MEMORANDUM OF CONVERSATION

PARTICIPANTS: President Ford
Dr. Henry A. Kissinger, Secretary of State
Brent Scowcroft, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs

DATE AND TIME: Sunday, October 3, 1976
2:18 - 4:18 p.m.

PLACE: The Oval Office

Kissinger: First, a few foreign policy things. I spoke to the editorial writers. I needled Carter a bit. They asked me if I still believed there was no difference between the foreign policy views of the two candidates. I answered that. I said that when I said that, he had given one speech. Since then, he has displayed the full complexity of his thought! So now I wouldn't say that. Now Carter is going in several directions at once.

On foreign policy there is a high probability that Egypt will jump Libya in the last part of October. This would be a donnybrook. We have said we would interpose the Sixth Fleet.

[Discussion]

The Soviets will think we put the Egyptians up to it. It will be tough for the Soviets -- it would reduce them just to Iraq.

President: It would be great if they succeed, but what if they get beaten?

Scowcroft: They won't get militarily beaten, but it is a thousand miles to Tripoli and they may not make it logistically.

President: We have to stand up to the Soviets if we need to.
Kissinger: That gets me to Gromyko. His behavior was really insolent. On Belenko [the defecting MiG-25 pilot] and Southern Africa.

I thought about calling him in and saying if they muck around in Africa, there will be no detente, no nothing.

In the Middle East they have interests. In Africa it is pure mischief. They don't really stand to gain much from this gang and they have no permanent interests there. They can only be doing it to weaken and humiliate us. If they have any ideas about another Angola....

President: I thought I had...

Kissinger: You made the points, but he slid off it.

On Namibia, I am beginning to think we should not put out the seven points yet. If we do it now, it can go the same way as Rhodesia. Now it would just get nitpicked by the Africans like what we did on Rhodesia. We may have to veto a resolution in the meantime, but we can do it after December.

On the Israelis, Max Fisher claims the Jews are mad about the boycott and Maverick and thinks you should administratively order disclosure. I spoke to Dinitz and I think giving them some military equipment -- tanks with 155 mm. guns, cluster bombs, FLIR, and the $1.5 billion in aid -- this would strengthen Rabin against Peres.

I think this is better than doing something on the boycott.

What the Congress wanted to do would have cost American jobs and trade and not helped the boycott.

Scowcroft: You could run through it. You could say you always believed an informal approach was the best, and we have made great progress. That's why you were opposed to counterproductive action by legislation. You had been willing to compromise, but the Congress didn't complete it. In reviewing it, you did think some additional inducement would be useful, by making public the compliance reports.

Kissinger: On the debate, you should not go on the defensive.

President: I have no intention of doing so.
Kissinger: He will say you are destroying the moral basis of our foreign policy.

President: I will say: What is more moral than peace? What is more moral than bringing peace in the Middle East? What is more moral than what we're doing in Southern Africa? There are about five things.

Kissinger: And what is more moral than bringing home 500,000 troops? The Democrats have gotten us into two wars.

President: I am well prepared on that.

Kissinger: He will hit also on secrecy. [Gives statistics on meetings.]

President: Good.

Kissinger: Another charge is that I am running foreign policy. The White House puts out that no, you overrule me frequently. That makes you look weak, as if we compete. You should look strong enough to have a strong Secretary of State. We are a partnership, with you making the decisions. We shape things in discussion -- it is not a case of competing views.

Scowcroft: [Hands the President the 1974 Carter quote praising Kissinger.]

Kissinger: Carter said we were good friends and met frequently. I have met him twice in my life and once was a handshake at the Gridiron this year.

He will throw morality at you -- using the State Department surveys I took. That is not true. We asked for criticisms and that is what we got. We asked what was wrong, not what was right. I told the editors that yesterday and got applause. It was a stupid way for us to go at it, but it shows our interest and a desire to get the views of the people.

Schlesinger is now with Carter.

Scowcroft: So says Dick Perle.

Kissinger: When Schlesinger went to China, I told the Chinese that we didn't object to his going but not to use it for political purposes. The goddamned Chinese said we officially protested.
Carter might say, "Schlesinger says our relations with China are lousy." You could say it is based on the Shanghai Communique and if they have any complaints they should convey them to the United States Government, not to a private citizen. If he says the Chinese say we are weak on the Soviets, I would say China can't tell us how to conduct our policy just like the Soviets can't. The Chinese would like us to be in confrontation with the Soviet Union to take their chestnuts out of the fire.

I said yesterday to the editorial writers we have to preserve peace both by strength and by conciliation.

If he hits generally on being weak on the Soviets, point out his positions. He wants to cut the defense budget, prevent our giving military aid to Kenya and Zaire, withdraw from Korea, and let Communists into European governments.

I would say there have been two Democratic administrations since World War II and we have gotten into two wars; we've had two Republican Administrations and got into no war.

I honestly believe that is no accident. They extend our commitments and reduce our strength. Do you have these statements on Communists in Italy? I would not defend the soft on Soviets charge. I would attack him for making it.

[Discussion of Earl Butz]

Kissinger: [Gives the President the Keyes UPI ticker on secrecy].

President: Let's call Schmidt [after seeing a vote projection].

Kissinger: Jack Valenti took some opinion polls and told Carter to stay away from me.

[Discussion of asking Carter to name his Secretary of State.]

Our Alliance relationships have never been better. There is not only official trust but close personal relations.

President: We have statistics showing the number of my meetings....

Kissinger: Okay, but I would say, "That really is not the central point. I challenge anyone to show that our relations in every aspect are not the best ever."
I spoke to a Frenchman who said it is amazing that that aristocrat Giscard could have such close affection for a mid-Westerner.

I would not even dignify it. I would say a man who could say this doesn't know what he is talking about.

[Discussion of Schlesinger]

What I would recommend after the election is that you unilaterally downgrade our representative in Taiwan to a Liaison Office but not make any deal at all and keep our defense relations.

You can be quite tough on the Chinese.

On the China-Taiwan issue, you can say we are moving toward normalization on the basis of the Shanghai Communique. The Shanghai Communique sets out the goal but leaves the process to negotiations. We will continue toward normalization but the actual process is up to the negotiations, and I am not going to discuss it at this point.

He says we have departed from the moral basis of foreign policy. I would say we have restored the moral basis of our foreign policy. I would blast him on that.

If he raises the Sonnenfeldt Doctrine, I would say there is none. What we also say is: we encourage the greatest independence and freedom of action but do not encourage a revolution. We have not intervened before during revolutions. Does he want to encourage a revolution? You have taken the responsible course -- Presidential visits and trade.

We won't imply there is possibility of revolution when three times in the past the Soviet Army marched in. Who would be willing to use United States troops for an issue like this?

The greatest possibility for freedom in Eastern Europe is an easing of tensions so they can maneuver. The worst situation for them is when the Soviet Army is on their necks. You visited three countries in Eastern Europe to symbolize our commitment to freedom in Eastern Europe. No Democratic President has ever been in Eastern Europe.

President: Didn't Kennedy go to Poland?
Kissinger: No, Nixon was the first, when he went to Romania. I wouldn't just attack Carter. On foreign policy I would attack the Democrats also. Most Democrats agree our foreign policy is better.

Scowcroft: Isn't that dangerous?

Kissinger: On domestic policy yes, foreign policy no. This is the man who wants to cut the budget, bring troops home and advocate revolution in Eastern Europe. This is the way to get us into war.

On Helsinki, the first point is there were 35 nations there, including the Vatican, not just the United States. Second, when he says it recognizes spheres of influence, it shows Carter doesn't know what he is talking about. Helsinki says nothing about the Soviet Union in Europe. It says that borders can't be changed by force, but only by peaceful means. To whose advantage is this? Ours or the Soviet Union's, with 70 divisions on the border? For the first time the Soviets have committed themselves to implementing human rights. They're not sticking to it right now but it gives us a standard to which we can hold them.

I am getting worked up. But this guy really burns me. He is a super liberal and now he is turning tough.

On grain, I don't like this answer [in Eagleburger's paper].

Scowcroft: He said we messed up the grain deal in 1972. The implications are that he would use grain as a weapon.

You will get a question on an oil embargo.

President: I will say we don't expect one but we can work with them now to work it out, unlike 1973.

Kissinger: The first part is okay but on the second I would say we won't accept an embargo, but I won't telegraph what I would do. Our policy is designed to avoid an embargo, but we will certainly deal with it if it happens.

On nuclear proliferation, he again doesn't know what he is talking about. We organized the suppliers. You have a policy but you are waiting to announce it until you have coordinated with our allies. Carter would do it unilaterally and in fact against our allies.

If you win this one, the third debate won't matter.
On human rights: What has any Democratic Administration done for human rights and when? We have brought Jewish emigration from 400 in 1968 to 35,000 in 1973 until Congress interfered. There is a difference: We believe in action, not talk.

When he talks dictatorship, say it is easy to make declarations, but a President has the responsibility for the security of the United States and he must deal with the world as it is. It was the Democratic killing of Diem which got us sucked irrevocably into Vietnam. We are working on a practical basis; what Carter proposes is either ineffective, dangerous or both.

On intelligence. He says people have been assassinated. I would say most of that was under the Democrats. Then I would say one of the most irresponsible things ever done to our intelligence was done by a Democratic Congress.

President: They have talked and done not a goddamned thing. I put in the changes.

Kissinger: I would say there was a reckless assault on intelligence by the Democratic Congress and you took responsible action.

President: Did you say all assassinations?

Scowcroft: Except for a little planning under Ike.

Kissinger: If they bring Chile into the assassination business I would say: read your own Church report.

On the Middle East, I would say the Democrats had no relations with the key Arab states. We have restored the balance and you are certainly not going to play politics with so volatile and dangerous an area.

I don't have an Israeli policy. I have an American policy. Say Rabin said our relations are at their peak.

President: Can I say the key Arab states didn't have relations with us?

Kissinger: Absolutely. I wouldn't use the actual amount of aid except if he does, to show he doesn't know what he is talking about.

President: I feel good about this one.
Kissinger: Here you can refute you have no vision of the future. Say: I will bring peace.

On the Third World, I would start with the World Food Conference.

On Defense, I don't know what Schlesinger can have him do.

President: I am ready for him.

Scowcroft: Arms sales.

Kissinger: He is using the wrong figures. He is saying $7.5 billion for the Saudis. Over $6 billion of that is for barracks, etc. I would hit him on it.

The biggest sales go to Israel and Iran, two countries who have made a big contribution to stability in the Middle East.

What is the threat to Iran? The Soviet Union, Iraq. The threat to Iran is from countries we would also consider a threat. Iran refused to impose an embargo in 1973 -- even on Israel. Truman threatened the Soviet Union on Iran's behalf in 1946.

Giving arms doesn't get us involved; not giving them would get us involved because their weakness would invite aggression and we would have to go in to bail them out.

The third category of aid goes to countries like Kenya and Zaire who have Soviet-equipped neighbors.

Most of the aid goes to Israel, Iran, and Saudi Arabia -- for infrastructure -- leaving only bits and pieces for the rest of the world.
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Kissinger: On the debate, you should not go on the defensive.

The President: I have no intention of doing so.

Kissinger: He will say you are destroying the moral basis of our foreign policy.

The President: I will say:

-- What is more moral than peace
-- Middle East
-- South Africa

There are about five things.

Kissinger: And what is more moral than bringing home 500,000. The Democrats have gotten us into two wars.

The President: I am well prepared on that.

Kissinger: He will hit also on secrecy, (gives statistics on meetings).

The President: Good.

Kissinger: Carter said we were good friends and met frequently. I have met him twice in my life and once was a handshake at the Gridiron this year. He will throw morality at you -- using the State polls I took. That is not true, we asked for criticisms and that is what we got. We asked what was wrong, not what was right. I told the editors that yesterday
and got applause. It was a stupid way for us to go at it, but it shows an interest and desire to get the views of the people. Schlesinger is now with Carter.

Scowcroft: So says Dick Perle.

Kissinger: When Schlesinger went to the PRC, I told the PRC that we didn't object to his going but not to use it for political purposes. The GD PRC said we officially protested.

Carter might say Schlesinger says our relations with China are lousy. You could say it is based on the Shanghai Communiqué and if they have any complaints they should convey them to the United States Government, not a private citizen. If he says the PRC say we are weak on the Soviets, I would say China can't tell us how to conduct our policy just like the Soviets can't. The PRC would like us to be in confrontation with the Soviet Union to take their chestnuts out of the fire.

I said yesterday to the editorial writers we have to preserve peace both by strength and by conciliation.

If he hits generally on being weak on Soviets:

-- Cut budget
-- Aid to Kenya/Zaire
-- Withdraw from Korea
-- Let Communists into European Governments

I would say there have been two democratic administrations since World War II and we have gotten into two wars -- two Republican Administrations and no war.
I honestly believe that is no accident. They extend our commitments and reduce our strength. I would not defend the soft on Soviets charge. I would attack him for making it.

Allies:

Alliance relationships have never been better.

There is not only official trust but close personal relations.

The President: We have statistics showing the number of my meetings....

Kissinger: Okay, but I would say that really is not the central point -- I challenge anyone to show that our relations in every respect are not the best ever.

I would not even dignify it. I would say a man who could say this doesn't know what he is talking about.

You can be quite tough on the Chinese.

On Chinese-Taiwan issue we are moving toward normalization on the basis of the Shanghai Communique. The Shanghai Communique sets out the goal but leaves the process to negotiations. We will continue toward normalization but the actual process is up to negotiations and I am not going to discuss it at this point.

He says we have departed from the moral basis of foreign policy.

I would say we have restored the moral basis of our foreign policy. I would blast him on that.
Sonnenfeldt Doctrine

I would say there is none. What we do say: we encourage the greatest independence and freedom of action but do not encourage a revolution. We have not intervened before during revolutions. Does he want to encourage a revolution? You have taken the responsible course -- Presidential visits and trade.

We won't imply there is possibility of revolution when three times in the past the Soviet Army marched in. Who would be willing to use United States troops for an issue like this.

The greatest possibility for freedom in Eastern Europe is easing of tensions so they can maneuver. Worst situation is when the Soviet Army repressing them. You visited three countries in Eastern Europe to symbolize freedom in Eastern Europe. No Democratic President has ever been in Eastern Europe.

Kissinger: I wouldn't just attack Carter. On foreign policy I would attack the Democrats also. Most Democrats agree our foreign policy is better.

Scowcroft: Isn't that dangerous?

Kissinger: On domestic policy yes, foreign policy no. This is the man who wants to cut the budget, bring troops home and advocate revolution in Eastern Europe. This is the way to get us into war.
Helsinki

-- The first point is there were 35 nations there, including the Vatican, not just the United States.

Second, spheres of influence. Shows Carter doesn't know what he is talking about. Helsinki says nothing about the Soviet Union in Europe. Says borders can't be changed by force but by peaceful means. To whose advantage is this? Us or the Soviet Union with 70 divisions on the border. For the first time the Soviets have committed themselves to implementing human rights. Not sticking to it right now, but it gives us a standard to which we can hold them.

I am getting worked up. But this guy really burns me. He is a super lib and now he is turning tough.

On grain, I don't like this answer (in Eagleburger paper).

Scowcroft: He said we messed up grain in 1972. The implications are that he would use grain as a weapon.

You will get a question on the embargo.

The President: I will say we don't expect one but we can work with them now to work it out, unlike 1973.

Kissinger: The first part is okay but on the second I would say we won't accept an embargo, but I won't telegraph what I would do. Our policy is designed to avoid an embargo but we will deal with it if it happens.
On Proliferation:

He again doesn't know what he is talking about.

We organized the suppliers. You have a policy but you are waiting to announce it until you have coordinated with our allies. Carter would do it unilaterally and in fact against our allies.


What has any Democrat Administration done for human rights and when?

-- We have brought Jewish emigration from 400 to 35,000 until Congress interfered.

-- There is a difference -- we believe in action, not talk.

-- When he talks dictatorship, say it is easy to make declarations, but a President has the responsibility for the security of the United States and he must deal with the world as it is. It was the Democrat killing of Diem which got us sucked irrevocably into Vietnam. We are working on a practical basis -- what Carter proposes is either ineffective, dangerous or both.

Intelligence -- He says people have been assassinated. I would say most of that was under the Democrats. Then I would say one of the most irresponsible things ever on intelligence was done by a Democratic Congress.

The President: They have talked and done nothing. I put in the changes.
Kissinger: I would say there was a reckless assault on intelligence by the Democratic Congress and you took responsible action.

If they bring Chile into the assassination business I would read your own Church report.

On Middle East, I would say the Democrats had no relations with the key Arab states. We have restored the balance and you are certainly not going to play politics with so volatile and dangerous an area.

I don't have our Israeli policy -- I have an American policy. Say Rabin said our relations are at a peak.

I wouldn't use the actual amount of aid except if he does to show he doesn't know what he is talking about.

The President: I feel good about this one.

Kissinger: Here you can refute you have no vision of the future.

-- I will bring peace.

-- On the third world, I would start with World Food Conference.

Defense -- I don't know what Schlesinger can have him do.

The President: I am ready for him.

Scowcroft: Arms sales.
Kissinger: He is using the wrong figures. He is saying seven and a half billion for the Saudis. Over $6 billion of that is for barracks, etc. I would hit him on it.

The biggest sales go to Israel and Iran. Two countries who have made a big contribution to the stability of the Middle East.

What is the threat to Iran?

The threat to Iran is from countries we would also consider a threat.

Iran refused to impose an embargo in 1973 -- even on Israel.

Truman threatened the Soviet Union on Iran's behalf in 1946.

Giving arms doesn't get us involved -- not giving them would get us involved because their weakness would invite aggression and we would have to go into bail them out.

The third category goes to countries like Kenya and Zaire who have Soviet equipped neighbors.

Most aid goes to Israel, Iran, Saudi Arabia (infrastructure) leaving only bits and pieces for the rest of the world.
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P/K
30 Apr 76

K: First on few C-P things. I want to shit
K: in Paris. I needed a change in.
K: M.D. 11 F: wine time. Then he
K: had given 1 speech. Since the two
K: played I feel 1 completely, I wanted
K: to that. He went my personal dir. groups.
K: C: F: shx just that E will go up
K: in last. But. This should be a change.
K: I have said we would continue a lot.

(Parisian)

The Sec. will think we put a flag up
K: to it. It will be tough for a Sec. with
K: Halberstam & to fix.

P: It meant if they succeeded, what if they got back.

S: I mean to get inside. But it was
K: able to fix this. I very much wish it
K: sophisticated.

P: We have to retand on the course we will to.
K: That put me to learn: His behavior was
K: really incisive. (Halberstam & Opinion)

K: Next. About calling him in. Any. My
K: think around in Paris. And not in
K: ms: didn't do nothing.

In '75 there was interest. In Paris it is
K: just mutual self-help. They think really.
K: Float & gain much from the group. They
K: have some sort of stability. They can only
K: understand in Saner & no. If they kend
K: say I also went another way.
I don't know. I think we should not just not just not just just. I agree. How can we use these tools. We may have trouble, but we can do it after.

Once a lady, Esther Elina, was one week about to cut a hammer. We should have a meeting about it. I spoke to Princess I think giving them some food. Some 1.5 liter in aid. This would help them against fear.

I think this letter shown doing something as long time. A very important thing.

What a very want to do would have cost some juice with a not help to import.

(amazon)

Now what you should cut pencil, I have no intention.

A nice one. I have an idea. Someone said, if you don't move around them first.

- No.

- Sir, again.

There are about 5 things.

and what is more second there.
K. Another change is that I'm...?

P. I'm not sure what

K. We will talk about it tomorrow.

Claire will talk on it anyway.

P. Good.

K. Another change is that I'm not...

P. Not sure yet, but I'm working on it. That makes your...?

K. That makes your concerned, you should look at it.

We need to think about it. The issue is not just your concerns, but also the concerns of the...?

S. (Hand over notes to question K)

K. He also said we should have a...? and I told him that.

Regularly, I have met him twice in my life. I even was a co-workers at one point in the past.

He will throw money at you — being a State polt, I think. I don't want him, and we agreed not to continue.

That isn't a good...? that we got. We...? and that was wrong.

I still believe that yesterday's...? applied.

It seems our path way to go, but it seems obvious to start it, and then we should...?

Seds are not with Carter.

S. So, no plans.

K. When Seds want to start, I told Pol to start.
we didn't expect to have any but not a one

for prod progress. Then we did, and

officially put it.

Crime might be solved by one nation

of crime in our society. You could say it

based on Stouphand's legal system if they

are countries everywhere. They should worry them to

life, into a fight against it. If the 1-yr bill is new, we need

the 3-yr bill we need. But I would

try China isn't all we have to understand.

try not just like some want. We want

need not be in a confrontation

To talk to one about it or

the actual matter and

my strength is by conviction.

If he's not ready on work or some;

- cut budget

- cut T. Chay / Zone

- 6/18 from Korea

- but we need to focus

It would be their home or they change since we II + we have gotten into it now.

2. People we were

I would try it even though I try

multiply our contacts + weaken our strength.

Do open them there statement to an extent to try

I would not defend a system some people

I would better listen for making it.
(Discussion of Real Estate)
R. Cline P. Keye (UP) Time on Murray
P. Lyle and Schmitt (attorney: parties) K.
Verteme took some formal notes and contacted K.
They were for attaching me.
(Proposal of asking some written name)
via Sec State

Allie:
They have made some changes.
There is not only financial threat but also
personal relations.
P. has some statistics. . .
K. OK but I would say that really what
is it? I should try my case to show that
some relations are foundation and not
just luck alone.
I spoke to an EOE. It feels kind of annoying
that matters. General would have change for
in mid west.
I would not want doing it. I send my
son who can say this in detail.
I know what he is saying about.

(Proposal of Settlement)
What I would recommend is that
some substantially damages sun in terms
to damage office but not make my client
all that bad to the written
I plan to deal with tough on a tough one.
I am unclear on our overall intentions. I understand
you feel the pressure to act quickly, but I am not
sure what our ultimate goal is. Can you explain
more about your vision for this project?

The deadlines are tight, and we need to make sure we
are on track. Have you considered the potential
risks and challenges we might face?

I have a lot of experience in this area, and I think I can
help you make the right decisions. Let's work together
to find a solution that works for everyone involved.

Are you comfortable with the current plan, or do you
need more information before we move forward?

Thank you for your time and consideration. I look forward
to continuing our discussions.
P. Did Kennedy go to Poland?
K. No. Nixon was 1st though. He went to Romania.
B. He might just attack Cuba? Can FD
send all attacks. Demo. Also, most demos agree on FE in bothers.
S. What are damages?
K. One character policy, FE vs. 
This is how we want to cut
budget, low crises to alarmed
restriction in FE. This is the
way to get into one.
H. B. Bush.

First part is that there are 35 nations,
and Vietnam, not just US.
2nd Gulf of Tonkin 
Stevic tells 
what he thinks...about a ship. About
my leading about 50 in warm. Says
Belgium isn't an engaged force but
by plane. To whose advantage is this?
Are 250x1/70 gives an advantage.
For 1st time since have ended to
inflating them right. Not
stabilize the diet, but at going a standard
to which they seem to hold.

Joe getting around up. But things
really bring me. He is so angry he
1 must be having trouble.
It's paragraph from a letter. The text is handwritten and somewhat difficult to read. It appears to be a personal communication, discussing some personal or professional matters.
We changed from sleep for 400
35-107. Don't understand.
There is a big - we embraced in action,
and talk.
When he talked dictatorship, we agreed to
understand, but I believe
a majority of 65 or 60 said we would
as it is, let war be done, killing
same without getting anywhere with
us anyway practically - what
Cartesian principles in physics,
and - more of both.
First - the way people have associated. It's
say must-yet meaning does. Then I say
presentation things, even un
until understood by becoming.
F. They have talked a little not about a little.
G. put in a summary.
K. Did any onecontinue around gone?
by some change your taste every sensation
P. Did you say all associations
L. Except for a little plan under the.
K. If that brings in Child, I say need you
come through report.

Can I. I wonder how far had relations
of effects. We have induced balance
+ sign - not sign to play politics.
I don't share not policy. I have one item
policy. Say Rodin would one nothing at
so quick
P. Can I say he Good, etc., didn't him
Mother
K. Absolutely, I saw that was a great deal
expect if he did to know, he didn't know
what he was talking about.
P. One dead sound this on
K. The up can objectively gone from me
vision of future
- I will say yes.
- One 3rd would, I would that my would
food easy.
Depress. I don't know what Barbie can
some minds
P. Stately for him.
B. Some Sort
K. Having my way points. Have any to hit
the Sanders. Could b of that in some way it.
wouldn't have him on it.
2nd biggest role go to the bar. 2
can't come from small big central.
do nothing in & c.
What is threat to him?
We exchange.
All threat to him is from internal
would one never a threat
Fensus threatened & c. One from
nothing in & c.
Going along do not get no unwavering
that way they could get no unwavering
and if any person is certain that they're
or whoever they have ever applied
anywhere.

Just did get to I, don't, S.A. (unfortunate)
claim into a place outside world.
Informal list

- The man set progress
  - Approve & expedite action
  - at Leg.

But in reality, if the staff sample
- add the recommendations will be to make
publicly...