to examine how we got into this situation in the first place. There are important lessons in this for the future conduct of our foreign policy. Further, we should call for a full-scale Congressional investigation and ask the cooperation of the Departments of State and Defense and the Central Intelligence Agency.

RR should say that as this tragedy is brought to a conclusion, it is important that Americans know the nature and extent of any commitments Mr. Carter makes to Iran.

In particular, we must ensure that we are not dragged into the "quagmire" of a Middle East war. A commitment to support Ayatullah Khomeini and his radical friends Quodaffi, Syria and North Korea -- against the moderates of the region (Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Egypt) may be short term relief and long term disaster. We must remain neutral. To support the "rejectionist Front States" undermines the foundation of 3 decades of Middle East policy. Egypt, Saudi, Jordan, Morocco are the key to peace in the region. To oppose them is to further remove the prospect of peace between Israel and her neighbors.

Finally, we are now down 3 million barrels a day as a result of the Middle East conflict. If we oppose Saudi and the moderates we could be down 16 million with disastrous consequences for our industrial base, our economy and the prospects of maintaining a strong America -- not to mention the impact on our European allies and Japan.

CARTER'S USE OF THE HOSTAGES FOR
POLITICAL PURPOSE

IOWA

- 1) A day before the Iowa caucuses on January 21st, Carter said, "my belief is that many of the responsible officials in Iran now see that this major threat to Iran's security and the peace of Iran is becoming paramount, and that there will be an additional effort on their part to secure the release of the hostages."

MAINE

- 2) On February 6th, two days before the Maine caucuses, "I hope that we will see some light at the end of that tunnel before too long." Four days before those caucuses, on February 2nd, the President agreed to delay sanctions against Iran, as campaign officials hinted publicly at a breakthrough.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

- 3) The New Hampshire primary was on February 26th. On Saturday the 23rd the U.N. commission arrived in Tehran. And on the 24th, the President returned to the White House from Camp David and told reporters, "I think progress is being made".

MASSACHUSETTS & VERMONT

- 4) The Massachusetts and Vermont primaries were on March 4th. At 10:00 the night before, Carter released a major foreign policy statement, saying a communications error led to the highly unpopular anti-Israeli vote in the U.N.

WISCONSIN

- 5) The morning of the Wisconsin primary the President called an Oval Office news conference to say "This morning the President of Iran has announced that the hostages' control would be transferred to the government of Iran, which we consider to be a positive step.

HOSTAGES CHRONOLOGY

1979

- October 22 --The exiled Shah arrived unannounced in New York from Mexico to undergo medical treatment at the New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center. The following day, the State Department announced that the United States had notified the Iranian government that the Shah was being admitted into the country strictly for medical reasons, and that he would return to Mexico after doctors had completed treatment.
- October 31-- The Khomeni-inspired Islamic Republic Party called for a march on the U.S. Embassy in Tehran for the next day to protest "U.S. imperialism." U.S. Embassy officials were reported to have said that contact would be made with the Iranian police in order to ensure the security of the Embassy compound during the forthcoming demonstration.
- November 1 -- Khomeni's office in Qom issued a statement appealing to Iranian students to take action against the United States to force the U.S. to return the Shah to Iran.
- November 4 --As several thousand persons demonstrated in Tehran, about 500 protesters, described as Iranian students, entered the U.S. embassy compound and seized some 100 hostages, including over 60 Americans. The attackers issued a demand that the United States extradite the deposed Shah. In Qom, a spokesman for Ayatollah Khomeni declared that the occupation of the embassy had the revolutionary leader's personal support.
- November 7 --A special diplomatic mission under former Attorney General Ramsey Clark and Senate Intelligence Director William Miller, appointed by Carter to negotiate with Khomeni, was not permitted to enter Iran and was recalled by Khomeni.
- November 9 -- The United Nations Security Council calls on the militants to free the hostages "without delay."
- November 14-- All Iranian assets in the United States are frozen on Carter's orders.
- November 19-- 13 women and black hostages are released.
- November 20-- The Pentagon orders the aircraft carrier Kitty Hawk and five other Navy warships to proceed to the Indian Ocean near Iran.

- November 23--President Carter warns Khomeini of "extremely grave" U.S. retaliation if a single U.S. hostage is harmed.
- December 2 --The Shah leaves New York for a military hospital near San Antonio. Iranians vote on a new Islamic constitution giving Khomeini supreme power for life.
- December 4 --The U.N. Security Council votes unanimously to urge Iran to free the American hostages.
- December 8 --Iran announces it is forming an international panel to help investigate alleged spying by the hostages and U.S. "crimes."
- December 12--The U.S. State Department orders the expulsion of 183 Iranian diplomats.
- December 15--The Shah left the United States and was flown to an island in Panama. The International Court at the Hague orders Iran to free all of the hostages.
- January 1 --Kurt Waldheim arrives in Tehran but is told he cannot negotiate the release of the hostages.
- January 13--Ten of 15 Security Council members vote in favor of economic sanctions against Iran but the Soviet Union vetoes the resolution. The United States decides on sanctions of its own.
- January 22--The Carter Administration delays imposing economic sanctions until after Iran's Presidential election Jan. 25.
- January 31--U.S. officials express optimism over a "package deal" for a settlement of the hostages proposed by U.N. Secretary-General Waldheim.
- February 13--President Carter says that he favors a U.N. commission to look into the U.S. role in Iran and Iranian charges against the Shah. Bani-Sadr says Khomeini has accepted an "action plan" to end the hostage stalemate.
- February 15--U.N. sources say the United States and Iran have agreed on the make-up of a five-member commission, selected by Secretary-General Waldheim, to go to Iran to investigate Iran's charges against the Shah and the United States.
- February 23--Khomeini says the decision on the release of the hostages will not be made until after elections for a new Iranian parliament in April. Carter reacts by cautioning against pessimism: "I am not cast into the depths of despair... I think progress is being made."

- March 11--The U.N. commission, declaring its mission a total failure, left Tehran on March 11th. U.S. government officials, including Secretary Vance, expressed the hope that the commission might resume its work.
- March 23--The Shah leaves Panama for Egypt.
- April 1 --President Bani-Sadr offers to take custody of the hostages from the militants if the United States agrees to a truce in what he calls its war of words and economic and diplomatic pressure against Iran. At an early morning news conference (this being the day of the Wisconsin primary), Carter characterizes Bani-Sadr's statements as a "positive step" and announces further postponement of new economic sanctions against Iran, which were scheduled to go into effect that day.
- April 7--Khomeini rules that the hostages must remain in the hands of the militants. In response, the United States breaks diplomatic relations with Iran, expelling 35 diplomats remaining in the country and imposing a series of economic sanctions.
- April 25--The White House announces that a U.S. military force flew to a remote desert in Iran in hopes of carrying out a rescue of the hostages in Tehran but the plan had to be aborted because of the failure of three helicopters. Eight American servicemen are killed in a ground collision of a C-130 and a helicopter as the aircraft were preparing to leave the area.
- April 26--Iran announces the hostages are being moved from the U.S. embassy to other parts of Tehran and to other Iranian cities to foil another U.S. rescue effort.
- April 28--Secretary Vance resigns in protest of the attempt to rescue the hostages.
- April 29--Senator Muskie is named to replace Vance.
- May 7 --The militants holding the American hostages say 12 groups of captives have been scattered to various Iranian cities to head off any new U.S. rescue attempt.
- May 10--The Islamic Republican Party, many of whose members demand spy trials for the hostages, takes a commanding lead in the Iranian parliamentary election.
- June 17--A Tehran newspaper says that the Iranian parliament is not likely to consider the hostage question until mid-September.
- July 10--Khomeini orders the release of hostage Richard Queen, a 28-year old vice consul who had been ill.

JULY 27--The deposed Shah dies in a Cairo military hospital.

AUGUST 10--The New York Times reported that Secretary Muskie expressed new hopes about the prospects for a break in the crisis because of the coming together of several factors: the end of the month-long fast of Ramadan on August 13th, the death of the Shah, the return of hostage Richard Queen, and the gradual emergence of the Parliament as a viable political institution. He made reference to the indirect contacts by the U.S. with people of importance in Iran, and indicated that there may be new initiatives soon.

AUGUST 23--A Pentagon panel in Washington says some planning flaws and other weaknesses, including assignment of too few helicopters, helped doom the hostage rescue mission on April 25.

SEPTEMBER 10--U.S. State Department spokesman John Trattner says the United States is willing to discuss the hostage issue with Iran but does not intend to apologize for its past actions in Iran.

SEPTEMBER 12--Khomeini lists four conditions for the hostages' release but omits a previous demand for a U.S. apology. The conditions: return of the late Shah's wealth, cancellation of U.S. claims against Iran, unfreezing of Iranian funds in the United States and U.S. guarantees of no interference in Iran.

SEPTEMBER 14--Iran's parliament votes to open debate September 16th on the hostage issue.

SEPTEMBER 16--Full debate of the hostage issue is delayed in the Parliament. A special committee is to be chosen to deal with the question.

SEPTEMBER 19--Air and ground battles break out between Iran and Iraq.

OCTOBER 3 --Iranian Parliament names 7 Islamic fundamentalists to a special panel to determine a course of action on the hostages.

WHAT THE HOSTAGES WILL DISCOVER ON THEIR RETURN

There were 5.7 million Americans out of work in November 1979. Today August 1980) 8 million were out of work.

The Consumer Price Index went from 227.5 in 11/79 to 249.4 in 8/80 - an increase of 9% in nine months.

A dollar put aside at the time the hostages were taken is worth less than 90¢ today.

Net income to farm operators dropped from \$32.8 B (1979, II) to \$21.9 B (1980, II).

Net income per farm in constant 1967 dollars dropped from \$6570 (1979, II) to \$3870 (1980, II), a decrease of 41%.

Real GNP dropped from \$1422 B in 1972 dollars (1979, II) to \$1408.6 B (1980, II)

Real per capita disposable income dropped from \$4510 (1979, II) to \$4423 (1980, II), a decline in well being of 1.9%.

The unemployment rate at the time of the hostage seizure was 5.8%. Today (9/80) it is 7.5%.

Productivity dropped from 118.3 (1979, II) to 117.1 (1980, II).

Capacity utilization rate for American industry dropped from 84.4% (11/79) to 74.5 (8/80).

During 1980 home mortgage rates hit a historic high of 16%.

The prime rate hit an historic high of 20%.

The federal budget for 1981, which Jimmy Carter pledged to balance, turns out to have a deficit of \$29.8 B (Carter's estimate), which is likely to turn into \$40 - \$50 B by the end of the fiscal year.

American taxpayers will pay an addition \$86 billion in FY 81 over FY 80, thanks to Carter's social security, oil, and bracket creep taxes.

Housing starts, 1.7 million in 1979, are expected to drop to 1.2 million for 1980.

The national debt went from \$833 B at the end of 1979 FY to an estimated \$900+ at the end of FY 1980.

CARTER CLAIMS OF ACCOMPLISHMENT

- 1.) Carter will claim to have developed the first comprehensive national energy program, citing the windfall profits tax, synfuels bill, the natural gas bill, and oil decontrol.
- 2.) Carter will claim to have promoted energy independence by cutting oil imports 1½ million barrels per day.
- 3.) Carter will claim to have increased aid to state and local governments, with major increases in mass transit, economic development assistance, and urban economic assistance.
- 4.) ...added 8.6 million jobs in 3½ years and proposed and enacted the largest minimum wage increase in history.
- 5.) Increased federal aid to education by 73%.
- 6.) Has really done the job for low income Americans; has increased food assistance by 193%, public service employment by 257%, and has started low energy assistance.
- 7.) Has supported ERA and has worked actively for its passage.
- 8.) Has completed an arms reduction treaty which can save the U.S. billions of dollars and has prevented the need to resort to the arms race wild card.
- 9.) Reversed decade-long decline in real defense spending and has committed U.S. to 3% real growth annually.
- 10.) Has pursued development of important and long overdue weapons systems such as the MX; has also revitalize NATO.
- 11.) Opened full diplomatic realtions with mainland China, despite Republican opposition.
- 12.) Camp David.
- 13.) Has established reputation of competence and integrity in the Persian Gulf. Look how readily the Saudis turned to us when things got hot in the Mideast a couple of weeks ago.
- 14.) Has lots for clean air, clean water, open space, etc.
- 15.) Deregulation of air, rail, trucks.
- 16.) Has sought tirelessly to prevent nuclear proliferation which is "our business."
- 17.)

ATTACK POINTS ON CARTER

- 1.) Inflation. 4.8% when Ford left office. 12% now. Carter promised to bring it down to 4% when he ran in 1976.
- 2.) Unemployment. 7.5% today. No improvement since Ford left office. Carter promised to reduce to 4%.
- 3.) Taxes. Nearly doubled from 1976 to 1981. CBO projects that if current rate of taxation is still in effect, will rise to over \$1 trillion a year by 1985.
- 4.) Deficits. Carter deficits will total nearly \$200 billion. FY 1981 deficit will be at least \$45 billion. Carter had originally promised to balance the budget by 1979.
- 5.) Interest Rates. Interest rates on conventional home mortgages nearly doubled.
- 6.) Agriculture. Net farm income down, in real terms, since 1976.
- 7.) Carter's Scapegoating. Carter is a master of attributing failures to everybody but himself, i.e. OPEC for inflation, the Fed for high interest rates, consumers for excessive energy use.
- 8.) Economic Roller-Coaster. Carter has announced five economic policies, 3 in the past 7 months.
- 9.) Margin of Safety. Carter has let our defenses slip, thereby increasing the chances of war.
- 10.) Draft. Carter supports registration, a first step to a draft.
- 11.) Military Pay. Carter has let military pay slip to the point where hundreds of thousands of military families can qualify for food stamps.
- 12.) Stealth. The leak damages effectiveness of Stealth by giving Soviets chance to develop countermeasures even before plans are in production or technology is complete.
- 13.) Veterans. Carter has allowed the G.I. bill to lapse.
- 14.) Housing. Cost of monthly housing payments has doubled in last 3½ years.
- 15.) Tuition Tax Credits. Carter broke his 1976 promise to support them.
- 16.) Refugees. Carter has been repeatedly confused on this. First he opened his arms to Cuban refugees; then he closed them; then he opened them again. The result is that we have no

coherent policy for dealing with the problem.

- 17.) Sleaziness. Carter has run a vituperative campaign. Reagan should act very pained about this; he is good at it.
- 18.) Hostages. After 11½ months of "hopeful assessments" by the Carter Administration, they're still there.
- 19.) Competence in Foreign Affairs. Carter has provided no leadership, and is regarded as an unreliable ally abroad. His incompetence itself should be an issue here.
- 20.) Foreign Policy Flip-Flops. Particular emphasis should be put on Carter's U.N. resolution "mistake" and the "unacceptability" of the Soviet brigade in Cuba. The point should not be that Reagan would be a harsher President, just that he wouldn't be viewed as a schizophrenic at home and abroad.

MEMORANDUM

To: Ed Meese
William Casey
Bill Timmons
Richard V. Allen
From: Elliott Abrams
RE: Carter-Reagan Debate

Based on discussions with Democrats and Jews in various cities, here are my comments on the debate.

1. War/Peace Issue: Defensiveness only reinforces the suspicion that Carter is right. The Governor's tone in his Sunday night address was just right. He ought to point out the unspoken message behind Carter's attack: "I am proposing nothing more than American firmness and American strength. Mr. Carter seems to be saying that American defense readiness and American power would threaten the peace. Every other American president since World War II--most especially the Democratic presidents, Truman, Kennedy, and Johnson--has understood that our power keeps the peace, that we live in a world where we must be so strong and so firm that our enemies won't even be tempted to launch invasions or take hostages. Mr. Carter's policy breaks with everything his party and mine have stood for. I do not believe America's strength is a threat to peace; I believe it is the guarantee of security and peace."

I would let few opportunities pass to state that this issue has been shamefully manipulated by the president, for one reason--to divert attention away from the real issue, his record in office.

2. Israel: Israel can be sneaked into the debate even if no question addresses it specifically. Our UN votes on Israel can be attacked as an example of Carter vacillation. This allows us a concrete example of how a Reagan Administration would differ on foreign policy, in a safe area--no-one can easily say that a changed UN vote would threaten peace.

3. ERA: The Governor says he opposes discrimination against women but also opposes ERA. I think we can use the following formulation to explain why he takes that view.

"We all agree on the goal of eliminating discrimination against women. What we are not in agreement on is whether ERA is the only way to do that. I have found persuasive the arguments of some of the leading constitutional scholars in this country [Prof. Paul Freund of Harvard and Prof. Philip Kurland of Chicago] that all the actual legal protection that's needed is already in place in the Constitution. The Fourteenth Amendment guarantees "equal protection of the laws" to all citizens. It has provided the legal basis for hundreds of lawsuits to stop discrimination against black Americans.

As the professors say, the Constitution already bars discrimination against women. If all the time dedicated to this symbolic matter of ERA were instead spent trying, under the Equal Protection Clause, to provide a real remedy in a real case of discrimination in, say, pay or promotion, discrimination against women would already be much reduced. Instead, ERA would introduce new language into the Constitution, which the courts would spend years just trying to interpret, and what they would ultimately come to mean is anyone's guess. Millions of Americans--men and women alike--cannot support ERA as the right way to go about our common goal, which is eliminating illegal discrimination, and I am one of them."

4. Domestic Issues: It will be easy to get nickled and dimed to death by Carter, and if we do our themes will not have been communicated. I would hit hard at the big government theme, in part because it can be made into an idealistic argument which I have found attracts attention. It goes something like this: "The Carter Administration believes that our country and our society will get better and better as there are more laws and regulations and officials telling us how to improve ourselves. Mr Carter proudly tells us that he has created two new Departments, the Departments of Energy and of Education, each with thousands and thousands of employees. Does anyone believe that thousands of new employees and thousands of new rules are going to produce more energy--or better educated children? I believe we do not need a bigger government to tell us how to lead our lives. That is the principle on which our nation was founded--indeed our Constitution is a series of limits on government power to protect the people from unwarranted and unwanted interference. The Carter Administration has increased the pressure of taxes, increased the size of government, increased the number and intrusiveness of government regulations; and it is time to stop it. It is time to return to the principles upon which the people of this country founded their government: that Americans are people who can be trusted with their own lives and that the federal government is not the source of wisdom and morality--the people are."

5. Conclusion of Debate: Concluding remarks should, I think, be directed at the undecided voters explicitly. One formulation might be "I know that many Americans are today undecided about this election. They are undecided because they have a deep respect for the Presidency, and a reluctance to vote against anyone holding that office. They are undecided because they are giving serious thought to the problems our country faces in the coming years. But we must admit that the Carter Administration has simply failed to meet the challenges at home and abroad. In this campaign everything possible has been done to keep attention off the record of this Administration--from attacks on me which are just shameful, to a manipulation of economic statistics, to the cynical use of Cabinet officers in an election campaign. But it is to the record we return." After some comments on the record, the Governor could turn to a positive and inspirational message. I suggest he not use the 'city on a hill' line again, as it is too familiar.

Mease

Reagan & Bush

Reagan Bush Committee

901 South Highland Street, Arlington, Virginia 22204 (703) 685-3400

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Ronald Reagan
FROM: Richard B. Wirthlin
DATE: October 24, 1980
RE: Summary of the Debate Strategy*

1. Be yourself. Don't hesitate, however, to attack Carter strongly on his record or to diffuse with disarming humor his personal charges when they become overblown.
2. Focus the thrust of each answer on Carter's incompetence and weak record.
3. In the presentation of your public policies show how they will impact people.
4. Cite the specific steps in your strategies for peace and economic growth.
5. Millions of voters are frustrated and disillusioned; they are looking for a competent, compassionate leader capable of giving them hope about the prospects for the future.
6. The key to the debate is to motivate Republicans and ticket-splitters to turnout on election day.
7. Our advantage lies in the fact that you are the best electronic media candidate in history.
8. Regardless of Carter's challenges, it is critical that you demonstrate constraint, firmness, moderation and compassion.
9. Use selected examples of Carter's mismanagement of government, his misstatements and flip-flops.

*Attached is a longer memo for your perusal.

Reagan & Bush

Reagan Bush Committee

901 South Highland Street, Arlington, Virginia 22204 (703) 685-3400

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Reagan/Bush Campaign

FROM: Richard B. Wirthlin, Richard S. Beal & Myles Martel .

DATE: October 21, 1980

RE: Reagan-Carter Debate Strategy

Campaign and Debate Axiom

If the Governor succeeds Tuesday in making Jimmy Carter's record the major issue of the debate and the campaign, we will succeed in the debate and win the general election.

If, however, Carter makes Ronald Reagan the issue of the debate and the campaign, we will lose both.

The above axiom holds because the major debate task turns on enhancing Ronald Reagan's perceived trustworthiness.

- Simply, if voters believe Ronald Reagan is more worthy of their trust after the debate than they did before, his vote support will expand and strengthen.
- This can be accomplished if the debate focuses on Carter's incompetence and weak record in office, and Reagan's compassion. Neither position can be reinforced when the Governor defends past positions.

Target Audience and the Voter Turnout Objective

The target audience consists of a key segment of the American vote--Republicans and ticket-splitters. It is these voters, not the panel and certainly not Carter the Governor is addressing.

- The Governor has already built a coalition large enough to win the presidential election, and hence, we want to use this debate to re-inforce our base and motivate them to turn out on election day.

- Our empirical studies show that if we increase the turnout of our voters by 2% over Carter's, it increases our electoral margin by 30 electoral votes.

The campaign strategy has been to deal initially to our Republican and conservative base, then to broaden our appeal, and finally to return to the base during these last two weeks of the campaign.

- The surveys show that we need, at this juncture, to increase our appeal among Republicans and ideologically moderate ticket-splitters who need to be reinforced through the Governor's debate performance.
- In answering the questions during the debate, the Governor must remember that ticket-splitters are solution oriented, somewhat skeptical and more interested in the issues and public policy than the image traits of the candidates.

These voters will respond to references to the "Nine Steps" in the Governor's peace strategy with the three critical elements of the "Strategy for Economic Growth." It is extremely important to avoid references to "Republicans and Democrats" or "I am a conservative" because ticket-splitters are non-partisans who are put-off by these words.

The Anderson debate helped, generally, to broaden our political base. Today the Reagan vote is larger, more committed and includes more segments of the voting population than does Carter's. Carter's base remains very fluid and uncertain.

The debate should help to solidify further the Reagan base and motivate them to turn out on election day. Only 22% of the electorate are self-identified Republicans, hence without the support of these ticket-splitters the Governor could not be elected.

Major Advantages

The principal advantages the Governor maintains going into this debate are:

- He has already debated six times before in this campaign and is more accustomed to such events.
- He is the best electronic media candidate in history.
- He will appear robust and vigorous by comparison to Carter who will likely appear bleached out and tense.

Principal Strategic Objectives

Televised political debates focus on image attributes more than issue positions. The image attributes we need to reinforce are:

- Competence
- Compassion
- Reasonableness, moderation, and thoughtfulness
- Strength

Essentially, the debate objective is:

Present Ronald Reagan as a reasonable and compassionate man with a vision of America and the competence to take us from simply providing the hope that vision conveys to its actualization.

How is this objective achieved?

Carter's attack strategy will undoubtedly try to represent Reagan's policies as "naive, unrealistic, anachronistic, and Alice-in-Wonderlandish." In response to this attack, the Governor has an excellent opportunity to show constraint, thoughtfulness and strength. And, when the attack becomes overblown, he should use disarming humor which will build both rapport and trust with the electorate.

It is essential for the Governor to use his answers to show that he is aware of different sides of the issues, that they are complex and that only after thoughtful consideration has he settled on a particular policy-orientation. In response to the Carter attacks that "he has flip-flopped," the Governor can use such attacks to demonstrate reasonableness and the lack of policy rigidity.

Carter's Attack Strategy

Exploit Reagan's flip-flops.

Make extensive use of Reagan quotes, e.g. during Democratic Convention.

Attack the Reagan California record and how Reagan has "distorted it."

Reagan's Response Strategy

Use changes to show reasonableness; defend public policy changes because circumstances have changed.

Counter with Carter and Kennedy quotes; avoid unnecessarily strident reactions; bring the discussion back to the Carter record.

Defend with confidence and indignation moving as quickly as possible back to the Carter record as the real issue; avoid unnecessary stridency; counter with "when Governor Carter approached this problem in his state, the record shows..." but the real issue of this is the Carter record which show he still hasn't been able to solve the

Carter's Attack Strategy

Attack Reagan's ideas as "quick fixes" that are unrealistic and even unworkable.

Suggest Reagan would be a dangerous man in the White House.

Several general points should be followed in the Governor's response strategy during the debate.

- It is not necessary to answer or respond to each of Carter's charges.
- It is especially important that the Governor be prepared for Carter's distortions of the California record. A good response to much of what Carter will say in this regard is something the Governor has already said: "You know, it's one thing when the Carter Administration jimmies its own economic figures to make its record look good, but when Mr. Carter starts jimmying my figures, that's going too far."
- The bottom line on the California record is that Californians were better off after the Governor's two terms of office, than this country is after four years of Jimmy Carter.

Reagan's Response Strategy

problems and maintain presidential tone and demeanor; act humored by Carter California record attacks-- he doesn't understand the problems of California anymore than of the nation.

Given the Carter record, the Carter Administration is incapable of evaluating what would work or not work; argue most Carter policies are in place for such a short time before Mr. Carter changes his mind that their only impact is a quick fix.

Respond with righteous indignation; no one wants peace more than I, after all, what reasonable person would not; the difference between Mr. Carter and I is my commitment to deter conflict by being economically and militarily strong, and pursuing a consistent foreign policy; uncertainty in our foreign policy is more apt to cause an international crisis that would result in war, than to have a strong economy and military.

- The Governor's responses must appear confident and strong, not strident.

Reagan Attack Strategy

The Governor should use his answers to remind the public of:

- Carter, instead of leading the people to greater peace and prosperity, was content to declare there was a malaise in the country and that it would not matter who was President the economy would be just as bad.
- Carter has failed to provide a steady hand at the helm, especially in foreign policy. We have very little support from our allies and largely undeveloped and fragmented policies toward our adversaries.
- Carter has been indecisive, and unwilling to pursue vigorously domestic and international policies.
- More than any previous administration, the Carter Administration has politicized the cabinet and compromised the non-partisan functions of the Departments of State and Defense.

Tactics and Special Considerations

- Emphasize strength and decisiveness while avoiding stridency. Anderson's stridency hurt him in the previous debate.
- Use of a combination of "Mr. Carter" and "President Carter" with more frequent use of "Mr. Carter."
- Remember the debate is between Ronald Reagan the candidate for President, and Jimmy Carter the candidate for the same office. When making references to the 1976 campaign, use "Jimmy Carter."
- Compassion is most easily communicated by referring to situations during the course of campaign experiences.
- Make use of the voter appeal of George Bush by referencing consultations and policy discussions with him.
- Avoid unnecessary references to "the past" and buzz words that alienate blocs of voters, e.g. "detente."

Reagan: Competence and Compassion

The man who will be the President of the United States for the next four years is:

The man who correctly identifies the nation's most pressing problems, and has the drive and ability to resolve them compassionately.

- What the American people want most is leadership in the White House that will give them hope that the country is heading in a direction that will mean greater security and prosperity.
- They are tired of pessimism and the acquiescence to mediocrity. But they are equally wary of political promises by office seekers who are not truly committed to the welfare of the people.
- Americans are looking for specific policy options such as those enumerated in the two speeches--"Strategy for Peace" and "Strategy for Economic Growth," which will already be given by the time of the debate. The Governor should not hesitate to repeat the steps outlined in each.

The Governor must communicate to the American people through his answers that it is the people's interests he intends to serve. The people say the thing that is killing them is inflation, and a weak economy. What will restore this country to its proper bearings is a President committed to reducing inflation and improving the economy.

DEBATE PREPARATION SCHEDULE

Friday, October 24

10:00 - 11:30	Review Debate Briefing Book and Economic Speech
11:30 - 12:30	Lunch
12:30	Chopper to WETA
1:00 - 3:00	Tape TV Address and "Reagan Reports"
3:30 - 4:00	Meeting with Arlington Headquarters Staff 1st Floor
4:00 - 4:10	Meeting with Senator Brooke - 4th Floor
4:15 - 5:30	Debate Strategy and Film Review Meeting 3rd Floor Conference Room

Saturday, October 25

10:00 - 11:00	Strategy Session <u>Participants:</u> Ed Meese, Dick Allen, Martin Anderson, Dick Wirthlin, Dave Gergen, Bill Carruthers, Myles Martel, and Jim Baker ***
11:00 - 12:00	Q & A (Foreign Policy and Defense) <u>Participants:</u> Same as above with addition of Cong. Dave Stockman, Stef Halper, Frank Hodsoll, and William Van Cleave
12:00 - 1:00	Lunch
1:00 - 2:00	Foreign Policy Briefing <u>Participants:</u> same as above
2:00 - 4:00	Q & A (Foreign Policy and Defense) <u>Participants:</u> same as above
5:30	Wexford fund-raiser

*** NOTE: Participants in all sessions on all days, as their schedules might permit: Bill Casey, Cap Weinberger, Stu Spencer, Mike Deaver, Bill Timmons, and Lyn Nofziger.

Debate Preparation Schedule
Page two

Sunday, October 26

10:00 - 11:00 Domestic Policy Briefing
Participants: Ed Meese, Dick Allen, Martin Anderson, Dick Wirthlin, Dave Gergen, Bill Carruthers, Myles Martel, Jim Baker, and Bill Simon

11:00 - 12:30 Q & A (Domestic Policy)
Participants: same as above with addition of Cong. Dave Stockman, Stef Halper, and Frank Hodsoll

12:30 - 2:00 Lunch

2:00 - 5:00 Simulation (Domestic and Foreign Policy)
Participants: same as above with George Will, Pat Buchanan, Jean Kirkpatrick, and Michael Boskin

Monday, October 27

10:00 - 12:30 Simulation (Domestic and Foreign Policy)
Participants: Ed Meese, Dick Allen, Martin Anderson, Dick Wirthlin, Dave Gergen, Bill Carruthers, Myles Martel, Jim Baker, Cong. Dave Stockman, Stef Halper, and Frank Hodsoll

12:30 - 1:30 Lunch

1:30 - 4:00 Review of issues
Review of Opening/Closing Statement
Participants: same as above

4:00 - 5:00 Strategy Wrap-Up
Participants: same as above

Tuesday, October 28

3:00 Depart for Dulles

*** NOTE: Participants in all sessions on all days, as their schedules might permit: Bill Casey, Cap Weinberger, Stu Spencer, Mike Deaver, Bill Timmons, and Lyn Nofziger.

CONFIDENTIAL

TO: PAUL LAXALT
Bill CASEY
ED MEESE ✓

October 26, 1980

FM: RICH WILLIAMSON

RE: THE "GREAT" DEBATE

Governor Reagan approaches Tuesday and the "Great Debate" in Cleveland an exposed candidate. Jimmy Carter is dealing the cards, and given the polls he must be getting desperate.

Our polling shows Governor Reagan with a strong electoral lead. In key states such as Illinois, Ohio and Michigan the trends continue to look good for us, far offsetting any erosion in the boarder states. Dick Wirthlin tells us that we have 10 different combinations of states we now lead in that would result in victory. And Ronald Reagan's personal appearances in key swing states are having a strong positive impact.

When we accepted the Debate on October 20th, Jerry Carmon observed that notwithstanding any public agreement the Debate would only take place on the 28th if on that day it is in Jimmy Carter's political interest to debate. If Carter's last minute polls show that it is not necessary for him to risk a debate, he can find any number of apparently legitimate reasons to pull out; the hostage "crisis" being the most obvious possibility.

WORST CASE

The worst case scenerio, it seems to me, would be for Carter to call a press conference Tuesday afternoon and report progress in the negotiations for release of the hostages. He would report further that the negotiations have reached a delicate stage where it would best serve the interests of the 52 hostages for him to return to Washington and personally oversee these negotiations. Mr. Carter would go on to say that he realizes this last minute cancellation of the Debate will hurt him politically but that he places the safety of the American hostages above his own political self-interest.

Mr. Carter might go even further. He might go on to say that he feels the American people have a right to see him debate with Ronald Reagan. That is why he was willing to debate Roanld Reagan any place any time one-on-one since last August, but that Reagan had ducked his challenge by hiding behind John Anderson. Now, since Jimmy Carter had to cancel the Cleveland Debate at the last minute, he will pledge he would debate Governor Reagan before election day - hostage negotiations permitting. Carter would go on and suggest Sunday, November 2nd as the new date.

There is great political risk for Carter in such a scenerio, but he is a total political animal unrestrained by normal standards of public duty or decency; a man who, I fear, would try extreme action for his own political survival. Given Wirthlin's numbers, he may feel he must take the risk, he must try the extreme action. For arguably, Carter has lost this election unless Governor Reagan makes a major blunder

during the debate - an unlikely eventuality given Governor Reagan's track record - or he pulls a rabbit out of the hat with the hostages. True it is desperation politics, but we should remind ourselves that he has been desperate before and he has not hesitated to exploit this issue.

IOWA: A "must win" show of early strength in the primaries for Jimmy Carter over Ted Kennedy was preceded by one day with this hostage maneuver; "...my belief is that many of the responsible officials in Iran now see that this major threat to Iran's security and the peace of Iran is becoming paramount and that there will be an additional effort on their part to secure the release of the hostages."

MAINE: On February 6th, two days before the Maine caucuses, "I hope that we will see some light at the end of that tunnel before too long." Four days before those caucuses, on February 2nd, the President agreed to delay sanctions against Iran, as campaign officials hinted publicly at breakthrough.

NEW HAMPSHIRE: The New Hampshire primary was on February 26th. On Saturday the 23rd the U.N. commission arrived in Tehran. And on the 24th, the President returned to the White House from Camp David and told reporters, "I think progress is being made."

WISCONSIN: Carter had been told that if Wisconsin fell to Kennedy Pennsylvania was sure to follow (it did anyway, narrowly). In a desperate attempt to recover momentum, the morning of the Wisconsin primary the President called an Oval Office news conference to say, "This morning the President of Iran has announced that the hostages' control would be transferred to the government of Iran, which we consider to be a positive step.

Consequently, I feel it is a live possibility that Mr. Carter may deal his cards in the manner described above. He would thereby seize the initiative; divert attention from the sick economy; hype the hostage issue - which tangentially has spin toward the war & peace issue;

and perhaps freeze Reagan's schedule further if we were to hold 3 or 4 days down time prior to the newly scheduled debate for candidate preparation - which denies our campaign of its greatest asset in the key swing states: Ronald Reagan personally campaigning.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1) VISION SPEECH: If Mr. Carter pulls out at the last minute, I suggest we immediately try to buy a 30 minute network TV slot that night - each of the nets will have 90 minutes freed up to fill with old movies and/or specials on the Hostage situation. We use that half-hour to present Governor Reagan delivering the Vision speech. The showing would have a good viewership, it would present Ronald Reagan at his best, it would divert attention from the Carter shell game, it would get us into the same news cycle with a positive Reagan presentation of his hopes for America.

To prepare for this possibility, Bill Gavin would have to complete his rework of the Dolan speech and we would have to reserve studio time for late Tuesday afternoon in Cleveland.

2) SET STAGE: The most encouraging development on the Hostage issue are the Wirthlin numbers that show voters ^{ARE} becoming more cynical about Jimmy Carter's exploitation of the issue for his own political purposes. (A few weeks ago only about 1 in 4 voters saw Carter using the hostages for political purposes; now with an 18% movement in

just 8 days almost 1 in 2 voters see Carter using the hostage issue for political purposes.) We should feed this skepticism. Per the decision of the "hostage planning group" we should continue to have the question asked: WHY NOW? Surrogates are being utilized for this. Our press department should also push this line.

The media are bored with this presidential campaign. Neither side has created much excitement. The tempo has not varied much. They seem ready to jump all over Carter's political exploitation of the hostages. We should continue to feed this predilection.

3) RISK OF WAR - SECRET DEALS: We should have former President Ford, George Bush and Henry Kissinger set to jump all over Carter about possible secret deals Carter might be making to free the hostages. They should raise the question of whether Carter might be making secret deals that could get us embroiled in a Middle East war to free the hostages. They should ask whether Carter is negotiating with pure motives - is he acting primarily for his own political survival rather than the long-term national good.

4) RESCHEDULED DEBATE: Governor Reagan should not commit himself immediately to any postponed/rescheduled one-on-one debate with Carter. He should buy time. We should not lock him into a position on debating next Sunday or next Monday night. Probably we will need him on the road in the key northern industrial states those final days. And even ~~if~~ Carter says he will be back in Cleveland next Sunday evening to debate, there is no guarantee that he will not back off again in the last minute.

THE "GREAT" DEBATE

Page 6

It would be a capital mistake to let Jimmy Carter control our campaign during the final crucial days. Furthermore, we should see how the Carter hostage shell game is playing with the media and the voters before we decide to a delayed/rescheduled debate.

MEMO TO: Bill Casey, Ed Meese
FROM: Jim Baker
RE: Debate Briefings
DATE: October 24, 1980

I have received requests from Ann Armstrong, Bill Brock, and John Tower that they be included in some or all of the debate briefing meetings at Wexford. Please let me know your wishes in this regard.

Billy Denies Meeting Arafat While in Libya

Billy Carter said yesterday that he met briefly with George Habash, leader of an extremist Palestinian organization, on one of his visits to Libya, but the president's brother denied ever meeting with Yasser Arafat, head of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

Billy Carter's comments were in response to an article, scheduled to appear in *The New Republic*, that says he met with both Palestinian leaders.

The article, written by Arnaud de Borchgrave, a former *Newsweek* writer, and Michael Ledeen, execu-

Billy Carter's Libyan friends, A-13

tive editor of *Washington Quarterly*, also reports that Carter received \$50,000 from Libya that he did not disclose to the Justice Department when he registered as a foreign agent for Libya in July.

Carter, in a telephone interview, vehemently denied receiving any unreported payments from Libya. "I never got anything more than I told the Senate about," he said, in reference to his testimony before a Senate panel.

The special Senate subcommittee that investigated Billy Carter's relationship with Libya made public yesterday about 2,000 pages of depositions taken by its staff attorneys in private sessions.

There was no mention in either the depositions or in the public hearings that Billy Carter had met with Habash or Arafat or that he had received an additional \$50,000 in expenses.

In his statement of registration as a Libyan agent, Carter declared that, in addition to lodging and food on his two trips to Libya, he received a total of \$13,680 to offset expenses. He also reported receiving \$220,000 as a loan from Libya.

New York Times Service

THE WASHINGTON STAR Friday, October 24, 1980

Debate Briefing

26 Oct 80

Mtg w/ Pat Buchanan

Explosive Areas

SALT
Iran

→ Don't want to build
more weapons.

We need a COMPASS rather
than a WEATHERVANE.

Chicago Tribune

FOUNDED June 10, 1847

STANTON R. COPK, *Chairman and Publisher*
CLAYTON KIRKPATRICK, *President*
HAROLD R. LIVVENDAHL, *General Manager*

MAXWELL McCROHON,
Editor

WILLIAM H. JONES,
Managing Editor

JOHN McCUTCHEON,
Editorial Page Editor

Section 2

Sunday, October 26, 1980

Ronald Reagan for President

The Tribune today endorses the candidacy of Ronald Reagan for President of the United States. We're not going to pretend that the decision was easy. To conscientious voters, this presidential campaign has been a nightmare. There is good reason to worry about Gov. Reagan—about his age, his glibness, his inconsistencies, and his failure to delve more than skin-deep into important issues.

We base our decision on these premises: Despite Gov. Reagan's weaknesses, his record suggests that the dire fears often expressed about him are exaggerated; to endorse John Anderson would be to sidestep the issue; a Reagan administration would be better able to deal with the country's problems, particularly inflation, than another Carter administration; and the Reagan candidacy carries with it a sense of mission, of direction, perhaps of change, that more and more Americans want and that the other major candidates lack.

Reagan's record

Gov. Reagan's loose tongue and some of his positions have invited charges that he would get us into war, that his economics are based on sleight of hand, and that he opposes the rights of women, labor, and minorities. We ourselves have been dismayed by some of the things he has said and some of the things in his platform. But there is a lot of emotion in the charges against him [just as there is among his supporters], and analysis suggests that the worst fears are exaggerated or misguided.

His record as governor of California from 1967 to 1975 offers little if anything to mark him as a wild man. On the contrary, his administration was generally acclaimed by both the public and the press. It saw broad extensions of women's rights [even though he opposes the Equal Rights Amendment as unnecessary]. He left the state's finances in better shape than he found them. He was particularly praised for the caliber of people he brought into government and the reliance he placed on them.

He made enemies, but he made most of them for good reason and he didn't make enough to prevent his reelection in 1970 by a margin of 500,000 votes. He

Look next at the caliber of people surrounding him now. With one or two exceptions they are capable and experienced men and women who would not be his advisers if they didn't expect to be listened to. Conservative, yes. But crackpots and firebrands—people like Alan Greenspan and George Shultz? Hardly. There is every reason to believe that a Reagan administration would be guided by experienced and sensible people with sound minds.

Finally, if less tangibly, election to as awe-inspiring a job as the presidency has a sobering effect on anyone who gains it. We can expect Mr. Reagan's comments to be a good deal more circumspect if he finds himself in the White House.

Anderson's candidacy

We endorsed John Anderson in the Republican primary in Illinois because we liked his candor and agreed with most of his positions. Since he lost the party nomination, he has been thrashing about in search of a constituency [and of funds], and has lost some of his identifiability. More important, it is clear that he will not win, with or without our endorsement. To support him under these conditions would be to avoid our responsibility. Those who are doing so hope that their gesture of protest will lead to improvements in the nominating procedure. But that can come later. Madness is not going to help us through the next four years. The real choice is between Mr. Reagan and Mr. Carter.

Reagan vs. Carter

A Carter victory would mean four more years of pretty words, vacillation, and national drift. True, Mr. Carter has had his successes, notably Camp David in foreign affairs and deregulation of airlines and trucking at home. But they are the exception rather than the rule. Even if the hostages are released before election day as part of a deal—something that would help Mr. Carter at the polls—it would not really be a victory; it would have come about on Iran's terms, at Iran's pleasure, and for Iran's convenience, not ours.

Mr. Carter's record on the economy has been dismal. It took him three years to learn that inflation is more dangerous to the country than unemployment, and we're not sure that he is convinced of it now. Occasional bursts of courage, such as the tightening of money last fall and the resistance to a tax cut now, have generally faded away as the political reaction became uncomfortable.

On energy, Mr. Carter has moved—albeit cautiously—toward the decontrol of fuel prices for the sound purpose of encouraging production at home and reducing our dependence on imports. But

antagonized the legislature, mainly because of his efforts to trim state programs such as welfare, which legislators wanted left untouched. He antagonized the bureaucracy by trimming its numbers and its costly perquisites. He opposed collective bargaining for public employes—something that more states should have done and that has won him the bitter enmity of the AFL-CIO.

80 ★ ★ **VOTE**
NOV. 4

"windfall profits" tax which is in fact an excise tax rather than a tax on profits, windfall or otherwise, and which substantially demolishes the encouragement promised to industry by higher prices.

Our foreign policy has tended to be a source of confusion to our allies and amusement to the Soviet Union, which has drawn one country after another into its orbit—most recently Cambodia and, if it succeeds, Afghanistan. For three years, Mr. Carter gave low priority to military spending—even as federal spending elsewhere rose—and our influence abroad declined accordingly.

Can Mr. Reagan do better? We believe he can, but not on the basis of what has been said during the campaign. None of the candidates has given proper attention to the major issues; the public, for its part, has been unduly distracted by peripheral issues such as ERA and abortion.

On the one hand we have Mr. Carter, who offers little but his record — one that promises only more inertia. On the other we have Mr. Reagan, whose proposals are marred by rash assumptions such as that a broad tax cut will help balance the budget, that total decontrol will promptly solve our energy problems, and that in dealing with the rest of the world we still have the dominant power that enabled our soldiers in 1941 to sing "We did it before and we can do it again."

The Carter administration is unlikely to change its ambivalent approach. It is too dependent on the support of liberals and big unions who have helped to bring on our troubles. A Reagan administration would be almost certain to tone down the rasher positions taken during the campaign, particularly on energy and arms control, thus heading us in a forward direction at a sensible speed. And Mr. Reagan's compass is pointed in the right direction — toward sounder fiscal policy, toward a stronger defense, and toward reliance on private initiative rather than bureaucratic planning. He would approach problems with a conviction and determination that the Carter administration has lacked.

Reagan's mission

This leads to the sense of mission or of purpose which may be Gov. Reagan's greatest asset. We don't mean the evangelical fervor of some of the groups that have latched on to the Reagan candidacy — the rabid anti-ERA and anti-abortion lobbies and the self-righteous zealots who act as if they had a proprietary interest in morality. This kind of shrill emotionalism is as troublesome as the anti-Reagan emotionalism, and would play no part in a Reagan administration.

We're talking about the more subtle and pervasive feeling that it's time to reverse what many Americans see as a trend away from individual responsibility, toward apathy, toward dependence on government handouts and regulation, and toward the self-indulgences of the "me generation." These trends go hand-in-hand with inflation and the decline of American influence in the world.

Some tangible signs of this awakening are already evident: the cooling ardor of Congress for demand-side tax cuts that will only push prices up faster, and the recognition by auto unions that utopia is not attained by constantly demanding higher pay for less work.

In short, the country may be in the mood for the kind of change that Mr. Reagan symbolizes. It can't be brought about overnight. But with public support and sound management, a Reagan administration might propel us in the right direction. It's not an unrealistic hope. A Reagan administration is not going to lead us into war or economic ruin, and the alternative to a Reagan administration is more of what already has made us a frustrated nation.

national elections, and on Nov. 4 its vote could well be decisive. We urge Illinois voters to recognize that while they may not be enthusiastic about any of the candidates, their vote — or their failure to vote — will do a lot to determine who is our next President at a time when leadership is as important to our future as it ever has been. Who is elected does make a difference, and we urge them to vote for Ronald Reagan.

The Vice Presidency

In a way, the two major candidates for Vice President are mirror images of one another. Walter Mondale, who is running for re-election with Mr. Carter, is an affable, gregarious, professional politician who performs beautifully in front of a crowd. But like a Potemkin village, there is little solid behind his attractive facade. He is the administration's liaison with organized labor and other special interest groups with an appetite for federal spending. He is an accomplished vote-getter — and his notion of what gets votes generally gets inflation, too. If this bothers Mr. Mondale, it has not been evident.

George Bush, who tried in vain for the Republican presidential nomination and settled for second place on the Reagan ticket, is ill at ease in the political arena. It was his awkward reaction to a minor crisis involving a television debate in New Hampshire that probably derailed him as a presidential candidate. Beneath the somewhat reserved exterior, though, is a man with a sound mind and broad experience, especially in intelligence and foreign affairs. Whatever their differences in the past, Mr. Bush makes a fitting teammate for Mr. Reagan. And if the need should arise, the country's affairs would be better off in his hands than in Mr. Mondale's.

W. Howard Bronson, Jr. Raymond McDaniel Jim Montgomery
President & Publisher Editor Editorial Page Editor

Members of The Times Editorial Board

Sunday, October 26, 1980

Times endorses Ronald Reagan

Some of our readers no doubt assumed long ago that The Times would endorse Ronald Reagan for president. Some, judging from remarks they've made, apparently thought we already had. The truth is, our decision to endorse the Republican candidate was not made until this week, and it was neither automatic nor easy.

The question was not whether we would endorse Ronald Reagan or Jimmy Carter. The Times did not endorse Mr. Carter four years ago, because we felt he was not the more capable candidate. Mr. Carter's four years in office have, we feel, borne out that judgment. His administration of American affairs has been pitiable, both at home and abroad. We cannot recall a weaker, more incompetent presidency than Mr. Carter's has been. There was never a question as to whether or not we would endorse Mr. Carter. We absolutely could not.

The question was whether or not we would endorse any candidate at all in 1980. Could we place The Times' integrity on the line with an endorsement of Ronald Reagan or John Anderson? In these final weeks, it became easier to count out Mr. Anderson, whose candidacy has increasingly become the sideshow of the 1980 campaign. But what about Mr. Reagan? Was he, as he has sometimes been portrayed, the warmonger, the transgressor on individual rights, the shoot-from-the-hip mouthpiece of the right wing fringe?

Based on what we had known of Mr. Reagan from national press and television coverage, it would have been easy to pass on a presidential endorsement this year, to say nothing. That would leave us saying, in effect, that inept as Mr. Carter has been, no other candidate would be any better. We found that thought profoundly disturbing, to say the least.

When the opportunity came last week for The Times editorial board to meet with Mr. Reagan, we accepted it, not at all sure what the outcome might be. Our Wednesday morning private session with him was a discussion of several issues which we felt important to the nation, and which we felt would reveal to us more of Mr. Reagan's thinking than campaign coverage has so far disclosed.

What we expected was a snow job. What we got was an honest, reasonable, candid — and above all else, encouraging — picture of a man who is, indeed, presidential material: serious, thoughtful, given to logical approaches instead of smart retorts. Within each of his answers, we could find a line or two which, if

Kenny
Klinge
Ext.
3470

Shreveport
LA.
TIMES

Kenny
Klinge
ext. 3470

four years ago, because we felt he was not the more capable candidate. Mr. Carter's four years in office have, we feel, borne out that judgment. His administration of American affairs has been pitiable, both at home and abroad. We cannot recall a weaker, more incompetent presidency than Mr. Carter's has been. There was never a question as to whether or not we would endorse Mr. Carter. We absolutely could not.

The question was whether or not we would endorse any candidate at all in 1980. Could we place The Times' integrity on the line with an endorsement of Ronald Reagan or John Anderson? In those final weeks, it became easier to count out Mr. Anderson, whose candidacy has increasingly become the sideshow of the 1980 campaign. But what about Mr. Reagan? Was he, as he has sometimes been portrayed, the warmonger, the trampler on individual rights, the shoot-from-the-hip mouth-piece of the right wing fringe?

Based on what we had known of Mr. Reagan from national press and television coverage, it would have been easy to pass on a presidential endorsement this year, to say nothing. That would leave us saying, in effect, that in spite of Mr. Carter's record, no other candidate would be any better. We found that thought profoundly disturbing, to say the least.

When the opportunity came last week for The Times editorial board to meet with Mr. Reagan, we accepted it, not at all sure what the outcome might be. Our Wednesday morning private session with him was a discussion of several issues which we felt important to the nation, and which we felt would reveal to us more of Mr. Reagan's thinking than campaign coverage has so far disclosed.

What we expected was a snow job. What we got was an honest, reasonable, candid -- and above all else, encouraging -- picture of a man who is, indeed, presidential material: serious, thoughtful, given to logical approaches instead of smart retorts. Within each of his answers, we could find a line or two which, if lifted out of its fuller context, would have been the sort of thing we've been hearing on the evening news broadcasts. A word or phrase, taken by itself, could have been sensationalized into a controversial remark. But surrounded as they were by the modifications of Mr. Reagan's complete statements, the words made perfect sense. We wonder how many of his so-called "blunders" have grown from exactly such situations. There is reason to worry about the kind of politics the modern news media have given us. Mr. Reagan, in our judgment, is a far better candidate than he has been portrayed.

CON'T.

... he can do better

With the above as background, *The Times* today endorses Ronald Reagan's candidacy for president, and we urge our readers to look closely at Mr. Reagan, as opposed to Mr. Carter.

There is no single issue more vital to United States citizens today than the state of the American economy, which has grown increasingly worse with Mr. Carter's inept handling. Inflation, specifically, is eating away at almost all of America's strengths, and only promises to get worse with another four years of the administration we have now. Buying a house is now almost a cruel joke to the average American, as is buying just about anything else. Inflation has crunched down on local governments, which must ask hard-pressed taxpayers for more funds. And still the federal tax bite grows, to fund the expansive spending of the national government.

Mr. Reagan proposes to do quite a lot to remedy this. First would come a federal tax cut, allowing the American worker to keep more of the money he earns. This would not reduce the amount of money the government now has; it would simply keep it from getting more, as it will if current structures remain in place. With that, Mr. Reagan wants a halt in the growth of federal spending, to bring the budget toward a balance. Is this mere campaign fluff? Well, when he became governor of California, he inherited a \$191 million deficit but brought the budget into line within a year. In the process, his administration also managed to improve dozens of state operations, put more money into education, and generally make the state government *click*. Mr. Carter has no such achievement to his credit.

Mr. Reagan has been called a hawk who would leave us at war in short order. Yet he made it clear to us that he sees military action — as any sane person would — as only the absolute last resort, when all other possible solutions have been tried. On the other hand, he sees military preparedness as the only sane way to prevent the need for military action. As is well documented by now, America's military strength is at an alarmingly low ebb — a weakness which may tempt international adventurers to draw us into a war that no one, including Mr. Reagan, wants. He is no warmonger. He is a sensible man.

In diplomacy, Mr. Reagan would be drawing not only on his own experience as a special envoy, but also on a think-tank of experienced foreign relations experts — not on the Georgia good ole boys who have put us where we are today. In many other fields of presidential endeavor, he would also be listening to men and women who have proved their abilities, instead of listening to political hacks. Age? Instead of creaking senility, we found vigorous maturity — a commodity sorely missing in recent American leadership.

In summary, we find much to fear in another four years of Jimmy Carter's administration. Contrary to what we had previously thought, we find almost nothing to fear in the prospect of a Reagan presidency. In our judgment, he would indeed be better than Mr. Carter at leading this nation out of its current multiple crisis. For that reason, *The Times* endorses Ronald Reagan for president.

Kenny
Klinge
Ext.
3470
Pg. 3

Copyright © 1980 by The Associated Press
All rights reserved. No reproduction or distribution permitted without the prior written consent of The Associated Press.

SUNDAY AFTERNOON

Kenny Klinge - RPD
Ext. 3470

Baton Rouge

AP and UPI Wire Services and L.A. Times-Washington Post News Service

Baton Rouge, La., Sunday Morning, October 26, 1980

Editorial

Republican win would serve nation's interests

Public opinion polls and informal political discussions indicate there are still voters with minds not made up definitely as to how they will vote for president. As it does every four years, the presidential election heading the Nov. 4 ballot will be the magnet attracting a larger number of voters to their polling booths.

The bulk of the votes cast then will be for the electors respectively pledged to President Jimmy Carter and Vice President Walter Mondale in the Democratic column or to Ronald Reagan and George Bush, the Republican nominees for president and vice president. The John Anderson-Patrick Lucey effort has been considerably less successful than those of the two major political parties, here and elsewhere.

Among voters still unsure which lever they'll pull next month, some have expressed dissatisfaction with the choices presented them. Others say they are unhappy with Carter's performance but unsure what kind of president Reagan will make. Neither of those approaches leads voters to the reasoning which will decide their choice Nov. 4.

Except from the most ardent of Carter supporters, there is considerable agreement that the President has failed to live up to the public's expectations which were the basis of his election victory over Gerald Ford four years ago. In the intervening time, things have gone in an almost diametrically opposed direction from what Carter pledged in his election campaign. Inflation, unemployment, economic floundering and loss of prestige internationally are prime examples.

In short, President Carter has demonstrated — and quite clearly — the type of chief executive he is while occupying the Oval Office. And there is very little to indicate that the caliber of his performance will improve should the voters return him for a second term.

Because Reagan is a challenger without a presidential record, as are virtually all opponents of incumbent presidents, his potential to serve as the leader of the most powerful nation in the world has brought some questions.

The only direct comparison that can be made of the Republican and Democratic candidates in this particular area is how they handled the governorships of their respective states — California and Georgia. To judge from those earlier executive abilities of the two, Reagan consistently emerges ahead.

For instance, Reagan surrounded himself in Sacramento with capable administrators who rescued California from a political and fiscal morass. Carter's record in Atlanta wasn't in any way comparative; additionally, he took his Georgia advisers with him to Washington and their records have been there since for all to see.

For another, Reagan was able to manage the progress he did in California as a Republican governor presenting his program to a predominantly Democratic legislature for approval. Carter took office four years ago with a very comfortable Democratic Congress to work with. But he succeeded only in producing a fragmented program because he was unable to work with that Congress. In fact early on during his current term of office, President Carter managed to alienate Congress completely.

The campaign styles of the two aspirants have been accorded a great deal of attention in the last weeks of the race. Carter has been faulted for raising the issues of divisiveness and bigotry; and Reagan for flipping out more quick one-liners than substantive explanations. If those approaches are to be weighed in the deciding balance, Carter's could be far more detrimental to the national health than Reagan's.

President Carter's performance in office over the past four years hasn't shown that he should be rewarded with reelection. Ronald Reagan, judging from past performance, could well be the type of forthright and effective executive this country now desperately needs. A Republican victory next month would give this nation a president with a great deal of promise to be the leader the U.S. and the world desires instead of one who, after having been given the opportunity, failed to make good on the expectations of his nation and the world.

For those reasons, the Morning Advocate recommends you cast your vote for the Reagan-Bush ticket Nov. 4. You and your country will be the better for it.

Published by the Baton Rouge Morning Advocate
Post Office: Baton Rouge, La.

Reagan & Bush

Reagan Bush Committee

901 South Highland Street, Arlington, Virginia 22204 (703) 685-3400

MEMORANDUM TO: GOVERNOR REAGAN

October 26, 1980

FROM: BILL CASEY

As you can imagine, I receive many suggestions on how you should handle questions and issues in the debate. Here are some I think are worth passing on. On questions relating to war:

"I am proposing nothing more than American firmness and American strength. Mr. Carter seems to be saying that American defense readiness and American power would threaten the peace. Every other American president since World War II -- most especially the Democratic presidents, Truman, Kennedy, and Johnson -- has understood that our power keeps the peace, that we live in a world where we must be so strong and so firm that our enemies won't even be tempted to launch invasions or take hostages. Mr. Carter's policy breaks with everything his party and mine have stood for. I do not believe America's strength is a threat to peace; I believe it is the guarantee of security and peace."

On the kind of questions that were thrown out yesterday about what you would do if the Russians invaded Iran and the North Vietnamese invaded Thailand, there is need for a formula answer which would run something like this:

If we had our intelligence service working effectively, military moves of this magnitude could not be launched without our having some knowledge of the preparations and deployments ahead of time. If we have our alliance commitments working properly there would be time for advance consultations in efforts to avoid a breach of the peace before it occurred. In addition, I assume we have contingency plans for this eventuality. If I find these plans workable, in a very short time I would take over these contingency plans. The intelligence, the contingency plans and the input from our allies should be carefully reviewed by the National Security Council and a course of action based on the realities of the situation would be determined upon. I do not think it is possible for me to try to be any more specific on so hypothetical a situation.

As a whole there are lots of ideas on handling the matter of personal characterizations. There is general agreement that they should be dealt with in a direct and face to face manner. The following is a modification of the way the lawyer, Joe Welch, destroyed Joe McCarthy by speaking up for young staffers who had been abused. You would speak up for Democrats who have been abused by Carter:

Mr. Carter, I know that in 1976 you said that Hubert Humphrey was too old, that Senator Jackson was exploiting racial fears, that Lyndon Johnson was a liar and a cheat. During the Salt II debate, Senator John Glenn complained that those expressing reservations on the SALT treaty were being characterized as war mongers.

In this campaign you have said that I would divide north against south, black against white, and Christians against Jews and made so many other false charges and distortions of my position that I've come to wonder whether there's anything you won't say to cover up your record and perpetuate yourself in office.

Fred Gottfurcht, who you know from Beverly Hills, called in urging you confront Carter with something like this:

In this campaign my adversary has been quite free throwing names about. He has called me an actor, which is something I have been proud of. I wonder what is wrong about working as an actor, or a farmer, or a plumber, or an engineer or any one of the thousands of other occupations which made this great economy of ours produce what was the highest standard of living in the world before Mr. Carter stopped being a farmer and got himself elected to public office. Mr. Carter you put out the idea that I am a racist and a warmonger, and then you apologized. Well, I am going to say something to you for which there is no need to apologize. You are deliberately sowing fear among the American public which makes you a scare-monger and you are doing it in an effort to cover up a record which you are unable to defend.

memorandum:

to: Hon. William Casey

from: Bob Feinberg

date: October 27, 1980

re: meeting between Rep. Tom Evans and chairman of Likud Party

Following the meeting at the Madison this past Saturday, Mr. Evans directed me to prepare a memorandum concerning a recent meeting between the Congressman and the chairman of the Likud Party of Israel, for your use as background information in preparation for the presidential debate.

There were five major points which emerged from the meeting:

1. Whatever the merits of the Camp David agreement, the Carter Administration has undermined the agreement by continuing to press for a "comprehensive" settlement which would include the Palestinian Liberation Organization, rather than leaving the future of the occupied territories to be decided by the parties themselves. This operates to the detriment of both parties because it undermines the confidence of the Israelis that they will have defensible borders and because it places the Egyptians in a position of having to be more supportive of the PLO than they would otherwise be, since the Egyptians cannot appear to be less supportive of the PLO than the Carter Administration.

2. The outbreak of war between Iraq and Iran reflects a power vacuum in the region resulting from the weakness, perceived by all powers in the area, of the ability of the United States to act effectively in support of its friends and in opposition to its enemies in the area. Even those powers which would normally be strongly supportive of the U.S., such as Saudi Arabia, Jordan, and Egypt, must be more mindful of the growing power of Iraq, and of the willingness and ability of the Soviet Union to support Iraq, than of the interests of the United States.

3. In order to support U.S. interests in the area, it is necessary for the United States to have the ability to deploy ground troops in support of Saudi Arabia and the other pro-western, oil-producing regimes. Neither the "rapid deployment force," as presently constituted, nor the sending of naval vessels into the region can be a substitute for a credible means of sending 100,000 ground troops into the area. The knowledge on the part of all powers that the U.S. lacks this ability makes it more likely that Iraq or some other unfriendly power will threaten the West's oil supplies. The likelihood that a major conflict would result is increased, because the range of options available to the U.S. is narrowed by the absence of an effective rapid deployment force.

4. The likelihood of an "October surprise" in the form of an announcement of significant progress in the negotiations between Israel and Egypt now taking place in Washington was discounted by the chairman on the ground that substantial progress had not been made and that he did not believe that the parties would support a hypothetical attempt by the Carter Administration to make a cosmetic claim concerning the progress of the talks.

5. Finally, with regard to the question of whether the United States should supply spare parts or provide other military assistance to Iran, which has been raised in the press in recent days, the chairman said that it was for the U.S. to decide whether and under what conditions it would assist Iran. This discussion occurred before the Evans-Novak column alleging that Israel itself was assisting Iran, so that the specific question of Israeli assistance was not raised. However, it was evident that it was much more important for the U.S. to prepare to defend its vital interest in Saudi Arabia and the other friendly Gulf states than to intervene on behalf of either side in the Iran-Iraq war.

RICHARD NIXON

10-29-80

Dear Ed,

Some lines which may be useful in this last critical week.

Above all we need big grounds + maximum within this last week.

Don't let any "high aides" be quoted as being pessimistic aft the debate - or if there is action on the hostage front.

If Carter's people can talk optimistically - certainly ours have much more room to do so -

Warm regards
Dick

RICHARD NIXON

October 27, 1980

Possible Debate Questions

Flip-Flop

The question may well mention a half a dozen instances in which the Governor has changed his position. It will not be possible to adequately answer each of the charges. The following answer might be a good way to cover the whole subject.

"Well, I hope we don't have a double standard here. As I recall candidate Carter in 1976 said that we should reduce our defense expenditures and in 1980 he says we should increase them. I believe he was wrong then and right now."

"As far as I am concerned, I believe that anyone who refuses to change his mind when confronted with new facts or a changed situation, isn't fit to be President. Let me emphasize, however, I have not and will not compromise my principles. For example, I believe deeply in private enterprise and generally take a dim view of big government solutions to problems. That is why I originally opposed massive federal aid to New York City and the Chrysler Corporation. However, when I found that Mayor Koch in New York and Lee Iacocca of Chrysler had instituted financially responsible programs which gave real promise of recovery, I decided to support federal aid. I did this because I believe government should help those who demonstrate that they are trying to help themselves. In other words I have changed my position, but not my principle."

The Use of Force

"In dealing with a self-proclaimed aggressive power, I believe weakness leads to war or surrender and that strength, wisely maintained and used, will preserve the peace. History tells us that time after time since World War II American Presidents have used the credible threat of force to prevent war and preserve peace."

"In 1958, President Eisenhower sent Marines into Lebanon. That action did not lead to war. It diffused an explosive situation and deterred the Soviet Union from intervening in that area."

"In 1962 when the Russians put missiles in Cuba, President Kennedy ordered a blockade. There was no war. Khrushchev backed down and removed the missiles. That incidentally is in stark contrast to what happened in 1978. The Russians put a combat brigade into Cuba. President Carter protested but did nothing. The brigade is still there."

"In 1973 when the Soviets threatened to intervene unilaterally in the Mideast war, President Nixon ordered an alert of our conventional and nuclear forces. The Soviet troop transports turned back and the foundation was laid for negotiating peace."

"I believe that a President has no more sacred duty than to preserve peace and defend freedom. I will only use force as a very last resort after all diplomatic options have been exhausted. It might be politically popular to rule out the use of force unless we are directly attacked. It would be totally irresponsible to do so. We must recognize that we live in a dangerous world. Aggressors small and large are on the loose. If they are not checked, war will be inevitable. That is the tragic story of Hitler in World War II. Lets not let it happen again. We should not act as the world's policeman, but when our interests are directly threatened, we must make it clear that we are prepared to defend them. This kind of a policy will not lead to war. It is the only way to prevent war, keep the peace, and avoid surrender."

Arms Control - SALT II

"Let us get to the heart of the question. The question is not whether Jimmy Carter or I am for arms control but how we can get arms control. His position is that he will resubmit SALT II to the next Senate. I believe that SALT II is not a good agreement for the United States, but leaving that point aside, even if it were, President Carter did not have the votes to get SALT II through the Senate last year. And he is going to have less support in the next Senate where at least three Senators who supported President Carter on SALT II will have been defeated. To put it bluntly, President Carter's proposal for arms control is a dud. SALT II has no chance whatever to be approved."

"And so the question is how do we get a new agreement? Now I don't want an arms race. However, the difficulty is that for the past few years the Russians have been racing and we haven't. We must make it clear that if there is an arms race we will win. This ironically is the way to avoid an arms race and to get an arms control agreement."

"SALT I is an example. By a margin of one vote the Senate approved an anti-ballistic missile system for the United States. The Soviet Union already had one. Those who voted against ABM said that it would torpedo any chances for the negotiation of arms control. Exactly the opposite proved to be the case and an agreement limiting both offensive and defensive missiles was negotiated. But if President Nixon and Dr. Kissinger had not had the ABM program in hand at the negotiating table, there would have been no chance whatever to get an agreement. In all walks of life and in international diplomacy, there is one undeniable truth. To get something, you must have something to give."

"In my administration I shall make it clear at the very outset that the United States is prepared not only to limit nuclear arms but reduce them. We must make it clear however, that if we do not get an agreement, we will do what is necessary to restore the balance in nuclear strength which has been so ominously tilted in favor of the Soviets during the Carter years. I believe we will get an

arms agreement if we negotiate in that way. The Soviets have a far greater incentive than we have. They know that because of the greatly superior economic power of the West, if there is an arms race, they will lose it."

"And so on this whole subject of arms control, President Carter advocates an approach in SALT II which has absolutely no chance for success. I am advocating a new approach which based on the past record of our dealings with the Soviets has a very good chance to succeed."

Arms Control - Linkage

"The purpose of arms control is to reduce the danger of war. What we have to recognize is that if war comes, it will be because of failure to resolve political differences, rather than because of arms buildup. If political differences are not resolved, there are plenty of arms in the world already even with the best arms control agreement possible to blow up the world many times over. Consequently, an arms control agreement by itself does not reduce the danger of war. That is why it is essential why the United States make it clear that while we want arms control we consider Soviet adventurism to be totally inconsistent with the overriding goal of avoiding nuclear war and preserving peace."

Hostages

"All Americans are thankful that our hostages are coming home. Because of the personal factor, their tragic ordeal has understandably commanded much of our attention these past few weeks and months. Fortunately, their long ordeal is over. How and why they had to endure it is an issue for future discussion and debate. Now is the time for all of us to turn our total attention to those great issues which will determine our future and the Free World's future for the next four years and thereafter. Millions of Americans will be making a critical decision this week; a decision that will effect

their own fate, the fate of the nation, and the fate of free people everywhere for years to come."

"The choice could not be more clear. Jimmy Carter offers no change from policies which at home have brought us the highest unemployment, the highest inflation, the highest interest rates in forty years; and which abroad have made America second to the Soviet Union in military strength and have resulted in _____ million people coming under communist domination or being lost to the Free World. Four more years of Carter means four more years of higher prices, higher unemployment, higher interest rates at home and continued drift into retreat and defeat abroad. The old leadership and the old team has failed America on all fronts. Now Jimmy Carter offers more of the same. He says, "Tighten your belts, grin and bear it for four more years." America has had enough of failure. Americans are fed up to here with incompetence and failure. That is why on November 4 they are going to vote for new leadership, a new team, and new ideas to restore our strength at home and our prestige abroad."

"Jimmy Carter busting the federal budget is his business. When his policies bust the family budgets for millions of Americans it is their business. The people are going to vote their pocketbooks on November 4 and send to Washington new leaders who will stop the rise in the cost of living, reduce their taxes, and provide jobs for millions who are unemployed."

"America is a sleeping giant. I have travelled across this country for the past year. I have looked into the faces of literally millions of our fellow citizens in the great cities, in the countryside, in the small towns, on farms, in factories, in schools and ghettos. I think I know what the health of America is. The heart of America is sound. What America needs is a new head. There is nothing wrong with America that new leadership won't cure."

Conclusion

"I have been deeply hurt and disappointed in the level of personal attacks in this Presidential campaign. President Carter has said that the choice this November 4 is between war and peace, between black and white, etc. Obviously I don't agree with his assessment of me but I will not respond in kind. There is no question in my mind that all three candidates for President want peace. All three want to bring America together rather than divide it. All three want a better life for the American people. The question is not goals, the question is means. I hope in these next few days we can all stay on the high road discussing the great issues which will effect our future rather than descend to the low road of attacking our opponents on a personal basis."

"President Carter has tried hard. He has worked hard. I don't question his sincerity. The problem is very simple; he sincerely believes in the wrong things."

"He constantly turns to government to solve our problems as contrasted with my position that we should first turn to private enterprise."

"He believes that the very policies which have brought us record high prices, high unemployment, and high interest rates in the past four years are good enough for the next four years. I believe that four years of failure is enough and that we need new policies and a new team."

"He believes that if we will set an example by cutting back our arms programs, the Soviet Union will do likewise. I say that's shockingly naive. The way to get the Soviet leaders to agree to arms control is to make it clear that if they don't agree, they will force us into an arms race that they will lose."

"Shortly before the war between the States, John Brown was riding on the back of a wagon through the Virginia countryside on his way to the gallows."

To no one in particular he said, "Isn't this a beautiful country."

"This is a beautiful country. I have been to the great cities of Europe and Asia. I have enormous respect for the people of those countries but every time I return to America, I realize that this is the place. Sometimes people have asked me why I would go through the ordeal of running for President. After all I have everything that any man could want; a loving wife, a fine family, a beautiful home, a ranch in the beautiful state of California. Certainly being Governor of the first state of the Union should be enough to satisfy any man's ambition."

"Putting it very simply, America has been very good to me. I want to do something for America. I grew up in the depression. I remember when my father lost his job. I have lived through four wars. I consider my most sacred duty is to preserve peace. I have benefited first hand from the fact that America is a free country and provides opportunities for those who are willing to work hard to achieve their goals. I want to preserve that freedom and opportunity for my children and your children in the years ahead."

"Yes, this is indeed a beautiful country. My greatest goal in life is to contribute if I can to making it possible for all Americans to realize the American dream as I have realized it in my own life."

Halloween Excerpt

"In a frantic effort to divert attention from a dismal record of unprecedented incompetence and failure, Jimmy Carter is trying to frighten people to vote for him by waging a desperate campaign of fear and smear."

"Halloween goblins may frighten little children but the American voters are too smart to be fooled."

"It is time to rip off his mask of self-righteousness and let people see the failed leader he has proved himself to be."

RICHARD NIXON

October 27, 1980

Possible Debate Questions

Flip-Flop

The question may well mention a half a dozen instances in which the Governor has changed his position. It will not be possible to adequately answer each of the charges. The following answer might be a good way to cover the whole subject.

"Well I hope we don't have a double standard here. As I recall candidate Carter in 1976 said that we should reduce our defense expenditures and in 1980 he says we should increase them. I believe he was wrong then and right now."

"As far as I am concerned, I believe that anyone who refuses to change his mind when confronted with new facts or a changed situation, isn't fit to be President. Let me emphasize, however, I have not and will not compromise my principles. For example, I believe deeply in private enterprise and generally take a dim view of big government solutions to problems. That is why I originally opposed massive federal aid to New York City and the Chrysler Corporation. However, when I found that Mayor Koch in New York and Lee Iacocca of Chrysler had instituted financially responsible programs which gave real promise of recovery, I decided to support federal aid. I did this because I believe government should help those who demonstrate that they are trying to help themselves. In other words I have changed my position, but not my principle."

The Use of Force

"In dealing with a self-proclaimed aggressive power, I believe weakness leads to war or surrender and that strength, wisely maintained and used, will preserve the peace. History tells us that time after time since World War II American Presidents have used the credible threat of force to prevent war and preserve peace."

"In 1958, President Eisenhower sent Marines into Lebanon. That action did not lead to war. It diffused an explosive situation and deterred the Soviet Union from intervening in that area."

"In 1962 when the Russians put missiles in Cuba, President Kennedy ordered a blockade. There was no war. Khrushchev backed down and removed the missiles. That incidentally is in stark contrast to what happened in 1978. The Russians put a combat brigade into Cuba. President Carter protested but did nothing. The brigade is still there."

"In 1973 when the Soviets threatened to intervene unilaterally in the Mideast war, President Nixon ordered an alert of our conventional and nuclear forces. The Soviet troop transports turned back and the foundation was laid for negotiating peace."

"I believe that a President has no more sacred duty than to preserve peace and defend freedom. I will only use force as a very last resort after all diplomatic options have been exhausted. It might be politically popular to rule out the use of force unless we are directly attacked. It would be totally irresponsible to do so. We must recognize that we live in a dangerous world. Aggressors small and large are on the loose. If they are not checked, war will be inevitable. That, is the tragic story of Hitler in World War II. Let's not let it happen again. We should not act as the world's policeman, but when our interests are directly threatened, we must make it clear that we are prepared to defend them. This kind of a policy will not lead to war. It is the only way to prevent war, keep the peace, and avoid surrender."

Arms Control - SALT II

"Let us get to the heart of the question. The question is not whether Jimmy Carter or I am for arms control but how we can get arms control. His position is that he will resubmit SALT II to the next Senate. I believe that SALT II is not a good agreement for the United States, but leaving that point aside, even if it were, President Carter did not have the votes to get SALT II through the Senate last year. And he is going to have less support in the next Senate where at least three Senators who supported President Carter on SALT II will have been defeated. To put it bluntly, President Carter's proposal for arms control is a dud. SALT II has no chance whatever to be approved."

"And so the question is how do we get a new agreement? Now I don't want an arms race. However, the difficulty is that for the past few years the Russians have been racing and we haven't. We must make it clear that if there is an arms race we will win. This ironically is the way to avoid an arms race and to get an arms control agreement."

"SALT I is an example. By a margin of one vote the Senate approved an anti-ballistic missile system for the United States. The Soviet Union already had one. Those who voted against ABM said that it would torpedo any chances for the negotiation of arms control. Exactly the opposite proved to be the case and an agreement limiting both offensive and defensive missiles was negotiated. But if President Nixon and Dr. Kissinger had not had the ABM program in hand at the negotiating table, there would have been no chance whatever to get an agreement. In all walks of life and in international diplomacy, there is one undeniable truth. To get something, you must have something to give."

"In my administration I shall make it clear at the very outset that the United States is prepared not only to limit nuclear arms but reduce them. We must make it clear however, that if we do not get an agreement, we will do what is necessary to restore the balance in nuclear strength which has been so ominously tilted in favor of the Soviets during the Carter years. I believe we will get an

arms agreement if we negotiate in that way. The Soviets have a far greater incentive than we have. They know that because of the greatly superior economic power of the West, if there is an arms race, they will lose it."

"And so on this whole subject of arms control, President Carter advocates an approach in SALT II which has absolutely no chance for success. I am advocating a new approach which based on the past record of our dealings with the Soviets has a very good chance to succeed."

Arms Control - Linkage

"The purpose of arms control is to reduce the danger of war. What we have to recognize is that if war comes, it will be because of failure to resolve political differences, rather than because of arms buildup. If political differences are not resolved, there are plenty of arms in the world already even with the best arms control agreement possible to blow up the world many times over. Consequently, an arms control agreement by itself does not reduce the danger of war. That is why it is essential why the United States make it clear that while we want arms control we consider Soviet adventurism to be totally inconsistent with the overriding goal of avoiding nuclear war and preserving peace."

Hostages

"All Americans are thankful that our hostages are coming home. Because of the personal factor, their tragic ordeal has understandably commanded much of our attention these past few weeks and months. Fortunately, their long ordeal is over. How and why they had to endure it is an issue for future discussion and debate. Now is the time for all of us to turn our total attention to those great issues which will determine our future and the Free World's future for the next four years and thereafter. Millions of Americans will be making a critical decision this week; a decision that will effect

their own fate, the fate of the nation, and the fate of free people everywhere for years to come."

"The choice could not be more clear. Jimmy Carter offers no change from policies which at home have brought us the highest unemployment, the highest inflation, the highest interest rates in forty years; and which abroad have made America second to the Soviet Union in military strength and have resulted in _____ million people coming under communist domination or being lost to the Free World. Four more years of Carter means four more years of higher prices, higher unemployment, higher interest rates at home and continued drift into retreat and defeat abroad. The old leadership and the old team has failed America on all fronts. Now Jimmy Carter offers more of the same. He says, "Tighten your belts, grin and bear it for four more years." America has had enough of failure. Americans are fed up to here with incompetence and failure. That is why on November 4 they are going to vote for new leadership, a new team, and new ideas to restore our strength at home and our prestige abroad."

"Jimmy Carter busting the federal budget is his business. When his policies bust the family budgets for millions of Americans it is their business. The people are going to vote their pocketbooks on November 4 and send to Washington new leaders who will stop the rise in the cost of living, reduce their taxes, and provide jobs for millions who are unemployed."

"America is a sleeping giant. I have travelled across this country for the past year. I have looked into the faces of literally millions of our fellow citizens in the great cities, in the countryside, in the small towns, on farms, in factories, in schools and ghettos. I think I know what the health of America is. The heart of America is sound. What America needs is a new head. There is nothing wrong with America that new leadership won't cure."

Conclusion

"I have been deeply hurt and disappointed in the level of personal attacks in this Presidential campaign. President Carter has said that the choice this November 4 is between war and peace, between black and white, etc. Obviously I don't agree with his assessment of me but I will not respond in kind. There is no question in my mind that all three candidates for President want peace. All three want to bring America together rather than divide it. All three want a better life for the American people. The question is not goals, the question is means. I hope in these next few days we can all stay on the high road discussing the great issues which will effect our future rather than descend to the low road of attacking our opponents on a personal basis."

"President Carter has tried hard. He has worked hard. I don't question his sincerity. The problem is very simple; he sincerely believes in the wrong things."

"He constantly turns to government to solve our problems as contrasted with my position that we should first turn to private enterprise."

"He believes that the very policies which have brought us record high prices, high unemployment, and high interest rates in the past four years are good enough for the next four years. I believe that four years of failure is enough and that we need new policies and a new team."

"He believes that if we will set an example by cutting back our arms programs, the Soviet Union will do likewise. I say that's shockingly naive. The way to get the Soviet leaders to agree to arms control is to make it clear that if they don't agree, they will force us into an arms race that they will lose."

"Shortly before the war between the States, John Brown was riding on the back of a wagon through the Virginia countryside on his way to the gallows."

To no one in particular he said, "Isn't this a beautiful country."

"This is a beautiful country. I have been to the great cities of Europe and Asia. I have enormous respect for the people of those countries but every time I return to America, I realize that this is the place. Sometimes people have asked me why I would go through the ordeal of running for President. After all I have everything that any man could want; a loving wife, a fine family, a beautiful home, a ranch in the beautiful state of California. Certainly being Governor of the first state of the Union should be enough to satisfy any man's ambition."

"Putting it very simply, America has been very good to me. I want to do something for America. I grew up in the depression. I remember when my father lost his job. I have lived through four wars. I consider my most sacred duty is to preserve peace. I have benefited first hand from the fact that America is a free country and provides opportunities for those who are willing to work hard to achieve their goals. I want to preserve that freedom and opportunity for my children and your children in the years ahead."

"Yes, this is indeed a beautiful country. My greatest goal in life is to contribute if I can to making it possible for all Americans to realize the American dream as I have realized it in my own life."

Halloween Excerpt

"In a frantic effort to divert attention from a dismal record of unprecedented incompetence and failure, Jimmy Carter is trying to frighten people to vote for him by waging a desperate campaign of fear and smear."

"Halloween goblins may frighten little children but the American voters are too smart to be fooled."

"It is time to rip off his mask of self-righteousness and let people see the failed leader he has proved himself to be."

October 27, 1980

To: R. K. Gray
From: Carole Trimble *CT*
Re: Post-Debate Interviews

Although the television networks are still formulating post-debate coverage plans, current formats call for cutting to local news at 11:00 p.m. and then coming back to debate analysis in Cleveland at 11:30 p.m.

CBS plans to use its own correspondents for debate analysis, but wants to tape short reaction interviews at 11:00 p.m. with Senator John Tower, Donald Rumsfeld, Dick Wirthlin, Jim Baker, Ambassador Anne Armstrong, and Senator Howard Baker.

NBC already has requested post-debate interviews with Ed Meese, Senator Howard Baker and Ambassador George Bush. Meese is to meet Tom Brokaw and Robert Strauss at the foot of the anchor booth at 11:25 p.m. Senator Baker is to meet Tom Pettit and Senator Howard Metzenbaum at the foot of the anchor booth at 11:25 p.m. Ambassador Bush will be interviewed by John Chancellor in the anchor booth at 11:35 p.m.

ABC wants Barry Serafin to conduct stand-up interviews with Ed Meese, Jim Baker and Dick Wirthlin at the post-debate rally at Stouffers beginning at about 11:30 p.m. Since Ed Meese is scheduled for an NBC interview first, the ABC interview schedule will be:

1. Jim Baker
2. Dick Wirthlin
3. Ed Meese

If we are to hold to this schedule, Baker, Wirthlin and Meese will have to leave for the rally immediately after completing their interviews with CBS and NBC.

Cable News Network has put in stand-up interview requests for Bob Berkowitz at the debate site with Senator Howard Baker, Henry Kissinger, Dick Allen, Dick Wirthlin, Senator Paul Laxalt, Jim Baker and Ed Meese. Because of the tight time schedule for Wirthlin, Senator Baker, Jim Baker and Meese, we will probably have to offer other representatives to fill this time.

Other debate-related interviews include appearances on "Today" and "Good Morning America." Ed Meese is scheduled for "Today" from Washington on Tuesday and from Cleveland on Wednesday. Bob Strauss will represent the Democrats in a separate segment both days. Jim Baker is scheduled for "Good Morning America" Tuesday from Washington. The Democrats have not yet scheduled a representative.

Once on site Tuesday, I will try to set up additional interviews.

POST-DEBATE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

<u>Time</u>	<u>Network</u>	<u>Person</u>	<u>Place</u>
11:00 p.m.	CBS	1. Jim Baker 2. Dick Wirthlin 3. Sen. Howard Baker 4. Sen. John Tower 5. Amb. Anne Armstrong 6. Donald Rumsfeld	debate site
11:00 p.m.	CNN - Bob Berkowitz	1. Dick Allen 2. Sen. Paul Laxalt 3. Henry Kissinger	debate site
11:25 p.m.	NBC - Tom Brokaw	Ed Meese	anchor booth
11:25 p.m.	NBC - Tom Pettit	Sen. Howard Baker	anchor booth
11:35 p.m.	NBC - John Chancellor	Amb. George Bush	anchor booth
11:30 p.m.	ABC - Barry Serafin	1. Jim Baker 2. Dick Wirthlin 3. Ed Meese	Stouffer's rally

October 27, 1980

Dolan Draft

A GIFT OF HOPE AND
A VISION FOR AMERICA

Two yellow ribbons are tied to a sign in East San Diego near Tierra Santa Boulevard. The sign reads:

"Tierra Santa--Mercy Canyon. Home of Richard Morefield.
One of 52."

Richard Morefield, one of our 52 hostages in Iran, was not forgotten during this last year. We all hope and pray that he will come home soon to Tierra Santa and be together again with his wife, Dorothea, his daughter Betsy, his sons Kenneth, Bill and Dan.

But we must not forget that Richard Morefield's family and all the families of our hostages--in the face of some of the worst anguish and longing that human beings can know--have watched and waited through ~~out~~ a long, painful year...and have kept for their loved ones a special gift: a gift of hope, a gift that belongs tonight--as we begin one of the most perilous decades of our history--not just to Richard Morefield and our other hostages but to America, to all of us.

I think that ⁱⁿthe brave example of these families we are reminded of that hope, that quiet optimism that unswerving belief in a better future that is part of our national heritage and our national character.

As this campaign draws to a close, many Americans are wondering, searching...feeling troubled and perhaps even a little afraid about our future.

What kind of country, what kind of legacy will we leave to the children born this year--the young men and women who will begin adult life in the 21st century and live out America's third century as a nation.

Our vision must be a vision of a better America, a vision of a society that sets loose again the energies and ingenuity^{of} our people while it extends compassion to the lonely, the desparate and the forgotten. A vision of a strong and peaceful~~ful~~ America, an America that protects her vital interests but seeks vibrant, cordial relations with other nations of the world.

It is true that many of us are unhappy about our eroding economy, the constant crisis atmosphere in our foreign policy, our diminishing prestige~~ge~~ around the globe, the weakness in our economy and military that jeopardizes world peace, and the lack of strong, straight-forward leadership.

And many Americans today, just as they did 200 years ago, feel burdened, stifled and sometimes even oppressed by government grown too large, too bureaucratic, too wasteful, too unresponsive, too uncaring about people and their problems.

That is why Americans, who know that bureaucracy is the enemy of excellence and compassion, want a change in public life-- a change that will make government work for the people.

I believe we can embark on a new age of reform in this country and an era of national renewal. An era that will reorder the relationship between citizen and government, that will make government responsive again to ~~the~~ people, that will revitalize the values of family, work, and neighborhood and that will reinvigorate our private and independent social institutions. These institutions always have served as both buffer and bridge between the individual and the state -- and these institutions, not government, are the real sources of our economic and social progress as a people.

That's why I've said throughout this campaign that we can offer a larger share of our economic bounty to all our citizens by reducing the burden of taxation on the average citizen and stimulating economic growth. That's why I've said we can relieve labor and business of burdensome, unnecessary regulations while we maintain high standards of environmental and occupational safety. That's why I've said we can reduce the cost of government by eliminating billions lost to waste and fraud in the federal bureaucracy -- a problem that is now an unrelenting national scandal. We can restore the health and vitality of state and local governments by returning to them control over programs best run at a level close to the people. We can fight corruption in public life and government agencies while we work to bring into our government women and men of competence, caliber and high integrity.

This last pledge is particularly important. No man who understands the American presidency can possibly hope to make every decision or tend to every detail in the national govern-

ment. But he can promise to bring to government the best leaders in this nation and put them to work for the American people.

During the past three months, many of these leaders have been working -- as part of our transition process -- on ways to reform the federal bureaucracy -- to make it truly a partnership between people and government.

With their help and guidance, some of the reforms I will seek to implement, if elected, are:

-- a new structuring of the presidential cabinet that will make cabinet officers truly the servants of the national administration and of Congress -- not the captives of the bureaucracy or special interests in the departments they are supposed to direct.

-- businesslike revisions of federal auditing and management procedures. These revisions I believe are long overdue and will ultimately save billions in wasted tax dollars.

-- appointment of a special ombudsman to work with labor and industry groups to strengthen needed federal regulations while eliminating those that are burdensome and unnecessarily costly.

-- a comprehensive program to strengthen health care services. In this area, we would seek to put the Social Security system back on a sound financial footing; cut out the enormous problem of overpayments and fraud in the Medicare and Medicaid programs; and revise federal health care regulations -- especially those dealing with nursing home care for our elderly -- so that these facilities improve the quality of care for their patients rather than just abiding by the letter of government compliance forms.

-- the appointment of special panels of top law enforcement experts to deal with the menacing problems of organized crime, drug abuse, and the corruption of public officials.

Now I realize that these reforms provide an ambitious agenda for our nation in the next four years. But let me make it clear that I believe each of these objectives can be achieved.

In accomplishing these goals, it will be imperative to establish a close working relationship with the new Congress. I want you to know that no objective will be more important to me, if I am elected president, than that of opening a new era of cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of government.

I believe these are much more than promises made in an election campaign. When I first entered office as governor of California, that state -- which if it were a nation would be the sixth greatest economic power in the world -- faced many of the same problems that confront our nation today.

I believe our record there speaks for itself. We did bring into California government the best leaders from the private and public sectors. We did cut the rate of government spending and offer millions in tax relief to our overburdened citizens. We brought the state back from bankruptcy by working closely with the legislature in constructing a welfare program that put the cheaters off the rolls while it increased benefits to the truly needy. Indeed, I'm proud to note that the Urban Institute, a non-profit scholarly foundation located here in Washington, recently referred to this program as a "major policy success."

That's why I believe we can approach our national problems with optimism and energy -- that's why I believe we can effect the reforms I have mentioned -- reforms that will get government off our backs, out of pockets and up to the standards of decency and excellence envisioned by the founding fathers.

But beyond even these reforms -- as important as they are -- there is something more, much more, that needs to be said tonight.

That's why I want to talk with you -- not about campaign issues -- but about America, about us, you and me.

Not so long ago, we emerged from a great war. Turning homeward at last, we built a grand prosperity and hoped -- from our own success and plenty -- to help others less fortunate.

Our peace was a tense and bitter one but in those days the center seemed to hold.

Then came the hard years: riots, assassinations, Vietnam, Watergate, our hostages in Iran -- the last four years of drift and disaster here in Washington.

It all seemed a long way from a time when politics was a national passion and sometimes even fun -- when John F. Kennedy pledged that "we will bear any burden, pay any price to keep the torch of freedom burning."

In a book that captured that spirit of renewal and optimism at the opening of the 60's, Allen Drury wrote an ending to *Advise and Consent* that was almost prophetic in its description of a "kindly, pleasant, greening land about to learn whether history still has a place for a nation so strangely composed of great ideals and uneasy compromise as she."

That is really the question before us tonight: for the first time in their memory many Americans are asking: does history still have a place for America, for her people, for her great ideals? Some answer "no." They say our energy is spent, our days of greatness at an end, that a great national malaise is upon us.

They say we must cut our expectations, that we must conserve and withdraw, that we must tell our children . . . not to dream as once we dreamed.

Last year I lost a friend . . . and I know some will think it frivolous to talk about such a thing at a time like this -- but I bring it up because that friend was more than a symbol of the Hollywood dream industry; to millions he was a symbol of our country itself. And when he died, the headlines seemed to convey all the doubt about America, all the nostalgia for a seemingly lost past.

"The Last American Hero" said one headline, "Mr. America dies" said another.

Well, I knew John Wayne well and no one would have been angrier at being called the "last American hero."

Just before he died, he said in his own blunt way that it was nonsense that our heroes were gone, our way of life crumbling.

"Just give the American people a good cause," he said, "and there's nothing they can't lick."

I remember -- it was only a few months later -- almost as if on cue -- there was a bunch of back-street, down-the-block American kids making Olympic history -- standing up to the Red Army team in a small town in upstate New York. And soon not just Lake

Placid but the whole world echoed the chant: "U.S.A., U.S.A."

It isn't some frivolous or misguided chauvinism that sparks these recollections -- just a realization that now more than ever we Americans need to look deep into our past, to draw inspiration, to understand fully that we have faced grim, dangerous moments before -- and not been found wanting.

In the memory of many of us tonight are men like Admiral Jerry Denton who ~~as he put it~~ "when hell was in session" in North Vietnam --- survived the tortures of a hideous captivity, and with our other prisoners of war stepped off a plane at Clark Air Force Base, said "God Bless America" and actually thanked us for bringing them home.

Only 8 months ago, at a place known as "Desert One" in Iran, young Americans showed again how willingly they would sacrifice themselves for their country and their countrymen. We think of them and their families tonight; we remember their names: Mayo and Bake, Holmes and Harvey and Johnson, McIntosh, McMillan and Lewis -- the sufferings of these men and their families are testimony to the awfulness of war and to our own sacred resolve to keep the peace.

And in remembering them we do not celebrate the martial spirit -- but American character. For our heroes of the last decades have come not just from our armed forces but from every walk of life, every part of the country.

Somewhere tonight, a Laotian or Southeast Asian remembers the caring hands of a doctor from St. Louis -- some say he was a saint -- his name was Tom Dooley and he kept his promise and

walked all those compassionate miles before he slept.

There were astronauts Virgil Grissom, Ed White and Roger Chaffee who died as other Americans have died in opening new frontiers -- these were men with "the right stuff" whose courage was remembered when the message came back to earth -- "the eagle has landed."

There were men like a Pennsylvania miner named Joe Yablonski, a Tennessee Sheriff named Buford Pusser or an Arizona reporter named Don Bolles -- they fought a lonely but typically American battle for reform in public life.

These were not the deeds of politicians or statemen -- not the deeds of men who set out to be heroes. In many ways, they were ordinary Americans whose spontaneous response to time and circumstance gave us a glimpse into the soul of this country and the enduring vigor of her people.

Do not mistake me, no reasonable man who sees the world as it is, who views the deterioration of our economy, the waning of our relationships with our allies, the growth of Soviet might and the sufferings of our recent past could underestimate the difficulties before us.

But I wonder if those who doubt America have forgotten that ^{just} in the lives of individuals so too in the lives of nations; it is always when things seem most unbearable -- that we must have faith that America's trials have meaning beyond our own understanding.

Since her beginning America has held fast to this hope of divine providence, this vision of "man with God."

It is true that world peace is jeopardized by those who view man -- not as a noble being -- but as a solitary gathering

of atoms ruled only by the all powerful state.

But it is our spiritual commitment -- more than all the military might in the world -- that will win our struggle for peace.

It is not "bombs and rockets" but belief and resolve -- it is not hubris before men but humility before God that is ultimately the source of America's strength as a nation.

Our people always have held fast to this belief, this vision, since our first days as a nation.

Every school boy knows the story: When Benjamin Franklin rose in the Continental Congress and told the assembled delegates that not the smallest bird falls from heaven without the hand of providence. Soon after that, a nation was born.

As early as 1630 -- on the ship Arabella bearing settlers to the New World, John Winthrop, the first governor of Massachusetts, held out this vision:

"For we must consider that we shall be a city upon a hill. The eyes of all people are upon us, so that if we shall deal falsely with our God in this work we have undertaken and so cause him to withdraw his present help from us, we shall be made a story and a byword through the world."

History records that America became more than just "a story," more than just a "byword" -- a sterile footnote in history. It is not surprising that I quoted John Winthrop's words often on the campaign trail this year -- for I believe that history will record that Americans in 1980 were every bit as committed to that vision of a shining "city on a hill."

We celebrated our 200th anniversary as a nation a short time ago. Fireworks exploded over Boston harbor, Arthur Fiedler con-

ducted, thousands cheered and waved Old Glory -- slowly -- back and forth.

These were not just images of our bicentennial; they are reminders of our birthright of freedom -- and of ~~our~~^a generous, fervent patriotism that burns in America.

That patriotism cannot even contain itself -- remember "baseball's designated patriot" -- Rick Monday -- an outfielder for the Chicago Cubs who on April 25, 1976 at Dodger Stadium grabbed the flag from two demonstrators who were trying to burn it in center field -- and as he ran to the dugout thousands stood and cheered and sang "God Bless America."

Only last year, during the last unforgettable scene of the movie Deerhunter, millions of modern sophisticated Americans wept in darkened movie houses at the sight of simple plain Pennsylvanians who -- trying to recover from the wounds ~~of~~ Vietnam brought into their lives -- sat at table singing quietly, reverently that song again -- so fittingly our second national anthem -- "God Bless America."

During the last year, while those who are pessimistic about America spent their time here in Washington, I had a chance to meet and talk on the campaign trail with Americans from Nashua, New Hampshire to Newport Beach, California.

I found no national malaise, I found nothing wrong with the American people. It is true that some Americans are "mad as hell" and "not going to take it anymore." But that is only evidence that the American people are as sturdy and robust as ever -- it is only evidence the American people understand the present crisis, that they comprehend the failure of the current

leadership in Washington and that this November they intend to do something about it.

Of course, the time is short -- but in 1941 it was the Japanese Admiral Yamamoto who noted the endearing if somewhat dangerous American habit of waiting until the last moment to prevail.

"I fear all we have succeeded in doing" Yamamoto wrote after ordering the devastating attack at Pearl Harbor, "is to stir a sleeping giant and fill him with a terrible resolve."

I believe our resolve, our national spirit is no less today than it was in 1941 or than it was in 1630 on the ship Arabella. We can and we must -- with all the speed of a Reggie Jackson homer or Rocky Balboa's comeback in the final round -- change our country's present course.

Any nation that sees softness in our prosperity or disunity -- in our sometimes noisy arguments with each other -- let such nations not make the mistakes others have made -- let them understand that we will put aside in a moment the fruits of our prosperity and the luxury of our disagreements if the cause is a safe and peaceful future for our children.

Let it always be clear that we have no dreams of empire, that we seek no manifest destiny, that we understand the limitations of any one nation's power.

But let it also be clear that we do not shirk history's call; that America is not turned inward but outward -- towards others. Let it be clear that we have not lessened our commitment to peace or to the hope that someday all of the peoples of the world will enjoy lives of decency, lives with a degree of

freedom, with a measure of dignity.

Together, tonight, let us say what so many long to hear: that America is still united, still strong, still compassionate, still clinging fast to the dream of peace and freedom, still willing to stand by those who are persecuted or alone.

For those who suffer wars of ideology or national aggrandizement, tonight let us speak for them.

For those who seek the right to self-determination without interference from foreign powers, tonight let us speak for them.

For those who suffer from social or religious discrimination, tonight let us speak for them.

For those who are victims of police states or government induced torture or terror, tonight let us speak for them.

For those who are persecuted for justice's sake, tonight let us speak for them.

For all the countries and peoples of the world who seek only to live in harmony with each other, tonight let us speak for them.

And to our allies -- who regard us with such constant puzzlement and profound affection -- we must also speak tonight.

To our Canadian neighbors who so recently rescued Americans in Teheran, to the people of Great Britain to whom ties of blood, language and culture bind so closely, to the people of France who midwifed our birth as a nation, to the people of Germany and Japan with whom we bound up the wounds of war, to the people of Ireland and Italy and Poland whose national heritages have become our own, to the people of Israel with whom we enjoy the closest of friendships, to the people of Latin America, Austra-

lia, the Philippines, Taiwan, Korea -- to all our allies great and small, we say tonight: at last the sleeping giant stirs and he is filled with a resolve -- a resolve that we will win together our struggle for world peace -- our struggle for the human spirit.

And to the people of Africa, we ^{say that we} seek a lasting, just and close relationship.

To the people of China, with whom we have begun the first important steps to friendship -- let us pledge to strengthen that friendship and bring our peoples closer together.

To the people of Russia -- by whom we will not be buried -- but for whom and with whom we will build an enduring peace we both so anxiously seek, we also speak tonight.

Tonight my fellow Americans, we have reached deep into our national past -- remembered the words and deeds of great men who have gone before us.

But before I close I want to leave with you a speech by a man who is not so well remembered in history, but those words, spoken on the eve of our struggle for independence, can uplift and inspire now as surely as they did in 1775.

"Our country is in danger, but not to be despaired of . . . on you depend the fortunes of America -- you are to decide the important question, on which rest the happiness and liberty of millions yet unborn. Act worthy of yourselves."

They were the works of Joseph Warren, a Boston Doctor, ~~first~~ president of the Massachusetts Assembly, a man whom historians say would have been among the greatest of our founding fathers if his life had not been cut short at a place called Bunker Hill.

Not many months ago in Washington I sat at a luncheon in the Capitol with our Senators and Congressmen, I thought of the challenge to come, of the long campaign before us -- and I thought of how Americans -- in the difficult years ahead -- would once again be asked to act worthy of themselves.

Any man who said that at such a moment he did not feel humbled and a little afraid would be less than honest.

I am not afraid to say I prayed.

But I also wondered if men like Joseph Warren and John Winthrop and Benjamin Franklin could ever have dreamed of the legacy they would pass on to those of us who would some day come to ~~that~~ Capitol -- ~~that~~ lovely, elevated city along the Potomac.

It is autumn now in Washington and the District residents say that more than ever during the past few years Americans are coming to visit their Capitol -- some say this is because economic conditions rule out more expensive vacations elsewhere; some say an election year has heightened interest in the workings of the national government.

But others say something different: in a time when our values, when our place in history is so seriously questioned they say Americans want their sons and their daughters to see what is still for them and for so many other millions in the world a city with a place for hope and room for freedom.

You can see them -- these Washington visitors -- looking for the famous as they walk through Congressional hallways; as they return silent and tightlipped to tour buses that brought them for a walk through rows of white crosses in Arlington Cemetery; you can see them as they look up at a towering statue of

Jefferson or look out from the top of Washington's Memorial; or as they read in the words inscribed in Lincoln's huge monument at the base of the reflecting pool . . . "Let us bind up the nation's wounds."

They are not white or black, not red or yellow, these visitors; they are not Jews or Christians; there are no conservatives or liberals, or Democrats or Republicans. They are only Americans awed by what has gone before, proud of what for them is still . . . a shining city on a hill.

Even as I speak tonight, some young American, coming up along the Virginia or Maryland shores of the Potomac is seeing for the first time the lights that glow on the great halls of our government and the monuments to the memory of our great men.

Let us resolve tonight that young Americans will always see those Potomac lights; that they will always find here a city of hope in a country that is free. And let us resolve they will say of our day and of our generation; that we did keep faith with our God, that we did act "worthy of ourselves;" that we did protect and pass on lovingly that shining city on a hill.

TV GUIDE NEWS

TRIANGLE PUBLICATIONS, INC.
James F. Haughton
4 Radnor Corporate Center
Radnor, PA 19088
(215) 293-8942

RELEASE: After 6 P. M. ET
Monday, Oct. 27

TV GUIDE, IN FIRST POLITICAL ENDORSEMENT, BACKS REAGAN FOR PRESIDENT

RADNOR, Pa.-TV GUIDE magazine, in the first political endorsement in its 27-year history, today endorsed Ronald Reagan for the Presidency.

Walter H. Annenberg, president of Triangle Publications, Inc., publishers of the magazine, said in a signed Commentary column (Nov. 1 issue) that initially the publication planned to remain silent on endorsing a candidate.

"I cannot, however, as a matter of conscience, refrain from speaking up when the result of this election is so critical to the future of the Nation," he said. Annenberg served as Ambassador to the Court of St. James's from March 14, 1969 to Nov. 29, 1974.

"While I respect the President's supporters for their loyalty to him and have high regard for Rosalynn Carter and her dedication to her husband," Annenberg said, "his unfortunate record of performance in office does not warrant his reelection. . . But be assured that I have the same high regard for Nancy Reagan and her dedication to her husband."

The publisher said he had known Ronald Reagan for more than 30 years as an actor, union leader and governor. "When he was chief executive of the important state of California he surrounded himself with the most qualified and capable men and women available to help him direct what has been termed the most successful administration in that state's history," he said.

"An administration headed by Ronald Reagan, with the experienced and able George Bush as Vice President, promises to offer in place of more years of political expedients to bolster weak domestic and international positions - an end to disillusionment with Government and an end to the feeling that we no longer can control our own destiny," Annenberg said.

Reagan & Bush

Reagan Bush Committee

901 South Highland Street, Arlington, Virginia 22204 (703) 685-3400

October 28, 1980

Anne L. Armstrong
Co-Chairman

MEMORANDUM

TO : ED MEESE

FROM: ANNE ARMSTRONG *Anne*

Re : Women's Issues and the Debate

Yesterday afternoon I called Lorelei Kinder to ask about the pre-debate briefing on women's issues. She said she felt it was complete, but would like to put emphasis on the following points which I agreed to pass on to you with my approval:

1. A positive lead on the legislative approach to women's rights from Ford's statement to the National Commission on Observation of International Women's Year, July 1976 ---

'There are different ways to approach this problem. One would be to await the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment....'

'But injustice cannot wait upon politics nor upon the lengthy public discussion which has already delayed ratification of this Constitutional Amendment. The time to act is now. Therefore, I have directed the Attorney General to develop, in consultation with those affected federal agencies, a plan to review the entire U.S. Code.

'The purpose will be to determine the need for revising sex-based provisions that are not justified in law nor supported by wise policy. I encourage the Governors of all the States to initiate a similar review of all State laws to bring them into harmony with our American philosophy of absolute equality under the law.'

(Note: U.S. Civil Rights Commission published a book in April 1977 identifying 800 statutes with gender-biased terminology. Book entitled Sex Bias in U.S. Code.)

2. Do not use Ford's record on appointment of women vs. Carter's. Carter's is better. It was a Republican President who put

(MORE)

the first woman recruiter in the White House and the record has improved every year since then. Reagan's record will be better than Carter's.

The only valid comparison is Reagan's record in California vs. Carter's record in Georgia. Reagan's record is significantly better than Carter's.

3. Lorelei has talked to Phyllis Schlafly, and Phyllis agrees that the Governor should try to avoid the subject of abortion.
4. Semantics: Do not use the phrase "protective legislation". Phyllis Schlafly agrees on this also.

Political Report

Many Undecided In Rank and File, AFL-CIO Says

By Lance Gay

Washington Star Staff Writer

Telephone surveys in 10 key states have found that many union members are still undecided about the presidential election and that blue collar support for Ronald Reagan is not great, state AFL-CIO leaders said yesterday.

In a nationwide satellite television hookup, leaders of the state AFL-CIO federations in the 10 states said they were worried by the large number of undecided among the rank and file of labor unions and vowed to redouble efforts to get out the vote next week.

For example, Dan Miller, head of the Florida State AFL-CIO Federation, said that a telephone survey of 1,950 Florida union members in Dade County and Palm Beach found 43 percent for President Carter, 13 percent for Ronald Reagan, 1 percent for independent John Anderson and 42 percent undecided.

"What was really upsetting was the 42 percent out of those calls who were undecided," said Miller, noting that efforts made by unions to flood the rank and file with campaign literature, pamphlets and statements in support of the Carter-Mondale ticket.

Bill Marshall, head of the Michigan state AFL-CIO, said a similar poll of union members in his state found 46 percent for Carter, 19.4 percent for Reagan, 4.7 percent for Anderson, and 25 to 30 percent undecided.

John Schmidt, head of the Wisconsin AFL-CIO, said 20 to 22 percent of the union members in his state are undecided. And in Texas, state federation leader Harry Hubbard reported his surveys showed 67.3 percent of union members support the Carter ticket, 21.7 percent are undecided and 11 percent "are voting for others."

AFL-CIO President Lane Kirkland called for the 90-minute satellite television conference to receive reports from the state federation leaders on their political activities.

Leaders of the state federations in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Wisconsin, Florida, Michigan, Illinois, Texas and California participated.

Kirkland acknowledged that the number of trade unionists who are undecided "seems a little high at this stage," but he was pleased that Reagan does not seem to be attracting that much blue collar support.

"I have not seen this alleged enthusiasm for Reagan that I've eard about" in the ranks of union voters, he said. "It's not there." Alexander Barkan, director of the AFL-CIO's Committee on Political Education, said that unions in support of Carter-Mondale are putting on the "best labor political effort since COPE was formed in 1956," but that the election is now so close, particularly in the 10 states, "that an ordinary get-out-the-vote effort will not do. We need a superior get-out-the-vote effort," he told the state federation leaders.

Joseph Kraft Organized Labor's Role

CLEVELAND—"Phone Bank" says a sign in the lobby of the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers building here in Cleveland. An arrow points to a stairway leading to the basement. In the basement sit a score of people who are probably going to be decisive in the presidential election.

Ted Kravinus is one of them. A retired communications worker. Gray haired and bespectacled. A pleasant manner.

In front of him is a phone. Beside the phone is a computer printout supplied by AFL-CIO headquarters in Washington. The printout lists the names, addresses and phone numbers of all union members known to be registered Democrats in Cuyahoga County, which embraces Cleveland and its nearby suburbs. Name by name, Kravinus goes down

the list. He makes a call, identifies himself, reads out the list of candidates endorsed by the union and then asks for a vote next Tuesday. He marks down the response.

Those favorable will be visited on Election Day by other union members and reminded to vote. If the record shows they have not voted by noon, they will be visited a second time. If they have not voted by four in the afternoon, there will be another visit.

Not all the responses to the phone calls are favorable. "I don't want to hear it," one person said when Kravinus started reading the endorsement list. "That lizard," another said when Kravinus mentioned President Carter, whose name heads the list.

Parma, a white ethnic suburb west of

Cleveland, is particularly difficult. "Two big auto plants there," Kravinus says, "are down. They're paying much less in local taxes. The real estate taxes are going way up. That makes people mad at whoever is in power."

But on the whole Kravinus says he has never found a more "receptive climate" for phone bank operations. "It's easy to get hold of people," he says, and then he explains:

"The average union person thinks the Democratic Party is a friend in need. They may not understand why we're so strong for Carter. I say, 'Look at the choice. They know about Reagan and he scares them. Sometimes they say, 'He should go back to the movies.'"

Before Election Day, Kravinus and his

colleagues in the phone bank here will have made 60,000 phone calls. There will be 18 union offices open in Cuyahoga County on Election Day to help get out the vote. About 250 union members will be knocking on doors.

Warren Smith, the secretary-treasurer of the Ohio AFL-CIO, has set up similar phone banks in every industrial center in the state. He showed me the Cleveland operation, which he believes is working well. Another we visited, in Warren, a steel town to the southeast, also seemed to be functioning effectively.

But in Youngstown, another steel center with heavy unemployment, there was obvious trouble. The biggest union in town, the Steelworkers, had not made money available for the local Democratic candidate for Congress, nor assigned

people to man the phone bank. "Not per se," a local union official said when I asked him whether the Steelworkers were playing a role in the presidential election. "We'll have to fix that," Secretary-Treasurer Smith said as we drove away.

Smith has been working Ohio politically for more than 15 years, chiefly as a lobbyist in Columbus. He's been into phone banks and precinct operations since 1975. This is his view of the presidential race:

"Carter won Ohio in 1976 with the rural vote in the southern counties. He won't do that this year. The novelty is over, and the grain embargo hurt.

"This time he'll have to win in Cuyahoga County, and the other industrial centers. We can do it. Reagan isn't that

far in front. The margins are narrow. If we turn out our vote, we can carry Ohio."

I think he is right—and not only about Ohio. The other big industrial states around the Great Lakes—Illinois, Michigan, Pennsylvania, New York—are also winnable for Carter. If he adds to them either Texas or Florida, the election is his.

Whether that will happen is not clear. The debate can change everything, as can the hostages. But if Carter does win, the key element won't be his personality or his record or his media advertising. It will be the Democratic Party, and the one remnant of that party with a preference on the ground Election Day—organized labor.

Reagan & Bush

Reagan Bush Committee

901 South Highland Street, Arlington, Virginia 22204 (703) 685-3400

MEMORANDUM TO: ED MEESE

October 28, 1980

FROM: Bill Casey

Unless this kind of statement goes out the Governor has a hard question in the debate and Jim Baker has to know so that he can advise the Governor on handling it. I feel strongly that Van Cleave's statement should be disavowed publicly.

_____, _____ The Reagan Bush Campaign organization said the remarks attributed to William Van Cleave in today's Washington Post to the effect that Ronald Reagan, if elected, would seek increases in the defense budget in excess of 7% per year in real terms represent the personal opinion of Mr. Van Cleave himself and do not accurately reflect Governor Reagan's position, which is set forth in his economic speech and the fact sheet attached thereto distributed on _____.

Reagan & Bush

Citizens Abroad for Reagan Bush

901 South Highland Street, Arlington, Virginia 22204 (703) 685-3400

October 28, 1980

Last night on TV Channel 26 in a three way electoral debate - we were represented by Ed Meese - the Democratic speaker was pretty nasty about the Governor's age.

Should the issue come out again, i.e. the debate, the best answer is:

CHURCHILL, ADENAUER AND DE GAULLE RULED TO THEIR EIGHTIES

Ed —
and each was a great
leader in large part because
each was a great communicator.
Joe (Bray)

Reagan & Bush

Citizens Abroad for Reagan Bush

901 South Highland Street, Arlington, Virginia 22204 (703) 685-3400

October 28, 1980

Last night on TV Channel 26 in a three way electoral debate - we were represented by Ed Meese - the Democratic speaker was pretty nasty about the Governor's age.

Should the issue come out again, i.e. the debate, the best answer is:

CHURCHILL, ADENAUER AND DE GAULLE RULED TO THEIR EIGHTIES

DEBATE DAY, 10/28/80

Tonight's debate will be a victory for the American people. After watching almost a year of presidential campaigning, they have finally been able to corner Carter -- and to force him into a debate to defend his record of economic and foreign policy failures.

He has avoided debates with Senator Kennedy. He has avoided debates with John Anderson. And he has avoided debates with me. So if he tries to run away from this one last opportunity to debate, whatever excuse he gives, the American people will know the real reason: he is afraid to discuss crucial national issues in public debate, and he is unable to defend his record.

Presuming he does debate tonight, however, Mr. Carter will have some very important questions to answer for the American people:

*How can a President, whose policies have created the highest average peacetime inflation in history, claim to be the one candidate who can control inflation in the future?

*How can a President, whose policies have caused the purchasing power of weekly wages to decline by more than 8%, credibly assert his policies will produce an "economic renaissance"?

*How can a President, whose policies have put nearly two million people out of work this year alone, legitimately claim to be a friend of working people?

*How can a President, who has increased federal spending by 58% in just four years, pretend to have been "prudent" with the taxpayers' dollars?

*How can a President, who has accumulated the biggest four-year budget deficit in history, claim to have any real answers to the problems of skyrocketing inflation?

*How can a President, who has presided over the highest interest rates since the Civil War, assert that he is the best candidate to restore the American dream of homebuying?

*How can a President, who will have more than doubled taxes from 1976 to 1981 while tolerating at the same time billions of dollars of waste, fraud, and abuse, credibly claim that there is no room for a tax cut for the people?

*How can a President, whose inconsistent and vacillating foreign policy has reduced American respect and prestige throughout the world to dangerously low levels, have the ability to preserve a lasting and stable peace?

*How can a President, who has been totally unable to negotiate a SALT treaty his Democratically-controlled Senate will ratify, claim to be the only man who can negotiate a true reduction in nuclear arms?

*And how can a President, who has broken probably more campaign promises than any President in U. S. history, be depended upon to keep the new promises he is making now, in the heat of a close election?

These are the questions Mr. Carter must answer for the American people tonight in Cleveland. I don't think he can answer them. And that is why I believe the American people will vote for a change in administrations this November 4.

#####