

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

~~SECRET/NODIS/XGDS~~

MEMORANDUM OF CONVERSATION

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

DATE AND TIME: Tuesday, October 19, 1976

PLACE: The Oval Office

The President: I think the [Synagogue Council] speech is good. I would leave the secrecy part in.

Kissinger: I have taken it out.

Clark MacGregor has asked me to go to Connecticut.

The President: I think that message should get out somehow. It's a good speech, but I think some time over the next two weeks you should get the secrecy thing out.

I am not going to Connecticut again, so it's good you are going.

Kissinger: Where are we on the Israeli wheat?

Scowcroft: Our objection is to a formal executive agreement, not to an informal announcement.

The President: Can't we get something done?

Kissinger: Why don't you call Dinitz?

Scowcroft: Okay.

The President: I am annoyed. I don't mind you saying that.

CLASSIFIED BY Brent Scowcroft
EXEMPT FROM GENERAL DECLASSIFICATION
SCHEDULE OF EXECUTIVE ORDER 11652
EXEMPTION CATEGORY 5(b)(3)
AUTOMATICALLY DECLASSIFIED ON Imp. to Det.

~~SECRET/NODIS/XGDS~~

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 12958, SEC. 3.5
NSC MEMO, 11/24/98, STATE DEPT. GUIDELINES
BY JK NARA DATE 6/20/04
State Review 8/13/04



Kissinger: I am preparing a larger PL-480 this year.

Scowcroft: Why don't we leak that?

The President: Good idea. Can we move all the PL-480 that's possible over the next two weeks?

Kissinger: On the debates, the problem is that no basic concept of what it all means comes across. I would be a little less stiff and more apparently responsive to what Carter says. You need to put out your major themes -- what are the big issues, what am I trying to do for the country. The issues can't be met with demagoguery -- they are tough issues.

Peace, security, prosperity, building a world community. We have made major progress. When Carter says we have no strength, no respect, he is in total defiance of the facts. There is progress in the Middle East and in Africa because we have the trust of both sides.

I would say that it is not an accident that a Democratic President has brought war and Republicans peace. You don't quarrel with the decision, but what led up to it. The combination of over-commitment and understrengthening. Like Carter on Korea -- is he going to defend it or not? I would comment on his SALT speech. Point out these are from flippant inexperience.

Rather than score debating points, I would say "this is what I am trying to do." Speak to the American people. He will hit the secrecy thing and I think you should use the things in my speech. If you can put across . . . the way you talked to me yesterday, that human quality. You know the material well enough not to fret about the answers. I would concentrate on building peace with justice.

If he raises Helsinki I would blast him. The agreement says nothing about Soviet domination. It only says that no force shall be used, and who is likely to use force? Why is it the Eastern European countries, the most independent, are the ones who wanted it? I would hit him on Chile and on falsifying the Saudi arms figures.

Scowcroft: On Europe, he said he wouldn't go to Yugoslavia's aid even if the Soviets attacked. That is like the 1950 statements before the Korean War that Korea was outside our defense p

Kissinger: Most people don't know what a MIRV, etc. is, so you don't have to show a lot of detail -- but don't let him get away with anything. You were great at your last press conference.

[Discussion of Carter's personality, chances to win, the press, etc.]

When you make the attack on Carter, I would say "He is wrong here, he misspoke there, but that is not the point."

How are we going to defend the world? We don't want to be the world's policemen. If we can't sell arms, how can we defend the world? Look at the people we are helping. To start with the figures are wrong -- brush that off. Iran -- which won't join an embargo; Saudi Arabia -- which is a great moderating influence in the Middle East; Kenya and Zaire -- who face Soviet-supplied enemies. We give arms in our national interest. And for our national purposes. You have to assume he will be on a high level. I would still drag out the errors but just brush them off and then go on the high road.

I would get indignant about no leadership and tick off a number of things. On leadership, I think what you are trying to do is prevent us domestically from going down the road some European countries have gone. Some countries have acted as if, if the government did it, it was free.

The President: My comment the other time on Portugal. . .

Kissinger: You were exactly right. We were absolutely the key in Portugal. The Europeans wanted to help Gonsalves to make him moderate. That would have been a disaster. It would have made him respectable and demoralized the moderates.

[SALT discussion.]

The President: What about MBFR?

Kissinger: I doubt it.

On Korea, I would say his statements are very damaging. It produces the same ambiguity as was produced in 1950, and the outcome.

at Swiss dinner
remarks for
HAK

~~add P/A date - what time have done
what time have done~~

+ Monday -
Service
- call Dinty on
passion
- high recommend
of higher PL480
6.5-7.

P/R 19 OCT 76 ✓

P I think a speech is good, I would leave
message in

K I don't know it out, MacGyver has asked
me to go to Curran

P I think that may should get out somehow.
It's a good speech, but I think some time over
a next 2 weeks you should get a survey thing
out.

I'm not going to Curran again just yet you going.

~~K~~

Where are we on - I what?

S Our objective is to a formal after agreement,
not to an informal arrangement

P Can't we get something done

K why don't you call Dinty

S OK

P I am annoyed. I don't mind you saying that

K I'm proposing a longer PL480 this year

S Why don't we look that?

* P Good idea. Can we make all a PL480 package
over next 2 weeks.

K Over a Libertes, a firm is no basic concept
of what it all means can be a cross. I would
be a little less stiff & more open with
reference to what Carter says. You need
to put out major themes - what are big issues
what are I trying to do for country. The
issues can't be met w/ changeover - they



and tough

Peace, security, prosperity, building a world community. We have made major progress. When Carter says we have no strength, respect, he is total defiance of facts. Progress in M.E. & Africa because trust by both sides.

I would say not on account that Carter has brought war & respect brought peace. You don't quarrel w/ decisions, but what led up to it - a combination of over-enthusiasm & under-estimation. Like Carter on Korea - is he going to defend it or not.

I would comment on his last speech. Point out those are frequent inexperience.

Rather than raise debating points I would say this is what I'm trying to do. Speak to the Chinese people. He will have a security thing & I think you should ~~not~~ use a thing in my speech.

If you can put across ... the way you talk to me yesterday, that human quality. You have a material well-being not to get about cars. I would concentrate on building peace w/ justice.

If he revises Helsinki I would blast him.

Part says nothing about Soviet domination.

Only says we have peace & what likely to see peace? Why isn't the Eastern European countries most respected?



Yugoslavia - no (traps)

these ones who wanted it.

Demell hit him on Chik + on falsifying
a Somali arms figures

S on Exon, he said he wouldn't go to Yugoslavia
+ even if Serb attacked. That like Korea 1950 statement

K Don't push don't know who's a MRU, et cetera, so
you don't have to show a lot of detail - but
don't let him get away w/ anything. You
were great at your last press conf.

(Discussion of Carter - personality, chances to
win, press, etc.)

When you make a attack on Carter I would say
he is wrong here, he misstates there, but
that's not a point

How can you depend a world. We don't
want to be a world's policeman. If we can't
sell arms, how can we depend a world. base
at a people we helping. To start w/ a
figures are wrong - least that's. From
which we're going to embryos; Saudi A. which
a great moderating influence in M.E.; Kenya
& Zaire, who face some significant issues.
We give arms in arm with interest
and for our own purposes.

You have to assume he will be on a high
level. I would still drag out a arms, but



- NYT said tax act passed yesterday.
Carter met - less protection reducing foreign to same & hit

just brush them off & then go on a high
road.

Should get indignant about no leadership &
tear off a # of things.

On leadership I think what you trying to
do is prevent us domestically from going down
& round some Euro countries have gone.

Some countries have acted as if none of a
great deal it was free.

P My comment earlier times on Portugal

K You were exactly right. We need a resolution
by in Port. The Euro wanted to help
Goussas to make him moderate. That would
have been disaster. It would have made
him respectable & reasonable moderate.

Last discussion

R MBER

K I don't it.

On Korea I would say his statements are
very damaging. It produces a sense of urgency
as was produced in 1950 + contains

