

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

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

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

Series: XV: Speech Files (Robert Garrick and Bill Gavin)

Subseries: A: Bob Garrick File

Folder Title: 10/17/1980, Chicago Suburbs

Box: 435

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Inventories, visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/research-support/citation-guide>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

Last Updated: 10/10/2023

To: Bob Garrick
From: Don Adams, Ill. State Chairman
Mike J. Skhidt
(217) 525-0011
S. J. Hart
5/25/80
10/17/80

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
FRIDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1980

SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS. OCTOBER 17, 1980. Republican State Chairman Don Adams commented today that "the people of central Illinois appreciate the fact that Republican nominee Governor Ronald Reagan has included a visit to Abraham Lincoln's tomb during his campaign bus trip visit to Springfield."

"Jimmy Carter was in Springfield recently, but neglected to pay his respects," Adams continued. "Carter must have also neglected to read Abraham Lincoln's famous 'House Divided' speech. In this historic address, Lincoln warned against the very rhetoric which Carter is employing in his 'black against white, Christian against Jew' style of campaigning."

According to Jay Monaghan, in his book The Man Who Elected Lincoln, Lincoln gave the "House Divided" speech in an 1858 campaign in Springfield. Lincoln's opponent, Stephen Douglas, excoriated Lincoln's speech as the words of a "warmonger".

Reagan is scheduled to arrive at Lincoln's tomb at 1:00 p.m. Saturday, as part of a daylong bus trip through central Illinois. The bus caravan will also stop in Bloomington, McLean, Lincoln, Pawnee, Butler, and Greenville before ending in St. Louis with a riverfront political rally.

###

The Man Who Elected Lincoln

By **JAY MONAGHAN**

THE BOBBS-MERRILL COMPANY, INC.

PUBLISHERS

INDIANAPOLIS - NEW YORK

Copyright 1956

Printed in the United States of America

OLN

hilarious crowd waved banners and exploded fireworks. In the evening Douglas spoke from the balcony of the Tremont House. He extolled the advantages of local self-government—popular sovereignty—as the solution to the slave controversy and excoriated Lincoln's "house divided" speech as the words of a warmonger.

Next day the *Press and Tribune* devoted three and a half columns on page one to Douglas' speech—wider coverage than was given by the Democratic papers. The paper also described the crowd, the processions, bands, runaway buggies, and all the attendant excitement. Here was a new kind of journalism—giving the devil his due. An extra edition was advertised for distribution downstate. Farmers in isolated villages now read all about the meeting, felt that they had been a part of the crowd, and became vitally interested in the campaign. An editorial added slyly: "The Hon. A. Lincoln will reply to Senator Douglas this evening. His speech will be a masterly dissection and exposure of the many sophistries and misrepresentations crowded into that of Judge Douglas. Let everybody turn out to hear him."

Lincoln did dissect Douglas' speech unmistakably. He pointed out that all the alleged blessings of popular sovereignty had been wiped out by the Dred Scott decision, which nationalized slavery regardless of the opinions of local groups. He said that if the "house divided" doctrine precipitated a war, it would be brought on by the South, and the theory that the United States must be all slave or all free was not a plank of the Republican platform, but merely a personal prophecy of his own.

Charles Ray devoted four columns on page one to Lincoln's speech. Once again he described the crowd and admitted that it was smaller than Douglas had drawn. He called special attention to the German Club of the Seventh Ward, which had marched to the meeting. Let foreigners note this and forget

the oft-repeated publicanism.

For rural were printed weekly editing clock on the leisure. "Co "would she points."

Lincoln at days. Douglas special train ty." A twelve arrival in each Judd, and R was considered hopelessly p in the center low Douglas to the remark for a reply print his spe

This plan 1858, but it of the crowd people were Douglas, in fensive and managers so must devise with Doug crowds, then him. Charles sibility of a j

Sound the loud timbrel o'er Egypt's dark sea.
Jehovah has triumphed; His people are free.

Honore White closed the dispatch with, "Mr. Lincoln, as I close this letter, is addressing an immense audience." Lincoln's address did not come through until the next day. Then a copy, carefully edited by Lincoln himself, was released for publication. Conservatives who feared Lincoln too radical on the slavery issue read:

A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved—I do not expect the house to fall—but I do expect it will cease to be divided. It will become all one thing, or all the other.

Did this mean that the Republican Party had shifted its position from opposing the extension of slavery to seeking its abolition in the slave states? Lincoln was careful to say no. The Republicans did not demand abolition in the South, but the Democrats were insisting on extending slavery into the North. To prove this, he summed up the recent Democratic acts: Stephen A. Douglas' Nebraska Bill, the arbitrary orders of Franklin Pierce and James Buchanan, the violation of all democratic processes to force slavery on Kansas, and Roger Taney's decision in the Dred Scott case. Then, to fix the pattern of the slave-power's aggression in the popular mind, Lincoln declared:

When we see a lot of framed timbers, different portions of which we know have been gotten out at different times and places and by different workmen—Stephen, Franklin, Roger and James, for instance—and when we see these timbers joined together, and see they exactly make the frame of a house or a mill, all the tenons and mortices exactly fitting, and all the lengths and proportions of the different pieces exactly adapted

to their respective places, and not a piece too many or too few—not omitting even scaffolding—or, if a single piece be lacking, we can see the place in the frame exactly fitted and prepared to yet bring such piece in—in *such* a case, we find it impossible to not *believe* that Stephen and Franklin and Roger and James all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked upon a common *plan* or *draft* drawn up before the first lick was struck.

Ray pondered Lincoln's address with some misgivings, but with admiration too. Lincoln had cleverly put Douglas on the defensive. He must not be allowed to run for Congress but must, instead, be set up as a whipping boy for Lincoln. The Little Giant, with his national reputation, would thus be forced against his will to carry Lincoln's light before the world. A series of joint debates between them would serve the press adequately and Charles Ray, reporting for the *Tribune*, would see to it that Lincoln received his due. Ray's first move was to force Douglas to participate in such a debate or leave himself vulnerable to the taunts of enemies who could say, with reason, that he feared Lincoln's logic. Only one possible obstacle stood in the way: the *Tribune* might not survive. Ray and Medill discussed their pending obligations. Then they worked out a plan which saved the paper's life—and made Abraham Lincoln.

TO: Jim Brady, Marty Anderson, Ken Khachigian, Lyn Nofziger, Mike Deaver

FROM: Bob Garrick

RR CHICAGO GERMAN NEIGHBORHOOD 10/17

JMc 10/16 1430

*Send
16 Oct
1640
ETA*

Guten Tag., meine Freunde! (GOOT'N TAHG , MYNA FROYNDA)

I'm really pleased to have the chance to come here to Lincoln Square, to meet the people of Chicago, and to sample some of your fine German delicatessen food.

I really enjoy neighborhood visits - frankly, I enjoy them more than campaign dinners in hotel ballrooms. For here on Lincoln Avenue, and in Wooster Square in New Haven and in the MexicanAmerican community of East Los Angeles, you can feel the pulse and the heartbeat of America. We come from many ancestries. Here I see Germans, Greeks, and Serbs, but there are scores of other nationalities right here in Chicago - all come together in neighborhoods like this to make our America what it is.

That's why I feel so strongly about the need to preserve strong neighborhoods. For millions of urban residents the neighborhood is far more than just the location of their home or apartment.

The neighborhood scale is a human scale - a place where a real spirit of community can develop. This is a place where you can have and cherish your roots. It is a place where families can live together with their retired parents and bridge the gap of generations.

It is on this scale that the people of our cities have their familiar institutions - the neighborhood merchant and the Chamber of Commerce, the church or synagogue, the deli, the corner pub, the street festival, the Fourth of July celebration.

NOTE: McCLAUGHRY WILL BRING FACT SHEETS ETC FRIDAY, JOINING TOUR IN NEW YORK.

Here, at the neighborhood level, you have an arena for civic action, and for creative self-help. In city after city across this country, I have seen people working together in their neighborhoods to make them better in a hundred ways.

I've seen block watch programs, where people report suspicious activities to the police. I've seen housing rehab and community gardens and some homemade energy technology. I've seen day care centers and tool libraries and community development corporations and merchants associations. I've seen the wonderful work so many of our churches are doing in meeting both the social and the spiritual needs of their congregations.

This is the real strength of urban America - its people working together in the neighborhoods where they live. BUT that strength is in jeopardy today. For we have, year by year, transferred responsibility and resources away from neighborhood people to government - City Hall, Springfield and Washington.

And what happens? Well, first of all a lot of bureaucrats have to be paid with the money taken from your pockets. Then they design programs that are supposed to benefit your community. The programs may be something none of you really want - but the only way you can get your own money back is to accept what the governments hands out.

Take the Community Development Block Grant program. Next year it will take almost \$4 billion of your tax dollars. Washington gives those dollars - minus a hefty handling charge - back to City Hall. Then City Hall decides how to spend it. It is usually spent in ways that please City Hall and comply with Federal regulations. Whether it is spent in a way that produces something of value here in Lincoln Square or in the many other neighborhoods of our cities is a good question.

Now I have long believed that problems should be solved by the people most directly concerned - not by vast impersonal bureaucracies many miles away. Who knows best about the problems and needs of Lincoln Square? City Hall? HUD? I doubt it. I think you know better right here. And I'd like to see community development proceed under your control - after all, it's your money that's paying for it, and you ought to get what you want, not what somebody else thinks is good for you.

When I'm President, I'm going to try an experiment. I'm going to ask my Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to do something a little unusual with a little bit of that \$3.8 billion community development budget.

I'm going to work with some city government to distribute some of those funds not to City Hall, and not to organizations favored by City Hall, but directly to every citizen of a neighborhood. Each citizen would get a voucher. It would say, "for example, "Fifteen dollars of your money plus this voucher will produce \$100 for the neighborhood improvement project of your choice." The citizen could choose from among dozens of neighborhood projects - some run by the city government, others run by churches or fraternal societies, others by a wide variety of block clubs and other improvement groups.

Now that is really returning power to the people - it's giving them, not the bureaucrats, the money and letting them, not the bureaucrats and the politicians, decide how that money should be spent. For after all, whose money is it? It's your money, and I'm convinced you can do more for your own neighborhood with it than Washington can!

There will be some - perhaps here in Chicago - who will say that giving power back to the people is a wrong idea. They may say that neighborhood people lack the big picture, that they will squander the money on projects of little value. They may say that only through City government or through ~~State~~ government or through the federal government can your tax dollars be wisely spent.

Well, I think they're wrong. And when you look at the ridiculous things that the bureaucrats have spent your tax dollars on - and when you look at all the times that neighborhoods have been overrun by federally funded urban renewal or freeways or other projects that destroy homes and businesses and places of worship and the rich and varied culture of our communities - you will realize, I think, that the people themselves could hardly have done any worse. And I'm convinced that you would do a lot better. Because you'll use the money the way you want it spent - for your benefit, for your family's benefit, for your neighbors' benefit. And then you'll make sure that it is used that way because you live here in the neighborhood and you know what works and what doesn't, and who you can trust to do the job, and who you can't trust because they owe their allegiance not to you but to the politicians downtown or the bureaucrats in Washington.

That's the kind of creative new approach I'm going to launch when I become your President. I don't want to be President so I can boss an army of bureaucrats who want to run your life. I want to be President so I can reverse the progress of power to Washington, and unleash the power of progress in Lincoln Square and in every neighborhood and town across this great land of ours.

TO: Jim Brady, Marty Anderson, Ken Khachigian, Lyn Nofziger, Mike Deaver
FROM: Bob Garrick

RR INSERT CHICAGO SUBURBS 10/17 JMc 10/15 2200 #1

0841
1000
Jo
Det'd 10/16, 8:30am
313-336-3460
Bill Hart

Education is a major concern of Americans everywhere.

It was a major concern of Californians when I served as Governor, because California has the most extensive higher education system of any state in the nation. We have a top flight university system, a far flung state college system, and a community college system that even then totalled 94 campuses the length and breadth of the state.

I might add that higher education for me was almost an impossible dream. During high school I worked summers for \$15 a week as a lifeguard, and, believe it or not, put money in the bank to pay for my college expenses. But it wasn't enough. My college gave me a half-scholarship, and I got a job washing dishes to make the rest of my expenses. Having a college education was darned important to me. It was worth sacrificing for. And when I graduated, I guess it was the greatest honor of my life.

When I became Governor, then, I had a long and active interest in higher education, and I set about to do what I could to improve our California higher education system so that every kid coming along would have a decent chance to get a college education.

The first thing I found out was that education was such a desired commodity in California that people didn't pay much attention to how much the taxpayers paid to support it. As a result, the administration of the state's higher education systems had gotten pretty sloppy. The schools didn't make a

serious effort, in many cases, to get the most out of their resources. The legislature didn't ask them to justify their budget requests with the same degree of care and detail as many other state spending programs.

In my first budget message, I served notice that we could get a lot more out of the education dollar if we ran a tighter ship. That wasn't just a way to save money. It was a way to make tax dollars go further - to help more young people get the education they hoped for.

Once we were able to get the new spirit of efficiency and sound management established, my administration gave strong support to all branches of the higher education system.

Aid to the universities rose 105% over my eight years, while enrollment rose only 43%.

Aid to the colleges increased 163%, while enrollment increased 78%.

The community college system, which was closest to home for many young Californians and offered the most flexible study programs, got an increase of 323%, while enrollment went up by 83%.

Of course there is some inflation in those cost figures over eight years, but I think it can be said that the spending to enrollment ratio increased for all branches of the system during my eight years as Chief Executive. I'm proud of that. I am not one for lavishing tax dollars on foolish and unproductive programs; but I am satisfied that our investment in the minds of our young people was a sound investment that has already paid

back our taxpayers in increased incomes and increased production of wealth in our businesses and farms.

One program I am particularly fond of, that worked out well, was the undergraduate teaching enrichment program. In my last year in office my staff and I had long talks with students at our university campuses. Out of those discussions came a proposal for a million dollar fund to enrich undergraduate instruction. Not only was the money well spent, but the process of involving students in making their university better was an important precedent that deserves to be tried on a wider scale.

When I first took office I was criticized for advocating higher tuition at the state colleges. What we had been doing was practically giving an excellent education away at the taxpayers expense - regardless of the circumstances of the students. I thought that was a mistake. Public funds should be focused to help the needy, the handicapped, the minority group members who have not had their full chance to achieve.

So we did raise the tuition. But at the same time we increased scholarships to needy students from just over 6,000 to more than 31,000. We increased the amount of funds spent on those scholarships from 4.7 to 43 million dollars. Many a young man or woman who thought they might never be able to complete college was benefitted by those scholar ships . And today I will wager that those young people are repaying society for that help as productive, educated men and women in all walks of life.

I learned from this and from other experiences as Governor of the nation's largest state, that it is fine to have strong opinions. In some things, where one's basic beliefs and

ideas of right and wrong are involved, one cannot with honor compromise.

But governing a large enterprise like the state of California - or the United States - is not a series of difficult philosophical or moral choices, by and large. It is a process of reasoned give and take, of balancing one worthy proposal against another, of prudent management, of reaching agreements among large groups of interested people.

I learned how to do that in Sacramento. Most of my years I had to deal with a legislature dominated by Democrats. We naturally differed on a number of things. On some things we had awful battles - for instance, they were not very keen about my desire to rebate to the taxpayers the huge surpluses our state income tax produced. They would rather have spent the money. I thought the people who produced the money might like to spend it themselves.

But on most issues, we could talk together and work together. And we did. And I think today that most fair minded California Democratic legislators who served during my Governorship would tell you - at least privately - that Ronald Reagan was a reasonable, decent, honorable, and concerned public servant. That's a reputation I'd like to take to the White House in January. The nation needs strong leadership for we are at a difficult point in our national history. But it needs leadership that knows how to work with a legislative body, a leadership that insists on prudence and practicality, a leadership that will set out bold long range goals - but which will count steady progress a victory. That's the kind of leadership I think I am equipped to provide, and with your help, I think I'll have that chance come January.