

## CASE FOR CARTER

*Outline  
January 1980*

### CARTER'S CHARACTER

- UNUSUAL VICE PRESIDENCY: WITH HIM; KNOW HIM.
- REFLECTS THE VALUES OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.
  - HONEST: NEVER SHAVES THE TRUTH
  - OPEN: PRESS CONFERENCES
  - STEADY: IRAN EXAMPLE

### COURAGEOUS PRESIDENT

AND HE'S A COURAGEOUS PRESIDENT. ABOUT ONCE A DAY A PRESIDENT HAS TO CHOOSE BETWEEN HIS COUNTRY AND HIMSELF. AND THIS PRESIDENT CHOOSES HIS COUNTRY:

- PANAMA CANAL: NOT FOR HIMSELF, BUT FOR AMERICA.
- SAVED SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM: EVEN THOUGH EXPENSIVE AND UNPOPULAR.
- TACKLED THE ENERGY CRISIS WHEN NO ONE WANTED TO FACE IT.

## EFFECTIVE PRESIDENT

HE'S AN EFFECTIVE PRESIDENT.

-- AFTER 7 YEARS, SALT.

-- AFTER 30 YEARS, PRC.

-- AFTER 40 YEARS, NATURAL GAS PRICING AND DISTRIBUTION  
DILEMMA.

-- AFTER 100 YEARS, CIVIL SERVICE REFORM.

-- AFTER 2,500 YEARS, EGYPT AND ISRAEL AT PEACE: CHILDREN  
OF ABRAHAM.

THAT'S WHY NATIONAL JOURNAL AND CONGRESSIONAL QUARTERLY  
SAY HIS LEGISLATIVE RECORD STANDS SHOULDER-TO-SHOULDER WITH THE  
BEST RECORD ANY PRESIDENT HAS EVER PRODUCED.

## PROGRESSIVE PRESIDENT

HE'S A COMPASSIONATE PRESIDENT. ANYONE WHO LEARNED AT THE  
FEET OF HUBERT HUMPHREY KNOWS A PROGRESSIVE WHEN HE SEES ONE, AND  
JIMMY CARTER IS A PROGRESSIVE PRESIDENT.

-- JOBS: 9 MILLION IN NATION

-- FIRST COMPREHENSIVE URBAN POLICY IN HISTORY: BETWEEN UDAG AND EDA, WE'VE INCREASED URBAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT 3,000%.

-- MINORITIES AND WOMEN:

- HALF OF ALL WOMEN EVER IN CABINET SERVE UNDER CARTER;
- MORE MINORITIES AND WOMEN ON FEDERAL BENCH THAN ALL 38 PREVIOUS PRESIDENTS COMBINED.

-- FARM PROGRAM:

- FARMER-HELD RESERVES;
- PROMOTED EXPORTS: 3 RECORD YEARS IN ROW;
- PROMOTED TRANSPORTATION: BROKE LOG-JAM ON LOCKS AND DAM 26;
- RAISED PRICE SUPPORTS AND REJECTED PRICE CONTROLS.
  - TARGET PRICE FOR CORN UP OVER 40% SINCE WE TOOK OFFICE [AND PROPOSED 7% MORE NEXT YEAR]
  - TARGET PRICE FOR WHEAT UP NEARLY 50%
  - LOAN LEVEL FOR SOYBEANS UP 80%

THAT'S THE RECORD OF THE FIRST FARMER-PRESIDENT IN THIS CENTURY.

### PRESIDENTIAL QUESTIONS

-- CARTER'S LOOKING BETTER.

- A MONTH AGO POLLS SO BAD I WASN'T SURE MY WIFE WAS GOING TO VOTE FOR ME.

-- BUT NOW DIFFERENT: FOR CANDIDATES MUST ANSWER THE "PRESIDENTIAL QUESTIONS":

- LIKE HOW DO YOU CONTROL INFLATION AND STILL KEEP THE ECONOMY GROWING AND KEEP AMERICANS AT WORK?
- HOW DO YOU HOLD DOWN THE BUDGET AND STILL STRENGTHEN OUR NATION'S DEFENSE?
- HOW DO YOU SOLVE THE ENERGY CRISIS AND STILL KEEP ENERGY AFFORDABLE?
- HOW DO YOU STRIKE A POSTURE OF STRENGTH OVERSEAS AND YET STILL PRESERVE THE PEACE?

THIS PRESIDENT HAS BEEN FACING THESE PRESIDENTIAL QUESTIONS FOR ALMOST THREE YEARS. AND THE AMERICAN PEOPLE KNOW IT. THEY CAN TELL HE CARES ABOUT THE NEXT GENERATION, AND NOT JUST THE NEXT ELECTION. AND THAT'S HOW A PRESIDENT SHOULD BE.

#### KENNEDY

I LIKE TED KENNEDY; FRIENDS FOR MANY YEARS. BUT WE HAVE A GOOD PRESIDENT NOW -- DECENT, PATRIOTIC, COURAGEOUS, EFFECTIVE, PROGRESSIVE. AND ALL OF US WHO MIGHT WANT TO BE PRESIDENT SOMEDAY CAN WAIT A WHILE.

#### CARTER'S EXPERIENCE

AND ONE THING MORE: HIS EXPERIENCE.

-- ONLY ONE PRESIDENT SINCE WORLD WAR II HAS SERVED TWO TERMS.

-- I SERVED IN SENATE 12 YEARS: LEARNED MORE IN TWO AND A HALF IN THE WHITE HOUSE -- ABOUT THIS COUNTRY, THE ECONOMY, OUR DEFENSES, OUR RELATIONS OVERSEAS.

-- WHEN YOU'VE GOT A GOOD PRESIDENT. . .AND HE'S HONEST. . . AND HE OBEYS THE LAW. . .AND HE WORKS HARD. . .AND HE'S EFFECTIVE AND COURAGEOUS AND PROGRESSIVE -- KEEP HIM THERE. KEEP HIM WORKING FOR AMERICA.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

## THE CASE FOR CARTER

### THE TESTS

The American people are mature and shrewd. They know how to judge a candidate for President. They know what leadership means. I'm confident that President Carter will meet the tests of the American people -- and win renomination and re-election.

### LEADERSHIP MEANS PERFORMANCE

First, it will be asked, Is this man a leader? Is he effective? Is he competent? Can he get things done? Promises and personality are nice, <sup>Glitter and glamour are fun. But</sup> performance is everything.

President Carter meets that test. His record is a stunning series of breakthroughs.

- o After years of negotiation, it was Jimmy Carter who concluded the SALT treaty -- and signed a far better document than the draft he inherited.
- o After 15 years of talks, it was Jimmy Carter who concluded a Panama Canal treaty -- and got it ratified against overwhelming odds.
- o After 40 years of inaction, four decades of haggling between producing and consuming states, it was Jimmy Carter who resolved the natural gas pricing and distribution dilemma.
- o After a generation and more of rhetoric and posturing about government waste, it was Jimmy Carter who said no to ~~the~~ pork-barrel and sacred cows ~~and~~ and despite all predictions, he made <sup>these</sup> vetoes stick.
- o Candidates love to talk about fiscal responsibility -- but when the campaign is over, they love their popularity even more. It was Jimmy Carter who inherited the biggest deficit in our history -- and despite the pain, despite the controversy, he cut it in half.

*aggravation  
politics*

*vetoes not the  
aggravation;*

- o Complaints about government inefficiency and intrusiveness have become an election-year institution -- but promises are soon forgotten. It was Jimmy Carter who cut paperwork at HEW by 25%...who reduced the Federal payroll by 20,000 people...who eliminated 1000 nit-picking OSHA regulations...who deregulated the airlines...and who got the Congress to pass the first overhaul of the Civil Service System in a century.

The examples go on and on. But don't listen to me on Jimmy Carter's effectiveness..

- o Listen to Forbes, the business magazine, which says, "Shouldn't we credit Carter with fat dividend checks, record high employment, cheaper airline fares, and a general level of economic well-being without parallel in the history of the world?"
- o Listen to Congressional Quarterly. One reporter examined over thirty years of data compiled by that journal, and found that Carter outranks every post-war Republican President; and that his congressional success rate stands shoulder-to-shoulder with the Kennedy-Johnson years, when resources were plentiful, and committee chairmen ruled the Congress.

#### LEADERSHIP MEANS PROGRESSIVE VALUES

The second question the American people will ask their candidates for President is this: Does he put his leadership in the service of progressive values? Is he committed to the needy, the marginal, and the vulnerable in American society? Does his record carry on our great tradition of compassion, and decency, and social justice?

President Carter meets that test.

- o Where we inherited tragic unemployment, we have created a record-breaking 8 million new jobs.
- o Where we inherited a legacy of vetoes and impoundments, we have secured the largest increase in support for education in American history -- a 60% boost.

- o To replace despair with hope, and inaction with solutions, we have created an unprecedented \$4 billion youth employment effort.
- o We have saved the Social Security System -- on which 35 million aged and disabled Americans depend -- from imminent bankruptcy.
- o Virtually every Democratic mayor in the country will tell you that we have fashioned the first pro-cities policy in our history.
- o With net income up over 35% since 1976, American farmers are having one of their best years ever.
- o President Carter has done more than any other American political leader alive today to ensure that our need for energy, food, fiber, timber, minerals, and room to grow will never ride roughshod over our priceless natural heritage and environment.
- o We have returned the government and its intelligence agencies to the rule of law.
- o We have made an all-out commitment to civil rights enforcement -- from cease-and-desist in housing, to support for ERA. *Half of all women over 65 to serve in the Cabinet have been appointed by Carter. No has*
- o We have appointed more women and minorities to top administration positions than any prior President, ~~and we have~~ appointed more women and minority judges than all previous 38 Presidents combined.

#### LEADERSHIP MEANS STRENGTH

The third question the American people will ask their candidates for President is this: Can he strengthen America? Can he increase our security? Can he add stability to the global community?

President Carter meets that test as well.

- o Our predecessors talked about American strength. But in 7 out of 8 years they let defense spending decline.

It was Jimmy Carter who joined with our NATO allies to produce a 3% real defense increase each year.

- o Our predecessors built grand geopolitical theories. But when they were through, America was supporting colonial powers in Africa; we had practically no relations with Nigeria, one of our major oil suppliers; and around the third world, we were met with harshness and suspicion.

Today we have put American values at the heart of foreign policy. We stand for human rights and majority rule. And in Latin America, in Africa, in Asia and the Pacific, we are reaping the powerful dividends of cooperation and respect.

- o Our predecessors were proud of their diplomatic wizardry and intricate consultations.

But it was Jimmy Carter who won the trust of the parties in the Middle East; who entered the fray against the experts' advice; and who emerged with the sons and daughters of Abraham united for the first time in 2500 years.

- o Our predecessors believed in peace. But they risked American lives for the sake of macho politics, and gave us the Mayaguez disaster.

It is Jimmy Carter who has steered our foreign policy with maturity and restraint. And I am deeply proud to serve with a President who is the first President in 56 years in whose term no American ~~boy has fallen~~ in combat.

*Soldier has been killed*

#### LEADERSHIP MEANS A VISION FOR THE FUTURE

A fourth test the American people will ask their candidates for the presidency to meet is this: Does he have a vision of the future? Does he anticipate problems? Can he lead us into the American '80s?

Jimmy Carter meets that test.

- o When they said the energy crisis was a hoax, a conspiracy, who said it was real? When they said we could just cut some deal with another country, who said America had to cut her imports? When they said there had to be some cheap ~~answer~~, who had the courage to say it would be painful? ~~for all of us?~~ The answer is Jimmy Carter.

*and easy way out,*

There are difficult times for leadership. It's different world than the Washington of the early '60s, when we could pass program after program... and hold a stable dollar. It didn't work that long any more. We can't have anything like that. If you told us every good idea to spend money, we would be short a trillion dollars in doing debt by Tuesday afternoon. 5. I'm for my best good idea. But a President truly had got to have confidence. But with things like problems -- and a little truly is better.

To keep price controls in place might be politically attractive. But it would increase our dependence on OPEC and produce not a single new drop of oil. Is that leadership? To turn windfall profits over to the oil companies would be simple. But it would be utterly without benefit to our future energy security. Is that leadership?

- o When President Carter proposed his energy program, he mapped out a vision for the 1980s. They said that this country would never move on it. Yet today, we have already made dramatic progress toward stand-by rationing; toward an Energy Mobilization Board; a windfall profits tax; an Energy Security Corporation; emergency fuel assistance for the poor; and toward a new Solar Bank. I say that's leadership.

We didn't want a \$67 billion deficit -- but that's what the Republicans gave us. We didn't want the energy problem -- but that's what we inherited. We didn't want to raise social security taxes -- but the impending bankruptcy of that program was the time bomb we found ticking when we arrived. We are dealing with the real problems of the real world in which we live. And we are determined to <sup>stronger</sup> ~~make a better~~ more progressive, and more just America <sup>than the one we inherited.</sup> give our children

You don't measure a President against impossible abstract standards. When you run against the Lord, He always looks better. Instead, you ask, Is the President right on the issues? Is he dealing with them?

← You don't measure a President against perfection. In our system, thank God, the President isn't a czar. And our Constitution never once enshrines the goal of efficiency in our legislative process. You measure a President on the record he achieves -- and we're proud of ours. The more <sup>our</sup> record is debated, the better it looks. It stands up to the tests of leadership. We have performed. We have been true to ~~the~~ progressive values. We have built America's strength. And we have a vision for the future.

THAT is it goes on 8

### THE QUESTIONS

To those in either Party who wish to be President, I ask this:

*Heat on homes with rhetoric? Pull down OPEC prices with emotional speeches?*

- o When OPEC raised its prices by 60% this year, causing a quarter of the inflation we are enduring today, what would they have done? Pretend the problem wasn't there? Perpetuate ~~forever~~ a creaky controls system that was stifling domestic production and misallocating our petroleum products? Would they have us go to war?
- o Would they champion a huge, irresponsible, across-the-board tax cut -- one that sounds good on the stump, but would be disastrous to our fight against inflation? Would they write a gimmicky balanced-budget amendment into the Constitution -- one that promises a quick fix, but would forever destroy our capacity to ride through tough times in the business cycle?

THIS  
IS  
(B)  
+ it  
gives me  
p.8

### KENNEDY THE CHALLENGER

Today we face unique political circumstances. A challenger seeks to take the nomination from an incumbent President of his own Party, ~~but no serious differences on issues divide the challenger from the President.~~

No single dominating issue -- no Vietnam -- splits our Party or our nation. No disagreement exists about the paramount problems we face -- energy, inflation, national security. Our challenger has been in substantial agreement with us on most of the questions facing the nation -- and he has said as much. He has been one of our strongest supporters in the Senate. He has not been critical of our ~~economic policy, of our foreign policy~~ <sup>or</sup> of our domestic initiatives. In nearly three years, he has found little fault with us. Where there have been

other areas domestic programs, and defense -- ~~the President~~ <sup>the President</sup> followed <sup>the President</sup> trained his <sup>points, and</sup> <sup>joined the</sup> <sup>mainstream.</sup>

<sup>(spending for)</sup>  
differences, such as on health insurance, they have been ~~on the edge of~~ <sup>disagreements</sup> which can easily be accommodated ~~within the Democratic Party's wide-open tradition.~~ Both of us, together, have pursued policies we thought best for the country -- policies which have received broad support both within the Party and across the nation.

If our challenger doesn't want the Presidency in order to alter our priorities or our policies -- what is it about the White House that attracts him? What drives him to seek the defeat of a sitting President, of his own Party, with whom he largely agrees?

That question is for the challenger to answer.

THE RACE

In our system, of course, anyone who wants to run is entitled to run -- and that's how it should be. We welcome debate <sup>on this issue -- because we want the American people to know</sup> for we are happy to compare what we propose to do <sup>all our challengers' ideas.</sup> in the future with the proposals of any and all challengers. We invite scrutiny -- for in three years, we have compiled a

~~record of which any Democratic President could be proud.~~

<sup>But they must be specific. They must say how they'd do things differently.</sup>  
~~Our Democratic challenger must state how he would do things differently -- to hold down inflation, to meet the energy crisis, to strengthen our national security. Because~~

he has broadly supported us on these and so many other issues over three years, it is up to him to fill the vacuum in public debate he has opened -- up to him to spell out in detail the ways his proposals for the future differ from ours.

~~For generalities aren't enough when you're talking about~~  
~~the Presidency.~~ The cost of a market basket, the bill for  
foreign oil -- these are <sup>the</sup> real problems <sup>of the real world in which we live ...</sup> and the American  
people want real answers <sup>to them</sup>.

The more our record is debated, the better it looks.  
It stands up to the tests of leadership. We have performed.  
We have been true to progressive values. We have built  
America's strength. And we have a vision for the future.

And if that isn't leadership, then what is? Rhetoric?  
Emotional speeches? Inspiration? Will stem-winders pull  
down OPEC prices? Will emotion create new barrels of oil?  
Will inspiration stall inflation?

We have made <sup>hard-m.</sup> important beginnings in tackling ~~head-on~~  
these difficult problems. <sup>INSERT (B) from p. 6</sup> We never thought it would be  
easy--and it's not. We have never tried to mislead the  
American people into believing that there are quick and  
simple solutions -- for there aren't any. These problems  
require responsible long-term solutions, and persistence  
in seeing them through. They don't lend themselves to quick  
fixes -- and anyone who suggests they do is wrong.

#### A SECOND TERM

<sup>INSERT (A) from p. 5</sup>  
We don't claim perfection. We don't claim to have done  
everything right or to have all the answers. But I'm con-  
vinced we have the best answers available. And we're going to  
stick with them. That's why this Administration deserves a

second term. It's not just because we have a good record -- as impressive as that record is. It is because we have set in motion a set of policies that are in the long-term best interests of our country. We must see those policies through if we're to have any hope of licking our most serious problems. These are policies that have the support of the Congress and of the country. The record proves that beyond any doubt. Equally important, no one -- absolutely no one -- has come forth with any better answers.

The question of this campaign is whether we are going to persist in pursuing those policies, or whether we will allow ourselves to be distracted from them by the emotional rhetoric of a campaign. I believe the vast majority of people want to see us persist, because they know there are no quick or easy answers. They know there are only difficult and often painful choices which require fair solutions and decisive leadership.

Americans have a history of being tough on our Presidents, and perhaps that's as it should be. We <sup>must</sup> ~~should~~ hold them accountable. But in recent years perhaps we've had a tendency to be too tough on them; increasingly, we expect our President, whoever he may be, to solve nearly every conceivable problem on the horizon -- and to solve it at once. But we're living in a complex, interdependent world. We can't control OPEC, or so many of the other forces at work in the world.

What we can do is to develop responsible and progressive policies which sustain and strengthen our national interests. What we can do is to see these policies through -- forcefully and vigorously and fairly.

That's what this President is doing, and that's why we're confident as we face the future. We look forward to a tough and open fight. We will go the distance. And we are encouraged by what we see all over the country.

In Florida, we won a 2-to-1 victory, even in counties where we frankly didn't think we'd do so well.

Democratic county chairmen across the country were polled -- and we're leading Kennedy 2-to-1.

In national polls, we've gained ground in recent weeks. And besides, if opinion polls were right, Tom McIntyre <sup>and</sup> ~~and~~ Mike Dukakis <sup>ARM</sup> were going to win <sup>ARM</sup> ~~and~~ and Brendan Byrne, Ella Grasso, Hugh Carey, and Hugh Gallen might as well have thrown in the towel.

The support I saw at the Carter dinner in Washington from a broad cross-section of Senators, Congressmen, Governors, mayors, county commissioners, civil rights and labor and religious leaders -- that support is encouraging, and it's growing.

Everywhere I travel around the country I'm discovering a broad and deep regard for the President. I'm convinced we will win a second term -- because the American people recognize strong and responsible leadership when they see it...and because they want this Administration to have the opportunity to finish the work it has begun.



OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

WASHINGTON

November 5, 1979

ADMINISTRATIVELY  
CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR DICK MOE

FROM: FRED MARTIN

RE: DEALING WITH KENNEDY

I think we might be making a mistake in our handling of Kennedy's candidacy. Specifically, I think we are mistaken to say that Kennedy differs little from us and that therefore he must explain why he seeks the defeat of a Democratic President.

1) First of all, the President himself has said several times that we do differ with Kennedy -- that Kennedy is a big spender, and that Kennedy favors a smaller defense program.

2) Second, the political advantage seems to lie in pointing out this difference, not minimizing it. Several weeks ago a New Hampshire poll showed that more people opposed Kennedy because of his "liberalism" than because of his personal history. And today a Yankelovich poll shows that Carter has reduced the gap between himself and Kennedy (from 2 to 1 down to a 10 point gap) because a growing number of people see Kennedy as too liberal.

3) Third, Kennedy has taken to emphasizing our differences lately. That is, he is doing what we say he hasn't done-- spelling out in detail the things he would have done differently (on decontrol and the windfall tax, for instance). And the press has given this extensive coverage--in West Virginia, Buffalo, and on the CBS special.

It therefore seems that we should rethink our line-- first to conform to the President's position; second because the President has found the right political position; and third because Kennedy has rendered our tactic obsolete.

All this argues for stressing our differences--for explaining and promoting our record; for portraying Kennedy as a big spender and a weak advocate of defense; and for describing what our future would be like--in terms of the deficit, inflation, energy production, our military posture--if the country adopted Kennedy's programs.

cc: Marty Kaplan



# MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



[www.mnhs.org](http://www.mnhs.org)