

**The original documents are located in Box 164, folder “Reagan, Ronald (4)” of the Robert T. Hartmann 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. Robert T. Hartmann donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections.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.

Rowland Evans and Robert Novak

## Reagan's Defense Tutor

The long shadow of President Ford's Halloween massacre stretched all the way to California just before Christmas when Mr. Ford's ousted Secretary of Defense, James Schlesinger, flew there at Ronald Reagan's invitation to talk defense and foreign policy.

No deals were struck between the two Republicans, one the party's leading conservative politician and presidential candidate, the other perhaps its leading expert on defense—and a hardliner on the Soviet Union and American preparedness.

But the half-day of conversation in the relaxed atmosphere of a Los Angeles hotel suite began a dialogue that could sharpen the political debate between Mr. Ford and his challenger, to the President's disadvantage. Reagan, no student of military or foreign policy, has a great deal to learn.

What he learned from Schlesinger just before Christmas, and what more he may learn in the coming months, is bound to emphasize differences between him and the President over such issues as military spending that caused Mr. Ford to fire Schlesinger.

Participants in the nearly four hours of Reagan-Schlesinger talks included John Sears, Reagan's canny political manager and an old friend of Schlesinger from the earliest days of the Nixon administration, when they worked together briefly in the White House. It was Sears who apparently arranged the meeting.

In addition to providing Reagan with facts and figures on U.S. military strength and weakness, gleaned from his more than two years as Defense Secretary, Schlesinger's tutorial for candidate Reagan could have great importance on such issues as U.S. policy toward Communist China. Reagan up to now has taken a rigidly negative position on Peking because of ideological commitment to Nationalist China.

Indeed, although the principals declined to give details, Reagan came away from this first tour d'horizon with Schlesinger far more aware of the importance of Communist China as a balance wheel in super-power (U.S. vs. U.S.S.R.) confrontation than he ever was before.

No second session has yet been scheduled and Schlesinger intimates carefully play down talk of a possible political alliance between him and Reagan, noting that Schlesinger has offered to brief other presidential candidates. Nevertheless, a new Reagan-Schlesinger link has now been forged out of the Halloween massacre of Oct. 26, with potential political danger to Gerald Ford.

Doctors' approval for full time political work has now switched the odds dramatically toward outgoing Secretary of Commerce Rogers Morton to become President Ford's desperately needed White House political aide, a job slated for former Pennsylvania Gov. William Scranton up to last weekend (Jan. 3).

Morton's medical clearance—he has a clean bill of health for cancer following extensive treatments but still suffers from diabetes—came last week after Mr. Ford tentatively settled on Scranton.

Morton had always been the President's first choice for a job gone begging far too

long, but his doctors, strongly backed by Morton's wife, said no. That left Scranton the sole alternative, as we reported on Jan. 2, even though the liberal Scranton was certain to generate major opposition from Republican conservatives—the grassroots strength of the Republican party.

The new White House assignment for old pro "Rog" Morton will make him the President's liaison with both the President Ford Committee and the Republican National Committee (which Morton himself headed in 1969 and 1970). In addition, however, Morton will be "available" for specific presidential assignments in non campaign politics.

Well-informed intelligence sources have quietly passed word to the U.S. that King Khalid of Saudi Arabia used all his powers of persuasion in his late December meeting with President Hafez Assad of Syria to mute Syria's harsh criticism of Egypt for negotiating the Sinai agreement.

These reports, regarded here as credible, said that the new King of Saudi Arabia strongly urged Assad to diminish his attacks on Egyptian President Anwar Sadat in the overall interest of Arab unity. This is in line with top-level Arab worry that every time the Arab world splits on a political issue, Israel profits.

Assad's venomous attacks on Sadat started with the signing of the Sinai pact (which restored the Sinai passes and the Abu Rudeis oil fields to Egypt) and increased in intensity for weeks thereafter. King Khalid strongly defended Sadat's domestic political rationale in making the deal with Israel, despite the fact that it broke the common Arab front. The communique (called a "press statement") issued at the end of the meeting ignored Sinai completely, indicating that Assad listened to the king.

Field Enterprises

William Raspberry

## A Classic Case


A 33-year-old Alexandria woman has been charged as a drunk.

What happened, she says, is that she was abducted in the early dawn, raped by two men and abandoned in the Virginia countryside.

She finally stumbled upon a police officer, she says, but what she got was not aid and comfort but a citation for being drunk in public.

It sounds like a classic case of male police insensitivity to a rape victim's plight—which is precisely what the Alexandria woman thinks it is.

Lynn Pendley, the Fairfax County officer who made the arrest, said in his report that he thought at the time that something might have been wrong with the woman but that she insisted there wasn't. And since she was thoroughly dishevelled (barefoot and clad only in a tee-shirt and shorts in the early morning December chill), since she was on her own admission, not terribly coherent, and since



# Reagan Disparages Own Funds Shift List as 'Some Stuff the Economists Gave Me'

BY RICHARD BERGHOLZ

Times Political Writer

CHARLOTTE, N.C.—Ronald Reagan said Tuesday that he had had no intention last September of providing details concerning his plan to shift certain federal programs to the states.

In an exclusive interview with The Times during a campaign stop here, the former California governor said, "I simply announced a broad program last September. I made no pretense of fleshing it out."

As for a detailed list of federally funded programs he gave to newsmen at the time he disclosed his proposal—a list designed to show the scope of his plan—Reagan snorted:

"I never did pay any attention to that list. That was just some stuff the economists gave me. I didn't even agree with all the things on that list."

He suggested that newsmen should discard the September list of prospective targets for the shift of programs from the federal government to the states, and he explained that he probably would not express his own opinion on which of the programs should be junked rather than continued by state and local governments.

In September, when he announced the plan, Reagan talked about balancing the federal budget by cutting up to \$90 billion from federal expenditures by transferring programs to the states.

Today, he talks about the shift only in general terms.

And he no longer talks about achieving a balanced budget as a direct result of the shift, or of granting an average 23% personal income tax cut or of making a \$5 billion payment on the national debt.

What caused him to change his approach?

"You can't expect a man to have a plan all worked out in detail," he said Tuesday. There are more than 1,000 separate programs in the social welfare field, and there may be some he would want to continue under Washington's control, he added.

When he first disclosed his program, Reagan said, his objective was "to tie spending and taxing functions together wherever feasible, so that those who have the pleasure of giving away tax dollars will also have the pain of raising them."

But today, he steadfastly refuses to discuss how the states would pay for the programs now funded by Washington, except to suggest that some taxes now levied and collected by the federal government might be collected at the state and local levels "without making the roundtrip to Washington and back minus a heavy freight charge."

Last September, Reagan said, "An immediate (federal income) tax cut, some of which might have to be balanced by tax rises in the states, would only be the beginning of the savings that could be achieved."

Today, Reagan admittedly gets explosively angry when his critics suggest that the Reagan plan inevitably would result in higher state and local taxes.

"That's the same kind of crap I heard when I proposed welfare reform when I was in Sacramento," he said. His critics then feared a sharp rise in local general relief costs if welfare recipients were cut off by the state, and it proved to be a groundless fear, he said.

Similarly, Reagan added, there is a broad fear in the states today that, if he becomes President, state and local governments will be stuck with tough decisions on how to pay for programs currently financed by Washington—or whether to finance them at all.

When asked how he was going to deal with this fear of his program, Reagan responded:

"I'm going to keep doing just what I'm doing, and put the monkey back and let those bastards in Washington tell me how they can keep on talking about decentralization and never come up with any way of doing it."

He blamed President Ford's supporters and campaigners for spreading these fears.

"All of our polls show that the people want control of these programs at the local level," he said.

He named Carla A. Hills, secretary of housing and urban development in the Ford Administration, as one of the fear-spreaders because she criticized the Reagan plan in a Washington news conference earlier this month.

But he became particularly excited and angered when he accused Ford campaigners of preceding him (Reagan) into a campaign state and giving local politicians or officeholders figures supporting to show what the Reagan plan would mean in each particular state.

Reagan said he was angered by "the thing of going into a state and getting a state senator and priming him then before I arrive to hold a press conference and to say that I'm going to raise his state's sales tax by 12%."

His major premise, in his current campaigning, is that perhaps the cost of the shifts programs could be met by state and local governments by simply subtracting their cost of the programs from taxes currently levied and collected in the states by the federal government.

A federal excise tax, such as on alcohol, might be used in some instances, he said, although he conceded that this

would involve persuading Congress to give up the current revenue yield and persuading the states that this was the proper way to meet their own new costs.

"There might have to be a bridge of continued federal funding until the people (in the states) decide," Reagan said.

When asked how, as President, he would balance the federal budget if revenues declined as the programs were shifted, Reagan simply said: "I recognize that we must go along with a planned balancing of the federal budget, a systematic schedule for achieving a balanced budget."

But he did not offer details on how he would achieve this. Social Security would not be one of the programs shifted to the states in the Reagan plan, but the Californian has made Social Security part of his current campaign rhetoric.

He got into the issue last December when, in a Houston speech, he lauded Barry Goldwater for questioning the validity of the Social Security system during the 1964 presidential campaign. Reagan mentioned also that Goldwater had been right and then said there are several plans worth studying involving a form of voluntarism.

This prompted at least one newspaper to suggest Reagan was flirting with the "voluntarism" issue.

Since then, Reagan has insisted in almost every speech that, although the system is badly out of actuarial balance, no changes should be made that would deprive present beneficiaries of their monthly checks.

When President Ford in his State of the Union message last week proposed another increase in payroll deductions

to pay for higher Social Security benefits, Reagan said, "I think we can demand more than the small increase in the payroll tax to deal with the short-range problem of cash flow."

Fearful that this might suggest he wanted an even bigger bite out of the payroll tax, Reagan then shifted his position to say that "resolving this problem will take more than a continued piecemeal increase in the payroll tax; fundamental reform is needed."

When next questioned as to what he would do, Reagan responded, "I think you start by getting a team of experts to look at the problem."

At the same time, he blasted what he called "demagogues" who were talking about Social Security system changes that frighten beneficiaries.

"Nothing can be more despicable than taking political advantage of those who have earned better treatment from us all."



A255

U R

FLORIDA 3-4

URGENT

1ST NIGHT LD A241 -- PREVIOUSLY MIAMI

BY DOUGLAS MONROE

ORLANDO, FLA. (UPI) -- RONALD REAGAN, APPARENTLY FOLLOWING HIS SUPPORTER'S ADVICE TO GET TOUGH WITH PRESIDENT FORD, CHARGED THURSDAY FORD HAS "NEITHER THE VISION NOR THE LEADERSHIP NECESSARY TO HALT AND REVERSE THE DIPLOMATIC AND MILITARY DECLINE" OF THE NATION.

"I FEAR FOR MY COUNTRY WHEN I SEE WHITE HOUSE INDIFFERENCE TO THE DECLINE IN OUR MILITARY POSITION; WHEN ELECTION YEAR RHETORIC IS USED AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR STRENGTH," REAGAN SAID.

REAGAN SAID FORD AND SECRETARY OF STATE HENRY KISSINGER HAD FAILED TO TELL THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WHAT THEY ARE GETTING OUT OF DETENTE.

"THERE IS LITTLE DOUBT IN MY MIND THAT THE SOVIET UNION WILL NOT STOP TAKING ADVANTAGE OF DETENTE UNTIL IT SEES THAT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE HAVE ELECTED A NEW PRESIDENT AND APPOINTED A NEW SECRETARY OF STATE," REAGAN SAID.

BACKERS OF REAGAN'S CAMPAIGN FOR THE REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION HAVE BEEN TELLING HIM TO START ATTACKING FORD'S RECORD. THE TWO MEN FACE EACH OTHER IN TUESDAY'S PRIMARY.

BUT REAGAN DENIED HIS STATEMENT WAS A DEPARTURE FROM A REPUBLICAN PARTY'S "11TH COMMANDMENT" WHICH SAYS REPUBLICANS SHOULD NOT SPEAK ILL OF EACH OTHER.

"I DON'T THINK THIS IS A VIOLATION OF THE 11TH COMMANDMENT," REAGAN SAID. HE SAID HE DID NOT CONSIDER IT A PERSONAL ATTACK AND THAT "THIS IS WHAT A PRIMARY IS ALL ABOUT."

MORE

UPI 03-04 05:38 PES



TO - POLITICAL AND NATIONAL NEWS DESKS

PR457 PRESS RELATIONS WIRE WASH 347-5155 03/4/76

FOR RELEASE AT 4:00 P.M. EST MARCH 4, 1976--TODAY

STATEMENT BY RONALD REAGAN,  
IN ORLANDO, FLORIDA, MARCH 4, 1976

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, IT IS NOT EASY FOR ME TO SAY THE THINGS I MUST SAY TO YOU TODAY, BUT I HAVE DECIDED THAT MATTERS OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND DEFENSE ARE BEYOND POLITICS AND THAT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE DESERVE MY ASSESSMENT OF THEM.

I AM DEEPLY CONCERNED ABOUT OUR DEFENSE POSTURE. DESPITE THE ASSURANCES OF DR. KISSINGER AND MR. FORD, THE UNITED STATES IS NO LONGER THE FIRST MILITARY POWER ON EARTH.

THE SOVIET ARMY IS NOW TWICE THE SIZE OF OURS. RUSSIA'S ANNUAL INVESTMENT IN WEAPONS, STRATEGIC AND CONVENTIONAL, NOW RUNS SOME 50 PERCENT AHEAD OF OURS.

OUR NAVY IS OUTNUMBERED IN SURFACE SHIPS AND SUBMARINES 2-TO-1. WE ARE OUTGUNNED 3-TO-1 IN ARTILLERY PIECES; 4-TO-1 IN TANKS. SOVIET STRATEGIC MISSILES ARE LARGER, MORE NUMEROUS AND MORE POWERFUL THAN THOSE OF THE UNITED STATES.

UNDER MESSRS. KISSINGER AND FORD THIS NATION HAS BECOME NUMBER TWO IN MILITARY POWER IN A WORLD WHERE IT IS DANGEROUS--IF NOT FATAL--TO BE SECOND BEST. ALONG WITH THE 93RD AND 94TH CONGRESS, THE FORD-KISSINGER LEADERSHIP MUST BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE TO HISTORY FOR ALLOWING THIS TO HAPPEN.

HAS THE SOVIET UNION BECOME MORE TRACTABLE, MORE ACCOMMODATING, MORE CAUTIOUS WITH ITS GROWING MILITARY SUPERIORITY? NO, THE OPPOSITE IS TRUE.

IN 1973, THE SOVIET UNION SECRETLY Poured INTO THE MIDDLE EAST THE WEAPONS USED TO LAUNCH A SURPRISE ATTACK ON ISRAEL. DR. KISSINGER SAID WE MUST NOT ALLOW THIS TO INTERFERE WITH DETENTE.

THAT YEAR THE SOVIETS ALSO URGED THE ARAB STATES TO STRANGLE THE WESTERN INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACIES WITH THE OIL BOYCOTT. AGAIN, DR. KISSINGER SAID WE MUST NOT ALLOW THIS TO INTERFERE WITH DETENTE.

IN 1974, THE SOVIETS DOUBLECROSSED KISSINGER, TORE UP THE PARIS ACCORDS FOR WHICH HE WON HIS NOBEL PEACE PRIZE, AND Poured INTO HANOI THE ARMOR USED TO OVERRUN SOUTH VIETNAM AND INFLICT UPON THE UNITED STATES THE WORST HUMILIATION IN ITS HISTORY. MR. FORD AND DR. KISSINGER SAID IN CHORUS: WE MUST NOT LET THIS INTERFERE WITH DETENTE.

LAST YEAR AND THIS, THE SOVIET UNION--USING CASTRO'S MERCENARIES -- INTERVENED DECISIVELY IN THE ANGOLA CIVIL WAR AND ROUTED THE PRO-WESTERN FORCES. YET, MESSRS. FORD AND KISSINGER CONTINUE TO TELL US THAT WE MUST NOT LET THIS INTERFERE WITH DETENTE.

WELL, THE TIME HAS COME FOR MR. FORD AND DR. KISSINGER TO TELL US, THE AMERICAN PEOPLE, WHAT WE ARE GETTING OUT OF DETENTE.

WE HAVE GIVEN THE SOVIETS OUR TRADE AND OUR TECHNOLOGY. AT KISSINGER'S INSISTENCE, MR. FORD SNUBBED ALEXANDER SOLZHENITSYN, ONE OF THE GREAT MORAL HEROES OF OUR TIME. AT BREZHNEV'S INSISTENCE, MR. FORD FLEW HALFWAY AROUND THE WORLD TO SIGN AN AGREEMENT AT HELSINKI WHICH PLACED THE AMERICAN SEAL OF APPROVAL ON THE SOVIET EMPIRE IN EASTERN EUROPE.

WHAT HAS THE UNITED STATES GOTTEN IN RETURN, OTHER THAN SOVIET BELLIGERENCE IN THE MIDDLE EAST; SOVIET DUPLICITY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA; AND SOVIET IMPERIALISM IN SOUTH CENTRAL AFRICA?

MR. FORD AND DR. KISSINGER ASK US TO TRUST THEIR LEADERSHIP. I CONFESS I FIND THAT MORE AND MORE DIFFICULT TO DO. DESPITE HENRY KISSINGER'S SOPHISTICATED AND WIT, HIS RECENT STEWARDSHIP OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY HAS COINCIDED PRECISELY WITH THE LOSS OF U.S. MILITARY SUPREMACY.

DESPITE MR. FORD'S EVIDENT DECENCY, HONOR AND PATRIOTISM, HE HAS SHOWN NEITHER THE VISION NOR THE LEADERSHIP NECESSARY TO HALT AND REVERSE THE DIPLOMATIC AND MILITARY DECLINE OF THE UNITED STATES.

THAT IS THE TRUTH, AND EVEN THOSE OF US WHO LIKE GERALD FORD AS A PERSON KNOW IT IS THE TRUTH.

I BELIEVE IN THE PEACE OF WHICH MR. FORD SPEAKS--AS MUCH AS ANY MAN. BUT IN PLACES SUCH AS ANGOLA, CAMBODIA AND VIETNAM, THE PEACE THEY HAVE COME TO KNOW IS THE PEACE OF THE GRAVE.

I FEAR FOR MY COUNTRY WHEN I SEE WHITE HOUSE INDIFFERENCE TO THE DECLINE OF OUR MILITARY POSITION; WHEN ELECTION YEAR RHETORIC IS USED AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR STRENGTH. I WORRY WHEN I SEE HENRY KISSINGER RUSHING TO MOSCOW TO BARGAIN AWAY OUR TECHNOLOGICAL BREAKTHROUGH IN THE CRUISE MISSILE, A WEAPON SYSTEM WHICH MIGHT HELP RESTORE STRATEGIC EQUALITY.

IN MY VIEW, THE POLICY OF DETENTE AS PURSUED BY THE ADMINISTRATION IS ONE OF MAKING "PREEMPTIVE CONCESSIONS" TO THE SOVIETS. PERHAPS THERE IS SOME GREAT STRATEGY IN THIS POLICY, BUT I CONFESS I CANNOT SEE IT.

ALL I CAN SEE IS WHAT OTHER NATIONS THE WORLD OVER SEE: COLLAPSE OF THE AMERICAN WILL AND THE RETREAT OF AMERICAN POWER. THERE IS LITTLE DOUBT IN MY MIND THAT THE SOVIET UNION WILL NOT STOP TAKING ADVANTAGE OF DETENTE UNTIL IT SEES THAT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE HAVE ELECTED A NEW PRESIDENT AND APPOINTED A NEW SECRETARY OF STATE.

WHAT DO I OFFER THE AMERICAN PEOPLE IN PLACE OF THE DELUSIONS OF DETENTE? I OFFER THEM WHAT I BELIEVE TO BE THE TRUTH, THAT ALL OUR SMILES, CONCESSIONS AND TOASTS OF DETENTE HAVE NOT BROUGHT GENUINE PEACE ANY CLOSER. THE TRUTH IS THAT THIS NATION MUST TRUST LESS IN THE PREEMPTIVE CONCESSIONS WE ARE GRANTING THE SOVIET UNION AND MORE IN THE REESTABLISHMENT OF AMERICAN MILITARY SUPERIORITY.

LET US REMEMBER ONE THING: IF MR. FORD AND DR. KISSINGER ARE INCORRECT IN THEIR BELIEF THAT SOVIET AMBITIONS HAVE MODERATED SO MUCH THAT WE NO LONGER NEED TO MAINTAIN MILITARY SUPERIORITY, THERE WILL BE NO FUTURE OPPORTUNITY TO RECTIFY THEIR ERROR.

THESE MATTERS ARE SO CRUCIAL THAT WHAT THE PEOPLE OF THIS STATE-- AND OF ALL THE STATES--DECIDE ABOUT THEM WILL AFFECT THE COURSE OF HISTORY.

--30--

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT LYN NOFZINGER OR JAN MCCOY/ CITIZENS FOR REAGAN FOR PRESIDENT/ WASHINGTON D.C. PHONE (202)452-7505.



DATE: 3-8-76

TO: RTH

FROM: GWEN ANDERSON

INFORMATION X

ACTION

APPROPRIATE

HANDLING

OTHER

Please return  
3/11/76  
Returned  
orig. to  
Gwen A.  
mm

COMMENTS:

This <sup>was</sup> all there  
was to report on,  
according to my  
source, during  
Resyn's visit to Wash.  
July 21, 1976

LIBRARY  
GERALD

Reagan, Ronald

JUL 21 1975

## Reagan made speech, but he didn't say . . .

Although he would not make a definite commitment, former California Gov. Ronald Reagan was acting much like a presidential candidate when he spoke at fund-raising functions for the Republican party here Sunday. Appearing at a news conference, a cocktail reception and later at a dinner, Reagan refused to criticize President Ford directly, but he laid out long-range plans for ending deficit spending, curbing inflation, reforming the welfare system and adopting a clearer foreign policy. He's headed for a heavy speaking schedule after leaving Tacoma. Major fund raisers here were a \$100-a-couple reception at the Sherwood Inn and a \$500-a-plate dinner at a lakefront home adjoining the Tacoma Country and Golf Club. Although Reagan was forthright in his views, the naked truth came from another source. Two young male streakers invaded the home where he was speaking. Stories, Page A-3.

Reagan, Ronald

JUL 21 1975

## Defense, welfare draw Reagan fire



Former California Gov. Ronald Reagan came to Tacoma Sunday, whipping up money for Pierce County Republicans and enthusiasm for a strong national defense policy and reform of the welfare system.

Reagan, a prospective candidate for the Republican presidential nomination, refused to criticize President Ford directly, however.

Speaking at a news conference, a cocktail reception at the Sherwood Inn, and later a fund-raising dinner in Lakewood, Reagan said he was not "going into a laundry list of where I agree or disagree with Mr. Ford. I'm just going to go around the country and tell people the things I believe in...the long-range things we have to do if

we're going to survive in this nation's third century."

He said major problems include ending deficit spending, curbing inflation, reforming the welfare system and adopting a clearer foreign policy.

"THIS COUNTRY will deal from strength," he said. "I don't think there would have been a Vietnam if we had allowed our men to win the Korean War."

Reagan stopped short of saying the United States should withdraw from the United Nations. But he said, "There are times when the U.S. should take a walk...we should assert ourselves. I don't think it's wrong for the U.S. to use its muscle when we know it's right." Welfare, Reagan said, "is totally out of control and destroying more people than it is saving. Every able-bodied person should at least be required to look for work, he said.

Reagan has no formal campaign committee, but has given his approval to a "Citizens for Reagan Committee" under the leadership of Nevada Sen. Paul Laxalt.

Voter preference polls indicate Reagan is the strongest potential GOP challenger to Ford now but is slipping. Last spring he trailed the

President by 12 points in the Gallup Poll and by seven points in the Harris Poll. This month, Ford's margin over Reagan is 41-20 in the Gallup and 40-17 in the Harris.

MANY conservatives who are dissatisfied with Ford want Reagan to run, but some say they fear a repeat of 1968, when they say Reagan waited until too late to launch his campaign.

Reagan said Sunday he has not yet decided whether to run. He added, in an interview with The Associated Press, that he does not place too much weight on the enthusiasm of the crowds on his speaking tours.

"When I go out and speak before a dinner, I very firmly fix in my mind that if I took the people who come to hear me as a public opinion poll, it would be very distorted," he said. "The thing is, what are the other people, who aren't there, thinking?"

Though not committed yet to running, Reagan is maintaining a heavy speaking schedule. His Sunday visit to Tacoma will be followed later this week by appearances in Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Virginia and South Carolina.

Color photo, page A-1.



Reagan, Ronald

JUL 21 1975

# Reagan draws crowd but says nothing new

By JACK PYLE  
TNT Special Writer

Ronald Reagan, a potential presidential candidate, is saying nothing different, but he's still drawing the crowds.

Reagan, self-professed conservative, drew 236 persons at the door of the Sher-

## Analysis

wood Inn here Sunday, despite an "informational" picket from the culinary workers unions who protested that the place is non-union.

THE OCCASION was another Republican fundraiser. County Chairman John Prins Jr. said ticket sales grossed \$36,498 from the \$100-a-couple price tag, plus a little more from sales at the door.

Still, Reagan spoke to only about 100 persons because the reception started at 5:30 p.m. and the former California governor didn't speak until 7.

He said again that when tax reform comes, government should be limited in what it takes from people's earnings.

HE REPEATED that he'd "like to see the people support a new second party—the Republican party."

And he once more insisted that no free enterprise in the world is more totally regulated than that in America.

The audience pretended it hadn't heard these statements before and responded with extreme enthusiasm.

And he called for conservatism in this country.

In his news conference, Reagan said the problems of the country can't be cured "by a band aid, but they must be met by surgery."

He blasted the welfare sys-

tem and foreign policy.

He was normally coy about his candidacy, but his press aides said he is on a campaign tour which will recess in August and come on strong again in September.

REAGAN SAID HE will announce his decision on whether to run against President Gerald Ford for the Republican Presidential nomination before the end of the year "but not before the end of this month."

And, he said, "there are little indications that I'm talked about in the White House more than I know."

He wouldn't say what these indications were other than that "I just think I'm not totally unknown there."

## Shooter's size

The word caliber, used in reference to a gun, is the diameter of the bore or barrel.

Reagan, Ronald



# Inn picketing planned when Reagan talks

<sup>the Wash. Union</sup>  
Labor will picket the Ronald Reagan speech here Sunday.

But it is not Reagan who is being picketed. It's the Sherwood Inn, where the employees have voted against joining unions.

Anthony J. Passanante, secretary of the joint board of the Hotel, Motel and Restaurant Employees and the Bartenders' International unions, said the picketing will be "informational."

Said Pierce County Republican Chairman John Prins: "We're not going to worry about it. I can't stop them from picketing. We're going ahead as scheduled."

The \$100-a-couple reception is scheduled for 5:30 to

7:30 p.m. Local Republicans will get the proceeds to use in the fall campaigns.

Reagan will be lining up delegate votes for the next national convention where he hopes to unseat Gerald Ford for the presidential nomination.

Passanante said the picketing is not a partisan matter.

"We picketed the Sherwood when Congressman Lloyd Meeds, a Democrat, was going to speak there," he said. "Meeds wouldn't cross the picket line. He spoke by telephone."

Passanante said he had informed Prins of the picket line last week "as a matter of courtesy."

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

3/15/76

Sent our Ronald

Reagan Column

file to Gwen.

nm



THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

From: Robert T. Hartmann

To: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Time: \_\_\_\_\_

a.m.

p.m.

Return  
to  
Crew


This is a transcript of a "Viewpoint" program with Ronald Reagan entitled "The Russian Wheat Deal" broadcast over KGMI radio, Bellingham, Washington, Wednesday, October 22nd.

"The Russians want to buy American wheat and American farmers want to sell their wheat and our anti-Communist waterfront workers don't want to load the wheat on foreign ships to carry it to Russia. American consumers with the experience of the previous wheat sale and high food prices in mind are alarmed.

Please don't think I am leading up to a pat answer to all these questions. It just isn't that easy.

If we believe in a free market shouldn't our farmers be allowed to sell their produce anywhere in the world for the best price they can get? To not allow this is to subsidize and make available to our own consumers low-priced food at the expense of our own farmers. Not inconsistent with that philosophy, however, is that <sup>of</sup> our own interest in our national security. If we believe the Soviet Union is hostile to the Free World, and we must or we wouldn't be maintaining a nuclear defense and continuing that in NATO, then are we not adding to our own danger by helping the troubled Soviet economy?

But isn't there also a moral issue? Are we not helping the Godless tyranny maintain its hold on millions of helpless people? Wouldn't those helpless victims have a better chance




of becoming free if their slave masters collapsed economically? One thing is certain. The threat of hunger to the Russian people is due to the Russian obsession with military power. Nothing proves the failure of Marxism more than the Soviet inability to produce weapons for its military ambition and at the same time provide for their peoples' everyday needs.

It only takes about 4% of our labor force to grow food for 211 million Americans and provide 80% of all the food shipped to the world's underdeveloped nations.

Fully one-third of the Russian workers are in agriculture and still they starve without our wheat. And the failure is not Russian, it is Communist. For every other country that has collectiveized its agriculture has gone down hill in farm production. Can America force the change to peaceful pursuits on Russia by refusing to sell or would we have to persuade the other Free Nations to do the same? Following such a course, what would we do about our farmers and the surplus they have on their hands. The wheat deal is beneficial to us economically. Right now with economic troubles and balances of trade maybe it benefits us enough to outweigh the tragic factors.

In other words, it strengthens us more than we'd be benefitted by weakening them. But, the moral question in the long run won't go away. The Soviet Union is an aggressor and a threat to world peace. It can remain so only by denying its people freedom and the basic commodities that make life worth living which we take for granted.



The Russians have told us over and over again their goal is to impose an incompetent and ridiculous system on the world. We invest in armament to hold them off. But what do we envision as the eventual outcome? Whether they will see the fallacy of their way and give up their goal or their system will collapse or/and we don't let ourselves think of this. We'll have to use our weapon one day. Maybe there is an answer. We simply do what's morally right. Stop doing business with them. Let their system collapse. But in the meantime, buy our farmers wheat ourselves and have it on hand to feed the Russian people when they finally become free."

END OF TRANSCRIPT



# President Ford Committee

P.O. BOX 16346, AUSTIN, TEXAS 78761 (512) 498-4101

## M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Texas Republican Leaders

DATE: March 31, 1976

FROM: Mrs. Beryl Buckley Milburn  
Campaign Director

I want to begin by congratulating Governor Reagan on his fine victory in North Carolina. Those of us who support President Ford can take some consolation in the fact that he won 25 of North Carolina's 54 delegate votes, but no one is making any excuses. We lost.

Recently our office began receiving inquiries from the news media about a letter which the Co-Chairmen of the Texas Citizens for Reagan had sent to their leaders around the state. This letter made a number of charges against President Ford and his campaign organizations in Texas. We contacted Ron Deere, the Executive Director of Texas Citizens for Reagan, and requested a copy of the letter which we enclose.

Actions speak louder than words, and I think the actions of the President Ford Committee during the next month in Texas will answer this letter more effectively than anything else. I only ask that each of you make a careful evaluation of the fairness of the charges leveled at the President and draw your own conclusions.

We hope you agree that a positive campaign, based on the issues, is what Texas Republicans want in order to determine how they will vote on May 1. We pledge to conduct such a campaign and call on the leaders of Texas Citizens for Reagan to join us.

BBM/tm  
Enclosure



Q.C.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 1, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR ROBERT T. HARTMANN *RTH*

FROM: GWEN ANDERSON *GA*

SUBJECT: REAGAN SPEECH

In response to your request for the quickest possible research check on the speech by former Governor Reagan, we checked the drafts of the candidate's speech for factual accuracy. See attached.

In checking any changes in the pre-released text as compared to the speech as it was actually delivered on TV, there were 28 minor changes, according to Bruce Wagner of Campaign '76 (833-8950). Of the 28 changes, however, there was only one factual change on page 11. That changed the figure from 45% to 43%.

This preliminary report has been compiled by three of our five research staff members headed by Agnes Waldron. The other two researchers have been handling the President's speech texts for Wisconsin. We have been assisted by the NSC, FEA, OMB, and PFC staff members cited as sources.

The economic section, despite some data provided by CEA, is obviously incomplete, but the material promised by Mr. Seidman is not yet available at this writing (4 p.m.).



ERRORS IN CANDIDATE REAGAN'S  
SPEECH OF MARCH 31, 1976

Page 1 - paragraph 3 - Reagan Statement

In this election season the White House is telling us a solid economic recovery is taking place. It claims a slight drop in unemployment. It says that prices aren't going up as fast, but they are still going up, and that the stock market has shown some gains. But, in fact, things seem just about as they were back in the 1972 election year. Remember, we were also coming out of a recession then. Inflation has been running at around 6%. Unemployment about 7. Remember, too, the upsurge and the optimism lasted through the election year and into 1973. And then, the roof fell in. Once again we had unemployment. Only this time not 7%, more than 10. And inflation -- wasn't 6%, it was 12%.

RESPONSE -- The peak of unemployment -- 8.9% -- was reached in May, 1975. Latest unemployment figures -- February, 1976 -- show the rate was 7.6%. But Mr. Reagan in deprecating these figures failed to note that total employment has returned to the pre-recession peak of July 1974 with 86.3 million at work.

Prices are not going up as fast. Inflation in 1974 was at an annual rate of 12.2%. Today it is at 6.3%.

In 1972 we were further into recovery than we are today. But Mr. Reagan has his statistical facts concerning 1973-74 somewhat askew. The peak unemployment figure was reached in May 1975 at 8.9%. It never reached 10% as he states.

Source -- John Davies, CEA

Page 2 - paragraph 2

Now, in this election year 1976, we're told we're coming out of this recession. Just because inflation and unemployment rates have fallen, to what they were at the worst of the previous recession. If history repeats itself will we be talking recovery four years from now merely because we've reduced inflation from 25% to 12%.

RESPONSE -- All of the figures -- retail sales, GNP, durable goods, housing, personal income, etc. clearly show we are moving out of the recession -- the Administration's statements are not based merely on improved unemployment and cost-of-living statistics as Mr. Reagan implies.

Page 2 - paragraph 3

The fact is, we'll never build a lasting economic recovery by going deeper into debt at a faster rate than we ever have before. It took this nation 166 years -- until the middle of World War II -- to finally accumulate a debt of \$95 billion. It took this administration just the last 12 months to add \$95 billion to the debt. And this administration has run up almost one-fourth of our total national debt in just these short nineteen months.

RESPONSE -- The national debt reached \$72 billion in 1942. The current estimated deficit for FY 1976 is \$76.19 billion. Gross federal debt for FY 1976 is estimated at \$634 billion. Thus the administration's share of the national debt is 15.6¢ not 25%.

Page 2 - paragraph 4

Inflation is the cause of recession and unemployment. And we're not going to have real prosperity or recovery until we stop fighting the symptoms and start fighting the disease. There's only one cause for inflation -- government spending more than government takes in. The cure is a balanced budget. Ah, but they tell us, 80% of the budget is uncontrollable. It's fixed by laws passed by Congress.

RESPONSE -- The President has offered specific plans for a balanced budget. But a large part of the cause of the current recession is the result of past fiscal policies, rapid increases in federal expenditures. There is no quick fix for problems created a decade or more ago. A rapid return to a balanced budget as Mr. Reagan calls for would provide faster progress on inflation, but at the same time, it would mean a long delay in recovery and much longer period of high unemployment.

The budget for FY 1977 estimates that 77.1% of the budget is uncontrollable.

Page 3 - last 2 sentences of top paragraph

But laws passed by Congress can be repealed by Congress.  
And, if Congress is unwilling to do this, then isn't it time we  
elect a Congress that will?

RESPONSE -- The open-ended or uncontrollable program caol  
for outlays of \$383.1 billion in FY 1977 (plus the third quarter)  
\$236.8 billion is allocated to payments for individuals. Doe  
Mr. Reagan want to repeal the following:

Social Security and Railroad Retirement -- \$108.0 billion

Federal Employees Retirement benefits -- \$22.9 billion

Veterans Benefits -- \$16.3 billion

Medicare and Medicaid -- \$38.4 billion

Public Assistance programs -- \$26.0 billion

Page 3 - paragraph 2

Soon after he took office, Mr. Ford promised he would end inflation. Indeed, he declared war on inflation. And, we all donned those WIN buttons to "Whip Inflation Now." Unfortunately, the war -- it is never really started -- was soon over. Mr. Ford, without WIN button, appeared on TV, and promised he absolutely would not allow the Federal deficit to exceed \$60 billion (which incidentally was \$5 billion more than the biggest previous deficit we'd ever had). Later he told us it might be as much as \$70 billion. Now we learn it's \$80 billion or more.

RESPONSE -- The President did draw a line at a deficit of \$60 billion on March 29, 1975 in a televised address. The largest single year deficit occurred in 1943 -- \$57.4 billion. The difference between 57.4 and 60 billion is of course \$3.6 billion. The current estimated deficit for FY 76 is not \$80 billion or more, it is \$76.9 billion.

Page 3 - paragraph 3

Then came a White House proposal for a \$28 billion tax cut, to be matched by a \$28 billion cut in the proposed spending -- not in the present spending, but in the proposed spending in the new budget. Well, my question then and my question now is, if there was \$28 billion in the new budget that could be cut, what was it doing there in the first place?

RESPONSE -- The proposed \$28 billion cut was not a cut in the budget as suggested in the next to last line, it was a \$28 billion cut in Federal expenditures in programs already in place. The President's proposal was an effort to prevent further increases in spending.

SOURCE: John Davies, CEA

Page 4 - paragraph 1

It would have been nice if they'd thought of some arrangement like that for the rest of us. They could, for example, correct a great unfairness that now exists in our tax system. Today, when you get a cost of living pay raise -- one that just keeps you even with purchasing power -- it often moves you up into a higher tax bracket. This means you pay a higher percentage in tax, but you reduce your purchasing power. Last year, because of this inequity, the government took in \$ 7 billion in undeserved profit in the income tax alone, and this year they'll do even better. Now isn't it time that Congress looked after your welfare as well as its own?

RESPONSE -- Inflation does indeed increase taxes. The President has recognized this and has been successful in reducing the inflation rate by 50%. He has also proposed curbing the rise in expenditures and matched this with a comparable tax cut.

SOURCE: John Davies, CEA



Page 5 - paragraph 3

Ending inflation is the only long range and lasting answer to the problem of unemployment. The Washington Establishment is not the answer. It's the problem. Its tax policies, its harassing regulations, its confiscation of investment capital to pay for its deficits keeps business and industry from expanding to meet your needs and to provide the jobs we all need.

RESPONSE -- The President's economic policies are anti-inflationary. That is why he has vetoed 46 bills and saved the taxpayers \$13 billion.

SOURCE: Pete Modelin, OMB

Page 6 - paragraph 2

At the time we were only importing a small percentage of our oil. Yet, the Arab boycott caused half a million Americans to lose their jobs when plants closed down for lack of fuel. Today, it's almost three years later and "Project Independence" has become "Project Dependence." Congress has adopted an energy bill so bad we were led to believe Mr. Ford would veto it. Instead he signed it. And, almost instantly, drilling rigs all over our land started shutting down. Now, for the first time in our history, we are importing more oil than we produce. How many Americans will be laid off if there is another boycott? The energy bill is a disaster that never should have been signed.

RESPONSE -- Candidate Reagan stated we were only importing a small percentage of our oil -- actually 35%. When he stated it's almost three years -- in fact -- it is only two years March, 1974 to the present. The amount of oil that we imported during 1975 was 6.0 bm/d, and we produced 8.4 mb/d.

SOURCE: FEA, Bruce Pasternak and Jim Peterson

SOURCE: CHRIS RATHKOPH/FRANK ZARB  
FEA -- Administrator's Office

Page 6  
Paragraph 2

Reagan Statement:

Today, it's almost three years later and "Project Independence" has become "Project Dependence." Congress has adopted an energy bill so bad we were led to believe Mr. Ford would veto it. Instead he signed it.

RESPONSE:

The Energy Policy and Conservation Act passed by the Congress in December signaled an end to the year long debate between the Congress and the Administration on oil pricing policy and opens the way to an orderly phasing out of controls on domestic oil over forty months, thereby stimulating our own oil production. Over time, this legislation, by removing controls, should give industry sufficient incentive to explore, develop and produce new fields in the outer continental shelf, Alaska, and potential new reserves in the lower forty-eight states. Removal of these controls at the end of forty months should increase domestic production by more than one million barrels per day by 1985 and reduce imports by about three million barrels per day.

More importantly, this bill enables the United States to meet a substantial portion of the mid-term goals for

energy independence set forth over a year ago. Incorporated in this are authorities for a strategic storage system, conversion of oil and gas-fired utility and industrial plants to coal, energy efficiency labeling, emergency authorities for use in the event of another embargo, and the authority we need to fulfill our international agreements with other oil consuming nations. These provisions will directly reduce the nation's dependency on foreign oil by almost two million barrels per day by 1985. The strategic storage system and the stand-by authority will enable the United States to withstand a future embargo of about four million barrels per day.

Page 7 - paragraph 3

Page 9 - paragraph 2

California was faced with insolvency and on the verge of bankruptcy. We had to increase taxes. Well, this came very hard for me because I felt taxes were already too great a burden. I told the people the increase, in my mind, was temporary and that, as soon as we could, we'd return their money to them.

This was government-by-the-people proving that it works when the people work at it. When we ended our eight years, we turned over to the incoming administration a balance budget. A \$500 million surplus. And, virtually the same number of employees we'd started with eight years before. Even though the increase in population had given some departments a two-thirds increase in work load.

RESPONSE -- The number of state employees increased from 113,779 in 1967 to 127,929 in 1975. Under Reagan, there were three huge tax increases totalling more than \$2 billion in 1967.

In 1967, there was an increase of \$967 million, the largest state tax hike in the nation's history. Of this, \$2280 million went for one-time deficit payment and state property tax relief. In 1971, the increase was \$488 million with \$150 million for property tax relief. In 1972, an increase of \$682 million with \$650 million for property tax relief. Much of this property tax relief was short term, but the overall tax increases were permanent.

State personal income tax revenues went from \$500 million to \$2.5 billion, a 500% increase. Taxable bracket levies were increased from 7% to 11%. The size of the brackets was reduced so that taxpayers reached the highest bracket more quickly and personal exemptions were reduced. Finally, after he adamantly denied that he would ever do so, the Governor agreed to a system of withholding state income taxes.

Bank and corporation taxes went up 100%. The state sales tax rose from 4% to 6%. The tax on cigarettes went up 7 cents a pack and the liquor tax rose 50 cents per gallon. Inheritance tax rates were increased and collections more than doubled.

Page 7 - paragraph 3  
Page 9 - paragraph 2  
continued

-14-

Under Reagan, the average tax rate for each \$100 of assessed valuation rose from \$8.84 to \$11.15. Under predecessor Pat Brown, the increase was much less in dollars and percentage -- from \$6.96 to \$8.84, and in the six years of Republican Knight's administration, it was still less -- from \$5.94 to \$6.96. One reason for the big increase under Reagan -- from \$3.7 billion to \$8.3 billion -- is that the state paid a statutory formulated percentage of the school costs -- one of the biggest reasons for local property taxes.

Despite periodic efforts to provide relief there has been a substantial increase in the burden carried by most property owners. Inflation and high assessments have helped wipe out any savings. Only \$855 million of the record \$10.2 billion budget in Reagan's final year was for tax relief for homeowners and renters.

SOURCE: Peter Kaye, PFC

Page 10 - paragraph 4

And in less than three years we reduced the rolls by more than 300,000 people. Saved the taxpayers \$2 billion.

RESPONSE -- Substitute for 300,000 and \$2 billion the following:

1. Drop by 20,000 persons in rolls due to correction in accounting procedures in largest county, Los Angeles.
2. Migratory rate of unemployed into California declined from 233,000 in 1967 to 44,000 in 1971.
3. 110,000 decline in rolls attributed to Reagan even though his welfare had not gone into effect when decline occurred.
4. Rolls for welfare families increased in 8 years of Reagan's Governorship from 729,357 to 1,384,400 and the cost went from \$32.3 million to \$104.4 million.

SOURCE: Peter Kaye, PFC

Page 11 - top sentence

And, increased the grants to the truly deserving needy by an average of 43%. We also carried out a successful experiment which I believe is an answer to much of the welfare problem in the nation. We put able-bodied welfare recipients to work at useful community projects in return for their welfare grants.

RESPONSE -- The program never touched more than 6/10th of 1% of welfare recipients. Also, the program designed to have 59,000 participants in 1st year in 35 counties, but program managed 1,100 participants in 10 counties in mostly rural farm areas.

SOURCE: Peter Kaye, PFC



Page 12 - paragraph 4

Independent business people, shopkeepers and farmers file billions of reports every year required of them by Washington. It amounts to some 10 billion pieces of paper each year and it adds \$50 billion a year to the cost of doing business. Washington has been loud in its promise to do something about this blizzard of paperwork. And they made good. Last year they increased it by 20%.

RESPONSE -- The figures 10 billion and 50 billion are guestimates. No one has counted the number of pages in all of these reports. Moreover, if it is liberally estimated that it costs \$100 an hour to work on these forms, the total cost to business would be \$4.3 billion.

Between December, 1974 and December, 1975, the number of reports from the Executive branch agencies excluding IRS, banking and regulatory agencies declined by 5%. However, the number of hours of burden associated with filling out the reports increased by 8%. One reason for that increase is reports required by the Congress, i.e., the Real Estate Settlements Act which requires information to be filed when house was sold added 4 million manhours of reporting burden last year. In the absence of that report the reporting burden would have declined. There are other reports mandated by Congress which have added to this burden.

Dr. Duncan can see no reason for the increase of 20% that candidate Reagan was talking about. It is also virtually impossible to estimate cost to business in completing the forms.

SOURCE: Dr. Duncan, OMB, and Roy Lawry of OMB

SOURCE: BUD MCFARLAND, NSC

Page 13

Paragraph 3

Reagan Statement:

We gave just enough support to one side in Angola to encourage it to fight and die but too little to give it a chance of winning.

Response:

The U.S. objective in supporting the FNLA/UNITA forces in Angola was to assist them, and through them all of black Africa, to defend against Soviet and Cuban intervention. Despite massive Soviet aid and the presence of Cuban troops, we were on the road to success in Angola until December 19 when Congress adopted the Tunney Amendment cutting off further U.S. aid to the FNLA and UNITA.

Page 13

Paragraph 3

Reagan Statement:

Mr. Ford's new Ambassador to the United Nations attacks our long time ally Israel.

Response:

Governor Scranton not only did not attack Israel, his veto blocked an unbalanced Security Council Resolution critical of

SOURCE: Bud McFarland, NSC

Israel -- a resolution that every other member of the Security Council voted for. In his March 23 speech in the United Nations Security Council Gov. Scranton was simply reiterating long-standing U. S. policy -- a policy articulated by every Administration since 1967 -- on Israel's obligations as an occupying power under international law with regard to the territories under its occupation.

Page 13

Paragraph 3

Reagan Statement:

In Asia our new relationship with mainland China can have practical benefits with both sides. But that doesn't mean it should include yielding to demands by them as the Administration has, to reduce our military presence on Taiwan where we have a long-time friend and ally, the Republic of China.

Response:

We have not reduced our forces on Taiwan as a result of Peking's demands. Instead, our reductions stem from our own assessment of U.S. political and security interests. We have drawn our forces down because the Vietnam conflict has ended and because the lessening of tension in the area brought about by our new relationship with the People's Republic of China has made it possible.

SOURCE: Bud McFarland, NSC

Page 13-14  
Paragraph 3

Reagan Statement:

And, it is also revealed now that we seek to establish friendly relations with Hanoi. To make it more palatable, we are told this might help us learn the fate of the men still listed as Missing in Action.

Response:

The Congress, reflecting the views of the American people and the Administration, has called for an accounting of our Missing in Action and the return of the bodies of dead servicemen still held by Hanoi. The Administration, in keeping with this Congressional mandate, has offered to discuss with Hanoi the significant outstanding issues between us. We have not said we "seek to establish friendly relations with Hanoi." Such an assertion is totally false.

Page 14  
Paragraph 2

Reagan Statement:

In the last few days, Mr. Ford and Dr. Kissinger have taken us from hinting at invasion of Cuba to laughing it off a ridiculous idea. Except, that it was their ridiculous idea. No one else suggested it. Once again -- what is their policy? During this last year, they carried

SOURCE: Bud McFarland, NSC

on a campaign to befriend Castro. They persuaded the Organization of American States to lift its trade embargo, lifted some U.S. trade restrictions, they engaged in culture exchanges. And then on the eve of the Florida primary election, Mr. Ford went to Florida, called Castro an outlaw and said he'd never recognize him. But he hasn't asked our Latin American neighbors to reimpose a single sanction, nor has he taken any action himself. Meanwhile, Castro continues to export revolution to Puerto Rico, to Angola, and who knows where else?

Response:

We did not persuade the OAS to lift the sanctions against Cuba. At Quito in the fall of 1974 we did not support a motion in the OAS to do so. At San Jose last summer the U.S. voted in favor of an OAS resolution which left to each country freedom of action with regard to the sanctions. We did so because a majority of the OAS members had already unilaterally lifted their sanctions against Cuba, and because the resolution was supported by a majority of the organization members. Since that resolution passed, no additional Latin American country has established relations with Cuba.

The U.S. did not lift its own sanctions against Cuba, did not enter into any agreements with Cuba, and did not trade with Cuba. We did not engage in cultural exchanges. We validated some passports for U.S. Congressmen and their staffs, for some scholars and for

SOURCE: Bud McFarland, NSC

some religious leaders to visit Cuba. We issued a few select visas to Cubans to visit the U.S. These minimal steps were taken to test whether there was a mutual interest in ending the hostile nature of our relations. This policy was consistent with the traditional American interest in supporting the free flow of ideas and people. We have, since the Cuban adventure in Angola, concluded that the Cubans are not interested in changing their ways. We have resumed our highly restrictive policies toward Cuban travel. With regard to Cuban efforts to interfere in Puerto Rican affairs, we have made it emphatically clear in the UN and bilaterally to the Cubans and other nations that the U.S. will not tolerate any interference in its internal affairs.

Page 15

Paragraph 2

Reagan Statement:

The Canal Zone is not a colonial possession. It is not a long-term lease. It is sovereign U.S. territory every bit the same as Alaska and all the states that were carved from the Louisiana Purchase. We should end those negotiations (on the Panama Canal) and tell the General: We bought it, we paid for it, we built it and we intend to keep it.

SOURCE: Bud McFarland, NSC

Response:

Negotiations between the United States and Panama on the Canal have been pursued by three successive American Presidents. The purpose of these negotiations is to protect our national security, not diminish it.

Finally, Governor Reagan's view that the Canal Zone is "sovereign U.S. territory every bit the same as Alaska and all the states that were carved from the Louisiana Purchase" is incorrect. Legal Scholars have been clear on this for three-quarters of a century. Unlike children born in the United States, for example, children born in the Canal Zone are not automatically citizens of the United States.

Page 16

Paragraph 2

Reagan Statement:

Why did the President travel halfway 'round the world to sign the Helsinki Pact, putting our stamp of approval on Russia's enslavement of the captive nations?

We gave away the freedom of millions of people -- freedom that was not ours to give.

Response:

The President did not go to Helsinki to put the stamp of approval on Soviet domination of Eastern Europe. On the contrary,

SOURCE: Bud McFarland, NSC

he went to Helsinki along with the Chiefs of State or heads of government of all our Western allies and, among others, a Papal Representative, to sign a document which contains Soviet commitments to greater respect for human rights, self determination of peoples, and expanded exchanges and communication throughout Europe. Basket three of the Act calls for a freer flow of people and ideas among all the European nations.

The Helsinki Act, for the first time, specifically provides for the possibility of peaceful change of borders when that would correspond to the wishes of the peoples concerned. With regard to the particular case of the Baltic States, President Ford stated clearly on July 25 that "the United States has never recognized that Soviet incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and is not doing so now. Our official policy of non-recognition is not affected by the results of the European Security Conference." in fact, the Helsinki document itself states that no occupation or acquisition of territory by force will be recognized as legal.

Page 16

Paragraph 3

Reagan Statement:

Now we must ask if someone is giving away our own freedom. Dr. Kissinger is quoted as saying that he thinks of the U.S. as Athens



SOURCE: Bud McFarland, NSC

and the Soviet Union as Sparta. "The day of the U.S. is past and today is the day of the Soviet Union." And he added, "...My job as Secretary of State is to negotiate the most acceptable second-best position available."

Response:

Governor Reagan's so-called quotes from Secretary Kissinger are a total and irresponsible fabrication. He has never said what the Governor attributes to him, or anything like it. In fact, at a March 23, 1976 press conference in Dallas Secretary Kissinger said: "I do not believe that the United States will be defeated. I do not believe that the United States is on the decline. I do not believe that the United States must get the best deal it can.

I believe that the United States is essential to preserve the security of the free world and for any progress in the world that exists.

In a period of great national difficulty, of the Viet-Nam war, of Watergate, of endless investigations, we have tried to preserve the role of the United States as that major factor. And I believe that to explain to the American people that the policy is complex, that our involvement is permanent, and that our problems are nevertheless soluble, is a sign of optimism and of confidence in the American people, rather than the opposite."

SOURCE: Bud McFarland, NSC

Page 17

Paragraph 2

Reagan Statement:

Now we learn that another high official of the State Department, Helmut Sonnenfeldt, whom Dr. Kissinger refers to as his "Kissinger", has expressed the belief that, in effect, the captive nations should give up any claim of national sovereignty and simply become a part of the Soviet Union. He says, 'Their desire to break out of the Soviet straightjacket' threatens us with World War III. In other words, slaves should accept their fate.'

Response:

It is wholly inaccurate, and a gross distortion of fact, to ascribe such views to Mr. Sonnenfeldt or to this Administration. Neither he nor anyone else in the Administration has ever expressed any such belief. The Administration view on this issue was expressed by Secretary Kissinger before the House International Relations Committee on March 29 as follows:

"As far as the U.S. is concerned, we do not accept a sphere of influence of any country, anywhere, and emphatically we reject a Soviet sphere of influence in Eastern Europe.

SOURCE: Bud McFarland, NSC

"Two Presidents have visited in Eastern Europe; there have been two visits to Poland and Romania and Yugoslavia, by Presidents. I have made repeated visits to Eastern Europe, on every trip to symbolize and to make clear to these countries that we are interested in working with them and that we do not accept or act upon the exclusive dominance of any one country in that area.

"At the same time, we do not want to give encouragement to an uprising that might lead to enormous suffering. But in terms of the basic position of the United States, we do not accept the dominance of any one country anywhere.

"Yugoslavia was mentioned, for example. We would emphatically consider it a very grave matter if outside forces were to attempt to intervene in the domestic affairs of Yugoslavia. We welcome Eastern European countries developing more in accordance with their national traditions, and we will cooperate with them. This is the policy of the United States, and there is no Sonnenfeldt doctrine."

SOURCE: BUD McFARLANE, NSC

Page 16

Paragraph 1

Reagan Statement:

The Soviet Army outnumbered ours more than two-to-one and in reserves four-to-one. They out-spend us on weapons by 50%. Their Navy outnumbered ours in surface ships and submarines two-to-one. We are outgunned in artillery three-to-one and their tanks outnumber ours four-to-one. Their strategic nuclear missiles are larger, more powerful and more numerous than ours. The evidence mounts that we are Number Two in a world where it is dangerous, if not fatal, to be second best.

RESPONSE:

Our nation is not "in danger," but it is damaging to the interests of this country when a politician declares to our adversaries and our friends abroad -- completely falsely -- that we are in second place. Such statements are both irresponsible and dangerous. They alarm our people and confuse our allies.

-- It is meaningless to say the Soviet Army may now be twice the size of the US Army! Considering that about half of the Soviet Army is deployed on the Chinese border, that isn't all that surprising. I suppose that if

we had to defend our borders and thus doubled our forces to do it, Mr. Reagan would be happier. Simplistic rhetoric such as this reflects a disturbingly shallow grasp of what true balance is all about.

-- For example, Mr. Reagan conveniently neglects to point out that our strategic forces are superior to Soviet forces. Our missiles are far more accurate and survivable. We have over twice as many missile warheads and, after all, it is the warheads which actually reach the target. Our lead in this area has been increasing over the past several years. Mr. Reagan likewise ignores our vast superiority in strategic bombers.

In short, if Mr. Reagan wants to alarm with use of numbers he can; but it only portrays his superficial understanding of these matters and by inflaming opinion -- at home and abroad -- falsely, does not serve the public interest.

-- Let's look at actions as opposed to words. President Ford is the one who reversed the trend of shrinking defense budgets. His last two defense budgets are the highest peacetime budgets in the nation's history. Mr. Reagan should speak to the Democratic Congress about its \$32 billion cuts in defense over the past six years.

Let's examine the question of America's strength.

First, we must dispose of the numbers game. National defense is not bookkeeping.

If it were, we could point out that our missile warheads have tripled, that we lead the Soviet Union by more than two to one. We would point out that we have over a three to one lead in strategic bombers. We could point out that our missiles are twice as accurate as the Soviet Union's.

We would point out that the Soviet Army -- which the Governor says is twice the size of ours -- has the problem of guarding a long border with China with a million men, and that our borders with Mexico and Canada are peaceful.

But it is a confusing disservice to the American people to dazzle them with numbers. If we were isolated in a fortress America, then it might be important to compare numbers. But we stand at the head of a great Alliance system in Europe and are firmly tied to the strongest economic power in Asia. We have friendly relations with most of the nations of the world. These are the valuable accomplishments of all of our previous Administrations since President Truman. We cannot insult our friends and allies by pretending they do not count.

Second, we cannot ignore that whatever might be the balance of power today, it is not fixed. And in our military programs, our defense budgets, we are indeed looking to the future, to guarantee that this nation will never be in danger. Consider our defense programs.

-- We are proceeding with the development and production of the world's most modern strategic bomber, the B-1.

-- We are proceeding with the development and production of the world's most modern and lethal missile launching submarine, the Trident.

-- We are developing a new large ICBM.

--We are producing three new fighters.

--We are planning the production of 15 new fighting ships, including two carriers.

It is true that you can cite a figure that the Soviets have more ships, but it is a trick to equate Soviet destroyers with our modern nuclear powered aircraft carriers.

Unfortunately, the money we have put into defense over the past several years has been inadequate. But the responsibility for slashing \$40 billion dollars must rest with the Congress.

Fortunately, under the prodding of President Ford the Congress has begun to awaken to the risks of constantly reducing our defense spending.

When the budget he proposed this year passes, then the trend will have been reversed.

So, we are in fact number one, and unless we falter, or give way to panic, we will remain number one.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 1, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: L. WILLIAM SEIDMAN  
BURTON G. MALKIEL

SUBJECT: Governor Reagan's March 31 Address

Governor Reagan's speech of March 31 is almost pure demagoguery. His facts are often wrong and his characterization of present policies is grossly misleading. The major implication of the speech is that we are excessively stimulating the economy for political purposes, just as was ostensibly done in 1972, and the result will be more inflation and an economic collapse. The analogy is completely unfair for the following reasons:

(1) Just the opposite is true. Our policies are moderate, balanced and geared to producing a solid and sustainable recovery and a reduction of inflation.

- (a) The President's vetoes during 1975 and 1976 have saved the taxpayers \$13 billion.
- (b) Monetary expansion is now far more restrained than in 1972. Over the last six months -- that is, from September 1975 to March 1976 -- the broadly defined money supply ( $M_2$ ) has grown at an 8.6 percent annual rate. In the comparable September 1971 - March 1972 period, it grew at a 14.6 percent rate. It should also be pointed out that a 14.6 percent rate is well above the 10-1/2 percent upper limit of the Federal Reserve's present target range for the growth rate of the broadly defined money supply.

(2) It is true that we are running a larger deficit now than in 1972. However, the following points should be made:

- (a) The unemployment rate is considerably higher now and therefore so are the payments under automatic stabilizing programs such as unemployment compensation. Does Governor Reagan suggest we should reduce or eliminate these programs?



- (b) Capacity utilization was 70.8 percent in the 4th quarter of 1975 versus 78.6 percent during 1972. There is far more room for expansionary policies to increase real output without simply generating inflation.
- (c) The inflation of 1973 and 1974 was not wholly the result of government deficits. It was also influenced by monetary policy and by unusual shocks such as the quintupling of international oil prices and a world wide food shortage.

The Reagan speech does not acknowledge the considerable progress made by the Administration in reducing inflation. Wholesale prices increased 12.5 percent from March 1974 to March 1975. In the twelve months through March 1976 the wholesale price index increased only 5-1/2 percent. Inflation in the CPI was also at double digit rates during the 12 months ending March 1975. Over the last 12 months the CPI has increased at an annual rate of just over 6 percent.

The President's program of matching expenditure cuts with tax relief is ridiculed by Reagan. "If there was \$28 billion in the new budget that could be cut, what was it doing there in the first place?" The whole point is that the President did not put the \$28 billion in his budget. The \$28 billion was measured from a projected current service budget, i.e. a budget assuming the continuance of programs Congress already legislated.

Indeed the President's program is based upon the very premises which Governor Reagan would cite for himself. The President has stated repeatedly that an enduring solution to the unemployment program must go hand in hand with a reduction in inflation. To argue otherwise is dishonest. The President has proposed a radical reordering of budget priorities so as to improve the operation of many federal programs and to slow the rapid rise in federal outlays for the transfer and grant programs. These proposals, if adopted, would enable the budget to swing back into surplus as the recovery carries the economy back toward full employment.

These proposals will also enable a reversal in the long decline in real military outlays, and some modest further reductions in taxes. The President's proposals will leave the incomes of the American people for individuals themselves to spend,

rather than transferring it to the Federal Government. These proposals, if adopted, will enable the transition in the Federal budget which was not made in 1972-73. The President has exercised his veto power 46 times in the past year to insure that the transition is made.

To advocate an immediate balanced budget would be both irresponsible and dishonest. Part of the deficit is due to the recession and the reduced level of Federal revenues. Part of the deficit is due to the explosion of Federal outlays for transfers and grants. It took a decade and more to create these problems. They cannot be solved overnight without imposing intolerable costs upon the American people. They cannot be solved without a solid sustainable recovery, an enduring reduction in inflation and the reordering of budget priorities which the President has proposed.

An immediate balance in the federal deficit would require either a large tax increase or a large expenditure reduction. Such measures would shock the recovery and probably bring it to a halt. The only way to achieve our goals is to follow a prudent and disciplined budget policy, or reorder our budget priorities, to curb the rapid rise in Federal outlays. Otherwise, instead of overshooting the mark as we did in 1972-1973, we will undershoot it -- and the American people will again pay the dual price of recession and inflation.

There were also a number of factual errors in Governor Reagan's speech. Among them are:

- (1) Governor Reagan stated the unemployment rate was over 10 percent at some point during the recession. In fact, it peaked at 8.9 percent in May 1975.
- (2) Governor Reagan stated the FY 1976 budget deficit will be over \$80 billion. In fact, our best estimate is \$76 billion.
- (3) Governor Reagan stated that the maximum social security benefit "today buys 80 fewer loaves of bread than it did when the maximum payment was only \$85 a month." This would imply the average benefit in terms of dollars of constant purchasing power has declined substantially. In fact, the average benefit in terms of constant purchasing power has almost tripled since 1940 when the maximum benefit was \$85.
- (4) Governor Reagan indicated that since the energy bill was enacted "almost instantly, drilling rigs all over our land started shutting down." In fact, there were

1660 drilling rigs operating in 1975, the highest number in a decade. Through mid-March 1976 there were as many rigs operating as were operating in the comparable period during 1975.



# CITIZENS FOR REAGAN

1835 K Street N.W. • Washington, D.C. 20006 • 202/452-7576

March 31, 1976

EMBARGO--RELEASE UPON DELIVERY 10:30 PM EST--WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 1976

CONTACT: Lyn Nofziger  
Jan McCoy  
(202) 452-7606

TEXT OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN'S NATIONWIDE TELEVISION ADDRESS

NBC NETWORK

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 1976

Good evening to all of you from California. Tonight, I'd like to talk to you about issues. Issues which I think are involved--or should be involved in this primary election season.

I'm a candidate for the Republican nomination for President. But I hope that you who are Independents and Democrats will let me talk to you also tonight because the problems facing our country are problems that just don't bear any party label.

In this election season the White House is telling us a solid economic recovery is taking place. It claims a slight drop in unemployment. It says that prices aren't going up as fast, but they are still going up, and that the stock market has shown some gains. But, in fact, things seem just about as they were back in the 1972 election year. Remember, we were also coming out of a recession then. Inflation has been running

at around 6%. Unemployment about 7. Remember, too, the upsurge and the optimism lasted through the election year and into 1973. Then, the roof fell in. Once again we had unemployment. Only this time not 7%, more than 10. And inflation--wasn't 6%, it was 12%.

Now, in this election year 1976, we're told we're coming out of this recession. Just because inflation and unemployment rates have fallen, to what they were at the worst of the previous recession. If history repeats itself will we be talking recovery four years from now merely because we've reduced inflation from 25% to 12%?

The fact is, we'll never build a lasting economic recovery by going deeper into debt at a faster rate than we ever had before. It took this nation 166 years--until the middle of World War II--to finally accumulate a debt of \$95 billion. It took this administration just the last 12 months to add \$95 billion to the debt. And this administration has run up almost one-fourth of our total national debt in just these short nineteen months.

Inflation is the cause of recession and unemployment. And we're not going to have real prosperity or recovery until we stop fighting the symptoms and start fighting the disease. There's only one cause for inflation--government spending more than government takes in. The cure is a balanced budget. Ah, but they tell us, 80% of the budget is uncontrollable. It's

fixed by laws passed by Congress. The laws passed by Congress can be repealed by Congress. And, if Congress is unwilling to do this, then isn't it time we elect a Congress that will?

Soon after he took office, Mr. Ford promised he would end inflation. Indeed, he declared war on inflation. And, we all donned those WIN buttons to "Whip Inflation Now." Unfortunately, the war--if it ever really started--was soon over. Mr. Ford, without WIN button, appeared on TV, and promised he absolutely would not allow the Federal deficit to exceed \$60 billion (which incidentally was \$5 billion more than the biggest previous deficit we'd ever had). Later he told us it might be as much as \$70 billion. Now we learn it's \$80 billion or more.

Then came a White House proposal for a \$28 billion tax cut, to be matched by a \$28 billion cut in the proposed spending--not in present spending, but in the proposed spending in the new budget. Well, my question then and my question now is, if there was \$28 billion in the new budget that could be cut, what was it doing there in the first place?

Unfortunately, Washington doesn't feel the same pain from inflation that you and I do. As a matter of fact, government makes a profit on inflation. For instance, last July Congress vaccinated itself against that pain. It very quietly passed legislation (which the President signed into law) which automatically now gives a pay increase to every Congressman every time the cost of living goes up.

It would have been nice if they'd thought of some arrangement like that for the rest of us. They could, for example, correct a great unfairness that now exists in our tax system. Today, when you get a cost of living pay raise--one that just keeps you even with purchasing power--it often moves you up into a higher tax bracket. This means you pay a higher percentage in tax, but you reduce your purchasing power. Last year, because of this inequity, the government took in \$7 billion in undeserved profit in the income tax alone, and this year they'll do even better. Now isn't it time Congress looked after your welfare as well as its own?

Those whose spending policies cause inflation to begin with should be made to feel the painful effect just as you and I do. Repeal of Congress' automatic pay raise might leave it with more incentive to do something to curb inflation.

Now, let's look at Social Security. Mr. Ford says he wants to "preserve the integrity of Social Security." Well, I differ with him on one word. I would like to restore the integrity of Social Security. Those who depend on it see a continual reduction in their standard of living. Inflation strips the increase in their benefits. The maximum benefit today buys 80 fewer loaves of bread than it did when that maximum payment was only \$85 a month. In the meantime, the Social Security payroll tax has become the most unfair tax any worker pays. Women are discriminated

against. Particularly, working wives. And, people who reach Social Security age and want to continue working, should be allowed to do so and without losing their benefits. I believe a Presidential commission of experts should be appointed to study and present a plan to strengthen and improve Social Security while there's still time--so that no person who has contributed to Social Security will ever lose a dime.

Before leaving this subject of our economic problems let's talk about unemployment.

Ending inflation is the only long range and lasting answer to the problem of unemployment. The Washington Establishment is not the answer. It's the problem. Its tax policies, its harassing regulations, its confiscation of investment capital to pay for its deficits keeps business and industry from expanding to meet your needs and to provide the jobs we all need.

No one who lived through the Great Depression can ever look upon an unemployed person with anything but compassion. To me, there is no greater tragedy than a breadwinner willing to work, with a job skill but unable to find a market for that job skill. Back in those dark depression days I saw my father on a Christmas Eve open what he thought was a Christmas greeting from his boss. Instead it was a blue slip telling him he no longer had a job. The memory of him sitting there holding that slip of paper and then saying in a half whisper "That's quite a Christmas present"-- it will stay with me as long as I live.



Other problems go unsolved. Take energy. Only a short time ago we were lined up at the gas station. We turned our thermostats down as Washington announced "Project Independence." We were going to become self-sufficient, able to provide for our own energy needs.

At the time we were only importing a small percentage of our oil. Yet, the Arab boycott caused half a million Americans to lose their jobs when plants closed down for lack of fuel. Today, it's almost three years later and "Project Independence" has become "Project Dependence." Congress has adopted an energy bill so bad we were led to believe Mr. Ford would veto it. Instead he signed it. And, almost instantly, drilling rigs all over our land started shutting down. Now, for the first time in our history, we are importing more oil than we produce. How many Americans will be laid off if there is another boycott? The energy bill is a disaster that never should have been signed.

An effort has been made in this campaign to suggest that there aren't any real differences between Mr. Ford and myself. I believe there are, and these differences are fundamental. One of them has to do with our approach to government. Before Richard Nixon appointed him Vice President, Mr. Ford was a Congressman for 25 years. His concern was the welfare of his congressional district. For most of his adult life he has been a part of the Washington Establishment.

Most of my adult life has been spent outside of government. My experience in government was the eight years I served as Governor of California. If it were a nation, California would be the 7th ranking economic power in the world today.

When I became Governor, I inherited a state government that was in almost the same situation as New York City. The state payroll had been growing for a dozen years at a rate of from 5 to 7,000 new employees each year. State government was spending from a million to a million-and-a-half dollars more each day than it was taking in. The State's great water project was unfinished and underfunded by a half a billion dollars. My predecessor had spent the entire year's budget for Medicaid in the first six months of the fiscal year. And, we learned that the teachers' retirement fund was unfunded. A four billion dollar liability hanging over every property owner in the state. I didn't know whether I'd been elected Governor or appointed receiver.

California was faced with insolvency and on the verge of bankruptcy. We had to increase taxes. Well, this came very hard for me because I felt taxes were already too great a burden. I told the people the increase, in my mind, was temporary and that, as soon as we could, we'd return their money to them.

I had never in my life thought of seeking or holding public office and I'm still not quite sure how it all happened. In my own mind, I was a citizen representing my fellow citizens against the institution of government.

I turned to the people, not to politicians for help. Instead of a committee to screen applicants for jobs, I had a citizens' recruiting committee, and I told this committee I wanted an administration made up of men and women who did not want government careers and who would be the first to tell me if their government job was unnecessary. And I had that happen. A young man from the aerospace industry dissolved his department in four months, handed me the key to this office and told me we'd never need the department. And to this day, I not only never missed it, I don't know where it was.

There was a reason for my seeking people who didn't want government careers. Dr. Parkinson summed it all up in his book on bureaucracy. He said, "Government hires a rat catcher and the first thing you know, he's become a rodent control officer."

In those entire eight years, most of us never lost the feeling that we were there representing the people against what Cicero once called the "arrogance of officialdom." We had a kind of watchword we used on each other. "When we begin thinking of government as we instead of they, we've been here too long." Well, I believe that attitude would be beneficial in Washington.

We didn't stop with just getting our administrators from the ranks of the people. We also asked for help from expert people in a great many fields, and more than 250 of our citizens volunteered, to form into task forces. They went into every department and agency of state government to see how modern

business practices could make government more efficient, economical and responsive. They gave an average of 117 days apiece full time, away from their own jobs and careers. At no cost to the taxpayers. They made 1,800 specific recommendations. We implemented more than 1,600 of those recommendations.

This was government-by-the-people proving that it works when the people work at it. When we ended our eight years, we turned over to the incoming administration a balanced budget. A \$500 million surplus. And, virtually the same number of employees we'd started with eight years before. Even though the increase in population had given some departments a two-thirds increase in work load.

The water project was completed with \$165 million left over. Our bonds had a triple A rating, the highest credit rating you can get. And the teachers' retirement program was fully funded on a sound actuarial basis. And, we kept our word to the taxpayers--we returned to them in rebates and tax cuts, \$5 billion, 761 million.

I believe that what we did in California can be done in Washington if government will have faith in the people and let them bring their common sense to bear on the problems bureaucracy hasn't solved. I believe in the people.

Now, Mr. Ford places his faith in the Washington Establishment. This has been evident in his appointment of former Congressmen and long-time government workers to positions in his

Administration. Well, I don't believe that those who have been part of the problem are necessarily the best qualified to solve them.

The truth is, Washington has taken over functions that don't truly belong to it. In almost every case it has been a failure. Understand, I'm speaking of those programs which logically should be administered at state and local levels.

Welfare is a classic example. Voices that are raised now and then urging a federalization of welfare don't realize that the failure of welfare is due to federal interference. Washington doesn't even know how many people are on welfare. How many cheaters are getting more than one check. It only knows how many checks it's sending out. Its own rules keep it from finding out how many are getting more than one check. Well, California had a welfare problem. 16% of all welfare recipients in the country were drawing their checks in our state. We were sending welfare checks to families who decided to live abroad. One family was receiving its check in Russia. Our caseload was increasing by 40,000 people a month. After a few years of trying to control this runaway program and being frustrated by bureaucrats here in California and in Washington, we turned again to a citizens' task force. The result was the most comprehensive welfare reform ever attempted.

And in less than three years we reduced the rolls by more than 300,000 people. Saved the taxpayers \$2 billion. And,

increased the grants to the truly deserving needy by an average of 45%. We also carried out a successful experiment which I believe is an answer to much of the welfare problem in the nation. We put able-bodied welfare recipients to work at useful community projects in return for their welfare grants.

Now, let's look at housing. Washington has tried to solve this problem for the poor by building low-cost houses. So far it has torn down three and a half homes for every one it has built.

Schools. In America, we created at the local level and administered at the local level for many years the greatest public school system in the world. Now through something called federal aid to education, we have something called federal interference and education has been the loser. Quality has declined as federal intervention has increased.

Nothing has created more bitterness for example than forced busing to achieve racial balance. It was born of a hope that we could increase understanding and reduce prejudice and antagonism. I'm sure we all approved of that goal. But busing has failed to achieve that goal. Instead, it has increased the bitterness and animosity it was supposed to reduce. California's Superintendent of Public Instruction, Wilson Riles (himself a black), says, "The concept that black children can't learn unless they are sitting with white children is utter and complete nonsense." Well, I agree. The money now being wasted on this social experiment could be better spent to provide the kind of school

facilities every child deserves. Forced busing should be ended by legislation if possible. By constitutional amendment if necessary. And, control of education should be returned to local school districts.

The other day, Mr. Ford came out against gun control. But, back in Washington, D.C., his Attorney General has proposed a seven-point program that amounts to just that: gun control. I don't think that making it difficult for law abiding citizens to obtain guns will lower the crime rate. Not when the criminals will always find a way to get them. In California I think we found an answer. We put into law what is practical gun control. Anyone convicted of having a gun in his possession while he committed a crime: add five to 15 years to the prison sentence.

Sometimes bureacracy's excesses are so great that we laugh at them. But they are costly laughs. Twenty-five years ago the Hoover Commission discovered that Washington files a million reports a year just reporting that there is nothing to report.

Independent business people, shopkeepers and farmers file billions of reports every year required of them by Washington. It amounts to some 10 billion pieces of paper each year and it adds \$50 billion a year to the cost of doing business. Washington has been loud in its promise to do something about this blizzard of paperwork. And they made good. Last year they increased it by 20%.

But there is one problem which must be solved or everything else is meaningless. I am speaking of the problem of our national security. Our nation is in danger, and the danger grows greater with each passing day. Like an echo from the past, the voice of Winston Churchill's grandson was heard recently in Britain's House of Commons warning that, "the spread of totalitarianism threatens the world once again and the democracies are wandering without aim."

"Wandering without aim" describes U.S. foreign policy. Angola is a case in point. We gave just enough support to one side to encourage it to fight and die but too little to give them a chance of winning. Now we're disliked by the winner, distrusted by the loser and viewed by the world as weak and unsure. If detente were the two-way street it's supposed to be, we could have told the Soviet Union to stop its troublemaking and leave Angola to the Angolans. But it didn't work out that way.

Now, we are told Washington is dropping the word "detente" but keeping the policy. But whatever it's called, the policy is what's at fault. What is our policy? Mr. Ford's new Ambassador to the U.N. attacks our long-time ally, Israel. In Asia our new relationship with mainland China can have practical benefits for both sides. But that doesn't mean it should include yielding to demands by them as the administration has, to reduce our military presence on Taiwan where we have a long-time friend and ally, the Republic of China. And, it is also revealed now that we seek to establish friendly relations with Hanoi. To make it more



palatable, we are told this might help us learn the fate of the men still listed as Missing in Action.

There is no doubt our government has an obligation to end the agony of parents, wives and children who have lived so long with uncertainty. But, this should have been one of our first demands of Hanoi's patron saint, the Soviet Union, if detente had any meaning at all. To present it now as a reason for friendship with those who have already violated their promise to provide such information is hypocrisy.

In the last few days, Mr. Ford and Dr. Kissinger have taken us from hinting at invasion of Cuba to laughing it off as a ridiculous idea. Except, that it was their ridiculous idea. No one else suggested it. Once again--what is their policy? During this last year, they carried on a campaign to befriend Castro. They persuaded the Organization of American States to lift its trade embargo, lifted some U.S. trade restrictions, they engaged in cultural exchanges. And then, on the eve of the Florida primary election, Mr. Ford went to Florida, called Castro an outlaw and said he'd never recognize him. But he hasn't asked our Latin American neighbors to reimpose a single sanction, nor has he taken any action himself. Meanwhile, Castro continues to export revolution to Puerto Rico, to Angola, and who knows where else?

As I talk to you tonight, negotiations with another dictator go forward. Negotiations aimed at giving up our ownership of the

Panama Canal Zone. Apparently, everyone knows about this except the rightful owners of the Canal Zone--you, the people of the United States.

General Omar Torrijos, the dictator of Panama, seized power eight years ago by ousting the duly-elected government. There have been no elections since. No civil liberties. The press is censored. Torrijos is a friend and ally of Castro and, like him, is pro-communist. He threatens sabotage and guerrilla attacks on our installations if we don't yield to his demands. His foreign minister openly claims that we have already agreed in principle to giving up the Canal Zone.

The Canal Zone is not a colonial possession. It is not a long-term lease. It is sovereign U.S. Territory every bit the same as Alaska and all the states that were carved from the Louisiana Purchase. We should end those negotiations and tell the General: We bought it, we paid for it, we built it and we intend to keep it.

Mr. Ford says detente will be replaced by "peace through strength." Well, now that slogan has a nice ring to it, but neither Mr. Ford nor his new Secretary of Defense will say that our strength is superior to all others.

In one of the dark hours of the Great Depression, F.D.R. said, "It is time to speak the truth frankly and boldly." I believe former Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger was trying to speak the truth frankly and boldly to his fellow citizens. And that's why he is no longer Secretary of Defense.

The Soviet Army outnumbered ours more than two-to-one and in reserves four-to-one. They out-spend us on weapons by 50%. Their Navy outnumbered ours in surface ships and submarines two-to-one. We are outgunned in artillery three-to-one and their tanks outnumber ours four-to-one. Their strategic nuclear missiles are larger, more powerful and more numerous than ours. The evidence mounts that we are Number Two in a world where it is dangerous, if not fatal, to be second best.

Is this why Mr. Ford refused to invite Alexander Solzhenitsyn to the White House? Or, why Mr. Ford traveled halfway 'round the world to sign the Helsinki Pact, putting our stamp of approval on Russia's enslavement of the captive nations? We gave away the freedom of millions of people--freedom that was not ours to give.

Now we must ask if someone is giving away our own freedom. Dr. Kissinger is quoted as saying that he thinks of the U.S. as Athens and the Soviet Union as Sparta. "The day of the U.S. is past and today is the day of the Soviet Union." And he added, "...My job as Secretary of State is to negotiate the most acceptable second-best position available."

I believe in the peace of which Mr. Ford spoke--as much as any man. But peace does not come from weakness or from retreat. It comes from the restoration of American military superiority.

Ask the people of Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary and all the others--East Germany, Bulgaria, Rumania, ask them--what it's like to live in a world where the Soviet Union is Number One. I don't want to live in that kind of world; and I don't think you do either.

Now we learn that another high official of the State Department, Helmut Sonnenfeldt, whom Dr. Kissinger refers to as his "Kissinger," has expressed the belief that, in effect, the captive nations should give up any claim of national sovereignty and simply become a part of the Soviet Union. He says, "Their desire to break out of the Soviet straightjacket" threatens us with World War III. In other words, slaves should accept their fate.

I don't believe the people I've met in almost every State of the Union are ready to consign this, the last island of freedom, to the dustbin of history, along with the bones of dead civilizations of the past. Call it mysticism, if you will, but I believe God had a divine purpose in placing this land between the two great oceans to be found by those who had a special love of freedom and the courage to leave the countries of their birth. From our forefathers to our modern-day immigrants, we've come from every corner of the earth, from every race and ethnic background and we've become a new breed in the world. We're Americans and we have a rendezvous with destiny. We spread across this land, building farms and towns and cities, and we did this without federal land planning or urban renewal.

Indeed, we gave birth to an entirely new concept in man's relation to man. We created government as our servant, beholden to us and possessing no powers except those voluntarily granted to it by us.

Now a self-annointed elite in our nation's capital would have us believe we are incapable of guiding our own destiny. They practice government by mystery, telling us it's too complex for our understanding. Believing this, they assume we might panic if we were to be told the truth about our problems.

Why should we become frightened? No people who have ever lived on this earth have fought harder, paid a higher price for freedom or done more to advance the dignity of man than the living Americans, the Americans living in this land today. There isn't any problem we can't solve if government will give us the facts. Tell us what needs to be done. Then, gets out of the way and lets us have at it.

Recently on one of my campaign trips I was doing a question and answer session, and suddenly I received a question from a little girl who couldn't have been over six or seven years old, standing in the very front row. I'd heard the question before but somehow in her asking it, she threw me a little bit. She said, why do you want to be President? Well I tried to tell her about giving government back to the people; I tried to tell her about turning authority back to the states and local communities, and so forth; winding down the bureaucracy; it might have been an answer for adults, but I knew that it wasn't what that little girl wanted, and I left very frustrated. It was on the way to

the next stop that I turned to Nancy and I said I wish I had it to do over again because I'd like to answer her question. Well, maybe I can answer it now. I would like to go to Washington; I would like to be President. Because I would like to see this country become once again a country where a little six-year old girl can grow up knowing the same freedom that I knew when I was six years old, growing up in America. If this is the America that you want for yourself and your children; if you want to restore government not only of and for but by the people; to see the American spirit unleashed once again; to make this land a shining, golden hope God intended it to be, I'd like to hear from you. Write, or send a wire. I'd be proud to hear your thoughts and your ideas.

Thank you, and good night.

(END)

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON


4/1/76

Mr. Hartmann:

Col. McFarlane of Gen. Scowcroft's  
office brought this over for Mr.  
Smith.

Mr. Smith has a copy and left this  
copy for you to look over if you  
want to.

Neta



1. Reagan Statement:

[in Angola]

We gave just enough support to one side, to encourage it to fight and die but too little to give it a chance of winning.

Response:

The U.S. objective in supporting the FNLA/UNITA forces in Angola was to assist them, and through them all of black Africa, to defend against Soviet and Cuban intervention. Despite massive Soviet aid and the presence of Cuban troops, we were on the road to success in Angola until December 19 when Congress adopted the Tunney Amendment cutting off further U.S. aid to the FNLA and UNITA.

2. Reagan Statement:

Mr. Ford's new Ambassador to the United Nations attacks our long time ally Israel.

Response:

Governor Scranton not only did not attack Israel, his veto blocked an unbalanced Security Council resolution critical of Israel -- a resolution that every other member of the Security Council voted for. In his March 23 speech in the United Nations Security





Council<sup>g</sup> Gov. Scranton was simply reiterating long-standing U. S. policy -- a policy articulated by every Administration since 1967 -- on Israel's obligations as an occupying power under international law with regard to the territories under its occupation.

3. Reagan Statement:

In Asia our new relationship with mainland China can have practical benefits with both sides. But that doesn't mean it should include yielding to demands by them as the Administration has, to reduce our military presence on Taiwan where we have a long-time friend and ally, the Republic of China.

Response:

We have not reduced our forces on Taiwan as a result of Peking's demands. Instead, our reductions stem from our own assessment of U. S. political and security interests. We have drawn our forces down because the Vietnam conflict has ended and because the lessening of tension in the area brought about by our new relationship with the People's Republic of China has made it possible.



4. Reagan Statement:


And, it is also revealed now that we seek to establish friendly relations with Hanoi. To make it more palatable, we are told this might help us learn the fate of the men still listed as Missing in Action.

Response:

The Congress, reflecting the views of the American people and the Administration, has called for an accounting of our Missing in Action and the return of the bodies of dead servicemen still held by Hanoi. The Administration, in keeping with this Congressional mandate, has offered to discuss with Hanoi the significant outstanding issues between us. We have not said we "seek to establish friendly relations with Hanoi." Such an assertion is totally false.

5. Reagan Statement:

In the last few days, Mr. Ford and Dr. Kissinger have taken us from hinting at invasion of Cuba to laughing it off a ridiculous idea. Except, that it was their ridiculous idea. No one else suggested it. Once again -- what is their policy? During this last year, they carried on a campaign to befriend Castro. They persuaded the Organization of American States to lift its trade embargo




lifted some U.S. trade restrictions, they engaged in culture exchanges. And then on the eve of the Florida primary election, Mr. Ford went to Florida, called Castro an outlaw and said he'd never recognize him. But he hasn't asked our Latin American neighbors to reimpose a single sanction, nor has he taken any action himself. Meanwhile, Castro continues to export revolution to Puerto Rico, to Angola, and who knows where else?

Response:

We did not persuade the OAS to lift the sanctions against Cuba. At Quito in the fall of 1974 we did not support a motion in the OAS to do so. At San Jose last summer the U.S. voted in favor of an OAS resolution which left to each country freedom of action with regard to the sanctions. We did so because a majority of the OAS members had already unilaterally lifted their sanctions against Cuba, and because the resolution was supported by a majority of the organization members. Since that resolution passed, no additional Latin American country has established relations with Cuba.

The U.S. did not lift its own sanctions against Cuba, did not enter into any agreements with Cuba, and did not trade with Cuba. We did not engage in cultural exchanges. We validated some passports for U.S. Congressmen and their staffs, for some scholars and for



some religious leaders to visit Cuba. We issued a few select visas to Cubans to visit the U.S. These minimal steps were taken to test whether there was a mutual interest in ending the hostile nature of our relations. This policy was consistent with the traditional American interest in supporting the free flow of ideas and people. We have, since the Cuban adventure in Angola, concluded that the Cubans are not interested in changing their ways. We have resumed our highly restrictive policies toward Cuban travel. With regard to Cuban efforts to interfere in Puerto Rican affairs, we have made it emphatically clear in the UN and bilaterally to the Cubans and other nations that the U.S. will not tolerate any interference in its internal affairs.

6. Reagan Statement:

The Canal Zone is not a colonial possession. It is not a long-term lease. It is sovereign U.S. territory every bit the same as Alaska and all the states that were carved from the Louisiana Purchase. We should end those negotiations (on the Panama Canal) and tell the General: We bought it, we paid for it, we built it and we intend to keep it.



Response:

Negotiations between the United States and Panama on the Canal have been pursued by three successive American Presidents. The purpose of these negotiations is to protect our national security, not diminish it.

Finally, Governor Reagan's view that the Canal Zone is "sovereign U.S. territory every bit the same as Alaska and all the states that were carved from the Louisiana Purchase" is incorrect. Legal scholars have been clear on this for three-quarters of a century. Unlike children born in the United States, for example, children born in the Canal Zone are not automatically citizens of the United States.


7. Reagan Statement:

Why did the President travel halfway 'round the world to sign the Helsinki Pact, putting our stamp of approval on Russia's enslavement of the captive nations?

We gave away the freedom of millions of people -- freedom that was not ours to give.

Response:

The President did not go to Helsinki to put the stamp of approval on Soviet domination of Eastern Europe. On the contrary, he went to Helsinki along with the Chiefs of State or heads of government of all our Western allies,



and, among others, a Papal Representative, to sign a document which contains Soviet commitments to greater respect for human rights, self determination of peoples, and expanded exchanges and communication throughout Europe. Basket three of the Act calls for a freer flow of people and ideas among all the European nations.

The Helsinki Act, for the first time, specifically provides for the possibility of peaceful change of borders when that would correspond to the wishes of the peoples concerned. With regard to the particular case of the Baltic States, President Ford stated clearly on July 25 that "the United States has never recognized that Soviet incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and is not doing so now. Our official policy of non-recognition is not affected by the results of the European Security Conference." In fact, the Helsinki document itself states that no occupation or acquisition of territory by force will be recognized as legal.

8. Reagan Statement:

Now we must ask if someone is giving away our own freedom. Dr. Kissinger is quoted as saying that he thinks of the U.S. as Athens and the Soviet Union as




Sparta. "The day of the U.S. is past and today is the day of the Soviet Union." And he added, "...My job as Secretary of State is to negotiate the most acceptable second-best position available."

Response:

Governor Reagan's so-called quotes from Secretary Kissinger are a total and irresponsible fabrication. He has never said what the Governor attributes to him, or anything like it. In fact, at a March 23, 1976 press conference in Dallas Secretary Kissinger said: "I do not believe that the United States will be defeated. I do not believe that the United States is on the decline. I do not believe that the United States must get the best deal it can."

I believe that the United States is essential to preserve the security of the free world and for any progress in the world that exists.

In a period of great national difficulty, of the Viet-Nam war, of Watergate, of endless investigations, we have tried to preserve the role of the United States as that major factor. And I believe that to explain to the American people that the policy is complex, that our involvement is permanent, and that our problems are nevertheless soluble, is a sign of optimism and of confidence in the American people, rather than the opposite."



9. Reagan Statement:


Now we learn that another high official of the State Department, Helmut Sonnenfeldt, whom Dr. Kissinger refers to as his "Kissinger", has expressed the belief that, in effect, the captive nations should give up any claim of national sovereignty and simply become a part of the Soviet Union. He says, 'Their desire to break out of the Soviet straightjacket' threatens us with World War III. In other words, slaves should accept their fate."

Response:

It is wholly inaccurate, and a gross distortion of fact, to ascribe such views to Mr. Sonnenfeldt or to this Administration. Neither he nor anyone else in the Administration has ever expressed any such belief. The Administration view on this issue was expressed by Secretary Kissinger before the House International Relations Committee on March 29 as follows:

"As far as the U.S. is concerned, we do not accept a sphere of influence of any country, anywhere, and emphatically we reject a Soviet sphere of influence in Eastern Europe.

"Two Presidents have visited in Eastern Europe; there have been two visits to Poland and Romania and Yugoslavia, by Presidents. I have made





repeated visits to Eastern Europe, on every trip to symbolize and to make clear to these countries that we are interested in working with them and that we do not accept or act upon the exclusive dominance of any one country in that area.

"At the same time, we do not want to give encouragement to an uprising that might lead to enormous suffering. But in terms of the basic position of the United States, we do not accept the dominance of any one country anywhere.

"Yugoslavia was mentioned, for example. We would emphatically consider it a very grave matter if outside forces were to attempt to intervene in the domestic affairs of Yugoslavia. We welcome Eastern European countries developing more in accordance with their national traditions, and we will cooperate with them. This is the policy of the United States, and there is no Sonnenfeldt doctrine."



3115  
J.

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

April 1, 1976

Doug:

Please call.

Bud McFarlane



REAGAN REMARKS ON FOREIGN POLICY

Q: What is your reaction to Mr. Reagan's attacks on your foreign policy?

A: Mr. Reagan's remarks on foreign policy reveal an extraordinary ignorance of what this country has been saying and doing over the last few years, perhaps because he has been so far removed from the main stream of America and the public debate on these issues.

Our nation is not "in danger," but it is damaging to the interests of this country when a politician declares to our adversaries and our friends abroad -- completely falsely -- that we are in second place. Such statements are both irresponsible and dangerous. They alarm our people and confuse our allies.

-- It is meaningless to say the Soviet Army may now be twice the size of the US Army! Considering that about half of the Soviet Army is deployed on the Chinese border, that isn't all that surprising. I suppose that if we had to defend our borders and thus doubled our forces to do it, Mr. Reagan would be happier. Simplistic rhetoric such as this reflects a disturbingly shallow grasp of what true balance is all about.



-- For example, Mr. Reagan conveniently neglects to point out that our strategic forces are superior to Soviet forces. Our missiles are far more accurate and survivable. We have over twice as many missile warheads and, after all, it is the warheads which actually reach the target. Our lead in this area has been increasing over the past several years. Mr. Reagan likewise ignores our vast superiority in strategic bombers.

In short, if Mr. Reagan wants to alarm with use of numbers he can; but it only portrays his superficial understanding of these matters and by inflaming opinion -- at home and abroad -- falsely, does not serve the public interest.

-- Let's look at actions as opposed to words. *I am* <sup>*the President Ford*</sup>  
the one who reversed the trend of shrinking defense budgets. *My* last two defense budgets are the highest peacetime budgets in the nation's history. Mr. Reagan should speak to the Democratic Congress about its \$32 billion cuts in defense over the past six years.

Mr. Reagan's misstatements and misjudgments of our foreign policy show equal distortion or ignorance of the facts:

-- He has the facts completely reversed when he claims that Angola was not allowed to interfere with detente. We said and demonstrated exactly the opposite.



It was the Congress , not the Administration, that failed to provide enough support to the Angolan majority.

-- The Helsinki Conference is clearly recognized as the biggest propaganda setback for the Kremlin in a decade. It is absurd to believe that after two years of hard bargaining, all the leaders of NATO went to Helsinki to be tricked into a sell-out of Eastern Europe. My statement in Helsinki, and my visits to Poland, Romania and Yugoslavia on the same trip, demonstrated that I was there to declare what we believed to be the standards of human rights and nonintervention that should govern East-West relations in Europe: Our policy in no sense accepts a Soviet "dominion" over Eastern Europe and I have said this repeatedly.



-- Mr. Reagan attacks our policy toward the Soviet Union and China. Is he opposed to efforts to resist firmly Soviet adventurism, to negotiate an end to the nuclear arms race, and to attempt to relax tensions and build a more constructive relationship. Does he think the American people want a return to the era of cold war confrontation?

-- He would handle the new Panama Canal Treaty by refusing to talk and simply dictating to the Government. He apparently believes that we should be good neighbors by threatening. We want a satisfactory agreement that permits the Canal to operate efficiently and not insult the people of Panama.

-- Mr. Reagan manufactures second hand, but false quotes attributed to Secretary Kissinger and ignores the Secretary's explicit denials of such quotes.

-- Mr. Reagan's goal is to turn the clock back to 1918, to his childhood, to an era of greater freedom. But what he is proposing is to turn the clock back to the Cold War, to saber rattling and cries of alarm. I regret that kind of defeatism. I say Americans do not want a jingoistic policy of rejection of our international obligations, international economic instability and a world, deprived of responsible American leadership, that contained the seeds of the world's greatest war.



[ca 4/1/76]

In his paid political broadcast Governor Reagan made the charge that "our nation is in danger, and the danger grows greater with each passing day." He explained that we are "number two in a world where it is dangerous, if not fatal, to be second best."

These are alarming and serious charges. As President and Commander-in-Chief, I owe an obligation to the American people to take on these extreme statements and set out the facts as I know them.

The United States is not in danger.

The United States is not number two.

The truth is the exact opposite.

We are the strongest country in the world by any reasonable measures of national strength.

- Our economy is the largest and the strongest in the world;
- Our democratic system has proven in strength for two hundred years;
- Our people are a united people;
- Our military forces are adequate for any threat we face;
- Our country is allied to the great industrial democracies;
- Our country is still the ~~best~~<sup>"</sup> best hope of mankind."

I welcome the fact that our foreign and defense policies are becoming a campaign issue. I am ready to stand squarely on my record.

As far as I am concerned there are two issues: peace and America's strength. I am proud of my record on both.



5/1  
Let me examine the question of America's strength.


First, we must dispose of the numbers game. National defense is not bookkeeping.

If it were, <sup>we</sup> I could point out that our missile warheads have tripled, that we lead the Soviet Union by more than two to one. <sup>we</sup> I would point out that we have over a three to one lead in ~~heavy~~ strategic bombers. <sup>we</sup> I could point out that our missiles are twice as accurate as the Soviet Union's.

<sup>we</sup> I would point out that the Soviet Army -- which the Governor says is twice the size of ours, <sup>with China</sup> has the problem of guarding a long border with a million men, and that our borders with Mexico and Canada are peaceful.

But it is a confusing disservice to the American people to dazzle them with numbers. If we were isolated in a fortress America, then it might be important to compare numbers. But we stand at the head of a great Alliance system in Europe and are firmly tied to the strongest economic power in Asia. We have friendly relations with most of the nations of the world. These are the valuable accomplishments of all of our previous Administrations since President Truman. We cannot insult our friends and allies by pretending they do not count.

Second, we cannot ignore that whatever might be the balance of power today, it is not fixed. And in our military programs, our defense budgets, we are indeed looking to the future, to guarantee that this nation will never be in danger. Consider our defense programs?





-- We are proceeding with the development and production of the world's most modern strategic bomber, the B-1.

-- We are proceeding with the development and production of the world's most modern and lethal missile launching submarine, the Trident.

-- We are developing a new large ICBM.

-- We are producing three new fighters.

-- We are planning the production of 7 new fighting ships, including 2 carriers.

It is true that you can cite a figure that the Soviets have more ships, but it is a trick to equate Soviet destroyers with our modern nuclear powered aircraft carriers.

Unfortunately, ~~I must acknowledge~~ that the money we have put into defense over the past several years has been inadequate. But the responsibility for slashing \$40 billion dollars must rest with the Congress.

Fortunately, ~~I can report~~ <sup>under the prodding of President Ford</sup> that the Congress has begun to awaken to the risks of constantly reducing our defense spending.

When the budget <sup>he</sup> I proposed this year passes, then the trend will have been reversed.

I am willing to be judged on this record -- a record that includes two defense budgets that increase our investment in defense in real, not inflated dollars.



*more*

So, I say that we are in fact number one, and unless we falter, or give way to panic, we will remain number one.

But we must face up to a brutal fact. In this decade and beyond, both the United States and the Soviet Union possess and will possess the power to destroy each other.

This imposes on the President of the United States a solemn responsibility to work tirelessly for world peace. I know that all the candidates believe this. So the issue is not who is for peace, but how can we guarantee it.

In none of the campaign oratory have I heard a concrete program. We have only generalities: for example, we will simply order the Soviet Union out of Angola; and if they refuse, apparently we will quit. Or we will order the people of Panama to be quiet. The Canal is ours, not theirs. If they don't agree, well. . . ? Or we will boycott international meetings because we and our allies are afraid that we will be tricked into signing a document.

Let me deal with the serious issues of American foreign policy that have been raised in this campaign.



THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

April 1, 1976  
3:23 p.m.

Mr. Hartmann:

Bob Hynes called. They are only able to get overnight A.C. Neilson ratings in two cities -- New York and Los Angeles.

In New York - 9.1 rating and a share of 16.

What these figures indicate is that of the homes that had tv turned on only 16% were watching Mr. Reagan and only 57% of the homes in New York had their tv turned on.

In Los Angeles - had a 12 rating and a 23 share.

There were 52% of the homes in Los Angeles that had their tv sets turned on. Of that percent turned on, 23% were watching Mr. Reagan.

As soon as he gets the Neilson weekly ratings which will be at least another week -- probably next Thursday or Friday -- he will get them to you.

The total national figure obviously will be some place in that same range.

Neta



THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

April 5, 1976

Mr. Hartmann:

Bob Hynes called with the National Ratings for Ronald Reagan's Address Wednesday, March 31 from 10:30-11:00 p.m. on NBC.

He received a 9.3 rating which means that of all the people in America who have television sets (whether they were turned on or off) 9.3% were watching him.

He received a 17 share rating which means that of all the television sets turned on, 17% were watching RR.

one rating point= 700,000 people.  
therefore, about 6.5 million people were watching RR.

Gail



THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

April 1, 1976  
3:23 p.m.

Mr. Hartmann:

Bob Hynes called. They are only able to get overnight A.C. Neilson ratings in two cities -- New York and Los Angeles.

In New York - 9.1 rating and a share of 16.

What these figures indicate is that of the homes that had tv turned on only 16% were watching Mr. Reagan and only 57% of the homes in New York had their tv turned on.


In Los Angeles - had a 12 rating and a 23 share.

There were 52% of the homes in Los Angeles that had their tv sets turned on. Of that percent turned on, 23% were watching Mr. Reagan.

As soon as he gets the Neilson weekly ratings which will be at least another week -- probably next Thursday or Friday -- he will get them to you.

The total national figure obviously will be some place in that same range.

Neta



NSC April

REAGAN REMARKS ON FOREIGN POLICY

Q: What is your reaction to Mr. Reagan's attacks on your foreign policy?

A: Mr. Reagan's remarks on foreign policy reveal an extraordinary ignorance of what this country has been saying and doing over the last few years, perhaps because he has been so far removed from the main stream of America and the public debate on these issues.

Our nation is not "in danger," but it is damaging to the interests of this country when a politician declares to our adversaries and our friends abroad -- completely falsely -- that we are in second place. Such statements are both irresponsible and dangerous. They alarm our people and confuse our allies.

-- It is meaningless to say the Soviet Army may now be twice the size of the US Army! Considering that about half of the Soviet Army is deployed on the Chinese border, that isn't all that surprising. I suppose that if we had to defend our borders and thus doubled our forces to do it, Mr. Reagan would be happier. Simplistic rhetoric such as this reflects a disturbingly shallow grasp of what true balance is all about.




-- For example, Mr. Reagan conveniently neglects to point out that our strategic forces are superior to Soviet forces. Our missiles are far more accurate and survivable. We have over twice as many missile warheads and, after all, it is the warheads which actually reach the target. Our lead in this area has been increasing over the past several years. Mr. Reagan likewise ignores our vast superiority in strategic bombers.

In short, if Mr. Reagan wants to alarm with use of numbers he can; but it only portrays his superficial understanding of these matters and by inflaming opinion -- at home and abroad -- falsely, does not serve the public interest.

-- Let's look at actions as opposed to words. I am the one who reversed the trend of shrinking defense budgets. My last two defense budgets are the highest peacetime budgets in the nation's history. Mr. Reagan should speak to the Democratic Congress about its \$32 billion cuts in defense over the past six years.

Mr. Reagan's misstatements and misjudgments of our foreign policy show equal distortion or ignorance of the facts:

-- He has the facts completely reversed when he claims that Angola was not allowed to interfere with detente. We said and demonstrated exactly the opposite.



It was the Congress , not the Administration, that failed to provide enough support to the Angolan majority.

-- The Helsinki Conference is clearly recognized as the biggest propaganda setback for the Kremlin in a decade. It is absurd to believe that after two years of hard bargaining, all the leaders of NATO went to Helsinki to be tricked into a sell-out of Eastern Europe. My statement in Helsinki, and my visits to Poland, Romania and Yugoslavia on the same trip, demonstrated that I was there to declare what we believed to be the standards of human rights and nonintervention that should govern East-West relations in Europe: Our policy in no sense accepts a Soviet "dominion" over Eastern Europe and I have said this repeatedly.





-- Mr. Reagan attacks our policy toward the Soviet Union and China. Is he opposed to efforts to resist firmly Soviet adventurism, to negotiate an end to the nuclear arms race, and to attempt to relax tensions and build a more constructive relationship. Does he think the American people want a return to the era of cold war confrontation?

-- He would handle the new Panama Canal Treaty by refusing to talk and simply dictating to the Government. He apparently believes that we should be good neighbors by threatening. We want a satisfactory agreement that permits the Canal to operate efficiently and not insult the people of Panama.

-- Mr. Reagan manufactures second hand, but false quotes attributed to Secretary Kissinger and ignores the Secretary's explicit denials of such quotes.

-- Mr. Reagan's goal is to turn the clock back to 1918, to his childhood, to an era of greater freedom. But what he is proposing is to turn the clock back to the Cold War, to saber rattling and cries of alarm. I regret that kind of defeatism. I say Americans do not want a jingoistic policy of rejection of our international obligations, international economic instability and a world, deprived of responsible American leadership, that contained the seeds of the world's greatest war.

