

12/31/79

Folder Citation: Collection: Office of Staff Secretary; Series: Presidential Files; Folder:
12/31/79; Container 144

To See Complete Finding Aid:

http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.gov/library/findingaids/Staff_Secretary.pdf

WITHDRAWAL SHEET (PRESIDENTIAL LIBRARIES)

FORM OF DOCUMENT	CORRESPONDENTS OR TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
draft	Security Council Resolution on Sanctions Against Iran <i>opened per RAC NLC-126-19-27-1-1 12/2/13</i>	12/27/79	A

FILE LOCATION

Carter Presidential Papers- Staff Offices, Office of the Staff Sec.- Pres. Handwriting File 12/31/79 BOX 162

RESTRICTION CODES

- (A) Closed by Executive Order 12356 governing access to national security information.
- (B) Closed by statute or by the agency which originated the document.
- (C) Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in the donor's deed of gift.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

12/31/79

Hedley Donovan
Phil Wise

The attached was returned in
the President's outbox. It is
forwarded to you for your
information.

Rick Hutcheson

Z. Brzezinski
Al McDonald
Rick Hertzberg
Jody Powell

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

12/27/79

Mr. President:

Phil Wise has no comment.

Rick/Bill

December 20, 1979

TO: THE PRESIDENT
FROM: HEDLEY DONOVAN *HD*
cc: DR. BRZEZINSKI
AMBASSADOR McDONALD

*cc Phil - ok -
Hedley: have P
added referring
strongly but indirectly
to SU attempts to
subjugate Moslems in
Afghanistan. I presume
a Moslem scholar
has approved
text
J*

There was agreement at one of the recent SCC meetings that it could be useful for you soon to reaffirm that the U. S. has no quarrel with the people of Islam, has long-standing ties with Islam, and great respect for the principles of that faith.

You don't seem to have any speech scheduled in the next few weeks that would offer any opportunity to make such a statement. Zbig asked me to consider what sort of occasion might be arranged by the White House. I suggested a gathering of the faculties in Islamic studies from the Washington area universities. If this could be held early in January your statement might be pegged to the beginning of the 15th century of Islam. Your remarks could be an expansion of what you said about Islam at the tree-lighting ceremony of December 13 and your press conference of November 28.

The Middle East people at the State Department are checking over the credentials of the scholars and professors who might be invited to such a meeting. There would probably be 15 or 20 of them.

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

Attached is a State Department - NSC - Donovan draft of possible remarks. I think you would have to allow at least half an hour for dialogue with the academics so they didn't feel they were being used solely as an audience for your statement.

DRAFT PRESIDENTIAL STATEMENT

I want to talk with you about the Iranian crisis, but more broadly, about the fundamental relationships between the United States and the followers of Islam. I will welcome your comments and questions. I would like first to read you a statement that the White House intends to release later in the day, and I hope you agree that it is appropriate for the President to reaffirm these principles at this time.

* * * * *

The history of the United States is brief compared to the venerable history of Islam. We are beginning the two hundred and fourth year of the Independence of our country. Islam is celebrating the first year of its fifteenth century. But, for almost all of our history, we have enjoyed close and valued ties with the Muslim world. A Muslim state was the first to recognize our Independence and we have welcomed a dynamic Islamic community among our people. Many scholars from the Muslim world pursue their studies here. You are distinguished representatives of the many centers for Islamic and Middle Eastern studies that have grown up in universities all over America.

I have been struck, personally and in discharging my responsibilities as President, by the values of humanity and morality which we Americans as a people share with Islam.

- We share, first and foremost, a deep and abiding faith in the one Supreme Being;
- We are all commanded by Him to faith, compassion and justice;
- We have a common respect and reverence for the law and an abhorrence for conduct that is arbitrary or capricious;
- We continue to place, despite the strains of our modern age, singular importance on the family and the home;
- And, we share a belief that hospitality is a virtue, that the host, whether a nation or an individual, should behave with generosity and honor toward guests, rejecting the abuse of the power over them.

I am concerned, as an American and as a Christian, that there are those who would suggest that Islam is in a state of confrontation with this country. We totally reject

Change to positive statement

that contention as we reject any attempt to make moral and spiritual beliefs a barrier to understanding and cooperation rather than the bridge they can and should be.

We, for our part, will continue to seek to strengthen our ties with the many Muslim nations with which we have longstanding and valued bonds of friendship and cooperation. We will lend our support to any nation working for peace and justice and to resist external domination. Our efforts to help resolve peaceably and with justice the disputes, including the Arab-Israeli conflict, which affect the Muslim world will continue.

And, in this season of rededication and resolve, I reaffirm what I said a few weeks ago: "We have the deepest respect and reverence for Islam and all who share the Muslim faith." I am determined that anger and frustration in this country over events in some Islamic countries not be transformed into a false resentment of Islam or its faithful. We continue to look forward to the closest possible political, economic and cultural ties with Islamic nations and with the Muslim population throughout the world.

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT
WASHINGTON

December 31, 1979

Mr. President:

I thought you might enjoy reading
this new biography of the Vice President
which will appear in late January.

Happy New Year.

Dick Moe

*Dick -
Thanks -
Great subject!
J*

Secret

Done

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: BOB TURNER
SUBJECT: Keokuk County Meeting, 12/30/79
Date: December 29, 1979

Keokuk County is a fairly strong Democratic county. The people involved are working very hard. I feel fairly certain about the on-going progress in the county.

There is a speaker phone set up for the call.

CONTACT: Bob Turner
Farm Bureau Building
Sigourney, Iowa (Si-gor-knee)

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

PHONE #: 515/622-2310

TIME: 4:00 p.m.

The following people will probably be in attendance:

Craig Downey

Superintendent of Schools in Keokuk County. Invited to SALT Briefing. He was unable to attend. This is his first involvement in active politics in Keokuk County. Thank him for his effort.

Paul McNaeb

Paul is on the Board of Supervisors in Keokuk County. He and his wife, Wanetta are very active supporters in the county.

> Russel & Judy Noller

Russel is the Clerk of Court in Keokuk County. Both are doing very good work.

> Homer Kerr

County Democratic Chair. He is also working hard

Bob Turner will introduce any other people in attendance.

NOTE: 3 organizational meetings have been consolidated into one meeting for the use of the speaker phone. There is only one call to make today for this reason.

*Catherine Clarence Mildred Norman Christina
Dennis Craig Terry*

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

12/31/79

The Vice President
Hamilton Jordan
Al McDonald
Stu Eizenstat
Jack Watson
Frank Moore

The attached was returned in the
President's outbox today and is
forwarded to you for your informa-
tion.

Rick Hutcheson

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

December 22, 1979

C
/

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: FRANK MOORE

SUBJECT: Weekly Legislative Report

I. DOMESTIC POLICY ISSUES

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

1. Energy

ESC

Staff will continue to work throughout the holidays. Conference meetings could resume on January 17.

The major dispute centers on Title 11 -- the Defense Production/Non Nuclear Act. The Senate Banking and Energy Committees are fighting over jurisdiction. The conference report should be ready for floor action by the first week in February.

EMB

The conference will resume work immediately after Congress reconvenes. Prospects for completion shortly thereafter are cautiously optimistic. The House conferees have offered a proposal that does not include substantive waivers. We feel that agreement is perhaps two rounds away.

WPT

As you know, the conferees agreed to split the revenue difference between the two Houses thus providing a framework for the parties to come together.

The conferees plan to reconvene on January 17. Staff will continue to work out the differences, and Long and Ullman will communicate over the holidays. They hope to have a bill before your State of the Union message.

2. Chrysler

On Thursday evening Senator Magnuson threatened to add an amendment to the Chrysler appropriations bill to provide funds for the Milwaukee Railroad. After meeting with OMB officials he reluctantly dropped the idea.

The appropriations bill covers \$1.5 billion in loan authority for the next three years. It does not provide a permanent, indefinite appropriation to cover possible loan defaults. OMB believes this issue can be resolved early next session.

In the authorization bill House and Senate conferees split the difference on employee contributions. The final bill calls for \$462.5 million from U.A.W workers and \$125 million from white collar employees.

3. EDA Authorization Bill

The conference has not made any progress toward resolving differences on the major issues of eligibility, authorization levels, or the Local Public Works program. Senator Muskie attended this week's sessions and joined the other Senate conferees in speaking out against the LPW program contained in the House bill. Chairman Roe continues to hold fast in support of this program.

The conferees have tentatively agreed to meet one or two days prior to the date Congress reconvenes. Staff will continue to try to work out differences during the recess.

4. Endangered Species

The Endangered Species Reauthorization Act conference report passed both the House and Senate by voice vote Wednesday. It should be ready for your signature soon.

5. Small Business Omnibus Bill

The conference report passed the House by voice vote on Wednesday, but was not taken up by the Senate because Senators Muskie and Bellmon refused to enter into a time agreement.

The Senate Budget Committee's concern is the elimination of a provision which authorizes SBA to pay interest to Treasury on the outstanding balance of the Disaster Loan Fund.

If the provision is struck by the Senate the conference could be reopened. The conference would be likely to reconsider the language which removes SBA from farm disaster lending.

6. Target Price Bill

The Senate passed the target price increase bill by voice vote. Two amendments were adopted:

- 1) applies a \$50,000 cap on disaster payments;
- 2) clarifies the Secretary's discretionary power to increase the 1981 target price and allows the Secretary to require that farmers stay within their normal crop acreage as a condition of eligibility for price support loans and payments.

Conference action will begin soon after Congress returns.

II. FOREIGN POLICY ISSUES

1. Iran

Congressional support for your handling of the Iran crisis remains high. On Thursday the Senate Foreign Relations Committee passed unanimously a resolution stating the Senate's full support for your efforts.

Nevertheless, the mood is troubled and criticism and sharp questions continue in closed sessions of the foreign affairs and intelligence committees.

2. SALT

The Senate Armed Services Committee voted Friday with seven abstentions to send to the Senate the "Perle report," critical of the SALT II Treaty. Although we understand that some of the criticism in the report has been watered down and the conclusions modified, the report concludes that the SALT II Treaty is "not in the national security interests of the United States." There will be an opportunity for the addition of dissenting views to the report, however, which pro-SALT Senators intend to add in the coming weeks.

3. Foreign Aid Appropriations Conference

The conference on the Foreign Aid Appropriations Bill remains deadlocked. Pressure from a number of sources seems to be building on both Senator Inouye and Representative Long to reschedule the conference and take the report to the floor immediately upon their return. The outlook, however, is by no means clear.

4. Central America Supplemental

Neither House took floor action on the Central America Supplemental Authorization Bill before the Christmas recess.

Although Senator Jesse Helms plans to oppose the bill vigorously, it does not appear to be in trouble in the Senate. On the other hand, a close vote is more likely in the House. State and AID are contacting more than 100 swing voters on this bill.

5. Sino-Soviet Issues in the New Year

With the Congress moving into a pro-forma schedule, the running clock in the China Trade Agreement will mean it will be considered immediately following Harold Brown's trip to China and just before tough debate over SALT. This will be a sensitive period for US-Soviet relations.

On the Hill there is a growing difference of opinion on how to manage the US/Sino/Soviet triangle. Throughout the recent hearings on the China Trade Agreement, we were pressed repeatedly by liberals to give some indication that we might move ahead on MFN for the USSR. On the other hand, an anti-Soviet attitude has solidified in both the Senate and the House, to a large extent as a result of the increasingly tense international situation. We are likely to see an increasingly divisive mood in both Chambers.

6. Morocco

On Thursday DOD completed the technical work necessary to determine which helicopter can be made available to Morocco so that we can go to Saudi Arabia for a firm commitment on funding. This will complete preparations for submission of a formal notification to the Congress on military sales for Morocco in January.

Senator Stone indicates that the Foreign Relations Committee will continue its support for the Morocco proposal. Congressman Solarz believes that he has the votes in the Foreign Affairs Committee for a resolution of disapproval, unless some compromise is reached. Solarz is now feeling some pressure from constituents asking him to reconsider total opposition.

7. Refugee Legislation

The Administration's comprehensive refugee legislation passed the House on Thursday by a vote of 328-47. It gives us virtually everything we sought: a liberalized definition of refugees, a floor of 50,000 refugee admissions for each of the next three years, and an orderly procedure for Congressional consultation leading to additional refugee admissions as the need arises. The House bill also has a number of undesirable features, the most troublesome being the ability of either House to veto refugee admissions above 50,000 and a Holtzman-sponsored amendment which would transfer the Refugee Coordinator from the State Department to the White House. The Senate bill has none of these undesirable provisions.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

12/31/79

Mr. President/

Zbig is requesting a
NSC meeting wednesday after-
noon to discuss Christopher's
trip to london and Brown's
trip to China. Shall I
schedule?

yes no

Phil

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Keedh

December 31, 1979

MR. PRESIDENT:

The Park Service is ready to dismantle the Peace Pageant decorations across from the White House. Because of the special significance of the tree lighting this year, they are asking for instructions on dismantling it. The tree is a living, permanent tree so it will not be moved. Do you want them to leave the lights on the tree so they can be turned on when the hostages are home or give any other special instructions?

_____ Leave lights on tree with top light burning each night and dismantle all other decorations

✓
_____ Dismantle all decorations including the tree lights

_____ Other



PHIL

Phil

~~SECRET~~

December 27, 1979

DRAFT SC RESOLUTION ON SANCTIONS AGAINST IRAN: FIRST STEP
OF A TWO STEP APPROACH

The Security Council,

Gravely concerned over the increasing tensions between Iran and the United States of America caused by the prolonged detention of American diplomatic personnel in Iran in violation of international law and the dangerous consequences for all States,

Recalling the appeal made by the President of the Security Council on 9 November 1979 (S/13616), which was reiterated on 27 November 1979 (S/13652),

Having taken note of the letters dated 13 November 1979 and 1 December 1979 concerning the grievances and views of Iran (S/13626 and S/13671, respectively),

Recalling also the letter from the Secretary General dated 25 November 1979 stating that, in his view, the present crisis poses a serious threat to international peace and security (S/13646),

Taking into account the Order of the International Court of Justice of 15 December 1979 calling on Iran to ensure the immediate release of all persons of United States nationality held hostage (S/13697),

DECLASSIFIED

Per: Rac Project

ESDN: NLC-126-19-27-1-1

BY KS NARA DATE 11/25/13

SECRET

Mindful of the obligation of States to settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered,

Conscious of the responsibility of States to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations,

1. Deeply deplores the non-compliance by Iran with Security Council Resolution 457 (1979) and the Order of the International Court of Justice of 15 December 1979 (S/13697),

2. Requests once again that the Government of Iran release immediately the personnel of the Embassy of the United States of America held in Tehran, to provide them protection and to allow them to leave the country;

3. Reaffirms the good offices of the Secretary General;

4. Requests the Secretary General to this end to proceed to Iran to assist Iran in taking the actions called for in paragraph 1 by 5 January 1980;

5. Decides that if the Government of Iran does not comply with paragraph 1 of this Resolution by 5 January 1980 the Security Council will immediately take effective measures under Articles 39 and 41 of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE
COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS
WASHINGTON

EYES ONLY

December 29, 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

From: Charlie Schultze ^{CLS}
Subject: The Index of Leading Economic Indicators

On Monday (December 31) at about 10:00 a.m., the Commerce Department will release the index of leading economic indicators for November. The index fell 1.3 percent last month, following a 1.4 percent decline in October. (The October index was revised down.)

These are fairly steep declines, and will probably be interpreted by the press as evidence that a recession is underway. As you know, we pay relatively little attention to this index, since we believe it is often a misleading guide to the course of the economy. In the present case, however, we do think a recession will occur in early 1980, and the index of leading indicators may be giving an accurate signal.

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Mr. President,

I have "inside info"
that you will be pushed
very hard on the —
"How long can this go on?"
"Aren't you losing the
support of the American
people?"
"Don't we look weak
and impotent?"

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

type questions.

This could be
the most important
part of the whole
in terms. I have
attached some suggested
comments. You need to
think hard and be
ready for this line of
questioning.

Jody

December 31, 1979

FRANK, I THINK THE AMERICAN PEOPLE FEEL THE SAME IMPATIENCE AND ANGER THAT I FEEL. BUT I CANNOT MAKE DECISIONS THAT AFFECT THE NATIONAL INTEREST OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE LIVES OF 50 AMERICAN CITIZENS BASED ON ANGER OR IMPATIENCE.

WE MUST BE DELIBERATE AND FIRM. AND WE WILL BE. WE MUST MAKE IT CLEAR TO THE IRANIAN AUTHORITIES THAT THEY WILL PAY AN INCREASINGLY HIGHER PRICE SO LONG AS THEY HOLD OUR PEOPLE -- AND THEY WILL.

I CANNOT ACCEPT THE IDEA THAT I TAKE SOME PRECIPITOUS ACTION THAT COULD ENDANGER THE LIVES OF OUR PEOPLE OR BE CONTRARY TO OUR NATIONAL INTEREST -- JUST TO MAKE ME LOOK TOUGH. NOR CAN I ACCEPT THE IDEA THAT THE UNITED STATES SHOULD ABJECTLY APOLOGIZE FOR OUR PAST POLICIES, SAY WE WERE WRONG TO ADMIT A FRIEND AND ALLY FOR NECESSARY MEDICAL TREATMENT, ADVOCATE RETURNING HIM TO IRAN FOR CERTAIN DEATH, AND IN EFFECT YIELD TO INTERNATIONAL BLACK-MAIL AND TERRORISM -- AND I WILL NOT DO THAT.

NOTHING WOULD PLEASE ME MORE THAN IF THERE WERE SOME SECRET, MAGIC SOLUTION TO THIS CRISIS. THERE IS NOT AND AMERICANS HAVE SHOWN THAT THEY HAVE ENOUGH SENSE TO KNOW THAT.

I OFTEN THINK OF TWO STATEMENTS MADE BY FORMER PRESIDENTS:

HARRY S. TRUMAN SAID THAT ANY PRESIDENT WHO MADE HIS DECISIONS BASED ON THE POLLS AND THE POLITICAL COMMENTATORS WASN'T FIT TO HOLD THE OFFICE.

JOHN F. KENNEDY SAID THAT IT IS A LOT EASIER TO MAKE SPEECHES THAN TO MAKE THE JUDGEMENTS.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON
DECEMBER 31, 1979

MR. PRESIDENT:

HERE ARE SOME THOUGHTS FOR YOUR REYNOLDS INTERVIEW:

1. DON'T BE QUITE AS SANGUINE ABOUT THE ECONOMY AS YOU WERE ON SATURDAY. STRESS THAT WE'VE HAD TOUGH TIMES BECAUSE OF OPEC. THERE IS NO QUICK, EASY SOLUTION. ANYONE WHO SAYS OTHERWISE IS MISLEADING PEOPLE. BUT WE ARE ON THE RIGHT ROAD AND MUST NOT TURN ASIDE.

2. ABC WILL TRY TO HAVE A SEGMENT ON THE PRESIDENTIAL RACE. YOU SHOULD AVOID A DETAILED DISCUSSION. JUST SAY THAT YOU LOOK FORWARD TO IT BUT HAVEN'T BEEN ABLE TO SPEND AS MUCH TIME AS YOU'D LIKE ON THE RACE, FOR OBVIOUS REASONS.

IF ASKED ABOUT THE ISSUES, POINT OUT "STRONG DEFENSE" AND "HOLDING DOWN GOVERNMENT SPENDING" AS THE MAIN DIFFERENCES BETWEEN YOU AND EMK IN THE SAME TONE YOU USED IN THE BOSTON T.V. INTERVIEW.

DO NOT GET INTO AN ANALYSIS OF THE POLLS. THEY GO UP AND THEY GO DOWN. AS TRUMAN SAID, ANYONE WHO BASES HIS DECISIONS ON POLLS AND COMMENTATORS DOESN'T DESERVE TO HOLD THE OFFICE.

3. ABOVE ALL, BE AS FIRM AND FORCEFUL AS POSSIBLE ON IRAN AND AFGANISTAN. AS FOR THOSE WHO ARE INCLINED TO BE CRITICAL IN AN ELECTION YEAR, AS JFK SAID, "IT IS A LOT EASIER TO MAKE SPEECHES THAN TO MAKE THE JUDGEMENTS." RESTATE OUR BASIC GOALS -- PROTECT OUR LONG-TERM INTERESTS AND SECURE SAFE RELEASE OF THE HOSTAGES

— and that those who will pay an increasingly higher price.

4. WHEN ASKED TO LOOK BACKWARD OVER THE 70'S, YOU CAN PICK UP ON THE THEMES FROM THE CAMP DAVID SPEECH. (PLEASE TAKE A LOOK AT THE ATTACHED HIGHLIGHTED SECTIONS. THEY ARE VERY GOOD AND STILL VERY REVELANT.) OUR COUNTRY HAS BEEN THROUGH A LOT. THIS WAS A DECADE IN WHICH SOME OF OUR SELF-CONFIDENCE WAS SHAKEN, WHEN SOMETIMES THERE SEEMED TO BE A PREMIUM ON SELFISH INTERESTS RATHER THAN OUR NATIONAL INTEREST, BUT WE ARE BEGINNING TO CHANGE THAT -- THE UNITY AND COMMON PURPOSE ON ENERGY AND IRAN SHOWS THAT WE CAN PULL TOGETHER AND RISE TO A CHALLENGE. YOU SEE THE 80'S AS A DECADE IN WHICH THE DISILLUSIONMENT AND CYNICISM OF THE 70'S CAN BE PUT BEHIND US. YOU CAN TALK ABOUT A DECADE IN WHICH WE HAVE MADE THE TOUGH DECISIONS NECESSARY TO GET ON TOP OF OUR ENERGY PROBLEMS AND THUS THE INFLATION THAT HAS BEEN ONE OF THE PRIMARY CHARACTERISTICS OF THE 70'S.

WE MAY FACE OTHER SHORTAGES OF RAW MATERIALS IN THE 80'S, BUT WE CAN DEMONSTRATE OUR ABILITY TO DEAL WITH THEM BY THE WAY WE HANDLE ENERGY. YOU CAN MENTION AGAIN THE IMPORTANT ROLE OUR PRODUCTION OF FOOD AND FIBER WILL PLAY IN THE COMING DECADE.

THOSE ARE THE MAIN POINTS I WANTED TO GET ACROSS. I ASSUME YOU ARE AS UP TO SPEED ON WARREN'S MISSION AND OUR POSITION AT THE U.N. AS YOU CAN BE. I WILL GIVE YOU A SEPARATE NOTE ON THE HOSTAGE SITUATION.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'J. L.' or similar, located in the lower right quadrant of the page.

Administration of Jimmy Carter

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

Week Ending Friday, July 20, 1979

Energy and National Goals

Address to the Nation. July 15, 1979

Good evening.

This is a special night for me. Exactly 3 years ago, on July 15, 1976, I accepted the nomination of my party to run for President of the United States. I promised you a President who is not isolated from the people, who feels your pain, and who shares your dreams and who draws his strength and his wisdom from you.

During the past 3 years I've spoken to you on many occasions about national concerns, the energy crisis, reorganizing the Government, our Nation's economy, and issues of war and especially peace. But over those years the subjects of the speeches, the talks, and the press conferences have become increasingly narrow, focused more and more on what the isolated world of Washington thinks is important. Gradually, you've heard more and more about what the Government thinks or what the Government should be doing and less and less about our Nation's hopes, our dreams, and our vision of the future.

Ten days ago I had planned to speak to you again about a very important subject—energy. For the fifth time I would

have described the urgency of the problem and laid out a series of legislative recommendations to the Congress. But as I was preparing to speak, I began to ask myself the same question that I now know has been troubling many of you. Why have we not been able to get together as a nation to resolve our serious energy problem?

It's clear that the true problems of our Nation are much deeper—deeper than gasoline lines or energy shortages, deeper even than inflation or recession. And I realize more than ever that as President I need your help. So, I decided to reach out and listen to the voices of America.

I invited to Camp David people from almost every segment of our society—business and labor, teachers and preachers, Governors, mayors, and private citizens. And then I left Camp David to listen to other Americans, men and women like you. It has been an extraordinary 10 days, and I want to share with you what I've heard.

First of all, I got a lot of personal advice. Let me quote a few of the typical comments that I wrote down.

This from a southern Governor: "Mr. President, you are not leading this Na-

tion—you're just managing the Government."

"You don't see the people enough any more."

"Some of your Cabinet members don't seem loyal. There is not enough discipline among your disciples."

"Don't talk to us about politics or the mechanics of government, but about an understanding of our common good."

"Mr. President, we're in trouble. Talk to us about blood and sweat and tears."

"If you lead, Mr. President, we will follow."

Many people talked about themselves and about the condition of our Nation. This from a young woman in Pennsylvania: "I feel so far from government. I feel like ordinary people are excluded from political power."

And this from a young Chicano: "Some of us have suffered from recession all our lives."

"Some people have wasted energy, but others haven't had anything to waste."

And this from a religious leader: "No material shortage can touch the important things like God's love for us or our love for one another."

And I like this one particularly from a black woman who happens to be the mayor of a small Mississippi town: "The big-shots are not the only ones who are important. Remember, you can't sell anything on Wall Street unless someone digs it up somewhere else first."

This kind of summarized a lot of other statements: "Mr. President, we are confronted with a moral and a spiritual crisis."

Several of our discussions were on energy, and I have a notebook full of comments and advice. I'll read just a few.

"We can't go on consuming 40 percent more energy than we produce. When

we import oil we are also importing inflation plus unemployment."

"We've got to use what we have. The Middle East has only 5 percent of the world's energy, but the United States has 24 percent."

And this is one of the most vivid statements: "Our neck is stretched over the fence and OPEC has a knife."

"There will be other cartels and other shortages. American wisdom and courage right now can set a path to follow in the future."

This was a good one: "Be bold, Mr. President. We may make mistakes, but we are ready to experiment."

And this one from a labor leader got to the heart of it: "The real issue is freedom. We must deal with the energy problem on a war footing."

And the last that I'll read: "When we enter the moral equivalent of war, Mr. President, don't issue us BB guns."

These 10 days confirmed my belief in the decency and the strength and the wisdom of the American people, but it also bore out some of my longstanding concerns about our Nation's underlying problems.

I know, of course, being President, that government actions and legislation can be very important. That's why I've worked hard to put my campaign promises into law—and I have to admit, with just mixed success. But after listening to the American people I have been reminded again that all the legislation in the world can't fix what's wrong with America. So, I want to speak to you first tonight about a subject even more serious than energy or inflation. I want to talk to you right now about a fundamental threat to American democracy.

I do not mean our political and civil liberties. They will endure. And I do not refer to the outward strength of America,

a nation that is at peace tonight everywhere in the world, with unmatched economic power and military might.

The threat is nearly invisible in ordinary ways. It is a crisis of confidence. It is a crisis that strikes at the very heart and soul and spirit of our national will. We can see this crisis in the growing doubt about the meaning of our own lives and in the loss of a unity of purpose for our Nation.

The erosion of our confidence in the future is threatening to destroy the social and the political fabric of America.

The confidence that we have always had as a people is not simply some romantic dream or a proverb in a dusty book that we read just on the Fourth of July. It is the idea which founded our Nation and has guided our development as a people. Confidence in the future has supported everything else—public institutions and private enterprise, our own families, and the very Constitution of the United States. Confidence has defined our course and has served as a link between generations. We've always believed in something called progress. We've always had a faith that the days of our children would be better than our own.

Our people are losing that faith, not only in government itself but in the ability as citizens to serve as the ultimate rulers and shapers of our democracy. As a people we know our past and we are proud of it. Our progress has been part of the living history of America, even the world. We always believed that we were part of a great movement of humanity itself called democracy, involved in the search for freedom and that belief has always strengthened us in our purpose. But just as we are losing our confidence in the future, we are also beginning to close the door on our past.

In a nation that was proud of hard work, strong families, close-knit communi-

ties, and our faith in God, too many of us now tend to worship self-indulgence and consumption. Human identity is no longer defined by what one does, but by what one owns. But we've discovered that owning things and consuming things does not satisfy our longing for meaning. We've learned that piling up material goods cannot fill the emptiness of lives which have no confidence or purpose.

The symptoms of this crisis of the American spirit are all around us. For the first time in the history of our country a majority of our people believe that the next 5 years will be worse than the past 5 years. Two-thirds of our people do not even vote. The productivity of American workers is actually dropping, and the willingness of Americans to save for the future has fallen below that of all other people in the Western world.

As you know, there is a growing disrespect for government and for churches and for schools, the news media, and other institutions. This is not a message of happiness or reassurance, but it is the truth and it is a warning.

These changes did not happen overnight. They've come upon us gradually over the last generation, years that were filled with shocks and tragedy.

We were sure that ours was a nation of the ballot, not the bullet, until the murders of John Kennedy and Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King, Jr. We were taught that our armies were always invincible and our causes were always just, only to suffer the agony of Vietnam. We respected the Presidency as a place of honor until the shock of Watergate.

We remember when the phrase "sound as a dollar" was an expression of absolute dependability, until 10 years of inflation began to shrink our dollar and our savings. We believed that our Nation's re-

sources were limitless until 1973 when we had to face a growing dependence on foreign oil.

These wounds are still very deep. They have never been healed.

Looking for a way out of this crisis, our people have turned to the Federal Government and found it isolated from the mainstream of our Nation's life. Washington, D.C., has become an island. The gap between our citizens and our Government has never been so wide. The people are looking for honest answers, not easy answers; clear leadership, not false claims and evasiveness and politics as usual.

What you see too often in Washington and elsewhere around the country is a system of government that seems incapable of action. You see a Congress twisted and pulled in every direction by hundreds of well-financed and powerful special interests.

You see every extreme position defended to the last vote, almost to the last breath by one unyielding group or another. You often see a balanced and a fair approach that demands sacrifice, a little sacrifice from everyone, abandoned like an orphan without support and without friends.

Often you see paralysis and stagnation and drift. You don't like it, and neither do I. What can we do?

First of all, we must face the truth, and then we can change our course. We simply must have faith in each other, faith in our ability to govern ourselves, and faith in the future of this Nation. Restoring that faith and that confidence to America is now the most important task we face. It is a true challenge of this generation of Americans.

One of the visitors to Camp David last week put it this way: "We've got to stop crying and start sweating, stop talking

and start walking, stop cursing and start praying. The strength we need will not come from the White House, but from every house in America."

We know the strength of America. We are strong. We can regain our unity. We can regain our confidence. We are the heirs of generations who survived threats much more powerful and awesome than those that challenge us now. Our fathers and mothers were strong men and women who shaped a new society during the Great Depression, who fought world wars, and who carved out a new charter of peace for the world.

We ourselves are the same Americans who just 10 years ago put a man on the Moon. We are the generation that dedicated our society to the pursuit of human rights and equality. And we are the generation that will win the war on the energy problem and in that process rebuild the unity and confidence of America.

We are at a turning point in our history. There are two paths to choose. One is a path I've warned about tonight, the path that leads to fragmentation and self-interest. Down that road lies a mistaken idea of freedom, the right to grasp for ourselves some advantage over others. That path would be one of constant conflict between narrow interests ending in chaos and immobility. It is a certain route to failure.

All the traditions of our past, all the lessons of our heritage, all the promises of our future point to another path, the path of common purpose and the restoration of American values. That path leads to true freedom for our Nation and ourselves. We can take the first steps down that path as we begin to solve our energy problem.

Energy will be the immediate test of our ability to unite this Nation, and it can also be the standard around which we rally.

On the battlefield of energy we can win for our Nation a new confidence, and we can seize control again of our common destiny.

In little more than two decades we've gone from a position of energy independence to one in which almost half the oil we use comes from foreign countries, at prices that are going through the roof. Our excessive dependence on OPEC has already taken a tremendous toll on our economy and our people. This is the direct cause of the long lines which have made millions of you spend aggravating hours waiting for gasoline. It's a cause of the increased inflation and unemployment that we now face. This intolerable dependence on foreign oil threatens our economic independence and the very security of our Nation.

The energy crisis is real. It is worldwide. It is a clear and present danger to our Nation. These are facts and we simply must face them.

What I have to say to you now about energy is simple and vitally important.

Point one: I am tonight setting a clear goal for the energy policy of the United States. Beginning this moment, this Nation will never use more foreign oil than we did in 1977—never. From now on, every new addition to our demand for energy will be met from our own production and our own conservation. The generation-long growth in our dependence on foreign oil will be stopped dead in its tracks right now and then reversed as we move through the 1980's, for I am tonight setting the further goal of cutting our dependence on foreign oil by one-half by the end of the next decade—a saving of over 4½ million barrels of imported oil per day.

Point two: To ensure that we meet these targets, I will use my Presidential authority to set import quotas. I'm an-

nouncing tonight that for 1979 and 1980, I will forbid the entry into this country of one drop of foreign oil more than these goals allow. These quotas will ensure a reduction in imports even below the ambitious levels we set at the recent Tokyo summit.

Point three: To give us energy security, I am asking for the most massive peacetime commitment of funds and resources in our Nation's history to develop America's own alternative sources of fuel—from coal, from oil shale, from plant products for gasohol, from unconventional gas, from the Sun.

I propose the creation of an energy security corporation to lead this effort to replace 2½ million barrels of imported oil per day by 1990. The corporation will issue up to \$5 billion in energy bonds, and I especially want them to be in small denominations so that average Americans can invest directly in America's energy security.

Just as a similar synthetic rubber corporation helped us win World War II, so will we mobilize American determination and ability to win the energy war. Moreover, I will soon submit legislation to Congress calling for the creation of this Nation's first solar bank which will help us achieve the crucial goal of 20 percent of our energy coming from solar power by the year 2000.

These efforts will cost money, a lot of money, and that is why Congress must enact the windfall profits tax without delay. It will be money well spent. Unlike the billions of dollars that we ship to foreign countries to pay for foreign oil, these funds will be paid by Americans to Americans. These funds will go to fight, not to increase, inflation and unemployment.

Point four: I'm asking Congress to mandate, to require as a matter of law, that our Nation's utility companies cut

their massive use of oil by 50 percent within the next decade and switch to other fuels, especially coal, our most abundant energy source.

Point five: To make absolutely certain that nothing stands in the way of achieving these goals, I will urge Congress to create an energy mobilization board which, like the War Production Board in World War II, will have the responsibility and authority to cut through the redtape, the delays, and the endless roadblocks to completing key energy projects.

We will protect our environment. But when this Nation critically needs a refinery or a pipeline, we will build it.

Point six: I'm proposing a bold conservation program to involve every State, county, and city and every average American in our energy battle. This effort will permit you to build conservation into your homes and your lives at a cost you can afford.

I ask Congress to give me authority for mandatory conservation and for standby gasoline rationing. To further conserve energy, I'm proposing tonight an extra \$10 billion over the next decade to strengthen our public transportation systems. And I'm asking you for your good and for your Nation's security to take no unnecessary trips, to use carpools or public transportation whenever you can, to park your car one extra day per week, to obey the speed limit, and to set your thermostats to save fuel. Every act of energy conservation like this is more than just common sense—I tell you it is an act of patriotism.

Our Nation must be fair to the poorest among us, so we will increase aid to needy Americans to cope with rising energy prices. We often think of conservation only in terms of sacrifice. In fact, it is the most painless and immediate way of rebuilding our Nation's strength. Every gal-

lon of oil each one of us saves is a new form of production. It gives us more freedom, more confidence, that much more control over our own lives.

So, the solution of our energy crisis can also help us to conquer the crisis of the spirit in our country. It can rekindle our sense of unity, our confidence in the future, and give our Nation and all of us individually a new sense of purpose.

You know we can do it. We have the natural resources. We have more oil in our shale alone than several Saudi Arabias. We have more coal than any nation on Earth. We have the world's highest level of technology. We have the most skilled work force, with innovative genius, and I firmly believe that we have the national will to win this war.

I do not promise you that this struggle for freedom will be easy. I do not promise a quick way out of our Nation's problems, when the truth is that the only way out is an all-out effort. What I do promise you is that I will lead our fight, and I will enforce fairness in our struggle, and I will ensure honesty. And above all, I will act.

We can manage the short-term shortages more effectively and we will, but there are no short-term solutions to our long-range problems. There is simply no way to avoid sacrifice.

Twelve hours from now I will speak again in Kansas City, to expand and to explain further our energy program. Just as the search for solutions to our energy shortages has now led us to a new awareness of our Nation's deeper problems, so our willingness to work for those solutions in energy can strengthen us to attack those deeper problems.

I will continue to travel this country, to hear the people of America. You can help me to develop a national agenda for the 1980's. I will listen and I will act. We

will act together. These were the promises I made 3 years ago, and I intend to keep them.

Little by little we can and we must rebuild our confidence. We can spend until we empty our treasuries, and we may summon all the wonders of science. But we can succeed only if we tap our greatest resources—America's people, America's values, and America's confidence.

I have seen the strength of America in the inexhaustible resources of our people. In the days to come, let us renew that strength in the struggle for an energy-secure nation.

In closing, let me say this: I will do my best, but I will not do it alone. Let your voice be heard. Whenever you have a chance, say something good about our country. With God's help and for the sake of our Nation, it is time for us to join hands in America. Let us commit ourselves together to a rebirth of the American spirit. Working together with our common faith we cannot fail.

Thank you and good night.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10 p.m. from the Oval Office at the White House. His remarks were broadcast live on radio and television.

Kansas City, Missouri

*Remarks at the Annual Convention of the National Association of Counties.
July 16, 1979*

Senator Tom Eagleton, Senator Jack Danforth, Congressmen Ike Skelton and Harold Volkmer, President Charlotte Williams, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

You may have heard that I spoke to the Nation last night on television. [Laughter] That speech encompassed the

ideas, the concerns, the dreams, the hopes, the determination of many Americans. Your own president, Charlotte Williams, came to Camp David to help me write that speech.

Last night I spoke to you about the deep wounds our society has suffered and about my absolute conviction that we have the power and the will to heal these wounds and to restore the unity and confidence of America. I promised last night to keep on discussing our Nation's most serious problems with Americans. And I also promised to keep on acting with the people to tackle these problems.

And today, I've come to Kansas City to meet with you to do both—to discuss the energy problem and to get you to help me succeed. I want to know, will you help me succeed? [Applause]

My belief is that almost all Americans feel the same way. Just as the energy shortage has forced us to face our deepest fears and divisions, so our goal of an energy secure America will help us to rebuild our strength and our confidence as a people. We are coming to understand that the reasons for our energy crisis go beyond gas lines and wasteful habits to a loss of confidence that divides us and threatens us and which, for years, too many years, has prevented Presidents and the Congress and a great nation from acting courageously to meet this energy challenge. That is why we must decide here and now that we can and will regroup, we can and will unite, we can and will restore our confidence, we can and will win the battle to solve our energy problems and restore our Nation's security and keep us strong.

There are no easy answers. That is why I will continue to explore new ideas and I will open new fronts and I will develop new points of attack. That is why I will seek more and more Americans, allies to

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON
DECEMBER 31, 1979

MR. PRESIDENT,

ON THE HOSTAGE FILM, I THINK YOUR COMMENTS SHOULD BE ALONG
THE FOLLOWING LINES:

"I HAVE NOT YET HAD A CHANCE TO SEE THE FILM,
BUT FROM ALL REPORTS THIS IS CLEARLY ANOTHER *CRUEL AND*
CYNICAL PROPAGANDA EFFORT TO DIVERT WORLD PUBLIC *OPINION AND AMERICAN*
OPINION FROM THE ILLEGAL AND UNCIVILIZED HOLDING
OF OUR PEOPLE AND FROM THE FACT THAT ~~COLLECTED FROM OUR~~
~~OUTSIDE~~ NO NEUTRAL OBSERVER HAS SEEN ALL THE HOSTAGES
SINCE THE FIRST DAY.

"I DON'T THINK THIS PROPAGANDA FILM WILL BE ANY
SIMILAR EFFORTS
MORE EFFECTIVE THAN ~~THOSE~~ IN THE PAST, BECAUSE I HAVE
CONFIDENCE IN THE GOOD SENSE OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE --
THEY KNOW THAT ANY STATEMENTS MADE UNVER THESE CONDITIONS
OF DURESS HAVE NO VALIDITY WHATSOEVER."

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

SOME PERTINENT FACTS ABOUT THE FILMS:

1. THERE WERE STATEMENTS THAT THE HOSTAGES "LOOKED WELL" WHICH ONLY RAISES MORE SHARPLY THE ISSUE OF THE 7 WHOM NO ONE HAS SEEN.
2. THE FILM WAS 2-½ HOURS LONG, TAKEN BY THE KIDNAPPERS AND EDITED DOWN TO 50 MINUTES BY THEM. NO ONE KNOWS WHAT WAS IN THE PORTIONS EDITED OUT.
3. IN SOME SEGMENTS THE SOUND AND THE FILM ARE CLEARLY OUT OF SYNCH.
4. THE NETWORKS WERE WARNED THAT HOW THEY TREATED THE FILM WOULD DETERMINE HOW THEY (THE NETWORKS) WERE TREATED BY THE KIDNAPPERS IN THE FUTURE.
5. COFFIN SAID THAT THE CLERGYMEN WERE WARNED NOT TO TELL THE HOSTAGES THAT THE SHAH WAS NO LONGER IN THE U.S. -- AND THE STATEMENTS FROM SEVERAL OF THE HOSTAGES MADE IT CLEAR THAT THEY DID NOT KNOW THIS.
6. FOUR HOSTAGES READ STATEMENTS WHICH TENDED TO CONDEMN THE SHAH AND/OR REQUEST THAT HE BE RETURNED.

7. AT ONE POINT, ONE HOSTAGE READ A CHRISTMAS
CARD FROM ^{ALL} THE HOSTAGES TO KHOMEINI, ALL ABOUT BEST
WISHES FOR PEACE AND HAPPINESS AND GOOD-WILL, ETC. ANYONE
WHO THINKS THAT WAS A SPONTANEOUS AND SINCERE GESTURE
PROBABLY ALSO THINKS THE KIDNAPPERS ARE REALLY NICE, CLEAN-
CUT STUDENTS HAVING A LITTLE FUN AFTER MID-TERM EXAMS.

8. SOME OF THE STATEMENTS FROM THE FOUR HOSTAGES
SAID THAT ^{NONE} ~~SOME~~ OF THEM HAD BEEN MISTREATED. THIS WAS
CLEARLY A CONTRIVANCE SINCE THE HOSTAGES ARE NOT
PERMITTED TO TALK TO ONE ANOTHER AND DON'T KNOW HOW ALL
THE OTHERS ARE BEING TREATED.

THOSE ARE THE MAIN POINTS. I WOULDN'T GET INTO A LONG DISCUSSION
SINCE YOU HAVEN'T SEEN THE FILM. YOU CAN DEFLECT ANY QUESTIONS
BY MAKING THAT POINT.



**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

December 31, 1979

POSSIBLE QUESTIONS ON PAKISTAN:

You are likely to be asked:

Q. How are we going to terminate the ban on economic and military aid against Pakistan?

Will we supply weapons to the Afghan-Moslem guerrillas in their struggle against Soviet domination?

A: In your meeting with the correspondents on Saturday, you said, "We'll have to explore the degree and type of assistance to Pakistan with the Pakistanis. I don't want to speak for them. They have a request to us already for certain kinds of aid prior to this. And it has been processed routinely. We will expedite delivery of items already approved and we'll expedite decision on those items that were still being considered. We've not had any additional requests from Pakistan in this short period of time. The President of Pakistan and other leaders are meeting -- have been meeting today with our Ambassador Hummell and I presume he would give me some report at the conclusion of those meetings, which I have not yet received."

You might add: Pakistani requests will be viewed in the overall context of the drastically changing situation in the region.

As to aid to Afghan guerrillas, it would not be in our interest to discuss such a matter publicly.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON 12/31/79

Mr. President:

The ABC taping is
scheduled for 1 pm. They
need to set up the Oval
office at 11 am and you
will need to move to your
study.

Phil

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to be the name 'Phil', written in dark ink.

**Electrostatic Copy Made
for Preservation Purposes**

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Mr. President,

You may wish to
review quickly the
transcript of your Sat.
Nov. session in preparation
for your Mon. T.V.
interview.

Jimmy

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY

THE WHITE HOUSE

INFORMAL QUESTION AND ANSWER
SESSION WITH THE PRESIDENT

THE FIRST FLOOR FAMILY DINING ROOM

(12:00 Noon EST)

MR. POWELL: I guess before we start anything serious we ought to try to establish the ground rules. Let's keep it --

Q You mean the grace was less than serious?

MR. POWELL: You may say that the Lord feels, the Lord thinks. --(Laughter.) However, you may not quote the Lord directly. (Laughter.) The same goes for the President.

I think last time -- the last -- one of the first times we did this we got into a little bit of a problem. It was my fault for sort of changing the rules after the thing was over and some folks were off gallavanting around didn't find out about it. I believe -- I was trying to remember exactly what we had ended up with at that time and I believe that we had agreed that you could say that the President had made his views known at, you know, or -- at a lunch and just -- but you just can't say, "The President said," and you can't quote him directly. That understood -- that's a compromise Nelson between my position and yours.

Q You **can** say, "The President said." You cannot quote him directly.

MR. POWELL: You can't say, "The President said."

THE PRESIDENT: Excuse me, I had a call in to Secretary Vance who just met with the Secretary General, I will be right back.

(Brief Pause.)

Q What did he say?

Q Now you know what we put up with every day. (Laughter.)

THE PRESIDENT: Well, he said he had a good meeting with the Secretary General and the Security Council is in closed meeting now discussing the situation in Iran and later on this evening -- later than 4:00 by the way, it will be open to the public, and at that time the statements will be made including the one by Secretary Vance.

What we are trying to do is get approval for our position in the Security Council, obviously, and I think there is **probably** negotiation going on within the Security Council closed session now with which I am not familiar, to decide on the position that the Security Council will take. I am available for questions.

MORE

CORRECTED

Q Mr. President, is time running out on your restrained and patient approach to the Iranian hostages, that is, do you sense public disfavor growing with the way you are handling of situation there?

THE PRESIDENT: Well not displeasure, I think the public attitude reflects my own impatience. We have made clear our position from the beginning to protect the long-term interests of our country and to secure the safe release of our hostages as soon as possible. And we have been properly determined that our position would represent strong support from the international community and that our actions should not be precipitous or radical or ill-advised, which would put us in the role of the condemned party when it is obvious that Iran is the one who has violated all standards of propriety and international law.

So, I would say those things; to protect our interests, to work toward the early and safe release of our hostages and to keep the support of the international community.

Q Sir, looking at the public unity that you are looking for, is time running out on measures on your part short of more forceful action?

THE PRESIDENT: If we can prevail with the -- with the call for sanctions under Sections 39 and 41 of the UN Charter, that is under Chapter 7, and get an adequate support for that in the Security Council, it would be a major additional step forward. I think this would put additional notice to the Iranians. Our hope is that between now and the date the sanctions are actually imposed, that there would be an additional pressure on Iran and the whole world community, including the United Nations as the Secretary General, to try to resolve the issue immediately -- by resolve I mean to release the hostages.

So, what we are working on is to stay within the framework of international law and the Security Council of the UN and achieve our goals, but --

Q Saving that, would you want to --

THE PRESIDENT: I would rather not speculate on that, I think that the press and the rest of the public are fairly well familiar with the options that we have. We would like to avoid bloodshed. We would certainly like to act in a way that present judgment and historical judgment would show was warranted and any action that we take that would be beyond completely peaceful means, would be accordance with international law and we would be sure that that is the case.

Q Can you get something done at the Security Council before the membership of the Security Council changes? What happens if the Security Council does change its membership on January 1?

THE PRESIDENT: We will push for an early vote in the Security Council prior to the end of the year. I would say the vote could come any time between late tonight and midnight on the 31st. But, all during this day, the Security Council is, in effect, negotiating with Ambassador McHenry on the wording of the resolution that they will

pass leading to sanctions. My own hope is that there would be a interim period in there though, relatively brief, to permit the Secretary General to try to get the hostages released under direct orders from the Security Council and with a firm commitment on the part of the Security Council that if this does fail because of recalcitrance on the part of the Iranians, that the sanctions would be imposed.

Q You would go over there and talk to the Iranians?

THE PRESIDENT: I can't -- that would be a judgment to be made.

Q What kind of time limit? Two weeks?

THE PRESIDENT: I think that would be excessive, two weeks.

Q I would think by your response that you put little weight on the Iranian Prime Minister's statements to the ministers and clergymen and others that any such sanctions would be counter-productive and would tend to exert -- would lessen the chances of releasing the hostages. That is what they are saying.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I would hesitate from my own voice to add anything to the present reputation of the Foreign Minister for authenticity or consistency. I will let you judge.

Q What about the argument, though, Mr. President, that if the sanctions are imposed they will put the hostages on trial immediately?

THE PRESIDENT: I can't say what the Iranians would do. We have made our position clear on how we would view trials.

Q Do you have unanimity amongst all the nations we normally consider our Allies and partners?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Yes, so far as I know.

Q Including the Japanese?

THE PRESIDENT: As you know, the Japanese are not members of the Security Council.

Q No, they are not.

THE PRESIDENT: But I would say yes. Yes, we do.

Q What is the advantage of letting -- of having these various sanctions imposed if Iranian oil, which is the largest earner of money continue to come forward?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the sanctions that would be imposed would be the interruption of commerce to Iran and I would not consider this to be a primal limit on what sanctions might comprise. I get sometimes confused about the exact Sections, but I think that Section 39 and 41 encompass fairly extensive sanctions of an economic nature.

Section 42 is available in the United Nations Charter to be imposed by land, sea or air forces, enforcing action mandated by the United Nations.

Q Yeah, later --

THE PRESIDENT: I am not going to insinuate that our patience is infinite or that we're going to wait a long period of time. We're trying to move with this thing expeditiously. Now, I think that the recent invasion by the Soviet forces of Afghanistan will add a sobering new element to the considerations by Iran and other neighbors of Afghanistan that might color their actions in the future.

I know that the Revolutionary Council yesterday did condemn the Soviet Union and it's obvious to me that they place a very serious threat now that the Soviets are trying to take control of the government in an adjoining -- in a neighboring country.

Q You mean interference in Iran by the Soviets?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, that certainly is a possibility. It's not unprecedented, as you know. In my statement yesterday I mentioned that actions by the Soviet Union at the end of the Second World War when Truman was President; when they went in and took over Azerbaijan, to the northeastern part of Iran, and held it until Truman insisted that they withdraw.

But this to us is a very serious violation of the peace by the Soviet Union, equivalent in nature to what they have done previously, in the case of Czechoslovakia.

Q What do you think their real motive was, and what is it in that area? Have they just decided that we wouldn't do anything or what is their -- why do they feel free to move like that?

THE PRESIDENT: I can't speak for them. We are -- consulting with our own strong allies and friends and I have communicated -- in addition to my personal telephone calls yesterday with other leaders of the non-align movement and a pretty large number of leaders with whom I communicated. We are now getting responses back from them, and so far as I know at this point, there is unanimity among all of the leaders whom I contacted in their condemnation of the Soviet Union. I don't know whether the result from the Soviets' invasion -- I had recent information just a few minutes ago that -- it's not yet been fully confirmed -- that the Soviets are moving fairly large forces across the border into Afghanistan.

MORE

My own assessment is that these are deeply religious people. They are highly motivated to preserve their own independence. This has been their historical nature. And when an atheistic military regime like the Soviets and their puppets try to impose control over the relatively independent, tribal, religious people, the problems that they have, I think, would be quite severe. They will not succumb easily, I wouldn't think, to this Soviet domination.

Q Well, are you saying new land forces in addition to what we've heard about earlier this week, the airlift, and so forth?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. That's my information. That has not yet been confirmed, but I'm -- that's what I've been informed about this morning.

Q Any estimate of how many, Mr. President?

THE PRESIDENT: I'm sorry?

Q Any estimate of how many?

THE PRESIDENT: I would -- I don't know how frank with you all to be -- my present information, which is not confirmed, is that the total of Soviet forces in Afghanistan now would be between twenty and twenty-five thousand.

Q More than doubling then?

THE PRESIDENT: That's correct.

Q Do you think this is because of resistance they are getting that they are sending more in?

THE PRESIDENT: I would presume.

Q Are they going to seal off the border over in Pakistan or --

THE PRESIDENT: No. It is in the northern part of Afghanistan. It's apparently moving down toward Kabul.

Q Mr. President, are there circumstances, if the resistance continues as you expect it to do, in which the United States would aid the tribesmen who are fighting there in Afghanistan, or give them some form of recognition which might be a kind of moral support to them?

THE PRESIDENT: That is a question that I can't answer now. I talked yesterday with President Zia of Pakistan. As you know, we have a long-standing relationship of friendship and mutual support with the Pakistanis. He certainly prefers to speak for himself, but he did express to me and has expressed publicly his concern about this development. We estimate that there are several hundred thousand, maybe 300,000, Afghan refugees that presently are in Pakistan. The border is an open border, there is no way to control it and seal it off. I think there is a fluid movement, not only between Pakistan and Afghanistan, but also between the Afghans and other adjacent countries including Iran. So, I think possible action in the future would best not be discussed in detail except to say that all of us are concerned about the independence of Afghanistan.

Q Is the thinking that you are waiting to get some support for it, or is it something that you are just still pondering?

THE PRESIDENT: I think I have commented adequately on that point.

Q Mr. President, we do have a treaty with Pakistan, though, that makes it legal and permissible and possible to help Pakistan increase its ability to resist aggression or prepare itself for something of this kind. Is there anything that would stop the United States from increasing the military assistance to Pakistan under the existing treaty?

THE PRESIDENT: No, not under the existing treaty. There has been a problem with Pakistan under the so-called Symington Amendment and, I think, the Glenn Amendment to the nonproliferation legislation. We have been negotiating with the Pakistanis, both under Bhutto and Zia, for some type of assurance, adequate assurance, against the development and testing of atomic weapons. That is something that is still under negotiation and we will have to honor the American law. But other than that, there is no impediment to our giving proper -- making proper sales to Pakistan.

Q Mr. President, in your statement regarding the Soviet action in Afghanistan yesterday, and a couple of statements by other government spokesmen in the same vein --

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

Q But I am wondering whether at this point at least, whether it is the end of it or will the American policy make the Soviets pay some kind of concrete price in terms of things that they really want from us, whether it is trade or SALT or whatever is on the table which they would be obliged to pay as a result of this aggression.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, again, we have always a series of options open to us which our government will explore at this point, but I would say that I believe that SALT is needed by this country and by the world whether our relationship with the Soviets is greatly enhanced in the future, or whether or not it deteriorates. But we need to control the further deployment of nuclear weapons under any circumstance. I would like to remove that particular element of your question from my answer. But we have a range of options. My obvious hope is that individual nations around the world, collectively if they choose, would speak out and express themselves on the Soviet action. It shouldn't, and need not be, something that is orchestrated by us because it is a threat to peace on a worldwide scale. The Soviets have so-called peace and friendship agreements with several African nations. They have justified erroneously their invasion of Afghanistan because they had such a treaty with the Afghans and under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. I would guess this has caused some pause in the thinking of other nations who might fear the Soviets who have similar treaties. The Soviets have used a peace treaty, in effect, to go into this nation with heavy armed forces under the guise of helping an established government. When they got there, the established government's leader was executed -- we hear that members of his family were also executed -- and the Soviets established a puppet that they had brought in with their own forces. This is obviously a travesty of any sort of interpretation of international law and the Soviets just used this justification and it is obviously unwarranted.

Q Could I ask you what you think the future of U.S.-Soviet relations is and are we in a period of continuing decline or deterioration, to use your word? Or is there some way that this can be arrested and turned around? What do you see in U.S.-Soviet relations?

THE PRESIDENT: My preference is to have a strong and friendly relationship with the Soviet Union and all other countries. I think the future relationship between our nations, as I told President Brezhnev in a very strongly worded message yesterday on the so-called "hot-line", that relationship would be determined to a substantial degree by their actions in the future in Afghanistan. But they have obviously violated the agreement that was worked out between President Nixon and the Soviet

2-2
corrected

Union when the framework for detente was established. Their pledge to resolve issues peacefully, that we are pledged to notify one another if any action is taken that in our judgement is to correct a threat to the peace or our own security.

Q Did you get a response?

THE PRESIDENT: The reply was coming when I came over here. We had received about half of it -- in Russian. It has not yet been translated. Dr. Brzezinski can read some Russian and was describing to me what it said.

Q What did it say?

THE PRESIDENT: I really would rather get the whole text before I --

Q Can you tell us more about your own message to Brezhnev?

THE PRESIDENT: It was compatible with the public statement I made yesterday, but with a heavier emphasis on the damage that this action would do to the relationship between our two countries.

Q What damage will it do to the relationship between our two countries? Do you think they already look at this as -- that the relationship is pretty bad, they are not going to get the sort of economic benefits they wanted when they signed that 1972 letter -- do they think they have nothing to lose?

THE PRESIDENT: My guess is that the Soviets are rapidly realizing that their move in Afghanistan is going to be quite costly politically, not only in our relationship with the Soviet Union but as far as their relationship with the world community and with other individual nations is concerned. They apparently, early yesterday morning or even in the middle of the night, had their ambassadors in different world capitals go and present a patently contrived excuse for their intrusion into Afghanistan. They claim that they were going there to, for instance to one major nation, to defend Afghanistan against a third country, and when the Foreign Minister asked him which country the ambassador couldn't think of the name of one to be used.

So I think the Soviets might, in the very near future, if not already, come to realize that what they have done in Afghanistan would bring down a severe condemnation on them by the rest of the world. What specific action we would take in the future, politically or economically, would -- I just can't say yet. Because I would want to consult with our allies. That is why I sent Warren Christopher to London to meet with our major allies in the European area plus Canada, so that we can get some concerted understanding of the consequences of the Soviet action and also consult with each other about what we should do.

Q Mr. President, if I could get just one question -- in your opinion, maybe if you could just look ahead at the economy for next year, I would like to get your evaluation of what lies ahead and, more specifically, what it looks like -- if its possible for a Democratic presidential candidate -- you or someone else -- to be elected next fall if, indeed, we are in a depression?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

(LAUGHTER.)

Q What do you see ahead for this next year? Do you see a recession?

THE PRESIDENT: All the economic analyses that I have seen

23

feel, at worst, a mild recession, some alleviation of the inflation rates, some likely reduction of interest rates, a likely increase -- moderate increase we expect -- in the unemployment rate, with our country being affected about the same, adversely, as other nations around the world because of the uncontrollable increase in OPEC oil prices. But I don't anticipate any catastrophic depression or recession. When the 1981 budget proposals are revealed, I think within the next few weeks, I think I will have prepared for the eventualities that I described to you.

MORE

CORRECTES

h-l

Q Could I get back to the one aspect that you did mention of the relationship with the Soviet Union, and that is, of course, our relationship with China, which is somewhat competitive to that one.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

Q Secretary Brown, I think, is due to go in about a week or so to Peking.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, in about a week.

Q Have you made up your mind about what he is going to do or say there and what kind of relationship we are going to have on the military and security side with the People's Republic of China, or could you give us some indication of what it might be?

THE PRESIDENT: We have been discussing the purpose and the goals of this trip, I would say, since August or September...I don't remember the exact date -- it was last summer -- with the National Security Council and in our private foreign policy meetings which we have every Friday morning and with individuals. It is fairly fixed in my mind what Secretary Brown will say and do about the key issues to be discussed with the Chinese. We will obviously give him written and updated instructions shortly before he leaves and then modify them during the trip if necessary, which has been my custom ever since I have been in the White House when a major emissary went overseas.

I don't think it would be possible for me to describe to you the details.

Q Could you give us a sense of what kind of relationship we expect in this field in a general way?

THE PRESIDENT: My own feeling has been one of gratification over the last 12 months since we announced that relations with China would be normalized. We have not been disappointed in any instance. We have made steady progress in recognizing common strategic goals of our two nations. We have not and will not play the so-called "China card" by aligning ourselves along with the Chinese against the Soviet Union or any other country. This is compatible with the publicly and privately expressed desires of the Chinese as well.

We will be exploring with them ways through which the peace can be maintained in the Western Pacific. We will certainly discuss with them the latest developments in Kampuchea and Vietnam. We will bring them up to date on our own defense policies as they relate to the Japanese and to the South Koreans and to New Zealand and to Australia. They will propose certain questions to him, I am sure, and he will respond.

Our policy is not to sell military equipment, weapons, to either the Chinese or to the Soviets. We will maintain that policy. But it will primarily be a matter just for consultation and to learn more about each other and to search out those areas on which we have basic agreement and to try to resolve differences that might exist.

Q But the Afghanistan aggression sort of changed the card game considerably. No China card would be played, I easily understand. But what is your perceptions of China's views of the Soviet adventure in Afghanistan? They can't be happy about it.

THE PRESIDENT: We have already communicated with the Chinese and I would say that their assessment of the Afghanistan invasion was basically the same as ours.

3-1
corrected

Q Mr. President, could I ask you a political question? Why do you feel that you don't have time to go to Iowa if the situation in Afghanistan and Iran continues pretty much as it has been for the last several days?

THE PRESIDENT: I could not possibly have gone in the last 48 hours and what will happen in the future is just unpredictable. The time requirement is part of the reason that I chose not to participate in the debate. There is another element that is very important. I think that during this time of rapid change in international affairs which are almost unprecedented short of war, where world events might be shaped by rapid decisions made by me and no one can take that responsibility from me, it is better for me to be here constantly being briefed, assessing the situation and making judgments accordingly.

Also, it is important for me to maintain a maximum degree of unity in our country and non-partisan support. Now, because of the press of circumstances for the last two months and the fact that I have foregone my highly partisan personal political campaign activities, even not going to the fund-raising events that were so important to us, I think that I have developed a relationship with the American people which is what they want. I think the American people want a President who is here on the job taking care of these rapidly changing circumstances on a non-partisan basis. That is another element of it.

We have -- I have had a long argument which Jody can describe to you, I need not, from most of my political advisors that I should have gone. I think it would have been strongly to my political advantage, certainly in Iowa, had I been in the debate. I think I would have done well. If I could have chosen a time to reap maximum advantage, it would be during the first week in January, when I am looked upon as the President dealing with a crisis on behalf of all of the American people. That is not the point at all. But I felt after I had consulted with others and thought about it myself that I would be better served and our nation would be better served if I stayed here.

Q If the debate is moved here to Washington will you participate?

THE PRESIDENT: No. That wouldn't change the overriding considerations. I think what the American people want --

Q You mean the overriding consideration is not to appear partisan at a moment like this?

THE PRESIDENT: That's right. I think the American people now need and want a President who is serving the country on a non-partisan basis in a time of crisis and serving it well. I don't think the American people need or want a highly partisan campaigner in the same personal course to be President.

Q What about the other issues that are facing the country, such as the ones Mr. Sperling asked about, aside from Iran and the foreign policy issues, the economic issues that people would want to ask you about, and the accusation made of hiding behind the crisis?

THE PRESIDENT: That is not avoiding that. In my telegram to Jim Gannon, the editor of the Des Moines newspapers, I pointed out to him that I would use every possible means to inform and to educate the American people, not only about Iran and Afghanistan, but also on any other matter that is important to our country. That would certainly include domestic matters. It would certainly include SALT and energy and inflation and other things. I just think that the distinction needs to be drawn there. I am not sure I made the right decision politically but I don't have any doubt at all in my mind that I made the right

3.2
Corrected

as far as our own nation is concerned.

Q Mr. President, can you look back a little on this past year what you feel you have accomplished, where you failed and what you look forward to in 1980 in the overall? Personally and you know, in terms of the Presidency?

THE PRESIDENT: You do a good job of describing where I have failed.

Q Every day.

Q This is your chance, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I think the 1979 record in the Congress is going to be written in 1980, early, because we have got so many important matters being carried over, I expect temporarily into 1980, notably the windfall profits tax, the Security Corporation, and the Energy Mobilization Board. When those three measures are completed we will have achieved an overwhelming portion of the original energy proposals that I made to the nation beginning in April of 1977. We have not yet dealt adequately with the rationing authority and I think it is obvious even now to a growing number of Congress members that we cannot wait to impose gas rationing until after we have experienced a 20 percent shortage throughout the nation, which would be very damaging to our economy.

We have made good progress in other ways. The unemployment rate has been surprisingly low. Our nation's economy has assimilated the 70 or 80 percent increase in OPEC oil prices successfully. The net or real income of the American families, on the average, has held up very well. Our balance of trade has been steadily improving, almost month by month. The agriculture community has fared well. We set another record on net exports. I think by most measures of the economy the American people have been well served.

Internationally, we are at peace. We have obviously been disheartened and our nation has been deeply concerned about the seizure of our hostages. I think under those difficult circumstances we have handled it fairly well. I believe a substantial majority of the American people agree with that statement.

Q Mr. President?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes?

Q Trying to get a little perspective on the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, we consider Poland and Czechoslovakia almost as internal matters. Some people do. This is the first time I can think of since World War II where they have made a very intensive high risk military gamble to take a country. It doesn't look like they are going to be worried about world opinion on this. What are they after? Pakistan, Iran?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't have any way to speak for them. I think you would be as well able as I to conjecture. I have looked at the globe a good bit in the last few days. I think the Soviets have always had a desire for an access to the warm water outlets into the Indian Ocean. Pakistan obviously stands in their way and I hope and I expect that they will be able to retain their independence; in spite of the

MORE

3.3

Soviets moving into Afghanistan.

We will do what we can to help them and I think that that is an historical fact more than an immediate desire or expectation at least on the part of the Soviet Union. I am not predicting that that will take place.

Q Has something been done already to bolster the Pakistanis with more than promises and words? Already? In the past 48 hours?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. Our Ambassador, Mr. Hummel, has been meeting with the leaders in Pakistan to explore how aid already approved could be expedited and delivered and also to explore how the additional needs of the Pakistanis might be met more expeditiously.

Q Could I follow Pat's question? You seem to be saying -- I just want to make sure I understand you -- that you think the move into Afghanistan was part of some broader strategy, not simply that they were stuck with a regime that was dragging them further downhill and they feared the loss of a --

THE PRESIDENT: I didn't really quite finish my answer to him.

Q Okay.

THE PRESIDENT: I don't want that to be the exclusive thing. As you know, the Soviets have 40 or 50 million Moslems who live within their own borders and I think there is a fairly free movement back and forth, and ties of friendship and kinship between the Soviet Moslem citizens and those who live in adjacent countries. The Soviets have deprived those Moslem citizens of many of their basic religious rights and my information is that there has been some movement within the Soviet -- among the Soviet Moslems -- for additional freedom to worship and to act as they prefer.

The Soviets don't look well upon any sort of dissident movement within their borders and I think that would be an element of it. I think you remember that the first president, I think it was Taraki, was installed with Soviet support and it was commented upon in this country that this was a tremendous victory for the Soviet Union. This was a number of months ago. Following that, Amin took over. My information is without the foreknowledge or the support of the Soviet Union. And then the Soviets apparently worked out a relationship with Amin. My information again is that the Soviet troops entered Afghanistan with the knowledge of Amin under the guise of, according to the Soviets, of giving him some assistance. As I said earlier, they immediately brought about his execution.

Whether it was looked upon by them as a threat to stability in the Soviet Union or an extension of their sovereign control or to further the spread of atheism among Moslems, I can't say which was a pre-eminent reason. It seems unreasonable to me that they would do it because they have made a -- I think it is an historical departure from the Soviet posture, certainly since the Second World War.

Q Your opponents are going to say that they did this at this time because they judged you as uncertain or a little weak, unable to really mount any kind of offensive or to stop this sort of military threat. Your political opponents.

THE PRESIDENT: I understand what you said. It sounded like a statement to me rather than a question. I can't deny that my

4-1

political opponents might say almost anything, and I can't deny that that is one of the thoughts of the Soviet Union. I would think an additional one, however, would be the obvious religious fervor that exists now among the Moslem people of the world and the confusion that has existed, obviously, among Moslem believers, not only in Iran but in several other countries that have large Moslem populations, all the way from Pakistan to Turkey.

So one of the things that may have been a consideration is that lack of stability and unanimity among the Moslem countries. But all of what I have said in the last two answers is conjectural. I am just trying to guess what might have motivated the Soviets.

Q Isn't there a paradox between this strong protest to the Soviet Union against what they have done in Afghanistan and at the same time asking that very same country to support us in the Security Council and a little further down the line to accommodate with us on this ephemeral SALT II treaty, which looks a ways down the pike to me? With one hand you are protesting with the strongest terms and with the other hand saying, really, "Give us some help on this Security Council thing." How do you reconcile those two elements of Soviet-U.S. relations?

THE PRESIDENT: I will answer your question if you won't make me endorse all of the adjectives that you used to describe the Treaty and so forth.

Q Okay.

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think it is anomalous or paradoxical to expect the Soviet Union to condemn the seizure of an embassy and the kidnapping of embassy personnel on the one hand and to refrain from warlike activity and the invasion of a sovereign country on the other. We are not involved here in a United States versus Iran altercation. It is the world community versus Iran. So far as I know, in modern history, this is an unprecedented circumstance, where a government instigated and condoned and endorsed the kidnapping of embassy personnel. This could happen to the Soviets in the future. It could happen to any country in the future and the Soviets, directly, through their Security Council ambassador, or representative, and indirectly through their member on the International Court of Justice, have consistently condemned this action by Iran.

I don't know what the Soviets will do in the Security Council. I think if they should vote against their previously established position of acting towards the release of the hostages it would be inconsistent. But I don't see any inconsistency between our position versus expecting the Soviets to support us in the Security Council and expecting the Soviets to withdraw their troops in Afghanistan.

Q This message or exchange now of messages between yourself and Mr. Brezhnev sounds as though it is the sharpest of your Presidency.

THE PRESIDENT: It is.

Q And I wonder if you could characterize it and where it leads us with the Soviet Union.

THE PRESIDENT: It is hard for me to say now. I talked this morning with President Ziaur of Bangladesh and, as I say, we sent

4-2 ✓

out personal messages from me to the leaders of key nations around the world. We are now getting those responses back. As I said earlier, we will be consulting at the Undersecretary level with five or six other nations in London this week-end. I think the world community has got to understand the Soviet threat not only unilaterally but collectively.

As I said earlier, it is better for us not to try to instigate or to orchestrate the statements made by the non-aligned countries or the Moslem nations or the African nations or other nations in the southwest part of Asia. It is better for them to act on their own after knowing our views and after my hearing privately what their views are. We have gotten a fairly large number of responses back already. They are coming in today. So far as I know, there is unanimity in the expression of deep concern and condemnation of the Soviet Union.

Only after that process continues for a few days can we begin to see what would be appropriate unilaterally or collectively, in groups or as a world body.

Q Did you ask them to withdraw their troops from Afghanistan?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

Q In the message?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes.

Q Did you contact all of the non-aligned nations?

THE PRESIDENT: No.

Q There are over 160 of them.

THE PRESIDENT: No, I didn't. I would rather not list the nations one by one because I don't want to --

Q 12, 14, 20?

THE PRESIDENT: I would guess 20, wouldn't you, Jody? Jerry? 20 to 25. I don't want to name one exclusively.

Q Do you have any reflection on the military aspects of the Soviet invasion? That is they appear to have been able, within a short period of time, to move a large number of air mobile troops across great distances and effectively use them in battle. I wonder whether that suggests anything in terms of our own abilities. I know there is a proposal to improve our so-called "rapid deployment forces". But are you concerned about the state of our military, particularly in a time of crisis, and do you have any ideas on how we can improve our military capability?

Q Can I add onto that? Can you add into that discussion on answering about the bases or the U.S. ability to land out there?

THE PRESIDENT: Our ability to move troops is not exceeded by the ability of the Soviet Union. The distances are not all that large. They are not all that long. They are equivalent to normal commercial airplane flights. In a period of 24 to 48 hours the Soviets apparently made in excess of 200 flights and perhaps transported 3,500 troops in an unimpeded way, I presume with the concurrence of the government that was then assassinated, I am sure to their surprise.

Now, across their own border, the Soviets seem to be moving ground troops. This has not been definitely confirmed, but I believe it to be true.

4-3

We tend to forget about geography and I would hope that all of you would refresh your memory, if you haven't already, about the isolated nature of Iran and in particular Afghanistan from access from the outside world. We are not trying to invade Iran, even though it does border on the sea. But these places are extremely great distances from any existing base where American troops are habitually located.

I announced already in the defense budget projections for the next five years a decision to increase our rapid deployment capabilities and we are exploring possibilities of servicing some of our aircraft or ships in the region. We do this at many places around the world, as you know, have in the past, and still do and will do in the future.

Q Mr. President, you said you asked the Soviets. Is the word "asked"? Did you demand, did you give an ultimatum?

THE PRESIDENT: I would rather not -- it was a very strongly worded --

Q Could you possibly phrase it in the sense that would be correct? Did you warn? Did you --

THE PRESIDENT: I pointed out to President Brezhnev that their actions in Afghanistan, if not corrected, could have a very serious adverse affect on the relationship between our two countries.

Q But how would they suffer from that? I mean what is the bad consequence to them of not getting along well with us? They don't seem to think there are any.

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think that we need to go into that. Obviously there are a whole series of options politically and economically that could be exercised if we chose to in the future. But I can't go into those now.

Q A political question again, if I may. Looking at the polls and some other political developments, including Kennedy's less than spectacular beginning, do you see any possibility now that you might be able to deliver an early knock-out blow to the challengers or do you see this thing going on and on, a struggle right up until the convention? What is the scenario now of this year?

THE PRESIDENT: My guess is that it will be quite an extended series of primaries. That is the basis for our own plan.

Q How do you characterize what has happened between you and the Senator in the last few weeks? Something has happened, hasn't it? It isn't the same ballgame, is it, as it was before maybe Kennedy got into it and before the Iranian crisis?

THE PRESIDENT: No, it is not, and it won't be the same ballgame two months from now that it was two months ago. My approach to the political campaign has always been to make the most careful, detailed, specific plans that we can, to organize to the utmost of our ability and to stay until the last vote in every individual state and there is nothing that I can imagine that would happen in the next few months that would cause me to yield to anyone until the last vote is counted at the convention and then the last vote is counted next November in the general election. We will be persistent, tenacious, determined, and I hope well organized, and I believe successful.

Q Some people here who are saying or at least maybe whispering that Kennedy has had it. You are not even whispering that?

THE PRESIDENT: No.

4-4

Q How can you afford to not get out and do some campaigning? If this drags on into January or through January, into February, can you afford not to campaign in New Hampshire or not to campaign in Florida or other primary states?

THE PRESIDENT: Jack, my hope and my expectation is that I will be able to campaign before long, and I don't want to say under what circumstances I will begin to campaign, the circumstances relating to Iran, that is, or what form my campaign might take.

Q Will you be willing to debate in other primaries once you get out and decide to campaign?

THE PRESIDENT: That is a question that we will answer later on.

Q In view of the events in the area of Afghanistan and Iran, have you given any thought to increasing the 21 or so American naval presence or any other formal presence and secondly, have you given any thought to declaring one of the lower rate alerts, such as we used during the 1973 war?

THE PRESIDENT: In the first few weeks of the Iranian crisis, I believe we assessed every reasonable option that anyone could imagine, and we did it in some depth -- and in many of those where the option was a possibility for future exercise, we went through the careful preparations and in effect put the options on the shelf to be used when I decide to do it. My own belief now is that the present level of military deployment in the Northern Indian Ocean is adequate -- in the Arabian Sea is adequate.

Q Even in view of Afghanistan?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes. We will be changing ships, as you know, shortly, it has already been announced and we make some small modifications in the deployment of forces from time to time depending on changing circumstances. But I don't envision any requirement for substantial changes now.

Q You've opened up on the idea that you said you don't know if you expect to campaign in some form soon, or at some point not too far away. Are you are saying that you could campaign from the White House?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, my preference is to campaign actively and in the particular states involved prior to the primaries there, because that's the most effective way to campaign. It's a great compliment to the people in the state when a candidate goes there. And there is some understandable displeasure when a candidate does not go there and campaign actively, and as you know, my campaign style has been one of personal presence and my attitude or philosophy has not changed. I'll have to make that judgment, Helen, as the time goes by; as soon as I see a possibility to go and campaign, my preference is to go to the states involved.

Q Could you see that you might, Mr. President, while the hostages are still being held?

THE PRESIDENT: That's a possibility, but it would depend on what the prospects were for the early release of the hostages or what -- how rapidly the circumstances were changing. We have dealt

4-a

with, I would guess, more than half of the nations on earth in the last two months concerning the Iranian hostage crisis, and hardly an hour goes by that I don't have to make some decision as President about how to deal with a particular person or a particular nation or a particular circumstance in Iran domestically or in individual countries in the United Nations and so forth. I am not trying to complain about the responsibilities that I have, but those decisions cannot be made by anyone else. I think that the Security Council members, for instance -- I mean the National Security Council members -- who meet daily, sometimes for two hours, sometimes for much longer, sometimes several times during the day, have performed well. They have acted harmoniously. They have supported one another. They submit their daily reports to me in writing. I respond instantly in writing to instruct them or to decide on an option and then frequently, several times a week, I meet personally with the Security Council.

This is kind of a -- it has become somewhat routine in its form but it is in addition to all of the other responsibilities that any President has to bear. There is no way for me to have avoided spending several hours each day, for instance, in the final preparation of the 1981 budget. I had the regular appeal procedures and I am now working on the state of the union message. I am dealing with governors and mayors and county officials on different elements of the budget proposals for 1981. We are informing key members of Congress.

Now, the point is that the Iranian thing has been on top of everything else and everything else has not changed. It has not been minimized because of Iran. I think that we have done well and as soon as I see an opportunity for me to go out and campaign, then the role of an active campaigner will be added to the other activities.

MORE

~~4-5~~
4-6

MR. POWELL: We can take about -- just about one or two more questions..

Q I just wondered -- the Republican candidates are beginning to criticize your handling of the Iranian crisis. Can you expect them to continue to be silent, most of them, or do you expect now that, particularly when you are not being in a debate, that it may become a matter of --

THE PRESIDENT: I would expect their criticisms to increase.

Q You have said, sir, that the Chinese reaction was pretty much the same as our own. Can we know what the reactions of only other large power in the area, India, as far as to what's happening in Afghanistan?

THE PRESIDENT: I think they've made a public statement. I have not heard from them.

Q Could I just --

THE PRESIDENT: I think it was very mild.

Q Did you communicate with them?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't recall. I'm not sure if I did -- anyhow, but I understand that their response was very mild.

Q I'd like to ask one for the flapping end that we have here.

MR. POWELL: This will have to be the last one.

Q With regard -- if it is confirmed that the Soviets are moving large numbers of troupes across the border into Afghanistan, would this be a change of some important nature in what we have had up to now as far as the U. S. attitude, U. S. response, or would it be simply a continuation of the same situation which we have had for the last several days, in your opinion?

THE PRESIDENT: I think it would be a continuation. There would not be a dramatic change between 10,000 troops and say, 22,000 troops. It is the principle involved and the seriousness of their invasion. That is the same. Whether the troops came there by 215 transport airplanes or whether they walked across the border or rode across in vehicles, the seriousness of the matter has not changed. It is extremely serious. As I say, it is a dramatic departure, even from the actions and attitudes of the Soviet Union, and there's no need to repeat myself but, after assessment of our own position viz a viz that of other nations with whom we are consulting, then we will make a judgment about what needs to be done about it.

Q And one of those possibilities, I gather, from what you have said today, would be increased assistance -- military assistance to Pakistan which could find its way to those 300,000 --

THE PRESIDENT: I didn't exactly say that. We'll have to explore the degree and the type of assistance to Pakistan with the Pakistanis. I don't want to speak for them. They have a request to us already for certain kinds of aid --

5-1

5-1

Q Prior to this?

THE PRESIDENT: Prior to this. And it has been processed routinely. We will expedite delivery of items already approved and we'll expedite decision on those items that were still being considered. We've not had any additional requests from Pakistan in this short period of time. The President of Pakistan and other leaders are meeting -- have been meeting today with our Ambassador Hummell and I presume he would give me some report at the conclusion of those meetings, which I have not yet received.

Q You've not spoken with President Zia in the last --

THE PRESIDENT: No. I spoke to President Zia in Pakistan and I spoke to President Ziaur in Bangladesh --

Q Today was --

THE PRESIDENT: -- Bangladesh. Yesterday was Pakistan.

Q I see. Would there be any possibility later today of getting some kind of reading, even a minimum answer. of Breshnevs response to you?

THE PRESIDENT: I'll let Jerry and Jody decide that. I need to see the text first. I have enjoyed it. Thank you very much.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END

(AT 1:10 P.M. EST)

CORRECTED

5.7