

The original documents are located in Box 27, folder “Second Debate, 10/6/76: Key Questions” of the Michael Raoul-Duval Papers at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Michael Raoul-Duval donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

To Mike Duval

NSC input

Questions for President Ford



1. Isn't your foreign policy on dead center, stalled: relations with the Soviets are deteriorating, China normalization is frozen, there is no movement on the Middle East; the world economy is still shaky.

2. You promised a SALT agreement in 1975 in the Vladivostok communique, but two years have passed. Isn't it true that Kissinger could not agree with Schlesinger, on SALT, and now he can't agree with Rumsfeld?

3. If talks resume with China on normalization will you stick by the Republican platform and work for the independence and freedom of people of Taiwan.

4. Would you consider selling arms to communist China?

5. The Chinese received Nixon and Schlesinger; doesn't that indicate that they are snubbing you, and warning that you have to make concessions, and should be tougher on the Soviets.

6. There is talk of an oil price rise in December, and even threats of an oil embargo. What have you done to head off a price rise?

What would you do if there was a new embargo. Would you use troops to seize the oil fields?

7. Carter says he won't use troops in internal conflicts but you supported Vietnam as a Congressman and you initiated covert program in Angola. Would you intervene in Africa or Latin America if there was a communist subversion or outside intervention.

8. You say your policies are in the open, yet for six months you sponsored a clandestine secret war in Angola. What guarantee is there that you would not do so again, if the stakes were important?

9. You say that your policies meet tests of morality, peace and so forth, but then why was it necessary for the Republican National Convention to introduce a special plank on morality, including exhortations against secret agreements?

Africa

10. Africa: you took office in 1974, and did nothing special about southern Africa, until after the introduction of Cuban troops into Angola. Isn't the only reason for your change the fact that you are concerned about the Soviets, not majority rule or racial justice?

11. There has been a great deal of controversy about Alexander Solzhenitsyn. You would not see him, and a State Department official called him a "fascist", while the Republican party called him a beacon of courage. What is your view on his political philosophy and why did you refuse to see him?

12. The large sales of arms to Iran are justified on grounds of friendship and mutual security, but isn't it true that the net result will be pressure for higher oil prices, since the Shah is running out of cash?

13. Why has your Administration worked against new legislation combatting the Arab boycott of Israel and American firms that do business there?

14. The major points that you cite as success can be traced to Nixon and Kissinger: China, Soviet detente, SALT, Middle East disengagement. Isn't your policy a simple continuation of Nixon's?

15. You have consistently supported the regime in Chile. It appears that the US had a hand in an assassination attempt in 1970, and in overthrowing Allende. Now we have a terrorist killing of the former Foreign Minister. Have you investigated this record? Will you?

DEFENSE

1. Carter says he can save \$5 billion, and you said in a recent statement that the Congress could save \$12 billion if they took your recommendations for economy. How can you criticize the Carter position, when you are saying that there is considerable fat?

2. On every major weapons program there is a great rise in costs, way beyond original estimates, in some cases 100 percent. Doesn't this prove the case that determined leadership could save on defense?

3. Throughout the primaries you debated with Reagan that we were not number two. But Secretary Rumsfeld has always hedged on this, and recently said that the Soviets were accelerating their missile programs. How would you prove the case that we are still number one?

4. Several Congressmen accuse you of political skullduggery in proposing a last minute billion dollar increase in naval shipbuilding which has already been turned down

1. Regardless of Henry Kissinger's merit, is it wise to be captive to only one viewpoint?

2. Kissinger is being sued for the wiretaps he put on his own people. Is that mentality consistent with your viewpoint?

3. Aren't the Russians getting a better deal out of detente than we are?

4. Where do you want the country to be in four years? What new directions do you expect to take?



2nd Debate

Slip cards "
for the
President

MORALITY (AMERICAN VALUES)

WE HEAR A LOT OF TALK ABOUT MORALITY. I BELIEVE:

- PUSHING BACK THE SPECTER OF NUCLEAR WAR, AS WE HAVE DONE IN SALT, IS A MORAL POLICY;
- MEDIATING CONFLICT, AS WE HAVE DONE IN THE MIDDLE EAST, IS A MORAL POLICY.
- AVERTING RACE WAR AND PROMOTING RECONCILIATION, AS WE HAVE DONE IN AFRICA, IS A MORAL POLICY.
- ORGANIZING WORLD COOPERATION TO PROMOTE FOOD PRODUCTION AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS IN POORER COUNTRIES, IS A MORAL POLICY.
- INSURING THE SOLIDARITY OF OUR ALLIANCES, FOR THE SURVIVAL OF DEMOCRACY, IS A MORAL POLICY.

- STANDING LOYALLY BY ALLIES WHO SEEK TO DEFEND THEMSELVES AGAINST AGGRESSION IS A MORAL POLICY.
- AND, FINALLY, KEEPING THE PEACE -- SAVING LIVES -- IS VERY MORAL.

I THINK EVERY AMERICAN CAN BE PROUD OF WHAT THIS COUNTRY HAS DONE -- FOR PEACE, FOR FREEDOM, FOR PROGRESS, FOR JUSTICE. I AM SICK AND TIRED OF HEARING OUR COUNTRY DENOUNCED AS IMMORAL BY PEOPLE WHO CLEARLY DON'T KNOW WHAT THEY'RE TALKING ABOUT.



FOREIGN POLICY GOALS

1. MY OVERRIDING GOAL IS THAT FOUR YEARS FROM NOW, AS I PREPARE TO LEAVE PUBLIC OFFICE, AMERICA WILL STILL BE AT PEACE AND AMERICA WILL STILL HAVE THE STRENGTH AND THE WILL TO KEEP THE PEACE.

2. I CAN ASSURE YOU THAT WE WILL SERIOUSLY JEOPARDIZE OUR HOPES FOR PEACE:

-- IF WE BEGIN DISMANTLING OUR MILITARY FORCES;

-- IF WE BEGIN PRECIPITOUS WITHDRAWALS FROM KEY AREAS SUCH AS KOREA AND EUROPE; AND,

-- IF WE SEW DOUBT AND MISUNDERSTANDINGS THROUGH FUZZY OR CONTRADICTORY STATEMENTS ABOUT OUR INTENTIONS. THE WORLD IS STILL TOO DANGEROUS AND HOSTILE TO PLACE OUR FUTURE IN THE HANDS OF THOSE WHO MIGHT WAVER OR BLINK WHEN WE'RE EYEBALL-TO-EYEBALL WITH THE RUSSIANS.

(OVER)

3. THROUGH STEADY, SKILLFUL DIPLOMACY AND THROUGH CONTINUED MILITARY STRENGTH, THE U.S. HAS GREAT OPPORTUNITIES IN THE NEXT FOUR YEARS:

-- WE CAN REACH SOUND AGREEMENTS TO REDUCE THE ARMS RACE;

-- WE CAN RESOLVE THE TENSIONS THAT STILL EXIST IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND AFRICA;

-- WE CAN PROVIDE CONTINUED LEADERSHIP TO SOLVE THE WORLD'S ECONOMIC TROUBLES; AND,

-- WE CAN CONTINUE AT THE FOREFRONT OF EFFORTS TO PROVIDE ENOUGH FOOD, ENOUGH ENERGY AND ENOUGH SECURITY FOR THE POORER NATIONS TO MEET THEIR PEOPLE'S NEEDS.

(MORE)

FOREIGN POLICY GOALS, CONT'D

IF WE MOVE STEADILY TOWARD THESE GOALS, WE WILL GREATLY ENHANCE THE PROSPECTS FOR PEACE THROUGH NOT ONLY THE END OF THE DECADE BUT THROUGH THE END OF THE CENTURY AND BEYOND.

FORD RECORD

I TOOK OFFICE IN A CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS AT HOME. THE WORLD WAS WATCHING TO SEE IF WE COULD RECOVER OUR SELF-CONFIDENCE AND REMAIN THE WORLD'S LEADER. WE HAVE DONE IT.

-- FOR THE FIRST TIME SINCE EISENHOWER, AN AMERICAN PRESIDENT CAN SEEK ELECTION AND SAY WE ARE AT PEACE.

-- WE HAVE REVERSED THE DANGEROUS TREND OF SHRINKING DEFENSE BUDGETS.

-- OUR ECONOMY HAS LED THE WORLD OUT OF ECONOMIC RECESSION.

-- WE HAVE STRENGTHENED OUR ALLIANCES -- IN MY NATO AND ECONOMIC SUMMIT MEETINGS.

-- WE ACHIEVED A BREAKTHROUGH IN STRATEGIC ARMS LIMITS AT MY MEETINGS WITH GENERAL SECRETARY BREZHNEV IN VLADIVOSTOK.

-- I VISITED CHINA AND CONFIRMED THE DURABILITY OF OUR NEW RELATIONSHIP.

-- WE REACHED A MILESTONE SINAI AGREEMENT IN THE MIDDLE EAST.

-- WE HAVE UNDERTAKEN A CRUCIAL ROLE OF MEDIATION IN SOUTHERN AFRICA TO END CRISIS AND RACIAL WAR.

-- WE HAVE BEGUN A NEW RELATIONSHIP WITH THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES.

-- AT THE UN WE HAVE SPOKEN OUT FORCEFULLY FOR FAIRNESS AND JUSTICE IN THAT ORGANIZATION.

WHO RUNS FOREIGN POLICY: KISSINGER OR FORD

THIS IS A SUBJECT THAT HAS ATTRACTED FAR MORE HEAT THAN LIGHT. LET ME TRY TO SHED SOME LIGHT ON IT.

DR. KISSINGER HAPPENS TO BE A SUPERB INTERNATIONAL NEGOTIATOR -- THE BEST IN THE WORLD, SO FAR AS I CAN TELL. AND IT HAS BEEN IN THAT ROLE THAT HE HAS NEGOTIATED THE TERMS OF MANY, MANY INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS -- FROM THE SALT AGREEMENT IN THE LAST ADMINISTRATION TO THE SINAI ACCORD AND THE AFRICAN AGREEMENT IN THIS ADMINISTRATION. IN THIS ROLE, HE HAS MADE AN OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTION TO AMERICA AND TO THE CAUSE OF PEACE. WE SHOULD ALL BE GRATEFUL TO HIM.

BUT I DON'T NEED TO TELL YOU WHERE THE FINAL RESPONSIBILITY RESTS FOR DECISIONS SHAPING THE OVERALL DIRECTION AND THRUST OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY. THAT RESPONSIBILITY RESTS IN THE OVAL OFFICE; IT HAS BEEN THERE IN THE PAST AND IT REMAINS THERE TODAY. IT IS THE PRESIDENT -- AND ONLY THE PRESIDENT -- WHO CAN DECIDE WHERE TO SEND OUR TROOPS, WHO CAN DECIDE HOW MANY MISSILES AND BOMBERS AND SHIPS WE NEED TO PROTECT OUR SECURITY, AND WHO CAN DECIDE WHETHER THE MOMENT OF TRUTH HAS ARRIVED IN THE NUCLEAR AGE. THAT IS NEVER AN EASY REAPONSIBILITY, BUT IT IS ONE THAT I WELCOME.

IF ELECTED, MR. CARTER WILL BE THE FIRST PRESIDENT IN THIS CENTURY WITH VIRTUALLY NO FOREIGN AND DEFENSE POLICY EXPERIENCE. THEREFORE, I BELIEVE HE SHOULD TELL THE PEOPLE -- IN THIS DEBATE -- WHO HIS SECRETARY OF STATE AND SECRETARY OF DEFENSE WILL BE. THE PEOPLE HAVE THE RIGHT TO KNOW WHO WILL BE RUNNING THE COUNTRY'S FOREIGN AND DEFENSE POLICIES.

CONTINUATION OF NIXON-HAK FOREIGN POLICY

ISSUE: IMPACT OF GRF UPON FOREIGN POLICY INHERITED FROM RN-HAK.

1. IN EARLY DAYS OF MY ADMINISTRATION, I MADE A CONSCIOUS EFFORT TO CARRY FORWARD THE GREAT FOREIGN POLICY TRADITIONS OF THE POST-WAR ERA:

-- IT WAS URGENT THAT OUR FRIENDS AND ALLIES UNDERSTOOD THAT AMERICA WOULD REMAIN THE STRONGEST PEACEMAKER IN THE WORLD. WE HAVE ENDED THEIR FEARS. (FOR EXAMPLE, I CALLED NATO AMBASSADORS IN FOR A MEETING THE DAY I TOOK OFFICE TO REASSURE THEM THAT AMERICA WOULD BE STEADFAST IN ITS COMMITMENTS.)

-- IT WAS EQUALLY URGENT THAT OUR ADVERSARIES UNDERSTAND THAT U.S. FOREIGN POLICY WAS NOT GOING TO BREAK DOWN IN THE MIDST OF A CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS. IT WAS A TIME OF GREAT TESTING FOR US. EVERY NEW PRESIDENT IS ALWAYS TESTED BY THE SOVIETS; JFK WAS TESTED BY KHRUSCHEV IN VIENNA AND IF MR. CARTER IS ELECTED, HE WILL BE SEVERELY TESTED. I FELT THAT IN THOSE EARLY DAYS IT WAS VITAL TO STAND FIRM WITH THE SOVIETS; WE DID THAT, AND I AM NOW BEYOND TESTING INTO A PERIOD OF MUTUAL RESPECT AND PROGRESS.

2. SO CONTINUITY WAS IMPORTANT IN EARLY DAYS, BUT SINCE THAT TIME, WE HAVE MOVED VIGOROUSLY ON SEVERAL FRONTS WHERE NEW PROGRESS AND NEW INITIATIVES SEEMED POSSIBLE. AND WE'VE MADE STRIKING BREAKTHROUGHS:

(MORE)

CONTINUATION OF NIXON-HAK FOREIGN POLICY, CONT'D

- NEW ACCORDS IN THE MIDDLE EAST;
- NEW AGREEMENTS IN SOUTHERN AFRICA;
- COORDINATED ATTACK ON WORLDWIDE RECESSION LED BY
U.S.;
- NEW U. S. PROPOSALS TO MEET FUTURE FOOD NEEDS, ASSIST
DEVELOPING NATIONS.

EACH OF THESE REPRESENTS A FORD ADMINISTRATION INITIATIVE
AND A FORD ADMINISTRATION BREAKTHROUGH. EACH HAS FURTHERED THE
CAUSE OF PEACE.

REBUTTAL ON SECRECY CHARGE

CARTER CHARGE: FOREIGN POLICY UNDER HAK HAS BEEN CONDUCTED UNDER A CLOAK OF SECRECY, LEADING TO MISTAKES IN VIETNAM, CAMBODIA, ANGOLA, CIA, ETC.

1. GOVERNOR CARTER HAS MADE A HABIT DURING THIS CAMPAIGN OF RUNNING AGAINST MANY OF THE GHOSTS OF THE PAST, ALONG WITH MANY OF THE SINS OF THE PAST. I WOULD REMIND HIM THAT THIS RACE IS ONLY BETWEEN THE TWO OF US -- AND WHAT THE VOTERS MUST DECIDE IS WHICH OF US WILL DO A BETTER JOB OF KEEPING AMERICA STRONG AND AT PEACE. THIS IS THE OVERRIDING ISSUE THAT WE OUGHT TO ADDRESS TONIGHT.

2. AS TO THIS RED HERRING ABOUT SECRECY, LET ME SAY THAT MY RECORD ON FOREIGN POLICY IS THERE FOR ALL TO SEE:

-- THERE ARE NO SECRET DEALS.

-- WE HAVE HELD AN UNPRECEDENTED NUMBER OF MEETINGS WITH THE CONGRESS TO KEEP THEM INFORMED.

-- WE HAVE BEEN AS CANDID AND OPEN AS POSSIBLE. FOR EXAMPLE, AFTER THE SINAI AGREEMENT WAS REACHED, WE TURNED OVER THE DOCUMENTS FROM THOSE NEGOTIATIONS TO THE FOREIGN POLICY COMMITTEES OF THE CONGRESS.

(MORE)

REBUTTAL ON SECRECY CHARGE, CONT'D

3. I WILL SAY THAT THERE ARE TIMES WHEN DIPLOMACY CANNOT BE CONDUCTED FULLY IN THE OPEN. FOR EXAMPLE, NEGOTIATIONS WITH OUR ALLIES OR OUR ADVERSARIES ON ARMS REDUCTIONS, INVOLVE WEAPONS SYSTEMS THAT DEFEND OUR VERY SECURITY. MR. CARTER MAY BELIEVE THAT SUCH NEGOTIATIONS CAN BE CONDUCTED IN THE OPEN, BUT I DON'T AND AS LONG AS I AM PRESIDENT, SENSITIVE INFORMATION ABOUT THE MILITARY SECURITY OF THIS COUNTRY WILL REMAIN CLASSIFIED.

4. MR. CARTER COMPLAINS ABOUT SECRET DIPLOMACY ON THE ONE HAND AND THEN, ON THE OTHER HAND, PROPOSES "UNPUBLICIZED" NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE SOVIETS ON THE MIDDLE EAST. HE CAN'T HAVE IT BOTH WAYS.

RELATIONS WITH ALLIES

RELATIONS WITH OUR ALLIES HAVE NEVER BEEN BETTER. WHEN I CAME INTO OFFICE, I FOUND THAT OUR ALLIES IN EUROPE AND ASIA FELT THEY HAD BEEN NEGLECTED OVER A PERIOD OF 10 YEARS, OR MORE, AND THEY QUESTIONED WHETHER WE HAD LOST OUR WILL, OUR STEADFASTNESS OF PURPOSE. ALL THAT HAS CHANGED:

- I HAVE MET SEVERAL TIMES WITH ALL OUR ALLIED LEADERS. THEY NOW HAVE CONFIDENCE IN OUR POLICY.
- THE ECONOMIC SUMMITS (RAMBOUILLET, NOVEMBER 1975; PUERTO RICO, JUNE 1976) WERE A MILESTONE. COOPERATION NOW EXTENDS BEYOND DEFENSE TO COOPERATION ON ECONOMIC AND ENERGY POLICY.
- WE HAVE BEEFED UP NATO DEFENSES.

- OUR COOPERATION WITH FRANCE IS CLOSER THAN BEFORE.
- SPAIN AND PORTUGAL, ONCE THOUGHT TO BE ON THE BRINK OF CHAOS, ARE MOVING STEADILY TOWARD DEMOCRACY.
- WE HAVE A COMMON POSITION IN THE EAST-WEST TALKS ON TROOP CUTS.
- I WAS THE FIRST AMERICAN PRESIDENT TO VISIT JAPAN.
- MY BASIC PRINCIPLE THAT WE STAND BY ALL ALLIES -- ISRAEL, KOREA, IRAN, AS WELL AS OUR NATO ALLIES AND JAPAN -- BECAUSE IF WE FAIL TO STAND FIRM IN ANY SINGLE PLACE, WE UNDERMINE THE CONFIDENCE OF OUR ALLIES AND ONLY HEARTEN OUR ADVERSARIES.

REBUTTAL ON ALLIES

CARTER CHARGES: RELATIONS WITH ALLIES IN DISREPAIR.

MR. CARTER SEEMS TO BE TALKING MORE ABOUT CONDITIONS THAT EXISTED IN THE PAST THAN THE CONDITIONS OF TODAY. IF HE WILL TALK WITH ALLIED LEADERS -- AS I HAVE -- HE WILL FIND THAT WE ENJOY CLOSE RELATIONS, AS SHOWN IN THE ECONOMIC SUMMITS, THE TROOP-CUT NEGOTIATIONS, AND NEW AREAS OF COOPERATION ON ECONOMIC ISSUES AND ENERGY ISSUES.

OUR ALLIES NO LONGER FEEL NEGLECTED; THEY NO LONGER QUESTION THE CONSTANCY OF AMERICAN PURPOSE.

MR. CARTER SAYS HE IS FOR OUR ALLIES, YET HE TAKES POSITIONS THAT WOULD INVITE A MAJOR CRISIS OF CONFIDENCE WITH ALL OUR ALLIES:

- HE WANTS TO RETHINK OUR WHOLE NATO ALLIANCE, AND TALKS ABOUT U.S. TROOP CUTS;
- HE WOULD CHANGE NATO'S AGREED NUCLEAR STRATEGY, SHIFTING TO A DANGEROUS "MASSIVE RETALIATION" STRATEGY INSTEAD OF THE AGREED POLICY "FLEXIBLE RESPONSE."
- HE WOULD WITHDRAW OUR TROOPS FROM SOUTH KOREA, WHICH WOULD RISK JAPAN'S SECURITY.

ALL OF THIS HAS BEEN VERY UNSETTLING TO OUR ALLIES.

KOREA

-- KOREA IS A FLASH POINT FOR POSSIBLE CONFLICT IN ASIA.

-- NORTH KOREA IS HEAVILY ARMED (500,000), DANGEROUS AND AGGRESSIVE AS WE HAVE JUST RECENTLY SEEN IN CRISIS.

-- THEREFORE, IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT AMERICA BE FIRM AND LEAVE NO DOUBT OF ITS OBLIGATIONS.

-- THIS IS ONLY WAY TO DETER A NEW WAR IN ASIA. WE PROVED THIS IN AUGUST, WHEN WE STOOD FIRM.

-- OUR TROOPS (42,000) ARE ESSENTIAL TO THE SUCCESS OF THIS POLICY.

-- PROPOSAL BY CARTER TO REDUCE OR PULL OUT ARE DANGEROUS, BECAUSE THEY TEMPT ATTACKS -- CREATE CRISIS OF CONFIDENCE, NOT ONLY IN KOREA BUT IN JAPAN AND ELSEWHERE.

(OVER)

-- MANY OF US RECALL WHEN WE TOLD THE WORLD IN 1950 THAT KOREA WAS OUTSIDE THE PERIMETER OF U.S. DEFENSES. SHORTLY THEREAFTER, THE NORTH KOREANS ATTACKED, AND WE WERE AT WAR. WE DON'T WANT A REPETITION OF 1950.

-- WE HAVE PROPOSED A NEW CONFERENCE WITH BOTH KOREAS, THE UNITED STATES AND CHINA. THIS IS THE WAY TO EASE TENSIONS. NO UNILATERAL WITHDRAWALS.



REBUTTAL ON KOREA

-- WE MUST REMEMBER THAT KOREA IS SURROUNDED BY HOSTILE POWERS - NORTH KOREA, THE SOVIET UNION AND CHINA. IT FACES SUBVERSION AND HALF A MILLION MEN ON ITS BORDERS.

-- THE PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN KOREA DOES NOT MEET OUR STANDARDS, AND I HAVE MADE IT CLEAR TO PRESIDENT PARK THAT I NEITHER APPROVE NOR CONDONE SOME PRACTICES THERE. BUT I ALSO THINK WE HAVE TO UNDERSTAND HOSTILE ENVIRONMENT IN WHICH THAT COUNTRY EXISTS.

-- WE SHOULD NOT WITHDRAW OUR TROOPS, CUT OFF OUR MILITARY AID, OR BLACKMAIL KOREAN GOVERNMENT BECAUSE IT DOES NOT LIVE UP TO OUR STANDARDS.

-- KOREA IN HOSTILE HANDS WOULD THREATEN JAPAN. ASIANS WILL LOSE FAITH IN OUR RELIABILITY IF WE FAIL TO LIVE UP TO COMMITMENTS IN KOREA.

-- CARTER'S WITHDRAWAL PLEDGES WILL UNDERMINE THE STABILITY ON THE PENINSULA AND SECURITY THROUGHOUT ASIA.

-- TROOP REDUCTIONS ANYWHERE SHOULD BE RESULTS OF MUTUAL NEGOTIATIONS. IT IS A SIGN OF INEXPERIENCE FOR MR. CARTER TO SUGGEST UNILATERAL WITHDRAWAL BECAUSE THIS OBVIOUSLY WEAKENS OUR ABILITY TO NEGOTIATE MUTUAL REDUCTIONS.

U.S. AND THE MIDDLE EAST

1. THE MIDDLE EAST IS A FOCAL POINT OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY FOR THREE MAJOR REASONS:

- STRATEGICALLY, IT IS AT A CROSSROADS OF THE WORLD;
- ECONOMICALLY, IT SITS ATOP THE LARGEST KNOWN SUPPLY OF PETROLEUM IN THE WORLD;
- AND, MORALLY, WE ARE COMMITTED TO THE SURVIVAL AND SECURITY OF ISRAEL.

2. FOUR TIMES IN THE PAST QUARTER CENTURY, THE ARABS AND ISRAELIS HAVE GONE TO WAR. A MAJOR PREOCCUPATION OF MY ADMINISTRATION HAS BEEN TO REDUCE THE TENSIONS AND ACHIEVE A JUST AND LASTING PEACE. OUR APPROACH -- STEP-BY-STEP DIPLOMACY -- HAS PAID OFF:

- EGYPTIAN-ISRAELI DISENGAGEMENT AGREEMENT OF JANUARY, 1974;
- SYRIA-ISRAELI AGREEMENT OF MAY, 1974;
- EGYPTIAN-ISRAELI SINAI AGREEMENT OF SEPTEMBER, 1975.

NOT ONLY HAS THIS KEPT THE PEACE, BUT SOVIET INFLUENCE IN MOST OF THE AREA -- AS RABIN HAS SAID -- IS AT ITS LOWEST EBB IN 20 YEARS. THE UNITED STATES TODAY IS THE ONLY NATION THAT ENJOYS THE TRUST OF BOTH SIDES.

(MORE)

U.S. AND THE MIDDLE EAST, CONT'D

3. CLEARLY, THE FORWARD MOMENTUM MUST CONTINUE. WE ARE FLEXIBLE ABOUT THE MEANS TO ACHIEVE THE ULTIMATE GOAL, BUT WE ARE UNBENDING IN OUR DESIRE TO MOVE FORWARD.

4. WE WILL PROCEED, OF COURSE, IN CONSULTATION WITH ISRAEL. WE ARE A STEADFAST FRIEND. FORTY PERCENT OF ALL U.S. POSTWAR AID TO ISRAEL HAS COME IN THE TWO YEARS OF THIS ADMINISTRATION.

5. ISRAEL'S CURRENT PROPOSAL -- SUBSTANTIAL TERRITORIAL CONCESSIONS IN RETURN FOR AN END TO THE STATE OF WAR -- IS ONE THAT SHOULD CERTAINLY BE DISCUSSED.



REBUTTAL TO CARTER ON MIDDLE EAST

I WELCOME MR. CARTER'S EVIDENT DESIRE TO ACHIEVE A LASTING PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND HIS COMMITMENT TO THE SECURITY OF ISRAEL. LITTLE OF WHAT HE SAYS IS INCONSISTENT WITH CURRENT ADMINISTRATION POLICY, EXCEPT ON THESE POINTS:

-- FIRST, HE SEEMS WILLING TO DICTATE TO ISRAEL THEIR FINAL BORDERS WITH THE ARAB STATES. FOR EXAMPLE, HE HAS SAID ISRAEL SHOULD WITHDRAW TO THE 1967 BORDERS BUT KEEP THE GOLAN HEIGHTS AND CONTROL OVER JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN HOLY PLACES IN JERUSALEM. WE BELIEVE THAT TERMS SHOULD NOT BE DICTATED BY THE U.S. OR ANY OTHER OUTSIDER BUT SHOULD BE DETERMINED BY THE PARTIES THEMSELVES.

-- SECOND, HE APPARENTLY WANTS TO INVITE THE SOVIETS INTO EVERY NEGOTIATION AND HAS EVEN TALKED ABOUT A SECRETLY NEGOTIATED U.S.-SOVIET PLAN FOR DICTATING A FINAL SOLUTION FOR THE MIDDLE EAST. ANYONE FAMILIAR WITH THE SOVIET RECORD IN THE MIDDLE EAST MUST BE TROUBLED BY MR. CARTER'S SUGGESTIONS; I KNOW THAT I AM, AND I DO NOT ACCEPT THEM.

THE COUNTRIES OF THE MIDDLE EAST ARE CLOSER TO A JUST AND LASTING PEACE THAN AT ANY TIME IN SEVERAL YEARS; THAT IS DUE IN PART TO THEIR OWN WISDOM AND IN PART TO THE VERY CONSTRUCTIVE POLICIES OF THE UNITED STATES. I INTEND TO MAINTAIN THOSE POLICIES AND PRESS FORWARD IN THE SEARCH FOR AN END TO TENSIONS AND HOSTILITY.

TERRORISM

-- THERE IS ONLY ONE POLICY THAT WORKS SUCCESSFULLY AGAINST TERRORISM: TO BE TOUGH AND AGGRESSIVE. TWO COUNTRIES HAVE ADOPTED THAT APPROACH -- ISRAEL AND THE UNITED STATES -- AND IN BOTH WE HAVE ACHIEVED NOTABLE SUCCESS. IN THE U.S., THERE HAS BEEN ONLY ONE CASE OF SKYJACKING IN THE PAST TWO YEARS, AND IT FAILED. TOUGH, AGGRESSIVE POLICIES ARE THE BEST APPROACH HERE AND ELSEWHERE.

-- THE UN IS IN A UNIQUE POSITION AND SHOULD TACKLE THE PROBLEM OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM HEAD ON.

-- WE INTRODUCED A DRAFT CONVENTION TO THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY TO PREVENT THE SPREAD OF TERRORIST VIOLENCE.

-- LAST SUMMER AFTER THE DRAMATICALLY SUCCESSFUL ISRAELI RAID AT ENTEBEE, THE U.S. AND GREAT BRITAIN INTRODUCED A RESOLUTION IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL CALLING UPON ALL COUNTRIES TO TAKE EVERY NECESSARY MEASURE TO PREVENT AND PUNISH TERRORIST ACTS.

-- WE WILL WORK WITH OUR ALLIES AND FRIENDS TO:

- EXCHANGE INTELLIGENCE
- TEACH TECHNICAL ASPECTS OF PREVENTING TERRORISM

-- SECRETARY KISSINGER AT THE UN LAST WEEK EMPHASIZED OUR DETERMINATION TO PROCEED UNILATERALLY IF MULTINATIONAL ACTION IS NOT FORTHCOMING.

(MORE)

TERRORISM, CONT'D

UNILATERAL

-- I HAVE ORDERED MAXIMUM SECURITY AT US AIRPORTS. THIS LED TO A MARKED REDUCTION IN HIJACKING ATTEMPTS IN US.

-- (THE HIJACKING OF THE TWA PLANE DID NOT IN FACT CARRY WEAPONS ONTO THE AIRCRAFT AND THIS CERTAINLY WAS A MAJOR FACTOR IN THE SUCCESSFUL CONCLUSIONS OF THAT HIJACKING.)

-- I HAVE ESTABLISHED A SPECIAL TASK FORCE COMBINING FBI, FAA, STATE, DEFENSE AND OTHERS TO DEAL WITH:

- CRISES MANAGEMENT, AND
- PROMOTING FIRM CONTROLS INTERNATIONALLY.

-- I HAVE INCREASED THE SECURITY OF OUR MISSIONS OVERSEAS.

ENVIRONMENT

THE UNITED STATES IS LOOKED UPON BY THE NATIONS OF THE WORLD AS THE LEADER IN DEVELOPING INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS TO CLEAN UP THE WORLD'S ENVIRONMENT.

MY ADMINISTRATION HAS TAKEN THE LEAD IN MANY INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, SUCH AS RECENT ONES WITH MEXICO AND JAPAN, AGREEMENTS WITH CANADA TO WORK FOR REDUCTION OF POLLUTION IN THE GREAT LAKES, INTERNATIONAL EFFORTS TO SAVE WHALES BY DRASTICALLY REDUCING WHALE QUOTAS.

WE HAVE TAKEN A STRONG STAND IN FAVOR OF POLLUTION CONTROL IN THE WORLD'S OCEANS.

ENVIRONMENTAL REBUTTAL

PRESIDENT MAY BE CRITICIZED FOR SUPPORTING SST WHILE A CONGRESSMAN;
ALSO, ADMINISTRATION LET IN THE CONCORDE.

REPLY: SST AND CONCORDE DO NOT IN THEMSELVES HARM THE OZONE
LAYER. CONCORDES ARE SO FEW THEIR ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WILL BE
MINISCULE.

ALSO MAY BE CRITICIZED FOR FAILING TO PROMOTE BAN ON FLUOROCARBONS.

REPLY: ADMINISTRATION WILL ACT WHEN DATA HAS BEEN THOROUGHLY
EVALUATED. NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCE PANEL HAS RECOMMENDED TWO-
YEAR DELAY WHILE FURTHER INVESTIGATIONS ARE CARRIED OUT. CURRENT
FINDINGS INDICATE NEED FOR PROTECTION.

FOOD POLICY

WORLD FOOD PRODUCTION IS RAPIDLY RISING. SINCE 1967 FOOD PRODUCTION HAS BEEN GOING UP FASTER THAN POPULATION. BUT THERE IS STILL ENORMOUS UNMET NEED. FIRST WORLD FOOD CONFERENCE WAS HELD AT MY INITIATIVE IN FALL OF 1974. OUR POLICY IS TWOFOLD:

1. A LONG-RANGE POLICY TO GIVE THE POORER COUNTRIES THE TECHNOLOGICAL KNOW-HOW TO FEED THEMSELVES.
2. AN IMMEDIATE POLICY TO HELP MEET PRESSING FOOD SHORTAGES IN SOME COUNTRIES. LONG-RANGE, WE ARE HELPING DEVELOP AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGY THROUGH OUR FOREIGN AID PROGRAM. ALSO, WE ARE PRESSING FOR AN INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM OF GRAIN RESERVES. WE ALSO HAVE PROPOSED AN INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT. CHIEF BOTTLENECK IS GETTING PARTICIPATION FROM OPEC COUNTRIES.

(OVER)

TO MEET IMMEDIATE NEEDS, WE ARE NOW PROVIDING SUBSTANTIAL FOOD AID. IN FISCAL 1976, WE GAVE SIX MILLION TONS OF FOOD WORTH ONE AND ONE HALF BILLION TO NATIONS WITH SERIOUS FOOD PROBLEMS.

POPULATION CONTROL

WE ARE WINNING THE WORLDWIDE FIGHT AGAINST EXCESSIVE POPULATION GROWTH. IN THE LAST TEN YEARS, THE U.S. HAS SPENT CLOSE TO ONE BILLION DOLLARS TO COMBAT THIS PROBLEM. THIS HELP HAS BEEN EFFECTIVE. THE BIRTH RATE HAS FALLEN IN EAST ASIA AND CENTRAL AMERICA. INDIA IS NOW MAKING PROGRESS. IN AFRICA, PROGRESS IS JUST BEGINNING.

IN TEN MORE YEARS, AT OUR PRESENT RATE OF EFFORT, THE PROBLEM SHOULD BE, TO A GREAT EXTENT, UNDER CONTROL. WE HAVE GIVEN ABOUT 60 PERCENT OF THE AID FROM DEVELOPED COUNTRIES IN THIS FIELD.

(SINCE 1973 WE HAVE GIVEN NO AID FOR ABORTION. OUR AID GOES FOR BIRTH CONTROL AND EDUCATION.)

THE WORLD POPULATION PROBLEM IS A HUMANITARIAN PROBLEM.

-- WILL THERE BE ENOUGH FOOD?

-- WILL ALL CHILDREN OF THE WORLD HAVE PROPER MEDICAL CARE?

-- WILL THEY IN FACT SURVIVE THEIR CHILDHOOD?

NO NATION HAS SHOWN AS MUCH COMPASSION IN DEALING WITH THESE PROBLEMS. NO NATION HAS DONE AS MUCH TO SOLVE THEM.

EVERY AMERICAN SHOULD BE PROUD OF OUR EFFORTS.

REBUTTAL ON POPULATION CONTROL

OUR AID HAS BEEN GENEROUS -- ABOUT 60 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL GIVEN BY DEVELOPED NATIONS.

THERE IS NO CONTRADICTION BETWEEN OUR AID GIVEN TO FAMILY PLANNING ABROAD AND THE PRESIDENT'S POSITION ON ABORTION -- U.S. FUNDS HAVE NOT BEEN USED TO SUPPORT ABORTION SINCE 1973.

MORALITY (AMERICAN VALUES)

WE HEAR A LOT OF TALK ABOUT MORALITY. I BELIEVE:

-- PUSHING BACK THE SPECTER OF NUCLEAR WAR, AS WE HAVE DONE IN SALT, IS A MORAL POLICY;

-- MEDIATING CONFLICT, AS WE HAVE DONE IN THE MIDDLE EAST, IS A MORAL POLICY.

-- AVERTING RACE WAR AND PROMOTING RECONCILIATION, AS WE HAVE DONE IN AFRICA, IS A MORAL POLICY.

-- ORGANIZING WORLD COOPERATION TO PROMOTE FOOD PRODUCTION AND ECONOMIC PROGRESS IN POORER COUNTRIES, IS A MORAL POLICY.

-- INSURING THE SOLIDARITY OF OUR ALLIANCES, FOR THE SURVIVAL OF DEMOCRACY, IS A MORAL POLICY.

-- STANDING LOYALLY BY ALLIES WHO SEEK TO DEFEND THEMSELVES AGAINST AGGRESSION IS A MORAL POLICY.

-- AND, FINALLY, KEEPING THE PEACE -- SAVING LIVES -- IS VERY MORAL.

I THINK EVERY AMERICAN CAN BE PROUD OF WHAT THIS COUNTRY HAS DONE -- FOR PEACE, FOR FREEDOM, FOR PROGRESS, FOR JUSTICE. I AM SICK AND TIRED OF HEARING OUR COUNTRY DENOUNCED AS IMMORAL BY PEOPLE WHO CLEARLY DON'T KNOW WHAT THEY'RE TALKING ABOUT.

NUCLEAR WAR REBUTTAL

MR. CARTER HAS SAID THAT IF WE USE EVEN A SINGLE NUCLEAR WEAPON WHEN ATTACKED IN EUROPE THAT THERE WOULD BE AN IMMEDIATE ESCALATION INTO AN ALL-OUT NUCLEAR WAR.

THIS IS AN EXTREMELY DANGEROUS VIEW. IT IS A MAJOR CHALLENGE TO THE MILITARY STRATEGY OF THE ATLANTIC ALLIANCE WHICH HAS BEEN CAREFULLY WORKED OUT BY THE PAST THREE ADMINISTRATIONS. MR. CARTER'S POSITION AMOUNTS TO A VIRTUAL GUARANTEE TO THE SOVIETS THAT THEY COULD LAUNCH AN ATTACK IN EUROPE AND THAT THE ONLY CHOICE FOR THE UNITED STATES MIGHT BE DEFEAT OR MASSIVE RETALIATION.

I STRONGLY DISAGREE WITH THIS VIEWPOINT. OUR TACTICAL NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN EUROPE ARE CRITICAL TO DETERRING AGGRESSION. SECOND, THEY GIVE THE ALLIANCE THE CAPABILITY TO MEET ATTACK AT WHATEVER LEVEL THEY ARE LAUNCHED.

I WILL NOT CREATE A CRISIS IN THE WESTERN ALLIANCE BY SUGGESTING WE WOULD WITHHOLD OUR NUCLEAR DETERRENT UNLESS THE UNITED STATES ITSELF WAS ATTACKED.



1. FOR SEVERAL YEARS, ONE OF CLEAREST AMERICAN ADVANTAGES OVER THE SOVIETS HAS BEEN THE SUPERIORITY OF OUR MANNED BOMBING FORCE. VITAL THAT WE MAINTAIN THAT SUPERIORITY BECAUSE BOMBERS CARRY ALMOST HALF OF OUR NUCLEAR MEGATTONAGE; BOMBERS CAN ALSO BE SENT ON MISSIONS AND THEN BE RECALLED.
2. BUT THE KEY TO OUR BOMBING FORCE, THE B-52, HAS BECOME OLD AND BECAUSE OF ADVANCING SOVIET TECHNOLOGY, CAN NO LONGER SAFELY PENETRATE SOVIET AIR DEFENSES. WE NEED A REPLACEMENT.
3. TWO FORMER PRESIDENT, SIX SECRETARIES OF DEFENSE AND THE PAST FIVE CONGRESSES HAVE ALL CONCLUDED THAT THE B-1 IS THE BEST REPLACEMENT BECAUSE IT CAN PENETRATE SOVIET AIR DEFENSES.

4. MR. CARTER AND I TOTALLY DISAGREE ABOUT THE B-1. I AM FOR IT AND WANT TO GO AHEAD WITH PRODUCTION. MR. CARTER CAN'T MAKE UP HIS MIND. THE B-1 IS A GOOD AIRCRAFT, AND AFTER IT SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETES ITS CURRENT TESTING, THE U.S. SHOULD BUILD A B-1 FLEET.
5. LET'S ALSO REALIZE THAT IN ADDITION TO AMERICANS WATCHING US TONIGHT, FOREIGN LEADERS ARE ALSO CAREFULLY OBSERVING US. I'M TROUBLED BY WHAT THE KREMLIN MUST THINK WHEN IT HEARS A SERIOUS CANDIDATE FOR THE PRESIDENCY TALKING ABOUT FORFEITING ONE OF ITS MOST IMPORTANT ADVANTAGES WE HAVE AGAINST THEM.
6. AS A GENERAL RULE, I DON'T THINK THAT A U.S. PILOT SHOULD BE SENT UP IN AN AIRCRAFT THAT IS OLDER THAN HE IS.

\$5 - 7 BILLION CUT IN THE DEFENSE BUDGET

1. MOST OF MR. CARTER'S REMARKS ON DEFENSE FOCUS ON BUDGET CUTS.
 - HE SAYS, "WE CAN CUT BILLIONS OF DOLLARS FROM OUR DEFENSE BUDGET AND AT THE SAME TIME INCREASE OUR ABILITY TO DEFEND OURSELVES."
 - MR. CARTER HAS USED AT LEAST THREE DIFFERENT FIGURES FOR THE AMOUNT THE DEFENSE BUDGETS CAN BE CUT:
 - \$12-15 BILLION IN MARCH 1976;
 - \$7-8 BILLION IN JANUARY 1976;
 - \$5-7 BILLION MOST RECENTLY.

2. WE HAVE NO "FAT" LEFT TO CUT. LAST JANUARY, I DIRECTED A SERIES OF MEASURES TO IMPROVE EFFICIENCY WHICH WILL SAVE \$2.3 BILLION THIS YEAR AND UP TO \$40 BILLION OVER THE NEXT FIFTEEN YEARS.
 - IMPLEMENTED EFFICIENCIES IN FEDERAL PAY SYSTEMS TO ASSURE THAT FEDERAL PAY DOES NOT EXCEED PAY IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR.
 - ISSUED TIGHT RESTRICTIONS ON DEFENSE TRAVEL COSTS.
 - REDUCED THE NUMBER OF SENIOR OFFICIALS BY 4-5%.
 - REDUCED THE SIZE OF MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS.
 - EXPANDED THE NUMBER OF ACTIVITIES PERFORMED ON CONTRACTS BY THE PRIVATE SECTOR RATHER THAN BY FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

(MORE)

3. SOME RESTRAINT MEASURES REQUIRED APPROVAL BY THE CONGRESS.

THESE INCLUDED:

- BASIC CHANGES IN COMPENSATION AND RETIREMENT OF MILITARY PERSONNEL.
- REVISIONS TO THE FEDERAL BLUE COLLAR PAY SYSTEM.
- THE SALE OF ITEMS FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE WHICH ARE EXCESS TO OUR NEEDS.

THESE AND OTHER RESTRAINTS WOULD SAVE THE TAXPAYERS \$1 BILLION THIS YEAR ALONE, AND MORE THAN \$80 BILLION OVER THE NEXT FIFTEEN-YEAR PERIOD. BUT CONGRESS VOTED TO ALLOW US TO INSTITUTE LESS THAN HALF THE SAVINGS WE PROPOSED.

4. BUT MR. CARTER WANTS A \$7 BILLION CUT IN THE PRESENT BUDGET. THIS MEANS HE WILL CUT INTO THE MUSCLE. MR. CARTER HAS YET TO SPECIFY WHERE HE WOULD MAKE HIS \$5-7 BILLION CUTS. HE SHOULD BE CRITICIZING THE DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS FOR NOT PASSING THE MEASURES WHICH I HAVE ALREADY PROPOSED.

IT'S ONE THING TO PROMISE TO REORGANIZE GOVERNMENT BUT REFUSE TO SAY HOW. AND IT MAY JUST BE CAMPAIGN RHETORIC TO PROMISE TAX REFORM AND NOT SAY HOW. BUT IT CAN BE TRULY IRRESPONSIBLE FOR AN INEXPERIENCED CANDIDATE TO PROMISE TO CUT \$5-7 BILLION FROM THE DEFENSE BUDGET AND NOT SAY HOW.

ARAB BOYCOTT/DISCRIMINATION

I HAVE TAKEN THE STRONGEST ACTION AGAINST THE BOYCOTT AND DISCRIMINATION OF ANY PRESIDENT SINCE ISRAEL WAS FOUNDED.

- NEARLY A YEAR AGO I DIRECTED THE COMMERCE DEPARTMENT AND ALL FEDERAL AGENCIES TO PROHIBIT COMPLIANCE WITH DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES IN FOREIGN TRADE.
- THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT HAS LAUNCHED THE FIRST ANTI-TRUST SUIT IN A MAJOR BOYCOTT CASE.
- I SIGNED THE TAX BILL, WHICH HAD SEVERE PENALTIES AGAINST U.S. FIRMS THAT PARTICIPATE IN THE BOYCOTT OR DISCRIMINATION.

BUT BEYOND THIS WE HAVE SEEN IN CONGRESS MEASURES THAT ARE SO ONE-SIDED THAT THEY WILL UNDERMINE OUR MEDIATING ROLE IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND PRACTICALLY INVITE THE SOVIETS TO REESTABLISH THEMSELVES IN THE ARAB WORLD.

IT'S AN EFFECTIVE BID FOR VOTES BUT IT'S NOT IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST OF THE UNITED STATES OR IN THE INTEREST OF PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST.

A POLITICIAN CAN TELL YOU WHAT YOU WANT TO HEAR; A PRESIDENT HAS TO TELL YOU THE FACTS.

ANSWER TO EVERY CARTER ATTACK

1. WE ARE AT PEACE -- THE ULTIMATE TEST OF OUR FOREIGN AND DEFENSE POLICIES.
2. MR. CARTER, IF ELECTED, WOULD GO INTO OFFICE AS THE MOST INEXPERIENCED PRESIDENT IN FOREIGN AND DEFENSE AFFAIRS SINCE THE LATE 1800's.

CARTER FLIP FLOPS ON DEFENSE SPENDING

March, 1975: Supports \$15 billion cut

Carter said he thinks the Ford defense budget could be reduced by about 15 billion without sacrificing national security.

Los Angeles Times
March 20, 1975

November, 1975: Talks of \$7-8 billion cut

"I would not agree that we need a cut in the major expenditures for our defense below a figure such as \$7 or 8 billion."

Presentation to National Democratic
Issues Conference, Louisville, Ky.
November 23, 1975

June, 1976: Supports cuts of \$5 to \$7 billion

"Without endangering the defense of our nation or our commitments to our allies, we can reduce present defense expenditures by about \$5 to \$7 billion annually."

Carter Recommendations to
the Democratic Platform
June, 1976
Quoted by Common Cause,
"How They Stand", August 24, 1976

October 3, 1976
D. G.

LESS DEVELOPED: NEGLECT

PROBLEM: 2 BILLION OF WORLD'S POOR LIVE IN OVER 100 COUNTRIES

THEY NEED AID; CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT; AND MARKETS FOR THEIR PRODUCTS FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH.

US AID: WE LARGEST SINGLE DONOR: 3 BILLION IN AID AND ASSISTANCE; MOST HUMANITARIAN IN FOOD AND MEDICAL CARE; \$1 BILLION TO THIRD WORLD POPULATION

US TAKEN LEAD: TO HELP LESS DEVELOPED, SUPPORT LOANS FROM INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONAL; \$375 MILLION US CONTRIBUTION THIS YEAR

CONGRESS CUTS: TOTAL EFFORT ECONOMIC, ASSISTANCE, MILITARY IS \$5 BILLION, CONGRESS CUT BY OVER \$680 MILLION.

BURDEN: CAN'T GO HIGHER: AMERICAN PEOPLE ALREADY BEAR HEAVY BURDEN

REBUTTAL

GIVE MORE: WE ALREADY LARGEST SINGLE DONOR OF AID; WE GIVE 3 1/3 OF WORLD TOTAL: \$5 BILLION IN ALL TYPES OF AID THIS YEAR: \$3 BILLION IN ECONOMIC AND SUPPORT ASSISTANCE.

\$700 MILLION TO INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTION REQUEST FOR \$1 BILLION, CONGRESS CUT BY \$300 MILLION.

CARTER PROPOSALS: WANTS ABOUT \$4 BILLION INCREASE. WHERE DOES INCREASE COME, WHEN CONGRESS CUT OVERALL ASSISTANCE BY \$680 MILLION.

KEY IS LONG TERM SOLUTION. CAN'T SIMPLY GO ON GIVING MONEY WITHOUT LONG TERM PROGRAMS. HE WANTS COMMODITY AGREEMENTS: THEY HIKE PRICES AND DISTORT MARKET, WE TREAT CASE-BY-CASE.

US INITIATIVES: IN UN AND IN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES, US TAKEN LEAD IN PROPOSING NEW PROGRAMS. BEGAN WITH WORLD FOOD CONFERENCE (Nov 74), UNGA SPECIAL SESSION LAST YEAR.

ARMS SALES

WHO GETS: BULK OF OUR ARMS SALES ARE TO CLOSE FRIENDS AND ALLIES.
ISRAEL RECEIVED OVER \$4.2 BILLION IN MILITARY ASSISTANCE LAST TWO YEARS.
ACTUAL SALES IN FY 76: \$2.3 BILLION, ABOUT 1/3 FOR ISRAEL

CASH SALES: IN 1950s USED TO GRANT AID, NOW WE SELL AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE FOR CASH: BECAUSE OTHER COUNTRIES HAVE RECOVERED THEIR ECONOMIC POSITION

COST OF EQUIPMENT: COST OF MODERN FIGHTER UP SEVERAL TIMES: CAN'T COMPARE WITH EARLY YEARS.

WHAT IS SOLD: ONLY 40 PERCENT (1975-76) FOR WEAPONS AND AMMUNITION.

IRAN EXAMPLE: MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO IRAN STARTED BY TRUMAN; JOHNSON SOLD MOST MODERN FIGHTER (F-4) IN 1966. IRAN CLOSE FRIEND, DID NOT JOIN OIL EMBARGO AGAINST US OR ISRAEL: NOW WANTS REPLACE FIGHTERS: WANTS BEST: PAYS FOR IT. HOW CAN WE BE FRIEND AND DENY COUNTRY DEFENSE, WHEN BORDERED BY SOVIET UNION AND IRAQ, WHICH SOVIETS SUPPLY.

REBUTTAL

SELLING BOTH SIDES: WE SELL ARMS TO ISRAEL FOR SELF DEFENSE; OVER \$4.2 BILLION, IN MILITARY ASSISTANCE LAST TWO YEARS: ONLY MIDDLE EAST COUNTRY THAT GETS US ARMS SAUDI ARABIA, SMALL PROGRAM FOR SELF DEFENSE FIGHTER PLANES; NOT AFFECT BALANCE.
CLEARLY IN OUR INTEREST TO STRENGTHEN MODERATE GOVERNMENTS THAT WILL HELP IN PEACE SETTLEMENT: ALTERNATIVE IS LET SOVIET DOMINATE WITH ARMS TO ALL ARABS.

ARMS RACE: OVER HALF IS FOR CONSTRUCTION, TRAINING, SUPPLIES, MERCHANTS OF DEATH AND SO FORTH.

AID TO DICTATORS: CAN'T BLACKMAIL COUNTRIES BY DENYING SELF DEFENSE: CONGRESS ATTACK ON SOUTH KOREA, WHEN THAT COUNTRY FACING 500,000 ON BORDER; US DENIAL OF AID WILL UNDERMINE PEACE, OR FORCE COUNTRIES TO TURN ELSEWHERE -- OR GO NUCLEAR. CAN'T STOP ARMS SALES UNLESS ALL COUNTRIES AGREE (CARTER SAYS HE'LL DO IT UNILATERALLY IF OTHERS DON'T AGREE).

TERRORISM

-- The UN is in a unique position and should tackle the problem of international terrorism head on.

-- The most pressing need is to deny sanctuary to hijackers and other terrorists.

-- ^{The United States} We introduced a draft convention to the UN General Assembly [REDACTED], to prevent the spread of terrorist violence.

-- Last summer after the dramatically successful Israeli raid, the US and the UK introduced a resolution in the Security Council calling upon all countries to take every necessary measure to prevent and punish terrorist acts.

-- If forced to, we will work with our Allies and friends to:

- Exchange intelligence
- Teach technical aspects of preventing terrorism
- Exchange visits by US experts.

-- The West German Government, with our encouragement, has put forward a draft international agreement to ban the taking of hostages. We are supporting this effort.

-- Secretary Kissinger at the UN last week emphasized our determination to proceed unilaterally if multinational action is not forthcoming.

Unilateral

-- I have ordered maximum security at US airports. This led to a marked reduction in hijacking attempts in US.

-- (The hijacking of the TWA plane did not in fact carry weapons onto the aircraft and this certainly was a major factor in the successful conclusion of that hijacking.)

-- I have established a special Task Force combining FBI, FAA, State, Defense and others to deal with:

- crises management, and
- promoting firm controls internationally.

-- I have increased the security of our missions overseas.

WHO'S IN CHARGE OF FOREIGN POLICY

The best combination is a strong President and a strong Secretary of State. This is how it was with General Marshall and Dean Acheson under President Truman.

Henry Kissinger is one of the greatest Secretaries of State we have ever had, and I'm proud he is on my team.

Let's take the African policy: The Secretary and I spent two meetings on strategy before he left. He sent me one or two reports every day, and I saw him immediately after he returned.

In the last analysis, the President is accountable. That's how it should be -- whether a President negotiates or participates directly (as I did at Vladivostok, or the Economic Summits, or in my 125 meetings with foreign leaders) or whether a President makes the basic decisions and asks the Secretary of State to carry it out (as in the successful Middle East and African negotiations).

Some Democratic Presidents who thought they could be "their own Secretary of State" have gotten us into some of the worst disasters.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

October 1, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: MIKE DUVAL
FROM: DAVE GERGEN

Here are the flip card materials which we discussed.



FOREIGN POLICY GOALS

1. My overriding goal is that four years from now, as I prepare to leave public office, America will still be at peace and America will still have the strength and the will to keep the peace.

2. I can assure you that we will seriously jeopardize our hopes for peace:

-- If we begin dismantling our military forces;

-- If we begin precipitous withdrawals from key areas such as Korea and Europe; and,

-- If we sow doubt and misunderstandings through fuzzy or contradictory statements about our intentions. The world is still too dangerous and hostile to place our future in the hands of those who might waver or blink when we're eyeball-to-eyeball with the Russians.

3. Through steady, skillful diplomacy and through continued military strength, the U.S. has great opportunities in the next four years:

-- We can reach sound agreements to reduce the arms race;

-- We can resolve the tensions that still exist in the Middle East and Africa;

-- We can provide continued leadership to solve the world's economic troubles; and,

-- We can continue at the forefront of efforts to provide enough food, enough energy and enough security for the poorer nations to meet their people's needs.

If we move steadily toward those goals, we will greatly enhance the prospects for peace through not only the end of the decade but through the end of the century and beyond.

WHO RUNS FOREIGN POLICY: KISSINGER OR FORD

This is a subject that has attracted far more heat than light. Let me try to shed some light on it.

Dr. Kissinger happens to be a superb international negotiator -- the best in the world, so far as I can tell. And it has been in that role that he has negotiated the terms of many, many international agreements -- from the SALT agreement in the last Administration to the Sinai accord and the African agreement in this Administration. In this role, he has made an outstanding contribution to America and to the cause of peace. We should all be grateful to him.

But I don't need to tell you where the final responsibility rests for decisions shaping the overall direction and thrust of American foreign policy. That responsibility rests in the Oval Office; it has been there in the past and it remains there today. It is the President -- and only the President -- who can decide where to send our troops, who can decide how many missiles and bombers and ships we need to protect our security, and who can decide whether the moment of truth has arrived in the nuclear age. That is never an easy responsibility, but it is one that I welcome.

CONTINUATION OF NIXON-HAK FOREIGN POLICY

Issue: Impact of GRF upon foreign policy inherited from RN-HAK.

1. In early days of my Administration, I made a conscious effort to carry forward the great foreign policy traditions of the post-war era:

-- It was urgent that our friends and allies understood that America would remain the strongest peacemaker in the world. We have ended their fears. (For example, I called NATO ambassadors in for a meeting the day I took office to reassure them that America would be steadfast in its commitments.)

-- It was equally urgent that our adversaries understand that U.S. foreign policy was not going to break down in the midst of a constitutional crisis. It was a time of great testing for us. Every new President is always tested by the Soviets; JFK was tested by Khrushchev in Vienna and if Mr. Carter is elected, he will be severely tested. I felt that in those early days it was vital to stand firm with the Soviets; we did that, and I am now beyond testing into a period of mutual respect and progress.

2. So continuity was important in early days, but since that time we have moved vigorously on several fronts where new progress and new initiatives seemed possible. And we've made striking breakthroughs:

-- New accords in the Middle East;

-- New agreements in Southern Africa;



-- Coordinated attack on worldwide recession led by U.S.;

-- New U.S. proposals to meet future food needs, assist developing nations.

Each of these represents a Ford Administration initiative and a Ford Administration breakthrough. Each has furthered the cause of peace.

U.S. AND THE MIDDLE EAST

1. The Middle East is a focal point of our foreign policy for three major reasons:

-- Strategically, it is at a crossroads of the world;

-- Economically, it sits atop the largest known supply of petroleum in the world;

-- And morally, we are committed to the survival and security of Israel.

2. Four times in the past quarter century, the Arabs and Israelis have gone to war. A major preoccupation of my Administration has been to reduce the tensions and achieve a just and lasting peace. Our approach -- step-by-step diplomacy -- has paid off:

-- Egyptian-Israeli disengagement agreement of January, 1974;

-- Syria-Israeli agreement of May, 1974;

-- Egyptian-Israeli Sinai agreement of September, 1975.

Not only has this kept the peace, but Soviet influence in most of the area -- as Rabin has said -- is at its lowest ebb in 20 years.

3. Clearly, the forward momentum must continue. We are flexible about the means to achieve the ultimate goal, but we are unbending in our desire to move forward.

4. We will proceed, of course, in consultation with Israel. We are a steadfast friend. Forty percent of all U.S. postwar aid to Israel has come in the two years of this Administration.

5. Israel's current proposal -- substantial territorial concessions in return for an end to the state of war -- is one that should certainly be discussed.

REBUTTAL TO CARTER ON MIDDLE EAST

1. I welcome Mr. Carter's evident desire to achieve a lasting peace in the Middle East and his commitment to the security of Israel. Little of what he says is inconsistent with current Administration policy, except on these points:

-- First he seems willing to dictate to Israel their final borders with the Arab states. For example, he has said Israel should withdraw to the 1967 borders but keep the Golan Heights and control over Jewish and Christian holy places in Jerusalem. We believe that terms should not be dictated by the U.S. or any other outsider but should be determined by the parties themselves.

-- Second, he apparently wants to invite the Soviets into every negotiation and has even talked about a secretly negotiated U.S.-Soviet plan for dictating a final solution for the Middle East. Anyone familiar with the Soviet record in the Middle East must be troubled by Mr. Carter's suggestions; I know that I am, and I do not accept them.

The countries of the Middle East are closer to a just and lasting peace than at any time in several years; that is due in part to their own wisdom and in part to the very constructive policies of the United States. I intend to maintain those policies and press forward in the search for an end to tensions and hostility.



RELATIONS WITH ALLIES

Relations with our allies have never been better. We have *repaired*
~~undone~~ the damage done by the ~~years of neglect under the Democratic~~
~~Administrations of the 1960's.~~ *They felt*

- I have met with all our allied leaders. They have confidence in our policy.
- The Economic Summits (Rambouillet, November 1975; Puerto Rico, June 1976) were ~~x~~ milestones. Cooperation now extends beyond defense to cooperation on economic and energy policy.
- We have beefed up NATO defenses.
- Our cooperation with France is closer than before.
- Spain and Portugal are moving steadily toward democracy.
- We have a common position in the East-West talks on troop cuts.
- I was the first American President to visit Japan.
- My basic principle that we stand by all allies -- Israel, Korea, Iran, as well as our NATO allies and Japan -- because if we fail to stand firm in one place, we undermine the confidence of our allies and only hearten our adversaries.

OK

REBUTTAL ON MORALITY

We hear a lot of talk about morality. I believe:

- Pushing back the specter of nuclear war, as we have done in SALT, is a moral policy;
- Mediating conflict, as we have done in the Middle East is a moral policy.
- Averting race war and promoting reconciliation, as we have done in Africa, is a moral policy.
- Organizing world cooperation to promote food production and economic progress in poorer countries is a moral policy.
- Insuring the solidarity of our alliances, for the survival of democracy, is a moral policy.
- Standing loyally by allies who seek to defend themselves against aggression is a moral policy.

I think every American can be proud of what this country has done -- for peace, for freedom, for progress, for justice. I am sick and tired of hearing our country denounced as immoral by people who clearly don't know what they're talking about.



REBUTTAL ON SECRECY

My record in foreign policy is there for all to see.

After the Sinai Agreement, every single document was turned over to the foreign affairs committees of the Congress. There was fuller disclosure of that negotiation to the Congress than ever before.

There have been more White House meetings with Congressmen, more speeches and testimony by a Secretary of State, than at any time in the recent past.

Diplomacy can't be conducted without confidentiality during negotiations and Mr. Carter knows it. Who would negotiate on the delicate question of arms control, or the Middle East in the glare of TV cameras?

After all, the Constitutional Convention of 1787 was not held in public and its proceedings weren't published for 30 years. Because that's the only way you can have free and candid discussion and negotiation.

NO

Bush

DEFENSE ECONOMIES

Q: You have criticized the Congress for failing to enact measures to save \$4 billion in defense spending. At the same time you criticized Governor Carter for suggesting that there is \$5 billion "fat" in the defense budget. How can you have it both ways?

A: The economies I proposed to the Congress would result from improved efficiency in management and ^{fair} equitable savings ~~in~~ ^{from changes in} pay scales. ^{schedules} In no case did I propose a cut that affected any weapons system or the battle strength of our forces

Governor Carter's proposals include withdrawals of forces from overseas which are critical to deterrence and the firmness of our relations with allies. He also proposes scrapping the B-1 and leaving us with a 30-year old bomber. These are cuts in muscle, not fat.

MORALITY IN FOREIGN POLICY

The first responsibility of any American President is to promote the security and wellbeing of the people of the United States. This does not, of course, mean that the President should be callous or ruthless in his conduct of foreign policy. Among nations, as among individuals, good manners and a decent respect for the rights of others generally lead to a more productive result.

It does, however, mean that we must at times deal with and work with governments whose internal policies we do not wholly approve -- or even of which we strongly disapprove. Our collaboration with the Soviet Union in World War II is an example of this. In more recent years, we have given economic or military support to some dictatorial regimes, simply because their strategic objectives coincided with ours. When issues affecting world peace are at stake, we must at times overcome our scruples in accepting partners who are not exactly proponents of Jeffersonian democracy.

All this being said, we must never resign ourselves to the view that moral values have no place in the conduct of foreign policy -- the view held by some of the foreign policy experts who Jimmy Carter says have influenced his thinking.

The United States, before it was a place or even a people, was an idea -- the idea that men and women can live together in a free society in which the welfare of each is the concern of all, as expressed in our Declaration of Independence and Constitution. We have very imperfectly embodied this idea in our institutions and practices, but we have never given it up, and we have never ceased trying to bring it closer to practical reality.

If we were to give up our hold on the American idea, we would lose our identity as a nation. We do not trace our existence to an ancestral past, like Britain or France, or to a theory of history, like the Soviet Union or the Peoples Republic of China, but to a belief about the kind of society that best serves the needs and aspirations of human beings. If we were to abandon that belief, we would be nothing but a collection of warring interests, regions, and classes.

The American idea has implications for foreign policy as well as for domestic goals. For the first century-and-a-half or so of our history, we thought of ourselves as chiefly a model of democracy for other nations to copy, if they chose -- a "city on the hill." This is still to a great extent our proper role. We have neither the means nor the desire nor the right to impose our forms of society or government on other peoples or other nations.

As our military and economic power have grown, however, our international responsibilities have similarly increased. We cannot pretend that our impact on other nations of the world is morally neutral. The way we dispose our military strength deeply affects the social futures of peoples all over the world. The outreach of the dynamic American economy is a powerful force for change in most parts of the globe. What the United States does matters in the world -- is bound to matter. An individual must take responsibility for the consequences of his acts. So must a nation.

Advancement of the general cause of human rights and human freedom is part -- not all, but part -- of the foreign policy objectives of the United States. Wherever men and women are tortured or unjustly imprisoned by brutal dictatorships, we are in trouble. Wherever governments or ruling oligarchies exploit the labor of their peoples, our national interest suffers. Wherever nations without provocation attack or threaten their neighbors, our welfare too is at stake. Wherever assassination and terrorism become accepted means of political action, we are endangered.

It is for this reason, as well as because of our direct strategic interests, that we use our influence, wherever we can, to promote social and economic justice, to end torture and terrorism, to produce peaceful settlement of differences among nations.

Our alliances and ties with Canada, the democracies of Western Europe, Israel, Japan, Australia, and New Zealand are based in part on common strategic interests, in part on ethnic bonds with some of these peoples -- but also in large part on common dedication to the ideals of a free society.

We should not delude ourselves into imagining that economic self-interest does not play a large part in motivating our conduct in world affairs. Of course it does - - no American government that neglected our own economic needs could or should survive for an instant. Nor should we allow other nations to fall into the delusion that their own long-run economic progress depends on anything other than increases in their own productivity.

But we do, as members of the human race, accept responsibility to maintain respect for the legitimate rights of individuals and nations, and to do what we can -- which often will be frustratingly little -- to better the general human lot.



Reichley

DEFINITION OF NATIONAL INTEREST

America's national interest, simply expressed, is that which promotes the peace and wellbeing of the people of the United States. Because of our far-reaching economic and military involvements in many parts of the globe, our national interest is affected by political or social changes within or among nations far beyond our boundaries. Some would argue that we should abandon these distant economic and military involvements, so that our national interest would be limited to protection against direct threats to the physical security of the United States. Of course, we can become over-extended -- perhaps were in the 1960s. But if the United States were to become isolated in the world, we almost surely would suffer severe internal social, economic, and political dislocations. Besides, our national interest is tied up with our general identification with the cause of human freedom and human rights. We have an interest in promoting the rights and welfare of others, where we can, because that is part of our idea of ourselves as a nation.

In general, our national interest is limited by two considerations: our national interest does not lie beyond where we can be effective; and possible benefits must always be measured against costs. For example, some element of our national interest is affected by the possibility of war between Kenya and Uganda. But not enough to justify any large commitment of our national prestige, or to run the risk of adverse reactions from the parties directly involved or from other African states. Prevention of a race war in southern Africa, in contrast, is of sufficient importance to our national interest to justify a major diplomatic effort.



AFRICA

Soviet Expansion

This past year, events in Africa threatened to get out of control. Because we failed to stop Soviet-Cuban intervention in Angola, the trend toward radicalism and violence was sharply accelerated. Guerrilla war was underway.

Because we alone had the trust of both sides, we were asked by many African leaders to use our good offices to help promote peaceful solutions while there was still time. That's why I sent Secretary Kissinger to Africa in April and in September.

Our initiative was warmly welcomed by Africans of all races. We worked closely with Britain which has an historical responsibility for Rhodesia.

~~Our success last month is only the beginning of a process. But Britain has now called for the negotiation to begin, and we believe it will succeed.~~

Protection of white minorities

REBUTTAL ON AFRICA

Africans want their future determined by Africans, free of outside interference.

We succeeded in this mediation effort because we had the trust of both sides.

The Democrats' policy of weakness -- such as failing to meet our responsibility in Angola -- only accelerated the trends of radicalism and violence in southern Africa. It gave a green light to foreign intervention.