

File: IRAN-IRAQ
~~Yia~~ LDX

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

~~CONFIDENTIAL WITH
SECRET ATTACHMENT~~

NSC-5400 XX

October 1, 1980

MEMORANDUM FOR:

THE VICE PRESIDENT
THE SECRETARY OF STATE
THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY
THE CHAIRMAN, JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF
THE DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

SUBJECT: Agenda for SCC Meeting Meeting on Saudi
Request for Military Assistance (U)

Attached is the agenda for the SCC Meeting on the Saudi request
for military assistance scheduled for October 3, 1980 at 9:00 a.m.
in the White House Situation Room. (C)

Christine Dodson

Christine Dodson
Staff Secretary

Attachment

~~CONFIDENTIAL WITH
SECRET ATTACHMENT~~

Review on October 1, 1981

SANTIZED

NLJC-07-108
per 5/1/07 NSC/lt
BY 6 NARA, DATE 5/21/07

COPY CARTER LIBRARY

~~SECRET~~AGENDA FOR SPECIAL COORDINATION COMMITTEE

The agenda for the SCC on Friday, October 3, 1980, at 9:00 a.m. on followup actions on the Saudi request for military assistance is as follows:

1. [REDACTED]
 - a. situation update; and
 - b. the Soviet role. (S)
2. State's assessment of:
 - a. UN action;
 - b. Allied reactions; and
 - c. Bahrain's request for a defense relationship. (S)
3. Defense's report on status of:
 - a. talks with the Saudis on air defense; and
 - b. multilateral naval planning. (S)
4. Energy report on contingency plans. (S)
5. Recommended further actions. (S)

COPY CARTER LIBRARY

~~SECRET~~

Review on October 1, 2000
Extended by Z. Brzezinski
Reason for Extension: NSC 1.13(e)

Iran

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

TALKING POINTS FOR ACTING SECRETARY'S BRIEFING OF SENATOR BYRD

-- The armed conflict between Iran and Iraq continues to expand with renewed attacks by both sides on economic and industrial targets and apparently extensive penetrations by Iraqi forces across the Iranian border.

-- The Iranians have shelled and bombed an Iraqi refinery at Basra and have reportedly attacked Iraqi oil-loading facilities in the Gulf.

-- The Iraqis have bombed the Japanese built petro-chemical complex at Bandar Khomeini.

-- The Iraqi Government claims its ground forces have cut off Abadan and Khorramshar and have taken some territory in the central sector, including the city of Qasr-e-Shirin.

-- There are continuing reports of air attacks from both sides against a number of targets.

-- The United States has publicly and privately declared its non-involvement in the conflict, urged a quick end to hostilities and called on others, especially the Soviets to maintain a hands-off policy.

-- We believe our objective of a quick end to hostilities, diminishing the impact of the conflict on the hostage issue and preventing Soviet exploitation of instability are best

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DECLASSIFIED
NLJC-07-108
per 5/1/07 NSC/Hr
BY 6 NARA DATE 5/21/07

COPY CARTER LIBRARY

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

- 3 -

served by a low profile, keeping others in front in pushing for Security Council action and other mediation initiatives.

- We are quietly supporting Security Council efforts to bring about a cease-fire; we are consulting with a wide range of governments on the implications of the conflict and urging their support for SC efforts and for any additional efforts that the Islamic Conference may be able to make.
- The Secretary is very active in the consultations with Foreign Ministers now in New York for the UNGA.
- To date, Soviets appear to be pursuing policy parallel to ours, i.e., neutral between the two parties and urging an early end to hostilities. The Soviets may have some leverage with the Iraqis through their military supply relationship, but they are probably reluctant to use it at this time. In the near term, the Soviets may look for ways to expand their influence in the area by attempting to mediate between Iran and Iraq. Over longer term, Iraqi military predominance over Iran could lead to greater destabilization in Iran and increase the prospects for Soviet intervention.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

COPY CARTER LIBRARY

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

- 3 -

-- We see a continued conflict as extremely dangerous because:

- oil supplies from the Gulf may be threatened by the actions of one or both of the combatants with serious consequences for our Western allies and Japan;
- a greatly weakened Iran will have even greater difficulty in resolving the hostage crisis;
- the opportunities for expanded Soviet influence in the region may increase, as might the dangers of Soviet intervention in Iran.

-- Oil exports from both Iraq and Iran have been suspended. An excellent world-wide supply situation at present means that we and other consumers can live with this shortfall of 2 to 2.6 million bpd for some months.

-- Oil shipments from other Gulf ports appear to be proceeding, ~~normally~~. *ALTHOUGH TANKER TRAFFIC IS LIGHTER THAN NORMAL.*

- The Iranians have declared their coastal waters a war zone and have issued maritime instructions for foreign ships to avoid this zone. Iranian warships are positioned at the Strait of Hormuz. They are reported to be querying merchant ships by radio as to their destination, but have not so far interfered with passage through the Strait.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

COPY CARTER LIBRARY

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

- 4 -

- We are making clear publicly our support for freedom of navigation in the Strait and Gulf and will be consulting closely with Allies and Gulf states on possible threats to free passage. We are not considering any naval movements in the Strait at this time.
- The hostage issue has been used by both sides. Baghdad announced Iran had released the hostages in an effort to assert U.S.-Iranian collaboration. Iran has announced the freezing of the issue in Parliament while the conflict continues and the students have indicated the hostages have been moved around for their protection. We have in both public statements and in private messages to the Iranians sought to delink the hostage issue from the conflict and to make the point that a solution to the hostage crisis is in our mutual interest.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT
WASHINGTON, D.C.

10/10

TO: Denis Clift
FROM: AL EISELE

F.Y.I.

file: IRAN-IRAQ

SLUG:MONDALE9
QU:BERTRA-USR

VER:00
HJ:

BY:BERTRA;0 REVISOR:LIFTMA;10/07,11:14
MSG:

DECLASSIFIED

Per: Rec Proj # 07-108

ESDN: NLG-

BY: CO NARA, DATE 5/21/07

This is the transcript of an interview with Vice President
Walter F. Mondale conducted at The Globe on Thursday, September
25, 1980.

Q. (Winship) Well, this is swell. It's always fun to have the Vice President here because he's such a straight person and he goes off the record less than most people do.

DECLASSIFIED

NLTC-07-108

Per 5/1/07 NISC/1r

BY: CO NARA, DATE 5/21/07

A. That's because I have less confidence ...

Q. Anyhow, The Globe, Davis Taylor who runs this joint and I for the paper are just thrilled to have you here and let's go to it.

A. Tom, thanks very much and I always appreciate this chance to have an opportunity to speak and discuss with leadership of this paper the concerns of our nation and humanity and I think it's particularly important that discussions of this kind occur as we near again that fateful decision that we make quadrennially about who should lead this nation of ours. I just came from MIT where I delivered a speech, one of several that I've been giving around the nation on different topics, trying to deal in a comprehensive way with a particular problem. The reason I cite that is that if it is yet uncertain that we've developed effective Stealth technology in the defense field, I have managed perfectly to develop the Stealth technology in terms of my speeches. They do not appear on any radar screen, newspaper, television screen or anything else. And we are constantly advised properly that we've had enough political scut work out of all of you, how about talking to the issues of today and tomorrow in constructive comprehensive ways that will allow us to measure what you really want to do, whether you should be trusted with our future and create a debate about the real matters that bear upon America's future. Today I talked about science and technology, about a major new initiative that's underway in our government to enhance the capacity of our excellent centers of research, in universities, in laboratories, graduate assistants, libraries, languages and the rest, that will permit them and in a role to cooperate between these centers and industry and excellent centers of industry to help in this whole growing concern about the resurgence and the modernization of American competitive posture in the world. If you don't have anything else to do, you might take a look at the speech.

Q. Speaking of making the radar screens, you may not make our radar screen unless you clip that on.

A. I don't want to miss that. The second thing is, we might talk just a minute about the Iranian-Iraqi matter. I've asked, since I've been on the road for a couple of days, I asked Peter Constable who is with me today, who is deputy assistant secretary on Near East and South Asian affairs, to come along.

COPY CARTER LIBRARY

along with Dennis Cliff (sp?), my foreign policy adviser who is here, in case you want to get into that matter in some detail and he's preparing to certainly stay back if one or more of you would like to go into that, our current assessments and so on. That situation and the fact that some 2.6 or 2.8 million barrels of oil would have been going on to the world market have been interrupted, temporarily I hope, reminds us again of the absolutely crucial nature of the problem of energy in our country and the world. We need to solve it. Energy these past few years, energy problems, have been the chief source of inflation. They've been the chief threat to our jobs and it poses the greatest threat to American independence. And the biggest threat to world stability because obviously energy is a world problem. And I think it's a good issue to test presidential leadership in this campaign. Over three years ago the President came before the Congress that wasn't listening, and most of us weren't, and warned us about the danger of the crisis and called on the nation and the Congress at that time to put in place the fairly massive program of energy conservation and production. The speech was received with, I would say, a minimum response at first. But the President kept at it and persisted long before we had gas lines or inflation, and as a result now, we have several things in place that are very, very significant. The 1978 Gas Act that gives us natural gas distribution, more natural gas -- we haven't had a gas outage in two years, people in fact are hooking up to gas. We have the tax credit legislation in the past two years -- 11 million Americans have retro-fitted their homes, insulated their homes and the rest as a result of these tax credits. We've had a much stronger response to our legislation dealing with smaller cars, more fuel-efficient cars than we could have anticipated. As the result of our policies, there are more oil and gas rigs at work today in this country than at any time in 25 years. The constantly declining rate of production in the lower 48 states has been arrested. There are more oil and gas wells being drilled this year than any time in American history. The link between economic growth and units of energy needed to fuel it has been broken, so that where it used to be one unit per one unit of increase, it's now something like four-tenths, I believe, of an energy unit. And this past month we imported 100 million barrels less per month than we did a year ago. And I don't have the exact figures, I think something like 25 or 27 percent less energy, imported oil than just two or three years ago. And we're just starting now to get in place the tremendous energy conservation and productive benefits out of the Windfall Profits Tax and the Energy Security Corp., which will increase a whole range of conservation efforts -- a whole range of efforts to develop alternative forms of energy, solar, geothermal, gasohol and the rest, and the synthetic liquids efforts. All of this is in place because we had a leader that solved a problem ahead of its time, before it was current political crisis, asked our nation to lead and he has led. Our opponent, on the meantime, recently said that he thought the federal government should "do nothing" about energy. He's against the Windfall Profits Tax,

(MORE)

the Energy Security Corp. He's against speed limits. He doesn't think there should be any federal solar energy effort whatsoever. He's against the low-income fuel assistance program. He wants the Dept. of Energy abolished. He has no program, except simply letting big oil have its way. I think this is a good test of presidential leadership and I think the President, he said an A-minus, I think knowing how tough this has been and the heat he's taken, I'd give him an A. And I think Mr. Reagan flunks. I'm sure you're surprised to hear that grade but I know you're overworked and I want to help you.

C. Why don't you tell us, I guess a logical follow would be, why don't you bring us up to speed on Iran and Iraq, politically or militarily.

A. I'll start and then I'll ask Peter to jump in. We are watching this situation very, very carefully. I'll go over some of these points. The conflict continues to expand, with renewed attacks from both sides, apparently directed at economic and industrial targets, petroleum particularly, and there have been extensive penetrations by Iraqi forces across the Iranian border. The Iranians have shelled and bombed an Iraqi refinery at Basra and have reportedly attacked an Iraqi oil loading facility in the Gulfs. The Iraqis have bombed the Japanese-built petrochemical complex at Bandar Khomeini and they claim their ground forces have cut off Abadan and Khurramshahr and have taken some territory in the central sector. They are continuing reports of air attacks from both sides and continuing reports against a number of targets. The situation continues to escalate at this point. The United Nations, as you know, is pushing hard for restraint. They have not yet formally called for a ceasefire but they're in the process of negotiating and developing a way that that might be done. We have said, and I want to repeat again, that we are not involved on either side, don't intend to be, that we want all other outside sources, including the Soviets, to do the same and at this point I think that is the situation. I think it's very important to try to keep this dispute between Iraq and Iran, and then to get those two countries to wind down the hostilities and resolve their differences and not to try to internationalize it further. There is about 2.6 or 2.8 million barrels of oil from Iraq and Iran that have been interrupted -- that's per day. Another third of the Iraqi production is still moving through the pipeline that goes north. But it is a substantial blow to their oil exports and I think I'm right in this, it terminates all Iranian exports. Now let's go off the record a minute if we can:

We had an intercept, not an intercept, but we were told the other day by an Iraqi official that they were going to stop in about two days. Whether they will or not, we don't know. They've had so much success, in fact, that they may feel encouraged to carry on. We are not, and cannot be totally sure what they're up to or whether they are sure of what they're up to, but we think what it is, it may be two or three things. One, they were

took away their water rights to the river and to some land, and they sense, they see that Iran is in a weakened condition and they thought this was the time to strike.

Q. Excuse me, surely this part is not off the record.

A. Let me just finish that and then we'll go back because I don't like to, it's one thing to give you our estimates. It's another thing for me to be publicly giving estimates because of the very tender and xenophobic nature of that area. And since both sides are blaming us, I think the less we appear, for example, even the United Nations efforts, we're being very careful to make certain that other nations lead and that we're behind in supporting them and not up front because, for many reasons and especially because of our hostages. The second thing is, so that and if that report the other day is correct, it would seem a possibility that they will move into Khuzistan and so on and hold that refinery which the Iranians need for their kerosene and so on, a threat to Khomeini, humiliation of that country. And then sit on that until Iran will negotiate a return to what they lost in the '75 agreement or maybe some more. That's one possibility. Another possibility or maybe as a part of their consideration, is the fear that the Iraqi government has of Khomeini's constant effort to excite Shiite unrest and concern in Iraq. As I understand it, the Shiites are a majority of the makeup of the Iraqi population and they see Khomeini as a major threat and a menace to them and in their own internal government. And the third thing is to serve the Iraqi interests in becoming the dominant force in that part of the world, replacing the shah and so on as the force to be reckoned with. There may be some other factors but those seem to be among the matters that would be driving the Iraqis. It is a very, very hairy situation because both nations desperately need the oil revenues. Iraq less than Iran. Iran needs it badly. Iran also needs to produce the products, kerosene and so on, to keep the people warm in the winter. The attack on Iran is a profound humiliation of the Iranians. It tears apart again these old wounds that have been around for centuries -- Iraqi-Iranian hostilities. And one wonders what Khomeini's response will be. Will it be a paranoid, xenophobic, irrational kind of long-term struggle that will lead to more bloodshed and war and hostility, and God knows what else, or will it force him to come to terms with the practical predicament that he is in. An economy that is on its knees, dreadful shape, and now losing the one thing that has held it together which is oil revenues. That's the only thing that's kept Iran going this last year. A nation whose military forces are obviously in terrible shape. They've not only done poorly in the air, although better there than elsewhere, but on the ground they are apparently unable to hold up to Iraqi assaults for long. We got reports this morning that one of their major tank units said we're going to have to give up unless you get us more help. We don't see any coming on the way and they are in a, and of course, there's that other thing we don't talk about. Right now, the Soviets are behaving very

(MORE)

correctly as far as we can tell. They are not involved, they're trying to stay out of it. They see great danger to them if they try to play on one side or the other. And that's the current but there is also the potential that they could stir in troubled waters. For example, if Iraq really proves to be a stable dominant force, they might since they are, almost the sole supplier of equipment to Iraq, I guess the French do some of it, move into a closer relationship with Iraq and try to establish dominance there. There could be all kinds of long-term dangerous problems. They might say, well why doesn't the United States and the Soviet Union establish a condominium in this area and agree how to manage it, something that Brezhnev hinted at in his speech I think a few months ago, something we don't want to accept at all, on their part. Finally the question is what'll happen to the hostages. There had been as you know some beginning new developments that offered some new dimension of hope. Khomeini personally listing four demands, three of which were easily achievable, one which was much more difficult -- what do you do with the shah's assets, but certainly providing a very good basis for talks. And without going into details, we responded to that. Now with this, they may either respond in a way that chills any efforts along the line of release or, on the other hand, if they deal in a practical way, they may say it's time to get this problem off our back, open up trade with the world, get the parts and so on we need to repair our broken-down military establishment, end our isolation in the world, get the 12 billion back that the United States has frozen and in other ways get back to nation-building. But this is all speculation at this time and none of us know. The main thing is to try to get the fighting stopped, at this point as quickly as possible.

1. How seriously do we view the possibility of the Strait being closed and how long could the US tolerate that?

2. At this point, thankfully, the only part of it that seems to be stopped is that coming from Iran and Iraq. All the other oil from Kuwait, the Emirates, Saudi Arabia, is moving through the Strait, a little more slowly than before. There is some sign of backup there. But it's moving and while the Iranian naval forces have been inquiring by radio, what's your destination, they have not been boarding or seeking to seize or slow down, and with the strong Arab, EC-9, United Nations and Great Power interest in freedom of the seas, without speculating, at least there seems to be some reason to think that that will carry on. A bigger problem is the soaring insurance rates. And if I can go off the record a minute because I don't want to talk about this publicly.

We are working right now with other governments to see if we can put a co-insurance program in place immediately to restore those rates to the private shipper to a feasible amount. I think that can be easily done with probably no risk to us. If, and then I've got to stay off the record on some of this, if there's a need to do any kind of protection of naval routes there, we prefer that some of the French forces and so on in the area

move in, rather than us, because of all the obvious problems when we show up and because of the very tender situation with the hostages. And there's some talks of that kind going on. We have tried to make it very clear that we have no military plans or intentions in that area whatsoever.

Q. Is there any indication that the Iranians are making a special effort to protect the hostages ...

A. (One of the VP's aides) They have said only that they have again redispersed them and moved them to other places and they've said it's for their protection but we have no solid information.

A. (Mondale) We never know how to compare their public statements with what's actually going on there.

Q. I spent part of yesterday talking to two people at the State Dept. on this problem and I got the impression that at the very least even if the Soviets don't overtly interfere, that they will probably come out of this better than they left it. So they could be the friend of both Iran and Iraq and reassert themselves into the area with influence where they haven't been before. Do you agree with that?

A. (Peter) I think that's not a necessary outcome at all. If this ends fairly quickly, I think the Soviets have already offended the Iranians by their previous military armed shipments to Iraq. They don't seem to be resupplying Iraq. If that became a critical question, they could alienate the Iraqis if they failed to do that. So they stand to lose quite a bit depending on how it comes out. If it goes on for a long time, they may decide to throw their weight fully behind one side and completely alienate the other. There are so many unknowns in the dynamic of a war situation ...

A. (Mondale) I've got to make my estimates off the record. I think I must. I don't like to but I think I must. My hope all along, and that's the reason we've put on the freeze and the technical changes and the import freeze on oil and so on, and the other is to force the Iranian leadership, even though they don't want to, to start dealing with the real problems of their society. Once they go down that path, it seems to me it's in the Western interests, not necessarily the American national interests, but once they have to start dealing with jobs and economy and exports and their defense structure, I think it's almost inevitable that it would be a pro-Western type of development.

Q. Mr. Vice President, what do you think the possibility of the Iranians to stopping Iraq, if they want to continue the war and .. in other words, do they have any options? Do you think they can stop the Iraqis? If they can't, what does that mean for the United States?

A. Well, I'll ask Peter. He's been working on this to respond to that. We can only speculate on that. I think, at least our hope is, that we can get a ceasefire as quickly as possible. Get them negotiating. Both nations have a profound interest in resuming oil production and resolving this military dispute. What the long term assessments of their ability to win a protracted all-out war is, I've been on the road for a couple of days. I don't think I ought to speculate on that. Peter. And I think you ought to be careful not to speculate.

A. (Peter) The Iranian forces are known to be in some disarray. They aren't well equipped, their equipment is run down and they're not in a good position in the near term to stop Iraqi advances on Iranian territory. Over the longer term, they might have considerable potential for a war of attrition and not allowing really deep penetration by the Iraqis into Iran, to Tehran for example. But I think really I can't say much more than that at the present time. Certainly the Iraqis have a short-term advantage.

Q. Do you think they could stop Iraqi ...

A. It depends where you presume Iraq is going, along the border and along the Shatt al Arab, it looks as if the Iraqis are quite able to penetrate and maybe hold some territory for awhile. It would take quite a bit of reorganization of the Iranian armed forces, a mobilization, to throw them back.

Q. ... get you back on the record, if we can. You mentioned the need for a debate in your opening remarks and I'm wondering if you could tell us whether you think there is any possibility that the President might change his mind and agree to a debate with himself, Mr. Reagan and Mr. Anderson.

A. I was just about to say yes, til you added the last name. And even then, I can yes if Mr. Reagan would agree to just one debate with us. In 1960 and '76, as we know, the two candidates had a chance to debate each other. Nixon and Kennedy, Ford and Carter. We had assumed that that's exactly what would happen in 1980. You remember in '76, McCarthy tried to get included and the League declined. And we had asked for debates. I had asked for a debate with my opponent who agreed, on the assumption that that would happen. Then, it became apparent that it was Reagan strategy to have either no debates or debates only with a third party candidate or candidates. And we had to deal with that. So we finally said, we will agree to debate for the first time in American history, that a sitting President would agree to debate other candidates as well as the Republican candidate, if we can have the first debate with our Republican opponent. Reagan refused. We accepted three debates for CBS, Ladies Home Journal, the National Press Corps. He rejected all of them. It is my hope that Mr. Reagan will now agree to at least one such debate. And

good, although I have not talked to the President recently on that.

Q. Is there anybody in the inner circle that is arguing the other side?

A. If there are, I'm sure I wouldn't say.

Q. Would you agree to a debate ...

A. I'll give you the same answer. I am willing, but, let me put it this way, the presidential matter has to be resolved first before we can move onto the vice presidential matter. I thought we were all set. I called Bush, as a matter of fact, from Senegal when I was over there, and said, let's debate. He said fine. And I thought that was what we were going to do. That's what I did with Dole in '76. And now let me just make one other point that I don't think you're going to accept, but I feel very strongly about. This two-party system of ours has served this nation well for a long time. I think the parties have been too weakened already and that has weakened the presidency and it's weakened the country. The nations that have had the multi-party systems have tended to disintegrate into a series of special interest parties that have only the dimmest view of the national interest. Our two-party system has forced the various interests roughly contained within it to be nudged toward some generalized view of the public interest in order to get a majority of the votes. I look with alarm at what I see to be the possibility if we're going to move into some kind of multi-party system with shifting parties and at the phenomenon where a candidate can try one party for some 20 primaries, lose every one of them including his own state's, say ah-hah, I think I'll start this way now. And I say that as a person who has spent most of his life in politics. I think there's a process by which the Republicans and Democrats pick their nominee. It is intense. It is relevant. It is democratic. It involves a great debate for months. And we went through that process. It was bloody but we made a decision. So did the Republicans. Some 19 million people participated in that process and I very much believe that that two-party system is a lot more important to this nation than is generally recognized. And I personally want to see it strengthened and not weakened.

Q. Side 2 begins here. Pick-up is in the middle of a question by Dave Nyhan -- it is very difficult to hear the question.

A. We're going to win them all. I think so. We're going to win New York. We're going to win Pennsylvania. I think we're going to win Ohio. This year I think we're going to win Illinois, Michigan. Indiana's tougher.

Q. So I guess Al Hunt (?) was right. Things are really getting better?

(MORE)

A. They are getting better. No question about it. I've been, this is one of the joys of my job, I've been everywhere twice since the convention and several things have happened. One, the party is rapidly unifying. I think the Kennedy-Carter dispute is largely behind us. And here I want to thank Sen. Kennedy for moving the way he has. He's been very helpful and I see that largely disappearing. Secondly, I think for all of the noise and tumult at our convention, it had a legitimacy to it, a representativeness that was legitimate, that enhanced our respect with the American people. Thirdly, the more the American people begin to do as the process inevitably requires, that is measure the President not against God where he does poorly, even though his communication system is better than most of ours, when they measure him against his real life opponent, he does much better. And that's what's happening right now. And the comparison I think has worked decidedly and in a devastating way against Mr. Reagan, and will continue to do so. One sees all across the board among the traditional Democratic constituencies, agriculture, minorities, labor, teachers, educators, and small businesses and all the rest, a firming up of support and, did I read correctly, ADA endorsed us. I saw Ben Hooks made a strong statement the other day. And so we are, I don't know that we're ahead yet. I think it's awfully close and I think we're gaining. Finally, I think for all the public attention on Mr. Anderson, like all third party candidates, he's fading and I think will continue to fade. He is already substantially behind where George Wallace was in 1968. The American people are very practical. They'll want to vote for one of the two possibilities and I expect, I observe as I go around the country, that there are pockets of strength for him, but I think it is fading. I think it will fade. And all these things are contributing to a resurgence of our strength.

Q. Mr. Vice President, we've certainly had a lot to read in the last four years about what makes Jimmy Carter tick, or as I suppose as ... Powell said, what makes him so tight as a tick. But what makes him so mean? Why is he running such a nasty little campaign in the last couple of weeks?

A. Well, let us take one statement that I assume you have in mind about the difference between the two candidates dealing with peacekeeping. Let us look at the two records and I think there's a real issue here. You know there's a new phenomenon here that when you quote Reagan directly, he attacks you for slander. He said. We didn't say it. We just repeated it. You call the roll on what this fellow has had in mind the last 10 years. He wanted to send forces to Ecuador, to Pakistan, to the Middle East and I think to Cuba, to North Korea. There are about eight of them where he wants to every time a country hiccups, he seems to want to suppress it not by lozenges but by American force. He wants to tear up the SALT II treaty on international television. Now I take that personally. I worked for 7 years to try to get that agreement. I spent a year on the road helping sell this to the American people. I spent a half a year in the

Senate talking to my colleagues and if it weren't for the Russian invasion, we'd have had that in place and it is crucial to this country and to the world. He said, tear it up. Even though every one of the Joint Chiefs, every NATO ally, every intelligence director we have is for it because it makes us stronger, not weaker. He says that nuclear nonproliferation is 'none of our business.' Well, if that isn't our business, what is? What is more dangerous in this world than the possibility through uncontrolled distribution of weapons-grade material and technology that irresponsible countries and nuts, the Idi Amins of the world, would gain that enormous power and ... not only with irrationality but with the power to destroy mankind or start the destruction. He says it's none of our business.

Q. Where did he say that, sir?

A. We'll give it to you. We happen to have it. And it's important because up until now, he's been saying, I changed my mind. But the last two days he's had a new strategy. He said, I didn't say it. And what I call a new strategy of selective political amnesia. He's hoping the country goes to sleep for 6 weeks. And I think we're doing a good job at that too. But he was against the Panama Canal treaty. He has shown a lack of concern about what I call the moral leadership of our nation and the world. For example, while it doesn't bear directly on the question, I think it really does in another sense, is our approach to black Africa. In the last four years, we have profoundly changed America's following in black Africa by doing two things that were very simple. Coming out for majority rule and against racial discrimination. Now throughout black Africa, we're respected, we're able to engage them in a range of very very important things for us and the world. He and the others still rail against Marxist leaders like Mugabe who may speak that language but who has really been a positive force and the rest. And I think this pattern. And he's even criticized the Camp David Accords as being full of loopholes. And I think there's a very strong issue to be made here.

Q. Mr. Vice President, in 1976, Mr. Carter spoke often and articulately about the issue of nuclear proliferation and to many people that issue became an important one to think about. ... the characterization of the Senate vote on the issue of nuclear fuel for India as an Administration victory. I wonder if you could tell us what's become of what was in 1977 when this Administration came into office, a very strong Administration view of the need to control nuclear ...

A. When we came into office as you well recall, the dawning of the plutonium age was on us. The Germans had reached an agreement with Brazil. The French with Pakistan. To take that fateful step into the production of weapons-grade material that could be easily stolen, transported and used around the world. We did several things. We moved to strengthen the work of the IAEA to stop it. Three days after the inaugural, I went to both

(MORE)

countries and urged them to cancel their agreements to construct these facilities. We put a full-time person in place on nuclear nonproliferation matters, Jerry Smith, who's certainly respected. We passed nuclear nonproliferation legislation in our country to control the way in which we supplied nuclear fuels around the world which was the issue in the ... plan. And we took, and are taking, a substantial amount of political pressure around the world to turn around that incipient new development in the world. We closed down the ... River breeder reactor. The President stopped a whole host of dangerous plutonium activity in our own country to try to provide the example and move into new technology that could accomplish it in a much safer way. We moved to negotiate intensively with the Soviet Union on SALT II, on CTB and many many other matters. And since that time, we have had a range of efforts all over the world that continue today to try to move away from that tendency and try to place new momentum behind the nuclear nonproliferation movement. Now, having said that, we've learned a lot. It is not as easily said as done. It is much more easily said than done. And the Indian example is a classic example of why it's so tough. There's a reason why that vote was so narrow, divided. And that is that the issues were so difficult to define. If we had just taken the position of mechanically applying the principle, no fuel without full-scope safeguards which is what we want, we would then no longer be supplying nuclear fuel to India. India would have to go elsewhere for its fuel, the Soviet Union or some other place. Our ability to talk with and seek to influence the Indians in nuclear military matters would be obliterated and replaced by somebody else. As you know, under the fuel supply arrangements, we do in fact control the use of all the fuel that goes to ... and will guarantee that it's used in peaceable ways under the provision of the act and under the regs of the IEA. It was a tough and a close call. And one of the reasons we did it is that we think we're in a better position to influence the long-term direction of Indian and other developments this way than the other way. As you know, there is a very strong feeling among the less-developed nations that all this nuclear nonproliferation thing is an arrogant attempt by the rich and powerful nations to impose a different set of rules on them from the rules that we have ourselves. And it is a very touchy and delicate matter as to how you influence them, gain their trust and over the long run, slowly change without offending nationalist sensibilities which are great, the course in which they're on. And we're doing the best we can in a very miserable situation. And I think I'm fair to say that no President has tried harder or is trying harder than President Carter.

Q. You said there was internal debate on this one?

A. Sure there was. As you know, the NRC voted against it.

Q. Mr. Vice President, I'd like you to address a little ... the peace issue. I think it is an interesting one and we find that there is a clear difference between Carter and Reagan. Two

things. One is the feeling that Brezinski is more like Reagan in many ways. And the other is the ... This question was very difficult to understand completely.

A. That's right, I was there. You know the person who runs foreign policy is the President of the United States. He's the person responsible. There are several of us involved in advising the President. The principals are myself, Harold Brown, Ed Muskie, Brezinski and David Jones and, depending on the issue, it may be Bill Miller or other specialists. But I think a President has to be selective based upon his own values and his own instincts and his own directions. Because finally the President has to make a decision. I have been in on any number of cases where the President has decided differently from Brezinski, differently from Brown, differently from Muskie, differently from myself. And contrary to what some seem to believe, he is a very strong-willed person who makes up his own mind and who, unlike most Presidents, spends an enormous amount of time, I think sometimes too much, trying to master the detail of a particular issue so that he's in a position to substitute his own judgment for say a specialist in one of those fields. During this time, I think there's been many indications that the key emphasis of this Administration has been on the side of peace. Whether it's the Middle East agreements which were a historic breakthrough, the Panama Canal thing which took a year and a half of our hide and our life at great political expense to us but for a good and valid reason to disabuse ourselves of the last vestige of colonial rule that we held, the Panama Canal Zone. We took a lot of racket from the right wing when we opened up and regularized relations with the People's Republic of China. I think it's one of the best things this nation has done in modern history. It has enhanced the stability of the Asian Pacific region. It has brought China into a more active role in all international institutions. And of course it has very significant security implications for us and for the world. We fought like hell for SALT II. We still are pushing it. We're trying to get a CTB agreement. We're trying to get an MBFR agreement. Trying to get an agreement on satellite usage and we're moving toward a theater (?) nuclear force talks with the Soviet Union. I think Muskie is probably talking with Gromyko this week I believe, today, to try to get something going in this excluded range of nuclear weapons that are found outside the so-called strategic systems. All of this has occurred with all of those advisers around the President. I think it's been a good record in a difficult time. We are, in fact, the first administration in over 50 years that can say we never sent American troops into war anywhere on earth. Now we had the mission for the rescue, it didn't work and some people were killed in an accident. But we have never despite several suggestions by many, and many suggestions by our opponent for different places to send our forces, we haven't done any of it. We've strengthened our forces in NATO and elsewhere. I think our nation is militarily stronger than it's been and it's getting stronger. But we've tried to use that power to bring about

(MORE)

stability and reduce tensions and I think if you compare it with any past administration, in allowing for the less than perfect world in which we live, it's been a peace-oriented record.

Q. Mr. Vice President, in the recent Massachusetts primary, the Archbishop of Boston ...

A. I've got to go to another meeting. I forget what it is but I'm on my way. Much laughter here!

Q. ... he issued a pastoral letter which urged the faithful to vote against candidates who support abortion. Do you think an action by a clergyman in such circumstances is a violation of the Constitutional separation of church and state? And do you think that's a healthy situation for religious ...

A. The first answer is clearly no. In this country, we have freedom of speech, freedom of speech guaranteed to all people, freedom of religion guaranteed to all people and people, thank God, can say and advise as they please without interference by government.

Q. Mr. Anderson said it was a violation of the spirit.

A. But it's very important, the spirit and the law of free speech is that you should be free to say anything you want to, except fire in a theater, and there is very little weighing or should there be on free speech. People have a right to say what they please and the wisdom of that should be tested in the marketplace of ideas and not in some censor's office, ever. That is not only the word but it is the fundamental spirit. We have found over 200 years that that's a lot safer than the censor's pencil. And I don't think we should ever fool around with it. Now, the Catholic Conference said, and I've often repeated this because I think it is a very strong and valid point to be made in our society. And that is that all candidates should be looked at in the total perspective of things -- their background, their ability, their positions on all issues, their standards of honesty and integrity, education background and the rest. And I would hope without getting into specifics that all candidates could be measured against this broader standard. I think it contributes to the civility of debate. It recognizes the complexity and difficulties of public life in national life, local life and I think the Catholic Conference is very wise to emphasize that point.

Q. Knowing that you are a strong defender of the First Amendment, do you have any ... feelings ... of the fact that the political committee carrying your name, the Carter-Mondale Committee, has sent letters to broadcast offices all over the country threatening them with requests for free time if they broadcast a paid ad of the independent ... groups working on behalf of your opponent?

A. No, no. The law, in other words, anybody can be heard as they please but equal time provisions is something else. We've got a right to be heard along with them. That is not in conflict with freedom of speech at all. Equal time was set up for the purpose of letting all views be heard and not just those that are financed by vast money. If only those that can afford massive financial backing, if those are the only views being heard, you have a form of censorship based on the ability to pay and that's where the equal time provisions arose.

Q. Do you really think it's fair to ask for free time when your opponent is buying it?

A. Look. I am an old champion of public financing. I think the biggest threat to the vitality of American democracy is the increasing role of big money. I don't think America should be for sale. I don't think who is heard or isn't heard should be primarily a principle of who has got enough money. I think there ought to be some rules of fairness and I would like to see them in the form of public financing laws such as we have at the presidential level but without loopholes. A few things the Supreme Court has done recently that I disagree with more than their decision that you have to receive public money in order to permit the federal government to have the Constitutional reach to control your spending. I think there's got to be power in that Constitution to control something as threatening to the integrity and the future of this country as the rivers and mountains of money that are pouring around this country trying to influence public policy.

Q. Question is inaudible.

A. I hope you're wrong and as you know Chrysler and auto workers think you're wrong. I understand the K-car is a very attractive car. They think it's going to sell. And the American people are certainly highly sensitive to the need for fuel efficient cars and I don't think we should assume for a moment that it's not going to succeed. We're doing several things trying to work with the auto industry. The latest presidential economic package has one feature in there that they very much like, the rebatable tax credit, the accelerated depreciation schedules that will be very very helpful to these industries who have to have tremendous expenditures as they shift to the smaller fuel efficient cars away from the big gas guzzlers. We are also trying, we have put in place a special small business program to keep the dealer network in place with a special program for minority dealers that were especially vulnerable. We have been going over regulations that impose costs on them that are very difficult to handle, trying to maintain our leadership in safety, the environment and etc., fuel efficiency without imposing costs that are tremendously burdensome and that could be stretched out or in some cases changed to be less onerous without abandoning our other objectives. We have been talking with the industry in a host of other possibilities that might be of help to them as

(MORE)

they move into this new era in which the American consumer is demanding a smaller car. The Chrysler loan was part of it. I don't think the American consumer will benefit with less competition in the American auto industry. I think competition is the best protector always of consumers. It's better than government regulations or anything else. And I say that being in the last truly competitive business in America. There's nothing as insidious as the secret ballot. My how hard we worked. That's something else.

Q. I think we have time for one more question.

Q. Mr. Vice President, part of the question is inaudible -- sounds like Ben Taylor -- would you agree with somebody who called your opponent a racist and then backed off on it later?

A. He didn't back off, he said at that time he did not intend to call him a racist. Within minutes, he did not intend to.

Q. Do you think that Ronald Reagan is a racist?

A. No. Nor does Carter.

Q. Did he imply that?

A. He said, Carter immediately said that is not what he intended.

Q. Will you run for President in 1984?

A. No one suggested it before but I'll think about it. I don't know.

Q. Another Nyhan question that is difficult to understand clearly enough to type. ... that really bothers a lot of people in this section of the country in talking about Carter is that, it started with Scoop Jackson in Florida in '76 when he ..., your old friend Hubert Humphrey was called a has-been ... Sen. Kennedy was accused of making a speech that ... very damaging to our country at a time when ... As you saw by the Massachusetts primary figures ... a lot of people including good Democrats are wary of President Carter and need constant reassurance that ... his personal style of campaigning is ...

A. First of all, I've been through nearly 30 years of campaigns. This does not justify them in this respect. But I think that one of the things that happens in campaigns is that people get tired, they get overworked, they get anxious, they speak hour-after-hour extemporaneously and occasionally they say things that are inartful, things that stretch the point and that is not a criticism visited on any intensively-engaged politician today. If you compare the rhetoric of all the candidates in the primaries in this last year, you will find statements made by all of us that was not what we intended or we regretted it or we

would like to put it some other way. And I think that what happens has to be viewed from that realistic perspective. I read the statement, for example, the President made before the California AFL-CIO. I think it was just as susceptible the way I read it as the way Reagan read it. That he was trying to draw the contrast between the one policy that I think has been dramatically committed to the cause of peace and on the other one, a kind of willy-nilly, shoot-from-the-hip kind of approach that is a real issue. Now maybe it wasn't stated just right but I don't, I think it has to be looked at from that standpoint. Secondly, if we're talking about New England, I notice Kevin White the other day said that no President has done more for Boston. I don't think any President has done more for the cities of this country, has been more responsive to education, health, housing, economic development, to energy, to regional mass transit needs and the rest than this President. He has been responsive. He has been caring, trying under very difficult circumstances. And he's been as good a President as we've ever had on civil rights. That is certainly a strong interest in this community. I just was at MIT and I was able to point out that we've broken all records in education. We've put our kids first, we put education and learning first. That is certainly something that's basic to this community. No administration has tried harder in human rights. No one has pushed it the way we have. That was my privilege and I did enjoy it to meet Mr. Vorster in Vienna and tell him the days of cynicism on human rights in Africa were over. And we've stayed true to that cause.

END OF TAPE!

(END)

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506CONFIDENTIAL WITH
SECRET ATTACHMENT

October 14, 1980

Filed: Iran-Iraq

MEMORANDUM FOR:

THE VICE PRESIDENT
THE SECRETARY OF STATE
THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY
THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE
THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY
THE CHAIRMAN, JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF
THE DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

SUBJECT: Discussion Paper for PRC Meeting (U)

Attached is a discussion paper from Department of State for the PRC Meeting on Iran/Iraq which is scheduled for Thursday, October 16 at 10:00 a.m. in the White House Situation Room. (C)

(For State: Without attachment)


Christine Dodson
Staff Secretary

Attachment

CONFIDENTIAL WITH
SECRET ATTACHMENT

Review on 10/14/81

DECLASSIFIED
NLJC 07-708
per 5/1/07 NSC/F
BY 62 NARA, DATE 5/24/07

COPY CARTER LIBRARY

~~SECRET~~SECRET/NODISDiscussion Paper: Policy Ramifications of Iran-Iraq ConflictIntroduction

The purposes of the PRC are to: (1) identify the implications for U.S. policy of the Iraq-Iran conflict; (2) discuss a range of issues which U.S. policy-makers will have to address in the months ahead and (3) examine a number of questions which may require operational decisions in the near term. Part I of the paper gives an area overview. Part II contains a more specific discussion of the impact of the war on countries or subjects of specific interest to us (Iran, Iraq, the Soviets, SW Asian security, the Middle East peace process, and oil). Part III raises a series of policy considerations flowing from the earlier discussion.

The Central Issues. Running throughout the various ramifications of the conflict are the questions of 1) whether it is in our interest and within our power to try to restore the pre-war balance in the region; and 2) whether we should seek balance in our relations with all the Gulf littorals, or try to move toward a pro-Iraqi or pro-Iranian posture -- or deeper commitment to Saudi/Gulf state security. How we move will in turn impact heavily on our relations with the Soviets and their role in the region. These central questions will be sharply raised in dealing with three issues which may require early decision:

1. U.S. Posture on a Settlement of the Iran-Iraq War

-- If Iran takes its case to the Security Council in the next few days, we may be faced with a requirement to take a more visible position on terms for a settlement of the war. The way we posture ourselves could have far-reaching consequences for our relations with the combatants and the Arab world generally, for Soviet opportunities to exploit the aftermath of the crisis and potentially for release of the hostages. In our policy statements to date, we have already foreshadowed a position in favor of Iran's territorial integrity and for Iraqi withdrawal.

-- A prominent U.S. role in the Security Council in favor of Iraqi withdrawal would have the advantages of a principled stand and would have a favorable impact on Iran. Iraq will resent external pressures on withdrawal if these are meant to be unconditional. The impact on Iraq and its Arab friends would be minimized by strong language on nonintervention and non-interference.

DECLASSIFIED

NLTC-07-108
per 5/1/07 NSC 1/R
BY 12 NARA DATE 5/21/07

~~SECRET/NODIS~~
RDS 1,3 10/13/2000

~~SECRET~~

COPY CARTER LIBRARY

~~SECRET~~

-- We will want to try to have a coordinated position with other Western states and to decide whether the U.S. should take the lead in putting forward a position or supporting a view advanced by our friends in the Security Council.

Action Required:

Formulation of a U.S. stance on issues for settlement of the conflict which will (a) be consistent with U.S. principles and UN Charter; (b) contribute to conditions for an early end to hostilities; and (c) minimize damage to U.S. interests in the Arab world, and (d) minimize Soviet involvement.

2. Extent of our Involvement in Gulf Security

-- We are moving into contingency planning with the Saudis and discussion with other Gulf states of how we might help improve and coordinate their air defense. At the heart of such discussions is the question of whether U.S. combat forces would come to the defense of Saudi Arabia and/or the Gulf states if they were attacked, not by Soviet forces but by a regional state and, if so, how firm an advance commitment we are prepared to make.

Action Required:

To consider whether we will commit U.S. combat troops to defend Saudi Arabia from attack by a regional state. To consider whether to give the Saudis firm prior commitment of such intention. To consider whether to extend that commitment to Oman and/or the Gulf emirates. To consider what "on the ground" personnel and prepositioned equipment and materiel may be necessary to implement a U.S. defense commitment.

3. Possible Soviet Reaction to Increased U.S. Involvement

The Soviets appear to be currently constrained in enhancing their forces in the area by an interest in preserving their "neutrality" between the belligerents; an increasingly active U.S. and Western role in Gulf security will probably lead the Soviets to respond with political actions to offset U.S. moves and possibly lead them to reinforce their military posture--along the Soviet-Iranian border and in the Indian Ocean. The Soviet objective would be to prevent significant increase in U.S. influence in Iran or Iraq and to prevent a further change of the existing gap in the U.S.-Soviet military balance in the Southwest Asian region in the U.S. favor.

Action Required: To consider what actions the Soviets might take to respond to further strengthening of the U.S. role in Gulf and Saudi security and whether and how the U.S. should react to such Soviet moves.

~~SECRET~~



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