

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: Attack Memos to Meese [9/26/1980]

Box: 867

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/>

TO : ED MEESE
FROM: TONY DOLAN

September 26, 1980.

CARTER WOULD "SEND TROOPS", CONSIDER
USE OF "ATOMIC WEAPONS" AND EVEN "PREMPTIVE STRIKE."

"If I felt that the security of our own nation or the security of a nation with whom we had a binding alliance was threatened, under those circumstances, I think we would have to consider using atomic weapons." Atlanta Constitution, July 27, 1976

"Last week, Carter said in an interview with Hearst Newspapers that he would authorize a 'pre-emptive' ~~strike~~ nuclear strike only if he were convinced the security or existence of the United States were threatened."

Associated Press, July 26, 1976

"If there was a war between countries and I felt that our national security ~~was~~ interest were directly endangered, I would certainly consider sending troops."

New York Times, July 7, 1976

"An attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf region will be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States....." "....it will be repelled by use of any means necessary, including military force."

State of the Union address,

January 24, 1980

"We're beyond the time for gestures. We want our people set free." ".... the only next step available that I can see is military action."

New York Times, April 18, 1980

Editorial and Commentary

- "President Carter's 'tough' new pledge to defend American 'vital interests' in the Persian Gulf may have him shooting up in the polls again." "...But it also may have the Russians laughing up their sleeves-- again." Raymond Coffey, Chicago Tribune, February 3, 1980
- David Broder comments on Carter's decision to remain in the White House: "Since the American hostages were seized on November 4, Carter has disappeared from the campaign stage and soared in the polls. Once again, this past week, he explained to a group of out-of-town editors that 'it would be better for me' not to make partisan appearances while the Iranian and Afghanistan situations remain in flux." "...Better for him, but not necessarily better for the country. For there are real choices of policy to be debated in the Persian Gulf region-- as at home -- and the president's insulation increasingly impedes that debate. He says national unity might be preserved. But increasingly it is clear that it is Carter's interests -- not the hostages' or the country's -- that are being protected by his sequestered status." Washington Post, February 3, 1980
- Joseph Kraft comments on discrepancies in the Carter Doctrine: "Does the Carter administration know what it is doing in the Persian Gulf? That is the question that has to be asked two weeks after the president supposedly laid down a new doctrine for the area in his State of the Union address."

"On January 23, in the State of the Union message, the president engaged the deterrent. He said:"

Any attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf region will be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States of America, and such an assault will be repelled by any means necessary, including military force.

"On January 29, speaking to a group of editors, Carter conditioned U.S. deterrence on allied cooperation. He said:"

I don't think it would be accurate for me to claim that this time or in the future we expect to have enough military strength and enough military presence there to defend the region unilaterally.

Washington Post, February 5, 1980

- Senator George McGovern criticized the "Carter Doctrine" saying: "It's natural that people in the House and the Senate are going to rally around the President when he enumerates something called a doctrine,..." "...But there is no way we can successfully challenge the Red Army in places like Afghanistan and Pakistan. There's just not enough young blood in this country to fight a land war against the Soviets on their terms."

But I think it would be better for the TVA to avoid any involvement in partisan politics.

INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES

Q. In response to your State of the Union address last week, on the CIA: Do you think Congress is going to be willing to revamp their reporting roles in letting them do some work they visualize in doing?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, I think so. We obviously don't want to wipe out all restraints on the intelligence agencies. We want to be accountable not only to the Congress but to the American people. And obviously I have to have the ultimate responsibility for any violations of propriety that might be threatened by the intelligence agencies. But I think there has been an excessive requirement for reporting in the past. There's been an excessive requirement for the revelation of highly sensitive documents. And there's been an excessive restraint on what the CIA and other intelligence groups could do. But we'll be very cautious, as we evolve this new charter, not to permit any improprieties by the CIA in the future.

The Executive order that I issued after I'd been in office for about a year or so is the basis for the kind of charter principles that we personally favor. And I will be meeting, by the way, with the Intelligence Committee members tomorrow, some of them, to iron out any remaining differences of opinion between my own administration and the Congress. But I think there's a fairly good meeting of the minds already on what originally seemed to be some very sharp divisions of opinion.

U.S. POLICY IN PERSIAN GULF AREA

Q. Mr. President, in view of our having drawn the line, so to speak, in the

Middle East, can you reassure us, and I hope everyone in the Nation, that we do indeed have what it takes militarily to draw that line and to make it stick?

THE PRESIDENT. Yes, we can protect our interests there. Obviously we don't intend and never have claimed to have the ability unilaterally to defeat any threat to that region with ease. What we called for was an analysis by all those nations who are there who might be threatened. We'll cooperate with them, as they request and as they desire, to strengthen their own defense capabilities.

Secondly, we'll be coordinating our efforts with nations who are not located in the region, but who are heavily dependent, even more than we are, on an uninterrupted supply of oil from that region. Third, we'll be arousing the consciousness of the other nations in the world to condemn any threat to the peace of that region. And the last thing is that we'll be increasing both our own military capability and our own military presence in the region surrounding Southwest Asia, the Persian Gulf and the Middle East.

But I don't think it would be accurate for me to claim that at this time, or in the future, we expect to have enough military strength and enough military presence there to defend the region unilaterally, absent the kind of cooperation that I've described to you.

Q. Mr. President, we heard Mr. Aaron prior to this meeting. He spoke of the continuing challenge in the Persian Gulf area and spoke of sacrifices that the American public is going to be called on to make in the long-term future. Can you enumerate any of those sacrifices?

THE PRESIDENT. What kind of channels did you say? I couldn't quite hear you.

Q. Challenge to the American people, to the United States.

THE PRESIDENT. Oh, challenge. Well, I think the sacrifices have already been