

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: Peace Statement (2 of 3)

Box: 436

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: 10/11/2023

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

FROM: Bob Garrick

Revised
3:00 AM
10/18

Send
17 Oct
6pm EDT
garrick

Reagan Bush Committee

memorandum

10/17/70

Mr. Garrick:

Attached is the speech draft with Mr. Allen's changes made on pages 6, 7, 8, 10, 11 and 14.

The changes are indicated by lining through the original language of the draft and where additions or corrections are made, they are done in smaller type.

Inserts are indicated where necessary on the original. (Pages 7 and 14A.)

If you have any questions, please call Irene in Mr. Allen's office. 347-3243.

On Page 6 the last two paragraphs on the original were combined into one.

note
✓

Irene

We are sending to you only pages with changes on them

FROM: BOB GARRICK

OUT AT:

5:00 p.m.

*Send Root
EDT
-S. 4894*

16 October

Senator Paul Laxalt

Ambassador Anne Armstrong

Bill Casey

Ed Meese

Jim Baker

Bill Brock

Dean Burch
(For Ambassador Bush)

Peter Dailey

Mike Deaver

Drew Lewis

Lyn Nofziger

Verne Orr

Bill Timmons

Dick Wirthlin

Congressman Tom Evans

INFORMATION

Enclosed is the speech that
RR will give on the Peace
Theme. Please return your
comments immediately. This
is a limited distribution.

Richard Allen

Martin Anderson

Jim Brady

Ed Gray

Others

*Ray Bell
Bob Gray*

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

FROM: Bob Garrick

1 - DRAFT - NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

(PH/RV) (10-10-83)
Oct 10 1983
Faded to replace
313-641-5833
1405, 10/10/83
Bill Hart

Good evening.

Three months ago, in accepting the nomination of my party to be its presidential candidate, I said: "Of all the objectives we seek, first and foremost is the establishment of lasting world peace."

Since I spoke those words, I have had the chance to visit with Americans like you, all across our great and beautiful country. I have brought that same message of the primacy of peace as our goal and it has been greeted by warmth and enthusiasm everywhere.

I will be forever grateful to you, my fellow citizens, for giving me this chance to share with you my beliefs on the issues that concern us most deeply.

But it hasn't all been one-sided. I have had the chance not only to talk with you but to listen to you about the course you believe our country should take. We have, in a way, been holding a national conversation together on the future of our country.

Tonight, I want to continue my part of that ongoing conversation, and offer what I believe are ways in which peace can be assured for every American family and for the world.

But before I do, I'd like to speak to you for a few moments, not as a candidate for the presidency, but as a fellow American, a

2 - DRAFT - NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

citizen, a parent--in fact, a grandparent--who shares with you the deep and abiding hope for peace.

I revere, as I know you do, the American tradition of free, open, and reasoned discussion of complex issues. Unfortunately, this great tradition has been abandoned by Mr. Carter.

Finding he cannot lead the people, he has been determined to try to scare them by innuendoes, misstatements, and distortions of my positions concerning peace.

The path to peace cannot be found in the fever swamps of emotionalism. That path must be traced, however long and laboriously, along the uplands of reason and fact and free exchange of views.

Mr. Carter is gambling that his long litany of fear will somehow influence enough voters to save him from the inevitable consequences of his own dismal record.

I think he will lose that gamble. I think the American people know--to paraphrase Franklin Roosevelt--that the only thing the cause of peace has to fear is fear itself.

Let us base our decisions about peace on the facts, on what we need to know and not on what we are told to fear.

There can be no doubt about what precisely is the major issue concerning the question of peace in this campaign.

It is whether you believe Mr. Carter's record--his words and his deeds--has placed the United States closer to or further away

3 - DRAFT - NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

from the goal of peace based on confidence in the strength of our nation.

On August 24, 1976, Candidate Jimmy Carter said: "...it is imperative that the world know that we will meet obligations and commitments to our allies and that we will keep our nation strong."

Did Mr. Carter keep his promise? That's the peace issue in 1980. Do you believe Mr. Carter has met his obligations and commitments? Do you believe he has kept our nation strong? Is your family willing to risk four more years of what he has given us? Has his desire to register and eventually draft your sons and daughters contributed to your peace of mind?

Those are clear, precise, factual questions. And they demand clear, precise, factual answers.

Whatever else history may say about my candidacy, I know that it will be recorded that I made my appeal to our best hopes instead of our worst fears, to our confidence rather than our doubts, to the facts, and not to fears and fantasies.

And these three--hope, confidence, and facts--are at the heart of my vision of peace.

I am reminded that throughout Scripture we see reference to peace-makers--those who through their actions--not just their words--take the material of this imperfect world and, with hard work and God's help, fashion from that recalcitrant material peace for the world.

4 - DRAFT - NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

I am convinced this understanding of how peace is gained--through competence and hard work and confidence and patience--must guide and inspire this nation in the years ahead.

And at the center of such peace-making is the need to restore the historic American tradition of bi-partisanship on the question of peace.

The cause of peace knows no party. The cause of peace transcends personal ambition. The cause of peace demands appeals for unity, not appeals to divisiveness.

These are truisms--but Mr. Carter has forgotten--or chosen to ignore--them.

Senator Kennedy was correct when he said earlier this year, in reference to Mr. Carter, that "no President should be reelected because he happened to be standing there when his foreign policy collapsed around him."

What Mr. Carter has created is a highly partisan foreign policy that demands that his Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense become political partisans rather than representatives of the entire nation. This partisanship does not just separate Republicans and Democrats; it is so partisan that it divides even Democrats. The great tradition of the Democrat party, as the Republican, has been one of bipartisanship in foreign policy. Mr.

5 - DRAFT - NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

Carter has broken with that tradition and is unable to muster full support for his policies among members of his own party.

I do not believe this administration's defense policies reflect the thinking of millions of rank-and-file Democrat party members. The Carter administration, dominated as it is by the McGovernite wing of the party, has broken sharply with the views and policies of Harry Truman, John Kennedy, and many contemporary party leaders.

A great American tradition of bipartisanship--where domestic political differences end at the water's edge--has been lost at a time when we are faced with growing instability and crisis abroad. I believe the bipartisan tradition is too deep and sound to be destroyed by one man in the space of four years, but damage has been done and it will take a determined effort to repair it.

I pledge, if elected President, to take the steps necessary to restore the bipartisan tradition in American national security and foreign policy. I pledge to work with congressional leaders of both parties to design and conduct a truly bipartisan foreign policy. I pledge to consult immediately with those of the Democrat party who have supported the concept of bipartisanship. And, I intend to have this bipartisan spirit reflected during my presidency in key foreign and defense policy appointive positions.

In the next few minutes I would like to outline for you nine specific steps that I will take to put America on a sound, secure

6 - DRAFT - NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

footing in the international arena. Working closely with the Congress, I propose to accomplish these steps with the support of an informed American public. Here are the steps:

- An improved policy-making structure;
- a realistic arms control policy;
- strengthening the quality of our armed services;
- combatting international terrorism;
- assisting African and ^{other less} ~~Third World~~ / ^{ed} development; ^{countries}
- a realistic policy toward our own Hemisphere;
- a plan to send our message abroad;
- restoration of a margin of safety in our defense planning;
- and a clear approach to East-West relations.

Reorganizing the Policy-making Structure

The present administration seems unable to speak with one voice in foreign policy. This must change. My administration will restore leadership to U.S. foreign policy by organizing it in a more ^{coherent} ~~logical~~ way.

In my administration, an early priority will be to make structural changes in the foreign policy-making machinery so that the Secretary of State will be the President's principal spokesman and adviser. It does not serve our national interest to tolerate a situation in which the National Security Adviser and the Secretary of State are at cross purposes on crucial issues.

7 - DRAFT - NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

In my administration the National Security Council will once again become the coordinator of the policy process. Its mission will be to assure that the President receives an orderly, balanced flow of information and ^{recommendations} analysis. The National Security Adviser will work closely in teamwork with the Secretary of State and the other members of the Council.

My goal also will be to build and utilize ^{our} a diplomatic corps ^{enhancing} with language proficiency, ~~organizational~~ and professional skills. I will do everything I can to ensure the safety of our representatives on duty overseas. It is not just an obligation to our people, it is a matter of national honor ~~so we can restore our pride in our foreign policy establishment.~~ that our diplomats must not be insulted, taken hostage or attacked while abroad. A Realistic Arms Control Policy (See 7A attached)

As the next requirement for a program for peace, I would assign a high priority to arms control. To succeed at arms control, we must first be honest with ourselves, so that we can be convincing with the Soviets.

We must honestly face the facts of the arms competition we are caught in. And, we must have a view of the world that is consistent with these facts and that does not change to suit different audiences. The Carter administration told Congress that the Soviet Union has long been investing about three times as much as we have in strategic arms and is expected to continue doing so, with or without SALT--the Strategic Arms Limitation Agreement. Yet, those who say that the administration's SALT treaty is not good enough are accused of wanting an "arms race."

Realistic
An Honest Arms Control Policy

As the next requirement in my program for peace, I would want a fresh approach to arms control. Let me explain to you how my views on arms control differ from those of Jimmy Carter.

o ^{Mr.} Jimmy Carter's SALT treaty lets the Soviets add three nuclear warheads each day. Even the official estimates of the Carter Administration concede that, with or without this treaty, the Soviets will invest about three times as much in strategic arms as the United States.

o ^{Mr.} Jimmy Carter wants a new SALT treaty that is not verifiable. Yet, over the past few months, evidence has come to light that the Soviets have been violating existing arms agreements on nuclear testing, biological weapons, poison gas, as well as SALT. Does Jimmy Carter now want us to trust the Soviets to abide by limitations we can't even verify?

o Mr. Carter's new SALT treaty would give the Soviets important and explicit advantages which would make our next step in SALT more difficult ^{by requiring us to make dangerous compromises which would affect our security.} and dangerous.

o Mr. Carter tried to sell this treaty to the Senate last year. Yet, even before the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, and despite its Democratic majority, the United States Senate would ^{approve} not buy it. Evidently, the arguments of the Carter Administration ^{could persuade} did not deceive the Senate. Is ^{Mr.} Jimmy Carter now trying to deceive the American public?

The Carter Administration argues that without this treaty, the Soviet nuclear buildup would be even worse. That's like saying we have to be grateful that the present rate of inflation isn't even higher.

If elected, I will bend every effort to get an agreement that puts an end to this one-sided arms race and leads to genuine arms reductions.

The way to avoid an arms race is not simply to let the Soviets race ahead. We need to create the incentives for the Soviet leaders to halt their buildup.

8 - DRAFT - NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

Mr. Carter never mustered the necessary votes there to pass his SALT treaty in the U.S. Senate, controlled by a Democrat majority, even before the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan. The Senate Armed Forces Committee, also controlled by a Democrat majority, after lengthy hearings, rejected the treaty as not being in the security interests of the United States. The Foreign Relations Committee-- yes, controlled by a Democrat majority--in a narrow vote, came out for the treaty, but only after more than 20 important changes had been made. Could members of his own party be trying to tell Mr. Carter something is flawed in his approach to arms limitation? It would appear so.

The way to avoid an arms race is not simply to let the Soviets race ahead. We need to remove their incentive to race ahead by making it clear to them that we can and will compete if need be, at the same time we tell them that we prefer to halt this competition and reduce the nuclear arsenals.

Restoring the Quality of our Armed Forces

Restoring a sense of pride in their careers for the men and women in our armed services is another important element of my program for peace. We must direct our attention to the urgent manpower needs of our services. In defense matters we hear much about hardware and not enough about hard work. The most important part of our military strength is the people involved--their quality, their training and their welfare. We must do all in our power to make sure they are well-trained and well-equipped, that

they feel proud and secure in their jobs and that their economic sacrifice is not out of proportion to what we ask of them. The economic policies of the Carter administration have made life especially difficult for our men and women in uniform and for their families.

I believe we can reverse this situation. My administration will implement a program of compensation and benefits for military personnel that is comparable to what is available in the private sector. I will ask Congress to reinstate the G.I. Bill, a program which was directly responsible for the most rapid advance ever in the educational level of our population. Our country must provide our service personnel and their families with the incentives and quality of life to compensate for the sacrifices they make on our behalf.

Combatting International Terrorism

Let us turn now to the need for the United States to assume a leadership role in curbing the spread of international terrorism. In sharing the outrage against terrorism, I will direct the resources of my administration against this scourge of civilization and toward expansion of our cooperation with other nations in combatting terrorism in its many forms.

Terrorists seek to undermine, paralyze and, finally, destroy democratic governments. Israel has long been the victim of the most wanton acts of terrorism. Our allies in Europe and elsewhere have experienced terrorism with increasing frequency.

Terrorist organizations have enjoyed the support--though generally covert--of the Soviet Union. In Iran, terrorism has been elevated to the level of national policy in the assault on the U.S. embassy and the year-long captivity of our fellow-citizens. The tactics and philosophy of the Palestine Liberation Organization are based on terrorism, too.

The United States must provide the leadership to forge an international consensus that firmness and refusal to concede or to pay ransom are ultimately the only effective deterrents to terrorism.

A Policy to Assist African and ^{Other Developing Countries} Third World Development

Our relationship with what is often called the ^{developing countries} "Third World" forms an important part of my program for peace. I see little gain, however, from lumping all these proud and different nations together, only to let ourselves be maneuvered into needless confrontations with the so-called "Third World". To ^{deal with these} ~~lump the~~ diverse nations ~~of that~~ "Third World" ^{had} together, as if they were identical ^{aspirations and problems} ~~to one another~~, not only belies the facts, it also plays into the hands of Fidel Castro and sundry other dictators who seek to appoint themselves as spokesmen for the "Third World" and want to vilify the United States largely for the purpose of concealing the dismal failures of their own policies at home.

A strong American economy and the spirit of our free enterprise system have a great deal to offer the poorer, less developed nations of the world. Africans, for example, look to us

and our industrial allies for the dominant share of their export markets, for their investment capital; for official aid and for technical know-how. If the nations of Africa and we are to work together in advancing our mutual interests, we must recognize the role our economy and our industrial and agricultural know-how must contribute to play in the relationships. Yet, the flow of American investment to Africa continues at only a trickle, and our export promotion has been neglected.

My administration will recognize that investment from the --especially the minority and small business sector -- can be private sector ~~is~~ the key to African development. In addition to growing economic interests, America has historic ties with this continent to which black Americans trace their heritage.

Clearly, we cannot cause other nations to grow by economic assistance alone. We must offer know-how, technology and marketing assistance, and I will support policies which support these goals.

A Realistic Policy for The Western Hemisphere

No area of the world should have a higher priority than the place where we live, the Western Hemisphere. My administration will forge a new, more realistic policy toward our own Hemisphere as an integral part of my program for peace.

In four short years, Mr. Carter's administration has managed to alienate our friends in the Hemisphere, to encourage the destabilization of governments, and to permit Cuban and Soviet influence to grow.

12 - DRAFT - NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

We must take steps to change the Carter administration's sorry record of vacillation, alienation, and neglect in the region.

I pledge that our policies towards our neighbors will be changed in the following ways:

--Our relations will be solidly based on shared economic and security interests, not upon mutual recrimination and insult.

--We shall initiate a program of intensive economic development with cooperating countries in the Caribbean, including a Western Hemisphere Venture Capital Corporation to promote the growth and development of the private sector in the Americas.

--Closer to home, I have spoken before of my belief that we should work toward a North American Accord with our immediate neighbors, Mexico and Canada. This would take the form of broadened, more open lines of communication between us to seek ways in which we can strengthen our traditional friendship. If Canada and Mexico are stronger our entire Hemisphere benefits.

Other than strengthening our own nation, there is no task of greater importance than the security and prosperity of the entire Western Hemisphere.

Sending the American Message

I have referred to the need to tell the American story of freedom and enterprise. Proclaiming the American message is a vital part of step in the program for peace. This message must be

sent around the world in our information programs, through our diplomacy and by the words and convictions of the President.

I would strengthen the Voice of America and other radio broadcasting programs. I would put men and women in charge of our worldwide information efforts who believe in promoting American principles of democracy, freedom, and justice. Compared with other costs of our national security, the dollar amounts involved in this are small. What is needed most is a sense of conviction, the conviction that by carrying the American message abroad we strengthen the foundations for peace.

Mr. Carter's administration, instead of strengthening and expanding our overseas broadcast and information programs, has permitted these vital efforts to decline.

During the turmoil in Iran, for instance, the United States was unable to broadcast to the Iranian people in their own language, yet all the while Soviet-sponsored broadcasts were stirring up hatred toward America throughout the Islamic world.

For our long-term strategy, the cause and promotion of liberty and the cause and promotion of peace are inseparable. If we remain proud of our basic principles, defend them against the propaganda attacks of totalitarians, and communicate them worldwide, we will not only promote justice and liberty, we will also promote world peace.

Restoring Our Margin of Safety for Peace

An important

~~The final~~ step--~~but~~ perhaps the most important of all--in a systematic program for peace is to restore the "margin of safety for peace" in our defense program by working closely with the Congress on a long-term program designed to meet our needs throughout this critical decade.

We must ask ourselves, are we better off today, in 1980? Are we more secure in the world than we were just four years ago? The answer, of course, is "no."

President Ford, on leaving office, left a long-range defense program designed to keep America strong throughout the 80s. But, in its haste to make good on a reckless campaign promise to cut defense spending by billions of dollars, the Carter administration insisted on a policy of systematic concessions in defense and in arms control negotiations. As a result, today we are in the position of having neither the margin of safety we need nor a SALT treaty. ~~a Senate controlled by members of Mr. Carter's own party~~

My task as President will be to fix what is wrong with our defenses and to lead our allies in a sustained and prudent effort to keep us, them and the entire world secure from confrontation. The preservation of peace will require the best resources we can marshal in this precarious decade. I am convinced we can marshal them by reaffirming our national purpose, by reasserting our will and determination, and by regaining our economic vitality.

14A

Relations with Friends and Adversaries

While these eight steps are important in themselves, we must address yet another, this one of overarching importance to all we do: The conduct of our relations with our Allies, with the Soviet Union and with China.

That confidence and trust in the United States has fallen to an all-time low is an established fact. This must be reversed. The United States has an important leadership role, and this role can be effective only if our alliances are cemented by unity of purpose and mutual respect.

For the decade of the 1980s, our Alliance relationships should be as those among equal partners. This requires frequent and searching consultation with our Allies, and it means that our leadership role will be restored only under these changed circumstances.

World-wide, our Allies are stronger, most are even robust and healthy. But the challenge of the 1980s is to assemble that strength in a manner which allows us to pursue the objective of peace together, in lock-step. If we cannot proceed together, we invite dissension and division. If our alliances are divided, only our adversaries can benefit.

With our Allies, we can conduct a realistic and balanced policy toward the Soviet Union. I am convinced that the careful management of our relationship with the Soviet Union depends on a principled, consistent American Foreign policy. We seek neither confrontation nor conflict, but to avoid either we must remain strong and determined to protect our interests.

14-A- (Insert)

Relations with Allies and Adversaries

To these eight steps we must add another effort, perhaps the most important one, to strengthen the foundations of peace. We have to work with our allies to create the conditions for a new relationship with the Soviet Union -- a more stable and peaceful relationship.

With our Allies we need to practice frequent and honest consultation. We must ^{cuss} dismiss common policies beforehand, and once we are agreed, the United States must keep its word. It is part of the greatness of our country that we belong to a larger community of free and independent nations. If we reestablish truthst and leadership in this community, we gain ^{immeasurably} ~~immemorably~~, not only in security and economic strength, but also in moral strength. And together with our allies we can best establish a solid and expanding relationship with China.

What is it that we want of our relationship with the Soviet Union? We have to find a third road between the cheerless prospect of a never-ending accumulation of armaments, and the illusion of faulty arms control agreements that serve merely as a cover-up for a one-sided Soviet buildup. We have to recognize that ^{the forces of freedom are} evolutionary change is on our side, provided we ^{recognize and maintain our strength,} support the dynamic forces that work for us. Our sources of strength are spiritual; our military power is merely a shield, it is never meant for offensive purposes.

The Soviet regime would like to be seen as the wave of the future; in fact, it is the ebb of the past. It reflects a more primitive stage in history: compulsion in place of free initiative, coercion in place of law, militarism in place of trade, empire building in place of self-determination. ~~This system is certain, in time, to wither. While we maintain our defensive margin of safety, we must create a world environment in which this obsolete system shrinks and wanes from its own internal contradictions.~~

~~REF ID: A66222~~

IF THE SOVIET LEADERSHIP WISHES PEACE, IT CAN HAVE IT BY TAKING STEPS TO REDUCE TENSION IN THE WORLD. IF IT IS GENUINE PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE WITH US AND WITH OTHER NATIONS THAT THEY TRULY WANT, THEY CAN HAVE IT BY REDUCING THEIR CONSTANT DRIVE TO EXPAND AND TO DOMINATE.

AS PRESIDENT, I WILL STAND READY TO NEGOTIATE WITH THE SOVIET UNION ON A WIDE RANGE OF TOPICS DESIGNED TO ENHANCE PEACE, INCLUDING, OF COURSE, NEGOTIATIONS ON BALANCED AND VERIFIABLE ARMS LIMITATION AGREEMENTS. BUT WE MUST NOT LET OUR DESIRE FOR PEACE LEAD US TO ACCEPT A POLICY OF UNREMITTING HOSTILITY TOWARD OUR COUNTRY; OUR RELATIONSHIP IS, AND WILL REMAIN, A TWO-WAY STREET, WITH NEITHER SIDE SEEKING TO BENEFIT AT THE EXPENSE OF THE OTHER.

OUR RELATIONSHIP WITH CHINA IS IN ITS BEGINNING STAGES. IT IS ONE THAT CAN AND WILL GROW, AND I REPEAT MY INTENTION TO ASSIST ITS RAPID GROWTH. THERE IS AN HISTORIC BOND OF FRIENDSHIP BETWEEN THE AMERICAN AND CHINESE PEOPLES, AND I WOULD WORK TO AMPLIFY IT WHEREVER POSSIBLE. EXPANDED TRADE, CULTURAL CONTACT AND OTHER ARRANGEMENTS WILL ALL SERVE THE CAUSE OF PRESERVING AND EXTENDING THE TIES BETWEEN OUR TWO COUNTRIES.

We can indeed make peace. We can have the peace we want for ourselves and for our children. We are going to have to work hard and think hard and act with competence and with confidence--but it can be done.

And, as we work, we will have to be inspired by the vision of what our country means to us and to the world.

In recent weeks, I have had that vision of our nation's meaning brought to my attention in a very personal way.

The home in which I am now living in the Virginia countryside once was owned by John F. Kennedy. And a relatively short distance away is the home of another great American President, Thomas Jefferson.

Two great Presidents--divided by time but united in spirit--Kennedy and Jefferson, have, in essence, helped us to define what it is to be an American.

It strikes me that among their many accomplishments, both men left us a legacy of a deep commitment to peace.

In his first Inaugural Address, Jefferson spoke of "the preservation of the general government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet-anchor of our peace at home and our safety abroad." He knew that peace in the world depended on the strength of our nation in its "whole constitutional vigor."

And, one hundred sixty years later, John F. Kennedy in his Inaugural Address, called to "begin anew the quest for

peace"--reminded us that peace must be built by each generation in its own way, out of its own special needs and special gifts.

Jefferson and Kennedy loved America and the cause of peace too much ever to give in or appeal to fear and doubt. It is that same love that has inspired my campaign for peace and, with God's help and yours, will continue to guide our quest for a just, lasting peace during my presidency.

MASTER

FROM: BOB GARRICK
OUT AT: 5:00 p.m.

16 October

- ? ✓ Senator Paul Laxalt
- ✓ Ambassador Anne Armstrong
- ✓ Bill Casey
- ✓ Ed Meese
- ✓ Jim Baker
- Bill Brock
- ✓ Dean Burch
(For Ambassador Bush)
- ✓ Peter Dailey
- Mike Deaver
- Drew Lewis
- Lyn Nofziger
- Verne Orr
- ✓ Bill Timmons
- ✓ Dick Wirthlin
- ✓ Congressman Tom Evans

INFORMATION

Enclosed is the speech that RR will give on the Peace Theme. Please return your comments immediately. This is a limited distribution.

-
- ✓ Richard Allen
 - Martin Anderson
 - Jim Brady
 - ✓ Ed Gray

Others

Ray Bell
→ Bob Gray
✓ Bill Gavin

→ Gary Bauer
→ STEF Halper

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

(PH/RVA/WFG)
OCT. 16, 1980

FROM: Bob Garrick

1 - DRAFT - NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

*Fwd'd to R. Place
313-941-5850
1405, 10/16
Bill Hart*

NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

Good evening.

Three months ago, in accepting the nomination of my party to be its presidential candidate, I said: "Of all the objectives we seek, first and foremost is the establishment of lasting world peace."

Since I spoke those words, I have had the chance to visit with Americans like you, all across our great and beautiful country. I have brought that same message of the primacy of peace as our goal and it has been greeted by warmth and enthusiasm everywhere.

I will be forever grateful to you, my fellow citizens, for giving me this chance to share with you my beliefs on the issues that concern us most deeply.

But it hasn't all been one-sided. I have had the chance not only to talk with you but to listen to you about the course you believe our country should take. We have, in a way, been holding a national conversation together on the future of our country.

Tonight, I want to continue my part of that ongoing conversation, and offer what I believe are ways in which peace can be assured for every American family and for the world.

But before I do, I'd like to speak to you for a few moments, not as a candidate for the presidency, but as a fellow American, a

2 - DRAFT - NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

citizen, a parent--in fact, a grandparent--who shares with you the deep and abiding hope for peace.

I revere, as I know you do, the American tradition of free, open, and reasoned discussion of complex issues. Unfortunately, this great tradition has been abandoned by Mr. Carter.

Finding he cannot lead the people, he has been determined to try to scare them by innuendoes, misstatements, and distortions of my positions concerning peace.

The path to peace cannot be found in the fever swamps of emotionalism. That path must be traced, however long and laboriously, along the uplands of reason and fact and free exchange of views.

Mr. Carter is gambling that his long litany of fear will somehow influence enough voters to save him from the inevitable consequences of his own dismal record.

I think he will lose that gamble. I think the American people know--to paraphrase Franklin Roosevelt--that the only thing the cause of peace has to fear is fear itself.

Let us base our decisions about peace on the facts, on what we need to know and not on what we are told to fear.

There can be no doubt about what precisely is the major issue concerning the question of peace in this campaign.

It is whether you believe Mr. Carter's record--his words and his deeds--has placed the United States closer to or further away

3 - DRAFT - NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

from the goal of peace based on confidence in the strength of our nation.

On August 24, 1976, Candidate Jimmy Carter said: "...it is imperative that the world know that we will meet obligations and commitments to our allies and that we will keep our nation strong."

Did Mr. Carter keep his promise? That's the peace issue in 1980. Do you believe Mr. Carter has met his obligations and commitments? Do you believe he has kept our nation strong? Is your family willing to risk four more years of what he has given us? Has his desire to register and eventually draft your sons and daughters contributed to your peace of mind?

Those are clear, precise, factual questions. And they demand clear, precise, factual answers.

Whatever else history may say about my candidacy, I know that it will be recorded that I made my appeal to our best hopes instead of our worst fears, to our confidence rather than our doubts, to the facts, and not to fears and fantasies.

And these three--hope, confidence, and facts--are at the heart of my vision of peace.

I am reminded that throughout Scripture we see reference to peace-makers--those who through their actions--not just their words--take the material of this imperfect world and, with hard work and God's help, fashion from that recalcitrant material peace for the world.

4 - DRAFT - NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

I am convinced this understanding of how peace is gained--through competence and hard work and confidence and patience--must guide and inspire this nation in the years ahead.

And at the center of such peace-making is the need to restore the historic American tradition of bi-partisanship on the question of peace.

The cause of peace knows no party. The cause of peace transcends personal ambition. The cause of peace demands appeals for unity, not appeals to divisiveness.

These are truisms--but Mr. Carter has forgotten--or chosen to ignore--them.

Senator Kennedy was correct when he said earlier this year, in reference to Mr. Carter, that "no President should be reelected because he happened to be standing there when his foreign policy collapsed around him."

What Mr. Carter has created is a highly partisan foreign policy that demands that his Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense become political partisans rather than representatives of the entire nation. This partisanship does not just separate Republicans and Democrats; it is so partisan that it divides even Democrats. The great tradition of the Democrat party, as the Republican, has been one of bipartisanship in foreign policy. Mr.

5 - DRAFT - NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

Carter has broken with that tradition and is unable to muster full support for his policies among members of his own party.

I do not believe this administration's defense policies reflect the thinking of millions of rank-and-file Democrat party members. The Carter administration, dominated as it is by the McGovernite wing of the party, has broken sharply with the views and policies of Harry Truman, John Kennedy, and many contemporary party leaders.

A great American tradition of bipartisanship--where domestic political differences end at the water's edge--has been lost at a time when we are faced with growing instability and crisis abroad. I believe the bipartisan tradition is too deep and sound to be destroyed by one man in the space of four years, but damage has been done and it will take a determined effort to repair it.

I pledge, if elected President, to take the steps necessary to restore the bipartisan tradition in American national security and foreign policy. I pledge to work with congressional leaders of both parties to design and conduct a truly bipartisan foreign policy. I pledge to consult immediately with those of the Democrat party who have supported the concept of bipartisanship. And, I intend to have this bipartisan spirit reflected during my presidency in key foreign and defense policy appointive positions.

In the next few minutes I would like to outline for you nine specific steps that I will take to put America on a sound, secure

footing in the international arena. Working closely with the Congress, I propose to accomplish these steps with the support of an informed American public. Here are the steps:

An improved policy-making structure;
a realistic arms control policy;
strengthening the quality of our armed services;
combatting international terrorism;
assisting African and Third World development;
a realistic policy toward our own Hemisphere;
a plan to send our message abroad;
restoration of a margin of safety in our defense planning;
and a clear approach to East-West relations.

Reorganizing the Policy-making Structure

The present administration seems unable to speak with one voice in foreign policy. This must change. My administration will restore leadership to U.S. foreign policy by organizing it in a more logical way.

In my administration, an early priority will be to make structural changes in the foreign policy-making machinery so that the Secretary of State will be the President's principal spokesman and adviser.

It does not serve our national interest to tolerate a situation in which the National Security Adviser and the Secretary of State are at cross purposes on crucial issues.

7 - DRAFT - NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

In my administration the National Security Council will once again become the coordinator of the policy process. Its mission will be to assure that the President receives an orderly, balanced flow of information and analysis. The National Security Adviser will work closely in teamwork, with the Secretary of State and the other members of the Council.

My goal also will be to build and utilize a diplomatic corps with language proficiency, organizational and professional skills, and to insure the safety of our representatives on duty overseas, so we can restore our pride in our foreign policy establishment.

A Realistic Arms Control Policy

As the next requirement for a program for peace, I would assign a high priority to arms control. To succeed at arms control, however, we must first be honest with ourselves so that we can be convincing with the Soviets.

We must honestly face the facts of the arms competition we are caught in. And, we must have a view of the world that is consistent with these facts and that does not change to suit different audiences. The Carter administration told Congress that the Soviet Union has long been investing about three times as much as we have in strategic arms and is expected to continue doing so, with or without SALT--the Strategic Arms Limitation Agreement. Yet, those who say that the administration's SALT treaty is not good enough are accused of wanting an "arms race."

I have repeatedly said in this campaign that I will sit down with the Russians for as long as it takes to negotiate a balanced and equitable arms limitation agreement which is designed to improve the prospects for peace.

Mr. Carter never mustered the necessary votes there to pass his SALT treaty in the U.S. Senate, controlled by a Democrat majority, even before the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan. The Senate Armed Forces Committee, also controlled by a Democrat majority, after lengthy hearings, rejected the treaty as not being in the security interests of the United States. The Foreign Relations Committee--yes, controlled by a Democrat majority--in a narrow vote, came out for the treaty, but only after more than 20 important changes had been made. Could members of his own party be trying to tell Mr. Carter something is flawed in his approach to arms limitation? It would appear so.

The way to avoid an arms race is not simply to let the Soviets race ahead. We need to remove their incentive to race ahead by making it clear to them that we can and will compete if need be, at the same time we tell them that we prefer to halt this competition and reduce the nuclear arsenals.

Restoring the Quality of our Armed Forces

Restoring a sense of pride in their careers for the men and women in our armed services is another important element of my program for peace. We must direct our attention to the urgent manpower needs of our services. In defense matters we hear much about hardware and not enough about hard work. The most important part of our military strength is the people involved--their quality, their training and their welfare. We must do all in our power to make sure they are well-trained and well-equipped, that

they feel proud and secure in their jobs and that their economic sacrifice is not out of proportion to what we ask of them. The economic policies of the Carter administration have made life especially difficult for our men and women in uniform and for their families.

I believe we can reverse this situation. My administration will implement a program of compensation and benefits for military personnel that is comparable to what is available in the private sector. I will ask Congress to reinstate the G.I. Bill, a program which was directly responsible for the most rapid advance ever in the educational level of our population. Our country must provide our service personnel and their families with the incentives and quality of life to compensate for the sacrifices they make on our behalf.

Combatting International Terrorism

Let us turn now to the need for the United States to assume a leadership role in curbing the spread of international terrorism. In sharing the outrage against terrorism, I will direct the resources of my administration against this scourge of civilization and toward expansion of our cooperation with other nations in combatting terrorism in its many forms.

Terrorists seek to undermine, paralyze and, finally, destroy democratic governments. Israel has long been the victim of the most wanton acts of terrorism. Our allies in Europe and elsewhere have experienced terrorism with increasing frequency.

Terrorist organizations have enjoyed the support--though generally covert--of the Soviet Union. In Iran, terrorism has been elevated to the level of national policy in the assault on the U.S. embassy and the year-long captivity of our fellow-citizens. The tactics and philosophy of the Palestine Liberation Organization are based on terrorism, too.

The United States must provide the leadership to forge an international consensus that firmness and refusal to concede or to pay ransom are ultimately the only effective deterrents to terrorism.

A Policy to Assist African and Third World Development

Our relationship with what is often called the "Third World" forms an important part of my program for peace. I see little gain, however, from lumping all these proud and different nations together, only to let ourselves be maneuvered into needless confrontations with the so-called Third World. To lump the diverse nations of that "Third World" together, as if they were identical to one another, not only belies the facts. It also plays into the hands of Fidel Castro and sundry other dictators who seek to appoint themselves as spokesmen for the Third World, vilifying the United States largely for the purpose of concealing the dismal failures of their own policies at home.

A strong American economy and the spirit of our free enterprise system have a great deal to offer the poorer, less developed nations of the world. Africans, for example, look to us

and our industrial allies for the dominant share of their export markets, for their investment capital; for official aid and for technical know-how. If the nations of Africa and we are to work together in advancing our mutual interests, we must recognize the role our economy and our industrial and agricultural know-how must play in the relationships. Yet, the flow of American investment to Africa continues at only a trickle, and our export promotion has been neglected.

My administration will recognize that investment from the private sector is the key to African development.

Clearly, we cannot cause other nations to grow by economic assistance alone. We must offer know-how, technology and marketing assistance, and I will support policies which support these goals.

A Realistic Policy for The Western Hemisphere

No area of the world should have a higher priority than the place where we live, the Western Hemisphere. My administration will forge a new, more realistic policy toward our own Hemisphere as an integral part of my program for peace.

In four short years, Mr. Carter's administration has managed to alienate our friends in the Hemisphere, to encourage the destabilization of governments, and to permit Cuban and Soviet influence to grow.

We must take steps to change the Carter administration's sorry record of vacillation, alienation, and neglect in the region.

I pledge that our policies towards our neighbors will be changed in the following ways:

--Our relations will be solidly based on shared economic and security interests, not upon mutual recrimination and insult.

--We shall initiate a program of intensive economic development with cooperating countries in the Caribbean, including a Western Hemisphere Venture Capital Corporation to promote the growth and development of the private sector in the Americas.

--Closer to home, I have spoken before of my belief that we should work toward a North American Accord with our immediate neighbors, Mexico and Canada. This would take the form of broadened, more open lines of communication between us to seek ways in which we can strengthen our traditional friendship. If Canada and Mexico are stronger our entire Hemisphere benefits.

Other than strengthening our own nation, there is no task of greater importance than the security and prosperity of the entire Western Hemisphere.

Sending the American Message

I have referred to the need to tell the American story of freedom and enterprise. Proclaiming the American message is a vital part of step in the program for peace. This message must be

sent around the world in our information programs, through our diplomacy and by the words and convictions of the President.

I would strengthen the Voice of America and other radio broadcasting programs. I would put men and women in charge of our worldwide information efforts who believe in promoting American principles of democracy, freedom, and justice. Compared with other costs of our national security, the dollar amounts involved in this are small. What is needed most is a sense of conviction, the conviction that by carrying the American message abroad we strengthen the foundations for peace.

Mr. Carter's administration, instead of strengthening and expanding our overseas broadcast and information programs, has permitted these vital efforts to decline.

During the turmoil in Iran, for instance, the United States was unable to broadcast to the Iranian people in their own language, yet all the while Soviet-sponsored broadcasts were stirring up hatred toward America throughout the Islamic world.

For our long-term strategy, the cause and promotion of liberty and the cause and promotion of peace are inseparable. If we remain proud of our basic principles, defend them against the propaganda attacks of totalitarians, and communicate them worldwide, we will not only promote justice and liberty, we will also promote world peace.

Restoring Our Margin of Safety for Peace

An important
The ~~final~~ step--~~but~~ perhaps the most important of all--in a systematic program for peace is to restore the "margin of safety for peace" in our defense program by working closely with the Congress on a long-term program designed to meet our needs throughout this critical decade.

We must ask ourselves, are we better off today, in 1980? Are we more secure in the world than we were just four years ago? The answer, of course, is "no."

President Ford, on leaving office, left a long-range defense program designed to keep America strong throughout the 80s. But, in its haste to make good on a reckless campaign promise to cut defense spending by billions of dollars, the Carter administration insisted on a policy of systematic concessions in defense and in arms control negotiations. As a result, today we are in the position of having neither the margin of safety we need nor a SALT treaty a Senate controlled by members of Mr. Carter's own party will approve.

My task as President will be to fix what is wrong with our defenses and to lead our allies in a sustained and prudent effort to keep us, them and the entire world secure from confrontation. The preservation of peace will require the best resources we can marshal in this precarious decade. I am convinced we can marshal them by reaffirming our national purpose, by reasserting our will and determination, and by regaining our economic vitality.

RELATIONS WITH FRIENDS AND ADVERSARIES

WHILE THESE EIGHT STEPS ARE IMPORTANT IN THEMSELVES, WE MUST ADDRESS YET ANOTHER, THIS ONE OF OVERARCHING IMPORTANCE TO ALL WE DO: THE CONDUCT OF OUR RELATIONS WITH OUR ALLIES, WITH THE SOVIET UNION AND WITH CHINA.

THAT CONFIDENCE AND TRUST IN THE UNITED STATES HAS FALLEN TO AN ALL-TIME LOW IS AN ESTABLISHED FACT. THIS MUST BE REVERSED. THE UNITED STATES HAS AN IMPORTANT LEADERSHIP ROLE, AND THIS ROLE CAN BE EFFECTIVE ONLY IF OUR ALLIANCES ARE CEMENTED BY UNITY OF PURPOSE AND MUTUAL RESPECT.

FOR THE DECADE OF THE 1980s, OUR ALLIANCE RELATIONSHIPS SHOULD BE AS THOSE AMONG EQUAL PARTNERS. THIS REQUIRES FREQUENT AND SEARCHING CONSULTATION WITH OUR ALLIES, AND IT MEANS THAT OUR LEADERSHIP ROLE WILL BE RESTORED ONLY UNDER THESE CHANGED CIRCUMSTANCES.

WORLD-WIDE, OUR ALLIES ARE STRONGER, MOST ARE EVEN ROBUST AND HEALTHY. BUT THE CHALLENGE OF THE 1980s IS TO ASSEMBLE THAT STRENGTH IN A MANNER WHICH ALLOWS US TO PURSUE THE OBJECTIVE OF PEACE TOGETHER, IN LOCK-STEP. IF WE CANNOT PROCEED TOGETHER, WE INVITE DISSENSION AND DIVISION. IF OUR ALLIANCES ARE DIVIDED, ONLY OUR ADVERSARIES CAN BENEFIT.

WITH OUR ALLIES, WE CAN CONDUCT A REALISTIC AND BALANCED POLICY TOWARD THE SOVIET UNION. I AM CONVINCED THAT THE CAREFUL MANAGEMENT OF OUR RELATIONSHIP WITH THE SOVIET UNION DEPENDS ON A PRINCIPLED, CONSISTENT AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY. WE SEEK NEITHER CONFRONTATION NOR CONFLICT, BUT TO AVOID EITHER WE MUST REMAIN STRONG AND DETERMINED TO PROTECT OUR INTERESTS.

~~REF ID: A7712~~

IF THE SOVIET LEADERSHIP WISHES PEACE, IT CAN HAVE IT BY TAKING STEPS TO REDUCE TENSION IN THE WORLD. IF IT IS GENUINE PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE WITH US AND WITH OTHER NATIONS THAT THEY TRULY WANT, THEY CAN HAVE IT BY REDUCING THEIR CONSTANT DRIVE TO EXPAND AND TO DOMINATE.

AS PRESIDENT, I WILL STAND READY TO NEGOTIATE WITH THE SOVIET UNION ON A WIDE RANGE OF TOPICS DESIGNED TO ENHANCE PEACE, INCLUDING, OF COURSE, NEGOTIATIONS ON BALANCED AND VERIFIABLE ARMS LIMITATION AGREEMENTS. BUT WE MUST NOT LET OUR DESIRE FOR PEACE LEAD US TO ACCEPT A POLICY OF UNREMITTING HOSTILITY TOWARD OUR COUNTRY; OUR RELATIONSHIP IS, AND WILL REMAIN, A TWO-WAY STREET, WITH NEITHER SIDE SEEKING TO BENEFIT AT THE EXPENSE OF THE OTHER.

OUR RELATIONSHIP WITH CHINA IS IN ITS BEGINNING STAGES. IT IS ONE THAT CAN AND WILL GROW, AND I REPEAT MY INTENTION TO ASSIST ITS RAPID GROWTH. THERE IS AN HISTORIC BOND OF FRIENDSHIP BETWEEN THE AMERICAN AND CHINESE PEOPLES, AND I WOULD WORK TO AMPLIFY IT WHEREVER POSSIBLE. EXPANDED TRADE, CULTURAL CONTACT AND OTHER ARRANGEMENTS WILL ALL SERVE THE CAUSE OF PRESERVING AND EXTENDING THE TIES BETWEEN OUR TWO COUNTRIES.

We can indeed make peace. We can have the peace we want for ourselves and for our children. We are going to have to work hard and think hard and act with competence and with confidence--but it can be done.

And, as we work, we will have to be inspired by the vision of what our country means to us and to the world.

In recent weeks, I have had that vision of our nation's meaning brought to my attention in a very personal way.

The home in which I am now living in the Virginia countryside once was owned by John F. Kennedy. And a relatively short distance away is the home of another great American President, Thomas Jefferson.

Two great Presidents--divided by time but united in spirit--Kennedy and Jefferson, have, in essence, helped us to define what it is to be an American.

It strikes me that among their many accomplishments, both men left us a legacy of a deep commitment to peace.

In his first Inaugural Address, Jefferson spoke of "the preservation of the general government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet-anchor of our peace at home and our safety abroad." He knew that peace in the world depended on the strength of our nation in its "whole constitutional vigor."

And, one hundred sixty years later, John F. Kennedy in his Inaugural Address, called to "begin anew the quest for

16 - DRAFT - NINE STEPS TO LASTING PEACE

peace"--reminded us that peace must be built by each generation in its own way, out of its own special needs and special gifts.

Jefferson and Kennedy loved America and the cause of peace too much ever to give in or appeal to fear and doubt. It is that same love that has inspired my campaign for peace and, with God's help and yours, will continue to guide our quest for a just, lasting peace during my presidency.

October 17, 1980

TO: BILL GAVIN

Dolan - Arkes Draft

FROM: ED MEESE

CC: NOFZIGER
ANDERSON
BRADY

NOTE: POSSIBLE WORDING FOR INCLUSION
IN SUNDAY "PEACE" SPEECH. EMM

Some weeks ago, in Missouri, Mr. Carter actually accused me of not believing in peace.

He has gone so far as to attempt to string together a list of my statements in response to one crisis or another over the years and finds in that list a desire to intervene with military force.

Listening to Mr. Carter, you would almost believe that my first act as president would be to send the marines to Jersey City.

Now let me read you a quotation:

"When something happens and it endangers our national security or when something happens that threatens our stature in the world, or when American people are endangered by the actions of a foreign country of just 40 sailors on the Mayaguez, we have to move aggressively and quickly to rescue them."

Those are not my words, they are the words of candidate Carter in 1976 during a television debate with President Ford.

On another occasion in 1976, candidate Carter said he would -- QUOTE -- "certainly consider sending in troupes" -- QUOTE -- in certain world situations.

In the same month in 1976, candidate Carter said he would even consider the use of "atomic weapons" to help our allies. The Associated Press reported in the same dispatch that under certain conditions Mr. Carter would also consider a -- QUOTE -- "preemptive nuclear strike" -- END QUOTE.

Forwarded to RR phone
10/17 4:17 PM
P

Now it is obvious that any candidate running for president is going to occasionally discuss -- in response to certain questions -- hypothetical or otherwise -- the use of force.

But military action is absolutely the very last resort -- I have always believed that. To accuse me of wanting to casually throw away the lives of American servicemen is as unfair as accusing Mr. Carter ^{of} wanting to incinerate the world because he once talked about preemptive nuclear strikes.

This is a bogus issue, an issue raised by those hungry and desperate to hold onto their political power. And this kind of politics has no place in American presidential campaigns. I will have some additional words to say about this in a moment.

But let me point out now that as president, Mr. Carter went far beyond his words as a candidate. He has engaged in threats of war and military action in a manner that is the dramatic reverse of what we could expect from any prudent statesman -- Mr. Carter reserves his most unmeasured and belligerent statements for those occasions on which he has lacked the means and the will to back up his words -- and where he soon had to back away from those words.

In September of 1979, Mr. Carter said that "a Soviet combat brigade in Cuba is a very serious matter. The status quo is not acceptable." He went on to warn that if this matter could not be resolved through diplomacy, the United States would "take appropriate action to change the status quo." But when the Soviets refused to back away, a status quo that was unacceptable in September suddenly became acceptable in October.

After the Russians installed a puppet government in Afghanistan, Mr. Carter responded to the sense of crisis by pretending to draw a line with the Soviet Union.

In his State of the Union address, he declared that "an attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf region will be . . . repelled by the use of any means necessary, including military force." This was nothing short of a threat of war. Five days later, he was compelled to admit that we did not have enough military strength or enough of a military presence in the Persian Gulf "to defend the region unilaterally." He even denied that he threatened to defend that area unilaterally.

When Americans were seized in Iran, Mr. Carter threatened the use of force, saying he saw military action as the only recourse left. He then foreswore the use of force. He then ordered a military mission that failed in large part for want of sufficient equipment or at least equipment that was in good working order -- a problem by the way that today plagues every branch of our military services. After this Iranian mission failed -- and eight American servicemen lost their lives -- Mr. Carter referred to it as an "incomplete success."

Let me pledge to you that as president I will not threaten or embarrass our country or damage our interests with empty threats. Such threats will not be necessary because ^{the current} ~~this~~ administration's chaotic, almost non-existent foreign policy will be replaced with quiet effective diplomacy and firm, prudent leadership.

Let me say something further, Mr. Carter's oscillations between brinkmanship and withdrawal -- between belligerence and

weakness in our foreign policy -- are I believe very similar to his behavior in this campaign.

Even newspapers and commentators sympathetic to his administration have been embarrassed by the character of his personal attacks and lack of self-command and self-possession which these attacks have reflected.

Since the issue of judgment has been raised in this campaign, it is only fair to raise it consistently -- for all the candidates: Can we honestly say that Mr. Carter has revealed in this campaign the sureness or stability of judgment that would make us confident in entrusting to him the direction of our military affairs and our dealing with other nations.

October 17, 1980

TO: BILL GAVIN
FROM: ED MEESE

Dolan - Arkes Draft

CC: NOFZIGER
ANDERSON
BRADY

NOTE: POSSIBLE WORDING FOR INCLUSION
IN SUNDAY "PEACE" SPEECH. EMM

Some weeks ago, in Missouri, Mr. Carter actually accused me of not believing in peace.

He has gone so far as to attempt to string together a list of my statements in response to one crisis or another over the years and finds in that list a desire to intervene with military force.

Listening to Mr. Carter, you would almost believe that my first act as president would be to send the marines to Jersey City.

Now let me read you a quotation:

"When something happens and it endangers our national security or when something happens that threatens our stature in the world, or when American people are endangered by the actions of a foreign country of just 40 sailors on the Mayaguez, we have to move aggressively and quickly to rescue them."

Those are not my words, they are the words of candidate Carter in 1976 during a television debate with President Ford.

On another occasion in 1976, candidate Carter said he would -- QUOTE -- "certainly consider sending in troupes" -- QUOTE -- in certain world situations.

In the same month in 1976, candidate Carter said he would even consider the use of "atomic weapons" to help our allies. The Associated Press reported in the same dispatch that under certain conditions Mr. Carter would also consider a -- QUOTE -- "preemptive nuclear strike" -- END QUOTE.

Now it is obvious that any candidate running for president is going to occasionally discuss -- in response to certain questions -- hypothetical or otherwise -- the use of force.

But military action is absolutely the very last resort -- I have always believed that. To accuse me of wanting to casually throw away the lives of American servicemen is as unfair as accusing Mr. Carter ^{of} wanting to incinerate the world because he once talked about preemptive nuclear strikes.

This is a bogus issue, an issue raised by those hungry and desperate to hold onto their political power. And this kind of politics has no place in American presidential campaigns. I will have some additional words to say about this in a moment.

But let me point out now that as president, Mr. Carter went far beyond his words as a candidate. He has engaged in threats of war and military action in a manner that is the dramatic reverse of what we could expect from any prudent statesman -- Mr. Carter reserves his most unmeasured and belligerent statements for those occasions on which he has lacked the means and the will to back up his words -- and where he soon had to back away from those words.

In September of 1979, Mr. Carter said that "a Soviet combat brigade in Cuba is a very serious matter. The status quo is not acceptable." He went on to warn that if this matter could not be resolved through diplomacy, the United States would "take appropriate action to change the status quo." But when the Soviets refused to back away, a status quo that was unacceptable in September suddenly became acceptable in October.

After the Russians installed a puppet government in Afghanistan, Mr. Carter responded to the sense of crisis by pretending to draw a line with the Soviet Union.

In his State of the Union address, he declared that "an attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf region will be . . . repelled by the use of any means necessary, including military force." This was nothing short of a threat of war. Five days later, he was compelled to admit that we did not have enough military strength or enough of a military presence in the Persian Gulf "to defend the region unilaterally." He even denied that he threatened to defend that area unilaterally.

When Americans were seized in Iran, Mr. Carter threatened the use of force, saying he saw military action as the only recourse left. He then foreswore the use of force. He then ordered a military mission that failed in large part for want of sufficient equipment or at least equipment that was in good working order -- a problem by the way that today plagues every branch of our military services. After this Iranian mission failed -- and eight American servicemen lost their lives -- Mr. Carter referred to it as an "incomplete success."

Let me pledge to you that as president I will not threaten or embarrass our country or damage our interests with empty threats. Such threats will not be necessary because ^{the current} ~~this~~ administration's chaotic, almost non-existent foreign policy will be replaced with quiet effective diplomacy and firm, prudent leadership.

Let me say something further, Mr. Carter's oscillations between brinkmanship and withdrawal -- between belligerence and

weakness in our foreign policy -- are I believe very similar to his behavior in this campaign.

Even newspapers and commentators sympathetic to his administration have been embarrassed by the character of his personal attacks and lack of self-command and self-possession which these attacks have reflected.

Since the issue of judgment has been raised in this campaign, it is only fair to raise it consistently -- for all the candidates: Can we honestly say that Mr. Carter has revealed in this campaign the sureness or stability of judgment that would make us confident in entrusting to him the direction of our military affairs and our dealing with other nations.