

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) –
Post Debate

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/>

MEMO

TUES. OCT. 28, 1980

TO: ED MEESE ✓
BILL CASEY
BILL TIMMONS
M. ANDERSON
FROM: DON RODGERS DR
RE: IMMEDIATE POST DEBATE LABOR ACTION

ALL INDICATIONS POINT TO A TOSS-UP SITUATION IN MANY OF THE KEY INDUSTRIAL STATES. (ATTACHED ARTICLES IN TODAY'S PRESS)

RECOGNIZING THAT THE VOTE OF UNION MEMBERS IN THESE STATES IS VITAL TO A CARTER VICTORY, THE AFL-CIO, THROUGH C.O.P.E. HAS MOUNTED A HUGE MAILING AND TELEPHONE BANK CAMPAIGN. ITS' OBJECTIVE IS TO SCARE UNION MEMBERS. GOV. REAGAN IS BEING PAINTED AS ANTI-UNION AND A DIRECT THREAT TO THEIR ECONOMIC SURVIVAL.

THESE THREATS ARE HAVING SOME EFFECT AMONG THE UNDECIDEDS.

MANY OF THESE UNDECIDEDS ARE REAGAN VOTES - IF -

WE COUNTER THE FALSE CHARGES.

WE DO NOT HAVE THE PHONE BANKS OR THE MAILING LISTS TO ANSWER THESE CHARGES.

GOV. REAGAN MUST SPEAK DIRECTLY TO THESE CHARGES IN A CALM, DELIBERATE MANNER, STATING THE TRUE FACTS AND ASSURING EVERYONE THAT HE IS NOT OUT TO DESTROY UNIONS.

THEY REALLY ARE GOING TO HAVE TO HEAR IT FROM HIM.

IT COULD BE IN A HALF HOUR NATIONALLY TELEVISED ADDRESS

OR

IN A 3 MINUTE TALK TARGETED FOR THE KEY STATES

U R G E N T

TO: ED MEESE - 1164
LYN NOFZIGER
DICK WIRTHLIN
STU SPENCER
JIM BAKER
BILL CASEY

FROM: MIKE DEAVER

THERE WILL BE A BREAKFAST MEETING IN BILL CASEY'S ROOM
(No. 1157), at 8:00 A.M. WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1980.

URGENT!

Dallas Times Herald

LEE J. GUTTAR
PUBLISHER

KENNETH P. JOHNSON
EDITOR

WILL D. JARRETT
MANAGING EDITOR

BERT HOLMES
ASSOCIATE EDITOR

22-A ·

Thursday, October 30, 1980

Reagan for president

The time has come for this nation to send a new leader to Washington, a man of experience in government who is devoted to individual freedom, economic stability and military strength. The Times Herald believes Ronald Reagan should be elected president in next Tuesday's voting.

We have reserved judgment on the presidential contest until now, weighing the views of Gov. Reagan and President Carter on the major issues facing the United States, evaluating their leadership abilities, and testing their rhetoric against the reality of their actions.

The differences between Gov. Reagan and President Carter have become clear in the long campaign, in the debate on Tuesday night, and in a discussion between Gov. Reagan and the Times Herald Editorial Board in Dallas on Wednesday.

The record of President Carter has been marked by repeated failures, inconsistent policies, fuzzy images and flawed leadership. His honesty and his concern for human rights have been overshadowed by a general incompetence and an inability to provide strong leadership at home and abroad.

Gov. Reagan demonstrated, during his eight years as governor of California, an ability to work effectively with diverse groups and an understanding of the need to restrain as much as possible governmental intrusion into private lives and into business affairs.

During his long career, Gov. Reagan has said many things about many issues. Some of his statements have been dredged up during the campaign, often out of context, in a questionable effort by President Carter to paint Gov. Reagan as a warmonger, an impulsive executive and a man insensitive to the hopes of the average American.

We believe Gov. Reagan is fully aware of the risks of nuclear confrontation and the concomitant necessity for the United States to guard its security through strength, pride and forceful negotiations. He is properly insistent on equipping America with the weapons and the manpower to protect our national interests at home and around the world.

The economic programs and the tax and budget proposals of Gov. Reagan and President

Carter are similar in many respects, but Gov. Reagan offers a more consistent philosophy of government and provides greater hope for economic revival through the private enterprise system.

Although both candidates sometimes talk as if they have unlimited power to achieve their goals, Gov. Reagan recognizes — better than President Carter — that there must be a partnership between president and Congress if this nation is to shake off the mire of conflict and the shadows of inflexibility.

Gov. Reagan is the Republican nominee, but in his acceptance speech at the GOP convention and in his campaign appeals he has reached out to Americans of all backgrounds. We feel confident that Gov. Reagan will have an administration devoted less to partisanship than to a restoration of unity based on America's historic values.

His choice of George Bush, a man of wide experience with roots in both Texas and New England, as his vice presidential running mate is evidence of Gov. Reagan's commitment to moderate policies and pragmatic problem-solving.

His service as governor of California was marked by an ability to recruit outstanding aides and a willingness to listen to their advice. He recognizes that presidents and governors must set goals and determine the course of action but need the conscientious assistance of capable executives in meeting the heavy responsibilities of leadership. We expect no less from Gov. Reagan as president.

There are many serious problems facing America but the national mood will improve if the challenges are faced in a spirit of optimism and confidence, even good humor. Gov. Reagan calls for a vigorous, can-do attitude, while President Carter is trapped in negativism, fear and confusion.

The thought of another four years of President Carter's administration repels millions of Americans. The hope of these thoughtful voters is that Ronald Reagan can lead this nation to a new era of individual freedom, sound economics and national security.

The Times Herald shares those hopes for a Reagan administration and we urge his election as president.



Republican
National
Committee

October 29, 1980

MEMORANDUM FOR: Bill Timmons
FROM: Warren Hendriks
SUBJECT: Surrogate Post-Debate Press Activities

Bill,

As discussed this morning, I am pleased to provide a listing of those media opportunities scheduled for our Surrogates following the debate last evening. While this list is extensive, there were, I feel, many other significant opportunities (Republican Governors, Bus Tours, and the Reagan/Bush press operations within the states) of which I am not aware.

Because of the lead time we had to initiate scheduling these opportunities last week, it was possible to blitz most of the key markets. You should know that our media schedulers, Claire Dorrell, Ron McDuffie, and Mark Tapscott, were singularly responsible for booking these activities and, in my opinion, did an outstanding job.

Please let me know if I may provide any additional information.

WKH:dm

cc: Bill Casey
✓ Ed Meese
Drew Lewis
Clif White
Lyn Nofziger
Bob Gray
Stan Anderson
Bob Garrick
Ed Gray
Chuck Tyson

MEMORANDUM

TO: Warren Hendriks
FROM: Ron McDuffie
DATE: October 29, 1980
PAGE: -2-

- Interviews for the EUGENE & PORTLAND, OREGON Area Markets arranged for SENATOR MARK HATFIELD were:

Radio

KASH	KUGN
KBDF	KPNW (50,000 watts)
KEED	KEX (50,000 watts)
KXL (50,000 watts)	KWJJ (50,000 watts)

Newspapers/Wire Services

Oregonian
Journal
Associated Press

- Interviews for the SEATTLE & TAXOMA, WASHINGTON Area Markets arranged for MR. WILLIAM RUCKELSHAUS were:

Radio

KIRO (50,000 watts)

Newspapers/Wire Services

Times
Post Intelligence
New Tribune
Associated Press

- Interviews for TERRE HAUTE (INDIANA), SPRINGFIELD, DECATUR, CHAMPAIGN (ILLINOIS) Area Markets arranged for SENATOR CHARLES PERCY were:

Radio

WCVS (ABC)	WMAY (NBC)
WTAX (CBS)	WDW (CBS)

Television

WCIA	WBAK
WTWO	WTHI

MEMORANDUM

TO: Warren Hendriks
FROM: Ron McDuffie
DATE: October 29, 1980
PAGE: -3-

(continued ... SENATOR CHARLES PERCY)

Newspapers/Wire Services

Associated Press - Chicago
UPI - Chicago
City News Service - Chicago
Champaign-Urbana News Gazette
Decatur Herald Daily Review

- Interviews for the DAVENPORT (IOWA), ROCK ISLAND, MÖLINE, PEORIA (ILLINOIS) Area Markets arranged for MAYOR RICHARD CARVER were:

Radio

WQAA
WHBF

WMBD
WKZW

Newspapers/Wire Services

City News Service - Chicago
UPI - Chicago
Associated Press - Chicago
Peoria Journal-Star

NOTE: This office arranged for Mayor Carver to open his home to reporters during the debate and notified area media of same. The phone list indicates media that confirmed their interest prior to the debate.

- Interview with DONALD TOTTEN, RPD of Reagan/Bush, was arranged for 10/29 on "Noonbreak" - WBBM (CBS-TV) - Chicago (300,000 viewers).
- GOVERNOR THOMPSON watched the debate in Chicago with open press availability (media was notified 10/27). A radio interview with WLS (50,000 watts) was arranged by this office.
- Interviews for the SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA Area Markets arranged for MR. CASPER WEINBERGER were:

Radio

KCBS (50,000 watts)
KXXR
KNBR (50,000 watts)

MEMORANDUM

TO: Warren Hendriks
FROM: Ronald McDuffie
DATE: October 29, 1980
PAGE: -4-

(continued ... MR. CASPER WEINBERGER)

Newspapers/Wire Services

Oakland Tribune
Penninsula Times Tribune
Associated Press
San Francisco Chronicle

- Upon request from this office, LT. GOVERNOR MIKE CURB conducted a press availability in Los Angeles, California, following the debate. His Press Secretary, Roger Ganst, arranged for phone interviews with media and wire services in the LOS ANGELES, SACRAMENTO, BAKERSFIELD, FRESNO, CALIFORNIA, Markets. Summary of interviews will be supplied by Ganst.
- This office called all the wire services, television, print and radio outlets in the above markets following the debate to distribute the contact information for both LT. GOV. MIKE CURB and SENATOR SAMUEL I. HAYAKAWA.
- A 30-minute call in interview was conducted by GOVERNOR JOHN CONNALLY on KABC Radio, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA.
- GENERAL ALEXANDER HAIG did two (2) 15-minute live radio programs on morning of 10/29:
 - KIOE - Hawaii - Tom Dancer Show
 - KABC - So. Calif. - Michael Jackson Show
- Upon request from this office, San Diego MAYOR PETE WILSON arranged for open press availability during and following the debate in San Diego. Oto Bos, Press Secretary, facilitated arrangements and will supply a summary of interviews.
- Interviews for the MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN, Area Markets arranged for CONGRESSMAN JAMES SENSENBRENNER were:

Radio

WUWM

Newspapers/Wire Services

Associated Press
PI
Sentinel/Journal

MEMORANDUM

TO: Warren Hendriks
FROM: Ron McDuffie
DATE: October 29, 1980
PAGE: -5-

- This office arranged for KTSP - ABC-TV, MINNEAPOLIS/ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA, to view the debate in the home of SENATOR RUDY BOSCHWITZ. He also was interviewed by WDGY-Radio (50,000 watts).
- GOVERNOR QUIE held a press reception in MINNESOTA during the debate; he also has a press conference, and live TV appearance in OMAHA, NE., on 10/29.
- SENATOR WILLIAM ARMSTRONG was available to the press in DENVER, COLORADO, during and after the debates with arrangements being handled by Lee Stillwell, Press Secretary. The following interviews were confirmed prior to the debate:

Radio

KDEN
KOA

Television

KOA (NBC)
KMGH (CBS)

Newspapers/Wire Services

AP
UPI
The Post
Rocky Mountain News.

(continued ...)

INTERVIEWS WERE CARRIED VIA THE FOLLOWING 50,000 WATT RADIO STATIONS

<u>NAME</u>	<u>STATION</u>	<u>CITY</u>
Mayor Pete Wilson	KSDO	San Diego, CA
Senator Nancy Kassebaum	KFAB	Omaha, NE
" " "	KRVN	Lexington, NE
Senator Orrin Hatch	KVOU	Tulsa, OK
" " "	KSL	Salt Lake City, UT
Senator Rudy Boschwitz	WDGY	Minneapolis, MN
Governor James Thompson	WLS	Chicago, IL
Senator Mark Hatfield	KXL	Portland, OR
" " "	KPNW	Eugene, OR
" " "	KEX	Portland, OR
" " "	KWJJ	Portland, OR
Mr. Casper Weinberger	KNBR	San Francisco, CA
" " "	KCBS	San Francisco, CA
Senator Paul Laxalt	KDWN	Las Vegas, NV
Mr. Steve Symons	KBOI	Boise, ID
Mr. Jack Courtemanche	KNX	Los Angeles, CA
Mr. William Ruckelshaus	KIRO	Seattle, WA

RM/sf
Attachments

DEBATE NIGHT PRESS

- John Connally
- KPRC-2-NBC TV, Houston, live interview during & after debate at JBC home
 - WFAA-7-ABC TV, Dallas. JBC to call-in interview post debate
 - KABC-Radio, Los Angeles, 30 minute live interview by phone with "Carol Hemingway Show"
- Ben Fernandez
- KCBD-11-NBC TV, Lubbock, Texas, live interview at station during and after debate.
- John Warner
- WAFF-48-NBC TV, Huntsville, Alabama, live interview in hotel suite during & after debate
- Guy Vander Jagt
- WDBD-6-CBS TV, Orlando, Florida, live interview during and after debate at hotel.
- Roger Jepsen
- WGST-AM News Radio, Atlanta, Georgia, post-debate live interview
- Dick Lugar
- WIBC Radio, post debate live interview
 - WTHR-13-NBC TV, live interview post-debate (Both call-ins are from D.C.)
- John Dalton
- Virginia News Network interview from New York, covers 42 stations primarily in Southside Virginia
- Dave Treen
- WDSU-6-NBC TV, New Orleans, live interview in hotel suite post debate
 - WGSO AM News Radio call-in post debate interview
 - WFMD Radio Evening Talk Show for post debate call-in
 - Associated Press post debate interview
 - United Press International post debate interview
 - WNDE Radio for A.M. interview

Claire Dorrell's FILE

POST-DEBATE COMMENTS & INTERVIEWS (October 28, 1980)

Surrogate: Frank Zarb New York
516-883-8310
212-489-6600

Station/Press
& Oth. Media: WCWP-FM
Brookville, Long Is. (Call at 11:00)

Claudia Greco 516-626-9730

WVHC
Hempstead, Long Is.

Kevin Palmer 516-489-8870
Sue Zizza - News Director

WHLI
Hempstead, Long Is.

Jerry Carr. 516-481-8000

Newsday
Long Island

Jack Kline, Nat'l Desk 516-454-2020
Ken Paul 516-454-2775
Allison Mitchel

In Studio Viewing - After Debate Analysis:

WCBS-TV -- New York City, N.Y.

Frank Zarb with Senator Moynihan

Contact: Bill Laplant 212-975-6475
Steve Greenwald
Sue Levitt

Claire Dorrell's FILE

POST-DEBATE COMMENTS & INTERVIEWS (October 29, 1980)

Surrogate: Alexander Haig

Station/Press & Oth. Media:	1:40	ARRIVED CWN (Cable News) 2133 Wisconsin	298-4700
	1:50	ON AIR	

Claire Dorrell's FILE

POST-DEBATE COMMENTS & INTERVIEWS (October 28, 1980)

Surrogate:	Orrin Hatch	603-225-6687 (Highway Hotel)
Station/Press & Oth. Media:	KSL (Salt Lake City) Bob Schildmeyer	801-237-2590 (Call after the Debate)
	WBZ (Boston) Dave Finnegan - talk show	617-787-7000
	KVOU (Tulsa, OK) Kathleen Young	918-743-6461
	KFAX (San Francisco) Sam Martin	415-673-4148

Claire Dorrell's FILE

POST-DEBATE COMMENTS & INTERVIEWS (October 28, 1980)

Surrogate: Sen. Thad Cochran 785-1483 (h)

Station/Press
& Oth. Media:

WRC - NBC Radio 686-4119
Washington, D.C. (Will Call Him)

Mike Cuspurt, HOST

National Public Radio 785-5400
Washington, D.C. (Will Call Him)

Paul Allen, HOST

Claire Dorrell's FILE

POST-DEBATE COMMENTS & INTERVIEWS (October 28, 1980)

Surrogate: Senator Howard Baker

Station/Press
& Oth. Media: CBS - Radio - National 212-397-9090
Manhattan, New York

Bob Bicroft

Tom Griscom 703-379-9394

CLAIRE FILE

AFTER DEBATE REACTION

GOVERNOR R. THORNBURGH - PENNSYLVANIA

KDKA - PITTS.

JOHN MICHELS 412-391-8825

392-2544

GOVERNOR TO CALL

KQV - PITTS

KATHERINE MALONEY 412-562-5960

GOVERNOR TO CALL

WSBA - YORK

NEWS DESK 717-764-1155

GOVERNOR TO CALL AT 11:40

WHP (AM) CBS NETWORK HARRISBURG

JIM SINKOVITZ (GOVERNOR KNOWS HIM)

717-238-2100

GOVERNOR TO CALL AT EXACTLY 11:35

CLAIR'S FILE

POST DEBATE REACTION

Delaware - Governor Pete DuPont
Mr. Stern 302-571-3210

RADIO

WDOV AM - Susan Seifried at 7:40 AM 10-29-80
News Director 302/674-1410

WDEL - Reporter, Mr. Tom Hubbard 302-478-2706 (direct line)
After Debate

WILM - Mr. Martin Feurer 302/656-9800

WNRK-AM
(network) - Mr. Al Campagnone 302/737-5200
Call 10-29-80 anytime except 9-10 AM - on air

WJBR - Mr. Bill Kay - News Editor PM 302/475-4000

NEWSPAPER

Delaware State News - Mr. Frank Fantini 10-29-80 8:00 AM

Sunday News Journal - Harry Themal 302/573-2000
After Debate

Claire Dorrell's FILE

POST-DEBATE COMMENTS & INTERVIEWS (October 28, 1980)

Surrogate: Jack Kemp (at Statler Hotel, Buffalo, NY, Suite 1202/0)

Station/Press
& Oth. Media:

WGR Chn 2 (NBC)	Bob Pfifer	716-856-1418	
WIUB Chn 4 (CBS)	Jim Peppard	716-876-7333	(Anch. Man)
" "	Vic Baker	"	
WKBW Chn 7 (ABC)	Alan Levi	716-845-6208	(11:02
" "	Jerry Fedell		11:05)

BUFFALO CONTACT: Marie Shattuck
716-846-4123

All Shooting Kemp Watching Debate:

ABC - 11:02 - 11:05 - Interview
CBS - 11:06 - 11:10 - Interview
NBC - NOT live - no requests

Available for Shooting During & Comments
(Press Availability - after 11:10 PM)

AP - 716-852-1051
UPI - 716-852-2085 (wants photos)
Evening News - 716-849-3434
Courier Express - 716-855-6300 (Mr. Batzer)
WUTV - Chn 29 - INO - 716-773-7531
WNED - Chn 17 - PBS - 716-881-5000

NBC - 5:30 Live from Studio

716-856-1011

Claire Dorrell's FILE

POST-DEBATE COMMENTS & INTERVIEWS (Oct. 28, 1980)

Surrogate: Bud Brown

Station/Press
& Oth. Media:

35 (1) WMRN (Radio) (11:00 P.M.)
614-383-6640 (Peter Francis)

36 (2) WDIF-FM--(11:05/11:10 or after)
614-387-6397)
-or-) Howard Cannon on duty tonight.
614-387-9345) (Brown is to call him.)

Claire Dorrell's FILE

POST-DEBATE COMMENTS & INTERVIEWS (Oct. 28, 1980)

Surrogate: Alexander Haig

Station/Press
& Oth. Media: \ Newsweek (Cleveland - Tues. Night)

Susan Zelman - Photographer
Larry Brown

UT/Wagergate
10-27

212-350-2509

Claire Dorrell's FILE

POST-DEBATE COMMENTS & INTERVIEWS (October 28, 1980)

Surrogate: Barber Conable

Station/Press
& Oth. Media: WHAM - Rochester
716-454-4883

Dave Wahl
Bill Lowe

(They will call him.)

- 1) 716-547-3536
- 2) 716-343-4036

Immediately after Debate.

CLAIRE DORRELL - FILE

POST DEBATE REACTION - CONGRESSMAN BRUCE CAPUTO

WVOX - 914-636-1460

CONTACT: Andy Denison

CONGRESSMAN TO CALL THEM BETWEEN 11:30 and 11:45 p.m.

WJIT - GIVEN CONGRESSMAN'S NUMBER (212)249-3884

*** MAY CALL HIM

WKCR - FM SAME AS WJIT

Claire Dorrell's FILE

POST-DEBATE COMMENTS & INTERVIEWS (October 28, 1980)

Surrogate: Senator William Roth

Station/Press
& Oth. Media:

- 1) WAMS (Wilmington, Del.)
302-658-2500
Jim Stoddard (Roth to call them)
-or-
Anyone at Station
- 2) WDEL (Wilmington, Del.)
302-478-2706 or 478-2700 (before 11:15 PM)
Ruth Marlow (Roth to call them)
- 3) WILM (Wilmington, Del.)
302-656-9800
Martin Feurer (Roth to call them)

(will use Wednes. A.M.)
- 4) WKEN (Dover, Del.)
302-674-1234 (11:15 and 11:30 PM)
Scott Singley (Roth to call them)

Claire Dorrell's FILE

POST-DEBATE COMMENTS & INTERVIEWS (October 28, 1980)

Surrogate: Senator Schweiker (Springfield)

Station/Press
& Oth. Media:

WCAU
Larry Kane
215-839-7012

(Call after Debate)

CLAIRE DORRELL

Mrs. Barbara Bush

Wednesday, October 29, 1980

9:30-10:30 WOPI - AM-Bristol, Tennessee
Live Telephone Interview
Interview with Paul Culp

Show: On The Line

615 764-5131 (O)
615 968-4717 (H)

Claire Dorrell's FILE

POST-DEBATE COMMENTS & INTERVIEWS (October 28, 1980)

Surrogate: Senator John Heinz

Station/Press
& Oth. Media:

National Public Radio (12 Midnight)
785-5400
Frank Fitzsimmons

WRC / NBC Radio
686-4119
Mike Cuspurt, HOST

an
18

October 29, 1980

MEMORANDUM FOR: Ed Meese and Bill Casey

FROM: Stef Halper

SUBJECT: Ten Carter Lies

On at least ten different occasions last night, President Carter used lies and flagrant exaggerations to distort the truth. Specifically:

- 1.) Carter claimed that his administration has taken a strong stand against nuclear proliferation. But contrary to his rhetoric, it was Carter who introduced and fought for the sale of nuclear material to India--over a majority vote of disapproval by both houses of the Democratically-controlled Congress.
- 2.) Carter claimed that his administration has not and will not deal with the PLO until and unless the PLO recognizes Israel's right to exist and recognizes UN Resolution 242 as a basis for Middle East peace. But Mr. Carter's U.N. Ambassador started talks with the PLO and his Ambassador to Austria was authorized to establish contacts with the PLO. Jimmy Carter's brother met with George Habash and Yassar Arafat in Libya. And Carter's first approach to the Arab-Israeli conflict was the proposal for a comprehensive peace process which would have brought in the Soviet Union--and the PLO.
- 3.) Carter claimed that his administration has made tremendous progress in restoring urban areas. Central City unemployment rose from 6.9 percent in the second quarter of 1979 to 8.4 percent in the second quarter of 1980. Black teenage unemployment in Detroit has reach the all-time peak of 56 percent.
- 4.) Carter claims to have raised defense spending substantially in real terms. Several incidents have been revealed in the Wall Street Journal concerning how the Carter Administration has purposely lowered the defense spending base and the defense inflation rate in calculating real spending growth. Additionally, to the degree that defense spending has increased, it has been in spite of the Carter Administration not because of it. The President and Secretary Brown has lobbied against Congressional attempts to raise the defense budget whenever given the opportunity. Fortunately, the Congress has prevailed on most occasions.
- 5.) Carter claimed that one positive result of "American sacrifice" has been a 1/3 reduction in oil imports in the last year. In fact, average oil imports in 1979 was 8.3 mm bbl/day versus an average of 7.5 mm bbl/day thus far in 1980. The decrease has been only 10%, nowhere near the 33% that Carter claims. (Source: "Weekly Petroleum Status Report " of Oct. 10, 1980 (DOE)).

- 6.) Carter claimed that this year's recession was the shortest since World War II. How does he know when the recession isn't over yet? Unemployment is still 7½ percent. Real GNP is still falling. Not a single prominent economist has yet to pronounce that the recession is over and done with. In fact, with interest rates climbing past 14 percent, the chances of a protracted recession have increased in recent weeks.
- 7.) Carter claims that air pollution laws in California were passed over Governor Reagan's objections. Governor Reagan in fact sponsored the legislation creating, for the first time, a state Air Resources Board which greatly strengthened the state's powers to control air pollution. He also sponsored legislation which created local air pollution districts, and which established programs for maintaining air quality standards in air basins within California. Furthermore, he implemented a program that outfitted automobiles with the most sophisticated smog-control devices then developed, resulting in 1971 and later model automobiles emitting only about 1/10th the hydrocarbons released by pre-control automobiles.
- 8.) Carter claims that he has brought down inflation. When Carter took office, inflation was less than 5 percent. Over the last year, the price index has risen by 13 percent. In addition, almost every economist in the business would agree that the "underlying" rate of inflation has risen steadily over the last four years.
- 9.) Carter claims that Reagan would have to cut Government spending by at least \$130 billion in order to balance a budget under his economic proposal. In fact, Governor Reagan's plan shows explicitly that only a \$39 billion reduction would be necessary to achieve a balanced budget by 1983.
- 10.) Carter claims that Governor Reagan has spoken out repeatedly against unemployment compensation and welfare While Governor Reagan has certainly criticized abuses of these programs, he has never questioned their necessity nor ever even hinted that they should be dismantled.

In addition, several good lines, they are:

1. Voodoo Economics. . . Carter's eight different economic plans must be "Hindu Economics" after so many reincarnations.
2. It is now obvious why President Carter did not want John Anderson in tonight's debate as it would be even more disgraceful to come in third instead of second.

cc: Bob Garrick

Daily News Digest I

Daily News Digest • Thursday, October 30, 1980

Republican National Committee • 310 First Street Southeast, Washington, D.C. 20003

The New York Times

The Washington Post

The Washington Star

Chicago Tribune

Los Angeles Times

THE  SUN

The Philadelphia Inquirer

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL.

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

PUBLIC AFFAIRS DIVISION OF THE RNC

A Buoyed Reagan Raps Carter on

By Lou Cannon

Washington Post Staff Writer

HOUSTON, Tex., Oct. 29 — Ronald Reagan, buoyed by what he regards as a winning performance in Tuesday night's presidential debate, today accused Jimmy Carter of wrapping himself in the mantle of other Democratic presidents because he can't defend his own record.

"When I look at what he has done in the last four years, you can see why he spent so little time last night in the debate talking about his record," Reagan told an enthusiastic crowd of about 10,000 in Houston's Tranquility Park. "He has grown fond of referring to Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman and John Kennedy. There's one Democratic president he doesn't talk about, and that's Jimmy Carter."

Reagan then recited a litany of negative economic statistics and also charged Carter with weakening U.S. military defenses during his four years in office.

"When Americans are no longer

proud of a president who promises so much and delivers so little, yes, it's time for new leadership in America," Reagan said.

In his speech here and another in Fort Worth, Reagan hammered away at Carter's performance on inflation, interest rates and unemployment.

"These disasters didn't happen by accident," Reagan said. "They occurred because of Mr. Carter's lack of competence for the job. They occurred because he has brought instability to the office. They came about because of his insensitivity to the economic suffering of millions of Americans."

Later in his speech, Reagan said that government spending had increased 58 percent during the Carter years and shouted a rhetorical question at the crowd: "How many of you were able to increase your spending by 58 percent in the last four years? Well, that's how much government spending has gone up."

Reagan painted a picture of an American economy which had steadily declined under Carter and which would decline further under four more years of his leadership.

"In just four years his policies have done more to reduce the standard of living than any president in recent memory," Reagan said.

The candidate's own assessment of his debate performance was positive, but with some reservations. He said he thought the debate "leaves us in very good shape" but acknowledged, without being specific, that there were some things he would have done differently if he had to do it over again.

Reagan's mood was high when he started out today and it became higher still in midafternoon, when the campaign obtained the result of an Associated Press survey which indicated that Reagan had won the debate. The Reagan strategy for the rest of the week is a simple one — hit hard and aggressively on the issues of Carter's record and campaign in key states where the GOP nominee is even or slightly ahead of his opponent.

Reagan's strategists now believe he will win the election barring any major unforeseen event. They are less concerned than they were last week about the political impact of the release of American hostages in Iran, believing that this issue has less impact on the campaign with each passing day.

One aide said that there is no plan for Reagan to bring up the hostage issue again. Another aide said that the GOP candidate also would try to ignore any last-minute Carter attacks on him.

The Reagan schedule for the final days reflects both the optimism of the campaign and the political strategy which Reagan aides see as a significant advantage over Carter.

That advantage is that Reagan continues to compete for electoral votes in Carter's southern base while all but shutting out his rival in Reagan's home region of the West.

After campaigning today in Texas, where Gov. William Clements predicted a Reagan victory, Reagan will carry his campaign Thursday to Texarkana, Ark.

and New Orleans. After a brief stop in New Jersey, he will spend the balance of the week in five key Great Lakes states, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan and Ohio.

The Reagan campaign team has surveys showing the Republican nominee ahead in all of these states except Pennsylvania, where he is even, and Wis-

consin, where Carter is ahead and vored.

On Monday, the day before the election, Reagan flies back to his home state of California from Peoria, Ill. Only stop en route is for an airport in Portland, Ore., the one far west state except Hawaii where the Reagan strategists give Carter a chance.

Record

Challenger Mocks Incumbent's Record

By Lisa Myers

Washington Star Staff Writer

FORT WORTH, Tex. — Republican presidential nominee Ronald Reagan yesterday accused President Carter of cloaking himself in the mantle of former Democratic presidents because his own record is too sorry to bare.

In a sharply honed attack on Carter's alleged incompetence, the challenger pointed out that in Tuesday's debate Carter repeatedly invoked the legacy of his party or the memory of presidents past rather than discussing the performance of the president present.

"He's grown fond of referring to Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman and John Kennedy," Reagan declared. "There's only one Democratic president he doesn't talk about and that's Jimmy Carter. To hear him talk, you would think that some-

See REAGAN, A-6

Continued From A-1

one else had been in charge for the last four years."

Later, in Dallas, Reagan charged that one of the few alleged bright spots on Carter's record of "disasters" — the reduction of oil imports — is itself a product of the economic misery he has inflicted on the nation. "Factories that are closed don't use energy and employees that are laid off and don't have jobs don't use gasoline to drive to work every day," he told a boisterous, overflow crowd at Southern Methodist University's Moody Coliseum.

Carter's alleged misfeasance will continue to be the overriding theme as Reagan takes his campaign to Texas, Arkansas, Mississippi and New Orleans today before returning this evening to pivotal industrial states to which he will devote all but one of the final five days of the campaign.

The fact that Reagan is stopping in Arkansas this morning — one of seven states that his campaign virtually wrote off before Labor Day — underscores the serious inroads that the GOP candidate has made in Carter's once-solid Southern base. Reagan's private polls showed him with a slim lead over Carter in that heavily Democratic state. Reagan strategists maintained from the outset that he would pick off a few Southern states — most likely Florida, Mississippi and Louisiana — but no one dreamed he would have a shot at Arkansas.

Yet, buoyed by polls indicating that Reagan won the debate, his camp is beginning to feel that a number of improbable victories could be within its grasp. The mood was best captured by Roy Rogers, the former movie and television cowboy and Reagan supporter, who struck up a few bars of "Happy Trails to You" for a cadre of reporters.

The optimism even crept into Reagan's rhetoric at his first stop in Houston. Speaking on what he claims is the worsening economy, Reagan declared: "We can start doing something on the first day of a Reagan-Bush administration." It was the first time in recent memory that the candidate referred to what might occur in the early days of his "administration."

Stuart Spencer, Reagan's chief strategist, said it is too early to gauge the debate's impact on the sea of undecided voters. But he argued that Reagan clearly has the edge going into the final days, particularly in terms of possible combinations of states to achieve the magic 270 electoral votes. Spencer added, however, that he expects new attacks from Carter and that a possible breakthrough on the American hostages in Iran still can't be discounted.

But, for now, the game plan remains to campaign aggressively on Carter's alleged mishandling of the economy and general inability to govern. "I don't think we need to look for any new wrinkle or new spectacular," said James Baker III, Reagan's senior adviser.

Reagan hammered Carter on everything in sight — the latest increase in the prime rate, housing, budget deficits, increased government employees, military vulnerability and the decline in U.S. prestige.

"When Americans are no longer proud of a president who promises so much and delivers so little, it's time for new leadership in this country," he said.

Reagan sought to diffuse controversy over allegations that Richard V. Allen, a senior foreign policy adviser, used past government positions for personal gain. "I'm confident that this is going to turn out to be much ado about nothing," he said. Nevertheless, he said he had instructed Edwin Meese, a top aide, to look into the matter.

A GOP cast zips about the state

From Inquirer Wire Services

In an updated kind of whistle-stop campaign, a plane-ful of prominent Pennsylvania Republicans went to seven cities in the state yesterday to celebrate what they regarded as Ronald Reagan's victory in the debate Tuesday night and to make pitches for the Reagan-Bush ticket.

Maureen Reagan, the daughter of the Republican presidential candidate who accompanied the politicians, said her father "did terrific" in the debate with President Carter, adding he was strong in all areas.

"He had no weak points," she said at the first stop of the day, Reading Terminal.

"The important thing was he got the opportunity to get across to America his policies and his programs in front of his 'great accuser,'" Miss Reagan said. "I think he did terrific last night."

Accompanied by Sen. Richard Schweiker, she greeted commuters at the train station before flying to Allentown. Later stops were in Scranton, Lancaster, Johnstown, Erie and Pittsburgh. In addition to Schweiker, Gov. Thornburgh, Sen. John Heinz and Lt. Gov. William W. Scranton 3d took part.

Dick Fox, Reagan's state campaign chairman, said Reagan accomplished what he had to in Tuesday night's debate.

"He had to do three things to win, and he did," Fox said. "He had to show up, he had to make sure he did nothing negative, no mistakes, and he had to show who he is, an able, decent guy."

"What we're talking about here is the last 10 percent, the voters who still haven't made up their minds. They're unhappy with what they've got, and unsure of what they're getting. I think (to win them over) Reagan had to blunt that character assassination by Carter, and I think he did it quite effectively."

Schweiker noted that "Jimmy Carter said four years ago today in our state, and I quote, 'We simply cannot depend on those who created this economic mess to clean it up.' I hope somebody asks him about those 1976 words when he's back campaigning in Pennsylvania."

Schweiker, whom Reagan designated before the Republican Convention 1976 as his running mate, said, "When we made our choice in 1976, the 'misery index' Jimmy Carter had invented for his campaign (the total of inflation and unemployment rates) was 12.5 percent. After four years of Jimmy Carter, the Carter misery index stands at 20.2 percent. Jimmy Carter has left Americans with empty promises and empty pockets."

Thursday, Oct. 30, 1980 Philadelphia Inquirer

Reagan Promises Probe Of His Security Adviser

By a WALL STREET JOURNAL Staff Reporter

HOUSTON—Ronald Reagan said his chief of staff will look into allegations that his national security aide used government jobs to further his private business.

The reports concerning Richard Allen, the Republican presidential candidate's national security adviser, were contained in a Wall Street Journal article Tuesday.

Speaking briefly to reporters here, Mr. Reagan said "I am confident that this is going to turn out to be much ado about nothing." Edwin Meese, the chief of staff, "is looking into this entire matter," he added.

Mr. Reagan said he "won't have any comment" until he hears Mr. Meese's report. Lyn Notziger, the candidate's press secretary, said Mr. Reagan expects the report before the election next Tuesday.

Meanwhile, Sen. Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island, ranking Democrat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and a member of the subcommittee that has been investigating Billy Carter's dealings with Libya, called for a congressional investigation of the Allen matter. "If the Journal's report on Mr. Allen's activities is correct, they reflect disgraceful conduct, far worse than anything Billy Carter did," he said.

Carter, Reagan Set Quick Pace In Final Stretch of '80 Campaign

President Hammers At Rival's Image

By James R. Dickenson
Washington Star Political Writer

NEWARK, N.J. — President Carter, his adrenalin obviously running after his Tuesday night debate with Ronald Reagan, yesterday began a concentrated attempt to persuade Democrats to return to their party and vote for him as he began a frenetic, final six-day campaign in his close, desperate battle for reelection.

Carter attacked Reagan on what he considers his Republican challenger's vulnerable points, Reagan's alleged inclination to be a hawk in international relations and his ingrained and longtime opposition to Democratic social programs.

Carter put in a long day yesterday after his late-night debate, keeping one eye on the Iranian hostage situation and making a final appeal

See DEMOCRATS, A-6

Continued From A-1

to traditional Democrats in the last week of the campaign.

Carter was asked about reports that release of the hostages might be imminent following completion of the debate of the Iranian parliament today, but he adamantly refused to comment and focused his attentions instead on the differences between him and Reagan.

Carter, like Reagan, is beginning a six-day political death march. The president's grueling schedule will take him from Philadelphia this morning to Saginaw, Mich., St. Louis and Columbia, S.C., tonight. He will go from there to Texas, Chicago, Detroit, and Philadelphia on Sunday night.

On Monday he is scheduled to make three campaign appearances in the Eastern states before flying to California, where he is scheduled to make three campaign appearances because of the three-hour time lag. He then is scheduled to make a late Monday-night redeye flight to Plains, Ga., where he will vote on Tuesday morning, and then return to Washington in the afternoon.

Carter spent yesterday earnestly campaigning as a Democrat in the tradition of Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, John Kennedy, and Lyndon Johnson, and attempting to paint Reagan as an irresponsible political dilettante who should not be

trusted with his finger on the nuclear trigger.

This is a campaign theme Carter has tried to sound all through the general election, which he feels he was finally able to do in the head-to-head debate with Reagan on Tuesday night.

"I've come here to form with you a partnership during these next few days to give the Democrats a tremendous victory, which this nation needs," he said yesterday. "You will remind yourselves and each other in the solitude of the voting place of the great tradition of the Democratic party which has meant so much to this country."

Carter also played heavily on the theme that Reagan has an irresponsible desire for confrontation with the Soviet Union, and has also opposed Democratic social programs in the past.

The president cast this in far more cosmic terms than just partisan politics, however.

"The choice next Tuesday is not just between me and Governor Reagan, it's not just between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party. It's a choice between two vastly different concepts or beliefs concerning what this nation must be," he said. "It's a choice between two vastly different futures for America, a choice crucial to your life and to the lives of the members of your family and those that you love."

Carter's schedule reflects the hardball arithmetic of this presidential campaign. He and Reagan are crisscrossing the same swing states of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Illinois, and Texas, with Carter's polls indicating that he is closing the gap enough in California, Oregon and Washington to warrant a last-minute trip to California.

Robert Strauss, Carter's campaign manager, reportedly has been encouraging local Democrats to raise money independent of the Carter presidential campaign for a last-minute television campaign in California.

Reagan, on the other hand, has been making inroads on Carter's Southern base, which has forced Carter to make last-minute campaign forays in the South.

Carter made a moving speech at a black church in Newark, the Bethel Baptist Church, and was received with considerably more warmth than he gets from his predominantly white audiences.

He reminded the audience, which sang the old hymn, "Amazing Grace," on his arrival, that the Democratic Party had been the champion of civil rights and programs designed to aid blacks and overcome the social and economic inequality they suffer in this society.

On the road, they repeat debate topics

By Walter R. Mears
Associated Press

CLEVELAND — President Carter and Ronald Reagan continued their campaign debate at a distance yesterday, in parallel quests for the support of major swing states that hold the key to the Tuesday outcome.

In the brief time remaining, the two will be concentrating on much the same territory: the battleground states that carry the majority of the electoral votes.

Carter, in Pittsburgh, forecast a top-to-bottom victory for the Democratic ticket and accused Reagan of misstating his own positions in the debate.

Reagan, in Houston, said Carter "refused to defend his record, he couldn't defend it, so he changed the subject." He said Carter economic policies "are leading us into the dark ages."

Carter was campaigning in Pittsburgh, Rochester, N.Y., Newark, N.J., then Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and New Jersey are on the list of big toss-up states. Reagan will be working in both before the week is out.

The Republican nominee went straight to Texas, another swing state, to campaign in Houston, Fort Worth and Dallas. Carter will be hunting Texas votes on Saturday.

The nuclear issue

"We'll whip the Republicans from the courthouse all the way to the White House," Carter said in Pittsburgh. Then he accused Reagan of misstatements in the Cleveland debate, concentrating once again on nuclear weapons policy, which he called "the most important single issue in this campaign."

He once again quoted Reagan as having said last winter that the spread of nuclear weapons was not America's business, and he challenged his rival's disavowal of that statement Tuesday night, when he said that an effort to halt nuclear proliferation would be a major part of his foreign policy.

Carter contended yesterday that Reagan's position "has been that if Libya, a terrorist nation, or Iraq or other countries like Pakistan, South Africa, want to have an atomic bomb, it's none of our business."

"Last night he insinuated that he had not said this," Carter said. "But I had my people look it up again this morning."

He said Reagan was quoted in the Feb. 1 New York Times as saying that if other nations develop nuclear weapons "I just don't think it's any of our business."

Carter said, "For people who care about controlling terrorism, that is the ultimate terrorist threat. . . and every American ought to stop and think what will happen to this world if we have no control over nuclear weapons between ourselves and the Soviet Union, if we launch — as Gov. Reagan has proposed — an arms race and if we take the position it's none of our business if terrorist nations have atomic weapons."

The windfall-profits tax

Reagan said that the debate left his campaign "in very good shape" and that he wished it could have lasted another 90 minutes so he could have continued to challenge Carter on "the falsehoods that have been told numerous times by the whole Carter campaign."

He also said Carter had claimed in debate that the windfall-profits tax would be paid by major oil companies. "Who is he trying to kid?" Reagan asked. "That tax will be paid by you and me, by the consumer in this country. . . ."

Campaigning in Toledo, Republican vice presidential nominee George Bush said that he and Carter now had something in common. "We both lost debates to Ronald Reagan," said Bush, who debated him during the campaign for the GOP nomination.

Network researchers estimated that more than 100 million Americans saw at least part of the nationally broadcast debate. NBC put the audience at about 105 million; ABC said 120 million.

Thursday, Oct. 30, 1980

Philadelphia Inquirer

Carter Continues to Press on Debate

By Edward Walsh
Washington Post Staff Writer

PITTSBURGH, Oct. 29 — President Carter, confident that he has dictated the agenda of issues for the last week of the presidential campaign, continued to press Ronald Reagan today on the same subjects that dominated their nationally televised debate Tuesday night.

While aides exuberantly claimed that Carter clearly had made headway in the critical business of winning over undecided voters, the president resumed his assault on Reagan as an "extremely dangerous" opponent of nuclear arms control and nuclear nonproliferation policies.

Answering questions before a friendly "town meeting" audience here, Carter seized on one of the openings offered him Tuesday night by Reagan's denial during the debate that he had ever said that halting the spread of nuclear weapons is "none of our business."

The president cited a newspaper clipping from Feb. 1 in which Reagan was quoted as having said precisely that, and told the audience:

"I've been discussing it, but I'm glad

that 80 or 100 million Americans last night could see that Gov. Reagan has another extremely dangerous approach, and that is not concerning the Soviet Union but concerning radical and terrorist nations who don't yet have atomic bombs.

"Every American," he added, "ought to stop and think what will happen to this world if we have no control over nuclear weapons between ourselves and the Soviet Union . . . and if we take the position that it is none of our business if terrorist nations have atomic weapons. That is the single most important issue in this campaign, and I'm glad last night it had a chance to come out."

Carter has tried to make the "war-and-peace" question the central issue from the beginning of the campaign and, in the view of his advisers, he succeeded in keeping it in the forefront before the huge national audience that watched the debate.

While the mood was confident as Carter left Cleveland this morning for his final campaign push, his schedule between now and Election Day, next Tuesday, indicated the political prob-

lems that still face him and the uncertainty that continues to hang over the election outcome.

The president barnstormed the Northeast today, moving from Pittsburgh to a rally in Rochester, N.Y., and an appearance in Newark before ending up tonight in Philadelphia.

But his schedule later this week calls for him to spend 2½ precious days trying to nail down his natural geographic base — the southern and border states of Missouri, Tennessee, South Carolina, Mississippi, Florida and Texas.

White House press secretary Jody Powell today also announced that Carter will end the campaign Monday night in Reagan's base of the West, making stops in Washington and Oregon, which the Carter advisers consider within their grasp, and Reagan's native California, generally conceded to the GOP nominee.

The president appeared to be in good spirits as he left Cleveland this morning, and he could only have been cheered by the size and enthusiasm of the crowds he encountered during the day. Several thousand people jammed the street in front of Pittsburgh's aging

Trinity Episcopal Church, site of the "town meeting."

An even larger crowd greeted the president later today in downtown Rochester. And at both stops, Carter, while hammering away on the "war-and-peace" issue, also called on Democrats to remember their traditional differences with the Republicans.

This will certainly be a constant theme during the last week of the Carter campaign, just as today's large crowds were orchestrated by White House advance teams bent on injecting a sense of winning momentum into the campaign.

At the "town meeting" the president for the first time directly confronted the subject of his 69-year-old opponent's age. The issue was raised by a man who identified himself as a ward constable in this heavily Democratic city and said, "I don't believe that a man that old should be running my country and your country."

"That's an issue that hasn't been raised in the campaign, one that I would not want to raise," replied Carter, who could only have been pleased that the subject came up in such a blunt

President, Trying to Lure Jewish Voters, Makes Series of Key Concessions to Israel

By WALTER S. MOSSBERG

Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL
The White House, anxious to win the backing of wavering Jewish voters, is scrambling to persuade them that if Israel needs a favor, Jimmy Carter will provide it.

The other day, on a Carter campaign swing through West Virginia and Ohio, political reporters were surprised to find aboard Air Force One former Israeli Defense Minister Ezer Weizman, a popular figure with many American Jews. Last weekend, Mr. Weizman all but endorsed the President's reelection.

But Mr. Weizman's trip was only the most visible of a recent series of moves by the White House to associate itself more firmly with Israel in the minds of Jewish voters. In at least three instances in recent weeks — one of them as yet unannounced — the administration has made important concessions to Israel on issues pending between the two nations.

On Oct. 17, Mr. Carter signed an agreement, long sought by Israel, guaranteeing the Jewish state the right to buy U.S. oil in emergencies. A week later, the President publicly ruled out the sale of jet-fighter bomb racks to Saudi Arabia, a move sought by the Saudis but opposed by Israel. And, in a still-secret ruling, the State Department has decided to let Israel offer to sell Mexico Israeli-built jets powered by U.S. engines.

No Momentous Change

None of the three moves represents a momentous change in U.S. policy, and all are generally consistent with past Carter stands. But each was something Israel badly wanted. By granting Israel's wishes in the closing weeks of the campaign, the White House has established a pattern that smacks of politics in the minds of some U.S. officials and to some Israelis as well.

"There seems to be a big effort to give the Israelis at least some of the things they want, before the election," says one administration official knowledgeable about American Mideast policy.

Both Mr. Carter and Republican nominee Ronald Reagan have professed strong loyalty to the Jewish state, and Israel's government, anxious to offend neither candidate, is taking a low profile in the campaign. Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin, for instance, denounced the trip by Mr. Weizman, his domestic political rival, as undue "intervention" in U.S. politics.

At the Israeli embassy here, officials decline to give their views on whether Mr. Carter or Mr. Reagan would be a better friend to Israel. That contrasts with some previous election years, such as 1972, when then-ambassador Yitzhak Rabin, who was later prime minister, endorsed Richard Nixon.

Carter's Jewish Vote Ebbs

But one knowledgeable Israeli observer in Washington conceded that Israel stands to gain from the scramble for Jewish votes. "Maybe when you are on the eve of election, it is a time for a reckoning," he ventures. "We believe that most of our requests to the U.S. are justified and solid. And it may be that the election simply expedites matters."

The Jewish vote probably put Mr. Carter over the top in some vital states in 1976, but Jewish support has ebbed for much of this year. Displeasure with Mr. Carter's perfor-

mance, and particularly his stands on matters involving Israel, has caused defections to Mr. Reagan and to independent candidate John Anderson. There's concern in the White House that Mr. Carter could win just 60% or so of the Jewish vote, low for a Democrat, and that such a poor showing could cost some big states, such as New York, Florida, Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

Mr. Carter and Vice President Walter Mondale constantly remind Jewish audiences that "nearly half" of all U.S. aid to Israel has been requested by Mr. Carter. And an aide to Mr. Mondale recently asked the State Department for a detailed accounting of U.S. aid to Israel for use in one of Mr. Mondale's speeches. The request was interpreted by some State Department and Pentagon official as a subtle demand for favora-

ble action on pending Israeli requests, an interpretation vigorously denied by Mr. Mondale's staff.

But there's little doubt that Israel won a timely victory when the President signed the oil agreement Oct. 17. The agreement grew out of a pledge in the Camp David peace accords that, if Israel agreed to give up captured Egyptian oil fields, the U.S. would sell oil to Israel in case its other sources dried up.

Resisting Israeli Demands

But the U.S., anxious to keep peace-talk pressure on Mr. Begin, had resisted for months Israeli demands for negotiations to work out details of the pact. In addition, the administration had rejected an Israeli interpretation of the agreement that guaranteed U.S. oil sales when Israel could obtain oil elsewhere, but only at exorbitant prices. The U.S. agreed to negotiate this spring and eventually agreed to the price-based clause.

A Tel-Aviv newspaper quoted Israel's energy minister as saying that, in the oil talks, "Israel exploited the election eve period as a means of pressure on the U.S." The minis-

tration's refusal to give Israel the permission to offer jets to Mexico is a breakthrough for Israel's drive to win much-needed cash through overseas arms sales. In the past, the U.S. has frustrated some Israeli attempts to sell its home-built Kfir jet fighter. Such sales require U.S. approval because the plane uses a U.S.-made engine. One reason for U.S. reluctance has been that the Kfir, a highly rated plane, competes with sales of Northrop Corp.'s F5E export fighter and of a more advanced U.S.-built export fighter known as the FX.

Starting this year, the administration has allowed Northrop and others to offer FX-type planes to a long list of Third World countries, and Israel has been allowed to offer the equally advanced Kfir in most of the same countries. But U.S. companies haven't asked to offer Mexico the FX, partly because the Mexicans may be prepared to buy the less capable F5E. By letting Israel offer Mexico the more advanced Kfir, the U.S. may be jeopardizing the F5E sale, though Northrop could still try to compete with the FX there.

ter later denied the quote, but U.S. officials concede that the administration could have postponed settling the price issue until after Nov. 4, but didn't.

Mr. Carter's comment ruling out bomb racks for Saudi Arabia, also a big win for Israel, came in a radio interview last weekend. When the U.S. sold Saudi Arabia F15 jets in 1978, Congress insisted that the jets couldn't be augmented with bomb racks or added fuel capacity that might turn them into offensive weapons with enough range to strike Israel.

But the Saudis have been pressing for the extra gear, saying they need it to defend themselves against other enemies. White House and Pentagon aides, believing the Iran-Iraq war bolsters the Saudi case, had been hoping to persuade the President after the election to grant the request, but they were shocked by Mr. Carter's remark. Some suggest it may still leave some leeway for a sale, but most worry that it could destroy U.S. hopes for increased military ties with the Saudis.

The State Department decision to grant



10 THE WALL STREET JOURNAL
Thursday, October 30, 1980

Carter stirs new furor over

By James Coates

Chicago Tribune Press Service

WASHINGTON—President Carter falsely assured Michigan and Wisconsin residents this month that the Defense Department has not yet recommended building an environmentally controversial radio transmission setup in the two states.

The President's misstatement came on Oct. 1 at a "town meeting" in Flint, Mich., where Carter was questioned about project ELF [extremely low frequency]—a 130 mile long radio antenna the Navy wants to build between the Upper Peninsula of Michigan and the scenic Eagle River region of Wisconsin.

WILLIAM PALO, who described himself as a member of the Submarine Veterans of World War II, asked Carter to comment on charges that he had given in to "political pressure" by not ordering the ELF project built.

Emphasizing his five years as a submarine officer during his 11 years in the Navy, Carter displayed familiarity with the various types of antenna programs suggested.

Then the President denied that he had postponed a decision because of election

year pressure from environmentalists.

"As soon as I get a recommendation from the secretary of defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff—whenever it might come—I will not hesitate to make my decision without delay," Carter said at the televised meeting.

PALO LATER WROTE a letter to the President accusing him of "lying" in his answer and enclosed a Dec. 8, 1978, memorandum to the President from Defense Secretary Harold Brown.

The memo states flatly: "I recommend that you approve selection of the combined Michigan-Wisconsin proposal, as the site for deployment of the ELF communication system."

Defense Department officials told The Tribune that the memo produced by Palo was authentic but defended the President, saying that following the Dec. 8 memo the White House asked for more details and a final decision was postponed.

BROWN'S MEMO advised Carter: "A draft memorandum to me as well as draft letters to announce your decision to the governors of Michigan and Wisconsin, the president of the Senate, and the speaker of the House of Representa-

tives are attached."

"If you desire," Brown wrote, "we can have senior Navy Department representatives call on the governors and hand deliver these letters as well as coordinate the announcement with members of the Michigan and Wisconsin congressional delegations."

Palo told Carter at the town meeting that he had copies of the documents and the President replied: "You're mistaken. There is no difference between me and the secretary of defense. And then

the time comes — when I get a recommendation from the secretary of defense either to go ahead with the system or not to go ahead with it, and the location that they advocate — I will not hesitate.

"I have not gotten such a recommendation," Carter said. "When I get one, I will make a decision."

Known under various codenames — "Sanguine," "Shelf," and "Seafarer" — before designated "ELF," the project was condemned as a threat to the environment.

Navy antenna plan

Carter's words softened on Iran arms sales, PLO

Washington (AP)—The State Department yesterday qualified President Carter's statement during his debate with Ronald Reagan that military spare parts bought by Iran before the American hostages were taken would be delivered if the captives were freed.

The department also diluted the president's branding of the Palestine Liberation Organization during the debate as a terrorist organization.

"Until we know what the Iran parliament sets out as its terms and what its feelings are about a release of the hostages, I will not be able to predict for you what we will do," said the department spokesman, John H. Trattner.

The U.S. attitude toward the PLO is watched closely in the Arab world, Israel and in Western Europe. Therefore, Mr. Carter's flat declaration Tuesday night that it is one of the world's "terrorist organizations" is considered significant.

To all Arab countries, the PLO is the only legitimate representative of the Palestinians. To Israel, it is a terrorist group. And to many European countries, it inevitably must be heard in Mideast peace talks.

The State Department took the position September 4 that "we view the PLO as an organization, elements and members of which advocate and carry out acts of terrorism. We condemn such acts and those organizations and individuals who perpetuate them."

That definition reflects the view of many Arab specialists in the department that there are moderate factions in Yasser Arafat's organization.

"That position is the U.S. government's position," the spokesman said. "It is the

president of the United States' position. If he had time in last night's debate to set out all of the nuances that position contains, I know that he would have."

The issue of Iranian spare parts is also complicated, with Mr. Carter, Vice President Mondale, Secretary of State Edmund S. Muskie and other administration officials making sometimes contradictory statements.

In the debate, Mr. Carter said, "If the hostages are released safely . . . we would make delivery on those items which Iran owns."

However, Mr. Mondale said Sunday, "We have not had to, nor should we at this point, in my opinion, face up to the question of spare parts. . . . I do not believe we should get involved in that issue at this time."

The question of whether delivery would violate the U.S. position of neutrality in the Iran-Iraq war also is getting murky responses.

On October 16, Mr. Muskie said the effect of lifting U.S. sanctions "would not be neutral because it would enable Iran to reduce its isolation and perhaps have access to parts that it would not otherwise have access to."

But Tuesday night, in New York, Mr. Muskie said "that action would not be unneutral with respect to Iraq. . . ."

Reiterating the main thrust of U.S. policy—winning freedom for the American hostages—Mr. Trattner told reporters yesterday: "We are losing ourselves in a debate about the meaning of words and the consistencies of action. . . . I think you have to look at the entire picture of what we are trying to do."

SUN, Thursday, October 29, 1980

Nonproliferation debate: Carter hit hard, but did Reagan miss opportunity?

By Daniel Southerland

Staff correspondent of The Christian Science Monitor

Washington

President Carter repeatedly raised the question of nuclear "nonproliferation" in his debate with Ronald Reagan, but his administration's record in this difficult field has hardly been an unalloyed success.

Mr. Reagan, for his part, gives the impression of a man who has never really focused on the subject but who also may have changed his mind considerably on the issue as the presidential campaign evolved. Nonproliferation is the specialists' language for efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to other nations.

In the debate Oct. 28, Mr. Carter used a question on the subject of terrorism to raise the nonproliferation issue, apparently as part of his effort to demonstrate that Reagan is incapable of dealing responsibly and competently with nuclear issues. Declaring that the most serious threat would be for radical nations to gain control of nuclear weapons, Carter said: "Both I and my predecessors have had a deep commitment to controlling nuclear weapons. But when Governor Reagan is asked about this, he makes a very disturbing comment that the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons is none of our business."

The President was referring to a statement Reagan was reported to have made in Jacksonville, Fla., last Jan. 31. According to the New York Times, Reagan indicated at a news conference that the US should not stand in the way of foreign countries developing their own nuclear weapons, stating: "I just don't think it's any of our business."

The Times reported that an hour after he made that comment, Reagan aides called an impromptu meeting with reporters at which the candidate stressed that he supported American efforts to halt the spread of nuclear weapons. But he repeated earlier remarks that he believed there was little chance the United States could do so, the Times said, and questioned whether as a practical matter any country could stop the development of nuclear technology by other nations.

Asked whether he would accept the concept of Pakistan's developing nuclear weapons, Reagan was reported to have replied: "All of us would like to see nonproliferation, but I don't think any of us are succeeding in that. We're the only one in the world that's trying to stop it."

In the debate, Reagan denied ever having said that it was not "any of our business" to try to stop the spread of nuclear weapons. He accused Carter of misstating the facts, and he indicated that nonproliferation would be a major part of his foreign policy were he elected president.

In Pittsburgh on Oct. 29, President Carter hammered once again at the nonproliferation theme, challenging Reagan's denial that he had ever said it was not "any of our business."

Specialists on the subject say Reagan missed a major opportunity to score a point in the debate. He could have pointed out that the Republican Party platform opposes the sale of nuclear fuel to India, and he could have reminded television viewers that only last month President Carter fought hard for, and succeeded in getting, congressional approval for such a sale to India (for reactor, not weapons use).

In fairness to Carter, some experts say that the legal dispute over that sale was many-sided and that a legal case could be made for selling the fuel to India. The President stressed that the US would be violating a contract if it failed to ship the nuclear fuel.

What made the sale particularly touchy was the fact that India had exploded a nuclear device in 1974, apparently with the help of fuel shipped by Canada and perhaps other nations, and may be developing a nuclear weapons delivery system.

Reagan also might have pointed out that one of his leading foreign policy advisers, Fred C. Iklé, is a former director of the US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and that Mr. Iklé made special efforts while in that job to place stricter controls on the transfer of nuclear-weapons materials and technology.

These are not simply academic questions. American experts believe that within only a few years, two more nations — Pakistan and South Africa — could join the six or seven current members of the so-called nuclear club.

Administration experts say that President Carter should be credited with focusing new attention on the

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

Thursday, October 30, 1980

Carter Hinders Probe of Billy, Report Asserts

An internal Justice Department report accuses President Carter of failing to cooperate with the investigation of how the administration responded to Billy Carter's relationship with Libya, according to persons familiar with the document.

The report was prepared by Michael E. Shaheen Jr., head of the department's office of professional responsibility, and was sent to Congress yesterday.

According to those who have read it, the report asserts that the president agreed to and then canceled three interviews with department investigators, on Oct. 15, 23 and 24, and that other administration officials were similarly uncooperative.

A White House spokesman said last night that no one there had seen the report and that there would be no comment until it was read.

The report asserted that the investigation could not be completed without the testimony of the president, and it said that sworn testimony from him would be obtained by "compulsory process," if necessary.

Carter pledged at a news conference Aug. 4 to cooperate fully in all investigations of his brother's activities. He made public then a detailed account of all administration contacts with Billy Carter relating to Libya. His cooperation then was credited by political analysts with defusing the matter as a campaign issue.

Shaheen, who came into the Justice Department in the Ford administration, is responsible for investigating misconduct in office by high government officials.

In a letter to the special Senate subcommittee that investigated the Billy Carter matter, Shaheen said

See CARTER, A-6

Continued From A-1

that he was prohibited by law from making his report public, because the investigation had not been concluded.

Last night, two Republican members of the subcommittee, Strom Thurmond of South Carolina and Richard G. Lugar of Indiana, urged Shaheen to publish the document.

In a telegram to Shaheen and to Sen. Birch Bayh, D-Ind., the subcommittee chairman, Thurmond said, "I see no purpose in the report having been prepared unless it is made public forthwith."

Republican officials understand that Shaheen is precluded from issuing the document, but they believe that Bayh is eager to have it kept under wraps until after the election.

Bayh could not be reached for comment, but his staff said that the senator was bound by Shaheen's request in his cover letter that the report be kept private.

The Senate subcommittee filed an interim report on the Billy Carter case earlier this month. It found that President Carter and other administration officials had acted unwisely and, in some cases, irresponsibly in not separating themselves more carefully from the president's brother's dealings with Libya. But the subcommittee found no criminal wrongdoing.

Shaheen was assigned by Deputy Attorney General Charles B. Renshaw in August to conduct a separate investigation of whether administration officials had acted properly. The subcommittee delayed filing a final report until it could see Shaheen's findings. Shaheen promised to supply what he could before the election.

The Shaheen report was highly critical of Attorney General Benjamin R. Civiletti and several other officials, according to persons who have seen it. Civiletti was said to have been untruthful in a July news conference when he declared that he had not discussed the Billy Carter matter with the president. The day after the news conference, Civiletti acknowledged that there had indeed been such a conversation.

The report also was said to have found that the testimony of Phillip J. Wise Jr., the president's appointments secretary, was unbelievable. Wise told the Senate subcommittee that he had no recollection of many telephone calls and other dealings with Billy Carter, and he reportedly made the same assertions to the Justice Department investigators.

A classified version of Shaheen's report was sent Wednesday to the Senate Intelligence Committee. The unclassified parts were filed with the special subcommittee.

New York Times Service

Carter aide: Khomeini has cancer

*Says Iranian
is 'not going
to last long'*

Associated Press

SHREVEPORT, La. — Iranian leader Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini has cancer of the colon and is "not going to last long," an aide to President Carter said in an interview published yesterday.

The remarks by Frank Moore, head of Carter's congressional liaison staff, were published in an interview in the Shreveport Journal conducted Tuesday while Moore was campaigning for Carter in northwest Louisiana.

In Washington, the State Department's Iran working group declined comment and White House spokesmen were not immediately available.

There have been reports that Khomeini, 80, is ill, but the specific ailment has never been identified publicly.

Moore's statement on cancer came during a discussion with newspaper editors about the United States' concern for safeguarding the internal security of Iran.

"It is not in our best interest in the short range or in the long range to see Iran disassembled. . . . We need to see it stabilized. Khomeini has cancer of the colon. . . . He's not going to last long," Moore said.

He said that U.S. leaders expect the Iranian military to take over in the event of the religious and revolutionary leader's death — probably a coalition of military leaders now serving Iran in its war with Iraq and some who were exiled after the fall of Shah Mohammed Reza Pahlavi.

Moore said that the Carter administration did not consider it likely that Iran would release the 52 American hostages before next Tuesday's election.

"We don't count on it. Chances are very, very slim that's going to happen. I mean, we're not in contact with them," Moore said.

Khomeini has said the hostages will not be released until the United States meets Iranian demands that include the return of Pahlavi's wealth and a pledge of nonintervention in Persian Gulf affairs. At the same time, he has said the decision on their release will be left to the Iranian Parliament.

Thursday, Oct. 30, 1980 Philadelphia Inquirer

Justice Dept. Report on Billy Is Said to Criticize Civiletti

By Charles R. Babcock
Washington Post Staff Writer

The Justice Department's internal investigative unit handed the Senate's Billy Carter subcommittee a political hot potato yesterday — its own report on the Libyan connection of the president's brother, complete with a reportedly critical assessment of the parts played by several Carter administration officials, including Attorney General Benjamin R. Civiletti.

The report also is said to criticize the White House for failing to cooperate in the investigation.

Michael E. Shaheen Jr., head of the department's office of professional responsibility, forwarded three copies of what he termed a "status report" to Sens. Birch Bayh (D-Ind.), the subcommittee chairman, Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.), the ranking minority member, and Philip W. Tone, the special counsel. He requested that the report not be released publicly because the investigation was not yet complete.

A department spokesman said Shaheen was sending the interim

report because he'd promised something to the committee by the end of this month. Receipt of the Justice report puts the subcommittee in the delicate position of determining how to deal with press requests for it a week before the presidential election.

Shaheen's office opened an investigation when Civiletti disclosed that he had discussed the department's investigation of Billy Carter with the president. The revelation created a furor because Civiletti consistently had denied speaking to the president about the case at all.

Billy Carter registered as a foreign agent for Libya this summer after Justice investigators found that he had accepted \$220,000 from Libyan officials. In its report, the subcommittee criticized Civiletti, and some White House officials, but concluded no one broke the law.

A spokesman for subcommittee member Richard Lugar (R-Ind.) said the senator will ask Justice to release the report.

Sadat Fears Carter Deal With Iran

Sees U.S. Weakness Imperiling Mideast

By Walter Taylor
Washington Star Staff Writer

Egypt's President Anwar Sadat is frantically trying to signal President Carter that he believes a "tilt" toward Iran in an effort to gain release of the American hostages will have disastrous consequences for U.S. relations with the Arab world.

Sadat is said to feel frustrated, however, by a belief that his message is going unheeded in the heat of Carter's re-election campaign. As a consequence, he is said to be trying to make it clear to other Arab nations that Egypt and the United States have parted company on the matter of the current Iran-Iraq fighting.

Cited as evidence of this is Sadat's studied decision not to answer charges by Iran that Egyptian troops are fighting alongside those of Iraq's President Saddam Hussein. The Egyptian president is said to have confirmed recently that about 5,000 Egyptians who were working in Iraq

See SADAT, A-7

Continued From A-1

indeed have been drafted into the Iraqi army and sent to the Iranian front.

These Egyptians are among about 20,000 sent to Iraq in the early 1970s as civilian agricultural workers, and many had experience in the Egyptian army. Some were trained by the Egyptians in the use of Soviet weapons, the same kind of equipment used by Hussein's forces.

Rather than protest Hussein's drafting of Egyptian nationals, Sadat is said to have chosen to remain silent on the issue as a show of solidarity with Baghdad. Because this point seemingly has been missed by policy-makers of the Carter administration, however, Sadat now is said to be considering a public acknowledgement that Egyptians are fighting alongside Iraqi soldiers.

Although the United States' closest ally in the Arab world, Sadat is not alone among Arab moderates supporting Iraq in its war against the Iranian regime of the Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini. Jordan's King Hussein, long a close American ally in the region, has routed supplies and equipment to Iraq through the Red Sea port of Aqaba.

Other Arab nations, including Saudi Arabia and Oman, provided sanctuary for Iraqi aircraft during the early days of the fighting.

Sadat's immediate concern is said to be the possibility that President Carter intends to free about \$400 million in spare parts and ordnance to Khomeini's military if the Iranian parliament agrees to free the 52 American captives. The Egyptian view is that this would be seen by the moderate Arab world as an unequivocal tilt toward the Iranians in the war, U.S. statements of "impartiality" notwithstanding.

Carter seemed to confirm the Egyptian fear during Tuesday night's presidential debate when he said he would "make delivery on those items which Iran owns, which they have bought and paid for" once the captives are freed.

As recently as Sunday, Vice President Walter F. Mondale had said that the matter of Iranian military equipment impounded by Carter following the hostage seizure would have to be a matter of U.S.-Iranian negotiations once the captives were released. Secretary of State Edmund S. Muskie has made similar statements during the past two weeks.

Beyond the appearance of taking sides in the hostilities is said to lie a greater concern on Sadat's part that the Carter administration, if seen as having capitulated to Iranian demands, would appear to be demonstrating weakness to an Arab world already rife with doubts about American commitment to its friends and strategic interests in the region.

Sadat himself is said to be disturbed by what he sees as "weakness" on Carter's part in the handling of the hostage situation, even though he sympathizes with U.S. concern over the plight of the captives and their families. He reportedly is concerned that Carter is allowing his commitment to return the hostages safely to dictate long-range U.S. policy in the Middle East.

Sadat's concerns have not been conveyed directly to the Carter administration, despite the longstanding friendship between the Egyptian and American presidents.

A spokesman for the Egyptian Embassy here, Ahmed Nasr, insisted yesterday that his country, like the United States, was officially neutral in the fighting.

But Sadat's failure to condemn the conscription of Egyptian nationals to participate in the fighting, his repeated statements against the Khomeini regime and his recent dispatch to Washington of his second-in-command, Hosni Mubarak, to warn Carter about possible Libyan intentions against Egypt are cited as efforts to convey his feelings to Washington.

The fact that Sadat's arch-nemesis, Col. Muammar Kadafi, the Libyan head of state, is supporting Iran in the fighting is cited as only one more reason Sadat believes the United States should be on the other side — and one more reason why he thinks Carter ought to recognize how strongly he feels on the subject.

Sadat's concerns are said to go beyond the U.S. position in the moderate Arab world. Because he is linked so closely with Carter and the U.S.-backed Camp David peace process, he also is worried that he, too, will be tarred by any American tilt toward Tehran. He is said to think this would dash any chance of a reconciliation between Egypt and the rest of the Arab world, particularly Saudi Arabia and Jordan, a hope he still nourishes.

Another by-product of such a U.S. move, Sadat is said to believe, would be the elimination of any hope that other moderate Arab nations might someday join the Camp David-inspired Palestinian autonomy negotiations.

From page 1

Countdown — candidates' final plans

By Richard J. Cattani
Staff correspondent of
The Christian Science Monitor

Washington

With the Cleveland debate behind them, Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan have resumed their rush to the finish of the 1980 presidential campaign with their end-of-the-race road maps intact.

Each must now convince the public he can win, strategists say. Each will strive to show assurance, confidence, but with the President staying the aggressor.

The President is pressing on in the odd role of incumbent challenger, as Gerald Ford did four years ago, trying to overtake his out-of-office rival.

On the road, Mr. Carter is circuiting the states and regions he must win. In the East it was Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey on Wednesday. The Midwest: Michigan and Missouri Thursday. The South/border region: South Carolina, Florida, Tennessee, Mississippi on Friday. Then Texas on Saturday, Illinois Sunday, and California — a surprise dash with an eye on Washington and Oregon to the north — on Monday.

Thus, as in the debate, Carter will be carrying the fight to Ronald Reagan all the way to the end, seeking a one-to-one election eve comparison with Reagan on the Republican's home turf.

Mr. Reagan plans to wind up his election run Monday with a San Diego gala, after campaigning nonstop in Texas, Louisiana, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Michigan, and Oregon.

For independent candidate John Anderson, the end-game strategy is to convince voters he is still a major factor in the outcome whether he can win any electoral votes outright or not, although "the company line still is he hopes he can win," aides say.

They point to Mr. Anderson's ratings of 8
★ Please turn to Page 10

to 14 percent nationwide, and 11 percent in California.

"Carter can't say that's insignificant unless he's whistling in a graveyard," an Anderson spokesman says. After visiting Pennsylvania and New Jersey Wednesday, Anderson campaigns in New York and Connecticut Thursday, Massachusetts Friday, California Saturday, Iowa on Sunday, finishing in Minnesota and his native Illinois Monday.

The two major party candidates actually deployed election strategies, not debate-winning strategies for the Cleveland debate.

What the public heard in the debate was a 90-minute replay of what they had earlier seen in 90-second segments over the evening news in recent weeks and months: Carter trying to plant the seeds of doubt about Reagan on war and on women's and minority rights; Reagan trying to shed the defensive role and focus on Carter's economic record.

These themes will be pressed relentlessly in their final drive.

The overall impact of the debate appears likely to be absorbed in the final days' playoff of the campaign, accentuating themes already in place.

Reagan supporters figure they entered the debate ahead, held their ground among the undecided, but still must turn out their own vote in force in the closing hours. As the week began, they counted 283 electoral votes — 13 more than needed to win — for Reagan, 126 for Carter, and 129 in doubt.

According to a post-debate Associated Press survey, Carter and Reagan scored identical six-point gains among undecided voters who watched the debate. On Monday, the day before the debate, a nationwide AP survey called the race Reagan 39, Carter 35, Anderson 7 percent, undecided 19 percent. Among the 1,062 who then watched the debate, Reagan held his own among the undecideds.

If such findings are borne out by other post-debate surveys, Reagan may be able to claim the coveted homestretch "confidence."

"Now, each candidate must try to convince the country he is going to win," says Richard Bennett, political strategist and pollster, based in New England. "For Anderson,

there's no way he can do that. Carter has the edge in national polls. But this is a state-by-state election, and Reagan in electoral vote has the edge. Carter particularly has to convince people he can win."

"The trend the last two weeks nationwide has been toward the Democrats," Mr. Bennett says. Three weeks ago, many Democrats felt excluded from the election.

"Now Democrats say they're going to vote, but they've been undecided," Bennett says. "Voters have to justify a vote. They're unsure which direction to go in. The game now is who is going to win. They want to gravitate toward a winner."

Carter's last-day thrust into Reagan's home territory may be no more than a "car-

'Carter obviously had a clear plan to make the South, ERA, war fears . . . the issues. . . . But Reagan showed himself no warmonger, no bumbler.'

win" bluff, Reagan campaign sources say. Public polls have shown Reagan holding seven- and five-point leads. Republican pollster Robert Teeter rates the state "strong" for Reagan. But Mr. Teeter rates Oregon a tossup, and both Democratic and Republican pollsters rate Washington at best narrowly leaning toward Reagan.

"Reagan has to appear to have a steamroller going here," says one Republican strategist. "The 2-to-1 ABC [post-debate] telephone poll win for Reagan was impressive — even discounting the Republican edge in such samplings. And then the AP poll, and the pundits saying the debate was even."

"Carter obviously had a clear plan to make the South, ERA, war fears, and the toughness of the job the issues in the debate. But Reagan showed himself no warmonger, no bumbler. There was no winner."

"Reagan has some tools now to say he can win this thing, some trumpets to rally the troops."

Both Carter and Reagan come a-courtin'

By Paul Taylor
Inquirer Politics Writer

This morning in the city, it's Jimmy Carter and the Polish-Americans followed by Jimmy Carter and the Jews.

Then tonight in the suburbs, it's Ronald Reagan and the blue-collar vote, with some special overtures to Greek and Irish Americans.

Both major presidential candidates swing through the Philadelphia area today wearing their strategies on their itineraries. Pennsylvania is the largest state in the country still considered by both camps to be a tossup, and each is putting forth a maximum effort here in the final, frenzied days of the campaign.

Carter, who was in Pittsburgh yesterday, will make three stops in the Philadelphia area before election day, reflecting the concern of Dan Horgan, the President's state campaign manager, that "we have to energize the vote here."

"Our polls show us ahead with all voters in the state but slightly behind with all likely" to go to the polls, Horgan said. "So the name of the game is getting a big turnout."

To help hype a big turnout, Vice President Walter Mondale will be campaigning four days in Pennsylvania, and Sen. Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts is expected to be in the state Sunday or Monday. In addition, a raft of "surrogates" led by Rosalynn Carter, the Rev. Jesse Jackson and Muriel Humphrey will be in and out of the state all through the rest of the week.

"They (the national campaign) have given me everything I want in terms of time, talent and treasure," said Horgan, whose budget has grown from \$1.5 million to \$2.2 million during the fall campaign. "I've got no alibis left if we lose this thing."

As for Reagan, he will make his final stop in the area tonight before heading to Pittsburgh tomorrow, making two last passes at the blue-collar voting bloc that he is convinced will swing the state, and the presidency, from Carter.

His running mate, George Bush, will campaign Saturday in Philadelphia and Sunday in Scranton. Yesterday, top state Republican elected officials, including Gov. Dick Thornburgh, Sen. John Heinz and Sen.

Richard Schweiker, made a whirlwind tour of six cities to make the case for Reagan at a series of airport press conferences.

While the scheduling for all this madcap activity is dictated in large part by in-house polls, it also must accommodate all of the egos, interest groups, turf wars, human foibles and idiosyncracies and logistical problems that give rise to the adage that all politics is local.

Carter, for example, is appearing at a breakfast at a Polish-American lodge in Richmond because Reagan upstaged him here a few weeks ago and, to the horror of local Democrats, ran off with an endorsement of the influential 6,000-member Polish American Congress of Philadelphia. Now a splinter group within the congress, led by its former president, is hosting Carter.

The President is speaking to a Jewish audience in Center City because his polls tell him it is the largest undecided bloc in the state and also because a series of misunderstandings with local Jewish leaders forced his staff to cancel plans at the last moment to have Carter lay a wreath at the monument to the Six Million Jewish Martyrs on the Benjamin Franklin Parkway the last time he campaigned in Philadelphia.

the area today

'Anderson Difference' Lost in the Chuckles

He and Entourage Find Humor in Plight

By David Wood
Washington Star Staff Writer

SPRINGFIELD, N.J. — The press secretary wears a blue plastic space helmet with a built-in microphone and public-address speaker, from which he makes stentorian pronouncements to the press.

The candidate's traveling medical aide balances glasses of wine on his knees while participating boisterously in the game of "skyball," played by rolling oranges and grapefruit up the steep aisle of the campaign plane as it takes off.

The traveling press corps contents itself, between bursts of journalism, to planning a blowout Halloween party and trying to orchestrate a cacophony of duck and goose calls, sirens, and tug boat whistles that have lately startled campaign outsiders from Seattle to Boston.

And the candidate? He told a television interviewer following Tuesday night's debate that "I'm going off to have a couple of belts."

This is the John Anderson campaign? The "Anderson difference" of talking honesty and common sense to the American people? The campaign of ideas, the candidate who disavowed flim-flam and campaign hoopla?

Yes, it is. But it is also the last days of the campaign, and a failed one at that. The candidate and his staff, and the reporters who have faithfully dogged his footsteps for almost a year, have undergone a metamorphosis, of sorts, in the closing days of the 1980 presidential race.

But the change is evident even to those not privy to life in the aluminum womb of the 727 aircraft chartered to the National Unity Campaign. A year ago, Anderson was a sober, reserved Republican, a congressman from a conservative, semi-

rural Midwest district, with a yearning for bigger things. As recently as last month a top Anderson aide was wailing that Anderson had failed to accomplish his most important political task: to make people like him.

But that has changed, in part because the possibility of winning — and the necessity of having to win, has been lifted from Anderson's shoulders. As his chances of winning have receded, his base of support has narrowed, down to the diehard political rebels, the liberals and students who have always formed the core of Anderson's support.

They are people who boo mention of Carter's name, and who hiss at Reagan's; people who wear Adidas running shoes and graduate degrees, and others like one man in yesterday's crowd who believes that Anderson is losing "because he hasn't quoted Eisenhower enough."

"My people," Anderson foldily calls them.

He spoke yesterday at noon to one such small but wildly adoring crowd in downtown Philadelphia. Standing on a flatbed truck, the wind creasing a stray lock of silvery hair down the middle of his forehead, glittering confetti falling around him, Anderson belted out lines that would have jarred a year ago.

"We were here a few weeks ago, and I told you the Phillies would win," Anderson shouted. "Well, John Anderson's going to win too."

"I don't have to tell you — of all people — how to win in the 10th inning," he said, referring to a series of late-game victories for Philadelphia's world-champion baseball team.

"After I listened to the debate last night, I knew where I had made my mistake — if I had only talked to Amy first," Anderson mock-lamented, referring to Jimmy Carter's statement during the debate that he had consulted his daughter about the campaign's most important is-

See ANDERSON, A-5

Continued From A-3

sue. "I would have said, 'Look, Honey, you just tell your Daddy it's important for the American people to hear John Anderson,'" he told the crowd.

"Did you think that after listening to Carter and Reagan, after they read all those briefing books, after Reagan took four days off to practice how to roll his eyes just so — didn't you think that there was some real evidence that both of those men were missing the real point?"

"Do we really have to choose between the dreams of yesteryear and the nightmare of four more years?"

Jimmy Carter said last night that he is a mainstream Democrat. But Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, and John F. Kennedy never induced a recession to fight inflation, never produced interest rates of nearly 20 percent.

"We are going to put this great country ahead of any political party."

"So start calling your friends, remind them that there will be a choice next Tuesday. Go knock

down the doors and tell them you are there for John Anderson and Patrick Lucey — Do it! Do it!" Anderson shouted.

Asked at a press conference yesterday to step back and view the debate as an impartial observer, Anderson grinned broadly and took four giant steps backward, away from the microphone.

A moment later, when asked for his campaign strategy, Anderson looked blank for a moment. Then he ostentatiously patted all his pockets and announced he had apparently

"left it in my other wardrobe."

But before leaving Philadelphia at mid-afternoon, only a few hours before both Carter and Reagan arrived to campaign, Anderson did reveal his strategy.

It is, he said, to "continue the same dynamic performance that I gave here in Philadelphia, in as many places as we can schedule between now and next Tuesday. And I hope that will have the desired result." At that, Anderson joined in the gentle chuckling from his press corps.

Anderson, in Phila., admits he's losing, but plunges ahead

By Ashley Halsey 3d
Inquirer Staff Writer

John B. Anderson, campaigning in Philadelphia yesterday, criticized Tuesday night's Carter-Reagan debate as a "shallow performance" that ended in a draw and boosted neither of his opponents.

Anderson said, however, that the effect of the debate made him the loser.

"Suddenly, the campaign was transformed, inevitably, into a two-man race instead of the three-man race that it has been," Anderson said at a news conference in the Warwick Hotel.

Anderson was excluded from the debate, which was sponsored by the League of Women Voters, because his standing in public opinion polls had dropped. The nationally telecast debate took place in Cleveland and was seen by an audience estimated at as much as 120 million.

Anderson did respond to the debate questions on Cable News Network, which spliced his answers into the broadcast of the debate it provided its 3.5 million viewers.

"I would have liked to have (had the) opportunity to direct some questions there in the Music Hall in Cleveland," he said. "I considered it a draw. Certainly, no one took the time to present concrete programs and proposals."

Anderson said the debate served to "freeze" or reaffirm, the support of those already committed to Jimmy Carter or Ronald Reagan but did not persuade the "vast" number of undecided voters.

In an interview earlier, the independent presidential candidate conceded he had "not been as successful as I would have liked to have been" in capturing the attention of the voters this fall.

"We raised \$10 million and, of that, just \$2 million for media," Anderson said. "The other sides had \$30 million. It's foolish to think my oratorical powers are able to bridge that kind of chasm."

Anderson employed those oratori-



An Anderson fan
One of crowd of a thousand

cal powers yesterday at a lunch-hour rally at 15th and Chestnut Streets in Center City.

He delivered a 20-minute speech from the back of a flatbed truck to about 1,000 supporters and passersby as confetti fluttered down from the skyscrapers above and clusters of red balloons bobbed about his head.

His mind was on the debate of the night before.

"It was held in a building very appropriately called the Music Hall, where the two performers danced around the issues," he said.

Anderson said he might have been invited to debate in Cleveland "if I had only talked to Amy first" — a reference to a remark by Carter during the debate that he had talked with his daughter about the issues, and she had said "nuclear arms" was the most important issue.

"I could have said, 'Honey, you just tell your daddy it's important for the American people to hear John Anderson's ideas on nuclear proliferation,'" he said. "If I could have gotten Amy's ear. . . ."

Anderson said Carter's positions on nuclear proliferation, foreign affairs and human rights had been inconsistent.

"Where are the results?" he asked. In bemoaning the candidates offered by the two major parties, Anderson quoted a newspaper editorial: "Do we really have to choose between the dreams of yesterday and the nightmare of today?"

With a chilly autumn wind whipping his snow-white hair, Anderson told those in his audience that he could win Tuesday's election if they acted in his behalf to get apathetic voters to the polls.

"Start calling and reminding them that they don't have to stay home on Nov. 4," he said. "Do it and we'll win Philadelphia."

At the news conference later, Anderson began to search through the pockets of his blue suit when asked if he had anything extraordinary planned for the final days of the campaign.

"I think I left the secret plan elsewhere in my wardrobe," he finally concluded with a grin. "I hope I am able to continue the same sort of dynamic performance I gave today before thousands in Philadelphia."

Anderson's itinerary called for appearances in New York, Connecticut, Boston, California, Minnesota, Iowa and Illinois before Election Day.

Campaign '80

'Viewer' Anderson differs with

By Bill Neikirk

Chicago Tribune Press Service

WASHINGTON—John Anderson lashed out at President Carter and Ronald Reagan on almost every major issue Tuesday night as he participated, sort of, in the debate between the two main contenders for the presidency in a unique show on Cable News Network.

More than 300 miles away from the main debate site in Cleveland, Anderson, thanks to videotape, had the opportunity to respond to the same questions put to Carter and Reagan, the Republican nominee.

It took a while for the bugs to be worked out. Once the network couldn't find the right place in the tape and had to delay Anderson's response. At another time, Anderson's voice boomed out over the air when Carter was speaking. All through the show, the squeaky sound of rewinding videotape went over the air.

BUT ANDERSON, acknowledging the little glitches, said he was grateful for the chance to speak to a few million viewers, and he didn't hesitate to criticize the President and Reagan.

He tore into Carter for lacking vision and being unable to get many of his

programs through Congress, such as the new Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty and his national health insurance plan. He said the President deliberately put the nation in a recession and added, "This President is not in the mainstream of the Democratic Party."

Anderson also found fault with Carter's response to the seizure of the American hostages in Iran, saying the President had indicated that Iran would be able to get military equipment it had already bought if the hostages were released.

He said he hoped the President didn't mean he would sell missiles to Iran which would enable it to block the Strait of Hormuz, through which much of the world's oil supply flows. "The President made a very broad statement he may have to explain later," Anderson said.

AS FOR REAGAN, the Illinois congressman said the former California governor's answer to every problem is to "turn the clock back." He criticized Reagan's stand on the Equal Rights Amendment, on turning loose the oil companies to produce more, and pushing a policy of nuclear superiority, which he called discouraging.

Anderson repeated many of his own well-known positions, including a 50-cent gasoline tax, catastrophic health insur-

ance, and a \$4 billion fund to help the cities.

He appeared to break new ground when he suggested that, to prevent another hostage situation such as that in Iran, a standby United Nations military force be created which could be sent swiftly into a troubled area.

Anderson ridiculed Carter's suggestion that the U.S. could send troops quickly to the Persian Gulf, quoting an American military official that it would take 21 days, and heavy loss of life, to send U.S. troops there. He said he would consult with America's allies to try to persuade them to send troops in case of trouble in the Gulf.

To solve the long-term crisis in financing the Social Security system, he also suggested that the retirement age under which benefits are received be gradually lifted to age 68. He said this would take several years to accomplish, but should be done so that young workers do not have too much of a financial burden.

ANDERSON SAID Carter has "adopted a head-in-the-sand attitude" on Social Security financing "as he has done on so many others."

He said Reagan, despite his statements during the debate, is really "not for the environment." Reagan's statements to coal miners and his comments

about the pollution from trees demonstrate this, he said.

Reagan believes that the nation "can produce its way" out of the energy crisis when it is not possible, Anderson said.

He said Carter's political operatives wrote a platform that called for phasing out nuclear power at the same time the President agreed with leaders of other countries that nuclear power should be increased in the U.S.

TO CONTROL inflation, Anderson said he would propose a plan under which those who followed responsible wage and price behavior would receive tax cuts, and those who violated responsible guidelines, would see their taxes go up.

On the issue of defense, Anderson said Reagan and Carter believed the nation could fight and win a limited nuclear war, a theory he said he couldn't buy.

Just before the debate began in Cleveland, NBC was supposed to have run a five-minute Anderson commercial, but due to technical difficulties the network put a "Please Stand By" sign on the air. That infuriated the Anderson camp.

NBC said it would reimburse Anderson, but David Garth, his campaign manager, demanded the network show 10 half-minute commercials taped by Anderson.

both

Chicago Tribune, Thursday, October 30, 1980

Early Debate Polls Favor Reagan

By Mary Thornton
Washington Star Staff Writer

Two national surveys of voters who watched Tuesday's televised campaign debate between Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan indicate that more viewers thought that Reagan won the debate than Carter did.

An Associated Press poll found that viewers believed by a margin of 46 percent to 34 percent that Reagan had done a better job. A survey by CBS News yielded similar results, with 44 percent giving Reagan the highest marks, 36 saying Carter did better, and 14 percent calling the debate a tie.

But the surveys differ on whether Reagan gained any advantage in voting strength from his debate performance.

The AP poll of 1,062 voters who watched the debate found the two candidates gaining equally. But the CBS survey of 1,019 such viewers showed that, by a very small margin, Reagan gained voting strength.

The network concluded, however, that the election is still too close to call.

The CBS poll found the debate did not change the minds of 90 percent of the people who watched it.

See EARLY, A-4

Continued From A-1

and most of those who were undecided still are.

Of those who were undecided before the debate, 82 percent still had not made up their minds afterward, while 12 percent had decided to support Reagan and 6 percent had moved to Carter. But because the number of undecided voters polled was small, the findings are subject to a large margin of error.

The poll also found that among Carter supporters who watched the debate, 5 percent said they planned to switch to Reagan, while 1 percent of Reagan's supporters said they planned to switch to Carter. But with a margin of error of 4 percent for the poll, it is difficult to determine how significant those numbers are.

The results of the CBS poll differ somewhat from the AP survey, which found that Carter and Reagan each picking up an additional 6 percent in voter support.

While the AP poll confirmed CBS' finding that more voters perceived Reagan as the winner, the AP poll also pointed out that the viewing audience included a disproportionate number of persons who had already decided to support him, while Carter supporters were less likely to watch the debate.

Meanwhile, Reagan pollster Richard Wirthlin called a press conference yesterday in Arlington, where he claimed the debate was a "positive factor" for his candidate.

Based on a national survey of 500 persons who watched the debate, Wirthlin claimed that among independent voters with an opinion on who won the debate, 2 out of 3 three believed Reagan had won. The pollster said Reagan was targeting independent voters because so many are still undecided.

"Our polling clearly indicates Governor Reagan won the debate," Wirthlin said. "It has proven to be a factor in the latter stages of the campaign, which has not only strengthened Reagan's image among the American people but has also motivated the undecideds in his favor."

But Carter's pollster, Patrick Caddell, disagreed. He said that although more viewers may consider Reagan the "winner" of the debate, he has seen no evidence that would translate into additional votes for the Republican candidate.

Caddell agreed that Reagan was probably the perceived winner because the debate was watched by more people who already supported Reagan. "On the average, people who watch debates tend to have a college education, and Reagan is getting his strongest support from that segment of the population," Caddell said.

He said he also suspected that because of the late hour of the Wirthlin survey, especially on the East Coast, it may have been biased in favor of the West Coast, where Reagan receives his strongest support. Caddell said he held off until last night before starting his own survey to give public opinion time to settle down.

But he said a small survey of undecided voters by the Carter campaign on the West Coast indicated that after the debate they tended to lean more toward Carter, especially on the issue of a Reagan presidency being "risky" and a Carter presidency being "safe."

The AP survey found that Carter and Reagan each gained their 6 percent by cutting into the undecided voters and to a lesser extent into voters who had earlier planned to support independent John Anderson.

The survey was conducted in two stages:

Before the debate 1,488 registered voters were interviewed by telephone. In that group, 39 percent planned to vote for Reagan, 35 percent for Carter and 7 percent for Anderson, with 19 percent undecided.

Those people were called again on Tuesday night after the debate, and the debate survey was based on interviews with the 1,062 who had actually watched. However, a larger portion of Reagan supporters than Carter supporters actually watched the debate — which tended to give the Republican an edge when viewers were asked which candidate "won."

Among those voters who watched the debate, the AP poll said, 43 percent started out supporting Reagan, 33 percent Carter, 8 percent Anderson, with 15 percent undecided.

By the time the debate ended, the figures for that group were: Reagan 49 percent, Carter 39 percent, Anderson 6 percent, and 6 percent still undecided.

Possibly because more Reagan supporters actually watched the debate, he got a higher total score

when viewers were asked who won with 46 percent saying Reagan did a better job and 34 percent saying that Carter did.

The CBS findings were quite similar, with 44 percent giving Reagan the highest marks, 36 saying Carter did better, and 14 percent calling the debate a tie. However, Reagan's supporters were much more convinced than Carter's that he was the winner of the debate. Among the Reagan voters, 82 percent said he won, 5 percent said he lost, and 10 percent called it a tie.

On the other hand, 69 percent of Carter's supporters said he won, 10 percent said he lost, and 14 percent said neither won.

Both polls are subject to a margin of error which could cause a shift of as much as 4 percentage points in either direction for each finding.

CBS Poll on the Carter-Reagan Debate



Who Won the Debate

Reagan	44%
Carter	36%
Tied	14%
Don't know	6%

Carter Supporters		Reagan Supporters	
Carter won	69%	Reagan won	82%
Reagan won	10%	Carter won	5%
They tied	14%	They tied	10%

Changes Influenced by the Debate

Undecided Voters	Carter Supporters
12% changed to Reagan	5% changed to Reagan
6% changed to Carter	Reagan Supporters
82% still undecided	1% changed to Carter

After the Debate, the Pollsters Scramble

By Martin Schram

Washington Post Staff Writer

President Carter and Ronald Reagan headed onto the campaign trail yesterday to begin their final week's run for the presidency, with advisers for each camp claiming that their candidate had significantly helped his prospects for victory with Tuesday night's debate.

As the president campaigned in the Northeast and his Republican challenger swung south into Texas, the biggest confrontation of the day occurred in Washington, in the battle of the pollsters. Featured were Reagan pollster Richard Wirthlin and Carter's Patrick Caddell, each serving up contradictory sets of statistics and analyses.

The events began with Wirthlin calling a news conference to say: "Our polling clearly indicates Gov. Reagan won the debate." He cited two polling efforts, one a nationwide survey by a Michigan firm, the other a survey in which 200 Seattle residents rated the candidates' handling of each question in the Tuesday debate.

The latter survey showed Reagan besting Carter on four questions asked, Carter winning two and two even, Wirthlin said.

Back at the Carter headquarters, Caddell convened a news conference of his own to say this was not so. He said he had just spoken with the Seattle pollster, R. D. Percy, and that Percy had authorized him to say

See DEBATE, A3, Col. 1

DEBATE, From A1

that the actual results were Carter four and Reagan four — and that Carter had rated considerably better on the final, closing statement of the debate.

Yet Caddell was not claiming a total Carter victory in Cleveland. "On the question of who won," he said, "I think it is basically a wash, with perhaps Reagan having a slight advantage."

But he went on to say that determining the victor is not the same as determining which candidate benefited the most from the debate performance. And on that, Caddell maintained, Carter helped his cause significantly with statements that will appeal to the undecided voters — and especially those who are traditionally Democratic voters and who are being lured back to the Carter fold.

As the Reagan and Carter pollsters were offering their assessments, another national survey indicated that the event had been essentially a draw in the minds of America's voters.

The CBS-New York Times poll surveyed 1,259 people before the debate, and then reached 1,019 of them again afterward. Of this sample, which turned out to consist of slightly more Reagan than Carter supporters, 83 percent watched at least some of the debate. Forty-four percent said they thought Reagan had won, and 36 said Carter.

The margin of error is plus or minus 4 percentage points. And more significant, perhaps, was that 90 percent of those interviewed said that the debate did not cause them to change their mind about their vote.

Late in the day, Caddell publicly lamented that it is an "unfortunate role" into which pollsters have forced themselves. "We're all running around playing games — racing around playing 'Who won?' ... The question is who

was impacted the most, how were they impacted, and how will it affect the electoral vote, if at all?"

On the Reagan campaign plane, Leadership '80, there were optimistic expressions from the candidate and his staff that Reagan had accomplished his major purpose in his 90-minute debate with Carter. That purpose, his aides said, was to show that Reagan is "presidential" — a feat he accomplished by performing on an equal footing with the president.

"I think anyone watching the debate would conclude that Reagan was a reasonable man and that he had command of the facts and the issues — perhaps surprisingly so," said James Baker, a Reagan adviser who was the GOP nominee's chief negotiator in the debate.

Reagan's message on the campaign trail throughout this final week will be largely the same one he has been trying to deliver for the last two weeks — that Carter's record of performance, especially on economic issues, is one of failure.

"What we have to do is what we did in the debate last night," he said. That is, "demonstrate that Ronald Reagan is a reasonable alternative to a failed presidency."

Meanwhile, on the Carter campaign plane, Air Force One, presidential press secretary Jody Powell offered this assessment of the debate results and the campaign prospects for the final week:

"I think it was the turning point. I think the movement was generally in the president's direction anyway, before the debate, and I think the results of the debate ... probably will give a little impetus to it."

One Carter adviser added, "We're not going to take many of his voters and he is not going to take many of ours. The battle was over the unde-

ecideds, and I think Carter hit them on every issue."

Reagan's chief pollster, Wirthlin, produced the results of figures from the firm of Market Opinion Research, a firm operated by Republican pollster Robert Teeter. The firm surveyed 500 people after the debate. Forty-five percent said Reagan did a better job, and

34 percent said Carter did better. The margin of error is plus or minus 4.5 percentage points.

Among independent and undecided voters, Reagan was the winner, according to this survey. But it is impossible to draw meaningful analysis from these figures, because there was no data provided on whether these were indepen-

dents and undecideds who had been leaning toward Reagan originally.

These figures offered by Wirthlin showed 35 percent saying they would be more likely to vote for Reagan because of the debate, and 30 percent saying they would be more likely to vote for Carter — a difference that is not significant due to the margin of error.

Caddell said that one of the major Carter strategies was to keep the debate focused on the issues that are Carter's strength — foreign policy, war and peace and social issues such as the Equal Rights Amendment and Social Security and Medicare — and away from the economy. This was accomplished, he said. And on this, Caddell and his Reagan counterpart seemed to agree.

Wirthlin said that from watching the debate he was convinced that Reagan had won. But then he read the transcript of the debate the next day, and he said: "Thank God it was on television."

So it was yesterday that advisers from both camps participated in that classic campaign ritual of declaring debate victory, win, lose or draw.

In the debate audience in Cleveland Tuesday, shortly before the event was to start, Republican vice presidential nominee George Bush was asked, jokingly, by a reporter if he would mind giving his post-debate analysis in advance, to avoid any last-minute rush.

"Not at all," Bush laughed, as he stood in the Reagan VIP section (front row, right) five minutes before the debate began. "Gov. Reagan was truly presidential. He demonstrated leadership and great depth in his handling of the issues."

The reporter, continuing this pre-debate repartee, asked Bush whether Reagan had really meant to liberate

Bulgaria in this debate (a reference to President Ford's 1976 debate gaffe about Poland's not being dominated by the Soviets), Bush joked right back:

"Well, you have to understand that we are talking about the spirit of the people of Bulgaria being liberated, not the actual government of Bulgaria itself. You see, it's all very clear now — and that's why Gov. Reagan has won this debate so convincingly."

After the debate, Bush offered his assessment for real, as he stood in front of a group of reporters and cameras and lights.

"Clearly Gov. Reagan emerged as presidential," Bush said, in words that rang familiar. "He projected a certain hope and leadership on the issues, and he resisted getting mired down in answering outrageous charges. Gov. Reagan was just way ahead, way ahead."

Despite Quickie Debate Polls, Carter May Have Gained More

By Jack W. Germond
Washington Star Political Editor

CLEVELAND — The morning after the presidential debate here one of President Carter's political advisers remarked facetiously that if there had been one more question about inflation, President Carter would have said that the worst inflation is that in nuclear arms.

Analysis

This was a wry reference to Carter's determination to focus on the issue of nuclear weapons, and the success he had in doing so in his confrontation

with Republican nominee Ronald Reagan.

There was nothing subtle about it. Barbara Walters had no sooner asked a question about the hostages in Iran and terrorism than Carter was talking about nuclear proliferation as the ultimate terrorism. That isn't what she meant, but it was what he wanted to talk about.

Then there was a question about strategic arms limitation, a legiti-

mate opening, and Carter talked about the "disturbing pattern" of Reagan's views and the "dangers" of an arms race. It was at this point that he even informed everyone — while his own folks winced — that his 13-year-old daughter Amy was concerned about nuclear weapons.

Finally, a couple of questions later, the president was on nuclear weapons again in discussing why people shouldn't vote for his Republican opponent.

None of this, of course, was an accident. And the lengths to which Carter went to stress the issue reveal another dimension to the question of who "won" or "lost" the debate here.

Reagan may have "won" in terms of scoring the most points with the viewers. That is what the quickie polls all suggest. But Carter may have been the real winner in quite a different sense — that is, because he achieved more of his strategic goals in the debate.

What Carter was trying to do with his emphasis on nuclear weapons was to increase the salience of the

See CARTER, A-5

Continued From A-3

issue. Patrick Caddell, the president's pollster, had found that people are much more comfortable with Carter than with Reagan on the nuclear issue. Therefore, the strategy of the White House was to make that issue more salient, that is, more often in the forefront of voters' concerns. To the extent that was achieved, Carter obviously gained.

Nor was that the only example of how the debate was used for strategic rather than simply cosmetic purposes.

For example, Carter also managed during the 90 minutes to direct a specific appeal to every major constituency of the Democratic Party — labor, blacks, Spanish-Americans, liberals in general and women concerned with the Equal Rights Amendment in particular.

Carter's intention obviously was to maximize the turnout next Tuesday, which is absolutely essential to his survival. Indeed, there are perhaps a dozen states holding the balance of power in electoral votes that may be decided by whether enough Democrats feel moved to go to the polls.

Carter did not operate in a vacuum, of course. Reagan also used the debate for strategic purposes. That is what he was doing in putting so much stress on the record of the administration in dealing with the economy. That was what he was doing in rebutting the most persistent Democratic criticisms of his own positions. Reagan showed enough self-assurance to be considered "presidential" by more voters. And he touched the nerve-endings of his own followers when he talked of such things as "taking government off the back of the people."

When it was over, it was clear Reagan did all of this well enough that he came out as the victor on those instant scorecards.

But whether he gained the most is a more sophisticated question and one that cannot be answered with neat rows of figures — at least, not until next Tuesday.

Carter's Stand on Gays To Be Target of TV Ads

A group called "Christians for Reagan" said yesterday it will run television ads in several Bible Belt states criticizing President Carter for supporting homosexual rights.

Gary Jarmin, national director of the group, said the 30-second spots would begin today in several southern states and southern Ohio.

United Press International

Both sides gained, AP survey finds

By the Associated Press

PRESIDENT CARTER and Ronald Reagan made significant and roughly equal gains in the preferences of registered voters as a result of their campaign debate, an exclusive poll by the Associated Press says.

The poll found that, in a debate-watching audience that leaned to Republican presidential candidate Reagan in the first place, each man gained 6 percentage points, mostly from the ranks of the previously undecided.

The nationwide canvass surveyed 1,062 registered voters who watched the debate on television Tuesday night. It yielded results from which each side could claim "victory" in the long-awaited confrontation.

In addition to the 6-point gains, the chief findings of the poll, taken in the 90 minutes after the debate went off the air, were these:

- More Reagan supporters watched than did Carter supporters.

- In this Reagan-leaning audience, 46 per cent said he did the better job while 34 per cent said Democrat Carter did, a

margin that roughly parallels the margin between them among the 1,062 both before and after the debate.

- Neither man made significant inroads into the other's camp. Both held on to virtually all of their supporters who watched the debate.

- Viewer reaction to the debate broke along partisan lines, with those who generally agreed with Reagan thinking he did the better job while Carter scored highest with those who found him well-informed and or in agreement with their views.

THE POLL WAS conducted in two stages. A scientifically selected nationwide sample of 1,488 registered voters was questioned by phone Monday. These same people were called back after the debate, and 1,062 said they had watched.

That the TV audience leaned more heavily to Reagan than the larger Monday sample is clear from these findings:

Among the group questioned Monday, Reagan got 39 per cent, Carter 35, and Anderson 7—figures roughly in line with

the findings of major national polls taken during the last 10 days.

But among the 1,062 who watched, the standing as of Monday was Reagan 43, Carter 33, Anderson 8, and 15 per cent undecided.

Among the 1,062 after the debate, the figures stood at 49 per cent for Reagan, 39 for Carter, 6 for Anderson, and 6 per cent still undecided.

Thus both Reagan and Carter achieved identical 6-point gains after the debate.

NEARLY 700,000 people paid 50 cents each to take part in an instant ABC News phone survey after the presidential debate, and by a 2-to-1 margin they said Reagan had gained more from the encounter than Carter had.

ABC said that of the callers who reached one of two special 800-prefix numbers during the 100 minutes after Tuesday night's debate, 469,412 people or 67 per cent dialed the number designated for Reagan and 227,017 or 33 per cent dialed the one for Carter.

Evidence not clear cut

Campaign pollsters swap victory claims amid hints of slight edge for Reagan

By Carl P. Leubsdorf
Washington Bureau of The Sun

Washington—Pollsters for Ronald Reagan and President Carter swapped somewhat conflicting claims of success in Tuesday night's debate yesterday amid indications that the Republican challenger may have gained slightly more than the Democratic incumbent.

But the margin was hardly clear cut and may have been influenced by the fact that the 90-minute confrontation was watched by more supporters of Mr. Reagan than backers of Mr. Carter.

An Associated Press independent telephone sampling conducted right after the debate suggested that support for each candidate rose by an equal margin—6 percent—as a result of Tuesday night's face-off.

A separate poll by CBS News showed a 6 percent shift in opinion with two-thirds of its favoring Mr. Reagan. The poll also

showed that 82 percent of Mr. Reagan's supporters thought their candidate had won but only 69 percent of Mr. Carter's backers thought he prevailed.

Richard Wirthlin, Mr. Reagan's pollster and chief strategist, cited two surveys as indicating an advantage for the Republican nominee, and claimed that the former California governor's nationwide lead

Carter, Reagan continue debate at a distance—on campaign trail.....A12

has doubled, from 5 percent to 10 percent, as a result of the debate.

Patrick Caddell, Mr. Carter's pollster, conceded: "There may have been a slight Reagan advantage," but he said the race remains close. He insisted that the key question was which previously undecided voters had been moved towards a decision by the debate and cited data suggesting Mr. Carter might have been helped more

than Mr. Reagan.

The difference in opinion was exacerbated by the fact that Mr. Wirthlin and Mr. Caddell gave different interpretations of the same data that had been purchased by each campaign from a marketing research firm in Seattle that monitored the reaction to the debate in 200 households.

Mr. Wirthlin contended that the study by R.D. Percy & Co., showed Mr. Reagan "won four of the rounds." Mr. Carter won two and two came out even but that the president "did somewhat better" in his closing statement.

Mr. Caddell said that the data showed each candidate won four rounds and that Mr. Carter had a "decisive" advantage on the closing statement.

Reached by telephone, Ralph Percy, the head of the firm, expressed annoyance that Mr. Wirthlin had released the data and took issue with both interpretations. Reactions showed that each candidate had

See REACTION, A7, Col. 1

REACTION, from A1

a higher positive rating on four of the eight questions. But when rebuttal comments were included, Mr. Reagan did better on five out of the eight.

But he added that "basically, the thing comes out fairly close to 50-50" because of the fact that, on the concluding statement, the listeners registered a 3-to-1 positive reaction to Mr. Carter but split evenly in their response to Mr. Reagan.

Mr. Caddell condemned what he termed "the race to claim victory and find some numbers to support it" and said research on past debate suggests "it takes some time" to determine the true impact and that the matter is "far more complicated than who won, who lost."

He reported on a study by a firm in Spokane, Wash., in which some 50 undecided voters, half of whom were leaning to each candidate, gave their reactions to the debate. He said the results showed that

"Carter had more impact on Reagan's leaners than Reagan had on Carter's leaners."

Each voter gave reactions during the debate on a scale that ran from 1 to 100, and Mr. Caddell said the results showed that those who had been leaning to Mr. Reagan moved 4 points toward Mr. Carter while those already leaning to the president moved 7 points closer to him.

Mr. Wirthlin said a telephone poll of 500 debate viewers conducted after the

debate by Market Opinion Research, the Detroit-based firm run by Robert Teeter, who often polls for GOP candidates, showed that 45 percent thought that Mr. Reagan won, 34 percent felt Mr. Carter had won and the rest had no opinion.

Among independents, who tend to vote Republican in presidential races, his margin was bigger, 50 percent to 26 percent

The poll also showed 38 percent said they were more likely to vote for Mr. Reagan than previously and 33 percent were

more likely to back Mr. Carter and that, on a presidential preference question, Mr. Reagan had a 10 percent lead.

The overall Teeter numbers were very similar to those in the AP poll of 1,062 previously polled voters who were called back after the debate. Of that total, 46 percent said Mr. Reagan did a better job and 34 percent said Mr. Carter did.

However, the AP noted that those who were called and said they had watched the

debate were somewhat more pro-Reagan than the population at large, judging from a pre-debate poll that provided the basis for the sampling. Based on their pre-debate and post-debate preferences the AP said that each candidate gained an identical 6 percent.

In the CBS poll, however, an effort was made to weight the results for the fact that more Reagan backers watched the debate. That result gave Mr. Reagan a margin of 44 percent to 36 percent.

HE SUN, Thursday, October 30, 1980

Still debatable — who was most

By Saul Friedman
and Remer Tyson
Knight-Ridder News Service

CLEVELAND — Whether it lived up to its billing as the Great Debate or not, the televised confrontation between President Carter and Ronald Reagan Tuesday night is likely to decide two critical questions:

Has Jimmy Carter succeeded in getting dissatisfied Democrats and independents who tend to vote Democratic to "come home" on Nov. 4?

Or has Ronald Reagan reassured

Analysis

enough of them that the world won't come to an end if they stay away?

That issue — on which the outcome of the election may depend — still is debatable, according to the pollsters and politicians in both camps.

Republican opinion surveyor Robert Teeter believes that Reagan won merely by holding his own against an incumbent president and there-

fore has a good chance to preserve his thin lead in key states where he has been slicing away at the traditional Democratic vote.

Reagan campaign official James Baker said the challenger's "reasonable and knowledgeable" performance "went a long way toward resolving the vote of the undecideds for Reagan."

But White House press secretary Jody Powell believes that the President has succeeded in his effort to draw the sharp differences between him and Reagan and thus strengthen

his appeal to Democrats.

"I think it will lead more people in the President's direction," Powell said yesterday.

It is the voters, of course, who are yet to be heard from, and their answer will come next week. A hint of it, though, came yesterday in an Associated Press poll of registered voters who watched the debate, many of whom said they were undecided before the debate began.

Follow-up interviews with those voters after the debate showed that many did indeed make up their

minds — and that Carter and Reagan split the newly decided group evenly.

Those voters they picked up, however, were not really converts from the other camp. For example, those who decided for Reagan said they did so because they agreed with what he said. And, among the sample, a higher percentage of Reagan-leaning voters watched the debate.

The post-debate interviews, conducted by telephone among a scientifically selected sample of 1,488 people, found .6 percentage points more support for Carter than before

the debate. But Reagan's support also rose 6 points.

Reagan and Carter basically held onto their supporters: 98 percent of Reagan's backers stuck with him and 95 percent of Carter's stayed with him.

In arguing that the President benefited most from the debate, Carter campaign spokesman Greg Schneider (See DEBATE on 5-A)

DEBATE, from 1-A
ers said that Carter, in a presentation carefully planned with the help of his pollsters, had "touched all the traditional Democratic buttons" — blue-collar workers, blacks, women, liberals and Southerners.

As a result, Schneiders predicted, the slow movement of Democrats and independents toward Carter that was visible prior to the debate will resume as Democrats "come home."

The dimensions of the Carter problem and the Reagan opportunity — both before the debate and in the concluding days of the campaign — could be seen clearly at the site of the debate, Democratic Cleveland.

Without an overwhelming victory in Cuyahoga County (Cleveland), a Democrat can't win Ohio. And as Ohio goes, so may go the presidency.

But on the eve of the debate, an opinion survey published here showed that a third of the county's

Democrats still were undecided. The survey found 30 percent of the blue-collar workers and lower income voters undecided, and 43 percent of the independents. Furthermore, 20 percent of union households favored Reagan and 29 percent of non-union blue-collar families said they intended to vote republican.

The survey, sponsored by the Cleveland Press and the city's WJKW-TV, Channel 8, has been a reliable barometer in the past.

Because Carter has similar problems in Michigan, Illinois and Pennsylvania, among other places, he aimed his debate strategy at shaky Democrats and liberal independents by repeatedly picking at Reagan's opposition to social programs, arms treaties and the Equal Rights Amendment.

Significantly, Carter's commercials in the Democratic areas of the industrial crescent bordering the Great

Lakes have a new ingredient as part of his appeal for Democrats to come home.

"Re-elect President Carter," the narrator says as usual in the television advertisements. Then he adds, "... a Democrat." That addition is not heard in areas where the moderate Republican or independent vote is heavy.

Similarly, the President's radio messages in this area now describe

him as a "moderate Democrat." And a new five-minute commercial features pictures of Franklin Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy, among other Democrats.

Since early in his presidency, and particularly in his primary campaign against Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, Carter has held stiff opposition from many traditional Democrats because of his conservative departures from long-held party positions.

Philadelphia campaign consultant Neil Oxman said yesterday that many Democrats have been reluctant to "come home" because of their belief that Carter "came home" only for the sake of the election.

Nevertheless, Oxman said, "Carter succeeded in the debate in one small area — he softened the attitude of Democratic liberals and probably made it easier for them to vote for him."

Like other Democrats, however, Oxman acknowledged that Reagan "handled himself well and did not come across as the kind of Nazi that Carter has been trying to make of him."

Reagan's Northeast coordinator, Roger Stone, who before the debate had been pessimistic about his candidate's chances, said yesterday, "His appearance gave him the edge he needs to win."

Reassuring to the most

Thursday, Oct. 30, 1980

Philadelphia Inquirer

Both candidates claim victory

By Michael Coakley
and Steve Neal

Chicago Tribune Press Service

CLEVELAND—To the surprise of no one, aides to President Carter and Ronald Reagan both instantly declared victory following Tuesday night's debate.

Within 15 minutes of the conclusion of the nationally televised event, White House Press Secretary Jody Powell told reporters: "I thought the President did very well. Gov. Reagan for the most part offered simplistic answers."

By contrast, Richard Wirthlin, a top strategist for the Republican nominee, said that, while "there are no absolute winners or losers," he believed that Reagan appeared more "presidential on the screen."

"We were attempting to do two things—show that the governor is a man of strength and dedication. And, on the other hand, reflect his compassion and sensitivity to such critical issues as war and peace."

Wirthlin said the campaign's preliminary polls, taken even as the debate was in progress, indicated that Reagan had outscored the President during the 90-minute telecast.

IN ILLINOIS, an angry Gov. Thompson blasted President Carter for "lying to the American people" during the debate on the President's major policies. Thompson said that Reagan "looked

strong" but "should have punched him [Carter] harder" on the issues. Thompson said he thought the debate was a draw.

Meanwhile, Joan Mondale, wife of the Vice President, said at a press conference in Chicago late Tuesday that she felt the debate would have a "decisive effect" on the outcome of the election. Mrs. Mondale said she was "very pleased with the President's appearance and his conduct during the debate" and that she felt the debate could sway a large number of undecided voters to Carter.

"Most of the undecided voters tend to be Democrats," she said. "I think that, after watching the President's conduct during the debate, many of them [undecided] will be swayed back."

CARTER himself expressed satisfaction at his performance, telling a cheering group of supporters at a rally immediately after the debate that he had been able to point out the "stark differences" between himself and his Republican rival.

Citing the control of nuclear weapons, world peace, and equal rights for women as three issues which he felt he had been able to stress to his advantage, the President appealed for help and predicted a "tremendous victory."

Former North Atlantic Treaty Organization commander Gen. Alexander Haig, a Reagan adviser, said he felt his candidate had succeeded in deflating the war

or peace issue which had been considered Reagan's most serious problem in the campaign.

GREG SCHNEIDERS, a longtime aide and confidant of the President, said the debate's focus on foreign policy, and especially on the peace issue, worked to Carter's advantage.

"The questions revolved around Democratic issues," he said.

The President's weakest point is clearly the economy—specifically the twin curses of double-digit inflation and lingering recession. Surprisingly, and to the delight of the Carter camp, there was relatively little time devoted to discussing economic problems.

Reagan's strategists contended that the former California governor had scored his strongest points by targeting precisely those ills, zeroing in on the latest consumer price index, which showed inflation rising to an annual level of 12.7 per cent.

There was some bitterness in the Reagan camp that the President had at one point evoked the memory of former President Richard Nixon with unmistakable pejorative connotations.

Robert Strauss, the President's campaign chairman, conceded that throughout the first half of the tense confrontation the two contenders came off "about even. But during the last 45 minutes, I thought the President moved out well ahead."

The debate continues

THE SUN, Thursday, October 30, 1980

—on the campaign trail

By Ernest B. Furgurson
and Gilbert A. Lewthwaite

President Carter and Ronald Reagan continued the campaign debate without their opponents yesterday, the president in the Northeast charging Mr. Reagan with misstating his own position on nuclear proliferation and the Republican in Texas hammering at what he believes to be his best theme—the economy.

Touring the populous industrial states, Mr. Carter played back his adversary's words from a statement last winter to support his accusation that the Republican believes "it's none of our business if a radical and terrorist nation like Libya has the atomic weapon."

Mr. Carter also implied that Mr. Reagan, in their tense

Cleveland confrontation Tuesday night, had suggested a lower minimum wage for those who "happen to be black." The debate transcript indicates that the Republican spoke favorably of a separate minimum for young people.

Mr. Reagan, saying he was refreshed and confident, stood among the glass and concrete towers of Houston to accuse Mr. Carter of a "lack of confidence" and of bringing "instability to the office" of the president.

Mr. Reagan said the nation's economic ills could be traced to Mr. Carter's "insensitivity to the economic sufferings of millions of Americans," thus meeting the promise from strategists of tougher language daily to shore up old positions for an aggressive ending to the campaign.

Reagan aides believe that the GOP candidate in Cleveland not only defused the issue of war and peace that has bedeviled him in recent weeks but laid the groundwork for a final assault, pursuing the economic themes he believes demonstrate his opponent's greatest weakness.

"I don't think we need to look for any new wrinkle or new spectacular," said Jim Baker, Mr. Reagan's chief debate strategist. "We need to continue speaking, campaigning aggressively on the issues in each state we go into."

"We think the economy is the fundamental issue and we would like to see the last week spent on that track," he said. "We will keep talking about the failures of the Carter presidency and particularly in the economic area."

As for the president, again and again as he blitzed through Pittsburgh and Rochester, N.Y., and headed to Newark, N.J., and Philadelphia, he brought up points on which he and Mr. Reagan had clashed in the debate, as if determined to get the last word now that the time restrictions of the television format had been removed.

His mood was up and his speaking style unusually forceful as he rang the themes of party loyalty in Democratic strongholds where next Tuesday's turnout is crucial to his chances of carrying three major states.

He spoke in a packed cathedral and to a street crowd of several thousand in Pittsburgh before addressing an even larger rally in Rochester's J. F. Kennedy square. But the high point of his day was before some 300 black ministers at Newark's Bethany Baptist Church, where he quoted the late Robert F. Kennedy in closing his appeal for the preachers to get out the vote.

Finally, before heading for Philadelphia, he spoke to a spirited Essex county Democratic fundraiser at a Newark hotel.

Mr. Carter's aides told reporters that a small-scale sampling of opinion taken by the presidential pollster, Pat Caddell, to detect any shift of opinion in a selected group of voters before and after the debate, indicated a slight move toward the president among likely Carter and Reagan voters.

The president's staff began examining the debate transcript immediately after it was typed, looking for openings to keep Mr. Carter on the offensive in his strenuous final days of the cross-country campaign. Their first target was Mr. Reagan's denial that he had opposed efforts to limit the spread of nuclear weapons.

At his earliest opportunity, Mr. Carter read back a quotation from the *New York Times* of last February 1, reporting that the GOP candidate had indicated in Jacksonville, Fla., that the United States should not try to halt proliferation. "I just don't think it's any of our business," he quoted Mr. Reagan as saying.

In the debate, the president had raised the specter of

some irresponsible nation or terrorist groups obtaining nuclear weapons, and he hammered at it harder as he cited the Reagan quotation yesterday in a town meeting at Pittsburgh's Trinity Episcopal Cathedral.

He also came back at the Republican on arms control, calling it "by far the most important issue." On the pending SALT II treaty, Mr. Carter asserted, Mr. Reagan's position is "a very radical departure" from that of every president since Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Mr. Carter did not limit his review of his opponent's debate statements to foreign issues. In his opening remarks at the Pittsburgh meeting, before taking questions, he volunteered that among the many vital questions debated had been "whether any citizens should be paid a lower wage because they happen to be black."

The White House transcript of the debate shows that Mr. Reagan recalled talking to young, out-of-work blacks who told him the minimum-wage law had done away with jobs they once could get. "Indeed, every time it is increased you will find that there is an increase in minority unemployment among young people and therefore, I have been in favor of a separate minimum for them," he said.

In response to an elderly woman's question about the future of Social Security, Mr. Carter again charged Mr. Reagan with altering his record. The *Wall Street Journal*, he said, reported Mr. Reagan as wanting to do away with the indexing of Social Security payments to keep up with inflation. And the GOP candidate's statement that young persons pay more into Social Security than they ever get out was "a very serious statement that was in error," he contended.

At the black church in Newark, Mr. Carter laid on Mr. Reagan the burden of his past opposition to national health insurance, civil rights legislation and Medicare. He said the Republican "started his political career as a spokesman for the American Medical Association, traveling the country speaking against Medicare."

And the president did not pass up the opportunity to remind his audience that in the debate, his opponent had said that "when he was young . . . this country didn't know it had a racial problem."

The gathering laughed and then applauded when he said, "Governor Reagan may not have known, but to millions and millions of Americans, including some in this congregation, who suffered racial prejudice and racial injustice for 300 years, it was not simply a problem, it was a lifelong disaster."

Mr. Reagan's day after the debate started with what might almost be termed a thanksgiving breakfast with a dozen of his top advisers, including Henry Kissinger, the former secretary of state; Bill Brock, the Republican Party chairman; Gen. Alexander Haig, the former NATO commander; William Simon, the former treasury secretary, and Senator John G. Tower (R, Texas).

Anne Armstrong, a former ambassador to London and a native Texan, said afterward: "We are delighted with the outcome. We feel now it is obvious that this is a man of peace. We have laid that unfair issue to rest."

Mr. Reagan, saying he felt "great" after a good night's sleep, assessed the debate this way: "I think it leaves us in very good shape. I had a chance face to face to rebut some of the personal attacks that have been made against me, and at the same time to focus attention on what I think is the issue, and that is the failure of this administration in economic and in international matters."

Candidates hit road after TV bout

By Jon Margolis
and F. Richard Ciccone

Chicago Tribune Press Service

CLEVELAND—The 1980 presidential campaign got off to yet another new start Wednesday, the morning after Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan went at each other for 90 minutes in a debate both sides claim to have won.

Both claims appeared plausible as the two candidates, taking nothing for granted, headed into the final week of campaigning, almost all of it in the large industrial states where the election will be decided.

In the boxing analogies so often used to describe political battles, aides to

both candidates conceded that there had been "no knockouts," but each camp argued that it's man had won "on points," or at least had held his opponent to a draw.

But a political debate is not a boxing match because neither man is really fighting the other but instead is projecting his own image to the voters. By that standard, both Carter and Reagan could

legitimately claim victory.

CARTER'S MAIN goal, according to his advisers, was to illustrate as vividly as possible how he and Reagan differ on some key issues. He did that. Reagan, his aides say, wanted to show that he was a reasonable, responsible man who could hold his own with the President of the United States. He did that.

"We were able to pin Gov. Reagan

down on where he stands on the issues," said Carter's campaign chief, Robert Strauss. And Edward Meese of the Reagan campaign said that Reagan took advantage of an "excellent opportunity" to correct Carter's "distortions" of Reagan's positions.

Those who watched the debate agreed in general that Carter was on the offensive during most of the debate and that Reagan had to spend a good deal of time defending his past and present positions.

Furthermore, the President kept returning to the theme that Reagan was outside the mainstream of political opin-

Continued on page 10, col. 1

Continued from page one

ion, even Republican political opinion.

IN THE AREAS of nuclear disarmament and women's rights, Carter often associated his views with recent presidents of both parties, contrasting those views with Reagan's policies.

"For 40 years," Carter said at one point, "the Republican Party platform called for guaranteeing women equal rights with a constitutional amendment. Gov. Reagan and the new Republican Party have departed from this commitment."

On the other hand, Reagan appeared more at ease. It was he who injected the debate's few moments of humor. Several observers bluntly stated, "Reagan seemed like the nicer guy," even if Carter had scored more substantive points on the issues.

After ABC correspondent Barbara Walters had asked Carter twice about proposals to deal with terrorism in the Middle East, the question was put to Reagan. "Barbara, you've asked that question twice," he said. "I think you ought to have one answer to it."

THE REAGAN CAMP had hoped to keep the debate and the rest of the campaign focused on the economy, where Carter is considered most vulnerable. But Carter was able to keep talking about his favorite issue—war or peace—where Reagan is on the defensive.

On the other hand, the foreign policy questions did give Reagan a chance to tell the audience, estimated at 105 million to 120 million persons, that he was just as committed to peace as Carter was.

"I'm only here to tell you that I believe with all my heart that our first priority must be world peace," he said in answer to the very first question, "and that use of force is always and only a last resort when everything else has failed."

CARTER CONSTANTLY returned to the issue of nuclear arms control, attacking Reagan for opposing the SALT II treaty. He said "control of nuclear weapons is the most important single issue in this campaign." He also sought to emphasize Reagan's reputation for belligerency by recounting some of the Republican's past suggestions for using military force in international crises.

"I think habitually Gov. Reagan has advocated the injection of military forces into troubled areas when I and my predecessors, both Democrats and Republicans, have advocated resolving

those troubles . . . peacefully, diplomatically, and through negotiation," Carter said.

While insisting on his desire for peace, Reagan did criticize Carter for what he called allowing U.S. defenses to deteriorate. He said Carter "stopped the B-1 [bomber], delayed the cruise missiles, stopped the production line for the Minuteman missiles, stopped the Trident or delayed the Trident submarine, and now is planning a mobile military force that can be delivered to various spots in the world, which does make me question his assaults on whether I am the one that is quick to look for use of force."

CARTER TURNED most questions on the economy into attacks on increased foreign oil prices and a defense of his energy proposals, which he claimed will stabilize prices in his next term. Asked about the inflation rate, Carter replied, "We have demanded that the American people sacrifice and they have done very well . . ."

Reagan got in his best poke at Carter's economic policies by replying, "I think this idea that has been spawned here in our country that inflation somehow came upon us like a plague . . . is entirely spurious, and it's dangerous to say this to the people."

Carter and Reagan Each Claim Victory In Debate; Little Convincing Proof Is Seen

By a WALL STREET JOURNAL Staff Reporter

WASHINGTON — President Carter and Ronald Reagan breathed sighs of relief that the Great Debate was over, took comfort in what they accomplished during it and then plunged on into the final six days of the presidential campaign.

Both sides insisted they won the debate, but no one was able to produce very convincing evidence.

Richard Wirthlin, Mr. Reagan's chief poll taker and strategist, said the overnight surveys he commissioned showed Mr. Reagan went into the debate with a five-point lead over the President and came out with a 10-point lead. Mr. Wirthlin cautioned, though, that gains and losses registered in these presidential debates usually are only temporary. What it does, he said, is "give us a little more cushion."

Jody Powell, the President's press secretary, told reporters about a complicated procedure in which that campaign's poll taker, Patrick Caddell, arranged for measurements of 50 undecided voters in the state of Washington, half leaning to the President, half leaning to Mr. Reagan. The debate made the Carter leaners lean more heavily to the President and the Reagan leaners lean less heavily to Mr. Reagan.

Perhaps the most reliable poll was taken by the Associated Press. In a nationwide canvass of 1,062 voters who watched the debate, AP reported that each candidate picked up six points, with Mr. Reagan leading Mr. Carter, 49% to 39%.

The most controversial survey was taken by ABC news. Nearly 700,000 people called special telephone numbers to register their decision on who won the debate. The network conceded there was nothing scientific about it, but reported anyway that Mr. Reagan was the winner, two to one. The Carter people were incensed that some newspapers decided to carry the results as important news.

The Reagan campaign pointed with some pleasure at a technological game played in Seattle, Wash., with 200 households hooked up to a computer. People watching the debate could push any of eight buttons, registering various reactions to what was being said. The operation is run by Roger Percy, Illinois Sen. Charles Percy's son, and both campaigns subscribe to the results. Mr. Wirthlin, Mr. Reagan's man, says Mr. Reagan defeated Mr. Carter on the "vox boxes," four rounds to two, with two even. But Mr. Percy says it really was an even split, with Mr. Carter picking up points at the end.

Independent candidate John Anderson, who was frozen out of the debate, said the performances of both the President and Mr.

Reagan were "shallow." He conceded that it currently looks as if this is a two-candidate race. He said he would try the best he could to "remedy" that in these next few days.

Irrespective of what the polls might have indicated, the Carter and Reagan campaigns cleared out of Cleveland in buoyant moods.

The Carter campaigners said the President raised all the issues he needed to raise to win over traditional Democratic constituents who have been wavering—blue-collar workers, Jews, suburbanites.

In his first post-debate stop, another town meeting, held in an Episcopal cathedral in Pittsburgh, Mr. Carter repeated his charge that Mr. Reagan wasn't concerned about the possibility of terrorist nations developing atomic weapons. He also attacked Mr. Reagan's positions on the minimum wage and Social Security. He continued to plead with Democrats to come home to their own party.

Mr. Reagan flew out of Cleveland to Houston, Texas and Florida are the two big Southern states Mr. Reagan hopes to steal away from Mr. Carter. Wins in those states would give Mr. Reagan breathing room in the North.

In Houston, Mr. Reagan gave his standard speech, adding that Mr. Carter refused to talk about his own record during the debate. "You can see why," Mr. Reagan said.

Mr. Reagan moves on today to Arkansas, Louisiana, New Jersey and Pennsylvania. Later in the week, he'll hit the industrial Midwest. Mr. Carter will be campaigning in the big industrial states too, with side trips to Texas and other states in the South to fend off Mr. Reagan. He'll take a real gamble in the final hours of the campaign by invading Mr. Reagan's home state, California.

After the debate, some 'undecideds' are just more so

By Frank Greve and Tim Kiska
Knight-Ridder News Service

DETROIT — Teresa Meehan, torn between Ronald Reagan and Jimmy Carter, had hoped Tuesday night's debate would resolve her indecision. Instead, it made her mad.

"If they'd only come out and tell you what they believe, you could judge them," said Miss Meehan, 20, a Dearborn, Mich., tool company secretary.

"But they don't. They're both too afraid of losing a vote to speak out clearly on anything. That way, they don't displease anybody but they don't please anybody either — or hardly anybody — and they make everybody more confused."

Her frustration drew sympathetic nods from eight other undecided voters from the Detroit area chosen, admittedly in an unscientific way, to watch the debate together and discuss how it affected their views. Undecided persons, believed number about 5 million, were the real target audience for both Carter and Reagan because their votes probably will spell the difference in a contest now too close to call.

A nationwide Associated Press poll, conducted among more than 1,000 scientifically selected voters in the 90 minutes after the debate ended, showed that the debate had actually helped many undecided voters make up their minds. It indicated that the two candidates gained evenly, each adding 6 percentage points to the standing they had among the same people when they were questioned before the debate.

Among the nine persons interviewed here by Knight-Ridder Newspapers, Reagan gained support and Carter lost it, but the panel, assembled from a large number of random phone calls and shopping center interviews, was too small and casually selected for that outcome to be significant.

Moreover, in Detroit, the candidates' gains and losses were little more than a side-effect of watching the debate. The principal effects were boredom, frustration, disappointment and cynicism.

As Jack Rockefeller, a furniture salesman from Redford, put it, "The only surprise was the boredom."

Frank Bugg, 37, an executive of Focus:HOPE, a local social action agency, said Reagan and Carter made Rep. John Anderson, whose debate performance he hadn't seen, look

None of the nine panelists, moments after the debate, thought he had learned any new information from it. Robert Keller, 34, a bearded biologist from the University of Michigan at Dearborn, quipped: "I didn't know that Carter talked to Ann that much."

He was referring to Carter's statement that his 13-year-old daughter considered nuclear weapons the most important concern facing the country.

In general, the undecided panelists seemed almost to find more reasons not to vote than to back either debater. That was true even though most felt Reagan had given the stronger performance.

"When it came to showmanship, Reagan had it, but I don't know if we need that," said Cynthia Burns, a student nurse at Henry Ford Community College. "I'm more confused now than I was before the debate," she continued, saying it might have been otherwise had either candidate answered questions directly.

That bothered Marilyn Lemmen, a bookkeeper from Royal Oak, too. "Reagan was the worst," she fumed.

"By the end of his answer, you didn't even know what the question was. He came across like a used-car salesman and I wasn't buying anything he had to sell."

Mrs. Lemmen and two other women panelists who thought Carter had won all cited the same reason: his calmness in a crisis. Carter hammered that argument repeatedly in the 90-minute debate.

Iris Glebe of Allen Park said she might not have given that point to Carter had Reagan not appeared reckless.

"When he talks about how we have enough oil and coal if we'll only lift restrictions, that's reckless," she

said. "We'd have to exploit the national parks and the federally protected lands, and that's wrong. We don't live by bread and oil alone and we want these lands protected."

Miss Meehan also thought Reagan had gone too far in opposing government regulations. "We've got to have environmental laws," she said. "You look at Los Angeles and you want to be protected. People have to be protected from pollution, and I want a guy in the White House who is going to protect me."

She was dismayed by Carter's performance, however, as were several other panelists. "Near the end Carter wasn't choosing his words very care-

fully and he was making a lot of mistakes," Miss Burns said.

Said Rockefeller: "He never really made a good defense of what he's done in the last four years."

In the course of the viewing and discussion, held at a meeting room of the Hyatt Regency in the suburb of Dearborn, it became clear that when the candidates address undecided voters they face cynics.

Almost without exception, the panelists were skeptical that anyone could change bureaucratic Washington. ("Reagan had my attention when he talked about cutting waste and fraud," said Mrs. Glebe. "Then he said he was having a task force

look into it and I stopped listening.")

Also, these voters tend to see little difference between Democrats and Republicans, doubt that the best person comes to the top in the primary system and don't really expect candidates to keep their promises. They feel politicians talk down to them. They would vote for the lesser of two evils if they could make that distinction. They consider Anderson an interesting lost cause.

"What we're left with," said Bugg, "is one almost totally incompetent man running the country and another one who would like to. But that's the electoral process: All the good men get eliminated along the way."

decideds' are just more so

Carter Wins Bout on Points, but

Reprinted from yesterday's late editions

By David S. Broder
Washington Post Staff Writer

CLEVELAND — In the 90-minute debate that could determine the outcome of his uphill battle for reelection, Jimmy Carter accomplished almost every objective except the most important one: the destruction of Ronald Reagan's credibility as a potential president.

For most of their nationally televised debate, Carter's challenger was kept on the defensive — explaining that his views on arms-control, military weapons, Social Security and domestic programs were not the "very dangerous, disturbing" and even "radical" notions that the president said they were.

In a confrontation where most of the time was spent on Carter's preferred issues — and not the economic record of the last four years, on which Reagan would have preferred to focus — the incumbent repeatedly managed to work in a partisan appeal to his fellow Democrats and to aim special messages at such key constituencies as blacks and Hispanics, the South and the Jews.

But in the end — when Reagan managed in his summation to ask voters the question Carter most ardently wished to submerge, "Are you and your family and your country better off than you were four years ago?" — the challenger was not only still on his feet but in contention for the White House.

The minimal objective defined by such Reagan strategists as pollster Richard Wirthlin was that the GOP nominee look like "a reasonable man" and not "a dangerous personality." By that standard, the former California governor earned much more than a passing grade.

Reagan used all the skills acquired in 40 years before the cameras — sprints and smiles and easily inflected small jokes — to tell the viewers that the portrait of him Carter was drawing, that of a weapons-prone right-winger, equally heedless of the threat of nuclear war and the aspirations of women and minorities, was a political caricature.

Reagan's advisers went into the Tuesday night debate confident that their candidate had an edge on Carter

in electoral votes and a chance to wrap up the election if he avoided obliteration. The Reagan camp passed off as insignificant Carter's consistent show of greater expertise on government programs, economic statistics and energy production figures.

Less easily dismissed was Carter's skill in developing what has, until Tuesday night, been a fitfully communicated message that — for all the surface blandness — Reagan's underlying attitudes are a source of danger to the nation and damage to most working Americans.

Carter's most direct hit came in the middle of the debate, during the emotionally charged discussion on the strategic arms limitation treaty (SALT II)

Challenger Defensive on Issues, But Personal Credibility Is Intact

After Reagan had attempted to rebut Carter's claim that such an arms race would be "a very dangerous and disturbing thing," Carter came back with an answer that used the word "dangerous" three more times.

Finally, he said, "it is extremely dangerous to hear this belligerent tone, though said in a quiet voice."

For close to half an hour, in the heart of prime TV time, Reagan found himself constantly on the defensive, as a series of questions on minorities, energy and Social Security bracketed the central exchange on nuclear weapons, war and peace.

It was that fact that pleased the Carter strategists. The president "didn't do everything I wanted him to do," said pollster Patrick Caddell, "but he did 75 percent of it."

Caddell said that Carter's message was aimed at specific constituencies in the debate audience — particularly the

"college-educated, Democratic-inclined women, who are unhappy about the economic squeeze of the past four years but nervous about Reagan's views on war and women's rights."

The debate was helpful to Carter, Caddell said, because so much time was spent on all the issues except the economy, which is Carter's biggest liability.

"When Reagan spent two full answers trying to get right on the Equal Rights Amendment, I couldn't believe it," Caddell said.

It was Carter's ability to cut off discussion on dangerous topics and to shift the ground to areas where Reagan was vulnerable that accounted for his political edge in the debate.

Both men started off a bit shakily, which was not surprising considering how much they had riding on the debate. They sparred on the opening question on international policy, with Carter getting control of his voice and facts a bit quicker than Reagan, but neither gaining a clear advantage.

In the camera work that continued all evening, both men appeared composed in the close-ups, but Reagan, of course, was the dominant figure with his greater height and bulk, in the longer-range shots.

Reagan had the better of the exchange on the second question — asking for anti-inflation strategies. While Carter was clearly on the defensive, he managed to introduce the theme he developed continually — that Reagan's economics were just a dressed-up version of the "heartless" Republican policies of the past.

To the disappointment of some of his backers, Reagan failed to grasp the opportunity offered by the next question, on the needs of the cities and the poor, to demonstrate clearly that Democrats have no monopoly on compassion.

Instead, he talked in hard-to-decipher terms about a specific legislative proposal to attract industry to center-cities and gave Carter an opening to suggest that only recently has Reagan even developed a "knowledge of racial problems" in America.

Then came the period when Reagan was on the defensive, constantly objecting that Carter was distorting his views: "I'd like to correct that misstatement . . . that is a misstatement of my views . . . There you go again."

Earlier in the campaign, Carter had been forced to apologize for some of his harsh anti-Reagan rhetoric. Tuesday night, obviously cautioned on the risks of such conduct, he stayed on the safe side by offering negative characterizations of Reagan's "attitudes" and "underlying views," rather than of Reagan the man.

This tactic may have been dictated by the obvious danger of an anti-Carter backlash if he further personalized the assault. But from the perspective of the Reagan camp, it almost guaranteed that their most precious commodity — Reagan's personal credibility as a potential president — would survive Tuesday night's encounter intact.

And that is what the Reagan people were saying when it was all over, and what Reagan himself obviously felt.

The challenger was at his best in his final comments of the night. "Ask yourselves in the polls," he advised prospective voters, "are you better off than you were four years ago? Is it easier to buy what you want? Is there more or less unemployment? Is America more or less respected in the world?"

And then he went back to what all the polls show is the prime support for his plausibility as a future president — his record as governor of the minination called California.

"My economic program will work," he said, "because we did it in California."

Carter did not destroy that proposition any more than he destroyed Reagan's personal credibility in Tuesday night's debate. In an election so close to the grasp of the challenger, that failure may count for more than all the good the president accomplished Tuesday night.

Gets No KO

News Analysis

and the whole question of a nuclear arms race.

Looking for Old Ghosts

By Robert G. Kaiser
Washington Post Staff Writer

When it comes to televised presidential debates, the wise men and women of the mass media are haunted by ghosts. Almost all of them are looking for Richard M. Nixon's 1960 bad makeup or Gerald R. Ford's 1976 Polish goof.

Tuesday night the makeup was fine and there were no Polish jokes. As a result, the pundits were thrown

News Analysis

back onto the contrast between their preconceptions of what the debate might bring vs. what they thought they saw from Cleveland.

So if you were Walter Cronkite or Bruce Morton on CBS, who talked as though they expected a Ronald Reagan goof, you were impressed by the Republican's ability to carry off a no-fault debate, and your post-game commentary was friendly to the Gipper.

But if you were Dan Rather, Leslie Stahl or Bill Plante of the same network, you gave credit to President

See MEDIA, A4, Col. 1

MEDIA, From A1

Carter for holding his own against the polished actor-politician, whom you apparently expected to do better.

A simple fact: on the basis of our scant national experience with this art form, instant analysis of it is usually worthless. After the Reagan-John B. Anderson debate the analysts said Anderson held his own, but within days the polls showed Anderson sinking like a cold soufflé. The instant analysts missed the significance of Nixon's makeup and misread the electoral consequences of Ford's Polish slip.

Not that this record discourages many of the instant analysts. Only NBC voluntarily passed up the chance to pass judgment on who did better in the debate right after it ended. At the other extreme, ABC cooked up a new form of instant analysis that set a new standard for pernicious irrelevance.

This was a national phone-in poll of viewers, a sort of 1980 version of the

famous 1936 telephone poll conducted by Literary Digest magazine, which confidently predicted Alf Landon's victory over Franklin D. Roosevelt. The Literary Digest poll was wrong because more Republicans than Democrats owned telephones.

The ABC "poll" was similarly given to distortions for a host of reasons. It cost 50 cents to participate, for example, and it was possible for callers to register their opinions more than once. The system was also riddled with technical problems, as ABC learned Tuesday night.

ABC's variant exploited a new Bell System invention that had never been tried, and still has not been tried successfully. The lines jammed and clogged, tens or hundreds of thousands of Americans never got through, and some who thought they were registering a pro-Carter sentiment apparently got counted in the Reagan column.

No matter. ABC proudly announced that Reagan had bested Carter in the debate by a 2-to-1 ratio, according to

did the same. Just one of the people interviewed in Cleveland admitted that the debate had changed her vote. She refused to say how.

Warren Mitofsky, who runs public opinion polls for CBS, observed yesterday that instant public reactions to a debate don't mean much. The real results show up a few days later, after voters have had a chance to read about the debate, think and talk about it with friends and listen to expert analyses, Mitofsky said. His observation has the crystalline quality of perceived truth.

Another simple fact: though the mass media is deeply wedded to the significance of mass opinion, in this case the net assessment of the mass audience doesn't matter. More than 100 million Americans may have watched the debate, but the voting intentions of 80 or even 90 percent of them were fixed before the first question was asked.

The relevant audience for this exercise consisted of undecided voters, decided but indifferent citizens who still aren't sure if they'll bother to vote, and swayable voters who had made only a tentative choice before the debate.

The instant analysts on the networks didn't deal with this fact. Instead they dwell on the showbiz aspects of the debate, wondering if Carter looked tense or if Reagan looked "reasonable," whatever that means. A great deal of the comment was on the theme that Carter had hoped to show Reagan up as a dangerous man to allow into the White House, but failed to do so.

There is no straightforward, scientific way to measure the impact of the debate in electoral terms. The Associated Press released one poll with a pleasingly perverse finding: both candidates improved their positions by 6 percentage points with a random sample of 1,062 voters questioned before and after the debate.

A CBS-New York Times poll released last night showed what amounted to a draw in opinion on who won, and said that just 6 percent of a sample of 1,019 voters had changed their minds because of the debate.

Those voters didn't explain their rea-

this nonfunctioning nonsample of non-representative Americans.

For ABC, the network that was supposed to be trying to establish a serious reputation for news coverage during this election year (though it couldn't make room in its schedule of movies for the Reagan-Anderson debate), this ought to be a major corporate embarrassment. The Carter campaign will think it is worse than that if Carter can later blame his defeat in 1980 on a public perception that Reagan won the debate.

CBS also opted for irrelevance, although of an innocent sort. CBS decided to "sample" public opinion by interviewing half a dozen of the only Americans who saw the debate without really seeing it — members of the public who had one of the rare tickets to sit inside Cleveland's Convention Center amid the klieg lights and cameras.

On the Today show yesterday, NBC

soning, but a victim of an overdose instant analysis is tempted to suggest that a lot of them probably thought about a subject the instant analysis mentioned only fleetingly — the issue. Perhaps it is logical in the media as that media commentators are preoccupied with appearances rather than substance, but this is no guarantee that the voters must also be.

Of all the instant analyzers, on Tom Brokaw on the Today show yesterday seemed interested in an issue. His was the strategic arms limitation treaty (SALT II).

In fact, the debate was riddled with specific references to specific topics which — if the polls can be believed — a lot of Americans really care about: inflation and unemployment, energy, women's rights, nuclear arms control and more. On the Today show Carter campaign chairman proffered a revolutionary opinion. His man won, Robert S. Strauss said, because "he's on the right side of these issues."

That was a partisan remark, naturally. But it seems reasonable to assume that some of the voters who decided Tuesday night how they will vote did so because they agreed or disagreed with things the candidates said.

Who won? Only the 'undecideds' know

By Godfrey Sperling Jr.
Staff correspondent of
The Christian Science Monitor

Washington

Both contestants handled themselves well and the outcome was not decisive in terms of turning the election around.

Therefore, the race probably remains about where it was: extremely close with Ronald Reagan very likely hanging on to his electoral-vote edge.

This is the early consensus of political observers of the Great Debate.

There appears to be at least a slight weight of opinion on the side of the conclusion that President Carter may have won on points — by keeping Ronald Reagan so

★ Please turn to Page 10

much on the defensive on the war and peace issue.

Mr. Reagan kept having to explain that he would not be "dangerous" in terms of how he would deal with a global crisis where the use of US military forces would be an option.

On the other hand, the political experts see Reagan gaining credibility as a potential president by showing again and again, through his good-humored, reasonable answers and his poise that he was not, indeed, the kind of person who would be belligerent and hasty to move to military confrontation.

The expectation in the Carter camp, during the weeks when the Carter people pushed hard for this one-on-one encounter, was this: that in debate the President would convincingly show that Reagan was a shallow thinker — a candidate who would not have the intelligence to cope with the terribly complex issues facing a chief executive.

This expectation was not borne out in the results. As observers here see it, Mr. Carter may have been better on details, but Mr. Reagan showed equal grasp of the issues posed by the questioners.

Thus, these observers are saying, Carter failed in what he may have had to accomplish to move the momentum clearly in his direction and gain the victory next Tuesday: He was not able to score a needed knockout of his opponent.

Meanwhile, early returns of viewer opinion — the decision that really counts — indicated Reagan was doing better than the relative standoff which critics were for the most part rating the encounter.

An ABC telephone call-in, with 700,000 viewers participating, showed that some 67

percent of the callers thought Reagan had "won" the debate. (The network admitted it was not a controlled sampling, that repeat calls were possible by the same person, and that there were problems with jammed phone lines.)

Some spot checks with voters around the United States showed that pro-Reagan people tended to say they thought Reagan won and pro-Carter people tended to call the debate for the President.

But in the wake of the intensely interesting TV encounter — marked by many pointed jabs, particularly from Carter, but with no real fireworks or major gaffes — the big question remained: How many undecided voters will be influenced to vote, one way or the other, by what they heard and saw in the debate?

Both candidates were really addressing this big bloc of "undecideds" — estimated at upward of 10 percent of the electorate and perceived to be much bigger when the "waverers" are included.

Carter sought to make the point that there was a distinct difference between the parties, particularly on issues pertaining to the problems of minorities and the disadvantaged.

His pitch was, indeed, a call to liberal Democrats, many of whom indicate they will vote for independent John Anderson or not vote at all, to come home to the party and vote for him.

Reagan was courting independents and Democrats as he sought to underscore, particularly in his concluding statement, that the lot of all Americans had worsened under Carter and that his approach, based on leaning less on government and more on the private sector, deserved a try.

105 million saw debate

NEW YORK [AP]—Between 105 million and 120 million Americans watched at least some of the debate between President Carter and his Republican challenger, Ronald Reagan, researchers for NBC and ABC estimated Wednesday.

Both estimates [ABC's was the higher] were based on overnight audience ratings from the A.C. Nielsen Co. for three large cities—New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles—as well as markedly higher-than-normal TV use in the three cities during the debate, 8:30 to 10 p.m. CST Tuesday.

THE AUDIENCE for the Carter-Reagan debate compares with an estimated audience of 90 million for the highest-rated of Carter's debates with President Gerald R. Ford in 1976.

So-called "HUT" levels [homes using television] normally are between 65 and 67 per cent at this time of year. HUT levels during the debate ranged from 72 per cent in New York to 73 in Los Angeles.

ABC had the largest share of the audience in each of the three cities surveyed: 33 per cent in New York, 46 in Chicago, and 27 in Los Angeles. CBS was second in both New York and Chicago, and NBC was the runnerup in Los Angeles.

Debate Settled the Choice For One Couple, at Least

The Ahlborns may or may not be typical of undecided voters who made up their minds about a presidential candidate on the basis of Tuesday night's debate. They were selected at random and interviewed before and after the event.

By Phil Gailey
Washington Star Staff Writer

WILMINGTON, Del. — Tom and Pat Ahlborn put their three small children to bed Tuesday night and turned on the television to watch the debate between Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan.

When it was over, these previously undecided voters, both registered Republicans in the middle of the political spectrum, reluctantly came down on the side of the president.

They don't feel that either candidate offers much hope to the country, or to people like themselves, but they have made up their minds to stick with a disappointing president because Reagan failed to convince them that he could do better.

"I didn't have any strong positive reaction to Mr. Carter," Pat Ahlborn said yesterday. "But I didn't care for Mr. Reagan's tone. He seems to have changed his positions significantly. I felt he was trying to hide his conservatism, and that troubles me because I'm left to wonder what he would really be like as president."

Tom Ahlborn had hoped for "clearer statements than we got from either candidate," but after listening to both he found Carter's answers to be generally more positive than Reagan's and saw the president as the one "who has the best understanding of what is going on."

The Ahlborns live in a modest, stucco house in a blue-collar suburb, next door to auto workers, drive two foreign compact cars, set aside \$90 a week for groceries and are active in church work. Tom, 40, teaches math and computer science at West Chester State College, and Pat, 32, teaches part-time in the public schools and conducts a Wednesday Bible class at her Presbyterian church.

They support the Equal Rights Amendment with reservations, but don't consider it an issue. They are concerned about high taxes, inflation and the state of U.S. military forces — issues Reagan has sought to use against the president — and they believe Carter lacks the leadership ability to, as Pat Ahlborn put it, "accomplish what he claims he stands for."

They are disturbed by the tone and rhetoric of Carter's campaign,

especially his insinuations that Reagan would lead the nation into war. "I think Carter making an issue of war and peace bothers me more about him than it does about Reagan," said Tom Ahlborn, who added that no single issue "is turning me on or off."

If anything, they are closer to Reagan's views on defense than Carter's. "There has been a complacency about our defense in recent years and we are not expanding our military as fast as the Soviets, and that concerns me," Pat Ahlborn said in an interview the night before the debate.

So why are they supporting Carter?

It wasn't the issues that tipped them toward Carter; it was the impressions they were left with after watching the 90-minute debate, which the Ahlborns figured was their best chance to size up the contenders for the nation's highest office.

Pat Ahlborn, a bright-faced woman with an easy laugh, said it is difficult for someone like her to know enough of the facts to base her decision on such issues as the SALT II treaty, nuclear non-proliferation, defense and the economy.

"It is hard for me to decide how much power is in the president's hands to change the economy," she said. "I am skeptical of anyone who claims to have all the answers to turn things around."

She came away from the debate with the impression that Reagan has "flip-flopped" on the issues, but conceded that Carter probably had too, although his flip-flops were not pointed out in the debate.

If they had been, she added, "I would have had to consider that."

Tom Ahlborn, bespectacled and bearded, is not wild about Carter, either. He voted for Carter in 1976 because he liked his Christian values, but if the choice today was between Carter and Gerald Ford, he admits, "I don't know how I would come down. It would be much tougher."

He went into the debate concerned about Reagan's "simplistic" answers to the nation's problems and the Republican candidate's proposal to slash taxes, increase the defense budget and balance the federal budget — all goals the Ahlborns share but doubt can be accomplished as easily as Reagan suggests.

He still had that concern after the debate.

"Economic concerns are important to us, but they're not the overriding issue in making our decision. I don't blame the president totally for the economic situation," Tom Ahlborn said. "Frankly, I don't see either candidate as having clear solutions to our problems."

He said he was surprised to find Reagan so close to the middle of the road in his views, and even gave the Republican higher marks than Carter for offering fresh ideas on such issues as urban renewal and the possibility of a separate minimum wage for youth.

On other issues, however, he said Reagan was too quick with "pat answers" — such as balancing the federal budget by cutting waste and fat.

In the past, Ahlborn said he had always considered voting for the man more important than party loyalty. But now, he added, "I see more importance in voting for a party and I am constantly evaluating the situation. Right now I think the positions of the Democratic Party are slightly more in line with my own views than the Republican platform."

Both Ahlborns also said the release of the American hostages in Iran before next Tuesday's election would not influence their vote in any way, unless, of course, there was evidence that the president had made a deal to boost his re-election chances.

"I think it is out of our hands now and I would judge the president on what he had done up until this point," said Tom Ahlborn.

Despite their unhappiness with the choice between Carter and Reagan, neither Ahlborn ever seriously considered independent John Anderson as a viable alternative.

ABC's Experimental Poll After Debate Was Marred by Technological Foul-Ups

By Lance Gay

Washington Star Staff Writer

The experimental phone-in survey conducted by ABC-TV and American Telephone and Telegraph Co., which proclaimed Ronald Reagan a 2-1 winner over President Carter in Tuesday night's debate, was marred by busy lines, a tape recording mix-up and other built-in technical problems.

Sources close to the polling operation yesterday acknowledged several technical problems that could have affected the outcome. But ABC insisted that the poll was not intended to be scientific and that this was stated repeatedly on the network programs where it was aired.

"It was not a traditional small-sample poll, demographically weighted," said ABC News President Roone Arledge. "But it was a novel and useful experiment."

There were several technical problems with the survey that make it unreliable. ABC acknowledged that the phone lines sometimes became overloaded, and Kitty Halpin, director of ABC's Washington public information office, said she had no measurement of the built-in margin of error in such a survey.

The poll came under sharp attack yesterday from Americans for Democratic Action, a group that has endorsed Carter's re-election effort. The ADA said the poll was so misleading that releasing its results within a week of the election was "irresponsible."

It was only the second time that the Bell System had used the nationwide phone-in network on such a scale. The first time was in 1977, when Carter took calls at the White House from 20 persons who called a 900 area code number.

On Tuesday night, the phones were opened up shortly before the debate concluded at 11 p.m. and the lines were kept open until 12:30 p.m. Nearly 700,000 people paid 50 cents each to take part in the survey, which involved calling one of two 900-numbers to register support for either Carter or Reagan.

AT&T said that 469,412 people, or 67 percent, dialed the number designated for Reagan and got through, and 227,017, or 33 percent, got through on the line assigned to Carter.

The central problem involved the Bell System's computerized network. The system would allow only two calls at once from each of the 2,000 local Bell System offices. AT&T says the system can handle 4,500 to 5,000 calls a minute.

If more than two persons from within a district attempted to call the numbers, they were greeted by a busy signal or a recorded voice. ABC said it received some 2,000 complaints Tuesday night from the Washington area, with the bulk of those calling complaining that they couldn't get through.

Most of the complaints, said a source close to the operation, came from Carter supporters who apparently were upset by the periodic televised reports on the poll showing that Reagan was a 2-1 favorite. Some asked ABC how Reagan could maintain such a lead if the Carter line was tied up so long.

Because of the way the system is set up, it also tended to discriminate against urban dwellers, whose phones are connected to heavily used exchanges. Rural areas tend to have fewer phones connected to an exchange.

Heavy complaints from viewers were also received in San Francisco and Oklahoma.

AT&T said that the poll brought

in 33 percent more calls than it handled during trial runs, but said it had no estimate of how many people tried and couldn't get through.

If callers did get through to the number, they were told by recording that their votes were recorded.

But at a Bell System switching station in Atlanta — one of seven centers nationwide — the taped message was inadvertently switched for 15 minutes and voters who were casting their votes for Carter were incorrectly told they had registered them for Reagan. AT&T said the votes were correctly recorded, although the mixup resulted in a flood of irate calls.

Other problems arose from people who attempted to place the calls from hotel rooms, pay phones or some office phones. The telephone network did not accept these calls. Some Carter supporters also contended that the phone-in system made it easy for one side or the other to "stack the deck" for their candidate by blitzing the number with phone banks.

Changes in New Jersey may give Reagan state

By Fred Barnes
Sun Staff Correspondent

Jersey City, N.J.—In the old days, Mayor Frank Hague would have issued a command and a whopping majority of the voters in this gloomy, unrenowned city would have jumped forward to support President Carter or any other Democratic candidate.

But Mayor Hague and his potent political machine are long since gone. And instead of lavishing a lopsided margin on Mr. Carter, Jersey City, the redoubt of Democratic strength in this critical state, may clear the way for a victory by Republican Ronald Reagan in New Jersey.

Given New Jersey's normal voting habits, this would be an anomaly. True, Mr. Carter has never won an election here, losing two primaries and suffering a narrow loss to President Gerald R. Ford in 1976, but the state has a strong penchant for moderate presidential candidates.

"People in New Jersey have turned away from conservative candidates whenever they've had a chance," noted a Democratic official. But the mood is different this year, as Mr. Reagan's conservatism is not the albatross it might have been and Mr. Carter's well-manicured image as a moderate is not the asset it was expected to be.

As anticipated, Mr. Reagan is lagging badly in the populous suburbs of northern New Jersey, which were Mr. Ford's stronghold four years ago. The affluent bedroom communities often vote Republican, but rarely for doctrinaire conservatives.

So how has Mr. Reagan managed to overcome this shortcoming? That is where Jersey City and other heavily Catholic and ethnic neighborhoods come in. Though Democrats outnumber Republicans by 10-1 in Jersey City, Mr. Reagan has nonetheless emerged as a candidate with strong appeal there.

Republican leaders are astonished at Mr. Reagan's breadth of support in Jersey City and pleasantly surprised at some of his supporters. In a poll last week of readers of the *Hudson Dispatch*—they were asked to mail in a mock ballot—Mr. Reagan won by nearly 3-1.

And by exploiting a factional dispute among Democrats, Mr. Reagan has managed to pick up the backing of a handful of Democratic leaders, many of whom had supported Senator Edward M. Kennedy (D, Mass.) in the presidential primary last June.

Ray Donovan, the Reagan coordinator in New Jersey and the architect of his breakthrough in Jersey City, insists that it has finally dawned on middle-income Catholic voters that they have much in common with a conservative Republican like Mr. Reagan.

"People in this city are blue-collar, ethnic, hard-working folks who believe in the values of family, church and neighborhood," he said. "That's the seedbed of Governor Reagan's support. They're street-corner conservatives. They are Democratic through and through, but this year they realize that Governor Reagan is speaking their language on the economy and the defense issue."

Others have a more sociological explanation for Mr. Reagan's popularity in Jersey City and other cities and towns where ethnic Catholics are predominant: Catho-

lics have stepped out of the working class, or at least they no longer draw low wages, and they are becoming more Republican.

"The ethnics have become upwardly mobile," said Walt Peters, the political director of the Reagan campaign in New Jersey. "They aren't all cops or laborers any more. The second and third generations are different. You know, bank vice presidents and lawyers and doctors."

In any case, Mr. Reagan's strength among Catholics in this heavily Catholic state means Mr. Carter has to pull an unusually large vote among Protestant suburbanites if he is to win the state and its 17 electoral votes.

Gerald Doherty, the onetime Kennedy operative who is directing the Carter campaign in New Jersey, sees the suburban "trough" from north of Newark down to Princeton as pivotal. If Mr. Carter can penetrate it this year, having failed to do so in 1976, he can win, Mr. Doherty said.

But in four trips to New Jersey since Labor Day, Mr. Carter has largely sought to stir the four groups of voters who, according to Mr. Doherty, form his base of support—labor, blacks, liberals and senior citizens. Yesterday, for example, the president appeared at a black church in Newark.

Obviously, Mr. Reagan is eager to cut into this base. His four visits here have been devoted to appearances in Democratic enclaves like Jersey City, where he kicked off his campaign on Labor Day. He has left suburbia to George Bush, his vice presidential running mate.

Jeffrey Bell, a Republican consultant who is one of the savviest political analysts in the state, said Mr. Reagan must bolster his support in "the upper-middle-class north Jersey suburbs" to assure himself of victory. Many of the undecided voters and backers of independent John B. Anderson live in this region.

Before Tuesday evening's debate, Mr. Reagan seemed to be picking up as many Anderson defectors as Mr. Carter was, which conflicted with the national trend. It was unclear how the nationally televised debate affected their appeal to Anderson and undecided voters.

In a poll by the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University in late September, Mr. Reagan received 36 percent, Mr. Carter 31 percent, Mr. Anderson 21 percent and undecided 11 percent.

In a new Eagleton survey released this week, Mr. Reagan rose to 40 percent and Mr. Carter to 36 percent, as Mr. Anderson dropped to 10 percent and undecided climbed to 14 percent.

Both the Reagan and Carter campaigns regard the actual situation a bit differently. "We're a solid 6 percent ahead, 6 to 8 percent," said Mr. Peters, the Reagan strategist. "Our polls show the race about even," claimed Mr. Doherty, the Carter campaign director.

By his own yardstick, Mr. Reagan would appear to have Mr. Carter right where he wants him in New Jersey. Both sides agree that Mr. Reagan was well ahead of Mr. Ford's victorious pace in 1976.

Mr. Ford, the incumbent, was about 6 percentage points behind 10 days before election day, but he shot past Mr. Carter, the challenger, with a strong finishing kick. This year, Mr. Carter is the incumbent with a 6-percentage-point gap to close.

Carter needs big win in uncertain

By Jon Margolis

Chicago Tribune Press Service

PHILADELPHIA—The question here is whether the troubles of Ozzie Myers and his friends will lose Pennsylvania for Jimmy Carter or whether the triumphs of Tug McGraw and his friends will help him win it.

As a Democrat, Carter can hardly win Pennsylvania's 27 electoral votes unless he gets a 200,000-vote margin in this Democratic city.

And he can do that only by piling up a big vote in the Democratic wards: the black wards in the northwest part of the city and the Italian working-class wards of South Philadelphia.

It is these last that were represented by Rep. Michael "Ozzie" Myers before he was convicted of bribery, expelled by the House of Representatives, and disowned by the City Democratic Committee, which is backing an independent while Myers keeps the Democratic line on the ballot.

THAT'S WHAT may hurt Carter, in the view of James Tayoun, the leader of Philadelphia's 1st Ward. "It does not aid and abet people to vote the straight Democratic ticket," said Tayoun, for whom voting the straight Democratic ticket is an act bordering on holiness.

Some voters will become confused, Tayoun said, while others will consider for the first time the idea of voting for someone who is not a Democrat.

As a result, in a ward with 11,000 Democrats and only 3,000 Republicans, Tayoun can now promise only a 3-to-2 Carter majority. "I'm not happy about it," he said, "but I'm trying harder."

That's where Tug McGraw and his friends come in. "The World Series inadvertently helped," Tayoun said. "It made people feel good. So I say to them, 'Try harder for the team, like Tug McGraw and Pete Rose did.'"

A WALK DOWN any street in Tayoun's ward reveals that there is indeed a lasting residue of this old city's first baseball world championship. There are

Campaign '80

The crucial states

This is one of a series of articles on states considered critical to the outcome of this year's presidential election.

as many Phillies pennants as jack-o-lanterns in the windows of the neat row houses along the tree-lined streets.

Philadelphia, of course, is more than just the 1st Ward. It is also the posh areas to the north where liberal Quakers and Jews agree on almost everything except the Middle East and are considering a vote for John Anderson.

And it is the black wards to the northwest where regular organization Democrats are conducting a major get-out-

the-vote effort for Carter but where maverick Democratic City Councilman John Street is not.

"He has to come to North Central Philly, look at our conditions, and tell us how he would deal with our problems," Street said. "Right now, we're making no statements, and the voter turnout is going to be light."

CARTER COULD make up for losses in Democratic Philadelphia by doing well in the suburbs, where Ronald Reagan did poorly in the primary. But Carter is not likely to do as well as he did in 1976 among the pious people of the German religious sects of central Pennsylvania. And Reagan has made a major effort to woo the coal and steel workers in the western part of this large, varied state.

So Philadelphia remains the key. Carter beat Gerald Ford by 255,000 votes in the city four years ago, enough to offset a 135,000-vote loss in the rest of the state. The polls show he might do it again, but just barely.

U.S. budget deficit reaches \$59 billion

Washington (AP)—The federal government spent \$59 billion more in its fiscal 1980 budget than it took in—a deficit more than twice that of the previous fiscal year, the Treasury Department announced yesterday.

The increased deficit for the fiscal year that ended September 30, due in part to the deep recession that gripped the economy during the January-August period, was the second largest in history.

It was exceeded only by the \$66.4 billion deficit in 1976. It more than doubled the fiscal 1979 deficit of \$27.7 billion.

President Carter had vowed during his 1976 campaign to balance the federal budget by fiscal 1981, and as recently as last March said he would achieve that goal. Now, however, his administration is projecting a \$29.8 billion deficit for fiscal 1981, which began October 1.

The federal government has not had a balanced budget since 1969, when there was a surplus of \$3.2 billion.

Ronald Reagan, the Republican presidential candidate, now is promising a balanced budget by 1983 if he is elected.

In a joint statement with the Office of Management and Budget, the Treasury Department said the federal budget listed income of \$520 billion in fiscal 1980 and expenditures of \$579 billion. Receipts totaled \$465.9 billion in 1979 and spending was \$493.6 billion.

The actual deficit for 1980 was almost \$20 billion higher than the president projected when he sent his 1981 budget to Congress last January. At that time, the president predicted receipts of \$523.8 billion, spending of \$563.6 billion and a \$39.8 billion deficit in fiscal 1980.

HE SUN, Thursday, October 30, 1980

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1980

FOUNDED IN 1852

The Washington Star

MURRAY J. GART, Editor

SIDNEY EPSTEIN, Executive Editor

WILLIAM F. McILWAIN, Deputy Editor

EDWIN M. YODER JR., Editorial Page Editor

The Cleveland Debate

If, as most political sages reckoned, all the marbles rode on the Tuesday evening Cleveland debate, they're still in the ring today. It was a forensic contest clearly won by neither contestant, a fact that may be of advantage to the challenger.

It was not, of course, for want of strenuous effort — and not for want of some decisive impressions.

President Carter's main liability is the high "misery index" (unemployment plus inflation) he invented for the race against President Ford in 1976. Governor Reagan got around to mentioning it late in the encounter, though the president managed to keep Mr. Reagan slightly off balance and on the defensive much of the time.

He kept Mr. Reagan busy fending off suggestions that his views on the control of nuclear weapons and the use of American forces abroad are "dangerous," "disturbing," a radical variant on recent Oval Office policy. And in fact Mr. Reagan has spoken somewhat more loosely of these matters, from time to time, than a man of presidential ambition may safely do.

In Governor Reagan's favor it must be said, however, that if the voters spent their suffrages on the appeal of such qualities as cheerfulness, grace and good humor he

would beat the president overwhelmingly. He is a polished performer. As a television personality Jimmy Carter, by contrast, comes across as cold, solemn and preachy — and sometimes outrageous. It was embarrassing to be told that Amy Carter's favorite issue is the control of nuclear weapons. If, as we have reason to suppose from other evidence, Mr. Carter is not without magnanimous instincts he certainly manages to control them when he is on the attack.

For the rest, it must be said that the debate left us about where we came in. Both candidates have lingering problems. The president has failed miserably as an economic manager and as a leader who inspires the people to elevated sentiments and ambitions. Nor has he yet admitted to full accountability for these failures. Governor Reagan, for all his manifest decency, has yet to establish himself as a man of serious reflection or masterly ideas about the great issues that would press upon him if the voters send him to the Oval Office.

Nothing in the debate decisively altered these impressions, which are widely shared by voters of both major persuasions. Perhaps the issues of this campaign, such as they are, were sharpened in Cleveland. They were neither transformed nor resolved.

THE SUN

A 22 •

BALTIMORE, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1980

DONALD H. PATTERSON, President and Publisher • PAUL A. BANKER, Managing Editor • J.R.L. STERNE, Editorial Page Editor

Unanswered Questions

The country is now trying to figure out who "won" the Cleveland debate between President Carter and Governor Reagan, a complicated matter in that perceptions have a way of altering. In 1976, the first polls said Gerald Ford won the foreign policy debate by 53 to 29. But after attention was riveted on Mr. Ford's bizarre assertion that Poland was a free nation, the polls gave the victory to Mr. Carter by 58 to 29.

While impressions of TV style weigh more heavily than substance in modern campaigning, let's for the moment focus on how the two candidates handled—or failed to handle—three crucial questions:

SALT—Alas, we still don't know why Mr. Carter thinks the next Senate will ratify the treaty that he did not dare send to the present Senate. His pretext in January was Afghanistan, but Afghanistan hasn't changed. The only thing changed is the loss of time before technology makes the present pact obsolete. As for Mr. Reagan, he no longer wants to scrap the treaty. Rather he wants to open it to renegotiation, though he neglects to say what he wants to renegotiate.

ECONOMY—Alas, the criticisms both candidates fling at one another are accurate without being corrective. Mr. Reagan's Kemp-Roth tax plan could be as inflationary as the president says it is. Mr. Carter's explanation for four years of inflation is to take comfort

in its fractional decline from a February peak. But since the marginally different tax programs will be rewritten anyway by Russell Long's Senate Finance Committee, the voters still wait for clear direction on jobs and prices and revitalization of industry.

SOCIAL SECURITY—Alas, the whole Carter-Reagan discussion of Social Security's future was conducted in a vacuum, with little reference to the relationship between higher defense spending and the delivery of social services. We can't fault Mr. Reagan's description of the problem, a multi-trillion dollar miscalculation on the number of retirees and the number of working-age citizens available to support them. His only solution: a study commission. As for Mr. Carter, he says we will have a strong, viable Social Security system as long as there is a Democrat in the White House. But he is in the White House and the Social Security system is not all that strong or viable.

The questions pile up as the candidates' purported answers are pondered. But voters still have reason to be grateful for even just one debate between the major-party candidates. How else could the presidential campaign have been embellished by Mr. Reagan's witch doctor and Mr. Carter's inquisitive little Amy and the vision of two coast-to-coast lines—one of the unemployed and one of railroad cars loaded with TNT?

The Philadelphia Inquirer

An Independent Newspaper

Published Every Morning by Philadelphia Newspapers, Inc.
400 N. Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19101

SAM S. McKEEL
President

EUGENE L. ROBERTS JR.
Executive Editor

EDWIN GUTHMAN
Editor

Thursday, October 30, 1980

Page 12-A

The debate did not dispel the peril of Gov. Reagan

In the eye of its mother, an Arab epigram declares, the baby camel is a gazelle. And so it was with Tuesday night's presidential debate.

To Ronald Reagan's committed enthusiasts, he was the clear winner, standing comfortable and comforting above a somewhat taut and defensive Jimmy Carter. Among our acquaintances who strongly favor Mr. Carter and his re-election, the President emerged as patient, reasoning and humane, with the great strength of modesty, against a Ronald Reagan who was platitudinous, superficial and more anxiety-ridden than his reputation as a smooth actor with a genius for coolness had promised.

So much for scoring the match.

The fact is that little or nothing was said in the hour and a half that has not been said time and again before. It is a tribute, if that is the word, or the value sought, to the effectiveness of both candidates' television-tuned advisors and handlers that whole passages of each of their responses to the necessarily predictable questions came virtually verbatim from well-used speeches.

So what was the point of it all? And what is the point now that the debate is over?

Beneath the coaching and the theatrical manipulation of it all, there is a matter of the most profoundly important substance.

In five days, the voters of America will choose who is to lead the nation domestically, and even more perilously to conduct its international relations, for the next four years.

Taken in sum, nothing Mr. Carter said Tuesday night amended the record of his administration, which has been inept, often morally insensitive, and slow to learn. And, for all his efforts to moderate by evasion, nothing Mr. Reagan said added to or detracted from the record, throughout the campaign, of his perceptions and attitudes and those of the men around him.

"I would like to have a crusade today," Gov. Reagan said at the very end of the debate. "And I would like to lead

that crusade with your help. And it would be one to take government off the backs of the great people of this country and turn you loose again to do those things that I know you can do so well, because you did them and made this country great."

For all his smoothness and evasions, Mr. Reagan made it clear again Tuesday that his vision of a crusade is to turn the nation's back on equality for women, on the most basic needs and tiny sparks of hope in and for the country's least advantaged. He made it once again obvious that for all the virtues of reducing unnecessary interference by government on private lives, the central meaning of his crusade to take it "off the backs of the great people of this country" is to give immense new force to the already powerful and the already rich, individual and corporate, by abandoning two generations of bipartisan progress toward protection and equity.

Most worrisome, however, and most perilous, is that once again, by omission as well as by platitude, Mr. Reagan made it unmistakable that his conception of America's role in the complex and dangerous world is to return the nation and the White House to the days of Teddy Roosevelt and the weapon-rattling bullying which Mr. Reagan clearly equates with "greatness."

That is not greatness. In a nuclear age, in a world full of vast power and vaster problems, the conception of America as a globally movable fortress is perilous to the nation's interests and to those of the human race, including its very survival.

Tuesday night should have made it clear, if it needed clarifying, that the prospect of a Reagan presidency is too dangerous, at home and abroad, to be risked. Mr. Carter's first term has had manifest failings, and the nation deserves better. But even more vitally, the nation deserves to be protected from irresponsible, superficial adventurism. The only way to achieve that is to re-elect Mr. Carter.

The Washington Post

AN INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPER

90-Minute Wonder

ONE GOOD thing about these debates is that if there is no clear or agreed-upon winner, at the least the thing is not thrown into the House. It is merely thrown into the press and the streets and the bars and the living rooms and metabuses where people talk about these things. Who looked better? Or—it seems to be the popular test in this campaign—who looked less worse? Which one the more sure-footedly avoided whatever awful fate the rest of us had predicted he would succumb to? Which one overcame whatever the rest of us had decreed he must overcome to stay alive?

You could get as many answers to these particular image and impact questions as there were viewers the other night, and we will, as a rare act of mercy—don't get used to it—spare you our own. More than was true of the comparable event in Baltimore, where Gov. Reagan and Congressman Anderson had at each other a short while back, it struck us this time around that each debater's strategy was showing, and that it was almost too obvious what each, in these image and impact terms, was trying to achieve. In fact, they stuck to their game plans with a ferocity that on occasion seemed to get in the way of their arguments or to deter them from making killing points.

Mr. Carter seemed so determined to keep hitting at Mr. Reagan with that arsenal of ancient and often slightly cooked-up quotes and to tell people how frightened they should be of Mr. Reagan, for example, that he let pass a couple of good opportunities to engage the Californian in a genuinely tough exchange over the arms issues that are so much on his mind. And Mr. Reagan was so reflexively at pains to point out that he had not said this or that weird thing the president kept charging him with that he

too let a couple of obvious ones go by. For instance, he protested that he had not said what Mr. Carter said he said about nuclear nonproliferation. An aggressive debater would have gone on to ask what Mr. Carter was doing harping on nuclear nonproliferation in the first place—having just given his all in the misguided battle to overrule his own Nuclear Regulatory Commission and send dangerous nuclear fuel to India.

Mr. Carter showed a grasp, which everyone already knew he had, of the myriad details and complications of some of the big troubles facing the country. Mr. Reagan showed an equally familiar and unsurprising feel for some of the valid discontents that are felt in the land and that find form in various government policy failures. Both men showed a very keen grasp of their own immediate political liabilities and needs, at least as spelled out by the experts. They self-evidently knew what they were supposed to do to improve upon their situation, although you could probably argue that Mr. Carter might have shown a little more presidential magnanimity to go with his demonstrable presidential knowledge and that Mr. Reagan could have pushed Mr. Carter harder on the economy and pulled away from some of his own more eccentric and unsalable ideas.

But knowing all this, we *still* do not know substantially more about either the president or the governor, in terms of personal qualities or staked-out positions, than was pretty clear before Tuesday night. What people may have learned from the 90 minutes that were (besides the demonstrable fact that the debate format could use a little work) is that there is no divine revelation coming. People know what they are going to know about the two candidates now.

Proliferating Confusion

The only way to explain the sudden emphasis the Carter-Mondale campaign is putting on the nuclear non-proliferation issue is that the President and his staff think the voters are dolts. Opposing the spread of nuclear weapons makes a nice symbolic touch, but in the real world there are few policies on which the Carter administration is more open to attack for confusion, inconstancy and generally getting the worst of both worlds.

Mr. Carter has talked a lot about keeping nuclear weapons away from powers that don't have them. In this pursuit he killed the U.S. facilities reprocessing spent nuclear fuel. On alternate days he has raised Cain and quietly acquiesced when our allies wanted to sell nuclear technology to the Third World. He cut off aid to Pakistan just as the Afghan and Persian Gulf crises were brewing. And then he turned around and overruled nuclear regulators to send more uranium to India—the only nation that has in fact used peaceful atomic aid to develop a nuclear bomb.

Why Mr. Carter has been so keen on selling uranium to India has always escaped us; our best guess is that it has something to do with his mother serving there while she was in the Peace Corps. Whatever the roots of this curious policy, Mr. Carter has pursued it almost as an obsession.

After India's "peaceful nuclear explosion" in 1974, Canada immediately cut off further nuclear cooperation. Though some American nuclear materials were also used in producing the bomb, the U.S. did not follow suit, ostensibly because it hoped to use the leverage to get new non-proliferation agreements with India.

When Mr. Carter went to India early in his administration, then-Prime Minister Desai rejected the

U.S. demand for full-scope nuclear safeguards in a face-to-face meeting. Mr. Carter, however, made a public pledge before the Indian parliament to send more uranium. And in a famous "open mike" incident, Mr. Carter was heard telling Secretary of State Vance to send Mr. Desai a "cold and very blunt letter." Our suspicion that the remark was not inadvertent but calculated to allay U.S. criticism gained substance when no letter was sent.

Ultimately, the Indian sale was refused by a unanimous vote of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which has original jurisdiction on approving the sale of U.S. nuclear technology abroad. Mr. Carter, however, overruled the NRC and approved the sale. The law gives Congress power to override presidential decisions in the area, and the House voted by a wide margin last summer to side with the NRC and veto the sale. But Mr. Carter raised the rafters of the Senate and won approval of his decision by two votes. Within days of the Senate vote, India submitted yet another request for more nuclear fuel, though existing supplies are sufficient to run its power plants for years.

The Indian sale makes an obvious hash of non-proliferation policy. If India escapes all punishment for developing a bomb, no American policy short of outright invasion is going to stop Pakistan from doing likewise. And the show of unseriousness will undermine any American effort to persuade Germany, France or Switzerland not to sell technology.

It is simply amazing that Mr. Carter goes out of his way to bring up such a debacle. The non-proliferation issue is in fact the perfect microcosm of the confused and unserious Carter foreign policy that has led us into trouble all over the world.

REVIEW & OUTLOOK

Good Show

Tuesday's presidential debate provided a welcome relief from the emptiness that has marked the campaign so far. After watching President Carter and Governor Reagan civilly savage each other for ninety minutes, the voters must have a better sense of the men; and even a better sense of the issues facing the Republic.

That is not to say, of course, that the exchanges were profound by the standards of a think-tank seminar. It is easy enough to spot the unanswered question here and the missed opportunity there. In a more rigorous forum—or perhaps against a more rigorous opponent—Mr. Carter would not be able to get away with the effrontery of bragging about his impossibly confused attempts to thwart proliferation of nuclear weapons (see below). Nor would Mr. Reagan be allowed the want of incisiveness and clarity that tends to mar his answers—to the point of criticizing his opponent for ducking a question he is about to duck himself.

But in fact the event was not a think-tank seminar, and due allowance must be made. The candidates are asked to perform in a pressure-cooker, playing for enormous stakes before a vast mass audience viewing through the unforgiving eye of the television camera. Considering this, the two men performed remarkably well.

The event was not decided by any random miscue. Each man showed skill in advancing his interests. President Carter wrapped himself in the traditions of the Democratic Party. Governor Reagan concentrated on establishing himself as a credible potential President. They developed clear differences on the strategic arms treaty, the minimum wage, the Social Security system, tax reduction and the role of government generally. With these issues presented in something more than the news clips and spot commercials through which the campaign was waged before the debate, the choice before the voter has to be clearer than before.

In scorecard terms, the outcome was perhaps a draw. The Associated Press reported that a panel of seven forensics professors rated it Mr. Reagan 161, Mr. Carter 160. In terms of who had the better case, the outcome obviously depends on the viewer's own ideas about the merits of the issues; we doubt that many minds could be changed on specific issues by such brief arguments. And neither candidate succeeded in the monumental task of projecting a compelling vision of America's future.

In electoral terms, though, the

guess here is that Mr. Reagan won, perhaps by a significant margin. This feeling is not based on after-debate polling; ABC's call-in sample showing a 2-1 Reagan margin is intriguing but the very model of an unscientific poll; a scientific poll by the AP showed the two candidates gaining by equal amounts among the undecided. Our guess, rather, is based on the feeling that Mr. Reagan made important strides in solving some of his strategic problems. And that if there is no further surprise in Iran or elsewhere, this may open the way for decisive gains over the next week.

A scorecard draw, as the conventional wisdom on debates holds, helps the lesser-known candidate. Even allowing for his Eisenhower-like syntax, Mr. Reagan stood up to the President toe-to-toe and fact-to-fact. This is bound to help portray him as a credible President, which is particularly important because of the Carter campaign's efforts to brand him an outrageous and illegitimate candidate.

Beyond that, Mr. Reagan seemed to us to cast a more presidential personal image. We carried away a general impression of an affable St. Bernard shooting off a pesky Pekinese. While Mr. Reagan often seemed on the defensive, touches like his "There you go again" throwaway and his taking the initiative to shake hands after the debate were calculated to show him the bigger man, externally and internally. While tastes differ, we suspect this bit of image-making was generally a success.

Finally, in standing up on the minimum wage, SALT and the like, Mr. Reagan made clear that there is some distance between the candidates on the issues. The caution of his campaign has been leaving voters wondering whether it makes a difference who is elected. Whether Mr. Reagan picked precisely the right issues is less important than making clear he has some thoughts of his own, that electing him would at least open the possibility of trying a little new thinking and a few new approaches.

Our own preference, expressed in these columns early and often, would have been for a far more issue-oriented, far more incisive campaign. But for that, with Mr. Reagan reopening the possibility of change and establishing himself as a legitimate personal choice, the door is open for the voter to make his own judgment about the record of the incumbent. If the last week of the campaign now proceeds on that basis, it can scarcely do Mr. Reagan's prospects any harm.

Carter scored — but not a

Knockout

By David Broder

CLEVELAND — In the 90-minute debate that could determine the outcome of his uphill battle for reelection, Jimmy Carter accomplished almost every objective except the most important one: the destruction of Ronald Reagan's credibility as a potential president.

For most of their televised debate, Carter kept his challenger on the defensive — explaining that his views on arms-control, military weapons, Social Security and programs were not the "very dangerous, disturbing" and even "radical" notions that the President said they were.

In a confrontation where most of the time was spent on Carter's preferred issues — and not the economic record of the last four years, where Reagan would have preferred to focus it — the incumbent repeatedly managed to work in a partisan appeal to his fellow-Democrats and to aim special messages at such key constituencies as blacks and Hispanics, the South and the Jews.

But in the end — when Reagan managed in his summation to ask voters the question Carter most ardently wished to submerge, "Are you and your family and your country better off than you were four years ago?" — the challenger was not only

still on his feet but in contention for the White House.

The minimal objective defined by such Reagan strategists as pollster Richard Wirthlin, was that the GOP nominee look like "a reasonable man" and not "a dangerous personality." By that standard, the former California governor earned much more than a passing grade.

Reagan used all the skills acquired in 40 years before the cameras — shrugs and smiles and easily inflected small jokes — to tell the viewers that the portrait of him that Carter was drawing, that of a weapons-prone right-winger, equally heedless of the threat of nuclear war and the aspirations of women and minorities, was a political caricature.

Reagan's advisers went into the debate confident that their candidate had an edge on Carter in electoral votes and a chance to wrap up the election if he avoided obliteration in this debate. The Reagan camp passed off as insignificant Carter's consistent show of greater expertise on government programs, economic statistics and energy production figures.

Less easily dismissed was the skill Carter showed in developing what has, until Tuesday night, been a fitfully communicated message that — for all his surface blandness — Reagan's underlying attitudes are the source of danger to the nation and

damage to most working Americans.

Carter's most direct hit came in the middle of the debate, during the emotionally charged discussion on the SALT II strategic-arms treaty and the whole question of a nuclear arms race.

After Reagan had attempted to rebut Carter's claim that such an arms-race would be "a very dangerous and disturbing thing," Carter came back with an answer that used the word "dangerous" three more times.

Finally, he said, "it is extremely dangerous to hear this belligerent tone, though said in a quiet voice."

For close to half an hour in the heart of prime time, Reagan found himself constantly on the defensive, as a series of questions on minorities, energy and Social Security bracketed the central exchange on nuclear weapons, war and peace.

Reagan protested that this was "just not true," that he had not called for nuclear superiority.

During the campaign, however, Reagan has asserted that if the U.S. were to enter the arms race — a race he says that only the Soviet Union has been competing in — the United States would be in a better bargaining position on SALT and other negotiable issues with the Soviets.

Reagan himself appeared taken aback by Carter's repeated attacks on his SALT II position and the constant

bringing up of the possibility of nuclear war.

Earlier in the campaign, Carter had been forced to apologize for some of his harsh anti-Reagan rhetoric. Tuesday night, obviously cautioned on the risks of such conduct, he stayed on the safe side of the line by offering negative characterizations of Reagan's "attitudes" and "underlying views," rather than of Reagan the man.

This tactic may have been dictated by the obvious danger of an anti-Carter backlash if he further personalized the assault. But from the perspective of the Reagan camp, it almost guaranteed that their most precious commodity — Reagan's personal credibility as a potential president — would survive the night's encounter intact.

And that is what the Reagan people were saying when it was all over — and what Reagan himself obviously felt.

The challenger was at his best in his final comments of the night. "Ask yourselves in the polls," he advised prospective voters. "Are you better off than you were four years ago? Is it easier to buy what you want? Is there more or less unemployment? Is America more or less respected in the world?"

And then he went back to what all the polls show is the prime support for his plausibility as a future presi-

dent — his record as the governor of the mini-nation called California. "My economic program will work," he said, "because we did it in California."

Carter did not destroy that proposition any more than he destroyed

Reagan's personal credibility in Tuesday night's debate. In an election as close to the grasp of the challenger as this one is, that failure may count for more than all the good the President accomplished for his cause in the debate.

Thursday, Oct. 30, 1980 Philadelphia Inquirer