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 (3 of 3) Box: 436

To see more digitized collections visit: <u>https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material</u>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Inventories, visit: <u>https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories</u>

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

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

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

Last Updated: 10/11/2023

To:Bob Garrick From:Bill Gavin October 15,1980

There is a plan for a televised "Peace" speech to be given this Sunday. Dick Allen and I have talked **a**bout a draft he has done(and to which Peter Hannaford will contribute).The scedule is this way, so far:

We should have a rough draft to RR by tomorrow(probably in the morning). A completed draft should be done by Friday(we hope by Friday morning)

Thats all I know.

INTRO 1

The most important responsibility of an American President is to devise and implement policies which will maintain world 'peace and protect American interests in an increasingly troubled world. The Chief Executive must marshal the great resources of our country, and must use the power and influence of the United States to achieve global stability.

THE FIRST CONDITION OF HIS SUCCESS MUST BE TO HAVE A LONG-RANGE STRATEGY, A PLAN FOR ACHIEVING THESE IMPORTANT OBJECTIVES. IF THERE IS NO PLAN, CONFUSION AND VACILLATION WILL BE THE RESULT, AND OUR INTERESTS WILL SUFFER.

As the American people prepare to elect a President, they will take into account the differences between the contender for the highest office in the land. This year, I believe, there is a clear and unmistakable choice. But as I have attempted to lay before you the great issues which affect world peace and our future prosperity, the air has become thick with innuendo, misstatements and outright distortion of my beliefs and my program to restore consistency, coherence and security to our country.

THERE IS AN IMPORTANT ISSUE AT STAKE HERE, AND IT IS THE FOREIGN POLICY AND NATIONAL SECURITY RECORD OF THE PRESENT ADMINIS-TRATION. IT IS A RECORD LADEN WITH FAILURE, CHARACTERIZED BY VACILLATION AND INTERNAL BICKERING, AND PROVEN UTTERLY INEFFECTUAL IN DEFENDING OUR NATIONAL INTERESTS.

Among Allies, confidence in the United States has declined, our reliability is questioned, and both our capability and our willingness to act have been jeopardized. WITHOUT A LONG-RANGE STRATEGY, WITHOUT A COHERENT PLAN, WE CANNOT CONDUCT A MEANINGFUL, EFFECTIVE FOREIGN POLICY. IF WE HAVE NO CLEAR PURPOSE, FRIENDS AND ADVERSARIES ALIKE WILL REMAIN CONFUSED AND UNCERTAIN AS TO OUR TRUE INTENTIONS. UNDER SUCH CIRCUMSTANCES, OUR ALLIANCES WILL CONTINUE TO DISINTEGRATE AND OUR ADVERSARIES WILL BE TEMPTED TO MOVE AGAINST OUR INTERESTS.

To REMEDY THIS, WE MUST FIRST DEVISE A FOREIGN POLICY TTHAT REFLECTS OUR NEEDS AND OUR PRINCIPLES. THAT PROCESS MUST BEGIN WITH A CAREFUL REDEFINITION OF OUR NATIONAL INTEREST, AND WE MUST ALSO IDENTIFY CAREFULLY OUR VITAL INTERESTS IN THE WORLD. IN SO DOING, WE WILL PUT AN END TO THE CRISIS MANAGEMENT OF THE PRESENT ADMINIS-TRATION, WHICH LURCHES FROM ONE MISCALCULATION TO ANOTHER.

I would like to discuss with you tonight nine specific steps that I will take to put America on a sound and secure footing in the international arena. I propose to accomplish these steps with the cooperation of Congress, with the support of an informed American public and through the efforts of an Administration staffed with top-flight, dedicated people who will be responsive to our policies in the new Administration.

FIRST. . . .

Second....

Fourth. . .

INTRO 2

2

FIFTH. . . .

 $\mathbf{h}_{i,i}$

· .

Sixth. . . .

Елентн. . .

Ninth. . .



FPS DRAFT 10/14/80

SALT

ARMS CONTROL SHOULD AND CAN PLAY A USEFUL AND CONSTRUCTIVE ROLE IN OUR NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY. WEAPONS OF MASSIVE DESTRUCTIVE POTENTIAL MUST BE STRICTLY LIMITED AND SUBSTANTIALLY REDUCED THROUGH AGREEMENTS AMONG THE NUCLEAR POWERS. THE PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS[®] MUST BE CONTROLLED.

As the <u>NTH</u> requirement for peace, I would pursue such arms control agreements as a matter of priority.

We must be realistic about arms control, about our security requirements, and about the ways arms control may help our security needs. Arms control agreements must be judged on their merits, for there may be harmful as well as helpful agreements. We must also be realistic about the extent to which our own arms control aspirations are actually shared by others; in particular, the Soviet Union.

IN THIS REGARD, LET ME ADDRESS SALT, FOR I HAVE BEEN FREQUENTLY CRITICIZED FOR SAYING THAT SALT II IS AN AGREEMENT WHICH WE SHOULD NOT ACCEPT.

The United States has been actively engaged in SALT for over a decade; and, in fact, we have been practicing our own unilateral arms control for well over a decade. It is a mistake to believe that the arms control comes only from written agreements. Our arms programs and policies are always controlled by our own desire to limit forces to the minimum necessary and by our own political processes. In fact, the United States reduced its strategic objectives and its strategic nuclear programs in the middle 1960s, hoping to induce reciprocal restraint on the part of the Soviet Union, and hoping to pave the way for the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks.

SALT-2

IN ENTERING SALT, WE SOUGHT TO REACH LONG TERM AGREEMENTS THAT WOULD EQUITABLY LIMIT AND REDUCE NUCLEAR ARMS, WITH THE AIM OF ENHANCING STRATEGIC STABILITY AND REDUCING THE NEED FOR FUTURE ARMS PROGRAMS. THOSE AGREEMENTS WERE SUPPOSED TO PROMOTE DETENTE AND HELP LEAD USE FROM AN ERA OF CONFRONTATION WITH THE SOVIET UNION TO ONE OF COOPERATION. SALT SUCCESS, IN FACT, WAS TO BE THE "LITMUS TEST OF DETENTS." TO REACH THESE GOALS, THE UNITED STATES WAS WILLING TO GIVE UP THE STRATEGIC NUCLEAR SUPERIORITY UPON WHICH OUR SECURITY HAD BEEN BASED AND ACCEPT A SITUATION OF NUCLEAR PARITY WITH THE SOVIET UNION.

Unfortunately, our experience in SALT quickly showed that the Soviet Union did not share our objectives; instead, the Soviets continued to accelerate a massive nuclear arms buildup during the time we were engaged in SALT. The Soviets also rebuffed American proposals that would have established meaningful and equittable arms limitations and reductions.

We accepted a SALT I agreement that heavily favored the Soviet Union. We did so in the belief that it was a necessary step in the SALT process, which would then lead to more productive arms agreements. (At the same time, the Congress of the United States expressed reservations about that agreement and called for a new and more equal agreement witthin five years.)

THAT SALT II AGREEMENT THAT HAS EMERGED UNDER JIMMY CARTER DOES NOT FULFILL THOSE EXPECTATIONS OR SATISFY THE ESSENTIAL CONDITIONS SET DOWN BY CONGRESS. IT IS INEQUITABLE IN MANY RESPECTS, AND UNVERIFIABLE IN SOME IMPORTANT ONES. THIS PARTICULAR SALT II AGREEMENT WOULD CONCEDE SUPERIORITY TO THE SOVIET UNION. IN MY JUDGMENT, IT IS A CHARTER FOR THE CONTINUATION OF THE ONE-SIDED ARMS RACE THE SOVIET UNION HAS BEEN RUNNING DURING THE SALT DECADE.

SALT-3

These conclusions are not mine alone. The U.S. Senate, controlled by a Democrat majority, did not approve this agreement, which could not muster enough votes even before the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The votes to pass SALT II do not exist today. The Armed Services Committee, after lengthy hearings, rejected the agreement as not in the security interests of the United States. The Foreign Relations Committee, in a narrow vote, recommended adoption of the agreement only with more than twenty important changes.

CLEARLY, SUCH AN AGREEMENT AND SUCH A SITUATION SERVE NEITHER ARMS CONTROL NOR NATIONAL SECURITY INTERESTS.

1. ¥2

I DO APPROVE OF STRATEGIC ARMS NEGOTIATIONS. BUT MY APPROACH TO SALT WOULD BE TO SET ABOUT CORRECTING BOTH THE SALT II AGREEMENT <u>AND</u> OUR STRATEGIC SITUATION. WORKING CLOSELY WITH CONGRESS, I would formulate the programs to provide for our long-range security. As a priority, I would simultaneously review negotiations with the Soviet Union, while also carefully consulting with our Allies. ORG 1

REORGANIZING NATIONAL SELURITY MACHINERY FPS DRAFT 10/14/80

CHANGES

For too long the world has witnessed the spectacle of an Administration unable to speak with one voice in foreign policy. This must change.

IN MY ADMINISTRATION, STRUCTURAL CHANGES WILL BE MADE IN THE FOREIGN POLICY MAKING MACHINERY, AND THE SECRETARY OF STATE WILL BE THE PRESIDENT'S PRINCIPAL SPOKESMAN AND ADVISOR. UNLIKE THE PRESENT SITUATION OF THE CARTER ADMINISTRATION IN WHICH THERE ARE OFTEN CONFLICTING STATEMENTS OF AMERICAN POLICY LEADING TO CONFUSION AMONG ALLIES AND ADVERSARIES, WE WILL RESTORE DECISIVENESS AND LEADERSHIP TO OUR FOREIGN POLICY BY ORGANIZING THE ADMINISTRATION IN A LOGICAL WAY.

It does not serve our national interest to tolerate a situation in which the National Security Advisor and the Secretary of State are at cross purposes on crucial international issues. The Carter Administration's first Secretary of State ultimately could take no more, finding himself in fundamental disagreement with both the Procedure and the policy. The present Secretary of State, by his own admission, a "political" Secretary, has been shut out of key decisions that require the imprint and counsel of the Department of State.

The position of the National Security Council is established by Law. It is a vital institution that serves the President. It should also serve to coordinate and synthesize the views of the Many departments and agencies which comprise our foreign affairs machinery. Sound policy demands that the coordination be done by persons who serve the President and the national interest, and without a harmonious process, we will have uncertainty, division and weakness. This leads to policy failure.

IN MY ADMINISTRATION, THE NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL WILL ONCE AGAIN BECOME THE EFFECTIVE COORDINATOR OF THE POLICY PROCESS, AND-ITS MISSION WILL BE TO ASSURE THAT THE PRESIDENT RECEIVES AN ORDERLY, BALANCED FLOW OF INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS. THE NATIONAL SECURITY ADVISOR WILL WORK CLOSELY, IN TEAMWORK, WITH THE SECRETARY OF STATE AND THE OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL.

IF THE CABINET IS TO FULFILL ITS MISSION IN THE FIELD OF FOREIGN POLICY, IT MUST WORK AS A TEAM, DEDICATING ITSELF TO FORMULATING AND CARRYING OUT EFFECTIVE POLICIES WHICH DEFINE AND DEFEND OUR NATIONAL INTEREST. IT DOES NOT MATTER WHO GETS THE CREDIT; IT DOES MATTER THAT THE NATION IS THE BENEFICIARY.

My proposal, then, is to restore a single voice to our FOREIGN POLICY. I WILL PUT AN END TO THE BICKERING, THE CONFUSION AND THE JOCKEYING FOR ADVANTAGE AND HEADLINES THAT HAVE COME TO CHARACTERIZE OUR POLICY.

I MEAN TO CREATE MACHINERY THAT WILL UTILIZE THE WEALTH OF TALENT IN OUR FEDERAL SERVICE, AND I WILL SEEK TO BRING TO GOVERNMENT SERVICE COMPETENT AND DEDICATED PEOPLE WHO WILL PERFORM AS A TEAM IN CARRYING OUT A CONSISTENT FOREIGN POLICY.

IN EVERY ELECTION YEAR THERE IS CRITICISM OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY AND THOSE WHO SERVE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE. I HAVE BEEN CRITICAL OF BOTH. BUT THIS DOES NOT MEAN WE HAVE NO NEED FOR A COMPETENT, PROFESSIONAL CORPS OF FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS. WE WILL HAVE MEANINGFUL CHANGES IN THE DEPARTMENT OF STTATE, BUT I WILL WORK TO STRENGTHEN THE PROFESSIONALS WHITE WORK IN THE DEPARTMENT.

RECENTLY, FOR EXAMPLE, A YOUNG SOVIET SOLDIER, ONE OF THE OCCUPYING FORCE IN AFGHANISTAN, TRIED TO DEFECT TO THE AMERICAN

Embassy in Kabul. I was astonished to learn that after ten months of Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, that we didn't have a single Russian-speaking embassy employee to communicate with him. As one ranking Asian diplomat remarked, "The Americans seem to fail at every turn. Not to maintain a Russian speaker at this time in Kabul is almost beyond belief."

AND DURING THE CRUCIAL PERIOD BEFORE AND AFTER THE FALL OF THE SHAH OF IRAN, OUR EMBASSY IN TEHRAN HAD ONLY _____ OFFICERS WHO WERE FLUENT IN FARSI, THE LANGUAGE OF IRAN. IS IT ANY WONDER THAT OUR POLICY WAS DOOMED TO FAILURE IF WE COULD NOT EVEN UNDERSTAND WHAT WAS GOING ON, MUCH LESS COMMUNICATE EFFECTIVELY?"

My goal will be to build a diplomatic corps with language proficiency, organizational and professional skills, and to ensure their safety while they are abroad in service to their government. Once we achieve consistency in our policy, we can restore the pride we once had in our foreign policy establishment.

2

ENDING THE AMERICAN MESSABE FPS DRAFT 10/14/80 AMA 1 (AMERICAN MESSAGE ABROAD)

THE LAST REQUIREMENT FOR PEACE, THAT I WISH TO STRESS, IS ONE THAT SHOULD COME NATURAL AND EASY TO AMERICANS. TO BUILD A MORE DURABLE AND MORE SECURE PEACE, WE MUST REASSERT MORAL LEADERSHIP OF AMERICA. WE MUST SPEAK UP FOR OUR POLITICAL IDEALS, AND NOT BE BASHFUL IN PROMOTING LIBERTY, HUMAN DIGNITY AND JUSTICE.

We must once again proclaim the American message. This message has to be brought to all the people abroad by our information programs, our diplomacy, and by the words and convictions of the President.

I WOULD STRENGTHEN THE VOICE OF AMERICA BROADCASTS AND OUR OTHER RADIO PROGRAMS. I WOULD PUT MEN AND WOMEN IN CHARGE OF OUR WORLDWIDE INFORMATION EFFORTS WHO BELIEVE IN PROMOTING AMERICAN PRINCIPLES FOR DEMOCRACY, FREEDOM AND JUSTICE, INSTEAD OF GOING AROUND APOLOGIZING FOR OUR ALLEGED FAULTS. COMPARED WITH OTHER COSTS OF OUR NATIONAL SECURITY, THE DOLLAR AMOUNTS ARE MINUTE. WHAT IS NEEDED MOST IS A SENSE OF CONVICTION, THE CONVICTION THAT BY CARRYING THE AMERICAN MESSAGE ABROAD WE STRENGTHEN THE FOUNDATIONS FOR PEACE.

I BELIEVE MOST AMERICANS UNDERSTAND THIS INTUITIVELY. JIMMY CARTER, HOWEVER, TALKED OF AMERICA'S "SHORTCOMINGS AND FAULTS," SAYING "WE ARE OURSELVES CULPABLE;" AND HAS EVEN EXPRESSED THE VIEW THAT THE UNITED STATES HAS BASICALLY THE SAME GOALS AS THE SOVIET UNION. THE CARTER ADMINISTRATION, INSTEAD OF STRENGTHENING AND EXPANDING OUR OVERSEAS BROADCAST AND INFORMATION PROGRAMS, PERMITTED THESE VITAL EFFORTS TO DECLINE.

DURING THE CRITICAL CRISIS IN IRAN, THE UNITED STATES WAS UNABLE TO BROADCAST TO THE PEOPLE THERE IN THEIR OWN LANGUAGE, WHILE SOVIET-SPONSORED BROADCASTS STIRRED UP HATRED AGAINST AMERICA

AMA 2

THROUGHOUT THE ISLAMIC WORLD. WE STILL DO NOT HAVE A RADIO FREE CUBA, A PROGRAM TO TELL THE CUBAN PEOPLE HOW CASTRO'S POLICIES FORCE CUBANS TO DIE AS SOVIET MERCENARIES IN AFRICA.

THE SOVIET UNION AND ITS ALLIES ARE IN THE BACKWASH OF HISTORY. IT IS WE, THE UNITED STATES AND OUR FRIENDS, WHO ARE THE WAVE OF THE FUTURE. THE DEVELOPMENTS IN POLAND SHOW THAT SOVIET COMMUNISM RESTS ON A FRAGILE FOUNDATION. IT IS NOT ONLY A DISMAL FAILURE IN ITS ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE, IT IS ALSO A FAILURE IN HUMAN TERMS.

BUT IF WE, IN THIS LAND, DO NOT SPEAK UP, WHO WILL BE THE SPIRITUAL LEADER OF THE OPPRESSED? WE MUST LEAD THE REVOLUTION FOR LIBERTY, A PEACEFUL REVOLUTION THAT WILL GIVE INSPIRATION AND COURAGE TO PEOPLE EVERYWHERE, TO WORK FOR GREATER FREEDOM AND HUMAN DIGNITY IN THEIR OWN COUNTRIES. THIS EVOLUTION MAY BE SLOW. BUT IT IS IN THIS WAY, OVER TIME, THAT WE STRENGTHEN THE FOUNDATIONS OF PEACE.

Communist propaganda has always insisted that capitalism is the cause of violence and war. Yet, it is evident that our democratic capitalism is the system of peace. It is precisely the nations under Communist, or radical, conttrol that make war on their neighbors -and routinely make war on each other. We see this today in Indochina And in the Persian Gulf region.

For our long-term strategy, the cause of liberty and the cause of peace are inseparable. Promoting freedom for ourselves and others and preserving the peace are one and the same cause. If we

AMA 3

REMAIN TRUE TO OURSELVES, IF WE REMAIN PROUD OF OUR BASIC PRINCIPLES AND DEFEND THEM, IF WE UPHOLD OUR SPIRITUAL STRENGTH, WE WILL NOT ONLY-PROMOTE, JUSTICE AND LIBERTY -- WE WILL PROMOTE WORLD PEACE. BUT IF WE SHOULD EVER LOSE FAITH IN AMERICAN AND WHAT IT STANDS FOR, WE WILL LOSE BOTH PEACE AND FREEDOM.

SAFETY 1

To Restore Our Margin of Safety

I PLEDGE TO RESTORE OUR MARGIN OF SAFETY BY WORKING CLOSELY WITH THE CONGRESS ON A LONG-TERM DEFENSE PROGRAM DESIGNED TO MEET OUR NEEDS IN THE CRITICAL DECADE OF THE 1980s.

In the year ahead, America faces serious challenges to its national security and economic well-being. By pursuing a tremendous military buildup far in excess of its defensive needs, the Soviet Union is threatening to upset the balance of power. Our economy is wracked by inflation and declining productivity. Our allies are rapidly losing confidence in us and our adversaries have long since ceased to respect us.

CLEARLY, WORLD PEACE WITH FREEDOM AND SECURITY MUST BE OUR NUMBER ONE PRIORITY. BUT TO ACHIEVE SUCH A PEACE, WE MUST CHANGE THE DISASTROUS COURSE SET BY THE CARTER ADMINISTRATION.

IF WE JUST STOP TO THINK ABOUT IT, HOW WILL WE ANSWER THIS VERY BASIC QUESTION: ARE WE BETTER OFF TODAY, IN 1980, ARE WE MORE SECURE IN THE WORLD THAN WE WERE JUST FOUR YEARS AGO, IN 1976? THE ANSWER IS CLEARLY "NO."

American foreign policy has always been based upon the pillars of collective security, a margin of safety in military capability, technological and economic superiority, and upon the perception by our allies and adversaries that the United States possesses the foresight, will and determination to deter crisis and confrontaion before they develop.

SAFETY 2

THE CARTER ADMINISTRATION CHANGED ALL THAT BY ITS PURSUIT OF AN IRRESPONSIBLE AND WEAK NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY.

PRESIDENT FORD'S LEGACY TO THE NATION UPON LEAVING OFFICE was a long-range defense program designed to keep America strong through the decade of the 1980s. President Ford recognized that, after years of negotiation, the Soviet Union was still bent upon surpassing the United States in over-all strategic strength.

WISELY, HE DID NOT GIVE UP ON ARMS CONTROL NEGOTIATIONS, BUT SOUGHT TO PROVIDE US WITH AN "INSURANCE POLICY" IN THE FORM OF A BALANCED PROGRAM TO KEEP US FROM FALLING BEHIND.

IN ITS EAGERNESS TO SLASH AT THAT DEFENSE PROGRAM, THE CARTER ADMINISTRATION DISMANTLED OR DELAYED IT, PIECE BY PIECE, PROGRAM BY PROGRAM.

PRESIDENT FORD KNEW THAT HIS DEFENSE PROGRAM WAS THE NECESSARY CONDITION FOR ANY MEANINGFUL ARMS CONTROL AGREEMENT, THAT WE COULD NOT SAFELY SIGN A TREATY WITHOUT IT. BUT THIS ADMINISTRATION, WANTING TO MAKE GOOD ON ITS RECKLESS PROMISE TO CUT DEFENSE SPENDING BY BILLIONS OF DOLLARS, INSISTED ON A POLICY OF SYSTEMATIC CONCESSIONS IN DEFENSE AND IN ARMS CONTROL NEGOTIATIONS.

As a result of Jimmy Carter's decisions, today we are in the position of having neither the security that President Ford's prudent defense program would have given us, a margin of safety, but we also do not have a SALT treaty the Senate will approve.

THE MAIN FUNCTION OF OUR POWER MUST BE TO CONVEY THE MESSAGE TO OUR ADVERSARIES THAT WE WILL RESIST AGGRESSION. FIRMNESS BASED ON CREDIBLE DEFENSES IS NOT PROVOCATIVE -- TO THE CONTRARY, IT IS THE ESSENCE OF A SOUND FOREIGN POLICY. WEAKNESS, ON THE OTHER HAND, CAN BE PROVOCATIVE BECAUSE IT TEMPTS OUR ADVERSARIES TO THREATEN AMERICA.

SAFETY 3

I HAVE EMPHASIZED THROUGHOUT MY CAMPAIGN THE NEED TO RESTORE THE VITAL MARGIN OF SAFETY, A POSITION OF STRENGTH THAT DETERS POTENTIAL AGGRESSORS. I HAVE CALLED FOR A PRUDENT, BALANCED RESTORATION OF OUR DEFENSE CAPABILITY, AND I WILL COMMIT MY ADMIN-ISTRATION TO THIS GOAL. TO DO LESS WOULD BE AN ABDICATION OF LEADERSHIP.

THIS HAS NOTHING AT ALL TO DO WITH THE NOTION OF AN "ARMS RACE." AN "ARMS RACE" IS NOT AN INSTRUMENT OF OUR NATIONAL POLICY. <u>AVOIDING</u> AN ARMS RACE IS, AND THE BEST WAY TO ACHIEVE THIS IS BY MEANS OF A CAREFUL, LONG-TERM RESTORATION OF WHAT THIS ADMINISTRATION'S POLICIES HAVE SYSTEMATICALLY DESTROYED.

Let us ask ourselves: will four more years of these policies enhance our security or undermine it? Will the Soviet Union find us any more credible in the mid 1980s than it does now if we continue to draw down on our defensive capability? Will our Allies restore their trust in us as they see us continue to avoid our obligations to them and to ourselves? We know the answers to these important questions.

So let us not tolerate the distortion of our proposals to restore what this Administration has allowed to disintegrate. My task as President will be to fix what is wrong with our defenses, and to lead the Allies in a sustained, balanced and prudent effort to keep us and our friends secure. We have the vision and the determination to preserve peace. And the preservation of peace will require the best resources we can marshal in this precarious decade. We must reaffirm our national purpose, reassert our national will and determination, °AND regain our economic vitality. This is a challenging task, but one we can meet and will meet in my Administration.

MANPOWER 1

<u>Restoring the Quality of Our Armed Forces</u>

I PLEDGE TO RESTORE THE SENSE OF PRIDE THAT THE DEDICATED MEN AND WOMEN, AND THEIR FAMILIES, FEEL IN THEIR MILITARY CAREERS. We MUST DIRECT OUR ATTENTION TO THE CRITICAL MANPOWER NEEDS OF OUR ARMED FORCES, AND I WILL DO SO AS A TOP PRIORITY IN MY ADMINISTRATION. THIS MUST COME FIRST, AS IT IS OUR MOST URGENT PROBLEM.

IN DEFENSE MATTERS, WE HEAR TOO MUCH ABOUT HARDWARE AND NOT ENOUGH ABOUT HARD WORK. THE MOST IMPORTANT PART OF MILITARY STRENGTH IS THE PEOPLE INVOLVED, THEIR QUALITY, THEIR SACRIFICES AND THEIR WELFARE. BECAUSE OUR NATIONAL SECURITY IS SO DEPENDENT UPON THE PEOPLE IN OUR ARMED FORCES, WE MUST DO ALL IN OUR POWER TO ASSURE THAT THEY ARE OF THE HIGHEST CALIBER, THAT THEIR ECONOMIC SACRIFICE IS NOT DISPROPORTIONATE TO WHAT WE ASK OF THEM, THAT THEY FEEL PROUD AND SECURE IN THEIR PROFESSION, AND THAT THEY ARE EQUIPPED WELL TO DO THEIR JOBS.

Above all, we must demonstrate that they are supported by a leadership that is both responsible and caring. The policies of Jimmy Carter have endangered our economic well-being, and in the process have made life difficult, if not impossible for the men and women of our armed services.

WE HAVE BEEN UNABLE TO RETAIN THE EXPERIENCED, SKILLED OFFICERS AND NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICERS THAT ARE THE BACKBONE OF OUR ARMED SERVICES. OUR CHIEFS OF STAFF HAVE REFERRED TO A "HEMMORHAGE OF TALENT" BEING LOST. NOR ARE WE ATTRACTING THE QUALITY OF PERSONNEL NEEDED IN OUR ARMED FORCES. THERE IS AN OVERLY HIGH, AND INCREASING, NUMBER OF NON-HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES AND RECRUITS OF THE LOWEST SKILL CATEGORY. OUR RESERVES ARE ALSO IN SAD SHAPE.

MANPOWER 2

I BELIEVE THERE IS A WAY TO REVERSE THIS SHAMEFUL AND POTENTIALLY DISASTROUS SITUATION.

I WILL IMPLEMENT A PROGRAM OF COMPENSATION AND BENEFITS, FOR OUR VALUED MILITARY PERSONNEL 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 IN HISTORY IN THE EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF OUR POPULATION. I WILL PROVIDE THE RESOURCES TO ATTRACT AND RETAIN SUPERIOR PEOPLE IN ALL THE SERVICES. OUR COUNTRY MUST PROVIDE THESE PERSONS AND THEIR FAMILIES WITH A QUALITY OF LIFE THAT IS EQUIVALENT TO THE SACRIFICES THEY MUST MAKE ON OUR BEHALF; AND I PROMISE THAT WE WILL DO SO.

<u>A Realistic Policy for This Hemisphere</u>

I PLEDGE TO DEDICATE MY ADMINISTRATION TO THE FORMULATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A COHERENT, SENSIBLE, LONG-RANGE POLICY FOR THIS HEMISPHÈRE. NO AREA OF THE WORLD SHOULD HAVE A HIGHER PRIORITY IN MY ADMINISTRATION THAN THE NATIONS OF LATIN AMERICA.

The first priority of our foreign policy for the Western HEMISPHERE WOULD BE TO HAVE ONE -- TO CONSTRUCT A FOREIGN POLICY WHICH TAKES ACCOUNT OF THE COMMON HERITAGE, INTERESTS AND PROBLEMS OF THE NATIONS OF THIS HEMISPHERE AND RESPECTS THE SOVEREIGNTY OF ALL NATIONS.

Nowhere have the policies of Jimmy Carter been more disastrous than in our own hemisphere. They have alienated our friends, encouraged neutralism, destabilized governments and permitted Cuban and Soviet influence to grow unimpeded. In effect, a political hurricane is swirling up out of Latin America, and it threatens our hemisphere with a foreign policy storm as grave as that from the Middle East.

In January 1977, when Jimmy Carter became President of the United States, our relations with the countries of Latin America were excellent. We had a cordial relationship with the most powerful countries of that vital part of the world -- Brazil, Mexico and Argentina. Direct Soviet influence was limited to Cuba, and that communist satellite country was increasingly isolated from the rest of the Hemisphere, gradually sinking ever-deeper into economic decay and social despair.

THIS WAS THE RECORD.

In the final months of 1980, after almost four years of Jimmy Carter in the White House, we enjoy a cordial relationship of

MUTUAL RESPECT WITH NO SINGLE COUNTRY IN OUR OWN HEMISPHERE. WE HAVE INSULTED AND ALIENATED MEXICO, ARGENTINA AND BRAZIL. THE SOUTHERNMOST SIX COUNTRIES OF SOUTH AMERICA HAVE FORMED A BLOC OF ENORMOUS POTENTIAL, AND IF IT IS NOT YET HOSTILE TO THE UNITED STATES AS A COUNTRY, IT IS CERTAINLY VERY HOSTILE TO THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATION. SOVIET AND CUBAN INFLUENCE NOW EXTENDS THROUGHOUT THE CARIBBEAN AND CENTRAL AMERICA: IN GRENADA, IN DOMINICA, IN JAMAICA, IN NICARAGUA AND EL SALVADOR. GUATEMALA, GUYANA, SURINAM AND MANY OF THE SMALLER ISLAND REPUBLICS HAVE BEEN TARGETED FOR THE NEAR FUTURE. HONDURAS IS POWERLESS TO PREVENT ITSELF FROM BEING USED AS A CONDUIT FOR CUBAN AGENTS AND SOVIET WEAPONS.

In the meantime, Cuba, faithful Soviet satellite and mercenary, and focus of communist infection, props up Marxist dictatorships in Angola, Ethiopia and other parts of Africa; encourages worldwide revolution in the ridiculous guise of leader of the so-called "nonaligned" countries; encourages upheaval and chaos in the Caribbean and Central America with arms and agents, and permits its territory to be used as a Russian military and naval base -- all this while trying to cover up its dismal failure to provide its own people with a decent standard of living.

SUCH IS THE RESULT OF FOUR YEARS OF IGNORANCE, VACILLATION, INCOMPETENCE AND NEGLECT OF THAT AREA OF THE WORLD THAT IS NEXT DOOR TO US, NOT THOUSANDS OF MILES AWAY.

THIS IS THE RECORD NOW.

THERE IS NO REGION OF THE WORLD, INCLUDING EUROPE, THE PERSIAN GULF AND JAPAN, WHICH IS OF GREATER STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE TO THE UNITED STATES THAN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE. IT IS WHERE WE

PHYSICALLY EXIST; IT IS AN ENORMOUS REPOSITORY OF RAW MATERIALS AND ENERGY SOURCES, INCLUDING MORE THAN ENOUGH OIL, IN CANADA, MEXICO, VENEZUELA AND ELSEWHERE TO MAKE THE HEMISPHERE SELF-SUFFICIENT; IT IS OUR LARGEST EXTERNAL MARKET AND OUR LARGEST SUPPLIER OF NATURAL RESOURCES.

There can be no reasonable comparison made between the danger posed by an enemy located in Europe or Asia and one located right next door to us. But this is the situation towards which we are heading. There can be no reasonable comparison made between the threat posed to us by instability, terrorism, guerrilla activity, Soviet clients and bases in other parts of the world and in our own part of the world. But that is what we have now.

AND YET, IN THE PAST FOUR YEARS WE HAVE SYSTEMATICALLY ANTAGONIZED AND INSULTED OUR FRIENDS AND ENCOURAGED OUR ENEMIES. WE HAVE TOLERATED AND AT TIMES ACTUALLY ENCOURAGED A SPREADING CANCER IN THE HEMISPHERE, WITH ITS SOURCE IN CUBA. AND IN THE FACE OF THIS GROWING THREAT TO OUR HEMISPHERE'S SECURITY, JIMMY CARTER HAS REFUSED TO IDENTIFY THE REGION AS A VITAL INTEREST OF THE UNITED STATES!

WE MUST TAKE SPECIFIC STEPS TO CHANGE THIS SORRY RECORD. WE WILL CHANGE IT, AND WE WILL BEGIN BY RESPECTING AND RECOGNIZING THE DIVERSITY OF THE COUNTRIES OF THE HEMISPHERE, BUT WE WILL LAY GREAT EMPHASIS ON OUR COMMON CONCERNS AND OUR COMMON DESTINY.

OUR INTERDEPENDENCE AND COMMON ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS MUST BE DEALT WITH BY EMPHASIZING, NOT UNDERMINING THE COMPLEMENTARY NATURE OF OUR RESOURCES, NOT ONLY IN RAW MATERIALS BUT IN RESEARCH, TECHNOLOGY AND MANAGEMENT.

• WE WILL NOT TOLERATE INTERFERENCE IN OUR INTERNAL AFFAIRS, AND BY THE SAME TOKEN WE MUST NOT INTERFERE IN THE INTERNAL ARRANGEMENTS OF OUR NEIGHBORS, HOWEVER INAPPROPRIATE WE MAY CONSIDER THEM.

• But -- THE INTERNATIONAL ATTITUDES AND POLICIES OF OUR NEIGHBORS <u>ARE</u> A LEGITIMATE CONCERN OF OURS, AND MUST BE RECOGNIZED AND DEALT WITH AS SUCH, AND THERE MUST BE NO DOUBT CONCERNING OUR DETERMINATION TO DO WHATEVER IS NECESSARY TO MAINTAIN HEMISPHERIC SECURITY.

• FREEDOM AND RESPECT FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS AND LIBERTIES ARE WHAT MADE THIS COUNTRY GREAT. THEIR GRADUAL BUT CONTINUOUS EROSION IS WHAT IS WEAKENING US NOW. THEIR RENEWAL DURING THE REAGAN ADMINISTRATION WILL PERMIT THE REPUBLIC TO MOVE AHEAD AGAIN. WE MUST PROCLAIM AND, MORE IMPORTANTLY, <u>DEMONSTRATE</u> TO THE WORLD THAT POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC FREEDOM IS THE MOST EFFICIENT SOCIAL SYSTEM YET DEVISED. BUT WE MUST AVOID THE ARROGANCE OF ASSUMING WE HAVE ALL THE ANSWERS FOR OTHERS AS WELL AS FOR OURSELVES, AND WE MUST <u>NOT</u> FALL INTO THE TRAP OF ASSUMING THAT FREEDOM AND INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS CAN BE IMPOSED UPON OTHERS BY FORCE AND EXTERNAL PRESSURE. WHEN A SOCIETY IS READY IT WILL EVOLVE ALONG SUCH LINES, IF A WORKING MODEL OF DEMOCRATIC FREEDOM IS CONTINUOUSLY HELD BEFORE IT. IF THERE IS AN ATTEMPT TO FORCE SUCH A DEVELOPMENT PREMATURELY, HOWEVER, THE RESULT HAS ALMOST ALWAYS BEEN THE SUBSTITUTION OF TOTALITARIAN TYRANNY FOR THE TRADITIONAL GOVERNMENT WE SO THOUGHTLESSLY UNDERMINED.

THE RECORD <u>WILL</u> BE CHANGED!

I PLEDGE THAT OUR COUNTRY'S POLICIES TOWARDS OUR NEIGHBORS IN LATIN AMERICA WILL BE CHANGED IN THE FOLLOWING WAYS:

• OUR RELATIONS WITH LATIN AMERICA WILL BE SOLIDLY BASED UPON SHARED PRACTICAL ECONOMIC AND SECURITY INTERESTS, NOT UPON MUTUAL RECRIMINATION AND INSULT.

SINCE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PROGRESS CAN ONLY TAKE PLACE IN A STABLE ENVIRONMENT, WE PLEDGE UNENDING RESISTANCE AGAINST TERRORISM AND SUBVERSION IN THIS HEMISPHERE, WHETHER OF THE EXTREME LEFT OR OF THE EXTREME RIGHT.

• As an essential element in this war on terrorism and subversion we must and we will neutralize its principal fountainhead in our midst -- the communist-terrorist government of Cuba. Without questioning the right of the Cuban people to choose whatever form of government they wish, we will firmly oppose any effort on the part of the Cuban government to spread its doctrines outside of its own borders by force and violence. Fidel Castro's Cuba is bankrupt. Politically. Economically. Socially. Morally. We do not need any more such neighbors as Cuba in this hemisphere. Yet we shall surely have them unless the policies of this Administration are reversed, and quickly.

• WE WILL INITIATE A PROGRAM OF INTENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT WITH COOPERATING COUNTRIES IN THE CARIBBEAN. MANY OF THESE COUNTRIES WERE GIVEN THEIR INDEPENDENCE AND THEN PROMPTLY FORGOTTEN. IN THEIR NATURAL RESENTMENT, SOME HAVE TURNED TO EXTREMIST MODELS -- FERTILE GROUND FOR CUBAN MEDDLING. OUR PROGRAMS WILL ASSIST THEM BOTH FINANCIALLY AND TECHNICALLY TO MAKE THE BEST USE OF THEIR RESOURCES IN AGRICULTURE, INDUSTRY AND TOURISM.

• WE WILL ESTABLISH A WESTERN HEMISPHERE VENTURE CAPITAL CORPORATION TO PROMOTE THE GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR IN LATIN AMERICA. THE GREATEST CONTRIBUTION THIS COUNTRY CAN MAKE TO[®] THE EVENTUAL TRIUMPH OF FREE AND JUST SOCIETIES IN LATIN AMERICA[©] IS TO ENCOURAGE THE GROWTH OF A STRONG AND INDEPENDENT MIDDLE CLASS OF ENTREPRENEURS, MANAGERS AND TECHNICIANS. THE COOPERATION OF OUR OWN PRIVATE SECTOR IN THIS INITIATIVE WILL BE ACTIVELY SOLICITED.

• WE WILL SPONSOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A UNIVERSITY OF THE AMERICAS, ALSO WITH PRIVATE SECTOR PARTICIPATION, AN IMPORTANT PART OF WHICH WILL BE A WESTERN HEMISPHERE TECHNOLOGICAL INSTITUTE. THIS HEMISPHERE MUST CREATE AND DISSEMINATE ITS OWN TECHNOLOGIES TO DEAL WITH ITS OWN SPECIFIC PROBLEMS. INNOVATION, HOWEVER, SHOULD NOT BE LIMITED TO PHYSICAL TECHNOLOGY. IMAGINATIVE INITIATIVES CAN ALSO BE TAKEN IN THE RESOLUTION OF COMMON SOCIAL PROBLEMS, SUCH AS THE APPLICATION ON A HEMISPHERIC SCALE OF TECHNIQUES FOR SPREADING THE OWNERSHIP OF PRODUCTIVE CAPITAL.

THIS IS THE RECORD WE WILL ESTABLISH.

Correcting the tragic mistakes and omissions off the past four years will not be easy. A legacy of mistrust and resentment has to be gradually overcome. But other than strengthening ourselves internally, there is no task that we will face that is of greater importance than this.

AFRICA 1

A POLICY TO ASSIST AFRICAN AND THIRD WORLD DEVELOPMENT

Our country has many important ties and bands of friendship with nations in the Southern Hemisphere. It is my intention to strengthen these ties.

But I see little gain from lumping all these proud and different nations together, only to let ourselves be maneuvered into needless confrontations with the so-called "Third World." I see little gain from cultivating the notion of a "Third World" group of nations in juxtaposition to us and our traditional alliances. The purpose of such a policy becomes particularly dubious if we then permit ourselves to be insulted and accused by a Fidel Castro and sundry dictators, as the alleged spokesmen of this "Third World." Their vilification of the United States, merely seeks to conceal the dismal failure of their policies at home.

A STRONG AMERICAN ECONOMY AND THE SPIRIT OF OUR FREE ENTERPRISE HAS A GREAT DEAL TO OFFER TO THE POORER, LESS INDUSTRIAL-IZED COUNTRIES OF THE WORLD. FOR EXAMPLE, OUR ECONOMIC RELATIONS WITH AFRICAN NATIONS HAVE A GREAT FUTURE POTENTIAL. AFRICANS LOOK TO US AND TO OUR INDUSTRIAL ALLIES FOR THE DOMINANT SHARE OF THEIR EXPORT MARKET, THEIR INVESTMENT CAPITAL, OFFICIAL AID AND TECHNICAL EXPERTISE. IF THE UNITED STATES AND AFRICAN NATIONS ARE TO WORK TOGETHER IN ADVANCING OUR MUTUAL INTERESTS, WE MUST RECOGNIZE THE ROLE OF OUR ECONOMY AND INDUSTRIAL KNOW-HOW. 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 our private sector is the key to African development. A cooperative

AFRICA 2

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OUR GOVERNMENT AND AMERICAN BUSINESS --SPECIFICALLY THE MINORITY AND SMALL BUSINESS SECTOR -- IS NEEDED.

The United States should not approach African economies as though they were running on charity.

Four years ago, we were told by the incoming Administration that we should keep the cold war out of Africa, restrain our arms sales, and reach an agreement to limit our naval forces in the Indian Ocean. But these people forgot to ask the right questions: who brought the cold war into Africa and shipped in arms and mercenaries in the first place? Who threatened the nations north of the Indian Ocean?

Much has been said about the West's growing stake in Southern Africa because of its mineral resources and economic activity. However important these economic relations, they must not override our basic political principles. My Administration will not endorse situations or constitutions in any society that are racist in purpose as in effect. We will press for, support, and recognize progress away from racial discrimination. Our goal must be the emergence in South Africa of a more equitable, non-racial society with which the American people and our government can preserve the fullest possible relationship.

These principles for our relations with African nations are valid also for other countries that must emerge from poverty and move through political transition. We have seen the impressive economic and social gains of hard-working people in Singapore, Taiwan, the Republic of Korea, Hong Kong and other countries of Asia. There is a direct relationship between their spirited private enterprise economic and a rapidly increasing standard of Living.

AFRICA 3

I BELIEVE THAT BY DEVELOPING SPECIFIC POLICIES TO FACILITATE RAPID GROWTH ALONG THE LINES OF FREE ENTERPRISE, THE UNITED STATES CAN OFFER A POSITIVE AND ATTRACTIVE INCENTIVE TO NATIONS WHICH MUST DEVELOP.

IT IS CLEAR THAT WE CANNOT RELIEVE THE GROWTH OF THESE NATIONS BY ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE ALONE. WE MUST OFFER KNOW-HOW, TECHNOLOGY AND MARKETING ASSISTANCE, AND I WILL SUPPORT POLICIES WHICH SUPPORT THESE GOALS. WE WILL NOT SEEK TO IMPOSE THE PRIVATE ENTERPRISE MODEL WHERE IT IS NOT WANTED, BUT WE WILL ADVOCATE IT WHEN AND WHERE POSSIBLE.

TERRORISM 1

COMBATTING INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

THE UNITED STATES MUST ASSUME A LEADERSHIP ROLE IN ATTACKING THE SPREAD OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM. IN SHARING THE OUTRAGE AGAINST TERRORISM, I WILL DIRECT THE RESOURCES OF MY ADMINISTRATION AGAINST THIS SCOURGE OF CIVILIZED NATIONS, AND I WILL DIRECT MY ADMINISTRATION TO EXPAND, IN EVERY WAY POSSIBLE, OUR COOPERATION WITH OTHER NATIONS IN COMBATTING TERRORISM IN EVERY FORM.

Today the spectrum of conflict has been expanded to include acts of terrorism by extremists who reject the rule of law, civil order, and the sanctity of individual human rights. These acts of terrorism seek to undermine, paralyze, and eventually destroy democratic governments. Israel has long been the victim of the most wanton acts of terrorism. In recent years, our European allies, as well, have been faced with a systematic spread of terrorist activities.

WE MUST BE PREPARED TO COPE WITH THE CRUEL VIOLENCE THAT TERRORISTS SEEK TO INFLICT UPON INNOCENT PEOPLE. TOGETHER WITH OTHER NATIONS, WE MUST DEMONSTRATE FIRMNESS AND UNDERTAKE INITIATIVES IN WORKING TO STEM THE TIDE OF TERRORIST VIOLENCE.

TERRORISM IS NOT CONDUCTED SIMPLY BY GROUPS OF EXTREMISTS. TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS HAVE ENJOYED THE SUPPORT OF NATIONAL GOVERNMENTS. SUCH SUPPORT HAS BEEN A CENTRAL, ALTHOUGH GENERALLY COVERT, FEATURE OF SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY. LIBYA, RULED BY A FANATIC, PROUDLY LENDS ASSISTANCE TO TERRORIST GROUPS. IN IRAN, TERRORISM HAS BEEN ELEVATED TO THE LEVEL OF OVERT NATIONAL POLICY IN THE ASSAULT ON THE AMERICAN EMBASSY AND THE YEAR-LONG CAPTIVITY OF AMERICAN CITIZENS. AND THE TACTICS AND PHILOSOPHY OF THE PLO ARE BASED ON TERRORISM.

TERRORISM 2

BUT LESSONS HAVE BEEN LEARNED, BOTH IN SUFFERING AND IN DEFEATING TERRORIST ATTACKS. THE UNITED STATES SHOULD TAKE THE LEAD IN BUILDING A POLICY OF DETERRING OR RESPONDING EFFECTIVELY TO TERRORISM BASED UPON THOSE LESSONS.

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. We will also work with other nations to create the means to deal PROMPTLY AND EFFECTIVELY WITH TERRORIST ORGANIZATIONS AND TERRORIST ACTS. ONLY BY FOCUSSING OUR ATTENTION ON THE MENACE OF TERRORISM AND BY PLAYING A LEADERSHIP ROLE CAN WE BEGIN TO REDUCE THE THREAT IT POSES TO THE WORLD.