

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Blackwell, Morton: Files
Folder Title: Conservative Political Action Conference
(1 of 2)
Box: 5

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

REAGAN At Mid-Term: AN ASSESSMENT

Moderator: Alan Ryskind

1983 Conservative Political Action Conference

As you know, this is going to be an assessment of the Reagan administration after two years and we have a pretty well balanced panel, I think. We have Bill Rusher who tends to be somewhat optimistic, I think, about President Reagan, and we have Stan Evans who probably is a little more pessimistic. Then, we have Lyn Nofziger who, I'd say is evenhanded. I mean he's very evenhanded. Last year, for instance, in August on one day he came out and he was attacking the hell out of the President's tax hike. That night he emerged from the Oval Office and he was leading the charge the other way for the tax hike. So, he can see things from both sides. Very good! Anyway, he's the first person I think I will introduce so he can come back at me and he's a sort of a jolly fellow. We consider him, he's accustomed to wearing Mickey Mouse ties, and he's addicted to atrocious puns which he will probably exhibit before you today. He was a hard hitting Washington newsman; he worked for the Copley newspapers; he quit, then, to join Reagan in 1966 and help him win the governorship, and he's been with President Reagan and Governor Reagan off and on since 1966. He served in the Nixon administration in various capacities and he came back here in 1981 to become head of Political Affairs for President Reagan and he did a bang up job trying to get conservatives into the White House and he had to go through that barrier which was in front of him who is known as the Chief of Staff. And, he did a very good job in spite of that obstacle. So, we ought to remember when the President was shot in March of 1981 that it was not Alexander Haig who really comforted us when he came to the television and talked about how he was in charge. It was really Lyn Nofziger who comforted all of us. So, I present to you now Lyn Nofziger.

Well, it's certainly nice to get a hand at the beginning 'cause I expect some boos somewhere along the line. As a matter of fact, if they had some boos up here, I'd probably do better! But, in any event, they've got a lousy light up here so I'm going to have to put on my glasses so I can see what I'm supposed to say, which, probably I don't need. Let me try it without them. I'm much more handsome without my glasses on! And God, that's damning with faint praise, I know. Anyway, I think that any fair

assessment of the first two years of the Reagan administration has to admit that the results have been mixed. (This is cream and I don't want to step on it . I don't know what the hell it's doing there). Last time I looked Stan Evans' purse was there!) But, in any event, I stalled here for 2 minutes which gives me eight more minutes. So, let me say in all fairness the President has not been a total success and I think that anybody who expects that he would have been a total success is unrealistic, doesn't understand how our system works, doesn't understand that the President of the United States, even Ronald Reagan, does not have a magic wand which he can wave and get things done. I think that basically a lot of our people forget that our system of government is based on compromise and that it's not enough to send up legislation to the Hill. You've also got to get the House to agree on it which, as you know, is controlled by Democrats, get the Senate to agree on it which, as you know, is sometimes controlled by liberal Republicans, and then get those two to agree on it and then come up with some sort of an agreement that they can accept and that the President can accept. So, you cannot get all you want every time you send something to the Hill and sometimes you don't get anything you want. And, I think too many of our people fail to take that into consideration. Secondly, when you get into the area of appointments, etc., our people say, well, Ronald Reagan should have appointed every conservative in the country. I wish he could have. More importantly, I wish he would have fired many more Democrats than they did fire! And, I want it known that I offered several times to take on that task....and was turned down by those at the White House who didn't want to create the kind of problems or ruckuses that that would have created. But, when you come to appointments, it's very well to say well just go out and appoint conservatives, but tradition and custom and once again the facts of political life dictate that you have to deal with Senators and Representatives and party leaders in making those appointments. And, so what are you going to do? If a John Tower, for instance, wants somebody for political reasons and I'm not picking on John Tower, 'cause he's an outstanding man, but if he wants somebody who we don't think should be there, well, you probably compromise and give it to him.....because you're going to need his vote somewhere down the line on something else or you're going to need his help in getting another appointment through....and that sort of thing. What are you going to do with a Chuck Percy? I know what I'd like But, you know, Chuck Percy has given the President many more votes than I think most of us expected he would. He is a Chairman of a

major Committee as is Bob Packwood, a chairman of a committee. You've got to deal with those people. And, in dealing with them you compromise here and you compromise there. Otherwise, you don't get anything done. So, I think as we assess this we must face the reality of our political system as it was written by the founding fathers and as it has emerged and changed over the years. Ok....where do I believe that Ronald Reagan has not been a success? Well, I think one place where this... he needs to do a lot of work in the next year if he's going to be re-elected is in the area of holding together the coalition that sent him here and once again, there are not enough of us conservatives, there are not enough Reaganites who have been there all along, to elect Ronald Reagan president even against Jimmy Carter. It took a coalition to do it. And, it took a coalition of blue collar workers and union people, Catholics, the moral majority types, and I say moral majority with a couple of small "m's"; it took Hispanics, it took Jews and it took a very small segment of our black population because we only got about 8% of that vote. But, nevertheless, you had to put that all together if you were going to send Ronald Reagan to the White House. I think because the President has been so wrapped up in the economy in trying to get inflation under control, trying to hold down the growth of government and so forth, that they have really not paid enough attention to those people who sent him there. Now, unfortunately, all those people are not basically conservatives. Many of us are not going to agree with what the union people want, many of us are not going to agree totally with where the Hispanics or the Jews or even the moral majority types are coming from because all our own ranks consist not only of people who are basically conservative but they also consist of many people who tend toward libertarianism and so there are going to be some differences in our own ranks. So, there have been failures there in doing the things that these various segments of our voting population wanted him to do. There have been failures in appointing proper numbers of them to jobs and so forth and so on. I think even more importantly the White House has done a lousy job of telling the country what it is doing, telling the country what it has done, and even telling the country what ought to be done and why/^{it}ought to be done. For instance, we have done not a good job of selling the country on the need to rebuild our defenses and on the validity of the size of the defense budgets. I think we've done not a good job in protecting this President and in cheering for him when he's done the right things and in going out and attacking his political enemies. I think because of that there has been a feeling in this country that there is a lack of concern

in the White House. There's a kind of a callousness about people who are out of jobs, about what happens to individuals. It seems that we have been so interested in doing a job for the whole country that we sometimes forget that the country is made up of individuals and that we have to be concerned about individuals as well as well as about the people. So, I think this is where there has been a significant failure in this administration. But, you know, let's turn away from that and get to the successes because there have been many successes in this administration. True, the President has not rolled back fifty years of steadily advancing "statism" in his first two years; and he has not yet rebuilt 15 years of declining national defenses. But, look, he has made a good start. Wherever you look in this government, every department you may say, ok the Secretary is not a conservative and there are liberals here and there are liberals there. But wherever you look in this government there are many more conservatives in key places than there were, certainly, four years ago and that there were really during the days of the Nixon--Ford administrations. You know, you can look at Interior, you can look at Energy; there is a good pocket of conservatives in Education; there are even some conservatives and I can point them out to you, except I might hurt their chances of keeping their jobs!! There are some conservatives in the State Department!!! There are a lot of conservatives over in USIA and you can always tell when there are a batch of conservatives in one of our departments because then you begin to read in the papers and hear from the liberal groups that we're ruining things and we're politicizing things and so forth. And, I say you bet your life we're politicizing and we're trying to turn this thing around and that's what this country is all about. This is a political system!! And we sat and we watched Democrats politicize it for years and when Republicans get in too often they're afraid to do that 'cause they're afraid somebody is going to get mad at us. And, you know, the point here on the good side where even The Washington Post, and you may have heard of that, their objective great newspaper, in the nation's capitol, even The Washington Post admitted that this administration has done more to get a hold of the top ranks of the federal bureaucracy than any administration in recent years. Don Devine, one of our really good conservatives, is getting a hold of that, is beginning to turn it around. He hasn't done it in two years either, but he has made progress. In the matter of appointing judges, so important to what happens in this country, not this year and not next year, but over a period of years; Congressional Quarterly admits that the Reagan administration has made major strides in

appointing judges who represent President Reagan's point of view. So, there has been progress in those areas. And, certainly when you come down to the economy, nobody can deny that we have made major progress in the area of inflation. And, you know if you want to talk about what has Ronald Reagan done for the poor and the people on fixed incomes, I'll tell you what he's done: he's made their buck worth something again. And that is more than any entitlement program up there that has come out of the Congress in recent years has done. So, and he has, by standing firm, he has been a major factor in bringing interest rates down. And, hell you know, there's one bank here, I was listening to the radio on the way in is now offering automobile loans not for the 11.9% that the automobile company's are offering, but 11%. So, there are pressures continuing to bring those rates down. Now, I think that is because this President has stood fast on things. There has been a net cut in taxes. Now, I know people will say well if you look at the whole thing such as the increase in Social Security taxes there has not been, but Ronald Reagan did not give you those increases in Social Security taxes. Those were put in effect by the prior administration. You would have had those whether or not taxes had been cut or had been raised, so yes, taxes have been cut, the President has stood firm against tremendous pressures (you tell me when my 10 minutes are up and then I'll quit); on that 3rd year of the tax cuts; he has stood firm against tremendous pressures to get rid of the indexing that will go into effect after the 3rd year of the taxes. So, he has made progress there; he has not made progress in balancing the budget; that's very clear and he is not going to until the economy begins moving again and already it has begun and I've talked to economist after economist; I really don't have much use for most economists unless they tell me what I'd like to hear!! You know, they say if you took all the economists in Washington and laid 'em end to end it'd be a good thing! But, in any event, many, many economists are saying they, we are going to get a boom here that is much better than any body was predicting a few months ago and much better than a super cautious White House was predicting even at the first of the year. My ten minutes is up; OK....So, just let me say very quickly, yeah, there has been progress made, there's been progress made in defense. We are heading again toward a 600 ship Navy. It was down to 400 ships when Ronald Reagan came in. We have got an Army and Marine Corps which once again has got some pride in itself. Talk to the people who are in the Marines and they are so happy they don't know what to do about what has happened under this administra-

tion. There is much to be done. There is much to be done in the social areas but I tell you, the President can stand and call for that stuff; it's still going to take a Congress to act and in many cases it going to take the states to act because it going to take constitutional amendments. I am confident that when the economy is under control again, then the President will begin to direct his strong efforts to that. But listen, when peoplewhen the economy is bad then that is the thing you have to take care of first. That's what he's aimed at; my suggestion is that the next 2 years is going to get better and in the next 6 years everybody will be able to see a remarkable change as we have moved again toward a government of individuals and toward individual rights and toward getting the federal government off our backs and its hands out of our pockets. Thank you very much.....

Thank you, Lyn....The next person I'm going to introduce is William Rusher. I think most of you know him. He was a Captain....he's got a distinguished career; he was a Captain in the Air Force, he's a Princeton graduate, Harvard Law graduate, Wall Street lawyer; he was an associate counsel in the U. S. Senate Internal Securities Sub-Committee when that sub-committee was in existence and was doing what we thought were pretty good things at the time. He's an author, lecturer, world traveler and, of course, he's publisher of National Review. I present you William Rusher.

Thank you Alan. When you see the assignments up here I'm to be optimistic, Stan is to be pessimistic and I think you will agree with me that Lyn has just done a fine job of being what might be called just plain mystic!! This is going to be an historic occasion in another way because if there is any day light at all between my position and Stan Evans' and I guess there may be a little, we'll have to fake it if nothing else, it'll be the first time!! I've long said that if I'm/^{ever}accidentally crushed beneath the wheels of a truck or something and anybody wonders afterwards what Rusher would have thought about something, had he been alive today, ask Stan Evans and he'll tell you because we agreed on everything!!! Now this time we may have our differences. I find that there is always in any large gathering of conservatives like this at least a small group of or individual or two who want it proven that they are the most conservative person in the room! And nobody to the right of me, that kind of

macho conservatism that loves to measure itself against the weaklings up there speaking. Let me say that I've never regarded that as a particularly profitable attitude that anybody wants to claim or establish, that they're to the right of me; it can be done, it has been done. I am a conservative because and to the extent that I think it's good for this country and I think it's awfully good for this country. But, as I say, somebody can turn my right flank and if anybody wants to try this morning, they're welcome to. I am optimistic, very optimistic about Ronald Reagan. A good many of you cannot remember, well even our last Republican president, let alone the one before that; I can remember them both!! And, I'll tell you the modern conservative movement in this country started because up until 1952 we were under the illusion that if we could just elect a Republican president everything would just naturally follow. It turned out not to be the case at all; by two to 3 years into the Eisenhower administration we had an independent, conservative political movement in this country because we patently needed one. He did, absolutely, well, I won't say absolutely nothing; he did some things, but certainly nothing like what conservatives were entitled to expect from their president. He now, as we know, moves into that period when he looks like the golden age and I repeat, in some respects I think he was. His policies were good; in others, they were not nearly so good, and that's why conservatism, the modern type, was born. Richard Nixon, appointed as nearly as I can recall, two conservatives in his administration; Pat Buchanan and Tom Houston, the former chairman of YAF; were you in it? Off and on....well, make it three. I was trying to cover up for you!! And, I'llI'll tell you this, I love Pat Buchanan like a brother, but I remember when he was up in the White House ten and 15 years ago telling us conservatives at meetings like this one to count our blessings and I much prefer the Buchanan who likes to put the heat on occasionally and say we want more!! Richard Nixon did such a job that a very great man recently dead, John Ashbrook, chose to run against him in the early primaries of 1972, simply because serious conservatives had had it right up to roughly here with Richard Nixon!! And, now we are invited to be dissatisfied, forsooth!...with Ronald Reagan. Let me tell you something; in politics, the battle, the issue, is not almost never shall we do the left thing or the right thing, or the right thing or the wrong thing; the issue is where is the battle field? Because it's always a shifting business; where is the battle field; and if you will notice one of the really great things

Ronald Reagan has done, is shift the battle field. We are now arguing not whether taxes shall be cut, but how much taxes shall be cut. We are not arguing how much whether domestic expenditures shall be cut, but how much domestic expenditures shall be cut. We are not arguing whether defense expenditures should be increased, but how much defense expenditures should be increased. In all these areas, by shifting the battle field, he has performed prodigies, one of his biggest contributions. The old Advocates, television programs that I was on, some you may have seen, the station which was naturally liberal, WGBH in Boston that did the production, had a rule that every question had to be shall the government do thus and so? How's that for stacking it? Of course, I got the negative most of the time and I began winning so many of the votes that they commissioned a man secretly to find out if the negative ^{had} some special advantage!! I didn't even find out about his memorandum until 2 years later! It didn't have any special advantage; people were against the government doing all these things. That was why. That was the battle field. Should the government or should it not? Now, Reagan has shifted the battle field; one of his biggest achievements. In the matter of appointments, he touched last night on the biggest problem. Normally when you pick somebody for really high government, ^{office,} cabinet level, you pick people who have had lower government experience, sub-cabinet and so on, from previous administrations. We didn't have any such people. Almost none. You had on the one hand all of these people who had been in the Nixon, or god forbid, ^{even} the Carter administration and claiming with endorsements you wouldn't believe that they wanted jobs under Reagan and where were the conservatives? Well, they were out there never having held public office and had an ear torn off voting for fighting for Goldwater or something like that. And, that was no credential by itself for government service. As the President said last night, we now have the seasoned conservatives for the future. They have been brought in and for the rest of your lifetime and mine there will be a pool of conservatives with prior government service who future presidents can draw on if they wish to. Another one of his biggest achievements.....I'm going fast because we have little time. In foreign affairs; I've been quite close to the situation and the attitude to the people in Taiwan. I have visited their country 17 times, most recently last summer and I can tell you that regardless of what you may hear, or even what they may say, because what they say is for public consumption, is that they feel quite confident that they are getting what they need from this administration and that they're going to continue to do so. The

problem with Taiwan is not ^{with} the attitude of this administration. The problem is that in this country, under our system, no administration can bind its successor. There's nothing Jimmy Carter could do that could keep Reagan from changing and helping Taiwan if he wanted to; nothing Reagan can do that ^{can} prevent the next guy, if he's another Carter, from betraying. But, therefore, you have to operate from administration to administration. You can be absolutely certain that the Reagan administration will be, and will continue to be, friendly to Taiwan and ~~continue~~ to give ^{it} precisely everything it needs. In Southern Africa, in southern Africa, that very hotly packed and difficult area, you may have noticed a very interesting shift. We're now discussing, everybody's discussing whether or not the Cubans ought to leave as a pre-condition for South African withdrawal from Namibia. Another question of shifting the battlefield. That was simply introduced, rather late in the negotiating game and now insisted upon by the United States. And, for a long time the front line countries no will absolutely never discuss such a thing, never, never, never!!! But, Angola is discussing it. Angola is willing to make this a part of the negotiating process; they won't call it a condition; they'll proceed on parallel tracks. You can bet your bottom dollar that the Cubans will have to get out of Angola before this administration consents to change the situation in Namibia. In Central America, I notice that El Salvador is still there and so are the guerillas, but they aren't shooting their way into the government as the left would have them do; sit down and negotiate cabinet posts with them and it's Nicaragua that's complaining that forces on its border are trying to destabilize it. You know where there's that much smoke there just might conceivably be a smudge pot! Somebody's working to worry the Nicaraguans; who do you suppose that is?! It isn't Cyrus Vance, yes, Costa Rica, as you say.....Has Ronald Reagan weakened or lost his way? I don't think anybody who heard him last night can think that he has become confused in the presidency. If, in point of fact, he was letting us down as some critics contend, it would have to be an out and out betrayal because the man who spoke last night was under no illusions at all about what he wanted to do, about what the conservative principles were, about what his policies with regard to them were,....he laid all that out for us. You didn't hear anything about, gosh, it's different folks, when you're in the White House, you've got to understand that. That wasn't what he said; that would be the signal that the man was losing his way, and I don't believe for a moment that he is betraying us.

I think that he is doing everything that humanly, from his position, can be done. Conservative pressures, conservative pressures, repeat, can help him. During the Nixon administration, I used to get a phone call occasionally from Tom Houston saying, if you folks at National Review are annoyed at Nixon, say so, beat on him, raise a little hell; Laxalt is doing it and I kept thinking/^{well,} is he being disloyal to his boss? He was Special Assistant to Mr. Nixon. No, no, he wasn't at all. I suspect he was doing it at Nixon's request. Nixon was saying, in effect, let's have a little percussion from the Right, please, to equal all that percussion I'm getting from the left, and then I can march down the middle, you see. I thought for a long time that there was actually a conspiracy between Mr. Nixon and Mr. Reagan and some of his right wing critics, of that type. I don't think so anymore, because conversations that I had with President last year convinced me that he's been genuinely hurt by the tone of some of the criticism he's gotten from the severe right. He spoke of one particular attack _____ me as the most dishonest piece of journalism he had ever seen. And, I'll tell you, when a man as inherently gentle as Ronald Reagan uses terms like that, it's because he's been hurt. We do ~~not~~ do ourselves or our country any service by hurting him. He's going, on my opinion, to run again.....and as I had the pleasure of saying to a panel up at Harvard last week, he's going to mop up the floor with whatever * unfortunate soul the Democrats manage to persuade to run against him!! (applause)

And, the next time you and I have to watch out, is when that sad day comes, and it will someday, when we have to let him go and pick another standard bearer. I hope we remember, and above all/^{that} the macho types remember it at that point just how conservative they are. Because, I'll tell you, the tendency of the Republican Party will be to inch back toward the center and squat right there on that old traditional conservatism on which they lost for so many years. Lyn is absolutely right, unless we can keep the social conservatives with the economic conservatives, we are absolutely through!! And, we're going to have to remember that! That's why the social issues are so important; don't be dissappointed we didn't pass a law through this session of Congress; things of that size and importance you have to introduce again and again and slowly, as the liberals can tell you, you get your way on them. But, these issues will....I remember in 1968, we'd had in '64 every conservative, at any rate, for Barry Goldwater. All together, a wonderful, happy band; came 1968 and Goldwater wasn't running, Reagan was running, at least he was available and a great many conservatives were for him to the eternal credit of Young Americans for

Freedom; their national board with 21 members, 19 of them there at Miami Beach voted to endorse Ronald Reagan for the Presidency then. In 1968 when he was only 56 years old, but oh,.....my friends, the former leading Goldwaterites who, yea, they were for Reagan, but you know, Nixon ^{has} ~~is~~ gotta better chance; Nixon can win, he's conservative enough. I wouldn't have to go far in this very room to find certain examples of that. What a tragedy it was; what it gave this country, what a disaster! What a series of disasters that was. Let's not make that mistake again. Let us appreciate what we have, let us follow him and then let us give him a successor worthy of what he will have done. He is a great president, he is our leader, he is our winner and our children's children will bow their heads at the mention of his name. Thank you very much.

I'm sure that Stan appreciate the fact that you've made his job so much easier!! (He could always agree with me).Anyway, M. Stanton Evans is our next speaker. Most of you people here certainly know him. I'd say he's probably the most active conservative around even though he's a little older than I am, and he'd.....he writes a syndicated column, he does radio commentary, he lectures, he writes books, he teaches at Troy State University in Alabama, he edits a hard-hitting newsletter called The Sentinel, he publishes consumer research, and runs the Monday Club in Washington, D. C., which is an elite group of people. And, he basically, however, beyond all this, he squeezes into his spare time, he's created The National Journalism Center in which literally dozens of students from all over the nation go to this journalism center, they learn about journalism and they actually get jobs in mainline publications, Readers' Digest, some of them have worked for Evans and Novak, and I really would ask you people out there who are interested in it, to talk to him about it and to write to him about it, because I think if conservatives are going to influence or can influence anything or should influence anything, it certainly should be the media, and I think this is a great way in which to do it. So, without further ado, I now present you Stan Evans.....

Thank you.....Thank you very much, Alan. I appreciate the commercial and welcome the opportunity of appearing here with three of my very good friends; in fact, Bill Rusher and Lyn Nofziger and I were indeed, all Reaganites in 1968 there in the Deauville Hotel in Miami Beach and Bill

and I never were for Nixon until Watergate.....and we....had we known he was doing stuff like that it would have been an entirely different story, but.....it seems to me that the question we are here to address this morning is: Will Jim Baker seek a Second Term??..... I'm afraid my good friend, Bill and I do part company here. I think we're looking at the same phenomena but with rather different emphases. Like the story about...is the glass half full or half empty? I think it's the question on whether it's 5% full or 95% empty and Bill is focusing on the 5%. I'd like to look at the 95%. From my standpoint, in 1980, a great opportunity was presented to the country and to the conservatives and to this administration. I believe in all candor, that that opportunity has been defaulted. I think that there has been no Reagan revolution in Washington; there will be, under present circumstances, no Reagan revolution in Washington and I'm here to give you my reasons for believing that and then to conclude the latter part of the 3½ hours that have been allotted to us,some possible steps for remedying what I think is a rather unfortunate situation. It is true that Ronald Reagan is a good man and as I've indicated, I think all of us are strong supporters of Mr. Reagan. I think there are probably more Reaganites on this platform than there are in the White House..... and I think, in addition, that the president's intentions are indeed, good. I think he is a good man, I think he is trying to do what is right, and when he does things that are right, we should support him and say that they're right. And, I can think of many things, Bill has cited some, I can think of others like energy deregulation and ^{this} Adelman appointment for which he is suffering a great deal of grief, and Jim Watt and many other things in this administration that deserve our support. And, we should not relent in that support in the slightest. The problem is, it seems to me, that while the Reagan administration has been good on some marginal issues and in some areas of controversy, that if you look at the fundamental tasks that this administration was sent here to perform, it is not performing them. And, the two main examples are the continued growth of government on the home front, and the faltering, ^{VAS} ~~flaccid~~ oscillating performance of the United States in foreign policy. And, there certainly isn't enough time to explore all of this, but let me just address these two areas very briefly. Bill said that to the question is how much more will spending be cut for domestic programs and how much more will taxes be cut, in the agenda of debate on the domestic side? Well, in fact, that's not so. The budget is not being cut; the budget continues to grow, right now,

just as rapidly as it did under Jimmy Carter. In fact, slightly more rapidly. In the four years of the Carter administration the budget was increasing at annual rate, an annual dollar rate, of 64 billion dollars a year. In the first 2 years of the Reagan administration, under current projections, it is increasing at an^{annual} average rate of 74 billion dollars a year. The average real growth of the budget in the final 2 years of the Carter administration, '80 and '81, averaged 4.5 percent. The real growth of the budget in 1982, the first fiscal year of Ronald Reagan, real growth was 6.3 per cent. Under Carter the budget as a percent of the gross national product averaged 22 percent. Under Reagan, last year, it went to 24 percent and this year it is projected to go to 25 percent. And all these figures, despite what Mr. Reagan said in Human Events this week, are from his own budget document. The question of taxes, I won't go into all the details of why the tax cut and I'm for that, and I want him to stand firm on the 3rd phase of it, in indexing and I'm strongly supportive of those concepts, nonetheless, as good as those are, and he is to be commended for promoting that program, they do not add up to a tax cut, but the partial roll back of the continuing automatic tax increase built into the system before he got here for Social Security and the upward climb of taxes through bracket creep as people are pushed into higher brackets through inflation. That will net out so that when the entire package is implemented the average American will still be paying as much or more in taxes as he or she was paying before the program began. Now, after all that happens, because the spending has continued to increase while the tax line, while it increased, it did not increase as rapidly as spending, huge deficits are projected for the future for this year and down the road and what we are seeing now is because the spending has not been brought under control, people are scrambling in the administration, in Congress to increase our taxes. Last summer the Congress passed with the backing of the administration, what was in fact, the largest legislative tax increase in American history, 228 billion dollar five year tax increase. We now have further prospective tax increases for this miserable Social Security compromise which is another default in getting the spending under control. We're going to raise taxes to pay for all of that stuff, and many other tax hikes are being contemplated in this session of Congress and within the administration. So the issue right now is not, indeed, How much are we going to cut taxes?, it's How much are we going to raise taxes?, and I guarantee you, your taxes will probably be raised before this Congress is out.

But I'm a great fan of Jean Kirkpatrick, I'm a great fan of...uhh... Ken Tomlinson at the Voice of America and some other people that I might name, Ken Adelman is a good man and certainly should be supported. Nonetheless, If you look at the basic conduct of our foreign policy, under the State Department, you see that the same programs are being administered and implemented as were being administered and implemented under the Carter Administration, I would argue with Bill about the Taiwan thing; I won't take time to do that today. I will simply say that the communique that was handed down last August, in every particular, was an extension of the Carter policy... so viewed by the people in the State Department who concocted it...so viewed by Peking...and so viewed by the Taiwanese to whom I have talked. If you take a look at SALT, to disarmament, to talks, we are continuing to abide under Ronald Reagan ~~to~~ ^{by} the SALT II Treaty, unratified, rejected by the Democrat Senate, and nonetheless, this Administration continues to abide by its terms, even though Ronald Reagan said that it was fatally flawed. There's a mass of evidence that the Soviet Union is violating the SALT I agreement and the ABM Treaty that was adopted in 1972. I've been trying since July to get the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency to confirm or deny some several dozen Soviet violations of the SALT accords. I've addressed these questions directly to members of the National Security Council. They will not answer my questions! What is happening under this Administration, under ACDA (Arms Control and Disarmament) is an extension of what was happening under Carter, which started under Henry Kissinger, under Gerald Ford, which is, in my view, a cover-up by the Administration of the fact that the Soviet Union is, indeed, violating the SALT accords to cover up or trying to keep the illusion of the SALT process and detente alive. If you look at El Salvador, we continue to back a collectivist land reform imposed on that country by coercion, by the Carter Administration which is ravaging the economy of El Salvador. We have the same attitudes in many respects, in the State Department towards the more conservative elements in El Salvador that prevailed under Jimmy Carter; and destabilization effort, in my opinion, has been conducted by the State Department against Roberto d'Aubison (sp?) down there. If you look at the issue of Red trade, the strongest stand that this Administration has taken was against the re-export of American technology and equipment to the Siberian pipeline, that was the one place the President had drawn the line...They have now backed off of that. You can go through a whole litany of these things. If you look at what is happening in both Domestic

and Foreign Policy, with these marginal distinctions, what you see is not as the President says, and I think he believes this, gradual movement back in a different direction, but continued movement in the same direction, on both Domestic and Foreign Policy, perhaps at a slightly slower rate of speed, than would have prevailed under Jimmy Carter, but nonetheless, movement in the same direction. Now why does this happen? It happens, in part, because the tremendous...it doesn't happen because Ronald Reagan doesn't want to change things, He does...It happens because of the tremendous intractibility of the system that is built, in place, in this parasitic city. (applause) You have an enormous (applause) (Lyn wants to know if that means its like Paris) and...uhh.. (Lyn, I'll explain this to you after I get through) What you have here...the bureaucracy and all of that, but you also have built into place, seventy-five percent of the budget, which consists of automatic, un... so-called uncontrollable spending, and about half of that is so-called entitlement programs, which are geared to external economic indicators: Unemployment Comp, Food Stamps, Welfare, Medicaid, Medicare, a whole host of programs which grind forward on an automatic basis, as the economic indicators change, and that makes the numbers that are written down by the budget planners at OMB and CBO utterly meaningless, and all the budget projections of the Reagan Administration, have been totally wrong at every step of the way because that process is continuing. You have a similar thing in the Foreign Policy side. The State Department consists of a bureaucracy that has been in place there for not simply decades, in some cases for a generation. And the continue to implement the Foreign Service bureaucracy continues to pursue the same programs ^{today} that it pursued before. The Reagan Administration, it seems to me, has underestimated the intractibility of that problem and many other problems that it has to deal with, and has repeatedly gotten itself it the ^{posture} position of back-peddling, being defensive, vis-a-vis the massed forces against it. And that the compromises, everybody knows that politics consists of compromises, the name of the game is to get the compromise going in your direction, not to be backing up and compromising in the other guy's direction. (applause) Now, if you look at why this has happened I think a lot of it ^{does} go to the question of appointments, I think there is no question about that, it is true (applause) There are Reaganites... There are Reaganites here and there in any Department of government, but I've talked to Reaganites in virtually every cabinet Department of this government today, and I can

tell you, from what they tell me, that every one of them feels isolated under attack, surrounded by Bush people, moderates, Carterites, Hold-overs, (applause) these people, in every case, feel like they are on the defensive, fighting a holding action, not able to implement the President's policies because they are surrounded by people who do not believe in those policies. The worst part of the appointments process in this government is in the White House, itself. That is the core of the difficulty (applause) For reasons that I do not fully comprehend, the President has staffed the Legislative side of his operation over there with people who have absolutely no track record whatsoever of believing in Reaganite philosophy, of supporting Ronald Reagan, when there was any option within the Republican Party to support anybody else... his Chief-of-Staff supported Gerald Ford in 1976 against Ronald Reagan when we were all supporting Ronald Reagan; His Chief-of-Staff was the campaign manager for George Bush in 1980 when all of us were supporting Ronald Reagan. Yet that is the person who's made the Chief-of-Staff in the White House, who brings in, as his deputy, a man named Richard Darman who used to work for Elliot Richardson, who is the guy who controls the flow of information to the President. And you can go right down the line in that staff and see that there is not a Reaganite in the bunch. And it seems to me, that when you've got that kind of situation sitting right there in the White House, it is very... going to be very difficult, indeed, to get legislative strategy or appointments which reflect the Reaganite philosophy. The President (applause) The President may well believe, as he said in his interview with Alan, that he tells Jim Baker what to do, and that is so, but it is Jim Baker and Richard Darman and others of their ilk, who decide what options are presented to the President. A good example was the tax increase last summer: According to Time magazine, there was a legislative strategy group run by Baker and Darman which presented the options to the President which blocked out access to the President by people in the White House staff who were against the tax increase and who prevented Conservatives in Congress from making their case effectively to the President. They control the information flow, they set the agenda, they limit the options the President believes that he has. That is a very, very serious problem, indeed. Above all, people of this nation, the pragmatic, problem-solving people who are in the White House do not have the temperament one needs to conduct a Reagan Revolution, they do not see ~~them~~ ^{issues} as we see them in this room. They think of us as a faction to be

appeased...We've been over there to the White House, we were brought in there just like American Indians, and handicapped Fillipinos....and, (laughter) you know...bring 'em in, massage 'em...you know...let 'em air their gripes, and get 'em out...That is exactly the way they look at us! They do not look at us as part of this administration, they look at us as an element that might be useful to them; They do not look at us as part of what they are doing and they do not look at themselves as an extension of what we're trying to do. It seems to me that that is the source of the default of the so-called Reagan Revolution...of the kind of people who are running this Administration at that level. Now, that's the good news (laughter) Now I want to give you what I think are steps to improvement. I do not believe you're going to get a Revolution of our kind out of this Administration. However, let me suggest four steps that I think should be taken, and we should work on, and we should demand in our political advocacy. Number 1, by far, in terms of the short term, is that the President should be asked by all of us and by Conservatives everywhere in America, to fire Jim Baker, and all of his ilk! (enthusiastic, sustained applause) Assuming (He says there's two Bakers, I'll come to that other one in a minute) We have got to keep... it's absolutely correct that we have got to keep pressure on this Administration on these issues, keep it up: Support the Administration when it is right; But, point out when it is wrong, and say it's wrong. Keep fighting it. (applause) Third, we have got to get some leadership in Congress. I would tend to say that if you're talking about the long pull, changing some...it's absolutely right...Ronald Reagan cannot change with a magic wand what is wrong in this government today. You have got to have people on Capitol Hill who are going to go in and undo this entitlement situation, reform entitlements in a realistic way. The Administration should propose it. It has not proposed it. Which is it's fault. But even if it did propose it, the kind of leadership that we have in Congress would not achieve the objective. You have got a Republican leadership in Congress which is, in my view, pitiful! You talk about Howard Baker, Bob Dole, Bob Packwood, Chuck Percy, (boos) this is the opposite of leadership. This is leadership that pulls in the wrong direction and presents the President with yet more options of compromising in the wrong direction. That has got to be changed. I would have to think that if you had to pick one thing that should be changed in the very short run, something to which Conservatives around America could dedicate themselves, it is to defeat Chuck Percy when he

runs for office again! (applause) Unfortunately, there are people in the Administration who send the President out to do fundraisers for Chuck Percy. That is symptomatic of the problems in the White House. We need to get more Conservatives in Senate and the House where we need them to coordinate those people...There is almost no coordination, no leadership over there...people are fighting lone battles, they are not focused. The one exception to the rule of not paying attention to things that other people are working on...the guy who tries, on every issue, to come forward, to stand for what is right, is Jesse Helms of North Carolina. (applause) The final thing is that even as we try for short term change...and we must, we must fight all these battles, we must fight them much better than we've been fighting them... We need to lift our sights. Bill Rusher, Alan Ryskind, Lyn Nofziger, all the people in this room, all of us, have been working on this stuff for years. Some of us for thirty years, or more. And, that's gotta keep going. We cannot relent. We cannot be disheartened, because of a... because of set-backs, under a given Administration. We cannot say, well, that's it, I throw in the towel because we elected Ronald Reagan, it didn't get the job done. Ronald Reagan, as great a man as he is, is a footnote, a honorable footnote, a great footnote, in the whole history of this movement. But the reason this country is great, and the reason that it will continue to be great, is not because of any one man, it is not because of any one President, it is not because of one politician, it's because of the people of this country, the people of this country who, first built the Conservative movement, nominated Ronald Reagan, elected Ronald REagan, those people are still out there. You're still out there. The people who responded to the concerns of growing government, and vacillation in foreign policy, still have the same distresses and the same aspirations they had when they voted for him in 1980. And as I think they will continue to vote for him in 1984. I think that we have to look beyond this Administration. Keep working within it. Look down the road. Keep building our movement. Keep articulating what we believe. Keep working for candidates who support what we believe. And I think that the opportunity that was presented to us in 1980 which in my view of the short term has been defaulted, can be reclaimed. And that we can, in time, restore ^{to this country} the ways of freedom, intended for it by its founders. Thank you. (applause)

- I understand that we have time for just a few question, really, because Jack Kemp has a schedule, and, so I can only ask maybe one or two questions. I would...Go ahead Sir.

-My name is Russ Wittenburg (sp?) from Carefree, Arizona. And, I would like to take this opportunity to tell you from what I have heard in the last three days, to compliment Stan Evans, Howard Phillipps, and Pat Buchanan as telling it like it is. My questions, two of them, Number One, Would somebody like to comment on holdovers in the Reagan Administration of the members of the Trilateral Commission; and, Why can't we have vintage Reagan, like we had last night, for the State of the Union message when we had something Reagan, moderate Reagan?

-Nofziger (?) I'd like to say about the holdovers in the Reagan Administration I wish to hell we'd got 'em all fired! I think that's a disaster!

^{2USHER?} To take the other half of the gentleman's question, and I want to use this to...to, sort of... comment generally on Stan Evans' critique, with a good deal of which I agreed, in the particulars. Although, I must say that it...I would no longer advise anybody after my departure, to ask Stan precisely what I would have felt on certain of these matters. A high official of this Administration said to me not long ago, ruefully, because I think he is a Conservative, he said, you know, sometimes Conservatives have the impression that the election of 1980 repealed all of the laws they don't like. And it didn't. We are assuming much too much if we think it did. If we think that every (valeyty ?) that ever occurred to us was ratified and passed into law by a plebiscitary vote of the American people on election day, 1980; forget it! No such thing happened! And any man who, elected that day, proceeded on that assumption, would fall flat on his face, because the American people never gave him any mandate of that size and type. Ronald Reagan has an estimate of what the American people would approve in relation to the maybe quite different things that that he himself would like to bring about, and he is bringing about as many of those as possible. This is the work of government and of politics. And I think that it is all very well for you and me, because we are not President, to live in a world if we want to, of our dreams, where everything goes our way. Don't ask him to, he has to live in the real world. (applause)
Thank you very much.

^{EVANS?} Joe (2) Let me just briefly address this. It seems to me that the question of holdovers goes to the issues that Bill was addressing. It

is indeed very difficult to change what exists here, and that I think should be the premise of any intelligent discussion. The difficulty is that you've got a lot of people in this Administration that don't particularly think it should be changed. So, they want business as usual. They want to maneuver within the existing framework, and, that is the problem in terms of blunting the President's own desires to bring about some kind of transformation. Secondly, in terms of the reality, Bill, when people of this city talk about reality, the President's coming to terms with reality, every time he get's praised in the Washington Post or the New York Times for coming to terms with reality, it makes the hairs stand up on the back of my neck. Because, what they're talking about is the reality of Washington! ^{They} ~~We~~'re talking about what they want. they talk about what the parasites and the vampires in this city want to keep a good thing going for bureaucrats and consultants and high-paid lawyers and accountants and all of the rest of them that are... that are living high off the hog at the expense of the American taxpayer. But the reality that Ronald Reagan should be looking at is not this reality, it is to deal with it, it should be the reality of the American people. The reality of what they want, which is totally different from what the Washington Post, the New York Times, and the bureaucracy want. And I would remind you this: In every...and you and I have seen this time and time again...you talk about what political feasibility of what we believe. The Republican Party doesn't run to the Left and then try to govern to the Right. The pattern is the opposite. It runs to the Right. Ronald Reagan did not run in 1980 and appeal to the American people that I'm going to adjust and compromise which is what Jimmy Carter did. And continue these programs and let the budget grow at the same rate and all of that. He said I'm going to change it. That's what they wanted. That is where true political strength exists for the Republican Party. Not in this fudging and compromising and caving in, to Washington, DC. (applause)

Alan

- (Ryskind) Could I have a sentence? Jack Kemp is waiting outside. Okay... one more question.
- I'm Dahl Stevens, Arlington, VA. Isn't one of the problems here the reliance on the Eastern Establishment which was the backbone of the Republican Party 50 years ago, but a lot of them have gone over to the Democrats who are very willing to give them special favors. And, the

big establishment is simply not coming through? And I have seen this in other places, and in the White House.

?? The answer is yes! (Evans ?)

(Rusher) I think that there is a real shift in this country, in terms of the power base, to the West and the South, and away from the Eastern Establishment and I think the Conservatives are totally comfortable with that. At the same time I must warn you, if this is my last comment, let it be, not to get yourself too heavily inoculated with the idea that the American^{people} in their vast majorities are all sitting out there, saying to you people and me, here in this room, thinking as we do, you are absolutely right; Some of them are, and some of them aren't! Now, don't get intoxicated with the idea that the whole world is your way and just a few people on the Washington Post stand between you and triumph.

Evans: The American people did say in 1980, that Ronald Reagan was right.

That's the issue (speaking to Bill Rusher) It's not what we think...

Rusher - But Ronald Reagan, even in 1980, represented a great many things to a great many people. Not just the particular program that you or I might have.

(Nofziger) This is the first time in my life, I've been caught in the middle of a filibuster.

(Ryskind) I am clearly not a moderator. Wait one second here. Apparently Jack Kemp is going to come in. We would hope that you would all stay seated, so that we can run Jack Kemp up here. And then if you want to talk to the speakers outside, mob them, and mug them or whatever you want to do, they'll be outside on the exit. Also, please give applause to these very stimulating speakers. (applause)

RONALD REAGAN LIBRARY
TRANSFER/PARALLEL FILE SHEET

Please circle "preservation" (put in AV, etc.), "classified" (parallel filed in vault/annex), "collection" (misfile, provenance), "RD/FRD" (parallel file), "NATO" (parallel file)

PRESERVATION CLASSIFICATION COLLECTION RD/FRD NATO

FROM:

Collection Blackwell, Merton

Series _____

File Folder Title/Casefile #/NSC # Conservative Political Action
Conference

Box Number OA ~~12499~~ 9077

Description of Material:

1 Audio-Cassette
Reagan at Mid-Term: An Assessment
Moderator: Alan Ryskind
1983 Conservative Pol. Action Conf.

TO:
Collection: AV for storage

Series: _____

File Folder Title/Casefile #/NSC # _____

Box Number: _____

Transferred by: dlb Date: 7/25/08

NEED ONE COPY IN ORIGINAL LOCATION
SECOND COPY WITH ITEM PARALLEL FILED OR TRANSFERRED
THIRD/FOURTH* COPY FOR COLLECTION FOLDERS - * IF TRANSFERRING TO/FROM TWO
COLLECTIONS

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

February 24, 1982

CPAC
Copy of
what went
down last
night 2-24

MEMORANDUM FOR RICHARD DARMAN

FROM:

ELIZABETH H. DOLE 

SUBJECT:

Comments Re CPAC Speech Draft

Please see attached pages 1, 3 and 13 for recommended specific changes. From an overall content standpoint, the audience will greet the delivery of this speech with much enthusiasm.

In attempting to observe the delivery of this speech in a "macro" sense, one might get the impression of an audience saying "Reagan is a nice guy and don't we love him." However, from an historic standpoint, grassroots conservative organizations have been most enthusiastic when the President has been forcefully in the lead, battling against the common foes of conservatism. In short, a "call to arms" speech.

The addition of some of this fire, leadership and continued urgency for activism might move this to the "barn-burner" category. Much of FDR's success during his darker days can be attributed to his constant efforts to keep his coalition together, in battle, against a common enemy. The President needs to help keep the grassroots from becoming complacent.

Now I think we can be proud of the fact that a conservative administration has pursued these goals by confronting the Nation's economic problems head-on. But it should not be forgotten that we also dealt with one other less publicized, but equally grave problem: the serious state of disrepair in our national defenses. The last Democratic administration had increased real defense spending at a rate of 1.8 percent a year -- not even enough to keep up with inflation. I don't think I have to recount for you again all the horror stories of 1980: the fighter planes that couldn't fly; the navy ships that couldn't leave port; the rapid deployment force that was neither rapid, nor deployable, nor a force.

The protection of this Nation's security is the most solemn duty of any President: that is why I have asked for substantial increases this year in our defense budget.

Those who think these increases are excessive should contemplate the erosion that has taken place in defense spending during the past two decades. In 1962, President Kennedy's budget called for defense spending that accounted for 47.8 percent of the entire budget; even with our increases, the defense spending this year will account for only 28.5 percent of the budget -- ^{barely} ~~almost~~ half of that figure 20 years ago. In 1962, President Kennedy's request for military spending accounted for 9 percent of the gross national product; even with our increases, the figure today ^{in my budget} is only 6.3 percent of the gross national product.

Those who call for defense spending cuts should think long and hard about the reaction they are likely to get from the American people. The Soviet Union outspends us by 50

that this remains a company town. And there's only one company, one business, one vested interest here -- its name is Government, Big Government.

This is the correct Evans quote

You know, I remember what Stan Evans used to call a few years ago his "iron law of politics": "When our people get ~~someplace~~ ^{where} they can do us some good -- they stop being our people." And it is easy to come here and forget our principles and our constituents -- to start wanting to be an insider, to start talking the conventional wisdom -- to forget that there's a big country out there across the Potomac, a country that sent us here with one job in mind: to cut the size and burden of government not to increase it.

Now I don't think that's happened in our Administration. In fact, I have a sneaking suspicion that a few of you here tonight agree with my recent decision not to ask the Congress for higher taxes. But let's be honest with ourselves: its going to take more than 402 days to completely transform the Federal bureaucracy. This came home to me the other day when I learned about one private citizen in Louisiana who wrote to HUD asking for help in developing his property and received this letter back from the bureaucracy: "We have observed that you have not traced the title prior to 1803. Before final approval, it will be necessary that the title be traced previous to that year."

So this particular citizen wrote to Washington:

"Gentlemen, I am unaware that any educated man failed to know that Louisiana was purchased from France in 1803. The title of the land was acquired by France by right of conquest from Spain. The land came into possession of Spain in 1492 by right of discovery by an Italian sailor, Christopher

(Dolan/AB)
February 24, 1982

CONSERVATIVE POLITICAL ACTION CONFERENCE DINNER
FEBRUARY 26, 1982

Nancy and I are delighted to be here at the ninth annual Conservative Political Action Conference. Anyone looking at the exciting program you have scheduled over these 4 days -- and the size of this gathering here tonight -- cannot help but be impressed with the energy and vitality of the conservative movement in America. And I think we owe a special debt of gratitude to the staffs of the American Conservative Union, Young Americans for Freedom, Human Events and National Review for making this year's conference the most successful in the ~~brief but~~ ^{long} impressive history of this event.

You may remember that when I spoke to you last year I said the election victory we enjoyed in November of 1980 was not a victory of politics so much as it was victory of ideas; not a victory for any one man or party but a victory for a set of principles -- principles that had been protected and nourished during years of grim and heartbreaking defeats by a few dedicated Americans.

You are those Americans -- and tonight I salute you. But I've also come here tonight to remind you of how much remains to be done and to ask your help in turning into reality even more of our hopes for America and the world.

The agenda for this conference is victory -- victory in this year's crucial congressional, State and local elections.

The media coverage you have received this week and the attention paid to you by so many distinguished Americans -- in and out of government, conservative and not so conservative --

Note:
CPAC
began more than
20 years ago.
It was discontinued
in 1966 and
resumed in
1973.
RR