

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: Governor Ronald Reagan
(Debate Strategy Memos)

Box: 247

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 TO: Governor Reagan
FROM: James A. Baker III
RE: Debate Strategy - Robert Teeter
DATE: September 12, 1980

Following are some fairly random thoughts on the Reagan/Anderson debate and they are based on the assumption that Carter will not make the decision at the last minute to show up.

First, I think it may be useful to think about Anderson options:

1. I think he'll take the high road and try to set his perception as a serious, thoughtful candidate who is qualified to be President. If he does this, I think he'll take only light jabs at the most at both Carter and Reagan and try to push Governor Reagan to the right, Carter to the left, and try to position himself into the middle as the moderate in the campaign. Maybe he'll try to emphasize his independence from the campaign. Maybe he'll try to emphasize his independence from the two old political parties, his intelligence, his courage to "Tell the voters the truth" and ask them to make sacrifices and hard decisions.

If he takes this road, he'll try to stick with the economic issues with some sprinkling of social concerns to show his compassion for the unemployed, poor, disadvantaged and minorities. The question in terms of issues is whether he'll want to deal with foreign policy or not. He may want to deal with it as he feels it's important that he deals with it knowledgeably but at the same time any specific things he has to say about foreign policy may well be inconsistent with his previous record and more importantly, will split the various elements of his constituency and limit his appeal.

The general theme of this approach would be that the problems are caused by the "old" answers and a tired old two-party system and he represents for the first time in 30 or 40 years new ideas and a new way of doing things.

2. Another strategy he may employ is up with a ploy to make him the clear winner over Reagan. I doubt if he would do this by attacking Reagan too hard, other than to point out some of the old very conservative positions Reagan has taken and statements he has made regarding unions ought to show his lack of compassion for the average person. He should try this to come off as being more knowledgeable, more intelligent and simply quicker on his feet than Governor Reagan. This strategy would be based on the idea that he ought to come off a clear winner over Reagan and then be able to go

Bob Teeter Memo
September 12, 1980
Page two

go to the press and the public and say that he had taken on and defeated the number one contender and he wanted a chance at the President. I don't think he'll do this because I think his number one concern is to come off not particularly as a victor over Governor Reagan but as someone who is qualified to be President.

Another strategy he could take is simply to attack Carter hard and assume that any votes he is going to get are going to be people who are deciding between Carter and Anderson and are basically Democrats and the more people he can simply pull away from Carter, the better he will do.

I also think it is important to make some assumptions about Governor Reagan. First, he goes into the debate ahead probably both in terms of popular vote and electoral vote, however, he probably has not added any voters since Labor Day and is simply holding what has been the Reagan base since summer. The marginal voters for Governor Reagan come from two categories -- largely working class, blue collar voters, many of whom are Catholics and union members in the northern states and some ticket-splitting, moderate Republicans. Concerns of these marginal voters about Reagan are:

1. He is an ideolog, too far to the right.
2. He is rash and there would be some chance of him starting a war.
3. He is simply too thin and not quite deep enough to be President.
4. Certainly to a lesser degree, that he is a Republican and might revert to old time Republican policies.

Given this background, my suggestions for the debate are:

1. Remember, as I am sure everyone has suggested, the winner or loser politically in this debate will be based on appearance, style, to some degree on press interpretation, not on substance, issue positions or debating points. The Governor's attitude toward Anderson ought to be polite, respectful of him as a serious candidate for President, possibly he should point out that he respects him for his efforts up to now for doing what he believes in but simply states that he doesn't agree with his programs and policies and that he thinks that what Anderson has proposed is exactly the things that have been tried and haven't worked in this country for the last ten or fifteen years and thinks it is unfortunate that he has moved so far to the left over

the course of his candidacy this year. Also, a good line might be that one of the things that is wrong with the old ways we have tried to solve our problems is that they have been a combination of social and economic engineering based in Washington by a group of politicians and bureaucrats. Then, to remind Anderson that in a democracy, the idea is to run things the way a majority of the people want them run and that Governor Reagan thinks it's time to try the solutions the people prefer, not those that the politicians, bureaucrats and "experts" propose. It might be a good time to go into a discussion of his citizen involvement of people in the California government.

2. The goals for Governor Reagan should be to come off in that overworked word as "Presidential", that is, he ought to be big, serious, gracious, knowledgeable, thoughtful, compassionate and never small or petty or take a cheap shot. However, he ought to disagree with Anderson in two ways -- one, simply by trying to zing him with a little humor and secondly, at least once or twice during the debate, he should state very firmly that he disagrees and thinks that Anderson is simply dead wrong with his position or whatever it is that he is saying.
3. Probably the most important thing for Reagan in the debate is to make people comfortable with him as a potential President and to show that he is a warm, friendly, compassionate human being as well as a strong, thoughtful leader. It is very important that he allay the fear of him as a hard core right winger who can't be trusted to be near the nuclear button. I think this is solved by using some humor, make sure he tries to vary the style, be serious at some points, possibly angry at others, warm and compassionate at others and funny at yet other points. Governor Reagan should dominate the general tone and nature of the debate and let Anderson look like he is the guy with the hard sell, not Governor Reagan.
4. He must come across as intelligent, knowledgeable and thoughtful. He should be prepared at least two or three times during the debate to use a series of facts, numbers or descriptions to prove his knowledgeability or thoughtfulness about an issue. This would be particularly helpful in the national security area. This may be done without taking any particular position but simply by detailing the problem or describing the situation for the audience.

5. Remember the key issue in this election is still the economy and people's concerns over inflation, fear of the recession and unemployment and their belief that the solution to this is to control federal government spending. Every time Governor Reagan gets the chance, he should stress these economic concerns and everytime he does, he should relate them to individual concerns such as the price of food, interest rates for mortgages, possibly utility rates, price of gasoline and those things that average working families are concerned with on a daily or weekly basis. I'd try and blame as many of the social problems as I could on the economy and when confronted with questions about minorities and others, revert back to the economy with the idea that there is no bigger tragedy for a family than to have the breadwinner unemployed and there's nothing better you can do for a disadvantaged or Black family than to provide them with a good or better job than they have now.

6. It is also important that Governor Reagan get into some discussion on foreign policy and national security. While there is no particular overriding issue in the press now, it is important that he make people feel comfortable as being knowledgeable and thoughtful in this area. For him to do this, he should not get into a discussion about confrontation with the Russians. Everyone is already familiar with and most agree with his views about national defense. He should make sure he doesn't say anything that will heighten those concerns of him causing an arms race or confrontation with the Russians. The foreign policy issue that appears to be as great a concern as our relations with the Russians and Chinese is how we, as a strong nation, supposedly number one in the world, are continually frustrated by and tangled up with impossible situations by apparently small, insignificant countries that most voters know nothing about, i.e. Vietnam, Cuba, Angola, Iran, etc. These situations, along with all of our domestic problems, have led to a general feeling that the "wheels are coming off" and we can't seem to get a handle on any of our problems.

There are at least two of these issues currently and while I don't think that the Governor should get into a major discussion of either one, they are of great concern and voters have suppressed them to just below the surface. The feeling seems to be of embarrassment that the President of the United States has been duped by a couple of despots from penny-ante countries, e.g., the Ayatollah and Castro. If

Bob Teeter Memo
September 12, 1980
Page five

the Governor could carefully touch on either of these concerns in a very sensitive manner, he would touch a very responsive nerve with many Americans.

In summary, the best thing Governor Reagan has always going for him is to be on television and talk directly to the voters and not be interpreted by either the other candidates or the press or even some kind of paid advertising. At this point, I don't think that many of the voters doubt that Reagan would be a stronger leader than Carter but they have some concerns and need to be made to feel more comfortable about the concerns of the average worker and family; that he is intelligent, thoughtful and knowledgeable; and he is not a hard core ideolog or at all rash.

I think the "don'ts" for this debate are relatively obvious. They are to stay out of any discussions of the politics of the campaign and try to talk strictly about problems facing the country and the whole idea of what we have tried up to now has been tried with good intentions but it just hasn't worked and what this campaign is about is that the country is now ready to change directions and try a different approach than we have tried over the past 10 or 15 years. Try to stay away from any discussion of liberalism or conservatisim or the fact that he has a more conservative or more liberal or more moderate view on some issue than someone else -- any discussion of ideology would be bad. Don't take any cheap shots, particularly at Anderson. Stay away from any of the traditional Republican/conservative cliches, particularly on government spending, balanced budgets, and that sort of thing.

MEMO TO: Governor Reagan
FROM: James A. Baker III
RE: Debate Strategy - Bryce Harlow
DATE: September 12, 1980

Being out of the stream of information and action, there is not much that I can suggest that can be really helpful. But, I do have a few notions that might be of use.

1) "The empty chair": If the President's empty chair is kept on the platform, it seems to me that neither one of the debaters needs to dwell on the President's absence - in fact, I suspect that would be overkill. Perhaps an expression of disappointment as the program began over the President's chickening-out would suffice. Ronald Reagan might congratulate the League for going ahead despite Jimmy Carter's refusal, saying that he too is disappointed, as of course the League was - but thereafter, the "empty chair" ought to shout quite adequately to the TV audience that the President is a twit.

2) Quiet mastery: Here I referred to stance - the "demeanor" for working with Anderson on this program. Seems to me that he is given, under tension, to yipping and barking like a wire-haired terrier taunting a master; if I might in that, "quiet mastery" will make him look sort of vapid. Moreover, he is strangely prone to preen very noticeably if he happens to extrude something he regards as very clever (Ronald Reagan surely noticed that in the Illinois debate). Basic point, though, is this: I think Anderson has a gift for garroting himself, given enough slack rope. So, perhaps the wise thing to do is to let him talk a lot - at least give this a try, let it go a while, and see if he doesn't overdo it. If this one doesn't work well, it can be corrected during the course of the program.

3) The ability to do: In the Presidency, having the moxie to get things done far outweighs the ability to talk. It's vice versa on Capitol Hill. My point is this: Ronald Reagan's executive experience as Governor can stand a good deal of reiteration, it seems to me, as this program evolves, because Anderson just cannot match it. Ronald Reagan did exactly that in other debates during the primaries (so did George Bush), so I guess I'm suggesting here that Ronald Reagan just stay on track on his executive experience.

4) Sliding confrontations: In legislative debates in the House of Representatives, Anderson has been tops for some years - scintillating with his forensic parries and thrusts and his verbal hyjinks. I suppose there's no chance for this to happen

Bryce Harlow Memo
September 12, 1980
Page two

in the debate format they have agreed to use, but John Anderson is exactly the wrong one to go nose-to-nose with in issue arguments. I rather believe the best thing to do would be to slide any direct confrontations and come off to the TV audience as a level-headed, steady, poised fellow who won't lose his cool under pressure or waste time on trivia.

MEMO TO: Governor Reagan
FROM: James A. Baker III
RE: Debate Strategy - "A Friend"
DATE: September 12, 1980

"A Friend" has offered the following suggestions for the debate:

1. Set a gentlemanly tone with Anderson, if possible. He is, in a way, human. Being nice to him may take the edge off his attacks. (He will attack. See below.) Furthermore, Anderson is pompous, Carter is nasty. You are the only likable man in the race. Indeed, an underestimated asset of your candidacy is that you are, and the press knows that you are, the only normal person in the race.

You can use gentlemanliness to define Anderson to his and Carter's disadvantage: "John, I'm delighted you're here. You, and your running-mate, Governor Lucey, who came to you from the Kennedy campaign, are the true representatives of the political philosophy Senator Kennedy represented in his gallant campaign. I hold a different philosophy, but those who supported Kennedy deserve a voice, and a chance to vote for their views."

2. Anderson's two major aims conflict: He wants to catch Carter by becoming the de facto Democratic candidate in key states. But he also wants to appeal to a jaded public's thirst for novelty by being an unusual combination of liberal and conservative values.
3. For example, look for him to say:

"Regarding fiscal matters, I am more conservative than you are. Talk is cheap, Governor, but your administration in California was very expensive." He will contrast California tax and spending increases with his fiscally conservative House votes.

Here are four suggested rejoinders:

- A. While you were governor of 20 million people, Anderson was just 1/435th of one house of Congress. He knows nothing about executive responsibilities.
- B. Cheerfully admit that your moderate conservatism does not mean radical hacking and slashing at government. Rather, it means reasoned restraints to slow the growth of the public sector relative to the private sector.
- C. If Anderson is such a fiscal conservative, what is he doing living in sin with Kennedy's campaign aide, Lucey.

"Friend" Memo
September 12, 1980
Page two

And what is he doing sleeping around with the likes of New York's Liberal Party?

- D. Besides, Anderson can't have it both ways. He cites (very selectively) his conservative past, and repudiates that past, wholesale, on issues like Vietnam, nuclear power, etc. His present views indicate that his past means nothing.
4. Having raised such a ruckus about debates, Anderson must debate. Besides, his big problem is credibility: Is he a heavyweight? He'll try to solve it by beating one of the big boys. You'll be the only one in Baltimore.
 5. When Anderson launched his campaign, he said that God would be the campaign manager. (Really: I'm not making this up.) More recently, God was replaced by David Garth, a media whiz. Someone who has watched Garth's New York campaigns, and who understands television, should be asked for advice: Are there distinctive styles that Garth's clients adopt? (Frank Shakespeare, or someone with the N.Y. Conservative Party, might know.)
 6. Gentlemanliness is preferable, but be ready to belt him. Remind him that he was (as I recall) an enthusiastic member of Goldwater's "Truth Squads" in 1964. Those who know Anderson best -- his colleagues in the House -- support him least. I do not think a single member supported him, even before he bolted the party.
 7. According to the chairman of New York's Liberal Party, Anderson is "to the left of Teddy Kennedy on foreign policy." He supports SALT II -- which the Democratic-controlled Senate would not ratify. He stresses arms control. Response: Unless the U.S. is seen to be willing to re-join the arms race, the Soviets have no incentive to negotiate limits.

Conclusion: About 80 percent of the voters do not want to re-elect Carter. About 80 percent know that Anderson cannot win. About 80 percent think he deserves "fair play" anyway. Treat him as gently as the circumstances permit. With or without the President present, this is a presidential debate, so above all be the most presidential man on the stage.

You would crystalize the feelings of millions of Americans if you would say, perhaps at the end of the debate:

"Friend" Memo
September 12, 1980
Page three

"Americans are desperately worried about decline abroad and disarray at home. They are right to resent the spectacle of politicians who would rather debate about debating than about the issues. Life is getting serious, and it is high time this campaign became serious. The plain truth is that there are three candidates in this race. To pretend otherwise insults the intelligence of the American people. Future debates should reflect this reality. I will debate either of these candidates again, alone or together. But I will not debate in any forum that excludes either of my two adversaries."

On the evening news, Governor, you are coming through as confident -- aggressive, yet relaxed. Don't let Carter off the hook on which he has impaled himself. Don't get into debates about debates, about this or that "round robin" that will blur the wonderfully clear issue: Carter is scared of something.

MEMO TO: Governor Reagan
FROM: James A. Baker III
RE: President Nixon's letter
DATE: September 12, 1980

We have checked the accuracy of the examples which the President uses because they are good ones which we think could be used in the debate. All are okay, except that the "\$20." which appears in the fourth line of the first paragraph on page 3 of the President's letter should read "\$12.".

MEMO TO: Governor Reagan
FROM: James A. Baker III
RE: Debate Strategy - Dwight Chapin
DATE: September 12, 1980

ROUGH IDEAS:

- 1) Governor Reagan's posture should be strictly Presidential, but that does not mean shying away from attacking hard the Carter record.
- 2) If the polls in the key states definitely show Carter's support shifts to Anderson, then the idea should be to tie Carter and Anderson together. A concept being that in the mind of the center and left-of-center Democrats, Anderson is as acceptable as Carter. Anderson will love this line of development since it is bringing voters into his camp, and he is likely to find himself agreeing with the Governor which could be a nice, subtle trap.
- 3) If the above premise has political merit, then Governor Reagan may want to refer to Carter/Anderson policies and not use Mondale's name.
- 4) Again, if the above premise is correct, on Sunday, the day of the debate, ads could run in the major newspapers with high numbers of Democratic voters. These ads could reference that tonight, John Anderson will be speaking for millions of Democrats and Independents. Ronald Reagan invites all Democrats and Independents to hear the choice - four more years of unworkable Carter/Anderson policies or Ronald Reagan's ideas of leadership.
- 5) Obviously, four or five key surrogates should witness the event and be available after the debate.
- 6) Gerry Ford should be available for NBC.
- 7) Surrogates should be available for the morning shows on Monday.
- 8) This should be kept quiet - within the headquarters. But think of a letter from Ronald Reagan to Jimmy Carter that would be delivered to the White House approximately ½ hour before broadcast of the debates. This letter should not be delivered earlier since you do not want to give time for a response. The letter would hit the key issues of the campaign -- the cancer of inflation, the depression of unemployment, and the inconsistency of foreign policy. The

Dwight Chapin memo
September 12, 1980
Page two

letter would state that Governor Reagan is talking to these topics and would ask Carter "how, when, and where do you expect to justify to the American people your request for the privilege of leading them for another four years?" The point here is that it will help Reagan, during the debates, focus on the three critical issues of the campaign and the Carter record. In addition, if managed properly, the letter and the handling of it will become a major part of the news story the next day. Carter will be very much on the defensive.

- 9) Here are a couple of lines that may be usable:
"John, tonight I see the Anderson difference. You're here and Carter's not!"
"Every working man and woman knows that if you don't show up for work, you can't keep your job. Tonight, Jimmy Carter is not on the job."

MEMORANDUM

September 12, 1980

TO: Jim Baker
FROM: Leonard Garment
RE: Debates

Washington is now filled with the most baroque speculation about the calculus of the Presidential debates. (My comments to you should have prepared you for anything). People are divided on why Jimmy Carter really didn't want to face John Anderson, or whether what he truly wanted was to scotch the debates altogether. Much of this talk pronounces on matters that no one can really know about for sure, and really doesn't help in making concrete decisions that make up a debate strategy.

What we do know is that Carter has steadfastly refused the three-man debate or any of its equitable variants. There is no reason to believe he will change his mind. Governor Reagan has agreed to debate Anderson alone; that too is settled. We must also assume, even if things don't actually work out that way, that Anderson -- no matter whose votes he's after -- will devote at least part of his pitch to attacking Reagan. The basic strategy is to get Carter votes by looking good against Reagan, the man there in the flesh. The jabs against Reagan will be augmented by skeptical questions from the floor -- on a variety of issues, but inspired by themes of suspected right-wingery and alleged flubbing and incompetence. We know finally that the whole truncated Reagan-Anderson format threatens to make both men look slightly ridiculous without the presence of the President (This was my principal concern the other day).

So the immediate issue is how to use Reagan's particular strengths to reach past these obstacles and deliver his message. It is fairly clear what the message should be. If Americans are going to be turned against Jimmy Carter by this debate exercise, it will be because they see his refusal to face Anderson as political, yes, but also cowardly and unfair. In the debate Reagan will have an opportunity to address this feeling and explain why it tells us something significantly more about Jimmy Carter than just his campaign strategy.

Jim Baker
September 12, 1980
Page 2

The Carter people are trying to convince everyone that their debate posture is simply the kind of maneuvering that every political candidate practices and that any self-respecting American would be naive not to expect. This is not true. Of course every candidate maneuvers; but there are some basic things in our politics that you must not maneuver about. Chief among them is the principle that people with a serious message to deliver to the American public and support for that message should be allowed to have their forum and their fair say. Anderson is no fringe candidate. He meets the tests, as the League of Women Voters discovered.

But Jimmy Carter has run away from their debate anyway; and in doing so he has run away from what a President should be. An American President, even when he is looking out for his own interests, has an obligation to be President of all the people, to guard the openness of our basic political processes, to take care not to manipulate the country into hearing only what he wants it to hear. Jimmy Carter, by running away, has shown that he does not feel these obligations. He has thus revealed something that goes beyond the debates; he has shown that he lacks a truly Presidential character.

If this is the key message (for the two-man debate) that I think it is, then the goal is to deliver it consistently and forcefully, but with the appropriately restrained and intelligent Presidential bearing. A corollary is that even Anderson's attacks must be answered in a manner that focuses on the Carter record; another is that even the outside questions designed to get rabid answers must get the same kind of restrained treatment. If you must talk about evolution in the schools, there is nothing to prevent you from saying that when there's a serious dispute like this in the American society, the traditional and fair thing to do is to give both sides a hearing. There's hardly a question of even the most hostile type that can't be answered in the same spirit. Such a manner would provide a welcome contrast to the performance of John Anderson, who if he behaves as in the past will be quick, intelligent and intense, but without the air of size, calm and good cheer that suggest the presence of trustworthy judgment. (By the way, someone should dig out Ronald Steel's new biography of Walter Lippman; at around page 260 there is a reference to Herbert Croly's immense enthusiasm for the spiritual promise of fascism.

Jim Baker
September 12, 1980
Page 3

This was in the late 20's and Croly, the editor of the New Republic, was one of the stalwarts of New Deal thinking. But, of course, check these details before using).

The strategy, or general "attitude", I've described, works much better, needless to say, without the physical presence of that "empty chair", which very much risks looking like a cheap trick. After all, we are talking about the Presidency and Governor Reagan can make clear that he doesn't need such scenic devices to make the rhetorical argument about Carter's no-show. The strategy should produce appreciable political benefits; it doesn't present much in the way of risks.

It does leave unanswered the question of what to do once this first debate is over. It is possible, of course, to finish with Anderson and debate no more, instead running around accusing Carter of having scotched the whole thing. The problem with this option, of course, is that it gives the President a juicy opportunity to turn the table and recover the high ground.

But if it seems at all possible, the Governor can come out of the Anderson debate announcing that now that Mr. Anderson has been given his hearing and his due, it is time for Jimmy Carter to be forced out of the Rose Garden into a debate of his own. This would permit yet another chance to work this issue for its broadest hearing.

I have not gotten into issues suggestions since they are presumably covered by other papers. My one tactical suggestion is to identify the constituencies that are particularly issues-salient and find some legitimate opportunity to talk to those concerns. Women, for example, are a Reagan problem. The Governor is not about to waffle on ERA, so he can talk as carefully and thoughtfully as possible about that other dominant "woman" issue - peace. He should talk about "unions" in terms of his own experiences and feelings, the central concern, shared by him, for jobs and family security. No constituency is more important (New York, Florida, California), potentially more available and yet subject to historical resistance than the American Jewish Community. The more he talks about their issues, the more credible he becomes. He should look for opportunities -- particularly ones outside the B'nai B'rith context like this debate -- to talk about his views on the Middle East and his long, consistent record of support of Israel.

Jim Baker
September 12, 1980
Page 4

The familiar, traditionalist issues -- flag, family, community, church -- won't hurt. But look for a "new frontier" issue for a change of pace. If you have something solid on space technology beyond the shuttle, use it. The Russians have a manned full-time station and by the turn-of-the-century will be mining the moon.

Sorry to end on such a nerve-rattling and visionary note.

Good luck.

Len

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

M E M O R A N D U M

TO : Jim Baker

FROM : Senator Domenici

SUBJECT: Advise on Probable Debate Issues for Presidential Candidates

DATE : September 9, 1980

As the Presidential debates near (if they, indeed, can be arranged) and pursuant to your meeting with the Reagan advisory group today, here is my judgment on what kinds of issues, specifically, might come up during the debates. Some of them are obvious; a few are not.

I will categorize the issues in three slots: a) those that will be brought up inevitably as a result of prior campaigning and prior statements by the candidates; b) those that will come up because individual media representatives have an interest in seeing how probable Presidents stand on issues the media representatives believe are important; and, c) those that will come up because it is in the interests of one or both of the candidates to try to raise the issue during the debate proper.

INEVITABLE ISSUES

1. (Reagan) What, in essence, is your China policy?
2. (Reagan) What do you say about your economic policy, now that it appears that the nation is climbing out of the recession and inflation is dominating the scene once again?
3. (Reagan) You have accused the President of weakening American national defense. Do you believe that America should have a superiority in defense preparedness and what is the probable cost of that superiority?
4. (Reagan) You have called the Vietnam War "a noble cause" during this campaign. What does this say about your view of American obligations in the world and about your view of the use of military force to achieve our goals? (This could develop into the Carter line of "Reagan just can't be trusted to bring peace.")

SPECIAL MEDIA INTEREST

5. (Reagan) Your tax policies would benefit both rich individuals and business more than the average working man. How can you justify this?
6. (Reagan) You have said that we should balance the budget, increase the defense budget dramatically, and cut taxes. Do you have any date as to when these can all occur and do you have any empirical data that shows that this, indeed, is a possible scenario?

7. (Reagan) As a follow to the question above, how much will you have to cut in domestic spending, and where, to achieve the three goals of more defense spending, less taxes, and a balanced budget? (This is a lead-in to the "Reagan will ruin the poor working man" argument that seems inevitable on the part of Carter).

"DEBATING POINTS" ISSUES

8. (50-50 as to whose benefit) What is your position on nuclear energy? How concerned are you about the dangers of increased reliance on nuclear energy?

9. (to Reagan's benefit) You have talked about cutting back on government regulations. Just what kinds of regulations are you talking about and how did you arrive at your cost estimates of their impact on consumers?

10. (to Carter's benefit) You have said that there is no shortage of energy in America, if we just turn private business loose to find it and develop. Just how expensive would this energy be and upon what data do you base your judgment that there is no real energy shortage?

RECOMMENDATION

I believe that you should stress the delicacy of the Reagan economic/tax/defense matrix during the meeting today. He seems most vulnerable, in a lasting and telling way, on this issue. In this regard, recall that Democratic campaigners are getting laughs from audiences in the sticks when they poke fun at Reagan's "balanced budget, tax cut, more defense spending" plank.

I believe that you should stress the need for the candidate to have very sound, objective, facts upon which to base his statements. The press is frankly skeptical and the Carter people are feeding this skepticism (if my contacts in the media are any indication).

And, the Reagan folks should view these debates from one perspective: not to win the debate as one would win a debating match, but to persuade viewers that Reagan has the intellect and the data base to be President. This seems the most important "character" vulnerability that Reagan has with many people, including the media. (Incidentally, Carter did a good job of this in his first debate with Ford in 1976--and the media picked it up).

###

September 12, 1980

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dave Gergen
FROM: Dave Stockman
RE: Anderson Debate: General Strategy and Energy Questions

I. General Strategy in Two-Way Debate with Anderson

Unless Anderson is firmly coached and disciplined, he will prove unable to resist attacking the Reagan program in a strident, condescending, and even vindictive manner.

In response, I would urge a pass-through strategy. At every appropriate opportunity, our candidate should be prepared to calmly and good naturedly fling Anderson's heated attacks right along an unbroken trajectory toward the absent Carter. In the process, Reagan looks gracious, unflappable and reassuring compared to Anderson's excessively animated persona; the Carter record is exposed again and again; and the TV audience is reminded that Carter is ducking the encounter.

Under no circumstances should Governor Reagan defend himself or his programs directly against Anderson's charges, thereby giving credence to them. Nor should he deliberately seek to undermine Anderson's candidacy or be drawn into Anderson's heated debating and rhetorical style. The outcome must be that Carter was pummeled by both debaters -- not that Anderson and Reagan got into a shouting match while the "presidential" Carter remained aloof from the fray.

The basic dynamics in the later stages of the campaign will be for Carter and Anderson to gang up on us -- since making Reagan the issue is Carter's only strategy and is the real purpose of Anderson's candidacy. The opening two-way debate provides a strategic opportunity to shift the "gang-up" dynamic toward Carter, which has to be our strategy.

The following are a few examples of how the "pass-through" might work in an issue context:

A) Anderson Attacks the Reagan Economic and Tax Program

Anderson will predictably term the tax program pie-in-the-sky, a house of mirrors, an irresponsible source of massive deficits, wildly inflationary, etc. when realism, sacrifice, and the avoidance of quick fix tax cuts are in order.

Reagan Response:

"John Anderson is right about quick fixes. We've had five economic game plans from the Carter Administration, yet everything keeps coming out worse: unemployment is higher, inflation is worse, productivity has collapsed, and our basic industries -- auto, steel, rubber -- are on the rocks. The nation can't tolerate four more years of quick fixes and revolving door game plans.

"He's also right about sacrifice. In 1980, President Carter slapped a 7 percent wage guideline on workers and then raised the federal budget by 17 percent. In my Administration, we're going to put the austerity harness where it belongs -- on the Federal spending machine.

"And I agree that balancing the budget is imperative. President Carter promised to by 1980, but his policies of low economic growth, big spending, and printing press money produced only a worsened flood of red ink.

"Correcting this mess will be tough, but with a steady, long-term economic growth program -- including systematic tax reduction, elimination of stifling regulations, firm spending control, and a sound monetary policy -- we will get Uncle Sam out of the red for the first time in two decades."

B) Anderson Attacks the Reagan Energy Program

Anderson will attack our energy program as simplistic, anti-conservation, irresponsible, and oblivious to the threat of OPEC oil blackmail.

Reagan Response:

"John, you were one of President Ford's chief energy advisers and know that nearly every one of the 'solid plans for national energy progress you helped develop were abandoned or bungled by the Carter Administration.

"President Ford's plan called for a major expansion of coal production by the early 1980's. The Carter Administration issued more than 1,000 pages of new regulations on coal mining and use, and we've been crawling along at a snails pace.

"The last Administration proposed to deregulate oil producers in order to raise domestic production and reduce imports. The Carter Administration waited three years even to start, and production in the lower 48 states has declined by 11 percent.

"You urged acceleration of safe nuclear power. Yet under the confused policies of this Administration, there has not been a new plant ordered in 21 months.

"In 1976, we set a goal of 375 million barrels by 1980 in our emergency oil stockpile. Thanks to Administration bungling and timidity, we're 75 percent behind.

"The only energy speed-up we've had in the last four years is a \$10 billion department, a half-dozen plans to tax energy consumers rather than spur producers, and energy regulations on everything -- new cars, homes, industrial power plants, and even kitchen dishwashers.

"If you want to talk about irresponsibility, it's right there -- in the Carter record.

"The fact is, the answer to shortages, high costs, and OPEC blackmail is simple -- dismantle production barriers, provide economic incentives for conservation, and develop an ample emergency oil stockpile so that we're ready in case of cutoff. In my Administration, we're not going to rest until the tough job of implementing these commonsense goals is finished."

These are only examples. The same technique could be extended to expected Anderson charges about an arms race and the threat of war (e.g. that Carter Administration policies have encouraged an arms race -- a unilateral race by the Soviet Union) and the problems of the old inner cities (e.g. get the preliminary census results -- most older cities have experienced an accelerated loss of population, jobs and fiscal status since 1975).

My impression (from long experience) is that this "pass-through" strategy would infuriate Anderson -- which would make the whole effect come off even better as the debate proceeded.

II. Questions and Answers Relating to Energy

A) The 55 mile per hour speed limit

Question: The Republican Platform urged repeal of the 55 mph speed limit and you seem to support it. But isn't that totally inconsistent with the need for national energy conservation and reduced import dependence?

Answer: OPEC Leaders won't lose any sleep regardless of whether Washington or the states control the U.S. speed limit. According to the experts, it saves two-tenths of one percent of U.S. energy consumption or four minutes per day worth of OPEC oil production.

But it is a symbol of the counterproductive "Washington knows it all" approach to the energy problem that has actually gotten us deeper in hock to OPEC since 1973. The Democrats have spent four years trying to pass laws to spread the shortage, and to manipulate American consumers with gasoline taxes, oil taxes, rationing plans, and regulations on how to build cars, houses and appliances.

But while Washington has been legislating energy controls, the American people have actually been conserving fuel at an impressive rate: gasoline consumption is down 10 percent, heating oil use was down 12 percent last winter; industry has become 15 percent more energy efficient since the embargo; and utility use of oil has dropped 36 percent from its peak level. That's the kind of commonsense conservation that I will promote and accelerate. It didn't take one Federal program to achieve these gains, and with strong economic incentives we'll achieve even more.

The speed limits that a Reagan Administration would cancel are the present bureaucratic impediments to oil and gas drilling, coal production

and the licensing of nuclear power plants. The states can handle traffic speeds on the highways. It's time that Washington start focusing on the accelerated production of domestic energy or the speed limit will drop all the way to zero.

B) The Synfuels Program

Question: President Carter has said that the new synfuels program is the centerpiece of the nation's hopes for reducing oil imports and assuring adequate supplies. You have been critical of a government run program. What will you do with the Energy Security Corporation if you are elected?

Answer: My fundamental strategy will be to encourage every kind of domestic energy production possible -- conventional sources like coal and oil; new sources like deep natural gas and solar; and new technologies like shale and coal liquification. But were not going to put all of our eggs in one basket and certainly not in one bureaucracy. The existing DOE bureaucracy has spent \$25 billion already with no results.

Nor are we going to dwell on paper plans for the new technologies of the 1990's until we've reversed the conventional production shortfalls of the 1980's.

When I hear the Carter Administration boasting about its \$88 billion taxpayer financed synfuels program I'm reminded of the cat calling the kettle black.

The present Administration has shown a vast talent for increasing Federal spending, taxes and bureaucracy, and for frustrating and retarding domestic energy production.

Its massive new synfuels slush fund won't change that one bit:*

- taxes and spending will keep going up to pay for it;
- the experts say it will add less than 1.5 percent to present production levels by 1990;
- but the Administration's policies for oil, gas, coal and nuclear will cause a loss of five times that much production in the interim.

My priorities would be different. We'll start with full throttle production of the fuels and technologies we already have: 20,000 idle coal miners will go back to work; we'll get the nuclear power industry moving again; will get the oil and gas rigs drilling in record rates in both the old areas and promising new frontiers like Alaska and off-shore.

At the same time, we will remove governmental barriers to new sources. Natural gas price controls are the biggest roadblock to household use of solar. The threat of new Federal regulations on leasing, waste disposal, air and water emissions are the major impediment to shale and coal conversion. We'll lay out sensible ground rules.

Overall, a Reagan Administration would expand domestic energy production by shrinking government involvement -- just the opposite of the Carter Administration's failed approach. Washington's proper role in synfuels is to help demonstrate new technologies -- not to saddle American industry with a new bureaucracy and the American people with still higher tax burdens.

C) Emergency Gasoline Rationing

Question: The Carter Administration, with the approval of Congress, has

*This assumes that maximum achievable synfuels production is 500,000 b/d in 1990; that the Windfall Tax will reduce oil production by 1 mb/d and that Carter policy constraints on natural gas, coal and nuclear reduce combined production by 1.5 mb/d from potential levels.

developed a standby rationing plan to be triggered in the event of a serious cut-off. It contends that the alternative would be chaos, but you have consistently opposed any type of rationing on ideological grounds. But don't we need something like this for a crisis?

Answer: Let me observe, first, that if the Carter Administration had spent as much time promoting domestic energy production as it has devoted to standby rationing plans, no-drive day proposals, factory closure plans and the like, we wouldn't be nearly so vulnerable to a cut-off.

And secondly, our first line of defense against a cut-off should not be a flood of funny money coupons, but an ample emergency oil stockpile. The latter would allow us to reduce the shortage by pumping crude oil into our refineries and fuel into our cars, homes and factories.

By contrast, gasoline rationing is a vastly inferior and less practical option. It can only spread the hardship, not alleviate it.

It would require a \$2 billion, 20,000 person bureaucracy. According to the latest DOE plan, \$40 billion dollars worth of coupons would be sent through the mails every 90 days; and since they could be legally bought and sold in order to avoid black market -- we'd end up with a vast national gambling casino for some and crushing financial hardship for others.

Rationing would not stop the long lines, either. People would have to line-up at the banks to cash them in.

It would be grossly unfair. Tickets would be distributed on the basis of how many cars you own, not how many miles you drive to work or the actual needs of your family. The experts testified that this feature would also create junkyard millionaires -- since an old jalopy would be worth \$900 annually in coupon allotments.

I just don't believe that Washington could regiment 140 million cars and trucks -- seven times more than in World War II when rationing didn't work, either -- without turning an oil cut-off disaster into a complete national nightmare.

That's why so long as the oil market permits, we must buy every barrel we can put our hands on to rapidly fill the strategic reserve. And that's why the Carter Administration's inexcusable bungling, that has left us 80 percent behind our storage goal, is an absolute national scandal.

In a Reagan Administration there will be an alternative to rationing chaos at home and diplomatic blackmail abroad. We'll get our strategic storage program out of the deep freeze and put the gasoline coupons back in the vault.

D) The Windfall Profits Tax

Question: You have advocated repeal of the windfall profits tax. But is that fair to the American consumer, and aren't the oil companies making record profits even with the tax?

Answer: Well, first let's get the label straight. It doesn't tax profits and it won't be paid by the oil companies. Its a sales tax on domestic oil production, and it is being passed through straight to the consumer -- to the tune of \$250 per family next year.

Secondly, I don't know where the Washington bureaucrats and politicians got the idea that we need more taxes on oil producers and consumers. The combined sales, severance, motor fuel, and income taxes on oil already make it second only to whiskey in the number and cost of government taxes. These will add up to nearly 30 cents per gallon this year, and more than one trillion

dollars over the next decade -- and that's before you add one penny of the windfall tax.

But I intend to reform the windfall tax because its not an energy policy at all. It's just another measure to fill Washington's revenue coffers. And \$57 billion of it is already earmarked for more welfare.

The tragedy is the experts say the tax will eliminate up to one million barrels per day by 1990. So yes, my plan is to give up some Federal revenue by exempting stripper wells, new discoveries and high cost recovery from old fields. But the increased domestic production will permit us to cut our tribute payments to OPEC by many times more.

E) Nuclear Power

Question: Opposition to nuclear power has been growing, especially since Three Mile Island. Many experts now believe its role should be reduced or eliminated. Yet the Republican platform calls for an accelerated nuclear power program. Do you think that is a wise course -- given the dangers?

Answer: Let's start by getting the record straight on nuclear plant safety. Three Mile Island proved that the safety systems and the back-up precautions do work. The reactor was brought under control. No member of the public was injured. There were no hazardous releases of radioactivity. The scientist who studied potential long range effects, could find no prospects for increased cancer incidence.

What Three Mile Island does prove is that the safety standards must be rigorously enforced, that we need better operator training and that control room indicators and procedures can be improved. I will support vigorous efforts in all of these areas.

But I absolutely reject the Democrat's platform call for a shutdown of existing nuclear reactors and moratorium on new ones. That strategy would either put our neck further into the OPEC noose or cause drastic electric power shortages at home. The alternative to nuclear power is not conservation, but deprivation and hardship. In a state like Illinois, 40 percent of the factories and jobs depend on it.

The bottom line is this: we're still using over 3 mb/d of oil and gas for electric power generation that could be used in homes, factories and cars, and could help reduce our dependence on OPEC. In my Administration, coal will fill part of that gap but nuclear power will play an indispensable supporting role.

We're not going to take our scientific advice from Ralph Nadar and Jane Fonda and we're not going to offer American workers austerity and unemployment, when the option of more energy and continued prosperity is readily available.

F) Gasoline Tax

Question: Both President Carter and Congressman Anderson have proposed major increases in the gasoline tax in order to encourage conservation. You say you support conservation but are adamantly opposed to a gas tax. Is that really consistent?

Answer: You can't make a silk purse out of a sow's ear by stitching it together with rhetoric. President Carter called his 10 cent a gallon gas tax an "import conservation fee". But it was no different than his windfall tax, crude oil tax, natural gas tax, or fuel oil tax -- just another \$10 billion revenue grab from motorists who had already been hit with a 100 percent increase in the cost of driving to work.

Let me draw a firm dividing line. Conservation occurs when people use their ingenuity to heat their homes with less energy and more insulation, or run their factory with more efficient equipment and less fuel. Conservation promotes jobs, economic growth and better living standards.

Energy taxes are just the opposite: they punish ingenuity, reduce living standards and impede jobs and growth. The Federal government never taxed anyone into greater efficiency -- just itself into a bigger slice of the wage earner's income.

A Reagan Administration will never punish the American people for the mistakes of their government. Instead, we will turn loose domestic production, promote real conservation and put the big gas tax idea to rest once and for all.

September 12, 1980

MEMORANDUM TO JIM BAKER

From: DICK MOORE

Subject: LEAGUE DEBATE, September 21

Here are my quick reactions and suggestions regarding the upcoming debate. They are not thought through and I am not sure I would hold to them after further thought or discussion. But at least they may stimulate some reaction or variations.

First, however, I am attaching a transcript of each of the three League debates in which Governor Reagan participated. Anderson also participated in two of them (Chicago and Manchester). We can assume that the journalists on the panel will have reviewed them, and I think someone on the Governor's staff should also look them over for contradictions or booby traps. In fact the Governor might find it helpful to peruse them himself with regard to Anderson's answers as well as his own.

Now here are some of my comments for what they are worth:

The Empty Chair

I don't think the Governor should come on too strong about Carter's absence, a fact which speaks for itself. I think Anderson will hit this one pretty hard. I think Governor Reagan could best make the point in his opening remarks where

he could thank the League and express his understanding of their deep disappointment that President Carter saw fit to reverse his acceptance. The women of the League went the extra mile to accommodate him, offering a number of optional approaches, etcetera. Governor Reagan shares their deep disappointment that they were prevented from bringing a full debate to the American people as they did so effectively in 1976, etcetera. (This "high road" approach to Carter's absence not only makes the point but will please the thousands of ladies of the League around the country, who have been so badly put upon.)

Attitude toward Anderson

"I don't blame you John... You didn't get us into this mess."

As I see it our purpose is not to make Anderson look bad but to use this occasion to make our case against Carter while respecting and even encouraging Anderson's status as a viable candidate entitled to be heard.

Thus the temptation to put down Anderson or to be condescending can be strong but I think it is important to resist it and treat him with respect. In terms of substance Reagan's differences with Anderson are not important; it is Reagan's differences with Carter that matter. Governor Reagan can hit these hard without demeaning Anderson simply by saying "I don't blame you John" when he is talking about the Carter inflation, unemployment and other failures of the Carter years. He can then answer any question in terms of Carter's record rather than Anderson's answer.

The Reagan Vision

The proposed panel format has a tendency to narrow the discussion by limiting it to the questions asked by the panel. It also tends to encourage an argumentative approach and even a carping approach in the case of Anderson. Nevertheless this vast TV audience offers a unique opportunity for Governor Reagan to give a positive and inspirational message which he does so well. And I strongly believe that the audience which has heard so much negative comment about Carter's failures will welcome some affirmative comments from Governor Reagan which will reflect the kind of leadership and direction he will offer America.

In short, Governor Reagan is in charge of his own answers. He should not feel constrained whenever he senses an opportunity to say some of the positive kind of things he said so effectively in his acceptance speech in Detroit.