

**The original documents are located in Box 24, folder “Campaign Speeches and Debates - Speechwriters' Recommendations” of the Robert T. Hartmann Files 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. Gerald Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections.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.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 21, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR ROBERT ORBEN

FROM: GEORGE DENISON 

SUBJECT: New Speech Concepts

1. My initial suggestion is broader than an idea for a speech subject. It is that the President should stage a series of carefully planned "events" that will show Mr. Ford acting Presidential in the days remaining before the Republican convention in Kansas City. Although I realize that it may be reaching for the impossible, I would like to see the President's great success in leading the country in the celebration of the July 1-5 Bicentennial weekend duplicated. The "events" I have in mind include possible major speeches, appearances such as at the All-Star game or an important legislative initiative.

2. A speech devoted entirely to the educational and social consequences of the forced bussing of school children. The bussing issue remains one of deep concern to a wide cross-section of the people; a recent Harris poll shows that Americans reject bussing as a means of improving education by a 2-to-1 margin.

The President has taken a strong position in opposition to bussing and his June 24th legislative proposal and message spelled out a means of Constitutionally restricting court-ordered bussing. But, the full implications of that message have yet to be laid out in a speech. The speech I envision would forcefully present the case against bussing but would be couched in a reasoned lawyer's tone similar to that of Mr. Ford's Yale Law School speech on crime of April 25, 1975. Such a strong and statesmanlike speech would be particularly difficult for Governor Carter, with his ambiguous record on the bussing issue, to answer.

3. A speech on the growing problem of compulsory unionism and strikes among public employees. The public outcry against work stoppages and the excessive demands of government workers has recently reached a fever pitch. Windfall pension plans, pried out of New York City politicians by powerful unions, helped cause that city's continuing financial crisis. Even the liberal citizenry of San Francisco got fed-up with a city workers strike and voted to freeze the pay of police and firemen. As Jerry Wurf, the President of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, put it: "You might say we're the object of some hostility."

I recommend that the President take advantage of all of this by exploiting his long-standing position against compulsory unionism among federal workers and his opposition to federal intervention to force public employee collective bargaining on the states. A speech explaining the Administration position and spelling out the ill-effects of compulsory unionism in the public sector would, once again, serve to point up Governor Carter's fuzziness on the issues. Carter has, for instance, been both for and against 14(b) and state Right-to-Work laws.

4. Finally, I recommend that an occasion be found for the President to deliver the speech I originally drafted for the June 22nd Jaycees National Convention. This speech took up the President's approach to two separate problems -- government intervention in the economy and excessive government regulation. The President has, of course, addressed these subjects before. However, in this speech draft, the discussion of the economy was put into fresh language and a number of new anecdotes were added to the material on over regulation. In short, although already written, this is a "new" speech concept that I hope will be used.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 22, 1976

MEMORANDUM TO: ROBERT HARTMANN

FROM: DAVID BOORSTIN

SUGGESTED TOPIC FOR PRESIDENTIAL SPEECH:  
"WHITE-COLLAR" CRIME

The American people clearly want the White House to be a place of moral as well as political leadership, and this subject -- largely untouched -- would enable the President to occupy high ground. The natural place for such a speech would be before a business group.

The President could emphasize that most businessmen are honest, and that indeed the very foundations of the American economy are trust and good faith. "White-collar" crime (ranging from bribery and fraud to theft by computer) not only threatens Americans' faith in the law, it imposes a serious burden on the U.S. economy.

According to a study by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce:

- the cost is more than \$40 billion annually, several billion more than total losses sustained through burglary and robbery;
- such crime contributes to some 30 per cent of all business failures each year (including bank closings);
- it inflates retail prices as well as State and local government budgets;
- it shakes public confidence in the business and financial structure.

This speech could have a broad appeal. It would enable the President to reaffirm his belief in the value and good faith of American business. At the same time, it would enable him to reaffirm his belief in a single standard for those who choose to violate the law, whatever their station in life, and to stress that legality and morality cannot be made separate.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 22, 1976

MEMORANDUM TO: ROBERT HARTMANN

FROM: DAVID BOORSTIN

SUGGESTED TOPIC FOR PRESIDENTIAL SPEECH: THE OCEANS

A speech on the oceans and oceans policy would give the President a chance to show leadership and foresight on a subject of long-term national and international significance. Although a speech on this subject was drafted for use in April, it was never used. Now the Administration has been criticized for permitting a "leadership vacuum" to develop in oceans policy (see attached clipping).

Under legislation signed by the President earlier this year, the United States now has economic control over a resource zone up to 200 miles from our coastal borders -- an area equal to two-thirds the total land area of the United States, largely unexplored.

Whether or not he lays down a policy, the President can take the initiative of calling for a "bold new look" at the oceans' potential as a supplier of energy resources, raw materials and food. He could point out that the oceans may well hold the answers to many of our pressing economic, social and environmental problems -- but that without action the oceans themselves may become a new problem. He could take this opportunity to announce the formation of a Cabinet Committee on Oceans Policy to present him with recommendations for action in areas ranging from management of coastal resources, to mining and the development of marine technology. Such a committee has already been discussed and awaits only final action.

The President could make a striking point by giving this speech somewhere inland -- increasing its significance by showing that the subject vitally concerns all Americans, even those who are physically distant from the oceans.

---

# Ford rapped on sea law talks

Christian Science Monitor

7/21/76

By the Associated Press

New York

The former No. 2 American delegate at international sea law talks says the Ford administration has violated treaty obligations and permitted a "leadership vacuum

Some items in this folder were not digitized because it contains copyrighted materials. Please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library for access to these materials.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 23, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR ROBERT ORBEN

FROM: GEORGE DENISON

SUBJECT: Campaign Strategy

The overall strategy should both emphasize the incumbency and hit hard on the issues. The themes laid out in the acceptance speech should be repeated and expanded.

Specifically, I recommend that:

- 1) The debates be utilized to the fullest extent.
- 2) A carefully planned series of "events" that will show Mr. Ford acting Presidential should be staged throughout the campaign. These events can range from greeting appropriate groups in the Rose Garden to major legislative initiatives. In each case, the important point is that all of us work hard to see that the President gets the maximum exposure from each event. Nevertheless, the events must not appear to be contrived for purely political purposes. A speech to the U.N., for example, on a highly important international issue that needs attention now, even though a campaign is on, would fit the bill.
- 3) Limit speeches to important events. Try to avoid excessive speechmaking that drains the President physically and detracts from the advantage of the incumbency.

The campaign must be orchestrated by the President; but, regardless of whether the R.N.C. or the P.F.C. has the primary role -- a single individual, a strong leader with organizational abilities, must actually run the campaign and be its operational chief. The campaign should be a closely meshed effort on behalf of all GOP candidates with the Presidential effort cooperating and working with Congressional candidates. The P.F.C. must not become another CRP!



THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON  
August 23, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

VIA: ROBERT T. HARTMANN  
FROM: PATRICK BUTLER  
SUBJECT: The Ford-Carter Debates

1. Two debates should be held, one hour apiece, one in September, one in October, about three weeks apart. The first should be limited to domestic affairs, the second to foreign policy. Any more debates and the audience will be cut at least in half, and probably much, much more.
2. The format should coincide roughly with that of "Meet the Press." There should be a distinguished moderator of reputable objectivity (Howard K. Smith, Lawrence Spivak, etc.). But the debates should not be burdened with prestigious correspondents who would rather listen to themselves than interview the candidates. Instead, the panel should consist of three or four of the meanest, toughest people in the news business (Mike Wallace, Tom Pettit, others whom Ron Nessen could readily identify). The candidates should also have the opportunity to question each other.

Any suggestion that candidates be allowed large blocks of time for self-serving rhetoric should be vigorously opposed by the President.

3. The President's primary objective in these debates must be to convey to the American public a far more in-depth knowledge of government, a far more sophisticated understanding of the issues than Jimmy Carter. Very likely, no single issue, nor either of the candidate's position on it, will override that general impression. (For all the public cared in 1960, Quemoy and Matsu might as well have been a vaudeville act.)

If at all possible, the President should participate without benefit of notes. This would be a very impressive display of presidential confidence and expertise.

The newsmen themselves will have primary responsibility for drawing Carter into specifics on the issues. Thus, the more relentless the journalist, the better for everybody, especially the public. If the press fails, the President can challenge Carter directly.

If Carter is as thin-skinned as he seems to be, if his knowledge of the Federal government is as superficial as it seems, if he must constantly refer to notes while the President works note-free, a bout of rugged questioning could damage the Carter candidacy quite severely.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 24, 1976

MEMORANDUM TO: ROBERT HARTMANN

FROM: DAVID BOORSTIN

SUBJECT: CAMPAIGN SPEECHES

I suggest the President make a limited number of important speeches. These should be thought out from beginning to end. A master list of speaking invitations the President has received should be studied now and a well balanced schedule drawn up as far in advance as possible.

The President should not make any speech just for the sake of making a speech. He should always have something new to say. The approach should be action-oriented: either what he has done or what he intends to do in a given area.

News pegs should be used wherever possible (e.g. the Korean incident). This will boost the effect of a speech, since it will be used in stories about the news event.

Every major action by a cabinet department should be considered for an announcement by the President. Since he will be held responsible for their actions anyway, he might as well take credit for them.

All speeches should be directed beyond the immediate audience, to the national audience -- in terms of both subject matter and the President's stance. He must not limit his appeal to conservatives.

Certain important but hitherto ignored subjects must be covered -- in particular urban problems and the environment. I recommend a speech on the subject of white-collar crime, stressing both the value of free and unencumbered enterprise, and the need for equal enforcement of the law.

To avoid debasing the importance of his formal speeches, the President should make greater use of news conferences and off-the-cuff remarks when "showing the flag" is all that is called for.

The President should be encouraged to rehearse his formal speeches as much as possible. In both the substance of his speeches and the manner of delivery, he should make a special effort to project his concern and compassion for people, as well as his sense of humor.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 24, 1976

MEMORANDUM TO: ROBERT HARTMANN

FROM: DAVID BOORSTIN

SUBJECT: CAMPAIGN SPEECHES

I suggest the President make a limited number of important speeches. These should be thought out from beginning to end. A master list of speaking invitations the President has received should be studied now and a well balanced schedule drawn up as far in advance as possible.

The President should not make any speech just for the sake of making a speech. He should always have something new to say. The approach should be action-oriented: either what he has done or what he intends to do in a given area.

News pegs should be used wherever possible (e.g. the Korean incident). This will boost the effect of a speech, since it will be used in stories about the news event.

Every major action by a cabinet department should be considered for an announcement by the President. Since he will be held responsible for their actions anyway, he might as well take credit for them.

All speeches should be directed beyond the immediate audience, to the national audience -- in terms of both subject matter and the President's stance. He must not limit his appeal to conservatives.

Certain important but hitherto ignored subjects must be covered -- in particular urban problems and the environment. I recommend a speech on the subject of white-collar crime, stressing both the value of free and unencumbered enterprise, and the need for equal enforcement of the law.

To avoid debasing the importance of his formal speeches, the President should make greater use of news conferences and off-the-cuff remarks when "showing the flag" is all that is called for.

The President should be encouraged to rehearse his formal speeches as much as possible. In both the substance of his speeches and the manner of delivery, he should make a special effort to project his concern and compassion for people, as well as his sense of humor.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 24, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR ROBERT HARTMANN

FROM: Bob Orben

SUBJECT: Campaign Speeches

I would opt for one major speech a week. This would allow for sufficient lead time for a well thought-out and constructed speech to be written, learned and rehearsed.

If minor campaign events are to be done, let's put together a basic stump speech that is worked on, honed down and completely to the President's liking -- and then have that speech virtually committed to memory, rehearsed and ready to go on virtually any occasion. This would take the pressure off the President to allow him to concentrate on the major speeches and debates.

I think we should seek out ways to allow the President to appear in public situations in formats other than set speeches. These formats should be focused on television audiences wherever possible. TV is the prime communicator today. I think the debates are a great idea.

How about a DAY IN THE LIFE OF THE PRESIDENT TV special? I'm sure one of the networks would be interested and it would allow the full impact of the President and the office to be perceived.

When it comes to frequency of speeches, I would agree with the thinking that "less is more." I would do less speeches and keep them short.

I would also do them in large, friendly, partisan crowd situations. The impact of the audience response at the Convention made a subliminal impact on the TV watcher and on the audience itself that is not easily erased.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 24, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR ROBERT HARTMANN

FROM: Bob Orben

SUBJECT: Campaign Speeches

I would opt for one major speech a week. This would allow for sufficient lead time for a well thought-out and constructed speech to be written, learned and rehearsed.

If minor campaign events are to be done, let's put together a basic stump speech that is worked on, honed down and completely to the President's liking -- and then have that speech virtually committed to memory, rehearsed and ready to go on virtually any occasion. This would take the pressure off the President to allow him to concentrate on the major speeches and debates.

I think we should seek out ways to allow the President to appear in public situations in formats other than set speeches. These formats should be focused on television audiences wherever possible. TV is the prime communicator today. I think the debates are a great idea.

How about a DAY IN THE LIFE OF THE PRESIDENT TV special? I'm sure one of the networks would be interested and it would allow the full impact of the President and the office to be perceived.

When it comes to frequency of speeches, I would agree with the thinking that "less is more." I would do less speeches and keep them short.

I would also do them in large, friendly, partisan crowd situations. The impact of the audience response at the Convention made a subliminal impact on the TV watcher and on the audience itself that is not easily erased.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 24, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR ROBERT HARTMANN

FROM: Bob Orben

SUBJECT: Preserving Impact of Presidential Speeches

The President's acceptance speech was a total triumph and has started this campaign off on a very strong and dramatic note. But the good effect of this speech is being somewhat dissipated by the many stories now appearing concerned with how the speech was produced and how the President prepared for it.

One of my favorite phrases is "technique is what doesn't show." For charisma, personality and performing ability to be truly effective, it must seem to come naturally. The words must come across as those of the speaker and the way those words are delivered must also flow from the speaker naturally and personally. The audience must emotionally believe these conditions to be so.

There can only be one star -- the person making the speech. No matter how much is done to provide words or ways in which to say the words -- the ultimate responsibility and ability is his and his alone. Any sharing of this credit detracts from the accomplishment of the speaker.

The President in his acceptance speech was seen by tens of millions of Americans as a strong, confident and able leader and speaker. I would strongly suggest that nothing be done or said to detract from this in any way. It is the President's speech, the President's performance, and the President's spotlight.

Future speeches, debates and other appearances should be treated in this same manner.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 24, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR ROBERT HARTMANN

FROM: Bob Orben

SUBJECT: Preserving Impact of Presidential Speeches

The President's acceptance speech was a total triumph and has started this campaign off on a very strong and dramatic note. But the good effect of this speech is being somewhat dissipated by the many stories now appearing concerned with how the speech was produced and how the President prepared for it.

One of my favorite phrases is "technique is what doesn't show." For charisma, personality and performing ability to be truly effective, it must seem to come naturally. The words must come across as those of the speaker and the way those words are delivered must also flow from the speaker naturally and personally. The audience must emotionally believe these conditions to be so.

There can only be one star -- the person making the speech. No matter how much is done to provide words or ways in which to say the words -- the ultimate responsibility and ability is his and his alone. Any sharing of this credit detracts from the accomplishment of the speaker.

The President in his acceptance speech was seen by tens of millions of Americans as a strong, confident and able leader and speaker. I would strongly suggest that nothing be done or said to detract from this in any way. It is the President's speech, the President's performance, and the President's spotlight.

Future speeches, debates and other appearances should be treated in this same manner.



THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 24, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR ROBERT HARTMANN

VIA: Bob Orben  
FROM: Pat Butler  
SUBJECT: The President's Campaign Speeches

The President's acceptance speech in Kansas City was, by all accounts, a triumph -- both personally and politically. The elements of this success are clear: sufficient time, thought and effort were devoted both to the preparation of the speech draft and to rehearsal for performance.

It has thus been demonstrated that the capability for successful speeches by the President exists. It follows that similar successes are possible in the future if the same formula is applied and strictly adhered to.

The formula will not work, however, at the mass production level, just as fine craftsmanship is always sacrificed when quantity is a more important consideration than quality. That is why Rolls-Royces are better cars than Chevrolets, and why the President's acceptance speech was better than his campaign speeches in Texas.

It will be impossible to duplicate the President's Kansas City success if the decision is to have the President speak as often as he possibly can. Inadequate preparation will be the certain result, and inferior speeches will be the ultimate -- and unacceptable -- outcome.

Furthermore, making speeches "by the gross" will inevitably debase the currency of the Presidential address. Ideally, every time the President makes a speech, that should be an "event" in itself. The President should pick his own topics, his own forums, his own times for speaking, as only a President can do. He should give a series of speeches, each giving thoughtful, vigorous treatment to one major issue, rather than burdening every speech with the President's position on every issue.

One speech a week would be a good average to plan for. This approach will have the dual benefit of enhancing the "Presidential" image we must cultivate, and making the President a more effective candidate when he does go out on the hustings.

It should be remembered that Presidential speechmaking is but one of many powerful weapons in our campaign arsenal. The President need not carry the heavy burden alone. We have a very aggressive running-mate, a major advertising campaign, a talented and distinguished cadre of presidential "advocates," and the capacity to create news at the White House and thus keep the President before the public eye.

Fewer speeches, well-written and well-delivered, will serve the President's cause infinitely better than many uninspired and uninspiring addresses. They will have a much more favorable and enduring impact. They will present the President's case more clearly. They will accrue to the President's advantage as a formidable candidate.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 24, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR ROBERT HARTMANN

VIA: Bob Orben  
FROM: Pat Butler  
SUBJECT: The President's Campaign Speeches

The President's acceptance speech in Kansas City was, by all accounts, a triumph -- both personally and politically. The elements of this success are clear: sufficient time, thought and effort were devoted both to the preparation of the speech draft and to rehearsal for performance.

It has thus been demonstrated that the capability for successful speeches by the President exists. It follows that similar successes are possible in the future if the same formula is applied and strictly adhered to.

The formula will not work, however, at the mass production level, just as fine craftsmanship is always sacrificed when quantity is a more important consideration than quality. That is why Rolls-Royces are better cars than Chevrolets, and why the President's acceptance speech was better than his campaign speeches in Texas.

It will be impossible to duplicate the President's Kansas City success if the decision is to have the President speak as often as he possibly can. Inadequate preparation will be the certain result, and inferior speeches will be the ultimate -- and unacceptable -- outcome.

Furthermore, making speeches "by the gross" will inevitably debase the currency of the Presidential address. Ideally, every time the President makes a speech, that should be an "event" in itself. The President should pick his own topics, his own forums, his own times for speaking, as only a President can do. He should give a series of speeches, each giving thoughtful, vigorous treatment to one major issue, rather than burdening every speech with the President's position on every issue.

One speech a week would be a good average to plan for. This approach will have the dual benefit of enhancing the "Presidential" image we must cultivate, and making the President a more effective candidate when he does go out on the hustings.

It should be remembered that Presidential speechmaking is but one of many powerful weapons in our campaign arsenal. The President need not carry the heavy burden alone. We have a very aggressive running-mate, a major advertising campaign, a talented and distinguished cadre of presidential "advocates," and the capacity to create news at the White House and thus keep the President before the public eye.

Fewer speeches, well-written and well-delivered, will serve the President's cause infinitely better than many uninspired and uninspiring addresses. They will have a much more favorable and enduring impact. They will present the President's case more clearly. They will accrue to the President's advantage as a formidable candidate.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 24, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: ROBERT ORBEN  
FROM: GEORGE DENISON  
SUBJECT: The Speeches

I recommend that the President's speeches from now until November 1 be limited to major events and generally kept short. It may be restating the obvious; but, I believe that the great success of the Acceptance Speech resulted from the time and care that Mr. Ford devoted to it rather than from its language. The spirit and force that he conveyed during the speech was remarkable and must be repeated in the weeks ahead.

To do this, I suggest that he make not more than two full scale speeches in any week. Most of these appearances should be limited to attacking one policy area (defense) or perhaps a single specific issues (labor policy, busing). On a few occasions, I recommend that he deliver a shortened version of the Acceptance speech itself -- to large, rally type audiences.

In addition to these appearance and, of course, the debates -- I suggest that the President have one or two T.V. fireside chats with the people in the last two weeks of the campaign. These chats, delivered from the Oval Office, can emphasize the key issues as they have developed by that point while showing Mr. Ford in his best setting.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 24, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR ROBERT HARTMANN

VIA: Bob Orben  
FROM: Pat Butler  
SUBJECT: The President's Campaign Speeches

The President's acceptance speech in Kansas City was, by all accounts, a triumph -- both personally and politically. The elements of this success are clear: sufficient time, thought and effort were devoted both to the preparation of the speech draft and to rehearsal for performance.

It has thus been demonstrated that the capability for successful speeches by the President exists. It follows that similar successes are possible in the future if the same formula is applied and strictly adhered to.

The formula will not work, however, at the mass production level, just as fine craftsmanship is always sacrificed when quantity is a more important consideration than quality. That is why Rolls-Royces are better cars than Chevrolets, and why the President's acceptance speech was better than his campaign speeches in Texas.

It will be impossible to duplicate the President's Kansas City success if the decision is to have the President speak as often as he possibly can. Inadequate preparation will be the certain result, and inferior speeches will be the ultimate -- and unacceptable -- outcome.

Furthermore, making speeches "by the gross" will inevitably debase the currency of the Presidential address. Ideally, every time the President makes a speech, that should be an "event" in itself. The President should pick his own topics, his own forums, his own times for speaking, as only a President can do. He should give a series of speeches, each giving thoughtful, vigorous treatment to one major issue, rather than burdening every speech with the President's position on every issue.

One speech a week would be a good average to plan for. This approach will have the dual benefit of enhancing the "Presidential" image we must cultivate, and making the President a more effective candidate when he does go out on the hustings.

It should be remembered that Presidential speechmaking is but one of many powerful weapons in our campaign arsenal. The President need not carry the heavy burden alone. We have a very aggressive running-mate, a major advertising campaign, a talented and distinguished cadre of presidential "advocates," and the capacity to create news at the White House and thus keep the President before the public eye.

Fewer speeches, well-written and well-delivered, will serve the President's cause infinitely better than many uninspired and uninspiring addresses. They will have a much more favorable and enduring impact. They will present the President's case more clearly. They will accrue to the President's advantage as a formidable candidate.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 24, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: ROBERT ORBEN

FROM: GEORGE DENISON

SUBJECT: The Debates

The proposed debates between President Ford and Governor Carter should serve to arouse fresh interest among the voters in the political system. Voter turnout has declined from the 63.1% of the eligible votes in the Nixon-Kennedy contest of 1960 (the last debate year) to the 55.4% in the Nixon-McGovern election of 1972. The debates, between men of contrasting natures and political philosophies, may reverse that trend and, in so doing, help the President.

The debates should be used to stress the President's expertise in government and in the issues. The President's knowledge of detail and his ability to react, on his feet, in give and take situations should be brought to bear.

Governor Carter, while he seems to be a quick study, lacks the President's intimacy with debate and with the details of the issues.

A true debate format, therefore, which permits give and take between the men, should be insisted upon. I recommend limiting set opening remarks to two or three minutes and then allowing the candidates to both rebut and cross-examine each other.

If members of the press are involved in one or two of the debates, I suggest that the format be similar to Meet the Press where the reporters have the opportunity to follow up on their questions.

I recommend that a maximum of four debates be held - once a week beginning in mid-September. The importance of the debates should be stressed; therefore, holding too many would be counter-productive. In addition, one hour is about as long as each one should last if maximum exposure and viewer comprehension is to be achieved ( an important factor for the President).



THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 23, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR ROBERT ORBEN

FROM: GEORGE DENISON

SUBJECT: Campaign Strategy

The overall strategy should both emphasize the incumbency and hit hard on the issues. The themes laid out in the acceptance speech should be repeated and expanded.

Specifically, I recommend that:

1) The debates be utilized to the fullest extent.

2) A carefully planned series of "events" that will show Mr. Ford acting Presidential should be staged throughout the campaign. These events can range from greeting appropriate groups in the Rose Garden to major legislative initiatives. In each case, the important point is that all of us work hard to see that the President gets the maximum exposure from each event. Nevertheless, the events must not appear to be contrived for purely political purposes. A speech to the U.N., for example, on a highly important international issue that needs attention now, even though a campaign is on, would fit the bill.

3) Limit speeches to important events. Try to avoid excessive speechmaking that drains the President physically and detracts from the advantage of the incumbency.

The campaign must be orchestrated by the President; but, regardless of whether the R.N.C. or the P.F.C. has the primary role -- a single individual, a strong leader with organizational abilities, must actually run the campaign and be its operational chief. The campaign should be a closely meshed effort on behalf of all GOP candidates with the Presidential effort cooperating and working with Congressional candidates. The P.F.C. must not become another CRP!

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 24, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: ROBERT ORBEN

FROM: GEORGE DENISON

SUBJECT: The Speeches

I recommend that the President's speeches from now until November 1 be limited to major events and generally kept short. It may be restating the obvious; but, I believe that the great success of the Acceptance Speech resulted from the time and care that Mr. Ford devoted to it rather than from its language. The spirit and force that he conveyed during the speech was remarkable and must be repeated in the weeks ahead.

To do this, I suggest that he make not more than two full scale speeches in any week. Most of these appearances should be limited to attacking one policy area (defense) or perhaps a single specific issues (labor policy, busing). On a few occasions, I recommend that he deliver a shortened version of the Acceptance speech itself -- to large, rally type audiences.

In addition to these appearance and, of course, the debates -- I suggest that the President have one or two T.V. fireside chats with the people in the last two weeks of the campaign. These chats, delivered from the Oval Office, can emphasize the key issues as they have developed by that point while showing Mr. Ford in his best setting.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 24, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: ROBERT ORBEN

FROM: GEORGE DENISON

SUBJECT: The Debates

The proposed debates between President Ford and Governor Carter should serve to arouse fresh interest among the voters in the political system. Voter turnout has declined from the 63.1% of the eligible votes in the Nixon-Kennedy contest of 1960 (the last debate year) to the 55.4% in the Nixon-McGovern election of 1972. The debates, between men of contrasting natures and political philosophies, may reverse that trend and, in so doing, help the President.

The debates should be used to stress the President's expertise in government and in the issues. The President's knowledge of detail and his ability to react, on his feet, in give and take situations should be brought to bear.

Governor Carter, while he seems to be a quick study, lacks the President's intimacy with debate and with the details of the issues.

A true debate format, therefore, which permits give and take between the men, should be insisted upon. I recommend limiting set opening remarks to two or three minutes and then allowing the candidates to both rebut and cross-examine each other.

If members of the press are involved in one or two of the debates, I suggest that the format be similar to Meet the Press where the reporters have the opportunity to follow up on their questions.

I recommend that a maximum of four debates be held - once a week beginning in mid-September. The importance of the debates should be stressed; therefore, holding too many would be counter-productive. In addition, one hour is about as long as each one should last if maximum exposure and viewer comprehension is to be achieved ( an important factor for the President).

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 24, 1976

MEMORANDUM TO: ROBERT HARTMANN

FROM: DAVID BOORSTIN

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL DEBATES

Some kind of opening statement will be called for, but the debates should not consist of "set" pieces for the following reasons:

- 1) It would make for less exciting viewing, and therefore a smaller audience;
- 2) While the President can deliver formal speeches well, they are generally not his most effective situation;
- 3) Prepared statements would be less likely to cover new ground, and more likely to restate established positions. In Carter's case, it would allow him to define his own positions as vaguely as he wished.

It would be more effective to have a panel of newsmen throwing out questions for both candidates to answer, with the opportunity to follow up their questions. This panel should be a tough one, but it must include Walter Cronkite for legitimacy. This arrangement would be more effective because:

- 1) It would provide a dramatic and exciting TV situation;
- 2) The President is most effective fielding questions off-the-cuff;
- 3) It is more likely that the President's statements would be specific than Carter's; the follow-up questions could pin Carter down and might push him into saying something unwise;
- 4) It would save the President having to needle Carter himself, which would be out of character.

Television will bring out the characters of the two men more than the substance of what they say. In particular, such prolonged intimate exposure is likely to bring out Carter's humorlessness. The President, by contrast, should allow his natural warmth and sense of humor to flow freely.

Since television is a truly national medium, the President should define his positions -- and the reasoning behind them -- in terms acceptable to as wide an audience as possible.

Finally, I recommend the President review films of the Nixon-Kennedy debates. It is worth remembering Kennedy's comment: "The first debate actually changed votes. The others simply reinforced convictions that were already forming. Only the first really changed votes."

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 24, 1976

MEMORANDUM TO: ROBERT HARTMANN

FROM: DAVID BOORSTIN

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL DEBATES

Some kind of opening statement will be called for, but the debates should not consist of "set" pieces for the following reasons:

- 1) It would make for less exciting viewing, and therefore a smaller audience;
- 2) While the President can deliver formal speeches well, they are generally not his most effective situation;
- 3) Prepared statements would be less likely to cover new ground, and more likely to restate established positions. In Carter's case, it would allow him to define his own positions as vaguely as he wished.

It would be more effective to have a panel of newsmen throwing out questions for both candidates to answer, with the opportunity to follow up their questions. This panel should be a tough one, but it must include Walter Cronkite for legitimacy. This arrangement would be more effective because:

- 1) It would provide a dramatic and exciting TV situation;
- 2) The President is most effective fielding questions off-the-cuff;
- 3) It is more likely that the President's statements would be specific than Carter's; the follow-up questions could pin Carter down and might push him into saying something unwise;
- 4) It would save the President having to needle Carter himself, which would be out of character.

Television will bring out the characters of the two men more than the substance of what they say. In particular, such prolonged intimate exposure is likely to bring out Carter's humorlessness. The President, by contrast, should allow his natural warmth and sense of humor to flow freely.

Since television is a truly national medium, the President should define his positions -- and the reasoning behind them -- in terms acceptable to as wide an audience as possible.

Finally, I recommend the President review films of the Nixon-Kennedy debates. It is worth remembering Kennedy's comment: "The first debate actually changed votes. The others simply reinforced convictions that were already forming. Only the first really changed votes."

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 25, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: ROBERT ORBEN

FROM: PATRICK BUTLER *PB*

SUBJECT: The President's Speech to National Guard Convention

The more I read about the "total force" defense policy, the more boring it becomes. To devote any more than a very small portion of the President's speech next Wednesday to a discussion of "total force" is to doom any chance of duplicating the triumph in Kansas City.

I suggest we abandon the idea of speaking directly and specifically to this audience at all, and write instead a speech that raises the following major points:

1. National disarmament following World War I left America ill-prepared for World War II, indeed helped provoke it.
2. National disarmament following World War II left America ill-prepared for Korea.
3. With Vietnam over, because it lasted so long, was so unpopular, there is a great temptation to lower our defenses once again.
4. Congress has slashed \$50 billion from defense expenditures in the last decade. Defense was getting an increasingly lower share of federal budget until the President reversed the trend.
5. The world is still a dangerous place. The millenium is not yet. The Middle East is a desert minefield. Africa and Asia seethe with the passion of war. Korea is so tense the simple act of chopping down a tree leads to the murder of two U.S. soldiers, an international incident.
6. The President averted a new war in Korea by responding to the crisis with quiet strength. "Peace through strength" found its latest expression on the Korean peninsula. We sent the Midway. We have 42,000 troops guarding the border between North and South. That's all it took. The conflict went no further because those elements were already in place -- there was no need to overreact or to rattle sabres.

7. The resolution of Korean crisis proves that while we cannot be the world's policemen, we must not retreat from the world. We cannot become the last island of freedom on earth. We cannot withdraw behind our nuclear arsenal alone, but must maintain a broad range of effective military capabilities for appropriate response to different challenges.

8. "Total force" helps ensure those capabilities. Without maintaining a huge standing army, costing the taxpayer billions of extra dollars a year, we can have a combat-ready force with proper support and training of reserve, National Guard elements. Cite the improvements Administration has made.

9. "A well-regulated militia" was so important to founding fathers, they gave it a constitutional amendment all its own (the real meaning of the "right to bear arms"). From Revolution to Vietnam, the Guard was there when America needed it.

10. The President will be there when the Guard needs a strong, decisive Commander-in-chief -- to deter aggression, to maintain national security, to keep the peace.