

Originally Processed With FOIA(s):

FOIA Number:

S

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the George Bush Presidential Library Staff.

Record Group/Collection: George H.W. Bush Presidential Records
Collection/Office of Origin: Speechwriting, White House Office of
Series: Snow, Tony, Files
Subseries: Subject File, 1988-1993

OA/ID Number: 13899
Folder ID Number: 13899-005

Folder Title:
[Snow-Memoranda, 2/92-1/93]

| Stack: | Row: | Section: | Shelf: | Position: |
|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| G | 18 | 29 | 2 | 7 |

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet (George Bush Library)

| Doc. No. / Type | Subject/Title | Date | Restriction | Classification |
|-----------------|--|----------|----------------|----------------|
| 01. Memo | Tony Snow to David Demarest, Re: Campaign Issues. [Open Upon Deed of Gift - March 16, 2015] (4 pp.) | 03/02/92 | PRM | |
| 02. Memo | From Tony Snow, Re: Problems, Opportunities for 1992. (9 pp.) | 03/05/92 | P-5 | |
| 03. Memo | From Tony Snow, Re: Problems, Opportunities for 1992. (11 pp.) | 03/05/92 | P-5 | |
| 04. Memo | Tony Snow to Bob Teeter, Re: Presidential Initiatives. (4 pp.) | 03/12/92 | P-5 | |
| 05. Memo | Tony Snow to Phil Brady, Re: Announcement of Appointment. (6 pp.) | 03/16/92 | P-5 | |
| 06. Memo | Tony Snow to Clayton Yeutter, et al., Re: Taxes. (2 pp.) | 03/17/92 | P-5 | |
| 07. Memo | Tony Snow to Anna Perez, Re: Cabal. [Open Upon Deed of Gift - March 16, 2015] (3 pp.) | 03/17/92 | PRM | |
| 08. Memo | [Tony Snow] to Dorrance Smith, et al., Re: Reform Speech. (2 pp.) | 03/25/92 | P-5 | |
| 09. Memo | Tony Snow to Samuel K. Skinner, et al., Re: Friday's Speech. (4 pp.) | 04/01/92 | P-5 | |
| 10. Memo | Tony Snow to Samuel K. Skinner, et al., Re: L. A. Trip. (8 pp.) | 04/05/92 | P-5 | |

Page 1 of 4

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Speechwriting, White House Office of
Series: Snow, Robert Anthony (Tony)
Subseries: Subject File
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: [Snow Memoranda 2/92 - 1/93]

Pinksheet Number: RML1862
OA/ID Number: 13899-005
Date Closed: 12/28/2004
FOIA/Sys Case #: S
Re-review Case #: 2005-0485-S
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

| Doc. No. / Type | Subject/Title | Date | Restriction | Classification |
|-----------------|--|----------|----------------|----------------|
| 11. Memo | Tony Snow to Samuel Skinner, et al., Re: Making the Most of Our Opportunities. (3 pp.) | 04/06/92 | P-5 | |
| 12. Memo | Tony Snow and Maria Sheehan to Samuel Skinner, et al., Re: Making the Most of Our Opportunities. (3 pp.) | 04/06/92 | P-5 | |
| 13. Memo | Tony Snow to Henson Moore and Dorrance Smith, Re: Op-Eds and Other Communications Topics. (3 pp.) | 04/13/92 | P-5 | |
| 14. Memo | Tony Snow to Samuel K. Skinner, Re: Reactions to L. A. Events. (2 pp.) | 04/30/92 | P-5 | |
| 15. Memo | [Tony Snow] to Al, Re: A few general notes on the San Francisco draft. (2 pp.) | n.d. | P-5 | |
| 16. Memo | Tony Snow to Samuel K. Skinner, et al., Re: Op-Eds. (3 pp.) | 05/19/92 | P-5 | |
| 17. Memo | Tony Snow to POTUS, Re: Los Angeles. (3 pp.) | 06/01/92 | P-5 | |
| 18. Memo | Tony Snow to Cathy Goldberg, Re: NYT ["New York Times"] Op-Ed. (1 pp.) | 06/09/92 | P-5 | |
| 19. Memo | Tony Snow to Gail Wilensky, Re: Op-Ed. (3 pp.) | 07/02/92 | P-5 | |
| 20. Memo | [Tony Snow] to Bob Teeter, Re: POTUS speech in Faith, North Carolina. (1 pp.) | n.d. | (b)(6) | |

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Speechwriting, White House Office of
Series: Snow, Robert Anthony (Tony)
Subseries: Subject File
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: [Snow Memoranda 2/92 - 1/93]

Pinksheet Number: RML1862
OA/ID Number: 13899-005
Date Closed: 12/28/2004
FOIA/Sys Case #: S
Re-review Case #: 2005-0485-S
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

| Doc. No. / Type | Subject/Title | Date | Restriction | Classification |
|-----------------|--|----------|----------------|----------------|
| 21. Memo | Re: Campaign speech themes/ subjects. [Open Upon Deed of Gift - March 16, 2015] (2 pp.) | n.d. | PRM | |
| 22. Memo | Tony Snow to Bob Teeter, Re: Campaign Themes. [Open Upon Deed of Gift - March 16, 2015] (27 pp.) | 07/16/92 | PRM | |
| 23. Memo | Tony Snow to Samuel K. Skinner, et al., Re: Op-Eds. (3 pp.) | 07/21/92 | P-5 | |
| 24. Memo | Tony Snow to Bob Teeter, et al., Re: Defining the Democrats. [Open Upon Deed of Gift - March 16, 2015] (8 pp.) | 08/03/92 | PRM | |
| 25. Memo | Tony Snow to Ray Price, Re: Convention Speech. (4 pp.) | 08/12/92 | P-5 | |
| 26. Memo | Tony Snow to Bob Zoellick, et al., Re: Campaign Themes, Strategies. [Open Upon Deed of Gift - March 16, 2015] (10 pp.) | 08/26/92 | PRM | |
| 27. Memo | Tony Snow to Robert Zoellick, et al., Re: Campaign Themes, Strategies. [Open Upon Deed of Gift - March 16, 2015] (7 pp.) | 08/27/92 | PRM | |
| 28. Memo | Tony Snow to Robert Zoellick, et al., Re: Campaign Themes, Strategies. [Open Upon Deed of Gift - March 16, 2015] (8 pp.) | 08/28/92 | PRM | |
| 29. Memo | Tony Snow to Robert Zoellick, et al., Re: 10 Percent Check-Off. [Open Upon Deed of Gift - March 16, 2015] (1 pp.) | 08/31/92 | PRM | |

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Speechwriting, White House Office of
Series: Snow, Robert Anthony (Tony)
Subseries: Subject File
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: [Snow Memoranda 2/92 - 1/93]

Pinksheet Number: RML1862
OA/ID Number: 13899-005
Date Closed: 12/28/2004
FOIA/Sys Case #: S
Re-review Case #: 2005-0485-S
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet
(George Bush Library)

| Doc. No. / Type | Subject/Title | Date | Restriction | Classification |
|-----------------|---|----------|----------------|----------------|
| 30. Memo | Tony Snow to Bob Zoellick, et al., Re: The Clinton Tax Increases. [Open Upon Deed of Gift - March 16, 2015] (1 pp.) | 09/01/92 | PRM | |
| 31. Memo | [Tony Snow] to Dr. Louis Sullivan, Judith Smith, Interested Parties, Re: Presidential Address on Race Relations. (2 pp.) | n.d. | P-5 | |

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Speechwriting, White House Office of
Series: Snow, Robert Anthony (Tony)
Subseries: Subject File
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: [Snow Memoranda 2/92 - 1/93]

Pinksheet Number: RML1862
OA/ID Number: 13899-005
Date Closed: 12/28/2004
FOIA/Sys Case #: S
Re-review Case #: 2005-0485-S
P-2/P-5 Review Case #:

01/13/93 14:05
Free: 52553728

Directory C:\WORK\WP50*.*

| . <CURRENT> | <DIR> | | | .. <PARENT> | <DIR> | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-------|-------------|--------|----------|-------|
| MACROS . | <DIR> | 04/17/92 | 11:25 | 0910 . | 845* | 09/10/92 | 10:51 |
| CAMPMEM1. | 9804* | 03/02/92 | 14:19 | DICT . | 8001* | 07/26/92 | 17:01 |
| JOBMEM . | 1881* | 03/16/92 | 15:09 | KAUFTP . | 10345* | 04/14/92 | 18:58 |
| KAUFTP2 . | 13482* | 05/11/92 | 13:39 | LET0320 . | 1923* | 03/20/92 | 09:56 |
| LET0403 . | 1663* | 04/03/92 | 12:22 | MEM0304 . | 23179* | 03/04/92 | 17:58 |
| MEM0305 . | 28368* | 03/12/92 | 14:16 | MEM0312 . | 10352* | 03/12/92 | 11:34 |
| MEM0317 . | 5718* | 03/17/92 | 15:17 | MEM0317A. | 7860* | 03/17/92 | 16:37 |
| MEM0325 . | 4298* | 03/25/92 | 16:18 | MEM0330A. | 673* | 03/30/92 | 14:42 |
| MEM0330C. | 1555* | 03/30/92 | 17:21 | MEM0331A. | 12352* | 04/01/92 | 13:27 |
| MEM0331B. | 3856* | 03/31/92 | 19:48 | MEM0403 . | 2618* | 04/03/92 | 09:53 |
| MEM0406 . | 6319* | 04/06/92 | 17:45 | MEM0409 . | 7530* | 04/07/92 | 13:28 |
| MEM0413 . | 8684* | 04/13/92 | 11:06 | MEM0415 . | 1897* | 04/15/92 | 16:46 |
| MEM0422 . | 6615* | 04/22/92 | 14:51 | MEM0422A. | 1551* | 04/22/92 | 13:00 |
| MEM0422B. | 1784* | 04/22/92 | 15:00 | MEM0422C. | 2303* | 04/22/92 | 17:58 |
| MEM0429 . | 4795* | 05/01/92 | 08:07 | MEM0505 . | 20863* | 05/05/92 | 11:26 |
| MEM0512 . | 4636* | 05/12/92 | 17:03 | MEM0515 . | 5747* | 05/15/92 | 13:50 |
| MEM0519 . | 2749* | 05/19/92 | 09:20 | MEM0520 . | 2212* | 05/20/92 | 09:24 |
| MEM0526 . | 7607* | 05/26/92 | 16:26 | MEM0526B. | 3151* | 05/27/92 | 08:56 |
| MEM0527 . | 1943* | 05/27/92 | 09:12 | MEM0527B. | 20192* | 05/27/92 | 10:14 |
| MEM0528 . | 3904* | 05/28/92 | 11:54 | MEM0528B. | 1495* | 05/28/92 | 17:38 |
| MEM0601 . | 7240* | 06/01/92 | 14:11 | MEM0601B. | 2472* | 06/01/92 | 09:39 |
| MEM0605 . | 1285* | 06/08/92 | 14:37 | MEM0609 . | 2422* | 06/09/92 | 10:31 |
| MEM0629 . | 1155* | 06/29/92 | 17:24 | MEM0701B. | 77943* | 08/03/92 | 11:36 |
| MEM0702 . | 6108* | 07/09/92 | 12:48 | MEM0703 . | 1439* | 07/04/92 | 07:10 |
| MEM0706 . | 9200* | 07/20/92 | 19:40 | MEM0709 . | 3980* | 07/09/92 | 12:33 |
| MEM0721 . | 8564* | 07/21/92 | 11:18 | MEM0721B. | 18490* | 08/03/92 | 11:37 |
| MEM0721C. | 5678* | 07/21/92 | 16:02 | MEM0722 . | 4782* | 07/22/92 | 07:26 |
| MEM0727 . | 1588* | 07/28/92 | 08:51 | MEM0727B. | 6413* | 07/27/92 | 17:04 |
| MEM0730 . | 1463* | 07/30/92 | 14:30 | MEM0812 . | 8712* | 08/10/92 | 15:19 |
| MEM0825 . | 25137* | 08/26/92 | 09:30 | MEM0825A. | 20204* | 08/27/92 | 12:50 |
| MEM0825B. | 20374* | 08/28/92 | 10:05 | MEM0828 . | 3212* | 08/28/92 | 10:02 |
| MEM0831 . | 2498* | 08/31/92 | 17:19 | MEM0901 . | 2432* | 09/01/92 | 15:05 |
| MEM0903 . | 1993* | 09/03/92 | 12:36 | MEM0904 . | 16676* | 09/04/92 | 17:34 |
| MEM0916 . | 1069* | 09/16/92 | 10:43 | MEM0924 . | 5288* | 09/24/92 | 10:01 |
| MEM0924B. | 1375* | 09/24/92 | 11:04 | MEM1001 . | 1823* | 10/01/92 | 13:10 |
| MEM1005 . | 3190* | 10/04/92 | 14:09 | MEM1005A. | 752* | 10/05/92 | 14:05 |
| MEM1006 . | 1408* | 10/06/92 | 20:26 | REFA . | 1057* | 03/26/92 | 12:07 |
| RESIGN . | 899* | 01/13/93 | 13:55 | WP{WP} .BK1 | 469 | 01/13/93 | 13:01 |
| WP{WP} .BK2 | 5338 | 12/31/92 | 14:44 | WP}WP{ .BV1 | 0 | 09/23/89 | 17:52 |
| WP}WP{ .CHK | 0 | 09/23/89 | 17:52 | WP}WP{ .SPC | 4096 | 09/23/89 | 17:52 |
| WP}WP{ .TV1 | 0 | 09/23/89 | 17:52 | | | | |

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

February 12, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR ROBERT ANTHONY SNOW
DEPUTY ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT
FOR COMMUNICATIONS AND DIRECTOR
OF SPEECHWRITING

FROM: NIKKI RICHNOW 
DIRECTOR OF WHITE HOUSE GIFTS

SUBJECT: Return to Sender Staff Gift

The completed Staff Gift Record Form, which you submitted to our office for a ruling, is being forwarded to you with this memo. The General Counsel's Office has determined that you may not retain the gift and that it is being returned to the sender. The return has been facilitated by the White House Gifts office, attached is a copy of the letter we sent to the donor. If you have any questions, please contact me on Ext. 7133.

Enclosure

**WHITE HOUSE
STAFF GIFT RECORD**

Send completed Form and Gift to Gift Unit, ext. 7133

[DO NOT DETACH COPIES]

To be Completed by Staff Member

| | | | |
|---|-------------------|--|--|
| STAFF MEMBER | | DONOR | |
| NAME (First, Middle, Last): Tony Snow (AS) | | NAME (First, Middle, Last): Felix Gutierrez | |
| TITLE: Director of Speechwriting | | TITLE: Vice President | |
| GIFT INTENDED FOR (mark <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> in appropriate box): <input type="checkbox"/> White House Staff Member (W) <input type="checkbox"/> Other (O) (e.g., family) | | ADDRESS (Street, City, State, Zip & Country): The Freedom Forum 1101 Wilson Boulevard Arlington, Virginia 22209 | |
| RECEIVED BY (mark <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> in appropriate box): <input type="checkbox"/> Mail Room (M) <input type="checkbox"/> Presented Personally (P) <input type="checkbox"/> Staff (S) <input type="checkbox"/> Other (O) (Specify) | | | |
| DATE ACCEPTED AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF PRESENTATION: Received 12.9.91 through the mail room. | | ORGANIZATION/BUSINESS OF DONOR (Specify): The Freedom Forum | |
| REASON FOR NOT RETURNING TO DONOR: | | DONOR CATEGORY (mark <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> in appropriate box): | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Personal Friend (F) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Public (P) |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Foreign Official (H) | <input type="checkbox"/> VIP (V) |
| DESCRIPTION OF GIFT: One (1) Waterman Ballpoint pen with two cartridges. Framed "First Day of Issue" commemorative envelope and stamp. | | | |
| REPORT PREPARED BY: Clay Wheeler | DATE: 12.17.91 | ROOM NO.: 122 | EXT.: 2930 |

To be Completed by Gift Unit and Counsel

| | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|----------------|---|---|
| ID: 9136424 | DATE: 1-3-92 | GSA #: | DISPOSITION (mark <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> in appropriate box): | |
| CATEGORY CODE: 9999 | APPRAISED VALUE: \$105* | ARCHIVE BOX #: | <input type="checkbox"/> Presidential Staff—Personal (PP) | <input type="checkbox"/> Archives (AS) |
| COUNSEL'S OFFICE DECISION: <input type="checkbox"/> APPROVE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DISAPPROVE | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Returned to Sender, Commercial (RA) | <input type="checkbox"/> Destroyed (DS) |
| SIGNATURE: M S Manson 1/15/92 | | | <input type="checkbox"/> Returned to Sender, Other (RC) | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (OH) |
| | | | <input type="checkbox"/> Returned to Sender, Over Minimal Value (RB) | |
| | | | <input type="checkbox"/> GSA Surplus, Turn Over to Government (GS) | |
| | | | <input type="checkbox"/> Presidential Staff—for official display/use (PS) | |
| COMMENTS: * Pen is \$60; refills are \$4 each; Framing is \$35/per Frank the per Fahrney's. *stamps are \$2.00 per Karl Keldenich at Woodies, stamp dept. Based upon information provided to Counsel's office, this is not a promotional item of nominal value, and is from a prohibited source under White House gift policy. COPY B - STAFF MEMBER | | | | |

Jun. 85



THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

February 7, 1992

Dear Mr. Gutierrez:

Thank you for your kindness in sending the pen and commemorative memorabilia for Tony Snow. He appreciated your gift and transmitted it to our office for an official ruling on whether he was permitted to keep it.

The Standards of Conduct applicable to White House employees prohibit receipt of gifts, although there are exceptions for promotional items of nominal value and for personal gifts from friends and relatives. My office has consulted with the Office of the Counsel to the President, which has determined that under the current standards, the enclosed gift may not be retained.

Please be assured that your thoughtfulness is appreciated and that this decision in no way reflects on your kind intentions.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,



Nikki Richnow
Director of White House Gifts

Mr. Felix Gutierrez
Vice President
The Freedom Forum
1101 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22209

Enclosure

cc: Tony Snow

MARCH 2, 1992

MEMORANDUM TO DAVID DEMAREST
FROM TONY SNOW
SUBJECT CAMPAIGN ISSUES

As we enter the busy part of the primary season, we should think about issues and themes that will affect us not only between now and March 20, but also will affect us throughout the coming campaign -- and the next presidential term.

First, a general observation: Before we can hit any home runs, we must regain the confidence and trust of our voters. Right now, we must deal with a generalized sense of unease -- the fear that the President doesn't believe in anything and that he will abandon promises for the sake of cutting deals.

These anxieties express themselves most vigorously when people think of taxes and civil rights. We can calm our own voters and build new supporters only if we address these issues credibly.

1) Taxes: We must deal with the Budget Agreement. I know we have tinkered with the idea of apologizing for it, but frankly, that won't work. It will sound like a campaign conversion, and it won't mollify supporters who complain that the President betrayed their trust.

Peggy suggested (and I tried) to put some hedging language in the President's campaign announcement speech. POTUS killed that language, and we haven't really focused on the issue since. Yet we won't begin connecting to our core audience until we raise and answer this vexing question.

Here's the line to take: 1) The President entered the budget deal for the right reasons: He wanted to cut spending and trim the deficit.

2) Democrats feigned goodwill at first -- then made it clear that they would demand even greater tax hikes. The President got the best deal available, and it pays dividends today in the form of spending caps that have kicked in. Democrats now want out precisely because the caps restrain spending.

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

3) Still, if he had it to do over again, he wouldn't. He has learned his lesson: Cut spending and taxes, period. Focus on programs that work. Don't cut deals with Congressional Democrats who believe more in partisanship than progress. The President should vow never to cut such deals again, and he should promise to veto anything that smacks of tax-and-spend politics.

4) We should understand that a confession alone won't do the trick. Starting March 20, the President should embark upon a series of unilateral actions to demonstrate his seriousness. Begin with the regulatory indexation of capital gains; then go for a line-item veto; then slash away some especially egregious regulations. Perhaps we could make each Thursday a bombshell day: a time to take unilateral action as Congress prepares to flee for the weekend, and as talk shows ready themselves for Friday tapings.

Such a strategy enables the President to take charge and to rebuff critics who question his courage and his conservatism. It also would weaken charges -- from Buchanan now, from Democrats during the campaign -- that he doesn't want to take action on domestic issues.

II) Civil rights. Buchanan has decided to hammer us over quotas, and we have let him do it. We shouldn't, and here's why:

The Civil Rights Bill is not a quota bill. Just look at its applications, and you'll discover that the measure actively discourages quotas. The President should argue that he hates quotas because 1) they're unfair and 2) because they set people at odds, rather than inviting them to join in a common campaign for the future.

Buchanan doesn't understand the law. He has taken the word of Democrats, who tried to spin their own defeat in the Civil Rights negotiations. The President should defend his bill, and use his record to appeal quietly to New South Democrats. These voters have supported Republicans in the past. They oppose quotas but they also oppose the divisive politics of Buchanan (whom they associate with David Duke).

The President also would appeal to Middle Class Blacks, who have lost patience with the Civil Rights establishment (cf. last week's Detroit News/Gannett poll; the piece in last week's Wall Street Journal, and a feature in the March 1 Washington Post). Middle class Blacks also dislike quotas for a series of reasons, from their innate unfairness to the fact that they cast doubts on the real qualifications of Blacks who have succeeded on their own.

But the Civil Rights Act should not serve as the beginning and end of our civil rights policy. We should follow strength with strength by appealing to conservative values.

We should think about doing a welfare reform appearance in a Black church in the South, for instance. There may be no more conservative institution in America than the Black church, and the responsibility theme would strike a chord. The President could offer a wonderful alternative to the typical liberal sermon, which treats Black Americans as if they cannot survive without the patronizing "help" of liberal pols.

Blacks wanted to be treated like human beings, and not merely as tax consumers. The President already enjoys some goodwill among Blacks. Why not build on that strength?

In so doing, the President could put Democrats on the defensive with regard to welfare reform -- and could give us a chance to bring black voters back into the Republican fold.

If we can demonstrate toughness without pandering to cross burners, and if we show concern without adopting the big government approach to government issues, we win an important values battle.

Now, I know the traditional wisdom argues against appearing in any black forum, for fear of embarrassing the President and inciting criticism from the usual suspects. But the traditional wisdom is wrong. George Bush believes deeply in promoting racial harmony, and he deserves a chance to show himself at his very best. Of all the strengths he brings to the office, none shines more brightly than his personal decency and example.

Furthermore, I think most Americans -- of all colors and backgrounds -- want someone to step above the fray and rekindle our national idealism. For many, the persistence of bigotry represents a great national failure and embarrassment. George Bush can lead America to new harmony in a way that no other current political figure can, and he can do it with a personal joy and passion that would appeal to most Americans.

Think of it this way: When people take Al Sharpton and David Duke seriously, we're in trouble. Decent people have no use for these people, but they also haven't seen anyone screw up the courage to take them on directly. The President could demonstrate real leadership and real courage by delivering such an address. And a speech of this sort could mark a true defining moment in the public life of George Bush.

As for the argument that Republican Presidents shouldn't risk this sort of exposure, I can just say: Remember. We are the party of Lincoln.

III) Values

We should think long and hard about giving greater prominence to values in this year's campaign. Republican base voters consider values absolutely critical -- as do many Democrats who wish they had some alternative other than their party. No candidate in American politics today can match George Bush when it comes to personal integrity. We should use this strength to build the larger case that leadership ultimately boils down to experience and values. When unexpected crises confront the nation, you want someone who will do the right thing without flinching, and that man is George Bush.

We should promote values that work: God, country, hard work, family. That means talking about school prayer. It means pushing again for a flag amendment. It means taking on the special interests that believe more in bureaucracy than family. And it means casting everything in very specific, personal terms. Educational reform helps our children. Welfare reform restores dignity to our poor. Capital gains cuts offer hope to workers and innovators and they especially help the elderly, who hold most of the assets subject to capital gains taxation.

The general point: We shouldn't be so bashful about our strengths. We should market our virtues in ways that put our foes on the defensive, and that answer lingering criticisms about "the vision thing."

A corollary of this point: We should go on the offensive wherever possible. As things stand, we spend far too much time on the defensive. A few bold strokes -- such as the above-mentioned visit to a black church, and the Thursday bombshell strategy -- would electrify the press and shock the opposition. They would enable us to lead from a position of political and moral superiority.

Although critics keep slamming away at us, let's remember our chief assets: We have the best candidate and the best policies. That combination always wins.

Enclosures: Simon memo
speech
newspaper articles

March 5, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT PROBLEMS, OPPORTUNITIES FOR 1992

The Buchanan challenge and the furious Democratic assaults on the President often cause us to focus on short-term problems, rather than longer-term opportunities. Although the bad guys will hammer us regularly, and even gleefully, we should keep in mind that George Bush occupies the Oval Office, and that the changes that have taken place during his presidency offer some extraordinary opportunities for action.

Before we can act, however, we must address several very serious problems:

PROBLEMS

PROBLEM #1) TRUST:

The American people want to trust George Bush, but they don't. They think him a decent man, but they worry about his depth and strength of character. The two most prominent questions: Does he believe in anything? and Can we trust him not to cut a deal with Congress?

These doubts exploded with special force after the 1990 budget agreement. Everyone here understands why. But we should not underestimate the price we will have to pay for this uncertainty.

If George Bush's greatest strength is his character, his greatest problem is a budget agreement that has enabled foes to call his character into question. We have diddled and dawdled over this matter for too long, and this week's attempted answers haven't gotten us out of the fix. The President must explain himself in a manner that is both principled and persuasive.

A proper answer would go something like this:

1) The President entered the budget deal for the right reasons: He wanted to cut spending and trim the deficit.

2) Democrats feigned goodwill at first -- then made it clear that they would demand even greater tax hikes. The President got

the best deal available, but he had to pay two prices: higher taxes and two years of extremely high spending. We must admit both portions of the deal if we hope to remain credible.

The good news is: the spending caps finally have kicked in. Naturally, Democrats want to break the agreement rather than saying no to spending proposals. The President remains true to his original aims, and he won't relent on the agreement now.

3) Still, if he had it to do over again, he wouldn't. He has learned his lesson: Cut spending and taxes, period. In mulling over the agreement the President could note that Congress has changed dramatically since he left it. Today, a stubborn and vicious partisanship dominates everything. The President has tried kindness, and it didn't work. Now, he he will veto any program that costs too much or doesn't work. And he will take his stand against tax-and-spend politics.

4) We should understand that a confession alone won't soothe our critics. Starting March 20, the President should embark upon a series of unilateral actions to demonstrate his seriousness. Begin with the regulatory indexation of capital gains; then go for a line-item veto; then slash away some especially egregious regulations. Perhaps we could make each Thursday, or every other Thursday a bombshell day: a time to take unilateral action as Congress prepares to flee for the weekend, and as talk shows ready themselves for Friday tapings.

Such a strategy enables the President to take charge and to rebuff critics who question his courage and his conservatism. It also would weaken charges -- from Buchanan now, from Democrats during the campaign -- that he doesn't want to take action on domestic issues.

We must understand that words alone won't get us out of the jam. We've got to take action, and we can't hide behind the excuse that Congress wouldn't let us do it. That argument just makes the President look whiny and weak. We can't really run against Congress until we outline an action agenda for the future. Otherwise, his talk will come across as nothing more than election year blabbing.

PROBLEM #2) "KINDER, GENTLER"

We have let Democrats rewrite history for three years over Willie Horton. In so doing, we've also let them claim that the President doesn't believe in kindness and gentleness at all: He's just a fatherly Machiavelli who will stop at nothing to win an election. That's outrageous, but we can't destroy the slander until we confront it.

I repeatedly have advocated taking on the Willie Horton charge, only to have people argue that we shouldn't "bring it up." Well, Democrats have brought it up. Editorial pages have brought it up. Columnists have brought it up. And we seem to have acquiesced in their conclusion that the President slipped into a vicious cynicism in 1988.

We shouldn't apologize for the Horton issue. Willie Horton was a sadistic racist, and we opposed the policy of setting him free upon an innocent public. We supported the old-fashioned belief that you punish crime -- and you reserve your most severe punishments for the most severe crimes. That's the key. Since black Americans suffer most from violent crime, they benefit the most from tough policies to fight crime and rebuild neighborhoods.

We also should stress the President's lifelong commitment to improving race relations. He should be proud of his actions and his instincts, and we should build a campaign around the theme of unity. That strategy will work in the South.

Stealing the march on my next section (opportunities), I will explain: The South has changed since the days of Bull Connor. The Bubba vote wants candidates who believe in something, who will speak the truth, and who stand for conservative values.

Coincidentally, that's exactly the same thing Black voters want. They're tired of patronizing liberal politicians. The only kind of person more loathed than David Duke in many Black Communities is the typical white liberal. Black voters want to be treated like human beings, not like mendicants. They want honesty and action and commitment.

This year, we have an historic opportunity to expand our Black base without shrinking our white base. The key issues resonate with all voters. These issues include strong families, effective schools, good government, a growing economy, safe streets and a society opposed to quotas but devoted to civil rights.

These issues also appeals to New South Democrats, most of whom opposed the Old Left politics of the Democratic Party, but fear that a vote for a Republican is a vote for Jim Crow. We should fight to expand our base now -- but we can't do it until we take on the issues of Willie Horton and quotas.

PROBLEM #3) A PRESIDENT OUT OF TOUCH

We all know that huge chunks of the electorate still view the President as a man out of touch with the people who elected him. Frankly, the speed campaigning won't solve that problem.

It makes him look frantic, and it denies him the opportunity to connect with the public, enjoy himself -- and think.

It also does not help matters when we refer to outside-the-Beltway America as "out there," and speak of Buchanan's challenge as coming from the Right. (We're the right. Right?) We have enough trouble with people's perceiving POTUS as a man in a bubble. We shouldn't reaffirm it with off-the-cuff comments.

We all understand the problems created by these little things -- his penchant for the Beltway acronym, etc. -- but a larger problem plagues us. We talk too much of the small things, the technical things -- deadlines, committee hearings, etc. -- and not enough time speaking from the heart about the big things, the important things. In short, the "out of touch" accusation arises out of the Vision problem.

As for the Vision problem, let me offer an hypothesis. Our problem isn't that he lacks vision, but that he's uneasy talking about it. The President's reticence about his own heart and mind illustrate his endearing humility, but they also make him a Mystery Man to many Americans. If we can persuade the President to give a thoughtful talk about his greatest passions and concerns -- no hype, no bull, no strained efforts to portray him as someone he is not -- many people will understand that this man follows values, not fads. From that, we can point out that a Congress equally committed to the same values can help him accomplish some striking and extraordinary things. And with that, I'll turn to opportunities.

OPPORTUNITIES

We have an extraordinary opportunity to turn the electorate upside down and build a campaign that appeals to people's restlessness and their desire to feel good about themselves. No matter how much we may malign Desert Storm right now, its legacies remain. Desert Storm proved that Americans can do things and can feel good about themselves in the process. And although the public may not react wildly to comments about Desert Storm, you can find real nostalgia for the post-war euphoria. Americans know that they can do great things: They just need a chance to dispell all doubts.

If we give voters a reason to strike back against malaise, and to join an idealistic crusade of sorts -- they will respond. This can help us more than any number of great ads. In political terms, we can restore our historic base; we can appeal to our future base (young voters); and we can steal votes from people tired of a Democratic Party that has become hopelessly mired in the politics of the Left.

Before we think about these opportunities, we should acknowledge a few facts. First, the Reagan Revolution is over. That revolution, spawned by Jimmy Carter's failures abroad (the spread of communism) and at home (unprecedented misery index numbers), achieved its aims. It stood up to communism, and it slowed down the tax-and-spend movement in Washington.

Now, we face a different world. Yes, we must decide just what we want government to do, and how far we want to go in cutting taxes and regulations. But we also have some other business at hand: Getting schools truly prepared for the future (we've got a great plan, and we ought to promote it). People developed great expectations during the 1980s, and we should help them find ways of achieving them.

Second, the Age of Innovation dawns, and we cannot really build the consensus we need simply by listing all the great things we tried, and failed, to do.

Third, if George Bush is to demonstrate his true greatness and skill, he will need a Congress that supports him. We won't get that Congress unless we build a campaign that can generate real enthusiasm, and can give people a reason to vote along party lines. In other words, we must define what it means to be a Republican, and the definition had better be awesomely good.

Finally, here's a suggestion for an overall strategy: We should argue that the end of the Cold War brought us to the brink of an entirely new world, at home and abroad. We need to gird ourselves for competition in this new world, and that will require some sweeping and important reforms. The age of bureaucracy is over. We can't afford flabby bureaucracies anywhere, and especially not in our key institutions -- government, school, big business. Look around and you'll notice that smaller, leaner, more flexible businesses rule the roost, and the giant has-beens (GM, IBM) have fallen on hard times.

With that in mind, consider a few opportunities:

OPPORTUNITY #1) VALUES

You don't have to go far to understand that Americans think the nation has gone crazy, and that a little old fashioned value-based sanity could make a huge difference. This is the central tenet of the much beloved Grand Canyon Kasdan masterpiece du l'annee.

We've used the riff before: When a kid can get a condom at school, but cannot lead a prayer, something's wrong. When a Good Samaritan gets sued for doing good deeds, while serial murderers collect millions in book royalties for detailing their atrocities, something's wrong. When the three r's at an urban

high school are rifles, revolvers and razors, something's wrong. When a demagogue can preach racial violence in the name of justice, something's wrong

What's wrong is that we haven't said: This is wrong. It must change. Now.

Hardy Republican issues will work here: School prayer, law and order, etc. The President should take the offensive, and portray him as the man determined to put an end to the insanity. That will do more to calm fears of his detachment than just about anything, because it will show that he understands all the petty outrages that offend law-abiding citizens. It also would enable him to highlight his strength of character.

We also should use values as our jumping-off point for such things as welfare reform, pro-family legislation, anti-crime efforts, etc. We don't propose those changes because they will save us a little money. We propose them because they strengthen our foundations -- home, church, family, school, community, country. Toqueville observed that this nation's greatness comes from the goodness of its people -- and that's still true. If we believe that sleazeballs and maniacs can rule our cities and our lives, we're in deep trouble.

A final note: There's nothing wrong with having the President lose his temper over a values issue. When someone calls him a racist, he ought to blow his top -- in a controlled manner, of course. When someone accuses him of dealing in bad faith with the public, he should blow his top -- and redirect the fire at Congress. If the President continues to absorb ugly personal attacks with equanimity -- his lumps, as he calls them -- he will look like the crook who shows no emotion as the jury delivers its sentence. When someone questions his very integrity, he should fight back.

Remember: George Bush's values and character define him as a man and a President. Values ought to stand at the center of our campaign, and all our initiative should have roots in the President's beliefs and in his experience. For example:

OPPORTUNITY #2) THE UNITY CANDIDATE

If you look at the President's challengers, you find that they share in common a desire to divide and conquer. One problem: When we divide, we lose.

Democrats and Buchanan have their own race cards -- Democrats appeal to Blacks' fears; Buchanan appeals to whites' suspicions. Some of the same characters also have tried to play a kind of global race card -- through protectionism, isolationism and Japan bashing.

Both sorts of division will lead to ruin -- moral, spritual, economic, political. As we look toward a new Century, everybody understands that we're in for a tough fight on trade and economic growth, and we've got to go into the game united and tough.

I described the historic opening to Blacks in the "problems" section. I don't have survey data to bolster my case, but I believe we have a chance to plant the seeds for a voter revolution, one that will persuade increasing numbers of Blacks to switch parties in years to come. This revolution depends on our remaining faithful to our first principles. We can build a larger base if we use conservative principles to appeal to the natural conservatism of black voters.

The President can fight against the global race-baiting by talking about the real benefits of security and trade. We shouldn't back away from our greatest triumph, the Cold War victory. But we must give our celebrations greater oomph. We shouldn't just proclaim victory before bored crowds. Let's show our victory in action. Let's find businesses made rich by foreign trade, and speak to them. I suspect we can find some companies near the Mexican border that also employ people of all ages, races, creeds and colors. It might make a nice event.

My point is simple: Americans have had it with David Duke and Al Sharpton. Many have had it with Pat Buchanan. We should make the case for unity vigorously and without apology. In so doing, we capture the high ground, we isolate Buchanan and the Democrats -- and we put ourselves in a position to make the case that Democrats, not the President, has lost touch with the American public on this important matter of the heart.

Americans love an idealistic leader. John F. Kennedy has gotten more historic mileage out of things he didn't do (such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964) than from things he did do. Why? He offered an idealistic vision of America, and he invited Americans to join him. (Ask not....) Now it's our turn.

OPPORTUNITY #3) BURY THE WELFARE STATE

We should declare the Sixties over and gone. In the process we should acknowledge that the Welfare State, a product of good intention but lousy theories, has run its course. It's important to praise the civil rights pioneers in order to prove that we're not mean-spirited, racist Republicans. But having acknowledged the wonderful motives of those who drafted the laws, we should show compassion for the Great Society's victims. That will prove that we live in the real world.

The Welfare State has done to some poor Black Americans what sharecropping could not: It has robbed them of their will to seek

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

their fortunes in the larger world. This is obscene, and we should say so.

We have talked about welfare reform, now we need to put our money where our mouth is. We should get someone to look at our own statutes, and we should get rid of any that encourage single-parent households; that reward people for not working; and, where possible, that do not make recipients responsible for getting off welfare. We should emphasize the dignity of work -- and we should follow by promoting other reforms that give people a real stake in the future. The HOPE program leads the list because it gives poor people an asset base that someday may help them build a foundation of real wealth.

Nobody loves the Welfare State anymore, not even the social workers. So let's do what everybody knows is inevitable -- Let's replace it with something that works, and let's define success in terms of the number of people liberated permanently from dependency.

OPPORTUNITY #4) THE ECONOMY

We entered office as the true heirs to the Reagan Revolution, and we should make good on that inheritance. How? Several ways: First, the President must come clean on the budget deal -- with its taxing and spending provisions. Second, through the sorts of actions detailed above -- taking unilateral steps to demonstrate seriousness, set the agenda, and put Congressional Democrats on the defensive. Third, we might want to think about putting together a 1994 budget before the campaign, and describe exactly what we want to do for the future -- or at least lay out some very clear criteria for future budgets. We need to make good on our repeated observation that government is too big and spends too much.

We should recast the fairness debate, and point out that fairness means: If you work hard and do your job, you shouldn't have to worry about losing it. If you work hard and develop job skills, you shouldn't have to worry about getting a job. If you have an idea, you should be able to get it to market. And you shouldn't be punished for working hard, saving, and succeeding. Democrats really do fit the Mencken caricature: They fear that someone, somewhere may be having a good time. An economy grows only when you get a chance to show what you can do.

OPPORTUNITY #5) DEFENSE AND SECURITY

Anybody who gets CNN understands that the world remains a volatile and potentially dangerous place. We really should give the often promised defense speech, which would enable us to draw clear distinctions between us and the Democrats, who seem more

interested in cutting defense spending than in building real security for the future.

OPPORTUNITY #6) REFORM

Jim Pinkerton has put together a list of reforms: welfare reform, legal reform, education reform, health care reform; and a "citizens charter," which offers a way of stressing the centrality of personal responsibility. He's right: The President can't run as an outsider, because he isn't. Therefore, he should run as a Washington reformer, who never has lost touch with the values and ideals he first brought to this town.

I don't know if we want to turn the President into an explicit reform candidate, but we certainly should stress reform and innovation wherever we can. That not only appeals to people's basic distrust of Capitol Hill, it also contains at least a subliminal reference to innovation and Yankee ingenuity.

OPPORTUNITY #7) DEFINE THE FUTURE

Democrats can tell you whom they dislike. They can't tell you where they want to go as a nation. Well, we do. We want to build the Good Society we described at the University of Michigan. We believe in limited government. We believe in responsible government (revisit the Congress-bashing speech). We believe in the people. We believe in low taxes and growing paychecks. We believe in family, good schools, safe streets -- and we believe in the programs necessary to make it all happen.

In short, we believe that we really have reached a defining point in history -- and unlike the other guys, we understand what it means, and what it promises. If we combine traditional values with an emphasis on innovation and reform, we can capture people's imaginations and offer them a chance to enlist in our crusade for a promised future.

CONCLUSION:

We really do have some incredible opportunities this year, and most of them play into George Bush's personal strengths. We should spend some time trying to think seriously about what we want the world to look like, and we should get the President to deliver some major talks on such topics as welfare reform, the educational revolution, jobs, race relations, competitiveness, Congress, and the powers of the Presidency.

March 5, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR JIM CICONI

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT PROBLEMS, OPPORTUNITIES FOR 1992

The Buchanan challenge and the furious Democratic assaults on the President often cause us to focus on short-term problems, rather than longer-term opportunities. Although the bad guys will hammer us regularly, and even gleefully, we should keep in mind that George Bush occupies the Oval Office, and that the changes that have taken place during his presidency offer some extraordinary opportunities for action.

Before we can act, however, we must address several very serious problems:

PROBLEMS

PROBLEM #1) TRUST:

The American people want to trust George Bush, but they just aren't sure. They admire his decency, but they worry about his depth and strength of character. They ask: Does he believe in anything? and Can we trust him not to cut a deal with Congress?

These doubts exploded with special force after the 1990 budget agreement. Since then, we have failed to provide a full and persuasive explanation of the agreement, or of what we want in the future.

If George Bush's greatest strength is his character, his greatest problem is a budget agreement that has raised questions about his character. We've run out of time: The President must explain himself in a manner that is principled, persuasive and final.

A proper answer would go something like this:

1) The President entered the budget deal for the right reasons. We were in the midst of the longest economic expansion in our nation's history. We saw an unprecedented opportunity to trim the deficit by cutting spending -- and not raising taxes. An agreement to cut the deficit while holding the line on taxes and spending would provide a capstone to the Reagan Revolution.

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

It also would have changed forever the way in which Washington does business.

2) Democrats feigned goodwill as before the talks, but that soon changed. They made it clear that they would demand tax hikes, and they would use their sizeable majorities in both houses to make things miserable for us. We tend to forget that the famous statement of June 26, 1990 was deliberately vague, and could have been construed as argument for reducing the capital gains rate. Democrats beat us to the punch, however. They quickly defined the "revenue raising" mention in the statement as a tax hike -- and we let them do it.

In this awful situation, the President got the best deal available. Still, he had to pay two prices: higher taxes and two years of extremely high spending. We have owned up to the tax part, but we also should note that Democrats insisted on unprecedented spending increases before spending caps would kick in. Otherwise, it makes it look as if we had no principled problem with runaway spending.

The good news is: the spending caps finally have kicked in. Naturally, Democrats want to break the agreement rather than saying no to spending proposals. The President remains true to his original aims, and he won't relent on the agreement now.

3) Still, if he had to convene a summit again and repeat the process, he wouldn't. Congress has changed dramatically since he left it. In the old days, you could get a bipartisan consensus on important things. Today, a stubborn and vicious partisanship dominates everything -- from the budget to the Gulf War. The President has tried kindness again and again and again, and it hasn't worked. But now, he has learned his lesson: No tax hikes, no spending explosions, and no doubt-raising compromises. He should vow to veto any program that costs too much or doesn't work. He can't just speak out against tax-and-spend politics. He must do something.

4) We should understand that a confession alone won't soothe our critics. Starting March 20, the President should embark upon a series of unilateral actions to demonstrate his seriousness. Begin with the regulatory indexation of capital gains; then go for a line-item veto; slash away some especially egregious regulations; implement the Beck decision by executive order; sign an executive order prohibiting racial quotas in the federal government. Perhaps we could make each Thursday, or every other Thursday a bombshell day: a time to take unilateral action as Congress prepares to flee for the weekend, and as talk shows ready themselves for Friday tapings.

Such a strategy enables the President to rebuff critics who question his courage and conservatism. It also would weaken

charges -- from Buchanan now; from Democrats during the general election campaign -- that he doesn't want to take action on domestic issues.

Words alone won't get us out of our jam. We've got to take action. We should make Congress look like stubborn, backward opponents of necessary change, because that's what they are. We should rebuff their intransigence by taking action -- over and over and over. Unilateral action also destroys charges that the President is too weak or too indecisive to lead effectively.

The President should run against the Democrat-dominated Congress this year. He can't do that credibly unless he acts now, and begins shoving a credible action agenda down Congress' throat. If just talk and complain about Congressional inaction, the President will look like another electioneering pol. We can keep him above the fray by turning him into a commander again.

PROBLEM #2) "KINDER, GENTLER"

We have let Democrats rewrite history for three years over Willie Horton. That has let them argue that the President doesn't believe in kindness and gentleness at all: He's just a fatherly Machiavelli who hell bent on winning an election. We can't destroy that slander until we confront it.

I repeatedly have advocated taking on the Willie Horton charge, only to have people argue that we shouldn't "bring it up." Well, Democrats have brought it up. Editorial pages have brought it up. Columnists have brought it up. And we seem to have acquiesced in their conclusion that the President slipped into a vicious cynicism in 1988.

We shouldn't apologize for the Horton issue. Willie Horton was a sadistic racist. We opposed the policy of setting him free upon an innocent public. We supported the old-fashioned belief that you punish crime -- and you reserve your most severe punishments for the most severe crimes. That's the key. Since Black Americans suffer most from violent crime, they benefit the most from tough policies to fight crime and rebuild neighborhoods.

We also should stress the President's lifelong commitment to improving race relations. He has acted when others didn't, and he has put his time and money where his mouth was for years. He should be proud of his actions and his instincts, and we should build a campaign around the theme of unity.

That strategy will work in the South. Stealing the march on my next section (opportunities), I will explain: The South has changed since the days of Bull Connor. The Bubba vote doesn't want a tough-talking bigot. It wants a candidate who has the

courage to stand for something, who will speak the truth, and who will stand unwaveringly for conservative values -- home, community, church, country.

Contrary to popular wisdom, that's exactly the same thing most Black voters want. They're tired of patronizing liberal politicians. The only kind of person more loathed than David Duke in many Black Communities is the typical white liberal. Black voters want to be treated like human beings, not like mendicants. They want honesty and action and commitment.

This year, we have an historic opportunity to expand our Black base without shrinking our white base. The key issues resonate with all voters. These issues include strong families, effective schools, good government, a growing economy, safe streets and a society opposed to quotas but devoted to civil rights.

These issues also appeals to New South Democrats, most of whom opposed the Old Left politics of the Democratic Party, but fear that a vote for a Republican is a vote for Jim Crow. We should fight to expand our base now -- but we can't do it until we take on the issues of Willie Horton and quotas.

PROBLEM #3) A PRESIDENT OUT OF TOUCH

We all know that huge chunks of the electorate still view the President as a man out of touch with the people who elected him. Frankly, speed campaigning won't solve that problem. It makes him look frantic, and it denies him the opportunity to connect with the public, enjoy himself -- and think.

It also does not help matters when we refer to outside-the-Beltway America as "out there," and speak of Buchanan's challenge as coming from the Right. (We're the right. Right?) We have enough trouble with people's perceiving POTUS as a man in a bubble. We shouldn't reaffirm it with off-the-cuff comments.

We all understand the problems created by these little things -- his penchant for the Beltway acronym, etc. -- but a larger problem plagues us. We talk too much of the small things, the technical things -- deadlines, committee hearings, etc. -- and not enough time speaking from the heart about the big things, the important things. In short, the "out of touch" accusation arises out of the Vision problem.

As for the Vision problem, let me offer an hypothesis. Our problem isn't that he lacks vision. It's that he's often uneasy talking about it. The President's reticence about his heart and mind illustrate his endearing humility, but they make him a Mystery Man to many Americans. If we can persuade the President to give a thoughtful talk about his greatest passions and

concerns -- no hype, no bull, no strained efforts to be something other than himself -- many people will understand that this man follows values, not fads. He'd hit a grand slam. After all, no one else is likely to commit honesty this year.

Once he has established his value-based vision, the President could argue credibly that a Congress committed to the same values can help him accomplish some striking and extraordinary things. That will provide the foundation for an anti-Congress campaign that will strike a real chord in people's hearts.

Now, I'll turn to opportunities.

OPPORTUNITIES

We have an extraordinary opportunity to turn the electorate upside down. Americans want action and innovation. You can feel their restlessness -- and their desire to feel good about themselves. Desert Storm proved that Americans can do tough and bold things -- and can feel good about themselves in the process. The people may not react wildly to Desert Storm applause lines, but they certainly remember the last spring's post-war euphoria -- and they want it back.

Democrats have spent a whole year trying to crush that self-confidence, but they can't succeed unless we let them. Americans know they can do great things: They just need a chance to dispel all doubts.

That's where we come in. If we give voters a reason to rebuff malaise and join an idealistic crusade to a promised America, they will respond. A focused conservative campaign can help us restore our historic base; appeal to our future base (young voters); and steal votes from people tired of the nutty politics of the Democrat left.

Before we think about these opportunities, we should acknowledge a few facts. First, the Reagan Revolution is over. That revolution, spawned by Jimmy Carter's failures abroad (the spread of communism) and at home (unprecedented misery index numbers), achieved its aims. It stood up to communism, and it slowed down the tax-and-spend movement in Washington.

Now, we live in a different world. Although most Democrats don't get it, most people want lower taxes, fewer regulations, and smaller government. Now, they want to recover a sense of themselves. They want us to move into an age of innovation girded by old, bedrock values.

Welfare reform, for instance, reflects the desire to assert the dignity and necessity of hard work. Educational choice appeals to people's desire for effective schools -- and schools that teach traditional values. (Bilalian schools, for instance, often resemble military academies in their insistence on discipline and clean living.) We must show that we're ready to let the people set off another economic boom. Americans developed great expectations during the 1980s. That's a good thing -- and we should help them find ways of achieving their ambitions.

Second, the Age of Innovation dawns. We should unveil a strategy to reform government, and drag it out of the age of bureaucracy. We should repackage initiatives that haven't gone anywhere, but should. We also should promote reforms we haven't promoted publicly before, like Roth's accountability in government proposals. (Call it the Truth in Government Act.)

Third, if George Bush is to demonstrate his true greatness and skill, he will need a Congress that supports him. We won't get that Congress unless we build a campaign that can generate real enthusiasm, and can give people a reason to vote along party lines. In other words, we must define what it means to be a Republican, and the definition had better be awesomely good.

Finally, here's a suggestion for an overall strategy: We should argue that the end of the Cold War brought us to the brink of an entirely new world, at home and abroad. That world starts right here -- and every American will play a role in shaping it. We'll bring government up to date, through reforms anchored in values and common sense. We'll put more power in the hands of individuals, families, communities, businesses -- the leaders of our little platoons. The bureaucrat no longer rules. The individual does. And our policies will liberate individuals and individual genius.

We should understand the risks of putting exclusive emphasis on government reform, since many voters will write it off as typical Inside-the-Beltway self-indulgence. We've got to reform government, but for a reason -- to give it back to the people. Furthermore, we must find ways to design programs and seek out issues that get people actively involved. Involvement generates enthusiasm, passion. It can turn bored voters into very active Republicans. If we get too bogged down in technical stuff, we'll look like strategy nerds retiring into the war room, rather than commanders leading troops into battle.

As we said in the announcement speech, this is the year of choices. We should come up with a tight list of crucial choices, and hammer at them over and over and over.

With that in mind, consider a few opportunities:

OPPORTUNITY #1) VALUES

You don't have to go far to understand that Americans think the nation has gone crazy, and that a little old fashioned value-based sanity could make a huge difference. This is the central tenet of the much beloved Kasdan masterpiece du l'anee, Grand Canyon.

We've used the riff before: When a kid can get a condom at school, but cannot lead a prayer, something's wrong. When a Good Samaritan gets sued for doing good deeds, while serial murderers collect millions in book royalties for detailing their atrocities, something's wrong. When the three r's at an urban high school are rifles, revolvers and razors, something's wrong. When a demagogue can preach racial violence in the name of justice, something's wrong. And when kids feel no remorse at committing hate crimes, something's very wrong.

What's wrong is that we haven't said: This is wrong. This must change. Now.

Hardy Republican issues will work here: School prayer, law and order, etc. The President should take the offensive, and portray himself as the man determined to put an end to the insanity. That will do more to calm fears of his detachment than just about anything. It will show that he understands all the petty outrages that offend law-abiding citizens. It also would enable him to highlight his strength of character.

We also should use values as our jumping-off point for such things as welfare reform, pro-family legislation, anti-crime efforts, etc. We don't propose those changes because they will save us a little money. We propose them because they strengthen our foundations -- home, church, family, school, community, country. Toqueville observed that this nation's greatness comes from the goodness of its people -- and that's still true. If we believe that sleazeballs and maniacs can rule our cities and our lives, we're in deep trouble.

A final note: There's nothing wrong with having the President lose his temper over a values issue. When someone calls him a racist, he ought to blow his top -- in a controlled manner, of course. When someone accuses him of dealing in bad faith with the public, he should blow his top -- and redirect the fire at Congress. If the President continues to absorb ugly personal attacks -- his "lumps," as he calls them -- with equanimity, he will look like the criminal who shows no remorse as the jury delivers its guilty verdict. When someone questions his integrity, he should fight back.

Remember: George Bush's values and character define him as a man and a President. Values ought to stand at the center of our campaign, and all our initiative should have roots in the President's beliefs and in his experience. For example:

OPPORTUNITY #2) THE UNITY CANDIDATE

If you look at the President's challengers, you find that they share in common a desire to divide and conquer. They don't understand that when we divide, we lose. America's future depends on our being united as a people, and on our remaining on good terms with our most important allies.

Democrats and Buchanan have their own race cards -- Democrats appeal to Blacks' fears; Buchanan appeals to whites' suspicions. Some of the same characters also have tried to play a kind of global race card -- through protectionism, isolationism and Japan bashing.

Both sorts of division will lead to ruin -- moral, spiritual, economic, political. As we look toward a new Century, everybody understands that we're in for a tough fight on trade and economic growth, and we've got to go into the game united and tough.

I described the historic opening to Blacks in the "problems" section. I don't have survey data to bolster my case, but I believe we have a chance to plant the seeds for a voter revolution, one that will persuade increasing numbers of Blacks to switch parties in years to come. This revolution depends on our remaining faithful to our first principles. We can build a larger base if we use conservative principles to appeal to the natural conservatism of black voters.

The President can fight against the global race-baiting by talking about the real benefits of security and trade. We shouldn't back away from our greatest triumph, the Cold War victory. But we must give our celebrations greater oomph. We shouldn't just proclaim victory before bored crowds. Let's show our victory in action. Let's find businesses made rich by foreign trade, and speak to them. I suspect we can find some companies near the Mexican border that also employ people of all ages, races, creeds and colors. It might make a nice event.

My point is simple: Americans have had it with David Duke and Al Sharpton. Many have had it with Pat Buchanan. We should make the case for unity with vigor and without apology. In so doing, we capture the high ground, we isolate Buchanan and the Democrats -- and we put ourselves in a position to make the case that Democrats, not the President, has lost touch with the American public on this important matter of the heart.

Americans love an idealistic leader. John F. Kennedy got more historic mileage out of things he didn't do (such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964) than from things he did do. Why? He offered an idealistic vision of America, and he invited Americans to join him. (Ask not....) Now it's our turn.

OPPORTUNITY #3) BURY THE WELFARE STATE

We should declare the Sixties over and gone. We should acknowledge that the Welfare State, a product of good intention but lousy theories, has run its course. It's important to praise the civil rights pioneers in order to prove that we're not mean-spirited, racist Republicans. But having acknowledged the wonderful motives of those who drafted the laws, we should show compassion for the Great Society's victims. That will prove that we live in the real world.

The Welfare State has done to some poor Black Americans what sharecropping could not: It has robbed them of their will to seek their fortunes in the larger world. This is obscene, and we should say so.

We have talked about welfare reform, now we need to put our money where our mouth is. We should get someone to look at our own laws. We should get rid of any regs that encourage single-parent households; that reward people for not working; and that do not make able-bodied recipients responsible for getting off welfare. We should emphasize the dignity of work, and we should promote reforms that give people a real stake in the future. The HOPE program leads the list because it gives poor people an asset base that someday may help them build a foundation of real wealth.

Nobody loves the Welfare State anymore, not even the social workers. So let's do what everybody knows is inevitable -- Let's replace it with something that works, and let's define success in terms of the number of people liberated permanently from dependency.

OPPORTUNITY #4) THE ECONOMY

We entered office as the true heirs to the Reagan Revolution, and we should make good on that inheritance. How? Several ways: First, the President must come clean on the budget deal -- with its taxing and spending provisions. Second, through the sorts of actions detailed above -- taking unilateral steps to demonstrate seriousness, set the agenda, and put Congressional Democrats on the defensive. Third, we might want to think about putting together a 1994 budget before the campaign, and describe exactly what we want to do for the future -- or at least lay out some very clear criteria for future budgets. We need to make

good on our repeated observation that government is too big and spends too much.

We should recast the fairness debate, and point out that fairness means: If you work hard and do your job, you shouldn't have to worry about losing it. That's fair. If you work hard and develop job skills, you should be able to get a job. That's fair. If you have an idea, you should be able to get it to market without having Congress skim off the profits. That's fair. And you shouldn't be punished for working hard, saving, and succeeding. That is fair.

Democrats really do fit the Mencken caricature: They fear that someone, somewhere may be having a good time. We should show that we appreciate the joy of creativity and the exuberance of a growing, teeming economy. We should make no apologies for success: We should demand it.

OPPORTUNITY #5) DEFENSE AND SECURITY

Anybody who gets CNN understands that the world remains a volatile and potentially dangerous place. We really should give the often promised defense speech, which would enable us to draw clear distinctions between us and the Democrats, who seem more interested in cutting defense spending than in building real security for the future.

We also ought to talk about the Soviet Union and Central Europe, places where our ideas triumphed, and where our expertise can and will make a difference. Our line makes sense: We will do everything we can to foster democratic capitalism (or "market pluralism, as the NSC guys say), but we won't flood the place with greenbacks. We have learned that incentives matter in any welfare system -- including one designed to get Russia on its feet.

OPPORTUNITY #6) REFORM

Jim Pinkerton has put together a list of reforms: welfare reform, legal reform, education reform, health care reform; and a "citizens charter," which would ensure responsible government.

We should push reform wherever possible. It's the right thing to do, and it implicitly indicts Congress. The President can't run as an outsider, because he isn't. Therefore, he should run as a Washington reformer, who has retained the values and ideals he first brought to this town.

We must decide just how hard we want to run against Congress. Frankly, we should run as hard as possible. Consider the recent House litany: cocaine in the Post Office, check bouncing, scandals involving personal behavior, pay raises signed

in the dark of night (I know, we have promised not to criticize the pay hike), a history of vehement inaction, and partisanship the likes of which we haven't seen since Reconstruction.

Americans want to believe in government, and we ought to answer their prayers. We can mount a campaign that is both idealistic and properly outraged. The stakes and potential will never be higher: By some accounts, 120 members of Congress will retire or get reapportioned out of office this year. With the right message, confidence and resolve, we can turn what now seems a tight race into a shocking sweep.

OPPORTUNITY #7) DEFINE THE FUTURE

Democrats can tell you whom they dislike. They can't tell you where they want to go as a nation. Well, we do. We want to build the Good Society we described at the University of Michigan. We believe in limited government. We believe in responsible government (revisit the Congress-bashing speech). We believe in the people. We believe in low taxes and growing paychecks. We believe in family, good schools, safe streets -- and we believe in the programs necessary to make it all happen.

In short, we believe that we really have reached a defining point in history -- and unlike the other guys, we understand what it means, and what it promises. If we combine traditional values with an emphasis on innovation and reform, we can capture people's imaginations and offer them a chance to enlist in our crusade for a promised future.

CONCLUSION:

We have some incredible opportunities this year, and they play into George Bush's personal strengths. We should think seriously about what we want the world to look like, and we should get the President to deliver some major talks on such topics as welfare reform, the educational revolution, jobs, race relations, competitiveness, Congress, and the powers of the Presidency.

At the heart of things, we can argue that this election really represents a referendum on our national values and our national direction. We can move forward with Republicans, or we can revisit the failed past with Democrats. We're for progress. They're for obsolescence. The choice should be easy, and we should make it so.

March 12, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR BOB TEETER

FROM TONY SNOW

REGARDING PRESIDENTIAL INITIATIVES

As we escape the gravitational pull of the Buchanan challenge, we should turn our attention to the larger question of how to establish Presidential leadership in the months ahead.

Democrats will subject us to a "Where's the Beef?" test, arguing that we're all talk and no action. For three years the President has said the right things about restraining government spending, cutting the deficit, holding the line on taxes, fighting crime, revolutionizing education, reforming health care, and so on. And for three years a partisan Congress has said, "No thanks."

Normally, you would expect a President to become very angry about such treatment. But with the exception of an occasional speech and occasional outburst, the President has treated Congress with deference. As a result, he looks like a man content to say the right things -- and let it stand at that. (Remember last year's 100-day challenge?) Buchanan made hay with our record, and revived the wimp argument in the bargain. Democrats will do even worse.

If we wish to restore our historic Republican base, and if we wish to generate excitement among crossover Democrats, we've got to do more than talk the talk. We've got to demonstrate that we can act. We've got to show that we mean business, and that we have big things in mind for a second term. No one doubts the President's heart, but many doubt his resolve.

Since we know that Congress won't give us a bit of help, the President must exercise Presidential powers in a way that dramatizes both his determination to lead and Congress' determination to stand in his way. In other words, he must settle on a menu of unilateral interventions.

March 20 offers a great opportunity for unveiling such a strategy. If we do come out firing -- not just with eloquence but with action -- we can shut off the "Where's the Beef?" challenge and put ourselves in a position to define the terms of the political debate. If we simply get up and offer a tone poem

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

about the glorious future, we'll play right in to the Democrat strategy of portraying the President as a nice guy who doesn't have a clue.

We hyped the State of the Union until people expected it to have as much impact as "Let there be light." We hyped March 20, so people expect we will do something. We should sent out an APB for suggestions, and decide that we will do something dramatic that night, and use the action to kick off a different campaign - one that combines vision and action.

I will let you and others decide whether on March 20 the President should give a speech on March 20, march down to Capitol Hill or find some other way to create the appropriate drama. I would like to put in my two cents' worth on the initiatives discussed most often in the press and in conservative circles: the exercise of an "implicit" line-item veto, and the regulatory indexation of capital gains.

First, the line-item veto. As much as I like the idea, I doubt it will pass constitutional muster. More important, most of the eggheads in our Office of Legal Counsel oppose it strenuously.

Frankly, I think there's a better way to go after pork and put Democrat leaders on the defensive. The President should signal soon and often his intention of vetoing appropriations bills that contain pork. Congress will try to play chicken, of course. It will warn of all the awful things that would happen if the President were to "shut down" the government.

But we can steal the issue if we follow our warnings with a veto, and we follow our veto with a press conference identifying each and every offending scrap of pork. The President could say: "Don't blame me. Blame the politicians who couldn't keep their hands off your money. Blame the politicians who couldn't resist the temptation to siphon money to their friends and contributors. I know the items here don't amount to much compared to the overall budget, but like viruses that can cause devastating diseases, these pork barrel appropriations attack the entire system. They weaken it in very real ways. I want Americans to believe in government, and I want government to earn the public's trust. So here's a challenge: Cut the pork and I'll sign the bill." This kind of approach enables him to assert leadership, draw a clear distinction between himself and a Democrat-controlled Congress, and make the kind of good-government pitch he has wanted to make before.

Second, the regulatory indexation of capital gains. I think this one's a winner. Seventy percent of the nation's capital stock is held by the elderly or in pension funds and other instruments created for future retirees. Furthermore, most

senior income (70 percent) comes from investments. (see attachment)

Today, workers don't have to worry about bracket creep because we index earnings for inflation. Retirees get slammed by bracket creep, however, because we don't index their chief income sources -- investments and capital gains.

The AARP already is considering an endorsement of a capital gains cut: Regulatory indexation almost certainly would get huge support from AARP and other seniors groups.

Consider the political ramifications. Suppose for a moment that the courts throw out any indexation-by-regulatory-definition. We could follow by submitting legislation to index cap gains immediately. That would put George Mitchell and Co. in the position of having to take money away from senior citizens - not likely in any year, let alone a general election year.

In short, the cap gains move offers a freebie to the President, and would answer all the supply-side critics who doubt his commitment to cutting taxes and spending. It also would show the right kind of defiance to Congress, helping set the stage for a larger and more ambitious campaign of government reform.

Congressional Democrats are counting on the President's not standing up to them this year. Clinton already has identified his core complaints. He will argue that the President has divided America along race and class lines; that the President represents the "old" wisdom -- and that Clinton's tax-and-spend policies will offer real help and hope to the poor; and that the President neither understands nor cares about domestic issues.

If we combine bold conservative actions on taxes and spending, with George Bush-like attempts to bridge the racial chasm -- I'll describe some options in a separate memo -- Clinton turns into a dust mote. Add to that the President's standing as the most adroit and qualified leader on the world stage, and Clinton vanishes.

But we don't touch Clinton unless we first show leadership. Lots of people around here can offer great reasons not to do something. But watch television. Talk to out-of-town friends. Check out talk radio. It's obvious that we've got to do something dramatic and we've got to do it now. We must show our core voters that we can do something about taxes and spending and values. We've got to demonstrate our reliability, not just during an election campaign, but throughout a second term. And we can't begin to do that until the President begins taking decisive, unilateral action.

Some other suggestions for unilateral actions:

- o Use enhanced rescission authority -- perhaps on the programs marked for extinction in the State of the Union address;
- o Promote the Roth initiatives on measuring the effectiveness of legislation -- a Truth in Government act; (In a similar vein, we ought to have someone find out whether the scandal involving the House Bank includes violations of the criminal code. If so, the Justice Department has jurisdiction.)
- o Start taking on Congress directly: Kick off a term-limitation campaign. Admit that the system's broke, and that well-heeled lobbyists have much more clout than mere voters and taxpayers.
- o Sign an executive order banning quotas in the federal government, while increasing the number of civil rights enforcement officers in the government. This would enable him to demonstrate that he opposes quotas because they are racially divisive, but supports civil rights because it's the right thing to do;
- o Implement the Beck decision;

None of these are original or new, and I'm sure plenty of others will surface. I have suggested in another memo that the President think about a "Thursday surprise" strategy -- announcing such measures on Thursday afternoons, when Congress is preparing to leave town and the talk shows are solidifying their topics for the weekend. If we adopt this strategy, we will show motion on domestic policy. We will energize our own supporters. We will prompt the press to become positively Pavlovian in their expectations for the latest bombshell. We will get activists in our own administration thinking about innovative ways to push our agenda forward. And we will drive the other side positively nuts.

Properly designed, such a strategy could give real punch and credibility to the President's message. We could announce each initiative in a brief, tough speech -- and use each speech to build a broader, subtler vision for the President. If we do so, we also build the kind of ideological momentum necessary to transform this presidential election into a referendum on which political party should govern America for years to come.

March 16, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR PHIL BRADY

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT Announcement of Appointment

How about this:

The President today announced the appointment of Robert Anthony Snow as Deputy Assistant to the President for Media Affairs.

Since 1991 Mr. Snow has served as Deputy Assistant to the President for Communications and Director of Speechwriting. Prior to joining the White House, he worked at five newspapers: The Washington Times, The Detroit News, The Daily Press (Newport News, Va.); the Norfolk (Va.) Virginian-Pilot and the Greensboro Record.

Mr. Snow graduated from Davidson College in Davidson, North Carolina in 1977, receiving a bachelor of arts degree in philosophy. He studied philosophy and economics at the University of Chicago in 1978-79. Mr. Snow has taught in Kenya and in public schools in Cincinnati, Ohio; he also worked as an advocate for the Mentally Ill and Developmentally Disabled for the State of North Carolina. Mr. Snow was born in Berea, Kentucky. He and his wife, Jill Snow, live in Alexandria, Virginia.

Notes on the Bush Record:

The greatest secret in American politics is that in three years George Bush has put in place the foundations for the most sweeping revolution in American politics since the Great Society.

One theme runs through all these reforms: We believe in letting the people seize responsibility for their futures. That's why we have tried to wrest power from special interests and give it back to American citizens.

George Bush may not seem like a revolutionary because he doesn't seem himself as one. But if you examine his policies, you will find a consistent effort to replace the one-size-fits-all; stand-in-line-and-fill-out-this-form government with government that ensures the swift, effective provision of services. We need a revolution to replace large, expensive government with government that works -- and knows its limits.

Consider some of the reforms the President has proposed.

First, he has put in place mechanisms that harness the genius of the free market. Too often in years past, the federal government has regarded business as a sort of menace, not as the driving force behind national progress. The government has regulated business without concern for results. It has taxed business without concern for results. And it has crippled business only to be stunned by the results -- an economic slowdown, and widespread business efforts to circumvent burdensome federal regulations.

The President has tried to set this right by crafting programs that harness the profit motive and the power of the marketplace in service to important national goals. The Clean Air Act, for instance, establishes a market incentive for reducing pollution. That plan saw its first real action this Tuesday (May 12) when the state of Wisconsin sold "pollution" rights to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The President and Vice President also have tried to get rid of regulations that make it difficult to do business, and that don't produce any results in return. This administration wants regulations to pass simple tests: Do their benefits outweigh their costs, and do they promote goals we consider important? If not, let's get rid of them.

Second, the President has made choice a centerpiece of his social policy. He believes that when it comes to matters that affect families and homes, parents know best.

We already have implemented choice in child care, and we will do everything in our power to bring choice to our schools, including religious schools. Our education system never will

scale the heights of greatness until we restore vigorous competition. Americans hate to loose -- and when parents get the right to choose, everybody wins.

Third, we believe in building social programs that work, not just programs that spend money. Our housing program -- Homeownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere, or "HOPE" - - tries to turn public housing residents into homeowners. We all know that ownership changes the way in which you view yourself and your community. When you own your home, you own a stake in your community's future. This approach to housing will help us put an end to the age of public-housing blight, and it will give public housing residents the dignity and independence we promised them a quarter century ago.

The social policies of the past quarter century have done to some of our poor what sharecropping did to blacks in the South. They have trapped them in dependency. Consider the following scenario: Most poor Americans now live in apartments subsidized by the federal government. If they work hard and earn a salary that places them above the poverty line, but not high enough to achieve real independence, we cut their benefits. If they scrimp and save and put away money to buy a home, we cut their benefits. If they stay married, we hold the line on their benefits. If, on the other hand, a welfare mother has a child out of wedlock, we increase her benefits. And at some levels, we still tax those who stay on welfare at lower rates than the working poor.

Everybody agrees that we shouldn't let this sort of condition continue. Only George Bush has tried to do something about it.

Fourth, we believe in giving power back to the states. The President has asked Congress to stop imposing wasteful mandates on the states, and he has promised to veto spending bills that impose new and unfair obligations on the states. That's a start.

The President also understands that the states are what Jefferson called "the laboratories of democracy." The states of Wisconsin, New Jersey, Michigan, Massachusetts and California have begun exploring innovative ways to reform our welfare system. Other states have pioneered innovations in other areas, such as transportation (the Dulles Toll Road in Virginia) and education (choice experiments in Wisconsin and other states).

Other Presidents have talked about federalism. George Bush has practiced it.

Fifth, the President understands that the system in Washington is broke. Congress has become more adept at bouncing checks, raising its pay, passing pork-barrel appropriations, and binding the administration in Congressional red tape than it is

in passing legislation on the issues people care about most: taxes, federal spending, crime, education, health care, energy.

The whole world has changed with the end of the Cold War. Now, the Democratic Party in America seems the only organization that still believes in central planning and costly bureaucracy. They believe that a bigger government will make things better. No wonder voters no longer believe in Congress.

The President has proposed modest but significant reform for Congress. He has asked Congress to obey the laws it imposes on everybody else. He has asked Congress to pass its own special counsel law, so independent investigators can ensure the integrity of investigations into possible wrongdoing. He has recommended a dramatic reduction in the size and number of Congressional committees and staff. There are more committees and subcommittees in Congress today than there were Congressional staffers at the end of World War II. And yet people have less faith in Congress now than ever in our history.

The President has suggested reform of the budget process, so Congress can pass budgets that meet the needs of the people, rather than special interests. He has suggested ways of getting rid of the middlemen who stand between people and their elected representatives: Campaign finance reform, expansion of the Hatch Act, which prohibits political activity by federal employees, and an executive order that implements part of the Supreme Court's Beck decision all help eliminate the middlemen, and give Congress a reason to spend more time thinking about its real constituents. Dan Quayle likes to argue that our government has been seized by an iron triangle of lobbyists, congressional staffers and special interests. The President's reforms break that triangle and restore the fundamental relationship between voters and their elected representatives.

Sixth, the President has strived to restore the balance of powers in Washington by proposing dramatic Congressional reform, and by selecting judges who understand that they should interpret our laws, rather than to act as unelected legislators.

Congress understands the importance of these changes. Liberals tried to cripple the Clarence Thomas nomination because they understood Justice Thomas's determination to oppose legislation from the bench. This meant that liberals would have to accept full responsibility for enacting unpopular liberal programs, rather than having judges impose those programs upon an unwilling public.

Seventh, this President has done more to create a basis for world peace than any President in history, and he hasn't gotten the credit he deserves because he has made it look so easy. The Soviet Union is gone. Historic enemies have agreed to talk peace

in the Middle East. The entire world has moved toward a New World Order marked by economic competition, rather than nuclear confrontation.

Yet we still face more than our share of challenges. The Middle East remains volatile. Former republics in the Soviet Union and East bloc must deal with ethnic tensions that have been bottled up for decades, and now threaten to explode. Terrorist states like Libya and Iraq continue to threaten us.

Survey the candidates and ask yourself: Who best can promote peace? George Bush, or someone who sounds like a pale and inexperienced imitation of George Bush?

Eighth, this President also has promoted free trade more vigorously than any President in recent memory. We stand on the verge of signing an historic North American Free Trade Agreement that would create the world's largest trading bloc. The promise of NAFTA has spurred incredible economic and environmental reform in Mexico, and transformed that nation from a tenuous democracy into one of the fastest growing nations on earth. We've enjoyed similar results with our Enterprise for the Americas initiative, which creates special trade relationships with partners throughout our hemisphere.

The President also wants an international trade agreement that will create a foundation for worldwide prosperity. Although other nations continue pressing for special and unfair advantages, the President has hung tough -- and he'll win. Before he leaves the White House, we will see freer and fairer trade than the world has ever known. That's good for everybody.

Finally, George Bush has worked to create an atmosphere of decency in government and throughout America. I'm sick of hearing people complain that he's a racist or a divisive person. Those insults come from desperate Democrats who can't cope with reform. The President has talked this year of five fundamental reforms: education, health care, government, legal reform, and trade. That's not just a vision; it's a detailed, common sense blueprint for the future.

Just look at the people who oppose the president, and you'll see that he's hit the mark. Unions don't like him. Lawyers don't like him. Special interests don't like him. And George Mitchell doesn't like him. That's quite an honor roll. On the other hand, the American people love him -- not for his glitz, but for his character.

Many liberals claimed after the recent riots in Los Angeles that the President didn't understand or didn't care. No one who watched him choking back tears in Los Angeles can say he doesn't care, and no one who has known him over the years and has seen

him work tirelessly and quietly for racial healing can doubt his commitment to civil rights and to an end to racial divisions. In this election year, people may try to smear the President, but it won't work. George Bush, more than any recent President, has the character and the power to heal racial divisions while leading us toward a new era of progress and harmony.

More than a century ago, a French observer noted that Americans always seem to have the morale of an army on the march. The President isn't a cheerleader, but he is a leader, and this year offers greater possibilities for reform than any year in recent history. Americans will need to be all they can be if we want to continue leading the world. We will need to reform our government. We will need to turn our cities into islands of prosperity rather than dungeons of despair. We will need the best schools on earth and the most motivated workforce. In sum, we will need the Revolution George Bush has outlined for three years. And we will need one thing more: We will need a Congress that will pass these reforms, and give power back to the people.

George Bush isn't a revolutionary by nature, and he'd get nervous if you tried to describe him as a revolutionary. But look at the subtle changes he's made, and you'll see the makings of a revolution aimed at giving government back to the people, and at unleashing America's genius for innovation, hard work, and greatness. The next time someone complains that George Bush lacks vision, just say: Have you got an hour? I'll just try to outline a few things for you. Then let 'em have it.

George Bush believes in government of the people, by the people and for the people. He has stood up to the politics of tax, spend, and comfort special interests. He's our first genuine patrician populist -- and he's the one man who can reshape our government to meet the challenges of the next century.

MARCH 17, 1992

MEMORANDUM TO CLAYTON YEUTTER
DORRANCE SMITH
BOB TEETER
JIM PINKERTON

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT TAXES

This seems to be the year that liberal Democrats take a swipe at our major issues. While most of us spend our time looking at Bill Clinton, Jerry Brown has caught fire with a simple idea -- a 13 percent flat tax. Michael Weinstein at the New York Times gave his imprimatur to the idea a couple of weeks ago (his piece is attached), and audiences seem to respond more to this idea than to any other in the campaign.

The flat tax neatly summarizes voter discontent with Washington. Our tax system symbolizes everything that's wrong with government today: It costs too much, it defies common sense, it seems incredibly complex, and it seems utterly detached from our everyday lives. People hate the tax code because it is the instrument through which special interests wheedle special benefits. When people scan their paychecks, they see that the government has taken out a hefty chunk, which can be returned only with the aid of a very good accountant or tax attorney. And when they look at their lives, they find it difficult to see just where the money went. Then they see Congress kiting checks, ignoring cocaine scandals, feathering its own nest, etc. -- and they get positively livid.

Brown wants to cut through all this: Trash all the complicated taxes, impose a 13 percent flat-tax with only three loopholes: home mortgage, rent, and charitable contributions. Everything else goes. His message: Throw the accountants out of work! Make the tax lawyers seek honest employment! Let the lobbyists have it right between the eyes! Keep your hard-earned money! This sounds like the kind of thing Republicans supported before we became took pride in mastering the intricacies of Washington life.

Democrats never will accept Brown's idea, because it takes power out of Congress and gives it to ordinary citizens. Many people in this administration will argue vehemently against it, usually summarizing arguments offered up by silk-suit lobbyists.

But if we really want to think about the future, we ought to devote some thought to a taxpayer crusade aimed at purging the tax code of its complexity and inefficiency, and finding something simple and fair. After all, what's the purpose of a tax code? Answer: to raise money without messing up people's private lives. Unfortunately, we decided years ago to add little incentives here and there -- for housing, health care, investments, and so on -- and pretty soon a simple little tax form became a hieroglyphic. Each change creates unwanted consequences, which sets off a search for another adjustment, which introduces its own unintended consequences, and so the cycle goes. The more our tax code mangles things, the more we resort to clever fixes: It's as if the patient entered the hospital with a hangnail, and after repeated ministrations by the medical staff, was confined for life in a body cast.

Nothing would better defuse the fairness argument than a flat tax, and nothing would better please the public. I know we have laughed off the issue for years, and we surely won't try to embrace it fully this year. But Brown's on to something, and we ought to make a decision to shape it into something dramatic for the future.

As Republicans, we also believe in trying to reduce the tax burden, and we should think about how to make voters feel the pinch of taxes. I don't have any practical suggestions. We could set off a bona fide taxpayer rebellion by repealing the payroll deduction and making people pay their local, state and federal income taxes four times a year, in advance. That certainly would illustrate the high cost of government. No one will buy that tantalizing little reform, so we should look for other measures. The President often remarks that government is too big and costs too much. We should build the case for cutting its size and cost. A flat tax offers a starting point.

A final observation: As government becomes more complex, it loses its touch with the people. Citizens become cynical, and the government slowly gives away its moral authority and political legitimacy. Communism fell because it destroyed the bonds between government and the people: We should think of communism's failure as a high-speed film of what happens when government grows and grows and encroaches upon people's precious liberties.

A flat tax makes government more comprehensible and user-friendly -- as does any other reform that simplifies the way in which we do business. We should think long and hard about how to restore idealism, confidence, and enthusiasm to government and for government. We have some obvious targets: the tax code, the Imperial Democrat-run Congress, executive-branch agencies that put decent people in regulatory fetters, programs that encourage bad behavior and discourage good behavior, etc.

MARCH 17, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR ANNA PEREZ

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT CABAL

I wish we had recorded our lunch conversation: It would be so much easier to capture the excitement and nuance of what we want to do. But in the absence of electronic snooping measures, I'll have to reconstruct the moment.

First, we want to assemble a group that understands the incredible opportunities this election offers; can design a policy package that captures those opportunities and silences technocrats who will want to know what we plan to do with program X, Y and Z; can create real excitement and optimism within the administration, especially among the lumpen-appointees; and that will help the President build a compelling message of unity while steering him free of embarrassments.

Obviously, we need to structure our deliberations, so here's a rough and long-winded cut:

Part I: Define the opportunity.

The opportunity falls into two parts: 1) Americans' understanding that things are screwed up; and 2) their disgust with hatemongers.

Start with the screwed-up part: We know some of the problems. Realtors, banks and others red-line cities -- for the most part, unintentionally, I imagine, but who cares? Red-lining is red-lining is red-lining. Schools provide subpar service to poor city kids, who more often belong to racial and ethnic minorities. Big government contracts tend to go to well-heeled white guys. And so on. We must identify the problems honestly and candidly.

Americans also have had it with lawyers who want to courts to impose a New American Order upon everybody. We want some role in the healing, and some credit when it gets done. We don't want to act nice just because the alternative might be a long stretch in the slammer.

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

Quotas don't work: They divide us by race. They're unfair. They imply that people of color can't cut it. Not even Bull Connor went that far.

Americans have had it with politicians who skirt the issue, and refuse to discuss racial problems honestly. When politicians run from the challenge, demagogues fill the void. When bad people gain a foothold in communities, good people who hold their silence drift into irrelevance.

We need a healer. And George Bush, more than any other candidate in the field, can heal. He should get out and talk to audiences about the importance of building a unity movement -- of rekindling the spirit that enabled Civil Rights pioneers to accomplish miracles, and to build a coalition that enlisted people of all races, ages and classes. He also should take on the libels most commonly used against him: Willie Horton and the civil rights bill, and explain why they fit into his kinder, gentler approach to things.

Then he should invite everyone to join a common sense movement to bring government back to the people: America 2000, including school choice; welfare reform; tough anti-crime programs; lower levels of spending and taxation; more vigorous enforcement of anti-discrimination laws -- basic conservative stuff, with an accent on traditional values.

And he should take on discrimination -- perhaps by visiting Harlem and trying to figure out why banks will take people's money, but won't offer any loans. That would be a whole lot more edifying than yet another trip to the South Bronx.

Part II: Define the obstacles.

We face the daunting task of dismantling government programs that have encouraged voluntary segregation, dependency, poverty and all the wrong stuff. We must decide what to do with 8-A set-asides, and various other programs (and we should list what programs fit under that descriptions). We must propose alternatives. And we must develop a strategy to inoculate ourselves and the President from the ugly recriminations that surely will follow from the usual suspects. This includes many old "friends" who trashed POTUS mercilessly during last year's debate about the Civil Rights Act.

Although rhetoric matters more in matters of race than in any other domestic arena, policy also matters. We've got to prove that we can deliver, and we should do everything in our power to put together a package that answers critics without surrendering principles.

Part III: Develop a strategy.

I believe we can win middle-class Black votes and white Southern Bubba votes the same way: Appeal to traditional values and common sense. We must persuade the President that he can do so without going down into history as the Simon Legree of the 20th Century.

Frankly, he won't accept counsel from white folks. We need to find a group of black professionals who can speak from the heart about these issues, and can persuade him that his instincts really can deliver America into a new age of unity and brotherhood.

We should pitch the opportunity in apocalyptic terms because we really do have a chance to move mountains. The right audience could whet his appetite for moving boldly, and follow his own instincts and ambitions.

We also ought to think up speech opportunities in which the President can break news, speak to an adoring and revved up audience, and shock normally cynical newsies. If he delivers a dud speech to a hostile audience, we're dead. He needs to see people cheering for him and his vision, and he needs to see administration types suddenly throwing themselves into a grand idealistic effort to remove that great blemish, racism. We could start by giving a no-federal-quotas, enhanced-civil-rights-enforcement speech to Justice Department types, and then build a broader message in churches, schools, workplaces -- everywhere but large institutional conventions.

Once we have established a safe beachhead, we can move on to more controversial topics, such as multiculturalism, race-based scholarships, etc. But we must begin with step one, which is to articulate his own vision of a united America.

A side note: somewhere along the line, someone he trusts must explain that dinosaurs are extinct, and we should not develop tomorrow's racial policies under the guidance of yesterday's leaders -- Art Fletcher, Bill Coleman, Ben Hooks, John Jacob, etc.

A final note: Race will become an issue in this year's campaign, whether we like it or not. Clinton already has seen and seized the opportunity, and he has receive praise from people who might otherwise be inclined to listen to us (see WJ Wilson piece, attached). I know Republicans generally avoid discussions of race, but we can't -- and shouldn't this time around. The only question is who will define the terms of the discussion -- us or the Democrats?

Cheers.

March 20, 1992

Editor
The Washington Times
3600 New York Ave, NE
Washington, D.C. 20002

Editor:

The March 20 Washington Times carried a short item about my shift at the White House from the Office of Communications to the Office of Media Affairs. While I appreciate being noticed by old friends, the piece did a disservice to me and the President. It took a year-old quote to another publication about last year's Louisiana gubernatorial primary, described it as "recent," gave the impression that I take seriously what you called David Duke's "insurgency," and implied that this represented administration policy.

This is truly bizarre. I don't think I've ever seen a piece crowd so many crazy insinuations and distortions into such a small space. For the record: I have no use for David Duke. Voters all across America agree. After seeing and hearing him, they have consigned him to his rightful place -- political oblivion.

Your Bewildered ex-colleague,

Tony Snow
Deputy Assistant to the President
for Media Affairs

MARCH 25, 1992

MEMORANDUM TO DORRANCE SMITH
DAVID DEMAREST
BOB TEETER
JIM PINKERTON

SUBJECT REFORM SPEECH

Next week's speech in Philadelphia gives the President an opportunity to cast his reform message in larger-than-life, historic terms. We should make full use of the venue to place the President above today's political fray and place him firmly in league with our Founders.

Philadelphia enables the President to give an historical cast to his remarks, and rise above the fray, while hitting Congress where it hurts most -- the truth.

Today's Congress shows what happens when our system of checks and balances breaks down, and one branch manages to rise above and dominate the others. The President thus comes not to bash Congress, but to save the Constitution. He alone has the Constitutional obligation to "preserve, protect and defend the Constitution," and he may want to make some reference to the fact.

As we criticize Congress for its perks, etc., we also should come prepared to mend our ways. The President may want to announce some change in perks or internal ethics standards or something -- I don't have any good ideas, but I'm sure somebody does.

The nice thing about the speech is that it offers endless opportunities for displaying the President's command of his office, and for highlighting his commitment to tradition, values, decency -- and a government of the people.

That last phrase is key: We should draw at least an implicit distinction between the President and the elitist Congress.

The present complicated system of committees, subcommittees, caucuses just ensures that the power lies not with the people, but with experts who know how to manipulate the Rube Goldberg

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

system. Our assaults on lawyers and on regulations win applause because people hate the idea that experts enjoy special benefits.

Our system supposedly makes all people equal before the law. But lawyers, accountants, lobbyists and others have become more equal than the average American citizen. If the President can restore people's ties with their own government, he becomes their advocate and their hope -- he becomes the man who breaks the special interests' stranglehold on our republican democracy.

The President's experience and temperament enable him to serve as the reformer-in-chief, and to promote the kind of internal revolution the system needs. A good, firm, principled speech, with the right balance of contemporary politics and timeless philosophy, can go a long way toward answering questions about "the Vision Thing," and can give us a springboard for any number of initiatives for this campaign and a second term. It also can provide a haven for Americans who don't want to spend their time grumbling, but want to feel good about themselves, their government and their country.

MARCH 30, 1992

MEMORANDUM TO DORRANCE SMITH
CLAYTON YEUTTER
DICK DARMAN

SUBJECT "THURSDAY SURPRISE" STRATEGY

The President's budget rescissions offer a powerful tool for illustrating the ways in which Congressional spending xxxxx

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

MARCH 30, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR SHIRLEY M. GREEN

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT PRESIDENTIAL LETTER TO DR. GLENN CAMPBELL

I mentioned earlier today that the Hoover Institution at Stanford University has requested a Presidential letter to Dr. Glenn Campbell, the retiring director of the Hoover Institution. The President wrote a note congratulating Dr. Campbell on his 25th anniversary at Hoover. That was in 1984.

They would like a comparable note now, to congratulate Campbell on his long career, his contribution to scholarship, etc. Hoover then would excerpt part of the letter for use in a tribute to Dr. Campbell, and possibly in promotional materials.

I have attached the original request, along with an excerpt of the 1984 letter. I'm afraid we haven't been able to find the original letter from 1984.

If you need further information, please contact Cathi Smith. Her phone number is 415/725-6714. Thanks.

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

MARCH 31, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR ADM. JONATHAN T. HOWE

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT POSSIBLE AIPAC SPEECH

As promised, here's a quick pitch for the President's speaking to AIPAC. This pitch rests on two assumptions: 1) that the President wants to speak publicly about our Middle East policy right away; and 2) we can produce the appropriate speech within a week. If these two conditions don't hold, we can postpone the speech until whenever.

At any rate, a speech before AIPAC at once could demonstrate the President's friendship with Israel; his determination to help build a lasting peace; the confidence necessary to speak before an ostensibly hostile audience; and the courage not to back away from positions that have brought the states of the region to the table, and have provided greater security for Israel than the nation has seen at any point in its history.

A speech like this enables the President to show off his best traits: his mastery of foreign policy, his toughness, his commitment to principle, and his vision -- a world tied by interest, not by the fear of nuclear war. He can offer a persuasive argument about the benefits of peace to the peoples of the Middle East, to the people of the United States, and to the nations of the world.

Finally, the address would enable the President to increase the stature gap between him and the other candidates. Democrats generally come to pander before such audiences. The President would come to lead.

I know the negatives:

1) The crowd might boo.

Answer: So what? That just makes the audience look like a bunch of jerks, and the President like a man delivering unpleasant truths. AIPAC surely suspects that it will have to deal with George Bush for four more years, and it will take steps not to embarrass itself.

Besides, Howard Kohr, AIPAC's political director, is a Republican -- and was one of Dan McGroarty's college buddies. If

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

we were to decide on such a speech, we could work with Howard to ensure at least a respectful reception. We should not expect the audience to leap to its feet and begin dancing gleefully in the aisles, however.

2) It's awfully late to put on such a speech.

Answer: Nobody refuses a President of the United States. If the Vice President would agree to step aside, that might be nice. On the other hand, two speeches might prove even more impressive to the doubters than one.

3) We won't win any votes here.

Answer: Maybe, maybe not. We'll certainly get some favorable press, if only for the kind of fortitude required to take on such a challenge.

4) I'm out of negatives.

APRIL 1, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL K. SKINNER
HENSON MOORE
CLAYTON YEUTTER
DORRANCE SMITH
DAVID DEMAREST
BOYDEN GRAY

FROM TONY SNOW
SUBJECT FRIDAY'S SPEECH

Tom Foley and Co. have decided to take the offensive on the reform issue by raving about executive branch perks. They have enjoyed mild success so far: The press really ripped into Judy Smith yesterday about perks, and we didn't have good answers prepared in response.

We shouldn't take the bait. Perks aren't the problem in Washington. The problem is that we're not doing the people's business, and we seem to be wrecking our system of government in the process. Americans want action, not finger-pointing.

This memo covers two topics: 1) a recommendation that we add performance standards to our policy mix for the speech; and 2) a brief discussion of the special possibilities Philadelphia offers as a speech site.

I) A POLICY RECOMMENDATION: PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.

Friday's speech gives us an opportunity to lift the reform discussion to a higher plane. If we simply try to exploit the Democrats' problems on the Hill, we'll prove that we, like the Democrats, don't understand life outside the Beltway.

Americans don't think that their government works, and it's hard to blame them. Taxes and spending continue to rise. Key problems -- lackluster schools, streets increasingly torn by crime, a sluggish economy, feelings of competitive inferiority, etc. -- go unaddressed. We don't pass important legislation; we just set deadlines and argue.

Congress suffers historically low approval ratings (18 percent, according to a recent Washington Post/ABC survey) because of scandals, perks, and performance: It never seems to pass really important legislation, but it always manages to find

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

time to finance pork-barrel projects. Many people believe that government works for the special interests, not for them. Jerry Brown, Ross Perot and Pat Buchanan all have feasted upon this combination of voter discontent and suspicion of powerlessness. This year's battle cry: When in doubt, throw all the bums out.

If we want to distinguish ourselves from the bums, we must prove that we understand the problem. Here's the problem: The people feel that they've been excluded, and that they're getting ripped off. Jim Payne recently analyzed budget hearings on the Hill and discovered that 82 percent of the people giving testimony either worked for government, or have government backgrounds. A significant portion of the remaining 18 percent work for interest groups that receive federal funds. In short, the budget process -- and hence, the government -- caters to a small, elitist corps of lobbyists and government lifers -- not for the working stiffs who pay most of the taxes.

As I understand it, we're now prepared 1) to submit legislation applying to Congress the same laws it applies to the executive branch, 2) to take another whack at campaign finance reform; and perhaps to promote term limits, through a constitutional amendment or other vehicle.

These items turn up the heat on Congress, but they don't address the fear that government has become a private preserve for the high, mighty and well-connected.

We can answer this fear adding one other reform to our list, performance standards. The President should recommend submitting all laws to a simple test: If programs work, we support them (Head Start, for instance). If not, we eliminate them (as we have with some Defense programs). We might even wish to consider adding sunset provisions to laws, along with designated criteria for success or failure. An attached excerpt from a Peter Drucker book lays out the case for such legislation.

The pitch is simple: We don't want to waste people's hard-earned money. We will measure programs by their results: Do they work? Not: Do they cost really impressive sums of money? In this way we protect the wage earner from the predations of the special interests.

Performance standards also lay a foundation for more ambitious reform proposals. If we decide at some later date to take on bureaucracy or talk in more sweeping terms of government reforms, we can rely on the only measure that counts: Does it work? We could call it the "Truth in Legislation Act." At any rate, this reform embraces common sense and appeals to George Bush's appreciation of basic honesty.

A final benefit: Bill Roth already has submitted legislation advocating performance standards, and our administration has signed off on it -- at least in theory. We could endorse the bill if we have no problems with it. At the very least, we could work with Roth to draft a bill that makes all of us happy.

By adding performance standards to the mix, we take the debate away from the Hill and back to Main Street. We acknowledge people's basic suspicion that they're getting ripped off, and that their government has been seized by staffers and lobbyists. To those people we say: We will give government back to you. Such a statement alone would be powerful, since a simple admission of truth would shock most voters. But we also must be serious. We can't use performance standards as a toss-off line. We should be prepared to offer them up as parts of our standard presentation of legislation.

As a general proposition, we come not to destroy Congress, but to save it. After all, our system depends on three healthy branches of government, each balancing the others. A weakened Congress hurts us all. We should note that we do not regard reform as a stalking horse for Republican candidates. We want reform because it's the right thing to do.

PAC reform, Congressional reform, term limitations, and the other measures send a powerful message -- but they have far more resonance in Washington than elsewhere. We need one element to fulfill the "Damn right!" test. If we say: "The government too often pours your money into programs that don't work, and it's time we put an end to it," half the viewers will slap themselves on the forehead and say, "Damn right!"

Furthermore, performance standards would make government submit to the same scrutiny workers endure when they get their annual performance reviews. By making government accountable, and setting deadlines for results, we tear government from its lofty perch, and return it to the world in which most of our voters work and struggle to build good lives.

Voters and C-SPAN junkies will watch the House investigations of executive-branch perks with interest, and they may conclude that everyone in Washington is on the take. In the end, however, voters don't care much about the your-perks-are-bigger-than-mine debate. They think of a more basic question: What have we (in government) done for them lately? Wouldn't it be nice to demonstrate that we hear their message -- and we have something to offer?

II) PHILADELPHIA POSSIBILITIES

This section may be completely gratuitous, and the suggestions may already be incorporated into the draft. Nonetheless, here goes:

Philadelphia offers spectacular possibilities for the speech. Jefferson drafted the Declaration of Independence here. The founders hammered out the Constitution in the City of Brotherly Love. And in every generation, Americans return in their hearts to Philadelphia by asking: What does the Constitution mean? What kind of government do we want? We have reached such a point again. The entire world has changed in three years, and most nations now look back out our Founders with awe. They want to capture the spirit of Philadelphia -- and so do we.

The speech basically argues for the restoration of checks and balances -- an energetic executive branch; a Congress that represents the will of the people, and an independent judiciary. It would make sense to mention in passing the President's commitment to a judiciary that interprets laws, rather than makes them. That's standard Federalist Society stuff -- and all four founders of the Federalist Society have worked for this administration. We also should mention Clarence Thomas, who is much beloved by the Federalist Society. Clarence is a guaranteed applause line, and adds another nuance to the address.

If we incorporate a philosophical element -- a return to Philadelphia, checks and balances, a government of, by and for the people, etc. -- we can impart a sense of history and weight. That's important. Never underestimate the idealism of the American people, especially when it comes to our Constitution. During last year's Desert Storm euphoria many people believed that America had finally lifted itself from the doldrums, and had restored its higher sense of itself. Americans believe deeply in the goodness and destiny of our country, and much of today's discontent arises from the fact that we seem to have violated that precious heritage.

George Bush travels to Philadelphia to save that system of government, to reclaim the founders' legacy -- and to restore people's rightful claim to power. The President's populism would stand in dramatic contrast to the elitism of the House, and of the Democratic party. It also would provide grist for columnists -- Broder and Will, particularly -- who yearn for such stuff.

If we combine real news -- Congressional reform to restore our system of checks and balances, and performance standards to demonstrate that we understand the source of public discontent - - with the loftier ideals of a government of, by and for the people, we can hit a home run, and establish a basic theme for this election year.

APRIL 3, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR SHIRLEY M. GREEN

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT PRESIDENTIAL LETTER

First, thanks for reviewing the request from the Hoover Institution. I agree with your decision: The President shouldn't be shilling for anybody.

Now, another request. I received a letter today from the wife of Thom Gephardt, the editorial page editor of the Cincinnati Enquirer. (The letter is attached to this memo.) She has requested a special letter from the President for Thom's retirement.

The Enquirer has resisted the trends of the age, and has endorsed Republicans in every presidential election since Thom's arrival 32 years ago. Having grown up in Cincinnati and having read the Enquirer for many years, I know. At any rate, I don't know how we handle these things, but it would be a nice gesture toward someone who has supported the President and the Republican Party.

If we can do something, I'd like to get it specially framed (at my expense), and I'll forward it.

Thanks for your consideration.

APRIL 3, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR CHARLES KOLB

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT FOOD

Well, not quite: Pinkerton, Cicconi and I met this morning for breakfast. Over hot coffee and stale pastries we came up with an idea that sounded good at the time: Why not convene an informal group of world-shaker wannabes to discuss broad themes and strategies for the campaign and, by implication, the second Bush term? Obviously, we can't do such a thing at the White House or the campaign headquarters -- so the next best idea was to meet on Saturdays at some place or other for breakfast.

I think it's a good idea, but only if we try to organize ourselves in advance -- picking out some topic of the day or week. If we don't establish an agenda, the confabs likely will degenerate into philosophical musings, Darman bashings, or seances. These activities might soothe the battered White House souls, but they won't help add shape or strategy to the campaign.

So, two questions: First, how do you like the idea?

Second: Whom should we invite? We really should keep the group small, so that we might accomplish something. I think the core group should consist of Pink, Cicconi, you, me, one or two others from the White House, and a couple of other mavens like Spence Abraham. We also should make full use of such wise men as Ed Rollins, soliciting their attendance and attention from time to time, but not regularly. Ed, after all, now works in the private sector, makes real money, and has better things to do on Saturday mornings. At any rate, we should think of one or two senior-ish White House types to join in.

If this interests you, let me know by Monday, and I'll pass word on to Cicconi. We'll try to start our get-togethers on April 11.

APRIL 5, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL K. SKINNER
CLAYTON YEUTTER
MARLIN FITZWATER
DAVID DEMAREST
DORRANCE SMITH
BOB TEETER

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT L.A. TRIP

The President's trip to California this week provides an unprecedented opportunity to show George Bush at his best and to let the President seize the initiative on some of our most important and troubling social issues. This memo will suggest an overall framework for dealing with the trip; then will discuss some of the major issues.

I) FRAMEWORK

This trip should be as dramatic and panoramic as any in this Presidency. George Bush should stake his claim to the future, by demonstrating his grasp of the large problems we face, and the actions we can adopt to address those problems.

We can dramatize the sweep of the L.A. tragedy by visiting people who played different roles in the drama (or trauma). He should visit shelled out neighborhoods, such as Compton or Watts. He should meet with church groups. He should meet with volunteers, like Sweet Alice Harris in Watts, one of our Points of Light. He should meet with cops and firefighters. And he should meet with the families of victims. The more we control events, the shallower and less satisfying the trip will seem. If the President faces angry questioners, or has someone reduce him to tears, he shows real understanding and empathy. He crushes the bad guys, and places himself in a position to lead more knowledgeably. We must engage his passions, and we can't do that in carefully controlled events.

We must show that we remain firm in our commitment to fighting crime and preserving the integrity of the judicial system; that we understand the problems of race; that we intend to revive American cities and sweep away the debris of the Great Society; and that we will mount a revolution designed to implement programs that actually produce results -- a revolution to give government back to the people, to give people real power to shape their own

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

futures. This is quite a juggling act, involving everything from deeply personal talk about race relations and prejudice to harder, more concrete discussions of crime, job creation, education and so on. Nevertheless, we can do it.

Here's the key: We must get the President to talk from the heart. We must draw links between the policies and the things George Bush loves most: family, friends and country. So far, we have put him before audiences and asked him to read lists: Five Fundamentals; Six National Educational Goals; Seven Basic Reforms in the State of the Union; Four Tracks of America 2000 -- and so on. We sound like a bunch of Gringo Maoists. Worse, we have precious little to show for these things. Most of our State of the Union initiatives remain moribund. We haven't followed up on our March 20 rescissions. We look like people searching for phrases, and not for solutions -- and that won't do.

If we don't put the President's heart and soul into these things, he will look like a bemused marionette. And if we fail to seize the initiative on key domestic matters, we run the risk of having this campaign degenerate into an examination of character -- Bill Clinton versus the Bush children -- Neal, then Jeb, then anyone else the media chooses to hound. It doesn't matter that the Bush children will escape in the end: A grinding, personal campaign could demoralize the President and his family. Unless we begin putting together a real series of themes, with real meat and real connections to the heart and soul of the candidate, we run the risk of turning the leader of the Free World into a moving target for Democrat marksmen.

In crass political terms, we must understand that we will squander a great opportunity if we confine our comments to law and order or to safe, traditional Republican issues. The American people don't trust Bill Clinton and they want George Bush to lead. He should do so by relying on his incredible personal decency and his fierce commitment to doing what is right. His personal virtues should serve as the springboard for what should amount to a revolution in domestic politics.

II) Issues

The events in Los Angeles helped illustrate the interplay between several social trends: 1) the increasing cynicism among minorities about the criminal justice system; 2) race relations; 3) public rage about gangs, wanton crime, and lawlessness; 4) the role of the media.

The events also place us right between the cross-hairs on the issue of leadership. We have hidden from race issues for three years, fearing that the other side would call us bad names if we decided to take the lead. Now, they're calling us bad names, anyway. We've got to seize the initiative.

We must put the Los Angeles events into a larger context. Marlin began the task yesterday by talking about the failures of the Great Society. We should not shrink from pushing that argument. Indeed, we should flesh it out.

Some remnants of the Great Society have created a generation of what I call urban sharecroppers -- people frozen in dependency by a system that denies them the means to escape, and that encourages them to engage in behavior that will keep them down.

Consider this scenario: If you're poor and you want to get out, the government reduces your benefits if you make too much, but not enough to escape. The government reduces your benefits if you scrimp and save and try to put together enough money to purchase a modest place to live. The government punishes you if you stay married. It does reward those who have illegitimate children, and it rewards with lower effective tax rates some of those who don't work or attend school.

Some neighborhoods in the Los Angeles area house second-and-third generation poor. In these places, a permanent underclass has begun to form. These places offer horrifying testimony to the shortcomings of the Great Society.

As we talk about the Great Society, we should take care not to blame anybody for the programs. Treat them as a fact of life, and obstruction to remove. If Democrats want to take reform as a personal insult, let them do so. We should argue that we don't want to revive old arguments. We want to produce results.

When we propose social programs, we should use common sense, and ask this question: What basics ensure human dignity? Answer: a fair chance at a decent education, a home you can own, a safe neighborhood, and assurances that if you work hard, you will be rewarded fairly for your labors. You also want assurances that the government will not treat you like a child. It will not patronize you or prevent you from doing the important things all people want to do: make important decisions about child care, schools, health care; where you want to work, etc.

We can show we care in one way only: by giving people the power to control their own lives. The keys to power: education, property and protection from discrimination. When people own homes and have faith in the future, they have a real stake in America and they behave differently. They keep the neighborhood clean. They participate in school events. They encourage good behavior. You know how it works: Just consider your own neighborhoods and social circles.

We can package all our domestic initiatives around the themes of independence and dignity. It's a common-sense way to get at the

heart of things and to appeal personally to our people.

Now, to the analysis:

A) Social trends revealed by Los Angeles:

1) Cynicism about the justice system

This week's snap polls on the Simi Valley verdict showed that four of five black Americans believes that the criminal justice system discriminates against blacks. Roughly half of white respondents feel that blacks can't get justice.

We should begin by noting this cynicism. That would score brownie points immediately. Our national debate about race too often is couched in euphemism. People love candor, and they always seem shocked when someone commits it. They expect politicians to deny reality and to propose programs that help cronies and friends. Why not show some refreshing honesty?

Indeed, we must. The cynicism about the courts hurts our justice system. Judge Reggie Walton notes that juries in the District often acquit obviously guilty black defendants, often as a way of protesting the system's seeming injustice. Conversely, some other communities have incredibly high conviction rates for blacks, perhaps because people consider blacks highly likely to commit crimes. In short, we've got a mess on our hands.

We should provide some sort of initiatives to deal with the problem, such as beefing up Justice Department efforts to study police brutality, as well as federal efforts to help out cops in big cities, since those cops put their lives on the line all the time, without the support they deserve and need.

We also should propose tough penalties for punks who commit the sort of crimes we saw in L.A. I doubt we could federalize it, but we certainly should make the point that this sort of "protest" has no place in American life, and we intend to punish it as severely as we punish other forms of terrorism.

I'm sure the AG has other suggestions: We ought to break out as many as we can.

2) Race relations:

Race relations in America stink, even though we've made incredible progress in knocking down barriers to opportunity and success. Democrats have fomented a good deal of this by blaming their failures on "racism" (shades of the Kerner Commission!), and preaching this gospel in every urban area in the country. We've kept quiet, letting this slander harden into an accepted fact.

Democrats place incredible weight on their black support. They know their programs don't work, that they got it all wrong during the Cold War, and that their Congress has grown complacent and corrupt. They cling to the sense of moral superiority that the black vote conveys for them. If we make inroads into the black vote by capturing the hearts and idealism of black voters -- especially the black middle class -- we drive a stake through their hearts.

That shouldn't be difficult. Many blacks have become sick of liberals who try to buy votes with programs that lure the poor into dependency. They want programs that treat them with the dignity they're due, and that offer some real hope of producing good results.

And there's more! A properly conciliatory/realistic approach would appeal to the vast majority of middle-class whites, most of whom now at least have black colleagues, if not neighbors, and who want very much to put all the talk of racism behind them. A quarter century's worth of race baiting has left people in a state of exhaustion and anger. We should note that and understand it. We also should demand that we move ahead.

To do so, we must confront the constant Democrat claim that conservatism equals racism. Remember when the President proposed welfare waivers for Wisconsin? Moynihan quickly accused the President of resorting to "code words." That was typical: Democrats use the charge of racism as a censorship tool. They want to prevent our talking about much needed reforms, so that they may cling to their own programs.

We have an easy response. We care about what works, and not about bureaucrats. We want poor Americans to join the American mainstream, and we want everybody to have a fair chance to live an independent and dignified life.

If we talk about groups and classes, we're dead. We must talk about individuals, and we must appeal to people's own common sense notions of what counts: education, family, home, community, job, etc.

Finally, on this topic: If we wish to establish real credibility on race issues, the President sooner or later must address two issues: Willie Horton and quotas. He should argue that Democrats turned Willie Horton into a racial issue in order to frighten black voters. We just wanted to talk about the viciousness of releasing sadistic rapists. As to quotas, the President opposes them because they're divisive. The quota is father to the glass ceiling. Today, many minorities have corner offices and high salaries, but many of them live almost like zoo animals: there for display, not for real work. This is disgusting and unfair, and we say so. The President wants to get rid of

quotas because they heighten racial tensions, but he also wants to increase efforts to enforce civil rights laws. Hence, the civil rights act of last year.

3) Public rage

We should not for a moment pretend to "understand" the animals who roamed around, beating and killing innocents last week. We should show special sympathy for the victims -- and appreciation for the brave people who waded through the mobs to drag innocent people to safety. We should demand real justice for the mobs. I wouldn't suggest federalizing the crimes they committed, but we should use the bully pulpit to demand harsh and fair punishment for these creeps.

I don't know that any of us have seen anything more frightening than the mob beatings last week, as gangs pulled people from their cars -- or in one instance, a couple of guys from a motorcycle -- intent merely on murder. There is nothing noble or understandable about this anger. We must stick with our values.

4) The role of the Press

Although members of the press talk piously about "objectivity," the press virtually lit the fires that consumed property and lives. The Los Angeles television stations all carried nightly updates of the police trial, and the Fox station carried the trial live. The media turned the entire thing into a spectacle, which would lead to a predictable result -- a cathartic conviction. When expectations went awry, the place went nuts.

Meanwhile, the national press left huge holes in its coverage, thereby inspiring the entire world to misinterpret the events in L.A. Even today, most people don't know that King led the cops through residential areas on a high-speed chase, and that he had two companions, both of whom surrendered with minimal struggle. Nor has the public ever seen the entire video tape.

Instant analyses further muddle things. The stock wisdom now is that L.A. burned because George Bush and Ronald Reagan didn't spend enough on social programs. That's factually wrong -- OMB should be able to supply the budget figures -- and it's morally craven. We should take on directly the charge that conservatism translates into racism (as I noted above), and we should argue that we care about what works. We want to wipe away a lot of failed programs because they cheat needy Americans of the chance to make it in life. We should show that we don't care about bureaucrats who earn their keep by running failed federal programs. We care about people. The President ought to be mad as hell about the way we short-change our poor, and he should challenge the media on insinuations that he's a racist. In this case, righteous anger is good.

There's a subtler point: In the age of instant communication, the public gets vivid views of isolated incidents, and broadcasters imply that these small events constitute the whole of reality. In fact, instant communication almost always means instant distortion -- and journalists must find some way of bringing these things into balance. Television cameras helped capture the King beating, but they also helped encourage people to draw facile conclusions, and to go out on the streets and raise gleeful hell.

III) The Big Picture

We should propose two R's: reconciliation and reform.

For starters, we should hammer at our proposals and our record, and explain each one in terms of what they do for all Americans. So: choice in education, child care, health care; America 2000; HOPE and other housing initiatives; welfare reform; job creation -- capital gains tax cuts, enterprize zones, job training 2000, etc. We should push these as key elements in a very subtle American revolution designed to give government back to the American people.

The President should argue that we accomplish nothing by pointing fingers and assessing blame. Those who raged through the streets of Los Angeles deserve the blame for their deeds. The President ought to ask all Americans, regardless of race, creed, national origin or any other damned thing to join in a great common purpose, for building a greater America.

We also must understand that racial tensions involve more than blacks and whites. When liberals divided America into an amalgam of groups with separate rights and claims, they made inevitable the war of each against all. Hence, we see tensions between all "groups" -- whites, blacks, hispanics, asians, etc. We can overcome only by repudiating the notion of group rights and focus on individual people.

The President has delivered many fine speeches during his presidency. Now we must produce results. We can't do that all by ourselves. We must encourage all Americans to join a movement toward a better future, and think of ways in which we can ensure greater self-reliance and greater levels of participation in such things as school groups, community organizations, etc.

We must instill in every American a sense of answering to a higher calling, and a sense that we all must create a new movement that relies on little platoons, and not on megabureaucracies. Greatness lies in that cause, and in that cause lies our own chance to push American politics into a new era of progress, optimism and hope.

We must speak in crisp, vivid and clear language. If we resort to fuzzy euphemism or cliché, people will say to themselves: "There they go again, trying to con us." If we wish to communicate, the President must speak with conviction and passion.

A) A final note: The importance of symbolism.

Symbolism is immensely important in racial politics. I will explain why by means of analogy.

If you ever have had something stolen, you know that it fills you with a sense of wild rage: You have been victimized, by some invisible foe, for no good reason, and you want to know why.

Now, imagine being a black American who has worked hard to get a good job. You dress well, obey the law, and raise your kids to honor traditional American values. Still, clerks look at you funny when you enter stores. Cabs whiz past you at night. Colleagues assess you regularly, asking: Did he (or she) get the job because of race or qualification? These and thousands of other humiliations follow black Americans every day. But prejudice works like an invisible thief. No one knows where it lurks, or how it might show itself, only that it's there -- always.

In such circumstances, nothing is more powerful than having the leader of the free world say: I understand this. I think it's outrageous and wrong. Together, we will fight to eliminate it. That shows a depth of understanding and empathy that no politician can match, and it cuts through all the patronizing BS that Democrats might want foisted upon us. If we can combine powerful measures of symbolism, tough action, personal involvement, and imaginative policy suggestions, the President will ascend to heights none of us would have dreamed possible. This is the greatest opportunity in this administration to seize control of the domestic agenda and to lead. Let's make the most of it.

APRIL 6, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL SKINNER
HENSON MOORE
DORRANCE SMITH
SCOTT COLLINS

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT MAKING THE MOST OF OUR OPPORTUNITIES

In a meeting this morning with Scott Collins, Maria Sheehan and I offered several suggestions for making the most of the talent available within our communications departments. This memo offers a few sketchy proposals along those lines: We will return with what we hope will be more thoughtful, detailed comments later this week.

Problem: The communications departments have been battered and demoralized by constant public talk of "communications problems." Policymakers meanwhile have become touchy over countercharges that our policy lacks oomph.

Suggestion: Understand that we don't have a "policy" problem or a "communications" problem. We have a coordination problem. We have severed policy and communications. If we bring the two into closer contact, we can do a better job of anticipating press reactions, taking public sensitivities into account, explaining policy nuances carefully -- and making everyone here happy.

Related Problem: Too often, the people responsible for crafting and distributing the message get left out of the policy loop until the last minute. They must rush to produce scripts or talking points or op-eds or speeches -- and can only guess at the philosophical, technical and political factors that went into crafting the policy. When they fail to read the policy experts' minds, accusations fly.

Suggestion: Keep the message-makers informed about what's going on in policy. Let the Speechwriting Department and Department of Media Affairs know about upcoming initiatives, etc. (The speechwriters' meeting with Clayton Yeutter offers a good start.) Get all fact sheets to both departments, and put Media Affairs people (Maria and me) on the distribution list for speeches. We can't resonate a message if we haven't seen it.

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

Furthermore, we must settle on a procedure for unveiling important or sensitive news, such as last week's Soviet aid announcement. NSC effectively assumed control of the event, and produced a leaden speech for an historic moment. That doesn't serve anybody well. Similarly, OMB effectively controlled the March 20 speech. Everybody else had to labor in relative darkness, waiting for the shadowy draft to emerge. Not good. We now talk about five pillars, but no one has answered the obvious question: What do these pillars uphold? Although the observation may seem trivial, it isn't: Metaphors matter, and murky metaphors usually raise suspicions that we're trying to hide something or dress something up.

Problem: Too often, major Presidential speeches or initiatives, like pebbles dropped into a pond, set off tiny ripples for a couple of minutes, then vanish forever. This phenomenon, perhaps more than any other, contributes to the impression that the President lacks vision. Scattered shell-burst announcements make the President look like a man groping for a policy, and they fuel "disarray" rumors.

Suggestion: Give your communications professionals a chance. Distribute in advance long-range "message" schedules -- the sort of block schedules that the Deputy Chief of Staff has created. Message schedules give us a tool for coordinating our efforts. They also give us a chance to suggest activities that might underscore the message. Our staffers know and understand communications, and they can offer suggestions that will serve the President well.

I understand the fear that such schedules, once given broader circulation, might end up in newspapers or on television. Frankly, we're not part of the leak problem -- and if anyone leaks, they don't deserve to be here. As we approach the election, we must ask whether we will base our decisions on the fear of leaks, or the determination to drive the debate. My prejudice: We should go on the offensive against our foes, rather than on the defensive against ourselves.

Also, use these message schedules as the template for long-range scheduling meetings. Find events that fit the message, rather than trying to twist events to meet the political demands of the day.

When we coordinate activities, we give new weight to speeches, press conferences, announcements, and initiatives. We inspire a feeling of teamwork and achievement. The more we reduce turf wars, the more effectively we will serve the President.

Note that all these suggestions involve improving the information flow. If we give everybody enough time to do some thinking, research and checking with colleagues, we can give the President the support he deserves and needs -- and we can boost sagging morale. Then, everybody will race to accept credit, rather than to apportion blame.

APRIL 6, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL SKINNER
HENSON MOORE
DORRANCE SMITH
SCOTT COLLINS

FROM TONY SNOW
MARIA SHEEHAN

SUBJECT MAKING THE MOST OF OUR OPPORTUNITIES

Prompted by a meeting earlier this week with Scott Collins, Maria Sheehan and I have developed a memo outlining some of the strengths and weaknesses of our present communications operation, along with suggestions for ways to make the most of the talent available in the communications offices at the White House.

[summary of the memo:

I) Communications Problem

A) structural

- 1) policy/communications gulf
 - a) turf battles, especially two agencies
 - b) no official vehicle for prying information free
 - c) uncertainty about larger message
 - d) disconnects with campaign
- 2) advance/communications gulf
 - a) failure to learn about audiences, sites
 - b) failure to make the most of audiences, sites
 - c) failure to make the most of the special talents and backgrounds of our own people
- 3) scheduling/communications gulf
 - a) lack of lead time
 - b) lack of structure
 - c) lack of communications strategy
- 4) leadership/communications gulf
 - a) lack of support
 - b) lack of leadership
 - c) lack of themes, etc.

II) Morale problems

- A) Turf battles, etc.

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

1) Problem: The communications departments have been battered and demoralized by constant public talk of "communications problems." Policymakers meanwhile have become touchy over countercharges that our policy lacks oomph.

Suggestion: Understand that we don't have a "policy" problem or a "communications" problem. We have a coordination problem. We have severed policy and communications. If we bring the two into closer contact, we can do a better job of anticipating press reactions, taking public sensitivities into account, explaining policy nuances carefully -- and making everyone here happy.

Related Problem: Too often, the people responsible for crafting and distributing the message get left out of the policy loop until the last minute. They must rush to produce scripts or talking points or op-eds or speeches -- and can only guess at the philosophical, technical and political factors that went into crafting the policy. When they fail to read the policy experts' minds, accusations fly.

Suggestion: Keep the message-makers informed about what's going on in policy. Let the Speechwriting Department and Department of Media Affairs know about upcoming initiatives, etc. (The speechwriters' meeting with Clayton Yeutter offers a good start.) Get all fact sheets to both departments, and put Media Affairs people (Maria and me) on the distribution list for speeches. We can't resonate a message if we haven't seen it.

Furthermore, we must settle on a procedure for unveiling important or sensitive news, such as last week's Soviet aid announcement. NSC effectively assumed control of the event, and produced a leaden speech for an historic moment. That doesn't serve anybody well. Similarly, OMB effectively controlled the March 20 speech. Everybody else had to labor in relative darkness, waiting for the shadowy draft to emerge. Not good. We now talk about five pillars, but no one has answered the obvious question: What do these pillars uphold? Although the observation may seem trivial, it isn't: Metaphors matter, and murky metaphors usually raise suspicions that we're trying to hide something or dress something up.

Problem: Too often, major Presidential speeches or initiatives, like pebbles dropped into a pond, set off tiny ripples for a couple of minutes, then vanish forever. This phenomenon, perhaps more than any other, contributes to the impression that the President lacks vision. Scattered shell-

burst announcements make the President look like a man groping for a policy, and they fuel "disarray" rumors.

Suggestion: Give your communications professionals a chance. Distribute in advance long-range "message" schedules -- the sort of block schedules that the Deputy Chief of Staff has created. Message schedules give us a tool for coordinating our efforts. They also give us a chance to suggest activities that might underscore the message. Our staffers know and understand communications, and they can offer suggestions that will serve the President well.

I understand the fear that such schedules, once given broader circulation, might end up in newspapers or on television. Frankly, we're not part of the leak problem -- and if anyone leaks, they don't deserve to be here. As we approach the election, we must ask whether we will base our decisions on the fear of leaks, or the determination to drive the debate. My prejudice: We should go on the offensive against our foes, rather than on the defensive against ourselves.

Also, use these message schedules as the template for long-range scheduling meetings. Find events that fit the message, rather than trying to twist events to meet the political demands of the day.

When we coordinate activities, we give new weight to speeches, press conferences, announcements, and initiatives. We inspire a feeling of teamwork and achievement. The more we reduce turf wars, the more effectively we will serve the President.

Note that all these suggestions involve improving the information flow. If we give everybody enough time to do some thinking, research and checking with colleagues, we can give the President the support he deserves and needs -- and we can boost sagging morale. Then, everybody will race to accept credit, rather than to apportion blame.

Talking points (4/13; for Ron Kaufman):

I know that some of you worry that the President lacks vision going into this campaign. But let me tell you, the greatest secret in American politics is that in three years George Bush has put in place the foundations for the most sweeping revolution in American politics since the Great Society.

One theme runs through all these reforms: We believe in letting the people seize responsibility for their futures, and we believe in wresting power from the special interests and giving it back to voters.

Let me just outline a few examples;

First, we have put in place mechanisms that harness the genius of the free market, rather than destroying the market for the sake of some planner's vanity:

The Clean Air Act establishes a market incentive for reducing pollution. We understand that you're much more likely to get results by rewarding people for good behavior than by threatening them with regulations and lawsuits that will only encourage them to develop ingenious ways to exploit loopholes in the law. When you impose burdensome regulations on businesses, they naturally spend a great deal of time and energy trying to foil those regulations. We prefer to let businesses figure out the best way to clean up the environment -- and to create the technologies that will give us a cleaner and more prosperous future.

The President and Vice President also have tried to get rid of regulations that make it difficult to do business, and that don't produce any results in return. This administration wants regulations to pass simple tests: Do their benefits outweigh their costs, and do they promote goals we consider important? If not, let's get rid of them.

Second, we have made choice a centerpiece of our social programs, knowing that no one is more qualified to judge the quality of a social program than families and parents.

We already have implemented choice in child care, and we will do everything in our power to bring choice to our schools, including religious schools. Our education system never will scale the heights of greatness until we restore vigorous competition. Americans hate to lose -- and when parents get the right to choose, everybody wins.

Third, we believe in building social programs that work, not just programs that spend money. Our housing program -- Home Ownership for People Everywhere, or "HOPE" -- tries to turn public housing residents into homeowners. We all know that ownership changes the way in which you view yourself and your

community. When you own your home, you own a stake in your community's future. This approach to housing will help us put an end to the age of public-housing blight, and it will give public housing residents the dignity and independence we promised them a quarter century ago.

Fourth, we believe in giving power back to the states. The President has asked Congress to stop imposing wasteful mandates on the states, and he has promised to veto spending bills that impose new and unfair obligations on the states. That's a start.

The President also understands that the states are what Jefferson called "the laboratories of democracy." Look at Massachusetts. The government reforms here ought to serve as shining examples for the government in Washington. If we get a Republican Congress this year, the Bill Weld Massachusetts Miracle will pave the way for better government in Washington. The states have pioneered education reform, welfare reform, privatization reform -- you name it. George Bush understands this, and he has done everything he can to encourage change, including granting waivers to states that offer promising ways to reform welfare, and build a system that rewards responsibility, enterprise and independence.

Fifth, we understand that the system in Washington is broke. Congress has become more adept at bouncing checks, raising its pay, passing pork-barrel appropriations, and binding the administration in Congressional red tape than it is in passing legislation on the issues people care about most: taxes, federal spending, crime, education, health care, energy. With two dramatic exceptions, the whole world has changed with the end of the Cold War. Those exceptions: The British Labor Party and the American Democratic Party. Democrats still believe that we can spend our way out of our problems. That is, they believe that a bigger government will make things better. No wonder voters no longer believe in Congress.

The President has proposed modest but significant reform for Congress. He has asked Congress to obey the laws it imposes on everybody else. He has asked Congress to pass its own special counsel law, so independent investigators can ensure the integrity of investigations into possible wrongdoing. He has recommended a dramatic reduction in the size and number of Congressional committees and staff. There are more committees and subcommittees in Congress today than there were Congressional staffers at the end of World War II. Is that crazy, or what?

He has suggested reform of the budget process, so Congress can pass budgets that meet the needs of the people, and not just the special interests. He has suggested ways of getting rid of the middlemen who stand between people and their elected representatives: Campaign finance reform, expansion of the Hatch

Act, which prohibits political activity by federal employees, and an executive order that implements part of the Supreme Court's Beck decision all help eliminate the middlemen, and give Congress a reason to spend more time thinking about its real constituents. Dan Quayle likes to argue that our government has been seized by an iron triangle of lobbyists, congressional staffers and special interests. These reforms weaken that iron triangle.

Sixth, the President has strived to restore the balance of powers in Washington by proposing dramatic Congressional reform, and by selecting judges who understand that they should interpret our laws, rather than to act as unelected legislators.

Seventh, this President has done more to create a basis for world peace than any President in history, and he hasn't gotten the credit he deserves because he has made it look so easy. But consider the progress: The Soviet Union is gone. Historic enemies have agreed to talk peace in the Middle East. The entire world has moved toward a New World Order marked by economic competition, rather than nuclear confrontation.

Yet we still face more than our share of challenges. The Middle East remains volatile. Former republics in the Soviet Union and East bloc must deal with ethnic tensions that have been bottled up for decades, and now threaten to explode. Terrorists states like Libya and Iraq continue to threaten us.

Survey the candidates and ask yourself: Who best can promote peace? George Bush, or someone who sounds like a pale and inexperienced imitation of George Bush?

Eighth, this President also has promoted free trade more vigorously than any President in recent memory. George Bush has proposed a North American Free Trade Agreement that would create the world's largest trading bloc. The very promise of NAFTA, as we call it in Washington, has spurred incredible reform in Mexico, and transformed that nation from a tenuous democracy into one of the fastest growing nations on earth. We've enjoyed similar results with our Enterprise for the Americas initiative, which creates special trade relationships with partners throughout our hemisphere.

The President also wants an international trade agreement that will create a foundation for worldwide prosperity. Although other nations continue pressing for special and unfair advantages, the President has hung tough -- and he'll win. Before he leaves the White House, we will see freer and fairer trade than the world has ever known. That's good for everybody.

Finally, George Bush has worked to create an atmosphere of decency in government and throughout America. I'm sick of hearing people complain that he's a racist or a divisive person.

Those insults come from desperate Democrats who can't cope with reform. The President has talked this year of five fundamental reforms: education, health care, government, legal reform, and trade. That's not just a vision; it's a detailed, common sense blueprint for the future.

Just look at the people who oppose the president, and you'll see that he's hit the mark. Unions don't like him. Lawyers don't like him. Special interests don't like him. And George Mitchell doesn't like him. That's quite an honor roll. On the other hand, the American people love him.

George Bush isn't a revolutionary by nature, and he'd get nervous if you tried to describe him as a revolutionary. But look at the subtle changes he's made, and you'll see the makings of a revolution aimed at giving government back to the people, and at unleashing America's genius for innovation, hard work, and greatness. The next time someone complains that George Bush lacks vision, just say: Have you got an hour? I'll just try to outline a few things for you. Then let 'em have it.

George Bush believes in government of the people, by the people and for the people, and he has taken lots of steps to put an end to the politics of tax, spend, and schmooze the special interests. He's our first genuine patrician populist -- and he's the one man who can reshape our government to meet the challenges of the next century.

APRIL 13, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR HENSON MOORE
DORRANCE SMITH

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT OP-EDS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS TOPICS

This memo will discuss several communications topics: 1) the op-ed operation; 2) making better use of the long-term communications block schedule; and 3) a suggestion for an event this week.

I) The op-ed operation

After several weeks of working in the op-ed vineyards, I've relearned several important facts of journalistic life.

o Op-ed editors get paid to provoke controversy, and therefore look for pieces that generate controversy or break fresh news. If we want our op-eds to make a splash, they must achieve one of these two goals. Editors don't want something that rehashes an administration position; they want something that will call real attention to their pages.

o We need to decide just what we want to achieve with these pieces. I see three uses: We can use op-eds to break news; we can use them to spin breaking news; and we can use them to define the terms of the debate. I would strongly encourage us to think of op-eds as an offensive weapon: We should use these pieces to define the debate and put the other guys on the defensive.

o We should choose our pieces and our authors with some care, and we ought to ask ourselves the obvious questions: What news do we want to generate? What response can we expect from our opponents? How can we use reprints of these pieces to help the President? And: When and how should we write under the President's signature?

We cannot do these things in a vacuum: When we write an op-ed we should be sure that it doesn't compete with anything else. Here's an example: I offered a rather mild op-ed to the Wall

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

Street Journal on grounds that it would in effect announce the administration's Beck action. As it turns out, someone in Cabinet Affairs had leaked the whole thing to Robert Pear of the New York Times, who wrote a story about it yesterday. The Journal's features editor was so angry that she was tempted to drop our op-ed altogether. I held her hand, and talked with her yesterday. She decided reluctantly to use it. Nevertheless, a leak almost screwed up the whole thing, and it strained our relations with what should be the friendliest and most influential op-ed page in the United States.

We don't need problems like that. If we want to leak something, fine. But let me know. I don't want to waste my time writing and pitching a piece that could get nuked because somebody in our administration decided to free-lance.

II) The communications block schedule

Too often, major Presidential speeches or initiatives, like pebbles dropped into a pond, set off tiny ripples for a couple of minutes, then vanish forever. This phenomenon, perhaps more than any other, contributes to the impression that the President lacks vision. Scattered shell-burst announcements make the President look like a man groping for a policy, and they fuel "disarray" rumors.

We can eradicate this problem by giving everybody access to the long-term communications block schedule, and keeping the various communications departments -- media affairs, public liaison and speechwriting -- informed of new or breaking policy developments. I know there's some fear that somebody might leak details of the schedule, but you needn't fear us: We gain nothing from leaks, and everything to lose. Most folks know who the leakers are in this administration, and you won't find them in Media Affairs.

So my advice: Give your communications professionals a chance. Distribute in advance long-range "message" schedules -- the sort of block schedules that the Deputy Chief of Staff has created. Message schedules give us a tool for coordinating our efforts. They also give us a chance to suggest activities that might underscore the message. Our staffers know and understand communications, and they can offer suggestions that will serve the President well.

I know that we've begun to use these message schedules as the template for long-range scheduling meetings, and that's great. I hope we can develop a series of criteria for approving or rejecting scheduling proposals -- for instance, does it fit our communications strategy? Will it shape the day's news? Does it push our message forward? Are we doing it just because we did it last year? If so, will it do any good? In short, we should

find events that fit the message, rather than trying to twist events to meet the political demands of the day.

This sort of openness will create occasional friction. For instance, the NSC delights in circumventing the various communications departments. But few in the NSC can write even a press release, let alone an op-ed or a speech, and we need to impose some discipline on them. Similarly, we still need to keep communications departments informed when we contract events to "outsiders." Everybody had trouble amplifying the March 20 speech because Bob Grady clung to it as if it were a state secret. That kind of control was good for Bob, bad for the President.

When we coordinate activities, we give new weight to speeches, press conferences, announcements, and initiatives. We inspire a feeling of teamwork and achievement. The more we reduce turf wars, the more effectively we can serve the President.

Furthermore, if we give everybody enough time to do some thinking, research and checking with colleagues, we can give the President the support he deserves and needs -- and we can boost morale. Then, everybody will race to accept credit, rather than to apportion blame.

III) An event suggestion:

I'd like to cast my lot with those who believe that we should make some hay on Tax Day (Wednesday) by casting a spotlight on pork-barrel expenditures. I hear that OMB has more than 1,000 rescission proposals sitting on the desk. We review the proposed rescissions and see if we can bundle them into packages that illustrate different aspects of the spending problems. Wednesday's event could fit into that strategy, and remind taxpayers that government has a duty to spend their money wisely -- not freely. We also could reiterate our commitment to restoring the bond between people and government, and making government answer to the real needs of working American men and women.

We could develop follow-up events that would highlight our strategy for creating more effective and responsive government. In any event, we should keep up pressure by unveiling rescissions regularly, and reporting the progress of the rescission efforts to the American people. If Congress continues to dawdle, we should turn up the heat.

The rescissions are the most visible part of the March 20 speech. If we fail to follow up on our own initiatives, we'll give the impression that they were just a gimmick, rather than an integral part of a larger, long-term reform strategy.

APRIL 15, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR ROSE ZAMARIA

FROM TONY SNOW
SUBJECT TV GUIDE COVER

TV Guide has requested a one-sentence "farewell" statement from the President regarding Johnny Carson's departure from the Tonight Show.

According to the fellow at TV Guide, the magazine submitted some sort of request of the President, which Dorrance approved. They need the magical sentence today, if at all possible, along with a Presidential signature. We would fax out the letter, and send the original out by the mails.

The cover would feature a picture of Carson on the left hand side, and seven figures saying farewell on the right: The President, President and Mrs. Reagan, Elizabeth Taylor, George Burns, Bob Hope and Roseanne Arnold.

The editor working on the piece, Greg Fagan, has read the other cover comments to me. Most simply offer fond wishes; George Burns and Bob Hope make jokes that say, in effect: "Retirement? What's that?" I don't see any possibility of the President's getting embarrassed by other comments. Roseanne Arnold merely thanks Carson for giving her a start in show business.

The cover would appear on the May 9 issue, which would arrive on Newsstands May 4. TV guide sells 16 millions copies each week.

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

APRIL 30, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL K. SKINNER

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT REACTIONS TO L.A. EVENTS

The tragedies in Los Angeles this week pose one of the great domestic challenges -- and opportunities -- of this Presidency. The President can show the American people just how great he is by demonstrating real and forceful leadership in the days ahead.

He faces real perils: Some conservatives, outraged at looting and murders in Los Angeles, want him to support the jury verdict. He can't possibly do that. Some liberals, outraged at the verdict, want the President to announce summary justice on the cops. He can't possibly do that, either. Most Americans, sickened by the whole mess, want the President to provide leadership out of the morass, and to demonstrate that he has the strength, the decency and the leadership to do the job.

In many ways, symbol will prove more important than substance in the next 72 hours. The President's personal concern and integrity can reassure the public and can establish a foundation for national healing.

I would recommend at least three events to promote this end. Two enjoy significant support around the White House; one may seem a little too controversial, but I think it could prove historic.

I) National television address:

I would recommend a brief (10-12 minute) national television address, in which the President would act as a leader and healer. I have attached to this memo a very rough suggested draft. He would deliver this Friday evening (or Monday), and could take into account the day's events. I'm attaching a rough draft of such an address.

II) Weekly radio address:

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

The President should deliver this speech live from Camp David, rather than on tape. By going live, we could ensure that virtually every station in the country would carry it, and they would have to run the entire speech, rather than selected snippets, as they usually do. We could use the talk to advance our arguments and assert control over the debate.

III) "Ask George Bush" event in California:

Here's my high-stakes recommendation, and frankly, most people think it's crazy. At any rate, I would hold the event in one of the neighborhoods racked this week by violence. Let the President field questions from an audience sure to be hostile and angry, and let him make his pitch for national moral leadership.

The President would need extensive pre-briefings to prepare for some tough and sometimes profane questioning. But personal integrity sets George Bush apart from the pack, and no one in American political life today can handle tough situations better than the President. Frankly, such a forum might force him to loosen up a bit and speak from the heart -- share some of his own experiences and feelings with the audience. If so, he would be a sensation.

An event of this sort would dispel questions about the President's aversion to risk. I've heard lots of our friends complain about "timidity" on the President, and I'm sure you have, too. The claims are unfair, and this offers a chance to rebut them forever.

In some ways, an event of this sort could elevate the President's national stature, while enabling him to do what the people elected him to do -- to create a "kinder, gentler" America.

The President also is scheduled for a "video tour" on Monday. We may want to use that opportunity to talk to some of the cities engulfed by the violence. I suspect that by Monday, everyone will need a breather, especially you and the President. But that's one more possibility, for what it's worth.

April 22, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR LEW CRAMPTON

FROM TONY SNOW
SUBJECT NAFTA OP-ED

Great work! I learned a lot from the piece. As you'll notice, I did some extensive rewriting and shifting, although I've tried to keep the guts of your piece. This little memo is designed to outline the method behind my editorial madness.

First, I wanted to sharpen the focus on the growth/environment linkage. That's sort of the theme of the week here (even though as a point of fact, the theme of the week really is that we have a theme of the week).

Second, I pared some of the particulars regarding Mexico's environmental efforts because they didn't fit into the main part of the argument. Hang on to them, though. I'm sure we'll visit the issue of Mexico's environmental record sometime soon.

Third, I had to cut two pages.

I'm sure to have hacked away some important nuances, so feel free to work with me on restoring them. I want to pack this piece with as much good stuff as possible.

Thanks again for getting back so swiftly. I'm sorry I took so long to respond, but I'm excited about this piece. It should be very good.

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

Al:

A few general notes on the San Francisco draft:

This is the Veep's chance to make coherent not just our urban policy, but our policy, period. This draft contains most of the basic themes, but I'd suggest that you build it around a central theme -- American values.

Values have broken down throughout our society, from Wall Street to South Central Los Angeles. The Bush administration understands that we can't move ahead as a nation until we rededicate ourselves to the fundamentals: respect for oneself, respect for others, hard work, fidelity, faith, etc. And that's what we're doing.

Our strategy for the cities begins by restoring a modicum of order. You can't build a new city on a battlefield. Once we have restored some order, we must begin to look at our policies. Some of our policies assail the poor with perverse incentives -- incentives for unwed mothers to have children out of wedlock, for young fathers to abandon their families, for workers not to work too hard or save too much. We want to liberate our poor from these legal fetters.

But we want more: We want to treat our poor like human beings by giving them responsibility for their lives and futures -- choice in schools, child care, health care.

We want the help the poor acquire the tools required to achieve self-sufficiency: a good education, job training, and property. In short, our policy aims at helping the poor move, step-by-step, from permanent dependency to dignified independence.

In general, the draft seems a bit pedantic. The Veep should speak conversationally, using personal examples wherever possible. Our entire administration stands accused of living in a bubble of privilege: Dan Quayle should prove that he's one rich kid who wants to learn and who isn't afraid to test his principles in the streets.

Second, I would suggest that the Veep hit law and order -- and then develop the Great Society critique in a way that enables him to stand as a defender of the poor. Ronald Reagan blew it when he talked incessantly about the Welfare Queen because he came off looking like a guy who hated black people.

Dan Quayle can make a quite different case: The Great Society in effect subjected our poor to a triple whammy: 1) the policies promised the impossible, creating high expectations -- and profound disappointments; 2) the policies encourage

dependency; 3) the benefits flow not to the poor, but to bureaucrats who earn their keep by administering these programs.

The Great Society transferred wealth from the middle class to the upper middle class -- from workers to bureaucrats -- and left the poor in even worse shape than before. It also created its share of welfare millionaires (or in the case of Ross Perot, a welfare billionaire). We want to try something radical. We want to cast our lot with programs that cut out the middlemen and actually help the poor. We want to silence those who tempt the poor to remain poor. We want to set the poor free, in part by treating them like responsible human beings. In short, we replace a rhetoric that talks about humanity and compassion, by programs that really do offer a better future to our poor -- and in the process give everybody a chance to participate in making America greater.

Third, note the link between urban policy and the New World Order (or whatever the hell we wish to call the world beyond our borders). We have no choice but to conquer these problems. If we want to compete in the New World we created, we will have to encourage every American citizen to accomplish as much as they can -- and to do so, we must cut away the dead weights that hold us down. Our urban policy, like tort reform and regulatory reform, just tries to set people free.

In many ways, this speech can lay the groundwork for defining what we mean by fairness, compassion and What Works. We also can make it clear that administration policy springs from some central principles: We believe in the power and dignity of the people. (The Great Society, in contrast, treats the poor as a bunch of ravenous, hedonistic morons.) We insist on defending basic rights, but not on expanding government authority to places where it doesn't belong. We want to give government back to the people by cutting out the sticky-fingered intermediaries, and weakening the iron triangle of special interests, congressional staff, and media. There's all sorts of populist potential here.

A final note: We should be careful not to equate "minorities" and "blacks," especially in California, where Asian and Hispanic populations grow larger and more vocal every day. Indeed, the Veep may want to note that the rhetoric of group rights and group entitlements merely encourages racial conflict, which we don't need. George Bush and Dan Quayle want to create new unity among all Americans by giving everybody a stake in our future. A real Opportunity Society clears away unfair privilege, and lets everyone compete on their merits. What can be more fair? In the end, the Veep should come off as authoritative, determined, tough -- and positive. We should lead by enlisting people's support -- and not just begging for more tax money.

I'm sorry this is so late and so long. I hope it helps.

April 22, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR HENSON MOORE

FROM TONY SNOW
SUBJECT OP-EDS

Help! At a time when the President wants timely op-eds, I'm having incredible difficulty getting senior officials' cooperation. I don't attribute this to malice; people are just very, very busy.

Still, we must find a way of getting pieces through the system and to newspapers quickly. Today offers a perfect example. The campaign press people are swamped with requests to respond to Clinton's environmental speech. I had produced an op-ed that could have gone on the Wall Street Journal's op-ed page this morning, effectively pre-empting Clinton and forcing him to respond to us. Unfortunately, we couldn't get Clayton Yeutter's approval in time -- and as I write, at 6:30 the following evening, I still haven't gotten a green light. At times like this our caution kills us. If we dawdle any longer, the piece will die -- and that's inexcusable.

We have two other pieces hanging fire: an Israel piece requested by the President, and a long piece on congressional reform, which also responds to concerns expressed in a recent note from the President. These pieces have been mouldering for ten days or more.

Fortunately, the agencies and the RNC seem far eager to get things done and into print. Bill Reilly's assistant, Lew Crampton, got me a NAFTA piece very quickly; Bob Bork Jr. did the same for Carla Hills. I've reworked both, and the Reilly piece seems just about ready to go. (I'm attaching it to this memo.)

I'm loving my new job, but I need your help in ensuring that it meets the President's desires and expectations. The present situation just doesn't cut it.

I'll be away tomorrow, but I will try by Friday to sketch out some sort of system for getting op-eds done and into newspapers. If you have any ideas, I'm not merely open to suggestions: I'm desperate.

Thanks.

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

MAY 19, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL K. SKINNER
HENSON MOORE
DORRANCE SMITH

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT OP-EDS

Our op-ed operation has bogged down. I'd like your help in getting it up to speed.

As I've noted before, most papers want at least one of two things from op-ed pieces: sharp political commentary or news. In many cases, our authors simply want to repeat administration policy. While that works for speeches, it just won't do for an op-ed piece. That's why I need your help in persuading senior staffers and other top officials to assist in drafting pieces in a timely manner.

We already have lost a series of good opportunities: We could have gotten POTUS into the Los Angeles Times at least twice in the past week, but we still don't know exactly what he wants to say or do. We lost a chance to get great placement in the Wall Street Journal regarding the Rio conference because we couldn't get the domestic policy shop to sign off on a series of pieces.

I'm enclosing five op-eds, each of which has been completed for some time, but have not seen the light of day. I should have at least two more completed before the day's end: 1) a Boyden Gray piece describing and promoting the President's forestry convention; 2) a Tommy Thompson piece on welfare reform. I'm also grinding away on yet another piece taking on the Sylvia Nasar/Paul Krugman "fairness" arguments, and one that outlines the President's positions on abortion and family planning (per his request).

As we look at the week ahead, here are several suggestions:

- 1) Environment -- Why our detractors have it all wrong: The case for growth
- 2) AFDC/Great Society reforms -- George Bush as the man who wants to craft programs that create independence, not dependency

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

3) Fighting words -- an analysis of how Democrats use the charge of "racism" as a way of defeating important reforms

4) Balanced budget -- do we want to promote our version of the amendment?

5) Values -- This election should serve as a referendum on values. Whose values best reflect voter sentiment and ambitions?

6) Others: do we wish to revive rescissions? Congressional reform? The President's growth package? The six reforms for cities? Weed and seed? Law and order?

Willie Horton:

1) not racial: Issue was do we let sadistic rapists out on the streets? Of course not. Crime indiscriminately afflicts African Americans, and we should fight it as hard as we can. When children worry more about survival in inner city schools than they do about tests and grades, something's wrong. We must put an end to the reign of terror that destroys so many lives and crushes so many dreams. Note that crime destroyed the American dream for many African Americans during the L.A. riots.

Great Society:

There's nothing to be gained from pointing fingers, but let's face it: The system hasn't put an end to poverty and despair. Right now, some programs encourage people to stay poor and punish them if they do the right things. If you make too much money, but not enough to get out of poverty, the government cuts your benefits. If you save pennies for the future and develop a nest-egg -- the government punishes you. If you stay married and the husband holds more than a part time job, you get your benefits cut. This is sick: The only sure ways out of poverty are hard work, thrift, and intact families and AFDC regulations discourage each of these building blocks to a better future. Meanwhile, we reward single mothers who have children, and we actually encourage some people to stay on welfare by subjecting welfare benefits to lower tax rates than hard-earned wages.

The system has the effect of keeping good people down. We want to eliminate these burdens and set them free. We also want to take care of other basics: We want the poor to have access to the same schools that rich children attend. That's why we promote school choice. We want the poor to have access to health care -- that's the guiding principle behind our health care reforms. We want safe streets. That's why we want tough punishment against drug kingpins. etc.

MAY 12, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL K. SKINNER

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT NEW REPUBLIC ARTICLE

This week's New Republic contains a Fred Barnes piece, "Stunned," which tries to portray the events leading up to the President's Oval Office Address on May 1. Although the piece generally blasts the President for what Barnes sees as a failure to adopt Kempian urban policies, it also contains a section about me, and I want to discuss that section in this memo.

I should start with most important stuff for me: I'm not the primary source for this piece, or any of the pieces that have appeared about the "dueling drafts." I don't know who leaked the tale, but it has hurt us all.

The portion about me contains lots of inaccuracies, none of which particularly serve my interests. For instance, it has me directing a non-existent department of Media Relations. It has my mother serving as a nurse in an all-black community. I can't tell you how much I wish that were true. My mother died 20 years ago. It says my father taught in a black high school. Close: He was a counselor in a predominantly black junior high.

My guess is that Fred got these "facts" from a lunch we shared a couple of months ago. We talked about race and other issues, and he culled the personal data from his notes.

There's more. The piece implies that I discourage Presidential discussion of "empowerment" and "school choice" in black neighborhoods. Not quite: We should promote those themes, but we also should do what we've been doing, talking about all our strengths. This, too must have come from the lunch.

It also alleges that I "presented" a draft speech to the communications group. Wrong. I presented that draft to you, Henson, David, Marlin and the others on the circulation list, precisely because I did not wish to act as or be viewed as an independent agent trying to subvert the process. As an ex-speechwriter, I understand the difficulties and strains that accompany speechwriting, and I don't want to contribute to them.

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

Finally, and most deliciously, Fred has me working through the night of May 1 on a draft. I may be dumb, but not that dumb: The President delivered the speech on May 1.

I did talk to Fred briefly about this piece. I argued that the "dueling draft" story had been overplayed dramatically. I noted that the President and the chief speechwriter had been in Ohio on Thursday and that I had put together a potential draft and memo as an aid to road-weary people preparing for a tough task. I told him that my draft was resurrected briefly on Friday, but only briefly, and that the speechwriting team, which properly had the action on the speech, completed the job.

I did not try to pit me against anybody. I had no interest in turf battles or personal disputes; I never do. And I certainly didn't try to feed the criticism of the President and his policies. We're doing the right things.

I know that my history as an ex-journalist renders me suspect in some eyes, that some of our colleagues believe that I leak to the press, and that the Barnes piece (as well as other press accounts) might be seen as evidence of my having a personal agenda.

Well: I cannot undo my past, and I hope it proves an asset to us. I do not leak; I despise leakers and leaking. I have only one personal agenda. I want to work as hard as I can and do as much as I can for George Bush. I'm not interested in any greater glory than enjoying the confidence of you and the President.

I've gone through this long, detailed explanation for a simple reason. The White House is a funny place, and slanders sometimes can take on the aura of fact. You understand that: You have felt this unfairness as much as anybody around here, and David Demarest has taken as many unfair shots as any member of senior staff. At any rate, I want to make clear what I have tried to make clear before: I am a team player, and want to be included on the team as you see fit, working as hard and well as I can to help the President.

cc: Henson Moore
Marlin Fitzwater
David Demarest
Dan McGroarty

June 1, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM TONY SNOW
THROUGH SAMUEL K. SKINNER
SUBJECT LOS ANGELES

Following our conversation Thursday, I have decided to pass on some comments and notes I received talking to some policemen and some "average" Angelenos Saturday in Los Angeles.

The cops are hopping mad at you, although for reasons that have more to do with their treatment by L.A. politicians and media than by anything we have done. They took our original comments about the King verdict personally, and read a snub into the Challenger Boys and Girls Club event (police and military forces) during the first trip, when they thought you deliberately refused to shake the hand of a police representative. When pressed, they admit that they don't really believe that you would snub them, even for a minute. They just feel that they have been hung out to dry and they're quick to find insults in any small gesture, oversight or piece of false gossip.

L.A. cops have fastened upon two analogies to describe their anger/disappointment. These seem pretty widespread: I heard different cops in different precincts using the same analogies, which leads me to believe that they've been widely circulated and repeated by members of the police force.

Variant Number One: "I feel the same way I felt in Vietnam. We go out and do our jobs, and everybody takes shots at us -- literally. The first ten minutes of the local news every night just pound us to pieces.

"I fought in Nam, and it was just the same. They [commanders] wouldn't let us do our jobs. Told us to hold back, hold our fire, and then we take the heat when things got out of control. If they'd just let us do our jobs that night [the night of the King verdict], we would have taken care of the problem before it blew up.

"The guys in Kuwait, they got to do their jobs, and look what happened. They showed what we can do. We've got a clean, professional force, and we've got one of the smallest forces

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

around [for a city this size, geographically, and in terms of population]. We deserve better."

This is the clean version of version Number One. Sometimes, passions lead the cops to use more colorful language.

Variant Number Two: "I feel like a son who got abandoned by his father when times got tough. I just don't understand it."

Generally, the cops support you. I don't think I've ever heard so many policemen express political affiliations, and especially affiliation with the Republican party. They still believe in you. They do not believe in Tom Bradley, whom they believe betrayed them from the get-go.

They allege, for instance, that Bradley urged people to take peacefully to the streets after the riot, thereby creating conditions for a riot. I've looked through clips for evidence or reports of this, and I haven't found any. I don't know if it's true, but the cops take it as true.

The cops also offered some important insights. I'll mention three here.

- o **Use of Force:** One man, who had run the department that trains officers how and when to use force, noted that the police in the King beating had followed the book: When faced with a violent criminal, "swarm" the suspect (form a circle); then use electric tazers to subdue; and if that fails, use billy clubs. The force several years ago abandoned the use of choke holds that put pressure on the carotid artery and put the suspect to sleep (the old sleeper hold that some big-time wrestlers like). Several suspects, especially people on PCP, got violent during the hold, and suffocated after getting crushed larynxes. It seems pretty clear that the cops that night got out of control, but in most respects, they did follow the book.

- o **Opposition to Federal Spending:** The other surprise is that the cops I met all vehemently oppose the extra federal spending on L.A. They regard it first as a reward to looters and second, as wasted money. "I'm a taxpayer," one said, "and I know that money's just doing down the rat-hole. They'll send all that money here, and the same people (bureaucrats and city contractors) will walk off with it, and the place won't look any different." Another was more blunt: "You know what they should do? They should just put an iron fence around the whole place [South Central]. With taxes and everything, most good people are leaving L.A., anyway. They pay all this money for a house and for taxes, and what do they get? Gangs and corrupt politicians."

- o **Pride in LAPD Record:** LAPD police take pride in the fact that their department is not like "those East Coast police

forces." They have a good record for resisting and flushing out corruption, and they value their independence from political control. Proposition F, on tomorrow's ballot, would remove this independence and, according to many cops, invite the kind of corruption that has weakened police forces in New York, Washington, Detroit and other cities.

They also note that they have an incredibly small force for the area they cover, and the population they serve. The 6,500-member force covers a large and diverse region, ranging from prosperous neighborhoods in Pacific Palisades to the tough streets in South, East and South Central L.A. "People don't understand that people in places like Palisades and Simi Valley don't have experience with gangs and tough guys. They're like an entirely different police force," said one officer. Furthermore, at any given time, only about 400 officers have regular street patrols -- in a city that covers more than 450 square miles. The other 1,250 or so on any given shift work in special units -- homicide, narcotics, etc., or in administrative jobs. The police take enormous pride in their success in covering a city with such a lean force. As one cop pointed out, "Willie Wilson had just 1,000 fewer cops in Philadelphia than we have, but we have a city 4 times as large and with a hell of a lot more people than Wilson had. He can't do things here they way he did there. It just won't work."

So much for the preliminaries. I think the cops' laments help illustrate some of the problems we've been talking about for a long time, and also offer a way to recapture the hearts of some Republicans who have been calling you bad names for some time.

JUNE 9, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR CATHY GOLDBERG

FROM TONY SNOW
SUBJECT NYT OP-ED

Cathy:

I'm faxing you two copies of the op-ed -- a "clean" version, and an annotated version that underlines each and every change. The second version presumably will make it easier for typists to clean everything up.

As you can tell, I've included a section that takes on the argument that Republican Presidents bear responsibility for the deficit. Feel free to turn it into English.

President Reagan also may want to consider a second addition, a brief section taking on the argument, advanced by a throng of liberal economists, that a balanced budget amendment would destroy our economy in all sorts of insidious ways. I'm attaching an ad that describes their hysteria in detail.

I don't think the President needs to take on each and every gloomy prediction advanced by these folks. He might just want to note that this same batch of eggheads once predicted that the Reagan tax cuts would produce rampant inflation, depression-level unemployment rates, and other horrors too awful to mention. Instead, it merely proved that these economists don't understand an economy that relies on human beings, and not computer models. The President might even want to introduce or wrap up his response with a version of his opening line: "There they go again."

My guess is that the Times' other pieces will blast Presidents Reagan and Bush for a) failing to submit balanced budgets; b) letting "other" expenditures, such as the S&L bailout, run out of control; and c) proposing an balanced budget amendment, which would either destroy the economy or hurt all our poor or both.

I'm betting that at least one critic tries to mention Willie Horton, although I don't know that Times editors would accept that. At any rate, critics will fall back on the old strategies: calumny and doomsaying. The more we can deflate their assaults with President Reagan's jaunty humor and wisdom, the better. Cheers.

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

May 26, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR DAVID BECKWITH

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT POSSIBLE OP-ED BY MRS. QUAYLE

In this memo I'll pitch a couple of op-eds, one by the Vice President, one by Mrs. Quayle, both on the subject of families and values. I don't want to get too deep into details because the most powerful pieces would draw upon the writers' personal experiences. Nevertheless, here are a few sketchy ideas:

Mrs. Quayle:

I think it might make sense to ask Mrs. Quayle to do a follow up on the Murphy Brown flap. The idea is simple: Talk about parenthood from the point of view of a mother who also has considerable policy expertise.

The arguments seem pretty simple: We oppose single-parent families not because we hate single mothers, but because we understand their plight. It's tough enough raising kids these days in intact households. Single mothers face almost impossible odds, especially if they make less money than Murphy Brown. It might make sense to include tales of friends who divorced, and the problems they faced as their children grew up.

She can talk about her own natural concerns for her kids: Will they resist the lure of drugs? How can they escape the funnel of violence that claims so many lives from all sorts of backgrounds? She could recite the evidence about children from single parent homes: They have more trouble in school. They get involved in violent mischief far more often than kids from intact households. Poor kids from two-parent households generally outperform rich kids from single-parent backgrounds. She could touch upon the notion of fathers serving as role models for sons, and also speak from experience about the ways in which parents must work as a team to raise and love their children.

The point is not that we hate single mothers: We understand their plight and we think that kids these days need every chance they can get to make their way through a rapidly changing, confusing and sometimes dangerous world. Every parent in America worries about what will happen with their kids, and the Quayles are no exception, I'm sure.

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

Other points:

1) Kids and values:

As kids enter this parlous world, they deserve the very best armor they can get, and that armor is values. If a kid can say no to drugs and yes to hard work; no to premarital sex and yes to the corny old virtue of deferred gratification; no to goofing off and yes to hard work; no to contempt for parents and yes to respect for elders -- if a kid can do these things, that kid not only can survive. He or she can thrive in a world that still rewards people who work hard and do good things, and know how to draw satisfaction from doing the right things.

2) The virtue of shame:

Society has discouraged the notion of shame, which may be the most powerful possible deterrent to bad behavior. If we impose a social sanction against teenage pregnancy or drug use or violence, we reduce the lure of these activities. We stand a chance of strengthening the family again.

3) Our perverse welfare rules

Our welfare laws (and AFDC in particular) encourage people to do all the wrong things and punish good behavior. If you work hard and save up money, you lose your benefits. 20-year old Sandra Rosado worked hard, scrimped and set aside \$4,900 for her own education. Federal welfare officials responded by ordering her mother to pay the government \$9,342. Here's a young woman who lived the American dream -- who worked hard, who saved every penny, who tried to pull herself out of poverty so she could pull her family out of poverty. She should get a medal. Instead, she and her family get slammed with a fine they can't possibly pay.

But that's not all. If you earn more money than the law permits, the system cuts you off -- and throws you right back into the maw of dependency. If a mother and father live together and the father holds more than a part time job, the system cuts off their benefits. If a person works at a low-paying job, that person may pay higher tax rates than someone who "makes" the same amount of money from welfare.

If on the other hand a young woman has a child out of wedlock, she gets a reward in the form of higher benefits. And if parents split up, they also get rewards, in the form of higher benefits. This sick system encourages poor families to become poorer and to surrender the work ethic, the family commitment and the personal pride necessary to pull themselves out of poverty.

4) The lifestyle question

The notion of single parenthood as a "lifestyle" change deserves more criticism. Georgie Anne Geyer wrote a column today excoriating the movement toward what she called "trophy babies" -- babies born to single mothers who see the children as trophies of the mothers' spectacular abilities. I suspect many mothers of

trophy babies quickly abandon the notion and devote themselves as most mothers do -- loving the child and wishing another parent could help her give the child a more well-rounded life. At any rate, it never hurts to whack away at yuppie vanity.

I hope these suggestions at least can provoke some discussion. I don't know which (if any) capture Mrs. Quayle's feelings on the subject. Nevertheless, I think a heartfelt piece about the absolute importance of intact families and solid traditional values could be a winner.

The Vice President:

I'd also suggest that the Vice President follow his recent values speeches by talking in greater detail about the values he considers important. This would serve as a natural follow to his remarks in San Francisco and at the Air Force Academy, and as a set up for the commencements and other speeches he intends to give next month.

We should drive home the point that in a world convulsed with change, we can be certain about only one thing: our fundamental values. The Veep could use a series of addresses to outline how these values affect the home, the workplace, the government, etc. A serious op-ed could lay the foundations for such a series by getting more specific about the particular values he considers most important. I won't attempt a roster here: That's the sort of thing best done by talking with him and provoking him to give better and more specific answers.

At any rate, I hope these jottings make some sense. Let me know what I can do in the way of drafting pieces or helping you guys as you hit upon what I consider the crucial issue of this Presidential campaign -- and of American politics in the years ahead. If we can make it clear what values we favor, why, and if we can explain what they mean in terms of people's daily lives, we will have established the foundations for a real Republican revolution.

cc: Bill Kristol
Al Hubbard

May 27, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL K. SKINNER
W. HENSON MOORE
DORRANCE SMITH

FROM TONY SNOW
SUBJECT PERSONNEL

Following our discussions in recent weeks, I would like to seek formal approval for two new positions in the Office of Media Affairs, a research assistant for John Undeland and me, and a secretary for Maria Sheehan and me. These two additions could increase our productivity immensely and help get more op-eds placed in newspapers around the country.

John Undeland works primarily on talking points, but could provide some much-needed help in producing op-ed pieces, especially for regional newspapers. We need a research assistant who can help track down important information, get raw data from the various departments and agencies involved in particular op-ed pieces, and to do fact-checking on our pieces before they go out for publication. Op-ed writing works much like speechwriting, and requires the same sort of research assistance. A single researcher could save a lot of time and footwork for the writers and could enable us to get pieces into circulation much more swiftly.

Similarly, Maria and I could use the assistance of a secretary who would provide administrative support -- answer phones, type correspondence, fill out office paperwork, and help ensure the smooth operation of our offices. Joyce Campbell now serves as a staff assistant for me, Maria and everybody else on the staff, and serves as the back-up for Dorrance's assistant. She's completely overloaded and deserves some relief so she perform her primary duties as a staff assistant.

A secretary would provide necessary support for Maria and me -- keeping track of writing projects, following up on contacts with newspapers, helping keep our files current and organized, assisting Maria in keeping office functions running smoothly -- and freeing me up to focus more on writing, editing and placement of op-eds.

Right now, I'm serving as a writer, researcher, editor, typist, proofreaders, salesman, and editor. I spend much of my

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

time performing duties that prevent me from producing as many pieces as the President wants. I guarantee we would make good use of a researcher and a secretary, and that the new people would increase office efficiency enormously.

If everybody agrees to these additions, I will prepare a memo for Tim McBride outlining all the details.

May 27, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL K. SKINNER
W. HENSON MOORE
DORRANCE SMITH

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT OP-ED UPDATE

Following up on last Friday's discussions, let me note that we're still having a tough time getting cabinet members to focus on the op-ed operation.

Last week we asked Justice to produce something on Weed-and-Seed. They promised a draft yesterday; as of noon today, we have nothing.

We also asked Cabinet Affairs to help us put together a piece detailing the ways in which AFDC rules hamstringing poor people who want to work, remain married, save and do all the things we normally associate with achieving the American Dream. Various bureaucrats disagree with the idea of criticizing the program's weaknesses, and we still have no data on this crucial topic.

Finally, we're racing against time to produce an op-ed on Haiti for USA Today. NSC doesn't want to do the piece; State wants us to shunt it off to Justice or Defense. We can't find an author, although a few helpful folks at state at least have produce talking points.

Notice that nobody seems willing to sign on to a controversial policy, with the result that cautious bureaucrats have left the President dangling. We're not here to torture the President, we're here to serve him. Later today I will draft a memo to cabinet members underscoring the need for prompt cooperation. If it does the trick, I will turn it over to Secretary Skinner for his signature and distribution.

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

May 27, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR CLAYTON YEUTTER

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT TALKING POINTS ON THE BUSH RECORD

First, an apology: I'm sorry I've taken so long to get these to you. I'm afraid I haven't added much to them in the past month or so. These points remain somewhat sketchy and thin, and I hope to add more muscle to them when time permits. At any rate, I hope they're useful. The text follows:

The Bush Revolution

The greatest secret in American politics is that in three years George Bush has put in place the foundations for the most sweeping revolution in American politics since the Great Society.

This revolution draws upon America's greatest strengths: its values and its people. It reverses a nearly 30-year trend of creating vast bureaucracies that lord over our citizens and it seeks to build a "user friendly government" that addresses people's actual needs.

George Bush may not seem like a revolutionary because he doesn't see himself as one. But if you examine his policies, you will find a consistent effort to replace the one-size-fits-all-stand-in-line-and-fill-out-this-form government with government that provides services swiftly, effectively, and unobtrusively. He has initiated a revolution to create programs that work, and government that knows its limits.

This revolution also respects traditional American values. George Bush is a family man, a public servant and a patriot. You know when he speaks that he speaks from the heart, and that he loves and honors the solid values of hard work, thrift, faith, fidelity, patriotism, friendship, service and loyalty.

All of us know that gradually, by degrees, things have gotten out of whack in America. Values have broken down. Anarchy has replaced order. Violence has become a nagging threat for everyone. Government has become too big, too powerful and too expensive. Programs that promised much have produced little.

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

We need some common-sense change. Our future relies on our recognizing fundamental American values, and letting them guide us to a New America in the 21st Century.

Consider reforms that combine a respect for the American people with a determination to honor traditional American values:

- o **Market reforms:** Too often in years past, the federal government has regarded business as a sort of menace, rather than as the driving force behind national progress. Washington has regulated business without concern for results. It has taxed business without concern for results. And it has crippled business only to be stunned by the results -- an economic slowdown, and widespread business efforts to circumvent burdensome federal regulations.

The President has tried to set this right by crafting programs that harness the profit motive and the power of the marketplace in the service of important national goals. This way, businesses use their ingenuity and resources to achieve those goals rather than to skirt cumbersome rules.

Some examples: The Clean Air Act establishes a market incentive for reducing pollution. That plan saw its first real action on May 12 when the state of Wisconsin sold "pollution" rights to the Tennessee Valley Authority. It works, and it may be the most revolutionary environmental policy by any President in any country to date. It doesn't order everybody to re-order their lives. It encourages them to do the right things.

Market-based programs have enabled us to reduce CFCs more swiftly than any nation on earth, and to achieve unparalleled reductions in airborne lead.

The President and Vice President also have tried to get rid of regulations that make it difficult to do business, and that don't produce any results in return. This administration wants regulations to pass simple tests: Do their benefits outweigh their costs, and do they promote goals we consider important? If not, let's get rid of them. The Competitiveness Council, chaired by the Vice President, has taken the lead in regulatory reform, continuing a tradition started by George Bush, when he served as Vice President.

- o **Pro-growth policies:** The President has promoted economic policies that encourage growth and create a foundation for a more prosperous America. He repeatedly has tried to get Congress to cut the tax on capital gains -- the tax on the American Dream.

He has pushed for incentives that would strengthen the construction and real estate industries, industries that traditionally lead us out of recessions. He has introduced

enterprise zone legislation repeatedly -- and without help from Congress. He has taken unilateral action where he could, trimming regulations and trying to streamline government services. These measures would continue the pro-growth policies initiated during the Reagan-Bush administration, and propel the United States to new heights of opportunity and prosperity.

o **Environment:** George Bush has become the environmental President, even if he hasn't become the environmentalists' President. He has harnessed market reforms in the service of a cleaner environment -- and the United States as a result has achieved unprecedented reductions in CFCs, sulfur dioxide and airborne lead. He understands that economic growth fosters environmental protection by enabling Americans to develop new and better ways to clean the environment and to produce goods in a "clean" manner. He also has worked to craft international agreements grounded in good science, good economics and an appreciation of the importance of protecting national sovereignty. Today, America's air and water are cleaner than they have been in decades and America leads the way in combining environmental protection and economic opportunity.

o **Reform of social programs:** George Bush has proposed social programs that deal with real problems in the real world. The President's housing program -- Homeownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere, or "HOPE" -- incorporates some simple common sense: People who own homes behave differently than those condemned to spend their lives as mere renters. Ownership changes the way in which you view yourself and your community. When you own your home, you own a stake in your community's future. This approach to housing will help us put an end to the age of public-housing blight, and it will give public housing residents the dignity and independence we promised them a quarter century ago.

We understand that the keys to independence and success are sound families, thrift and hard work. Yet many of our welfare programs punish these virtues.

Consider the following scenario: Most poor Americans now live in apartments subsidized by the federal government. If they work hard and earn a salary that places them above the poverty line, but not high enough to achieve real independence, we cut their benefits. If they scrimp and save and put away money to buy a home, we cut their benefits. If they stay married, we hold the line on their benefits. If, on the other hand, a welfare mother has a child out of wedlock, we increase her benefits. And at some levels, we still tax those who stay on welfare at lower rates than the working poor. This does to poor Americans what sharecropping tried to do to poor African Americans in the South. It punishes good behavior and rewards bad. It encourages dependency and discourages dignified independence.

Everybody agrees that we shouldn't let this sort of outrage continue. Only George Bush has tried to do something about it. He has proposed changes that would let people save more money to escape poverty. Today's AFDC savings limit is \$1,000. The President wants to increase that limit to \$10,000.

He wants to put an end to laws that punish poor men and women who stay married. He wants to clear away the perverse incentives that plague the present system. And he has encouraged innovations that offer real hope to our poor, and that send them a powerful message: We believe in you. You can do it.

Our social programs have succeeded in creating a prosperous class of caseworkers, clerks, bureaucrats and other middlemen, all of whom benefit handsomely from increased funding of social programs. The poor meanwhile get left out. Our programs discourage the very virtues necessary to break out of dependency, and they lavish most of their money not on the poor, but on those who administer federal programs.

o **Choice:** The President has made choice a centerpiece of his social policy. He believes that when it comes to matters that affect families and homes, parents know best.

We already have implemented choice in child care, and we will do everything in our power to bring choice to our schools, including religious schools. Our education system never will scale the heights of greatness until we restore vigorous competition. Americans hate to loose at anything. When parents get the right to choose, they fight to get access to the best. This creates real pressure for quality -- and everybody wins.

o **Civil rights:** The President understands that discrimination still hurts many Americans, and he wants to put an end to that. At the same time, he wants to create an atmosphere in which all Americans join in common cause to wipe away bigotry and discrimination.

He opposes quotas because they divide people by race, and because they lead to subtler forms of discrimination, such as glass ceilings. His administration has replaced the arbitrary "justice by numbers" approach with one that takes dead aim at actual discrimination. [[get number of cr prosecutions, etc.]] In addition, the President pushed through the sweeping Americans with Disabilities Act, which made it easier for 43 million Americans with disabilities to prosper in our legal and economic mainstream.

o **Federalism:** The President believe in giving power back to the states. The President has asked Congress to stop imposing wasteful mandates on the states, and he has promised to veto

spending bills that impose new and unfair obligations on the states. That's a start.

The President also understands that the states are what Jefferson called "the laboratories of democracy." The states of Wisconsin, New Jersey, Michigan, Massachusetts and California have begun exploring innovative ways to reform our welfare system. Other states have pioneered innovations in other areas, such as transportation (the Dulles Toll Road in Virginia) and education (choice experiments in Wisconsin and other states).

At the same time the President has fought the Congressional practice of imposing mandates upon states without providing the money to pay for those mandates. He does not want Washington to dump burdens on states. We want Washington to liberate states, so local officials can do their jobs more effectively. For George Bush, "federalism" does not mean skipping out on responsibilities and letting states pay the price. The President honors the original meaning of the term, the notion of increasing the freedom of states to do what they consider right and best. No President this century has done more for federalism than George Bush.

o **Government Reform:** The President understands that the system in Washington is broke. Congress has become more adept at bouncing checks, raising its pay, passing pork-barrel appropriations, and binding the administration in Congressional red tape than it is in passing legislation on the issues people care about most: taxes, federal spending, crime, education, health care, energy.

The whole world has changed with the end of the Cold War. Now, the Democratic Party in America seems the only organization that still believes in central planning and costly bureaucracy. They believe that a bigger government will make things better. No wonder voters no longer believe in Congress.

The President has proposed modest but significant reform for Congress. He has asked Congress to obey the laws it imposes on everybody else. He has asked Congress to pass its own special counsel law, so independent investigators can ensure the integrity of investigations into possible wrongdoing. He has recommended a dramatic reduction in the size and number of Congressional committees and staff. There are more committees and subcommittees in Congress today than there were Congressional staffers at the end of World War II. And yet people have less faith in Congress now than ever in our history.

The President has suggested reform of the budget process, so Congress can pass budgets that meet the needs of the people, rather than special interests. He has suggested ways of getting rid of the middlemen who stand between people and their elected

representatives: Campaign finance reform, expansion of the Hatch Act, which prohibits political activity by federal employees, and an executive order that implements part of the Supreme Court's Beck decision all help eliminate the middlemen, and give Congress a reason to spend more time thinking about its real constituents. Dan Quayle likes to argue that our government has been seized by an iron triangle of lobbyists, congressional staffers and special interests. The President's reforms break that triangle and restore the fundamental relationship between voters and their elected representatives.

o **Balance of powers:** The President has begun restoring the balance of powers in Washington by proposing dramatic Congressional reform, and by selecting judges who understand that they should interpret our laws, rather than to act as unelected legislators.

Congress understands the importance of these changes. Liberals tried to cripple the Clarence Thomas nomination because they understood Justice Thomas's determination to oppose legislation from the bench. This meant that liberals would have to accept full responsibility for enacting unpopular liberal programs, rather than having judges impose those programs upon an unwilling public.

o **World Peace:** This President has done more to create a basis for world peace than any President in history, and he hasn't gotten the credit he deserves because he has made it look so easy. The Soviet Union is gone. Historic enemies have agreed to talk peace in the Middle East. The entire world has moved toward a New World Order marked by economic competition, rather than nuclear confrontation.

Yet we still face more than our share of challenges. The Middle East remains volatile. Former republics in the Soviet Union and East bloc must deal with ethnic tensions that have been bottled up for decades, and now threaten to explode. Terrorists states like Libya and Iraq continue to threaten us.

Survey the candidates and ask yourself: Who best can promote peace? George Bush, or someone who sounds like a pale and inexperienced imitation of George Bush?

o **The international economy:** This President also has promoted free trade more vigorously than any President in recent memory. We stand on the verge of signing an historic North American Free Trade Agreement that would create the world's largest trading bloc. The promise of NAFTA has spurred incredible economic and environmental reform in Mexico, and transformed that nation from a tenuous democracy into one of the fastest growing nations on earth. We've enjoyed similar results with our Enterprise for the Americas initiative, which creates

special trade relationships with partners throughout our hemisphere.

The President also wants an international trade agreement that will create a foundation for worldwide prosperity. Although other nations continue pressing for special and unfair advantages, the President has hung tough -- and he'll win. Before he leaves the White House, we will see freer and fairer trade than the world has ever known. That's good for everybody.

o **Values:** George Bush has worked to create an atmosphere of decency in government and throughout America. He is not a racist and he does not incite division. He is a healer, but he has come under assault because he has dared take on the Great Society orthodoxy in search for government that works. The President has talked this year of five fundamental reforms: education, health care, government, legal reform, and trade. That's not just a vision; it's a detailed, common-sense blueprint for the future.

Just look at the people who oppose the president, and you'll see that he's hit the mark. Unions don't like him. Lawyers don't like him. Special interests don't like him. And George Mitchell doesn't like him. That's quite an honor roll. On the other hand, the American people love him -- not for his glitz, but for his character.

Many liberals claimed after the recent riots in Los Angeles that the President didn't understand or didn't care. No one who watched him choking back tears in Los Angeles can say he doesn't care, and no one who has known him over the years and has seen him work tirelessly and quietly for racial healing can doubt his commitment to civil rights and to an end to racial divisions. In this election year, people may try to smear the President, but it won't work. George Bush, more than any recent President, has the character and the power to heal racial divisions while leading us toward a new era of progress and harmony.

More than a century ago, a French observer noted that Americans always seem to have the morale of an army on the march. The President isn't a cheerleader, but he is a leader, and this year offers greater possibilities for reform than any year in recent history.

Americans will need to be all they can be if we want to continue leading the world. We will need to reform our government. We will need to turn our cities into islands of prosperity rather than dungeons of despair. We will need the best schools on earth and the most motivated workforce. In sum, we will need the Revolution George Bush has outlined for three years. And we will need one thing more: We will need a Congress that will pass these reforms, and give power back to the people.

George Bush isn't a revolutionary by nature, and he'd get nervous if you tried to describe him as a revolutionary. But look at the subtle changes he's made, and you'll see the makings of a revolution aimed at giving government back to the people, and at unleashing America's genius for innovation, hard work, and greatness. The next time someone complains that George Bush lacks vision, just say: Have you got an hour? I'll just try to outline a few things for you. Then let 'em have it.

George Bush believes in government of the people, by the people and for the people. He has stood up to the politics of tax, spend, and comfort special interests. He's our first genuine patrician populist -- and he's the one man who can reshape our government to meet the challenges of the next century.

May 28, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL K. SKINNER
DORRANCE SMITH

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT DRAFT COS MEMO ON OP-EDS

Here's a draft memo on the op-ed operation. Please feel free to comment, and we'll prepare a version for circulation today.

The President is very eager to produce op-ed pieces for major and regional newspapers. He has asked me to secure the cooperation of all senior White House officials, cabinet members and agency heads. The White House op-ed operation is in the office of Media Affairs, headed by Dorrance Smith. Tony Snow, the deputy assistant for Media Affairs, serves as chief writer and editor for the op-eds.

With a few notable exceptions, we have had problems getting senior administration officials to cooperate in producing op-eds. We must do better. When we call with a request for assistance, please respond immediately. If necessary, assign a contact person who can help provide information or drafts, can assist in the clearance process and can ensure that the work gets done on time.

Find a working relationship that suits you best. If you want to work with our writer, set up an appointment. If you want your office to produce drafts, which Dorrance or Tony will edit, make that clear. If you want us to produce drafts and proceed from there, let us know. But set the ground rules right away: This will save time, calm nerves, and keep egos in check.

Also remember that most op-eds have short shelf lives. If we don't complete the work within one or two business days, we lose our chance to serve the President. The President understands this. He repeatedly has expressed his desire for swift responses to many opinion pieces. He also wants us to drive the debate by offering sharp, focused pieces about administration policy. He is unhappy with the sluggish response we have received so far. So, to repeat: We must do better.

Many requests from Dorrance and Tony come in response to memos by the President, and all of them have my personal

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

approval. Dorrance and Tony are media professionals. Work with them, and accept their help in producing the best pieces possible. They have the President's full backing. If you have special problems of concerns, feel free to call me. But do not stonewall them: They have a job to do, and they need your help.

Here's an update on op-eds that should be completed and placed by COB today:

- 1) Rio:
op-eds by Boyden Gray, Clayton Yeutter [attached to this memo]
- 2) NAFTA:
op-ed by Bill Reilly; San Diego Union [attached]
- 3) Haiti:
op-ed by ??? -- Miami Herald [attached]
- 4) Clean Air Act:
op-ed by Vice President Quayle; ???
(I may need to finish this one on the road)

Other projects for the next week:

- 1) Rio: Op-ed by the President -- Wednesday, Wall Street Journal
- 2) Los Angeles: Op-ed by the President; Sunday, June 7; LA Times
- 3) Family Values: Op-ed by Marilyn Quayle; Washington Post?
- 4) Welfare reform: Op-ed by ???
- 5) Weed and Seed: Op-ed by Bill Barr (so far, no draft from his office); Philadelphia Inquirer
- 6) Balanced budget amendment: do we want a piece? If so, by whom?

May 28, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR MY COLLEAGUES

FROM TONY SNOW

RE ALL THESE DAMNED OP-EDS

This diskette contains the most recent versions of an op-ed by a writer to be named later on Haiti (slugged HAITI7), for the Miami Herald; Bill Reilly on NAFTA (slugged, MEXICO6), for the San Diego Union; Clayton Yeutter on Rio (slugged RIO17), possibly for the Orange County Register; and Boyden Gray on Rio (slugged TREES6), for the Washington Post.

Please note that Boyden's piece can run no sooner than next Tuesday. (The others may go ASAP.) The Reilly piece is done, kaput, finished. The others undoubtedly will require further editing and negotiations.

If you have questions, please feel free to reach me at the hotel in L.A., but please beep me because I, like a total fool, left my beeper at home this morning.

Go, fight, win.

And thanks for all your help.

JULY 2, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR GAIL WILENSKY

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT OP-ED

Gail:

I like the op-ed very much. It hits the points we need to make and puts the onus on Democrats to get moving. Nevertheless, I'd suggest several sorts of changes. Rather than doing them and resubmitting a piece to you, I thought it might make sense to put the general suggestions on paper. If they make sense to you, we can proceed.

1) Opening:

I think it might make sense to slap readers with the choice right away. Everybody in America wants affordable, reliable, first-rate health care -- now. The good news for those Americans is that we could start making their lives tomorrow. The bad news is that we must rely on Democrats, who see more eager to dangle the issue invitingly a hungry public's eyes than in treating it as a priority.

I'm sure there's a snappier way to set it up, but you get the idea: Note a) the universal desire to fix the system and b) the possibility of immediate Congressional action. After that, we can describing the ways in which we improve our present system, and prevent a Canada-style, go-to-America-if-you're-really-sick system.

We must create the proper political drama here, and give people a sense of the real struggle behind the scenes: Will we saddle innocent Americans with a system that has proved a failure elsewhere, or will we improve the world's best system and offer its riches to everyone in the United States?

2) Pay or play: You may need to be a little more explicit on price-setting, and explain that some Democrats want to do for health care what Richard Nixon did for inflation. I'd also suggest a personal anecdote from your HCFA days. It makes the bizarre challenge of price-setting seem comprehensible -- and crazy.

3) Examples: Use examples to explain just what Action Now would achieve.

For instance, Job lock: People sometimes must make an awful choice between remaining healthy and getting a better job. Suppose you have a heart condition, and some company makes you an offer you

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

can't refuse. If that new company offers its employees health benefits, they must cover you, too. They can't "lock" you out because of a pre-existing health condition. If you're good enough to hire, you're good enough to cover. Your job should not be a life or death situation. (I know, pretty lousy: But you get the idea.)

4) Explain some technical terms: "'swipable' cards," "MediSave accounts," the importance of "Action Now."

5) Look for fun facts: As I read the piece, I wondered about a few fun facts. For instance,

Cost controls and medical costs: Is there any literature on what cost controls have done to medical costs? Can we argue that some of our noble efforts have inflated costs instead of controlling them? What, if anything, would this plan cost taxpayers and consumers? What, if anything, would it save?

Paperwork costs and savings: How much money do American companies now spend on health-care paperwork? (a good factoid for use in the swipable cards passage). How many tons of paper does this consume? Just how much would this reduce paperwork? Would it cut down on the number of bewildering forms people now must fill out if they wish to purchase a simple vial of prescription medicine? Would it eliminate those intolerable insurance lounges in hospitals, where the weary and sick await their turns to fill out forms?

Liability costs: How much of the average medical bill goes to pay liability insurance and wicked, greedy, awful, offal trial lawyers? It might be nice to note that it costs \$xxxx on average to bring a baby into the world, \$yyyy of which goes directly to the local lawyer.

Total costs: If we wanted to get insanely adventurous, we might even devise a pie chart that shows just where the average medical dollar goes -- the insurance company, the lawyer, the accountant, the federal government. Of each penny, how much actually goes for treatment and medication? Such a visual also could help us make the case that coverage would get cheaper right away if we cut out the overhead and got right to the patient.

Health information: How would we make health insurance information available? How would we make it comprehensible? Right now, HMOs and PPOs and even some insurance firms advertise -- about deductibles, co-pays, choice in selecting physicians, etc. What's new about our idea?

Costs of inaction: Finally, what will Americans forfeit this year if we don't act. Debaters often employ the crass and effective device of arguing that a foe's policy (or lack thereof)

will cause innocent babes to die and blood to flow through the streets. Without being unduly hysterical or inaccurate, what price can we attach to Democrats' inaction?

6) Include the unkindest fact of all: We're only trying to give the American public access to the sort of health care system that Congress has designed for itself.

I know this long roster of comments looks daunting. It's not meant to be. Indeed, with the proper factoids, we can get this thing ready to go in a couple of hours. I'd suggest trying the Washington Post this weekend (i.e., Sunday). It should be a good one for them.

Sorry I've run on so long. I hope this makes sense.

Cheers.

June 1, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR CABINET MEMBERS
AGENCY HEADS
SENIOR WHITE HOUSE STAFF

FROM SAMUEL K. SKINNER
SUBJECT OP-ED PIECES

The President is very eager to produce op-ed pieces for major and regional newspapers. He would like to enlist all senior White House officials, cabinet members and agency heads in the effort. The White House op-ed operation is in the office of Media Affairs, headed by Dorrance Smith. Tony Snow, the deputy assistant for Media Affairs, serves as chief writer and editor for the op-eds.

You will be receiving requests to cooperate in producing these op-eds. When you receive a request for assistance, the President would appreciate your responding immediately. It may be necessary to assign a contact person who can help provide information or drafts, can assist in the clearance process and can ensure that the work gets done on time.

If you want to work with our writer, please feel free to do so. If you want your office to produce drafts, which Dorrance or Tony will edit, that's fine too. If you want us to produce drafts and proceed from there, let us know.

Most op-eds have short shelf lives. If we don't complete the work within one or two business days, we lose our chance to serve the President. The President understands this. He repeatedly has expressed his desire for swift responses to many opinion pieces. He also wants us to drive the debate by offering sharp, focused pieces about administration policy.

Many requests from Dorrance and Tony come in response to memos by the President. Dorrance and Tony have been asked to help produce the best pieces possible. They have the President's full backing. If you have special problems or concerns, feel free to call me.

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

JUNE 8, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT
THROUGH DORRANCE SMITH
FROM TONY SNOW
SUBJECT OP-ED FOR THE LOS ANGELES TIMES

Attached is a draft op-ed piece for the Los Angeles Times. The piece, which has been fully staffed and reconciled, would appear under your signature. It discusses your recent trips to the city, describing the steps you have taken to reform urban policy, and explaining what these measures mean to citizens in Los Angeles.

We would try to get this piece published in weekend editions of the paper if possible, and expect that it also would get distributed nationwide, through the Los Angeles Times Syndicate.

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

| Document No. and Type | Subject/Title of Document | Date | Restriction | Class. |
|-----------------------|---|------|-------------|--------|
| 20. Memo | [Tony Snow] to Bob Teeter, Re: POTUS speech in Faith, North Carolina. (1 pp.) | n.d. | (b)(6) | |

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Speechwriting, White House Office of
Series: Snow, Robert Anthony (Tony)
Subseries: Subject File
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: [Snow Memoranda 2/92 - 1/93]

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Date Closed: 12/28/2004 | OA/ID Number: 13899-005 |
| FOIA/SYS Case #: S | Appeal Case #: |
| Re-review Case #: 2005-0485-S | Appeal Disposition: |
| P-2/P-5 Review Case #: | Disposition Date: |
| AR Case #: | MR Case #: |
| AR Disposition: | MR Disposition: |
| AR Disposition Date: | MR Disposition Date: |

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P-1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- (b)(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- (b)(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- (b)(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- (b)(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- (b)(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- (b)(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- (b)(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- (b)(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information

JUNE 29, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR CATHY GOLDBERG

FROM TONY SNOW
SUBJECT FODDER FOR SPEECHES

Cathy: Rather than subjecting you to cruel and unusual punishment in the form of many long memos, I've decided to send just two things today: 1) a month-old memo to Clayton Yeutter, which lays out in a preliminary way some essentials of the Bush vision and 2) some speech language, which you guys can translate into English.

I hope these are helpful. As I mentioned earlier, we'll start sending you propaganda every day, and I'll try to give you guys calls whenever other stuff comes up. I'll also forward a few other memos later this week.

I'm serious about my offer to help in any way I can. Feel free to call whenever I can do something for you.

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

o Bill Clinton's economic proposals fail two crucial tests. First, they fail the math test. His numbers don't add up. His deficit reduction package falls back on the Democratic orthodoxy: He wants to tax and spend -- and pray that nothing bad will happen. At best, his plan will nibble away at the deficit. But you have to worry when even his calculations are off by tens of billions of dollars. [[See Darman attachment]]

Second, his policies will make things even worse. Candidate Clinton has offered the United States a polished up version of Carteronomics, complete with taxes, regulation and industrial policy. Americans suffered enough the first time.

o On the few occasions where Bill Clinton has dared break the liberal mold of the Democratic party, he has just offered pale imitations of Bush administration policy. His tax cuts don't do the real job of gunning our economy into high gear.

His proposals for research and development credits don't do enough to push the leading edge of technology.

And his uncertain stance on trade shows that he still doesn't understand the new world we face: Open markets and fair competition will characterize our future. Those who want to hide behind protectionist walls want to do for our economy what Herbert Hoover did for the economy in 1928.

o I remember when Bill Clinton was a moderate. Unfortunately, he belongs to a party that just can't help advocating a little bit of everything for everyone. A President must make choices, hard choices, like George Bush did in the Gulf War, and like George Bush did when he resisted irresponsible environmentalists in Rio de Janeiro. Notice what Bill Clinton did in both cases: nothing.

President Bush stood up to the media in Rio. He stood up to Al Gore. And he promoted an environmentalism that will clean the environment while helping create good jobs in the United States and around the world. That -- and not Albert Gore's environmental pandering -- is leadership.

BUSH ACCOMPLISHMENTS, LINES

o George Bush's problem isn't that he has done too little as President, but that he has tried too much. He has proposed the most sweeping overhaul in American politics in years.

o George Bush's proposals -- choice in health care, child care and schools; his assault on federal mandates to states; his push to let poor people own their homes and apartments; his willingness to liberate our poor from the perverse incentives of a welfare system that punishes those who work hard, save money, stay married and attempt to build a future; his free-market approaches to cleaning the environment -- all of these rest on a simple and powerful political principle: Trust the people.

Example: In education, he says: We want the best schools in the world, and we want parents to help run them.

Example: In Clean Air, he says to business: We'll set the goals, you figure out how best to meet them. This promotes innovation and compliance.

The President trusts you. Bill Clinton and the Democrats trust elitists and have fought tooth and nail to stop every initiative that takes power from Washington and gives it back to working Americans.

o George Bush has the experience, toughness, and character to lead America through uncertain and exciting times. He understands world politics. He understands business. And he understands the importance of putting duty before vanity. No figure in American politics today can better lead America into the international arena than George Bush. And none but George Bush has earned the respect of our allies and competitors.

JULY 16, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR BOB TEETER

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT CAMPAIGN THEMES

This memo belatedly answers a request to suggest ways of framing the issues in this year's campaign and providing some zip for our message. I break it up into three parts: Our assets, our liabilities, a strategy for maximizing assets and minimizing liabilities.

I) Assets: Our Winning Hand

1) SETTING THE SCENE

Never in recent years has history dealt a greater winning hand to the Republican party. We have reached the point in history that our political forebears have dreamed about for years: The Age of Peace; the Triumph of Freedom.

At home and abroad, our old enemies have collapsed or withered away, and the principles we have promoted for years have won. The electorate wants vigorous, fresh leadership -- which helps explain why nearly 100 members of Congress have decided to seek other employment next year, and why Ross Perot thinks he has a chance of leapfrogging his way to the White House. If ever the time were ripe for a Republican sweep, it is now. But as ripe as the time may be, we're not even close to the promised land.

One key characteristic of this year is uncertainty. Nobody, from the political maven to the street cleaner, has a clear fix on the future. We just know that life will be different. Not just Future Shock different, but post-Cold War Information Revolution different; order-your-groceries-by-phone different; 3-D M-TV different -- the sort of stuff that would astonish even Ray Bradbury.

The old reliable pillars of the political world -- the communist threat abroad, the Great Society and its heirs and assigns here at home -- have fallen away. Once stable institutions, including the family, home, church and school, have fallen into disarray.

With such confusion and change comes a related phenomenon: Nostalgia for values. Americans want something familiar to sustain us in this unfamiliar world. We want a revival of the old American values of decency, goodness, honor, hard work. Many of us want a

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

better, more upright America than this nation has ever seen. Our founding fathers could never pass an FBI background check these days, and they'd all be hauled before the public dock on charges of swiving, scheming, backstabbing, and general orneriness.

Characteristic #3 of this era: impatience. The American people want the world to make sense NOW; they want the ability to plan for the future NOW; they want good jobs, effective schools, safe streets and domestic harmony NOW.

They want a leader to define the future not in abstract or campy terms, but in ways that have weight and heft to them. They want a future they can almost feel and touch, and they want a leader who will give them a role in building that future.

It may seem like a bit of hype, but it's not: We should make this an election about history -- about who understood the past, and who can guide this nation forward to a greater future. The higher the stakes, the greater our advantage.

2) WE MADE THIS REVOLUTION

George Bush has played a role in each of the great movements that made the recent Freedom Revolution possible -- World War II, the rise of entrepreneurial capitalism, our outreach to the former communist world; the information revolution; America's serving as the bulwark of liberty through the Cold War to the present post-Cold War world. He got his ticket stamped the old-fashioned way, through hard work, risk and sacrifice.

He understands what the Freedom Revolution wrought -- a new world built on the triumph of old principles. This is a crucial notion. The great difference between the French Revolution (bloody, violent, inconclusive) and the American Revolution (vastly more idealistic and successful) was that the French tried to remake society -- to make people conform to the blueprints drafted by "experts" -- while the American Revolution simply pushed forward the proud ideals and traditions of a people.

Every great revolution poses this choice: Do we invent a new man and a new society, or should we use our past as the foundation for the future? Democrats have chosen the former path: They still believe that centralized power and control will produce good results if you teach the despots table manners and give them soothing sound bites. We believe in building on past strength because that very strength made this moment in history possible.

Lorean Snow, my 82-year-old grandmother born on the Fourth of July, gets a message that eludes Bill Clinton, Al Gore, Robert Reich and Co. She knows that the very best governments rely on a single, simple principle: Trust the people. Faithless ones lean on a more exploitative notion: Tax the people; let smart people figure out the right configurations of wealth and industry -- and let the little people toil and pay.

American liberalism has degenerated into a series of photogenic gestures pasted around an empty shell, sort of a talking, moving papier mache model of JFK, with a little Elvis

mixed in (or, in the case of Gore, Mr. Rogers). That came through most stunningly in this week's video at the Democratic convention. For the first time, a film invoking the Kennedys did little to inspire tears: It was more like rummaging through a musty attic, rubbing the dust and mold off the old albums, taking a little peek -- and realizing that those days are gone forever.

Even the most warm-hearted liberal understands that Americans now know that the great roster of liberal, reinvent the world programs, from the New Deal to the Great Society, didn't finish the job. The supposed beneficiaries of these programs also have come to detest their saviors because they know that in the end, big government programs, no matter how noble the aims, will degenerate into highly developed forms of patronage and favor-swapping. For many of our urban poor, the Great Society was a great sick joke that helped pals of Marion Barry and Coleman Young and Ed Koch and every other strong mayor in the country.

The Clinton economic proposals carry the heavy, mildewy scent of Failed Programs Past. They betray no understanding the changes in the world, or the changing challenges that the American people face in an international economy, although they give plenty of lipservice to noticing the changes. Their programs will help Harvard faculty members obtain a heady rush of moral superiority, but they won't help a poor woman gain a degree, purchase a home, send her kids to private schools, and elect Republicans. They will do for America what Clintonomics has done for Arkansas: Nothing. On fundamentals, then: Game and Set to Republicans.

3) BEYOND FUNDAMENTALS: REACHING THE PEOPLE

Politics does not follow the law of the excluded middle. The simple fact that our ideological foes have fallen does not mean that voters will sidle up to us: They also can vote for none of the above. That was the entire impetus behind the Perot campaign, and it still could inspire many people to spend election day at work or home in 1992.

Our challenge is not merely to claim the victory our principles have won. The campaign must be the first step toward the next era of American greatness.

Consider a few themes for this election year.

a) TRUST THE PEOPLE:

George Bush's domestic policy relies on the simple article of faith I mentioned earlier: Trust the people.

In 3-1/2 years the President has proposed a sweeping revolution in domestic policy that 1) takes power out of the hands of bureaucrats and puts it back into the hands of families; and 2) focuses on results and not rhetoric -- what works, versus what sounds good.

Start with the basics: Family and home. He has made it possible for parents to choose the best child care for their children; now he wants them free to choose the best schools.

Educrats hate this. They want to make the crucial parental choices.

On the home front, he wants to take housing ownership away from government and transfer it to people. When you own the home, you gaze at the world through new eyes. You want to protect the present, and build for the future. You look out for yourself and your neighbors. You grow up and become responsible. Ownership may do more to create urban calm than a zillion more cops and community development bloc grants. It lets poor people obtain work without a laying-on of hands by Bill Clinton.

The President wants welfare policies that reward people who work hard, save money, get better jobs and stay married. He wants to let states and cities decide upon the best way to spend federal dollars. We should judge social programs on their results, and not on whether people have stood in line and filled out forms. (This cut-the-BS approach also undergirds our emergency package to LA.)

Move on to safe streets: He has pushed hard for a crime package that would enable people to sleep easier knowing that we'll catch and punish criminals, we'll look after victims, and we'll try to put an end to the crummy litigiousness that has turned forced Little League baseball teams to take out liability insurance. Again, trust the people -- and kill most of the lawyers.

At work: the President has assailed discrimination -- and rejected the use of devices, especially quotas, that incite racial division. When on the job, people should be free to labor and create, and not have to spend their time worrying about inscrutable regulations and unnecessary government burdens.

Put it all together, and here's the picture: George Bush wants government off people's backs -- and back in their hands.

b) VOTE FOR ACTION. VOTE REPUBLICAN

If you asked most Americans whether they wanted this kind of government -- one that met its obligations while getting off people's backs -- they'd say yes. But this approach New Class Bureaucrat-bosses to the core. And everytime you shake the establishment, it lashes vengefully back.

We've got a Congress that has a hard time coming to grips with the fact that the Sixties are over, and that only one Democrat has won the White House since Nixon resigned. The world has swept past the Democrats.

The media haven't accepted the march of time much better. Elitists in the news and entertainment businesses (I use the term "elitists" advisedly: See Jeff Bell's book, "Populism and Elitism") have tried to batter our values through derision.

But the people who watch "Evening Shade" have one advantage over the people who create and produce it. The American people still understand that Norman Rockwell has more to say about America's future than does Norman Lear.

People want to be liberated from the crushing oppression of dead ideas. No one who understands the prohibition against cruel and unusual punishment would willingly submit innocents to four

years of sappy preachments by Jimmy Carter, let alone four years of homilies from the far more tortured Bill Clinton. They want a chance to make a difference, all by themselves, without prompting, through the eager goodness of their souls.

They also want a government at least as flexible, innovative, and consumer friendly as the average, two-bit computer game company. They don't want no government; they want good government. Only one person has proposed the changes that make innovation possible: George Bush.

As I will note in section III, we must do more than say the right things about Congress. We must make our fight for the common man more palpable, tangible, and effective.

c) VALUES

T-H-E key.

Americans watch television, read the papers, and worry that the nation has gone insane. When Sister Souljah, Ice T, and Linda Bloodworth-Thomason serve as the nation's conscience, people ask: Have we gone crazy? What ever happened to folks who weren't afraid to distinguish right from wrong? who weren't afraid to take a stand? who didn't flinch from demanding good schools, safe streets, and public officials whom you could trust with your money -- or your daughter?

Dan Quayle may have gotten hammered by Jay Leno for his "Murphy Brown" comments, but they have struck a chord elsewhere. People understand that a kind of glib corruption runs through Hollywood, and that the entertainment industry seems almost like a small child -- eager to push the limits, equally eager to get caught and disciplined. That's where we come in.

As I noted at the outset, the world we all have known for so long, the world of Communism vs. Capitalism; of wet-socialist Democrats versus balanced-budget Republicans has come to an end. As I pointed out above, we won the key ideological and historical battles. We won them for a single, crucially important reason: Our values won.

When you get down to it, Americans want someone to assure them that their core values still make sense -- that they won't have to reinvent themselves and suddenly begin doing odd and strange things, such as engaging in pseudo-Mayan sun rites to demonstrate their oneness with the earth.

The President can do that without a briefing from us. For him, these values arise as naturally as the need to breathe. That's one key reason that people, when faced with the hard choice of which candidate to elect, will see a lineup with George Bush and Bill Clinton. If you imagine the two side-by-side, you can envision a statesman standing next to a student council president: No comparison. Indeed, on foreign policy, Clinton wants to be like George Bush -- but he can't quite master the intricacies of the art.

Clinton's liabilities are obvious, and in many ways similar to Gore's. You have young guys touting old ideas. It doesn't

matter that they attach that appellation "new" to their proposals. For them, "new" is a marketing word. Their approach is a half century old, a sort of wet New Deal. They don't get it: Their approach failed, but they still want to try it one last nostalgic time.

Sometimes, people in our party act as if we must decide between a jobs-and-peace approach to politics and a values approach. That's a false choice: Values make prosperity possible. This insight is as old as Max Weber's analysis of the Protestant work ethic. Here's the point: We cannot win jobs and peace unless we feel some sense of coherence and mission as a people. We can't lead the world unless we carry forward the values we (Republicans) have advocated for decades.

America can't lead that world if it crawls behind a protectionist wall, refuses to challenge our kids and our businesses to do their best, or surrenders to the fates a generation of urban young. We can't lead that world if the government second-guesses each and everything that people and businesses do. We can lead that world only by doing what Americans do best -- test, innovate, explore, pioneer, and win.

Again, only one person understands that our strength at home will determine our strength abroad. That's George Bush. If you want an economy that grows and creates jobs, and if you want a country that will remain the world's envy and dream, you need a President who understands the one principle that distinguishes us from the semi-socialist European countries and the strong-armed Perotocracies in the developing world: Trust the people.

d) OUR MAN

Ultimately, people choose Presidents more on the basis of personal qualification than on white papers. Here, we win big. Bill Clinton cannot compare in terms of stature, class, decency, experience -- you name it. He has a batty enough past that it will be fairly easy to drive his negatives into the upper stratosphere. The real key for us, however, will be to accentuate the President's virtues, so that we also establish positive reasons to return George Bush for four more years.

If we use a negative approach, Clinton will howl: "He's the man who said he'd do anything to get elected, and here he goes again." It matters little that we've sent Floyd Brown packing. The public will buy it -- and an excessive burst of negatives on our part could explode in our faces.

4) VENI, VIDI, VICI

To conclude this first section: Every large issue goes our way. Every historical current pushes in our direction. We should paint a Republican portrait of the future -- an America safe, at ease with itself, blessed with good schools and whole families, eager to accept the challenge of competition at home and abroad, and united around the principle: Trust the people. This is the

America people want. Then we should point out that only one thing stands between us and this future. Old-style politicians want to protect old style government and prevent us from carrying forward the Freedom Revolution. We should brush them away, and complete the Freedom Revolution.

This moment in history virtually screams: Carpe diem, you idiots! Or, as an old editor of mine used to say: Let's kick ass and take names. This cheery note prepares the way for a less cheery set of observations:

II) Liabilities

A) The President's problems

Overview: The President often seems shocked or faintly angry that his leadership has come under fire. He knows something we know -- and should talk about much more in the future: George Bush's problem is not that he has done too little; it is that he has attempted too much.

This whirl of activity has created another fundamental problem: Americans don't think they know George Bush. He remains a genial enigma, and many people believe that his evil twin Skippy emerges during elections to smear people with such ugly issues as prison furloughs and past political records.

Our first challenge should not be to cover the landscape with watertight policies, it should be to present the man to the public. Ecce Homo!

As we prepare to do that, we should confront the fact that the President has a lousy public image right now. A few of our worst problems include:

1) People don't trust the President. The key is the budget deal. When a President breaks the most important promise of his political career, and doesn't seem to have lost a lot of sleep over the betrayal, he has problems. HUMONGOUS problems.

Suppose we put together a killer domestic package, the kind that the vast bulk of the American public would endorse with great enthusiasm. We still would have problems because voters would say: "Sure, but 'Read my lips. No new taxes' sounded great, too." The fact is, a Perot could steal our entire agenda and argue: He said it, but I will do it.

We must explain the budget agreement -- why we did it -- and we must explain next what we learned from it. We can't afford to get cute on this one. Let's tell the truth, with no attempts to engage in weird or untenable spin. If the President cannot demonstrate that he has been chastened by the event, and that it has changed the way he conducts himself in office, we're toast.

2) People don't respect the President. With the signal exception of the Persian Gulf, the President has been a doormat for Democratic leadership in both houses of Congress.

We have made ourselves look either spineless or inept by setting deadlines for hopelessly dreary proposals -- and then watching silently as Congress ignores the programs, the deadlines, the whole shebang. This series of batterings and retreats makes the President look like the grade school weakling who continues scratching lines in the dirt, shouting "double dare," and shrinking in utter terror as the larger bullies advance with huge grins on their faces.

It also creates the impression that the President really doesn't care about much, including his personal integrity -- that he's a man of expedients, not principles.

When a President fights hard over something, you know he cares. When a President takes on Congress, even though he's likely to lose, you know he cares. When a President shows real passion on issues that matter to the public -- and Saddam Hussein is not one of them -- you know he cares. George Bush has played it safe and deliberately avoided fights that might break the all-important veto streak. That's one big reason people don't think he cares. Conservatives especially would feel better if he slammed Congress with a hard veto -- and lost.

3) People don't expect anything of the President.

We have broken the modern record for empty promises and goofy futile gestures. A partial listing: the 100-day plan after Desert Storm; our push for Congressional reform after the Thomas nomination; our you're-not-going-to-believe-how-good-this-is exercise in expectation-building before the State of the Union; the two plans in SOU; the March 20 speech, with rescissions; the post-Los Angeles urban aid package; the Balanced Budget Amendment "push." Note that we have presented most of this stuff in the past six months.

Nobody expects results anymore when this President unveils a new program. They expect a nice event, a Democratic response, a very intricate strategy of compromise and capitulation on our part, some goofy rhetoric at a press conference, and some titillating stories about the what the White House and the campaign are saying about each other.

Today, most journalists spend their time vying for discovery of the Bushism of the week. Most regard our good initiatives and ideas as a bunch of uninspired crap. No wonder: We treat our own programs like uninspired crap, tossing them out like confetti, letting them flutter to the earth by the handful. We then seem shocked when nobody seems to have pieced the confetti together to discover a proposal of genius.

This is not good.

Even worse, we have created our own expectation that the President is a man of serene inaction. When somebody proposes any kind of innovation, or any act of Presidential aggression, the idea dies: "It's not George Bush." This sometimes comes as news to George Bush, who upon occasion has said spontaneously what activists staffers had suggested unsuccessfully. I remember one instance during my too-brief tenure as speechwriting honcho when

I actually received a call from an enraged senior staffer, who accused me of slipping words into a text. Not true: That sin was committed by George Bush.

The President is not a magical icon. He will not change people's lives simply by standing placidly amid the noise and the haste. He must act. He must show signs of continued vigor, ambition and life. And we who serve him must not write off suggestions of tough action as beneath the dignity of the leader of the free world. He should not become a statue until after he has left office.

4) The President is running like a vice president who has been saddled with a faintly disreputable record. Everything has a ring of defensiveness about it, an almost desperate cry that "they would change their minds if only they knew what we've tried to do!!!"

The people care less about what we've tried than what we will accomplish. They want a world they can reach out and touch, and they want a President who can make things happen.

Right now, we're talking an entirely different language than the American people, and that language underscores the impression that we're part of the Permanent Washington Establishment problem, and not part of the Trust the People solution.

The President continues mumbling in Washingtonese about ADA, the Clean Air Act, the G-7 plus One; GATT; CSCE. People don't want their President to sound like a turbo-nerd sophomore at the Kennedy school. They want him to talk about issues important to everybody: taxes, spending, regulation, education, safety, crime, quotas, race relations, health care, the environment. He mentions them, but only as parts of a long and awesomely dull laundry list.

George Bush does not seem like his own man. When we propose domestic initiatives, we do almost as a peace offering to George Mitchell, rather than as an aggressive step to serve the American public. We do not establish our own priorities or sense of command. We do not engender enthusiasm or earn praise. We react - - and that gives the other guys the ability to set the agenda.

Even though I get paid for reacting to the media, we spend too damn much time worrying about what the papers and the networks say.

5) The President seems out to lunch. When the President says, as he has for most of the past 13 months, that we're out of recession, working people shake their heads and say: "He doesn't get it." The President must demonstrate leadership by showing real command of the situation, and building the kind of drama we need to sustain our own political case.

The economy is not peachy: It can rise or fall, depending upon whether Congress moves ahead to cut taxes, pare regulations and set the American imagination free. If not, things will get worse, Bill Clinton will offer bewildering homilies about industrial policy, and nobody will much care whether George Bush has anything to say.

Today, people fear losing their jobs, and even though that fear often arises less out of a real threat than out of their

uncertainty about what the post Cold War world portends. If you're an auto worker, you worry about import competition. If you're a computer company employee, you worry about imported clones. When the President says there's nothing to fear, he insults those who do little but fret about what might happen next week or next month. People cannot visualize the economy of the future. They can see only the past clearly and, given the general lack of optimism today, they want the past back. Clinton and Gore boldly beckon the people to look backward.

Mike Boskin argues persuasively that the economy follows the dramatic shifts in the world, and that we have spent the past three years preparing for the future. In many ways, we're far better off now than we were four years ago -- I won't go into the details now, but we hope to have an op-ed on the topic next week -- but we won't really see the results for a couple more years.

6) The President seems content to act as a broker, not a leader. Our two mottos seem to be: "We want a bill we can sign," and "Follow the process." These are both insider aims, and they have absolutely no appeal to the people. They do not call upon one's ambitions, abilities, courage or imagination. They simply call for tax money.

We too often act as the people's emissaries to Congress, instead of letting the people serve as our emissaries to Congress. Our approach offers no drama or motion: It's like watching a clock operate. It moves slowly, regularly, predictably: Big deal.

Today, Americans want an adventure. They want someone who will give them the sense that they really are reshaping the world, that the little things they do when they leave home each morning will, in some small but seemingly tangible way, alter the course of human history and give them a chance to say to their grandchildren ages and ages hence: "I'll never forget the great movement that got started in 1992."

Our insistence on the inside game makes us part and parcel of the Washington Problem, not part of the solution. We should stop acting as brokers and leverage the President's experience as part of a crusade to reform the system. That would get people's juices flowing, and transform the President from a hapless negotiator to the guy who can accomplish the kind of sweeping change Ross Perot can envision only in his little dreams.

6) The President has not defined himself, his first term of office, and his mission for the future. Or: To quote one of my colleagues here at the White House, "The American people don't know what he stands for."

The President doesn't seem able to answer the question, "Why should we elect you again?" without falling back on the old laundry list of unpassed programs and failed initiatives.

"Ask George Bush" sessions banish fears that he cannot complete sentences or that his physical ailments might render him unsuited for re-election. They do not enable him to show what he

wants. A President much preach and teach in such a way that discloses his soul. People feel for him when he talks passionately about his kids, but that won't help them discover whether he will go to war with Congress over important conservative principles or what he plans to do about the education revolution.

7) We have locked ourselves into utterly traditional thinking during this least traditional political year in decades.

We want to consolidate a base that in many respects does not exist. During the past decade, America has become shockingly more suburban and urbane. Neighborhoods have become integrated, and workplaces all have become far more mixed. Gas station attendants no longer take the family out for a night at McDonald's. They order out Chinese.

Our political parties have not kept up. We still behave as if it were 1970. The good news is that Democrats think it's 1964.

Power, as the usually incorrect Bill Schneider has observed, has flowed out of city centers -- Washington or Detroit -- and into places like Fairfax and Montgomery Counties and Oakland County. City life, with a few exception, no longer confers special or exclusive benefits: Everybody shares in a growing and vital common culture, and the information revolution has made it virtually impossible for small elites to monopolize any sort of fad or frill.

Rednecks now have carphones and cable television. Rap singers conduct satellite teleconferences and raise money for causes or political parties. The nation has become more entrepreneurial and tolerant at the same time that most of us have developed a ravenous appetite for a diet of traditional values and individual power (or in Pinkertones, empowerment).

Our traditional base will respect us only if we take stands and demonstrate a little moxie. And the same thing that will impress the traditional base should broaden the universe of those who consider themselves Republicans or potential Republicans.

We should preach traditional values in inner cities -- in order to build support among suburban blacks. This vote enables Democrats to maintain something they consider more precious even than the White House, their sense of moral superiority. Chip away at the black vote, and they go bonkers. That's why they've devoted so much time and energy into rewriting the Willie Horton story. A good firm talk in a black church about values -- and against such divisive matters as quotas -- still could provide some drama and moral leadership.

Go for Yuppie voters by stressing international issues, and linking them to the economy at home. Anybody with kids and bills will vote Republican if we give them a reason. And we should give them abundant reason. Rush Limbaugh has demonstrated that an unapologetic, engaged, passionate, thinking conservative can develop one hell of an audience.

I'm not suggesting the president puff up to 300 pounds and start singing, "Born Free," but he certainly should stand a little taller and firmer.

Too many of us seem determined to turn 1992 into a replay of

1988 -- same faces, same target groups, same tactics, same drubbing at the polls in the early summer. Well, we can't. It's not 1988. 1988 was a Cold War ago, and in 1992 we face two ravenously ambitious politicians who won't slink off into the sunset whenever somebody exposes their flaws.

But 1988 does offer one very significant lesson. We cannot present ourselves as a sheaf of white papers or laundry list of accomplishments. We must demonstrate that everything that has happened in this presidency happened for a reason, and the reasons tell you something about the heart and soul of George Bush -- and also something about the long history and deep soul of the Republican party. We must demonstrate again that George Bush didn't sleepwalk through the 1980s. He played leading roles in holding back communism, trimming away regulation, and building a foundation for winning the Cold War.

The other lesson is that we should not hesitate to use the R words: Ronald and Reagan.

8) The President is not a party leader. The Republican party, like the White House and campaign look to George Bush for a signal, a sign, a cry of "Charge!" Instead, we get a vacuum, filled by Newt Gingrich or Phyllis Schlafly or Eugene Delgaudio or any number of other leadership wannabes. Their unedifying struggles for control of the party and its ideology do little to push the party forward. For the most part, they merely rehash boorish feuds that have festered for years. This vacuum maximizes the influence of those who occupy the party fringes. In this day and age, the Right especially seems addicted to histrionic confrontation. The President has an obligation to impose order on the GOP. He must find ways of saying: This is what it means to be a Republican today, and articulate core principles firm enough to give the party real shape, and broad enough to enable us to pursue the important goal of the Big Tent.

Right now, Congressional Republicans ask themselves: What will four years of George Bush do for me? Right now, the answer is: Make it tougher to get re-elected. This is embarrassing -- and it is our fault.

Many Republicans took umbrage with our handling of the 1990 election cycle -- never deciding whether to run against Congress or with it; whether to embrace the budget agreement or explain it; and finally, blasting Ed Rollins for suggesting that people whose elections might hinge on repudiating the agreement should do just that: repudiate it. A good number of Republicans thought the White House had placed its own interests before the interest of party, and had condemned a number of good candidates to defeat in the elections. It also led to some incredible embarrassments, such as the memorable moment when a Republican candidate (later defeated) actually skipped to avoid sharing a stage with the leader of the world's only remaining superpower.

In short, we need better party outreach, and we need it yesterday. This includes outreach to Pat Buchanan: It's cheap, it's easy and it's smart politics. Buchanan will continue

appealing to the dark side of Right Wingers. We can't stop it. But if we give him a few minutes to blow off steam and rev up his troops, we can certainly prevent an insurrection we don't need.

9) Many conservatives hate the President. I wish I were engaging in poetic license here, but I'm not. It's simply a fact that many died-in-the-wool Republicans would vote for Karl Marx before they vote for George Bush. It may be tempting to dismiss our opponents as Movement Conservative Blowhards who have mailing lists, but do not have constituents, but that's not the case. Sure, the usual suspects (Howie Phillips, Burt Pines, Richard Viguerie, Paul Weyrich, et al) have started grandstanding. But you and I know that these folks eventually will pull the Republican lever. When I talk about "conservatives," I'm talking about parts of our base whose defections may not show up in our polls -- retired military officers, self-made business tycoons, etc. These folks have a visceral hatred for the President, whom they write off as a gutless preppie. It's frightening that the President, one of the nicest and most decent (and toughest) men on earth, has inspired hot passion in but one group so far -- the people who despise him.

We still have a chance to regain their ardor, but words and gestures won't do it. The President must regain their faith through credible and sustained action.

This leads us to part B:

B) Party Problems

1) The Amazing Shrinking Base.

In truth, we have no base. I know this is heresy. I know it does not conform to our polls. I believe it is true.

I also believe in a second heresy: In this day and age, the notion of a demographic base is inherently limiting. Our increasing national homogeneity makes it virtually impossible to make tidy cuts between groups or to design wedge issues that will produce predictable voting results. The Perot phenomenon proves that. Even with Perot's departure, we face the challenge of beckoning former Bush backers into the fold. This won't be easy. After all, it takes a certain kind of leap to defect in the first place: To return involves all sorts of admissions of error and fallibility -- something not terribly common in any political circle, among any person involved in politics. We enter this business because we believe we are RIGHT.

We should court those who have supported us, but we also should begin crafting a message that will help us define a new and broader base. Ideas, not Kiwanis Clubs, form the backbone of the Republican base.

An Idea Base enables us to forge a larger and hardier coalition than we have yet assembled.

This idea base is crucial for Congressional elections, and

Congressional elections hold the key to the success of a second Bush term.

In general elections, ideology provides coattails. If we offer no ideological difference between us and them, we give people no reason to vote a party ticket, and we deny the President the sort of support he will need to make the most of his historical opportunities during the second term.

Instead, the President will spend four years watching Congressional committees strip the hide off family and friends, and paralyzing the Presidency by means of trumped-up "scandals" and fights.

We cannot build our idea base until we clarify our ideas, and we cannot consolidate our traditional base until we do the same.

Consider our problems:

- o The business community thinks we've sold out to the greens.
- o The anti-tax folks don't trust us farther than they can throw us.

- o The social issues folks consider the President a squish on questions they consider important.

- o The anti-communists love to pick away at what they consider our transgressions: failing to bump off Saddam, waiting too long to recognize the Baltics, dragging our feet on Yugoslavia, and anything else they can think up.

- o Movement conservatives mostly want to be loved and invited to the White House from time to time. They're the easiest constituency in the world to stroke, other than opinion journalists, and we haven't done a thing to keep them happy or at least quiet. The same goes, by the way, for conservative pundits.

- o We've got to rebuild our base the old-fashioned way. We've got to earn it. We must build political drama. Start with dramatic ways of framing a dramatic message. I outlined the elements in that drama above: Identify a dream; point out the villains who stand in the way; portray the election as an attempt to sweep away the bad guys who want to kill our dream.

But we also have to answer skeptics within our own ranks. Here are a few key challenges:

- o How do we explain the Budget Agreement?
- o What will we say about taxes?
- o How will we curb regulation?
- o Will we wage war on Congress?
- o Will we defend our honor by taking the offensive on such matters as taxes, environment, values and regulation?
- o How will we prove that we mean any of the above?

There has been a tendency in the White House to wish that such sticky problems as the Budget Agreement would just go away. They will not. For most Americans, the Budget Agreement, and its violation of the no-tax pledge, define the domestic portion of the Bush Presidency, and his unfortunate "I will do whatever it takes to get re-elected" quip to David Frost defines him as a candidate. The other questions listed above raise issues first brought to the

surface in the budget deal: the President's commitment to free-market economics and the supply-side dogma; his determination to complete missions, even in the face of opposition from a partisan Congress; his reliability the red-meat Republican economic trinity: tax cuts, spending restraint and deregulation. We need not address these matters defensively. But we must address them.

2) The lack of enthusiasm among loyalists.

This flows out of the previous section. I continue to be stunned by the total lack of fervor on the part of anybody who doesn't have a White House parking space, and even among some of those folks. George Bush's personality and loyalty always have proved his greatest strength, but in election years like this, politicians also draw strength from the passions they ignite in others. Right now, we have people in White House halls saying the unmentionable: "Whatever is wrong, it's not Sam Skinner's fault; it's not Bob Teeter's fault; it's George Bush's fault."

An amazing number of people have succumbed to a variety of dread bordering on resignation. Several months ago, one of the brightest of the Bush loyalists sighed in a hallway and said, "I never thought it before, but I know it now: We're going to lose."

Increasingly, people give voice to such taboo sentiments, without seeming to consider the consequences. We have a whole bunch of administration appointees hedging their bets and trying to figure out how to make a buck either before or right after November 3. In short, they have developed losing attitudes. When that afflicts those closest to the President, it cannot help but spill over to others.

It does. Outside the White House, we have become a vast yawn. We don't have cadres of screaming, committed college kids. We get rich white kids with monogrammed shirts and Louis Vuitton purses.

We don't have housewives calling in, asking how they can contribute. Businessmen have left open spaces in their checkbooks for Perot.

We seem to have forgotten the possible joy in politics, largely because we have driven the fun out of it. We don't have people assailing the dunderhead Congress. We don't have devotees who will breathe life into the Gospel according to Bush. Mostly we get a bunch of people scratching their heads and saying, "Jeez, it's never been like this before!"

Remember: Most Americans want Presidential elections to combine equal measures of sporting-event entertainment, cloak-and-dagger intrigue; tent-revival moral passion; and a little old bare-knuckled political warfare. At the risk of committing another heresy, we must find ways to take some of the science out of our proceedings and put a little more of the blood and guts and folksy tales back in.

This is not just an aesthetic point: No candidate since Vietnam has won without the support and enthusiasm of a large group of people who did not get mixed up in politics before. Carter got Southerners to troop around; Reagan excited the kids and changed

the demographics of the parties; the President did the same thing in 1988. In contrast, Carter, Mondale and Dukakis all ran defensive campaigns -- which is exactly what we're doing today.

3) Congressional Republicans

I touched upon most of the relevant points above in the section about the President and the Republican party. Our relations with Republicans in Congress remind me of the old saying: With friends like you, who needs enemies? Needless to say, they say the same things about us. This complicates the task of building a credible assault on Congress, and a credible argument that we can make things happen with a Republican Congress.

Ironically, the key splitting point seems to be our lack of willingness to take on the Democratic leadership. Young Turks in the House and Senate want some partisan warfare, and so do many not-so-young Turks. We must develop a strategy for waging that war, but in terms of our values and approaches: the growth package, educational reform, etc. After all, the President's right: we don't want to polarize the parties so dramatically that nothing gets done. We need action, and we need to force some votes so Democrats will define themselves by their stands.

4) The Generation straddle

The problems that beset the administration and the party reflect a generational difference between members of the party. On the one hand you have those described pejoratively as "Country Club Republicans" -- moderates descended from earlier generations of Republican leaders. These Republicans believe in the importance of traditional values, stability, and firm, competent leadership.

On the other hand, you have activists, many of whom consider themselves Reagan Republicans, who believe in the great oxymoron: activism in the service of smaller government. These Republicans focus on wedge issues: taxes, regulations, social issues, etc.

One White House official recently put the distinction tartly: "The President believes the Republican Party is still the party of Prescott Bush. It hasn't been that way for years. There's another party, one pioneered as much by George Bush as by Ronald Reagan. We need to recognize that party: it's the party of the future."

President Reagan managed to persuade both groups to maintain an easy truce, and President Bush did the same from his nomination through the budget deal. Our challenge now is to unite the sides again. If the President appears to choose one generation over another, he loses support he cannot afford to give up. Right now, we have a secure hold over neither.

The fact is, the Republican party is a party in the midst of a dramatic transformation, a transformation from minority party to majority party. George Bush needs to assert leadership to help lead that movement forward -- and avoid the possibility of the party's splintering into Hatfield-and-McCoy clans who place personal animosities before party loyalty.

Ironically, Democrats want to portray themselves as the Party of Youth. As I noted before, they're not: They're the party of kids who have gobbled up the old dogmas of their fathers, without mastering any of the great changes in the world. They're the party of anachronistic, humorless, earnest kids who want to impress their elders by mimicking their behavior.

5) The Reagan Factor

Many Reagan loyalists believe that we have given the back of our hand to them, and to Ronald Reagan. Let's be honest: We have. That should not continue. Ronald Reagan will prove one of our most valuable assets this year -- but only if we treat him like a cherished part of the team, rather than as a nice guy who will cut a few ads on our behalf.

It strikes me as outrageous that Jimmy Carter gave a warmer speech at the Reagan Library than did George Bush, and that the Reagan office has been receiving material from the White House only because I have done so on my own. Reagan can help us restore our links to the Reagan Democrats and would-be Perot voters. He's not a hot dog. He won't overshadow the President. He can be a valuable and important tool.

As we think of building bridges to the Reagan people, we should try to figure out how the rifts developed -- and address that problem. When Ronald Reagan seized the nomination in 1980 (from George Bush, among others), many long-time Republicans treated him like the guy who shows up late to the dance and leaves with the pretty girl. Some of President Reagan's loyalists made things worse by acting as if they had just swept away forever the final remnants of moderate Republicanism. Moderate Republicans, many of whom had slaved for years in the vineyards and who had withstood the brutal assaults of Democrat-controlled Congresses, resented this.

These tensions grew even worse as the party itself grew younger, and the generational divide mentioned earlier grew larger and more obvious. As a result, the President's victory led to some recriminations that put former Reaganistas "in their place." While George Bush and Ronald Reagan always managed to remain above this fray and struggled to put an end to the squabbling, the bad feelings festered. As a result, we have intraparty messes that we don't need.

We all should remember: Without Ronald Reagan there would be no Bush Presidency, and without George Bush there would be no credible way to sustain and build upon the Reagan legacy. We need to mend fences with the Reagan camp, and we should do everything we can to get his competitive fires raging for his last campaign.

We need to remind voters, as we did in the announcement speech, that the Bush record flows from the Reagan record, and that George Bush, man of missions, still must complete the revolution that so far has 1) changed the way people view government; 2) toppled communism; 3) restored people's faith in themselves; and 4) created expectations for a New American Century.

For ourselves, we must understand that George Bush can complete the Revolution he helped build by serving as the great American unifier, the man who can transcend old party differences and forge a coalition devoted to conservative principles in a new world.

III) STRATEGY/TACTICS

A) FIRST THINGS FIRST:

We begin with two crucial challenges: Transform the President into a three-dimensional man, and to decide whether we wish to control the debate this year, or whether we will let outside forces determine our fate.

A) Defining George Bush

I) Drive up the Positives:

A) Action

We'd better put together a vision this year -- and that vision had better come through action. Actions really will speak louder than words. We've used many of the right words, but we've achieved very few of the critical actions.

We must define a vision of America that appeals to everyone's ideals, impatience and ambition -- and that banishes uncertainty about the future by supplying a clear goal, which voters can visualize. We should argue: This grand world will be yours the moment you sweep away that awful bridge-blocking troll known as the Democratic Congress.

Earlier, I mentioned key rhetorical elements in the action agenda:

Vote for Action. Vote Republican.

We trust the people: choice, deregulation, innovation, market incentives.

Less government, more family responsibility.

Leadership for the future -- demonstrate the President's unique ability to deal with a frighteningly volatile world.

Leadership you can trust.

Government in your hands -- and off your back.

When all is said and done, we must make George Bush predictable, reliable and stable. We have made him look like a wind-up President in recent months, as the theme of the week becomes the 30 themes of the week, as we respond in frantic ways to the news of the day and the newspapers of the day. When we put the White House in Brownian motion this way, we appear either to have taken far too many drugs, or to have fallen prey to manic panic.

It does not serve the President to look as if he had fallen prey to a bad Halcion flashback. It does not serve him well to

switch statements several times within a day, as we did with Los Angeles, and almost did with regard to abortion. Let's keep it simple. Let's identify our principles. And let's make him predictable, so a man on the street, confronted with a new issue, will be able to say: This is where George Bush will stand on the issue.

Consider a few varieties of Action:

1) **War on Congress**

We must find credible ways of explaining why we have not finished our domestic mission. There is only one way: We must draw distinctions between ourselves and an inert Congress. We do not need to stomp and whine, but we do need to make the confrontation credible, and we do that only by forcing the action.

a) The growth package: I am told that Darman has suggested attaching our growth package to the Urban Aid package. Boyden Gray has played with a slightly more dramatic idea: Have the President refuse to sign the Legislative Branch Appropriation until Congress passes certain key elements of his growth package.

As I mentioned in a memo last week, the best strategy would mix initiatives in such a way as to preserve our spending caps and keep the budget agreement intact. That way, we keep the debate simple, and we debate it on our terms. If we turn it over to Democrats, and enable them to play around with it through shenanigans in the rules committee or on the Senate floor, we're dead.

b) Rescissions: I know we've got problems with some Hill Republicans on this, but we should mount a crusade against pork spending, send up rescissions on a regular basis, and use the rules in the Budget Enforcement Act in order to force debate on the rescissions. We should think about doing it over and over and over: Make Quayle the point man, if you want, but get someone out in front on the issue of spending. Remember the line we used earlier this year: Our government is too big and it spends too much. Rescissions make it clear that we want to do something about it -- and Congress doesn't.

If we pursue rescissions, of course, we must not harness ourselves to rules that forestall debate for 25 working days or whatever. We must leap into action, and let our friends on the Hill call the Democrats' bluff.

c) Implicit line-item veto: The Office of Legal Counsel argues that the Constitution grants no such power, and I'm inclined to agree. But from the viewpoint of crass politics, what harm would it do to try it out and float it before the circuit court?

d) Dramatic gestures in support of our programs: We may want to gin up some dramatic overture or gesture -- like flying to Los Angeles and blasting Congress for its refusal to help out the people of South Central, and then a tour in which we take some sort of steps on our own -- to address the problems, show up Congress and establish real leadership. (If we do some L.A. stuff, we also should mend fences with cops out there. They're furious with the

President for what they see as non-support of a hard-working and non-corrupt department.) For a really wild time, challenge Maxine Waters to join you.

2) Unilateral action

a) Executive orders: Even if we don't choose the economy as a battleground, we must find ways to accentuate the differences between us and Congress, and to create an air of impatience with its dithering. Executive orders might have some promise. I have asked some lawyers in the administration -- in and out of the Office of Legal Counsel -- to compile a list of options. These will appear in another memo, which I promise will be much pithier than this.

b) New Initiatives: I know that Jim Pinkerton and Jim Cicconi have been pushing for the President to propose a Bushian CCC. Although I don't much cotton to the idea, Bob Dole does, and so do lots of Democrats. If we're for it, let's do it -- and grab credit while the grabbing's good. At this point, many of us would be happy to see anything get done.

c) Reprogram funds: Find some clever way to reprogram funds in such a way as to get pilot initiatives underway -- and to demonstrate that our push for innovation can pay off in tangible ways. We also could zero out programs by rescissions that would take effect for 45 days at a time. The Office of Legal Counsel also says we can do it: Why not try?

d) Recess appointments: The Senate Judiciary Committee continues to hold judges hostage to the whims of Joe Biden. If they dawdle, we should think about wholesale recess appointments, made with great fanfare. When Biden reacts, we can use it as yet another chance to talk about Congress' preference for political posturing in lieu of action.

We should fill other vacancies this way as well, making the point that the President has a country to run, election or not.

e) Anything: As a retired army Colonel who lives in Washington and works closely with many of our top people recently told me: Do something, dammit.

We need to turn George Bush back into the man of missions. Right now, he's the man of moribund seven-point plans with baffling cacophonous acronyms.

Our biggest problem in this election is not that we don't use the right words; it's not that we don't have good policies; it's that people don't think we care enough or have enough muscle to do anything. Perot draws all his support from people who want to see things get done.

We MUST MUST MUST MUST establish some credibility in terms of domestic accomplishments. The Clean Air Act, ADA, child care and other stuff sound nice, but they tend to do much more for policy mavens than for average voters. And a good number of Perot supporters have abandoned us precisely because of our stands on Clean Air, ADA, etc. We should not run as wet liberals this year. We must run as Republicans with excited about the rough and tumble

future. Let Clinton pose as the library rat: We should run as well-educated frontiersmen (and women).

2) Accomplishments

Begin with the theme: His problem isn't that he's done too little, but he's attempted too much. We must surprise people with all the great stuff we've tried to do and get them mad at a Congress that hasn't played a long. When they ask why we didn't push harder, we respond: What more could we do? Further polarize relations with Congress and ensure that NOTHING gets done??!

We cannot possibly convey our full range of policies through a tidy little ad or a series of speeches. That leads to the mind-numbing laundry list. Instead, we should break out parts of the record -- what's he's achieved (ADA, Clean Air, etc.) -- and the revolution he has tried to put in place (see my memo of May 27).

For the "attempted" stuff, I'd suggest an ad campaign in which we do man on the street type interviews asking people what they want most, explaining that the President has proposed that, eliciting an "I didn't know that."

The "I didn't know that" approach enables us to chip away at a series of crucial issues, and subtly make the point that George Bush has slaved away for the things the American people want, only to have a stubborn Congress and cynical press cover up the story.

It also gives us a chance to link important themes. When we talk about environment, for instance, we can broaden the issue's appeal by describing the President's efforts to clean the environment while creating jobs -- and tout his leadership in Rio, where he stood up to pressure from Al Gore, the sandal-and-bead crowd, some aging hippies, and third-world countries that wanted to steal technology and cripple our biotech industry.

Ditto on trade: We push for trade because the President wants to lead us toward a future filled with good new jobs for Americans, and we want to create opportunities for future commerce and expansion.

Foreign policies: Leadership: jobs, toughness, security, the end of nuclear threats, the opening of another frontier (the international marketplace). Note that during each Presidency, someone, somewhere tries to test the mettle of American presidents by manufacturing foreign policy crises. Sometimes, the entire nation's morale and prestige hinge upon a President's performance. Jimmy Carter demoralize America; George Bush showed it the greatness of its heart and soul.

Education: Leadership: Innovation, common sense, trust the people, rebuild America neighborhood by neighborhood; sweep away a smokestack-era education system and create one tailored to meet the demands of the information age, etc.

You get the idea: If we wish to promote jobs, family and peace, we can do so through each and every issue -- but we also should personalize the salient parts of the President's leadership:

constancy, innovation, common sense, faith in the people, a determination to complete the freedom revolution.

I have played Subliminal Man in this section, accenting LEADERSHIP again and again. Jobs, family and peace are good themes, but they're nothing unless people accept the President as a good domestic leader.

Although we want to promote themes that make sense, we should remember something else: THIS SHOULD BE AN ELECTION ABOUT HISTORY, AND WE SHOULD RAISE THE DRAMA TO A LEVEL AT WHICH NO ONE ELSE CAN DARE COMPETE WITH THE PRESIDENT. We don't need to take a high road: We must find a stratospheric road for our key issues. If we make this an election about shaping history, Bill Clinton dissolves -- an earnest schoolboy; Ross Perot self-destructs, because he has absolutely none of the prerequisites for international leadership; and George Bush stands tall and alone, the undisputed king of the future. If we get mired in little stuff -- we play on other people's playgrounds and we flirt with defeat.

3) Character

This obviously will be a key, and a source of incredible strength for us. George Bush wins the character wars big. Here are a few gruesomely obvious highlights:

a) Courage

Like it or not, the wimp accusation has returned -- not using the "w" word, but using insinuations that make the same point. A few biographical ads and testimonials can knock that one out of the park and turn the tables on the bad guys.

Crucial point: George Bush has never played it safe. He volunteered for Naval duty right out of high school. He became the youngest pilot in World War II. After college, he refused easy jobs on the east coast and took up the challenge of the oil business. Within a couple of years he risked virtually every penny his company owned on a patch of land that produced 27 straight strikes.

In Congress, he risked offending constituents by supporting the Fair Housing Act. As Vice President, he took on regulations that choke off American jobs. As President, he has stood up to those who promote unwise choices -- such as the zealots at Rio. He also has been true to his word, unleashing an education Revolution that says: We want the best schools on earth, and we want parents to run them. He has done more for environmental protection than any President, and has crafted policies that actually help create jobs. And of course he ignored the polls and committed troops to the Gulf. When history called, he answered.

Testimonials and ads could prove powerful in drawing distinctions between the President and his would-be successors. Perot in particular seems addicted to fabrications. He wants to be Jack Armstrong -- but he comes across as a billionaire Rogue Weasel with a mean streak that would cause even Hulk Hogan to say:

Hey buddy, lighten up.

b) Determination:

Nothing we say will mean a thing unless we act. The rap against the President is that he talks a good game (sometimes), but lacks either the conviction or confidence to lead. We cannot win the sort of victory we need unless the President takes command and pushes things forward during the next few months.

Otherwise, the man of missions stuff becomes joke fodder for the late-night quartet (Leno, Miller, Letterman and Hall.)

c) Decency and values: A zillion pictures with Barbara Bush and the kids, and the right sort of moral outrage when democrats get nasty.

d) Passion: The President needs to understand the difference between anger, high blood pressure and passion. He shows passion when he talks about kids and country. He tends to show off anger and high blood pressure when he screams about Democrats. America wants a President motivated not just by good policies, but by a strong inner voice that commands him to do great things in the name of great principles. Passion flows from values, and Americans do want a President to have a special contact with the Ages. We can build passion not just through the issues he describes, but by linking them to the things he cares about most: Family, friends, country, the majestic office of the Presidency.

B) Distinguishing our guy from the Bad Guys:

I will leave this to more distinguished masters of the arts. This part should be easy.

II) SEIZE THE INITIATIVE:

I touched upon much of the initiative-setting stuff above, so this section will talk a bit about the media. We should let the media help us accomplish some of our key aims in restoring luster to the Bush campaign and presidency. We should understand first that Clinton's present burst of glowing publicity will wither after our convention, provided we assemble enough interesting constituencies to demonstrate that he is an avatar of the outdated, and not the young man carrying the idealistic torch of youth. Reporters want nothing more than to be hip. Clinton's star will fade if we demonstrate that he's just a dinosaur yearning for lost youth.

At the same time, we must change expectations for the President, so that it becomes worthwhile for reporters to cover Bush events. We should go beyond the normal strategies of doctoring spin and try to make the points we want to make by designing events that drive and shape coverage. In other words, we should do the unexpected from time to time, in ways calculated

to underscore the President's leadership, courage, determination and values.

1) Newspapers:

We remain hostage to the cruel fates of the news desks, but for a couple of areas, the op-ed and letters pages, and the places where conservative writers practice their craft. We should figure out a couple of dramatic ways of using op-eds to drive the news, and push the debate our way. This most often will involve pieces by the President himself, or by very prominent administration figures.

For instance, we might want the President to write a piece titled, "What I learned from the Budget Agreement," and place it in the Wall Street Journal. Failing that, we could encourage such a piece from Dick Darman.

In the same vein, I have proposed a sweeping Congressional reform piece under Quayle's byline, to appear in Roll Call. The placement itself will generate some news, and the substance can spawn other pieces on various parts of the original message.

We should take our case into the Lion's den whenever possible, and make cases that will persuade skeptics while reassuring our own people. We should adopt similar tactics for opinion magazines.

At the same time, the campaign should develop a strategy for writing letters to editors of local papers, and blasting them when they misread the Bush record. We should give activists tips on Dos and Don'ts (I have prepared one) so they might enjoy reasonable success in getting into the local press.

As for conservative writers, we should mount an aggressive schmooze campaign. I have been working for several months to develop lists that group conservative journalists by interests and specialties, and I hope to have those various groupings put together soon. We should invite them in, give them briefings that will teach them something, find ways of meeting and greeting worthies in the administration (including, in some cases, POTUS himself), and follow up with letters or other inquiries to find out how we can help the invitees. That will create a vast reservoir of goodwill. I'm preparing a memo to Dave Demarest that will outline such a schmooze strategy. The journalist on this list come mostly from the print world, but we have managed to dig up a few conservative radio and television folks.

2) Radio:

I mentioned earlier a campaign to call in to talk radio stations and present a good case for George Bush and a Republican Congress. The campaign is working on general points; we also should develop a strategy for getting out talking points on breaking events, so we can track the news as closely as possible.

3) Television: We should send our radio talk-show package out for use by C-SPAN and CNN junkies as well. Such assaults could make a difference. I have some other ideas for television as well,

but I want to test them with Dorrance first.

4) 123s of communicating the message

a) Don't do too much.

Too often we try to explain this Presidency in cosmic terms, jamming every initiative and accomplishment in each and every speech. This is boring to write, boring to deliver, boring to report and boring to read. At one point earlier this year we had in circulation a two-part plan, three fundamentals, four tracks, five pillars, six education goals and six points in an urban plan, a seven-point short-term economic package and God knows what else. Political numerology sometimes gives us the comfortable feeling of substance and weight, but it strikes most folks as an attempt to put fancy clothes on a homely policy. We can do much, much better -- and we need to start with the fundamentals.

b) Talk in plain terms.

George Bush hates being cast in the role of Yankee seer or Connecticut Churchill. We need short sentences, active verbs, and enough real-life examples to show that he has a real feel for life outside the secret-service bubble.

c) Use humor, stories, examples. This seems to be Steve Provost's forte, so let's use it, and use it well. If anything defines our competitors, it's their earnest lack of humor. When Ross Perot smiles, it's like watching a ferret prepare to attack.

When Bill Clinton smiles, you feel Jimmy Carter's self-righteousness and Elvis' utter lack of self-discipline. Too often, when George Bush smiles, we see Bambi in the headlights. The President has a great sense of humor and a soul large enough to pull off humor. Encourage him to share more of his experiences with audiences -- and with speechwriters.

d) Give fewer speeches, and prepare carefully for them. The frantic pace of Presidential activity wears down the President and the press, and it forces him to drag his way through speeches that he would rather not give. I suggest we make the case two ways: First, note that practice really does make perfect, and can produce good results. Ted Williams and Joe DiMaggio took more batting practice than their colleagues. So do Cal Ripken and Wade Boggs. You've got to practice to become good -- it's not enough just to get slapped around by Roger Ailes at somewhat sporadic intervals. From now on, every speech is the Big Game.

Second, in each and every audience, the President will find someone who has never seen or heard a President before and never will see or hear a President again. We owe it to those people to give them something worth passing, something about which they can say: "I heard George Bush talk one day. I'll never forget it. Here's what he said...." Most of us even laugh at that thought -- that's how jaded we've gotten. But if the President starts thinking about kids who someday will have grandkids, he might just

perk up a little bit during the staffing of speeches, during preparation, and even during delivery.

e) Be direct.

The cuter we get in explaining ourselves, the more people will believe that we're trying to pull a fast one. The President needs to be direct about a lot of things, and especially about himself.

Americans don't know the man who has served as Vice President or President for the past dozen years. To many, he seems an amiable chap who goes ballistic during election campaigns. We should paint a whole portrait, in glowing colors. We should give it zip and snap by stressing the historic nature of this election. In 1992, we will lay the foundation for a new century and a new world -- and only one candidate has what it takes to do that job properly. Just because George Bush doesn't like to boast doesn't mean that we shouldn't.

5) Communicate with the communicators

a) Diversify the surrogate operation:

This is self serving, and I'll admit it: I think we need to get fresh faces out making speeches, doing television interviews and making the case for George Bush. (It's self serving because I want to help do some of these things.)

We must show that the President understands the establishment well enough to seek real reform -- and we must make clear his commitment to change by pushing forward a generation of advocates who haven't been before the national press for the past 15-20 years. Let these folks pioneer new trails and supplement the hard work that veterans will do on the campaign trail: New blood, new life. Let enthusiastic young-uns build enthusiasm for the man and the message.

b) Communicate with the communicators

For those of us laboring in the vineyards, crucial matters of strategy, tactics and policy remain a bit of a mystery. For all I know, vast portions of this memo either are irrelevant, have already been incorporated into the campaign, or fall into some nether land beyond my knowing.

We need to ensure that everyone charged with the message has at least a rudimentary understanding of where we want to go and how we wish to get there. I also would hope that we could establish some channels by which people with ideas may set them sailing toward higher levels in the White House and campaign. Right now, people with ideas simply give up because they don't know whom to contact, how, or what results they may obtain. This creates the worst possible atmosphere: stifling oppression mingled with fear. As I have noted many times in this memo, this should be a year for celebration and fervor.

Which leads me to my very, very last two points:

c) Kick ass and take names.

If we have fun and show boistrous confidence, so will our supporters. We still have potential for the kind of victory we envisioned a year ago. The job's tougher, but the foundation remains strong (Sorry, I sound like Chance the Gardner when I write like that). Amid all the chaos and panic, we should remember: We have the only candidate truly suited to the Presidency, and our guy can do great things in a second term -- if we give him the Congress and the support he needs.

d) Understand: We control our fate.

Not even Democrats fully believe in Bill Clinton, and most are waiting for him to collapse. We should hasten that collapse by showing the one emotion that frightens Democrats most: self-confidence. If we push our strengths boldly, our man will soar - and Clinton will look like a cheap posturer.

#

JULY 21, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR SAMUEL K. SKINNER
W. HENSON MOORE
DORRANCE SMITH
MARLIN FITZWATER

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT OP-EDS

With the assistance of Diana Furchtgott-Roth and some interested cabinet members and policy wonks, I have assembled a very ambitious op-ed schedule. Before describing them, let me note that Diana has been a dynamo, and I really appreciate Clayton Yeutter's letting her assist in the op-ed operation on a half-time basis.

With that as introduction, here's an update of topics and status:

- 1) Trade: We should be ready soon with proposals for NAFTA pieces, along with general pieces on the trade situation. Barbara Franklin's ready to go; Carla Hills and Clayton Yeutter also will help. We'll coordinate the op-ed effort with Nick Calio's NAFTA working group.
- 2) Women: We should have a draft ready by next week on George Bush's record on women's issues. I've got lots of good stuff; I just need the time to organize it and write it up. Connie Horner will serve as author.
- 3) Winning Hand: A description of Republicans' winning hand this year -- Rich Bond. This one I'll do on my own time at home.
- 4) Environmentalism: We need a blitz against Gore. Reilly is working up a piece. I hope to persuade Deland to help out as well.
- 5) Deregulation: Diana F-R has drafted a dereg piece; I should have it edited and ready to sell to a prospective author no later than tomorrow
- 6) Health Care: Gail Wilensky has produced a decent piece on our health care initiatives. We should have it ready for distribution later this week.

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

7) Education: I've been working as an editor on several pieces by Lamar Alexander. The first should go out to newspapers this week.

8) Congressional Reform: A long piece awaits the Vice President's attention and signature. Later on in the campaign, I'll seek out pieces from retirees, including Vin Weber, in order to make the case that people who want action should vote for a Republican Congress.

9) Economy -- Michael Boskin is working on a couple of explainer pieces: one, to discuss the state of the economy; a second to note that the American economy has restructured itself to compete in a new international environment, and that the changes will make possible a boom in the years ahead.

Boskin also has volunteered to do some pieces on Clintonomics. I'd also like to recommend that we get Darman to do one, based on his press briefing several weeks ago.

Diana is making inquiries of Pat Saiki, to see if Administrator Saiki would be willing to do something about the impact of Clintonomics on small business.

Diana and Boskin also plan to do pieces on the Democrats' declinist myths.

10) Executive orders -- We should get Boyden or someone to produce a piece describing all the ways in which the President has used executive orders to accomplish important business that the people wanted done, but that Congress refused to undertake. I've got researchers working on a list of such orders.

11) Welfare reform -- Gail Wilensky also has volunteered to do a welfare reform piece. I'd also like to solicit something from Louis Sullivan, but to be honest, his office goes its own way and tends not to want our help.

12) Defense restructuring: We're working on turning a speech by Chris Jehn of DoD into an op-ed about the virtues of our restructuring efforts -- and the craziness of Clinton's.

13) Scandal -- Democrats want to demonize our every attempt to discuss the Clinton and Gore records. This strategy of pre-emptive name calling is for the birds. I've proposed writing a piece calling their bluff for Teeter's signature. I'll start working on it once I've talked to him.

14) Iraqgate -- We have placed one piece, and have two others in the process. I've written one that puts pressure on Jack Brooks and Henry Gonzales. Henry Hyde, despite his tragic personal problems, has agreed to take the point. Steve Rademaker of the counsel's office/NSC also has drafted a good piece, and we'll seek an author for that. I've also asked through channels to see whether Lawrence Eagleburger would agree to a piece setting the record straight.

15) Change: A piece drawing contrasts between us and them: We are the change. We should get a highly visible administration official to do this. SOON!

Summary:

Completed Drafts:

| | | |
|----------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| Environment | 1 | Reilly |
| Deregulation | 1 | Furchtgott-Roth (signatory TBD) |
| Health care | 1 | Wilensky |
| Education | 1 | Alexander |
| Cong. reform | 1 | Snow (Quayle) |
| Defense reform | 1 | Jehn/Furchtgott-Roth (signatory TBD) |
| Iraqgate | 2 | Snow (Henry Hyde); Rademaker (TBD) |

Drafts due by end of week:

| | | |
|--------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| Scandal | 1 | Snow (Teeter) |
| Winning hand | 1 | Snow (Bond) |
| Clintonomics | 2 | Boskin; Furchtgott-Roth/Snow (Saiki) |

Due next week

| | | |
|----------------|-----|---------------|
| Women's issues | 1 | Snow (Horner) |
| Welfare reform | 1 | Wilensky |
| Education | 1-2 | Alexander |

August 3, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR BOB TEETER
SAMUEL K. SKINNER
DORRANCE SMITH
MARLIN FITZWATER

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT DEFINING THE DEMOCRATS

Bill Clinton and Al Gore have been on a bit of a roll lately, at least judging from the papers and t.v., but they haven't provided any surprises. Their campaign so far seems designed to do four things: 1) mislead the American people about their basic philosophy and ideology, using Madison Avenue tactics to describe something ancient and moldy as new and improved; 2) to vilify us at every turn, even when we haven't said a thing; 3) to rebuild their political party and make use of the organizational, political, spiritual and emotional weapons that remain locked in the arsenals of local Democratic party offices; and 4) go on the offensive so we will remain on the defensive.

This memo will suggest ways of defining Clinton and Gore in such a way that we seize control of the debate. We must define them; we must define ourselves; we must draw sharp distinctions between the good guys and the bad guys, and we must make the message stick.

I) Uncloaking Clinton and Gore.

I skip over one obvious area because we have it covered: the personal and legislative records of Bill Clinton and Al Gore. Instead, I'll focus on tactics they have used to disguise their political ambitions and lineage.

Every key Democratic speech and position paper teems with cozy, gauzy codewords: white-noise words that comfort listeners without saying a thing. Clinton and Gore understand that they're at odds with most Americans, which is why they adopt the old strategy of trying to sound normal, while promoting radical policies. The two remain the ultimate apple-polisher students - young men lugging around very old ideas, trying to impress the professor.

If we really want to strike terror into the hearts of Bill

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

Clinton and Al Gore, we should do two things: 1) Make people laugh at them; and 2) Expose their inexperience and immaturity. In short, we must drive a stake through their vanity, for the Clinton/Gore ticket is nothing if not a tribute to the power of political vanity.

A) Democratic Newspeak:

We can define Democrats effectively by mocking their deliberately vague use of language. But we must do one thing more: We must answer the question: Just what do these guys mean, and how will their policies affect people where it counts: at home, with their kids, at work, in the pocketbook?

Haul them all before the dock of our three major themes: family, jobs, and peace. I have attached as an appendix a Devil's Dictionary for Democratic terms. National Review has accepted it for publication in the issue that will appear around Labor Day. I may see if I can find an interested buyer in some other national publication before then.

We also should point out that many of their policies rely on the lie that everything has gotten worse. The line that "men and women work harder for less pay" just ain't true. We should take on their declinism, and blast them for their love of gloom. The Democrats' reliance of distortions and outright lies deserves special treatment -- but I won't go into detail here.

As prelude to the dictionary, consider a few major themes:

1) The Economy:

A) Their Side:

The Clinton-Gore plan means more people will lose jobs or worry about their futures. It throws on the largest tax hike in history, along with the biggest spending increase. It will hurl new burdens upon states, forcing them to raise taxes and spending. After four years of Clinton-Gore, American workers will give more than half their earnings to the government (federal, state and local). In short, if you liked the recession, you'll love a Clinton Presidency.

B) Our Side (Actions, Deeds, Vision):

We must define ourselves by way of stark (and credible) contrast. We want smaller, better government. [[We could make this point with rescissions or line-item vetoes.]]

We want lower taxes [[and here we MUST discuss the budget agreement, if only to mollify our own people]].

We want fewer regulations and only regulations compatible with a growing, enterprising economy. [[Here, we fight for the Competitiveness Council, and announce some of its decision with more-than-appropriate fanfare.]]

We want to lead the world internationally, rather than to retreat into defeatist protectionism. [[NAFTA, GATT]]

Note that I've recommended an action to go with each theme. If we just blab, no one will care. Action alone can establish the two things we sorely lack: continuity and credibility.

In addition, we must explain our vision for the future as vividly as possible.

Identify concrete goals for four years hence, such as: In four years, we want to push tax freedom day back into the previous month. We'll do it by cutting taxes by xx dollars.

We want our export business to grow 20 percent. We'll fight for free trade and assist businesses that need help in getting fair access to markets abroad.

We want patents to surge 15 percent. We'll support R&D, but we'll also give investors a reason to risk money on good, untried ideas. We'll cut the capital gains tax. We'll strengthen the investment tax credit. Etc.

We want the average family to be able to afford a home, a car, and college educations for the kids. We'll continue fighting inflation. We'll build a strong economy for the future, etc.

We want Americans to feel that they control their government, and that they control their individual destinies. We'll strip away the power of the special interests and honor the power of the people.

You get the idea.

2) Bill Clinton, GB Wannabe

There's a second trend in the Clinton plan: It adopts (usually in tamer form) good ideas long ago proposed by George Bush. Clayton Yeutter has circulated a pretty good list of Clinton's attempts to steal our proposals. I've attached that as well.

We must force Bill Clinton to decide publicly whether he wants to copy George McGovern or George Bush. If it's George Bush, people would be better off sticking with the original. If it's George McGovern, people still would be best off sticking with George Bush.

3) MACRO CONSIDERATIONS:

A) Democrats don't get it.

A growing economy needs people with three things: ideas, freedom and capital. Democrats seem determined to deprive Americans of all three. Democrats believe in an economy of privilege -- one where planners, lobbyists and legislators make the big decisions, and the little people pay for them. To put it aphoristically: Democrats believe that a small business loan is a grant from the National Endowment for the Arts.

B) The Great Pork Rush

It is as if they wanted to set off The Great Pork Rush. Their platform proposes special programs for big businesses and farmers; vast new spending programs for development banks, a civilian R&D agency; mandates out the wazoo (family leave, worker education, play or pay, etc.). [I realize that we proposed some of these things first. Even so, he proposes a large batch of "new" programs that would add significantly to our debt and significantly impair our international competitiveness.]

C) The Party of Depression

At a time when the rest of the world races to embrace the challenge of free enterprise and competition, Democrats espouse higher taxes, more regulation, protectionism -- a combination of defeatism and romance over programs that failed in the past.

The Democratic platform is remarkable for what it fails to mention: innovations such as privatization, including in transportation; tax cuts to encourage innovation; individual enterprise. In other words, it doesn't endorse change; it only talks about it.

II) THE MAJOR ISSUES:

A) **Crime:** An easy one. Clinton won't take on his do-nothing party. He won't take on the trial lawyers. He won't take on any of those who threaten to turn our system of justice into a laughingstock. We're serious. He's not.

B) **Environment:** Democrats believe that we can best save forests by hugging trees; Republicans believe in harvesting trees and planting new ones -- this creates a job for the tree-cutter; the shipper; the logger; the person who plants the seedling; the person who watches over the growing forest. It also pumps more carbon dioxide into the air (thus abating the greenhouse effect)

than does an old forest.

We don't believe you must kill a job to save a tree. We don't believe that you must destroy working families to preserve the environment. In this age of innovation, people find ways to clean the water and air. In fact, our air and water are far cleaner than they were two decades ago. We know what works, and we have had the courage to put it into action. Democrats know what has failed - and they want to put it into action.

C) **Government:** The preamble to the Democratic platform includes this extraordinarily revealing sentence: "Republican mismanagement has disarmed government as an instrument to make our economy work and to support the people's most basic values, needs and hopes." (emphasis mine)

If this doesn't prove that they don't get it, nothing does. The Clinton-drafted platform sees government as the central agent for doing all the things people don't want government to do: muck up the economy; meddle in their lives; tarnish their values; frustrate their needs; dash their hopes. When most of us think about our "most basic values, needs and hopes" we do not think about government. We think about teachers, parents, friends, spouses, lovers. We don't think of snarling bureaucrats.

We want to clean up government [the very first thing George Bush did as President was to sign an executive order dealing with government ethics] by making lawmakers obey the law. We want to get government off people's backs, and put it back in their hands.

D) **Race Relations:** Clinton has played the demagogue masterfully, with all his Willie Horton ranting, and we have let him get away with it. At the very least, we should appeal to the growing black middle class by expressing our opposition to quotas (on the grounds that they divide us and raise unnecessary suspicions in the workplace), our determination to enforce civil rights laws with unprecedented vigor, and our commitment to the basics: school choice, safe streets, lower taxes, greater opportunity.

We should note that George Bush was practicing racial healing before Bill Clinton was even born, and note that it takes an incredible amount of gall for Clinton, who deliberately used Sister Souljah as a way of driving a racial wedge between blacks and whites, to cast George Bush as a bigot and divider.

This issue has tremendous resonance, not just among blacks, but among whites who work with blacks. I'd recommend a quick look at Joel Garreau's piece in Sunday's Post Outlook section. It makes a point I've been arguing for months: Whites care about race relations because most of us work in integrated offices.

Furthermore, race relations remain a key moral issue for most Americans. The issue defines who we are and where we will go as a nation.

Clinton panders to black special interests, and in the process he patronizes black voters. We should take our own message to black neighborhoods and give voters a real choice. We might be surprised.

E) THE NEW COVENANT

Put the issues mentioned above and others together (Clinton's positions on family values, foreign policy, etc.) and you realize this: The only thing new about the New Covenant is the math: You add \$220 billion in spending along with \$150 billion in new taxes, and somehow you get a surplus. Maybe Hillary balances the family checkbook.

The New Covenant is not new and it is not a covenant. It would stick workers with the most expensive and restrictive series of government edicts in American history. It is the kind of thing our founding fathers staged a revolution to escape.

Clinton promises everything, pays for nothing, and seeks everybody's admiration. He's a bit like the insolvent cousin who shows up, borrows money and declares: "I love you guys, and I'll pay you back next paycheck. Honest." But the American people will end up holding the bill if Clinton enters office, and in sums that none of us dares imagine today.

Once we have attacked the overarching label, we ought to chip away and away and away at the platform, forcing Democrats to define and justify everything. If we can get Clinton and Gore involved in the details (exactly which programs will you cut, and why? what do you mean by "affirmative action," etc.), they're sunk.

Their platform, despite the fealty to new ideas and rhetoric about smaller government, is a liberal tar baby: The more they wrestle with it, the more tightly they will become stuck to their party's past and to its present interest groups. It will destroy any pretence of novelty or change, and expose clearly the fact that Clinton and Gore are incredibly slick, ambitious, cynical kids who have never held real non-political jobs in their lives, and understand only how to make government grow larger, more expensive, and less efficient.

III) KINDER, GENTLER NEGATIVE CAMPAIGNING

Clinton and Gore have spent the past year cultivating a tactic that, if unchecked, would enable them to inoculate themselves

against any and all criticism. They have taken to claiming that any and all scrutiny of their record, criticism of their comments or analysis of their positions represents more Republican dirty tricks, scheming and conniving.

And why not? We have refused to defend our honor in recent years, preferring to adopt a noble and stoic silence when George Mitchell or Dick Gephardt or Al Gore or Bill Clinton talk trash about us. (This was the point of Mary Matalin's famous Sunday fax.) As a result, they will try to get away with as many vile characterizations as possible so that anything we do or say will smack of cynicism, calculation, or unadulterated evil.

A) Expose the Tactic

I'm attaching an op-ed sent last week to Bob Teeter, and now in the hands of the Washington Post, under Rich Bond's signature. It lays out the first line of counterattack -- exposing the tactic. The Press is sick of Clinton's grotesque moralism already, and it's just waiting for us to pounce on Clinton's whiny Blame Republican First tactics. The New York Times seems especially interested in an op-ed that would assail that tactic in particular. Their caveat: They want someone with good conservative credentials, but not officially affiliated with the White House or the campaign. Any ideas for authors?

B) Get mad, and get even

After exposing their tactics, we should deploy a second round of fire: Anger. We should be pissed that these jerks have spent the past year trotting around the country and trying to sell the notion that the President is a racist, opportunist bastard. The Press has bought much of the Willie Horton crap, although we can begin to reverse that tide if we only take it on. Mike Barone at U.S. News and World Report understands the issue and chronology perfectly, and I know I can egg him on to writing about it. Better yet, the President should blow his stack in an eloquent and calculated way.

C) Take the High Road:

Step three: Call for a clean debate and explain what it means -- a ruthless examination of facts and records; a tough debate about ideas and our future. You know the drill. Seize the high road from Clinton, and never ever relinquish it. At the same time, form some effective truth squads to chip away at the dramatic Clinton-Gore weaknesses -- the craziness of their policies, the transparency of their ambition, and their utter lack of qualification to take on the big and important challenges of shaping history in the aftermath of the Cold War.

The President promises to fight, and many of us are ready to

join the fray. If we want to succeed quickly and thoroughly, we must transform Clinton and Gore back into glamorous lightweights, and we must pound away with an attack featuring a confident, visionary President -- and a band of ruthless surrogates who will expose every little portion of the Clinton-Gore platform and record.

And, as I noted at the end of my previous memo, we should remember one other cardinal rule: We should have fun. This remains our election to win.

August 12, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR RAY PRICE
BOB TEETER
SAMUEL K. SKINNER
CLAYTON YEUTTER

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT CONVENTION SPEECH

The President's acceptance speech, for good or ill, will set the tone for this year's Republican Presidential Campaign. It must be a winner, and should be. Ray Price knows the President, knows politics, and has real and reliable political passions.

I know many others will contribute their thoughts on the speech: For what they're worth, here are mine: This memo will outline key goals of the speech, but it will not burden its readers with suggested speech language. Part II will recommend ways of following up the speech, so that it really does establish momentum for the campaign, rather than providing the kind of fizzle characterized the much-touted State of the Union Address.

PROLOGUE:

A good speech should do two things. It should tell a story and it should make an argument. In this case, we should tell the story of George Bush's life. The President, despite his long tenure in the public eye, remains an enigma to most Americans. We should strip away layers of mystery in ways that fit the man.

The argument we seek flows from the biography. Americans should re-elect George Bush because he alone can lead America at this historic juncture. He has the experience and character one expects of a President. He also has tried to unleash American greatness through a program of continued reform.

As the speech tells a story and makes an argument, it should try to achieve several important goals: It must define the President. It must define the opposition. It must draw clear distinctions between the political parties. It must unite the party and the country. And it must create the kind of enthusiasm that will transform viewers into volunteers.

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

This speech must make the American people active agents in George Bush's agenda for the future. Many Republicans have recommended that the President do so by sprinkling a few dramatic announcements in the address. I agree, but subject to two caveats: 1) the "dramatic" changes should arise naturally out of the things we have tried to accomplish since 1989; and 2) they should enable us to depict for the public the kind of America they can expect if George Bush gets four more years in the White House. In other words, the proposals should meet the tests of continuity and credibility.

If they meet these conditions, they can lift the President to a plane far above where Clinton could possibly stand. They also will provide the Vision Thing by describing in clear and concrete terms what four more years would provide: a more vigorous economy, thriving in the new international marketplace (Olympic analogies might work); an education system in which parents can choose schools for their children, and in which the school provide the best education in the world; safe streets and neighborhoods where cops and citizens work together to take on criminals, and especially drug kingpins; smaller government and lower taxes, so you keep more of your hard-earned pay; and an America brimming with confidence and ambition -- the America we all know and love.

When the President steps off the stage in Houston, every listener should be able to answer the question: If we re-elect George Bush, what will our lives be like four years from now? If they cannot answer that question, we're in deep trouble.

PART ONE: WHAT THE SPEECH SHOULD ACCOMPLISH

I) It should enable people to know the President

People don't know George Bush, and that bugs them. Frankly, they have no desire to know the "inner" George Bush, and they don't want the encounter-group goopiness we get from Al Gore and to a lesser extent, Bill Clinton. They want a mensch, driven by defining passions and principles; determined to achieve clear and worthy goals. They also want someone who combines the humility of Mother Teresa and the daring of Sergeant York. They want, in other words, George Bush.

Without getting gushy, this speech should explain the President, and do so fairly briefly. The President must tackle the key personal claims against him: That he broke his word with the budget agreement; that he lacks any real convictions; and

that he really wants to manage the status quo, rather than to lead America toward a defined destiny.

A) He could take on the Budget Agreement by discussing the importance of a man's word. He must demonstrate that the agreement did not expose a character flaw or prove that he is just another cynical pol who will promise anything on the stump. He also must give an honest, full, no-B.S. explanation. My guess is that he would say that he wanted to i) get a handle on the budget deficit; ii) work with Congress; and iii) demonstrate the kind of leadership necessary to kick the economy into a higher gear. He should not apologize for wanting to do those things. Nor should he argue that in retrospect he would behave differently. He simply should explain that the agreement was a moral, economic and political mistake, and that he never again will place his reputation and the nation's economy at the tender mercy of Democrats who put politics before country.

Having done that, he must make some credible commitments and talk personally about honor and one's word.

B) He also could talk about the importance of one's deeds. In the end, deeds matter more than words, and George Bush has nothing to apologize for in terms of deeds. In foreign policy, he has led the world through the collapse of communism without hastening the end of the world. He took on Saddam, and as a result now stands ready to help the nations of the Middle East try to settle millennia of religious and ethnic hatred. He wants to prod the nations of Europe into exercising moral leadership in all the lands under assault from the Serbs. In short, he understands the world, and he understands the ticklish and crucial business of waging peace.

At home, he has proposed a breathtaking overhaul in American government and politics, based upon the key concepts of choice, limited government, and belief in the people. Now, he must let the past serve as prologue, and demonstrate how he will make that revolution happen. He must announce unilateral actions to get things moving now -- and thus create some tension with Congress. But as I noted above, he also must show in concrete terms what another four years under George Bush will mean for American workers and families.

II) The Speech Should Outline Clear Differences Between Us and Them

Clinton and Gore have tried to fuzz up the differences between the parties by resorting to gauzy rhetoric and comfy phrases. The President should call their bluff. Most of the

"new" stuff in the New Covenant has gathered dust on Capitol Hill for nearly four years. Clinton and Gore want to claim credit for endorsing watered-down versions of reforms George Bush proposed long ago.

We should press the key Democratic weaknesses: They just want to tax and spend. If that sounds like a broken record, it seems like a recurring nightmare to the American worker. Bill Clinton may mock the charge, but he richly deserves it.

Second, we should point out that the Presidency is the Big Leagues. When it comes to tough decisions and choices, Clinton and Gore still sound like candidates at Boys Nation, and not like serious contenders for world leadership. In ways subtle and not, we should point out that it takes more to govern than good press.

Third, we want people to control the nation's destiny. They want bureaucrats to chart it.

JULY 27, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR PAUL MCNEILL

FROM TONY SNOW
SUBJECT OP-ED TRACKING

Here's a quick summary of op-eds now in circulation, with the general subject; authors in parenthesis; op-ed signatory; and publication, if we have decided upon one:

- 1) Devil's Dictionary (Snow) -- Snow -- submitted to National Review
- 2) Change (Roth/Snow) Clayton Yeutter
- 3) Declinism (Roth/Snow) Clayton Yeutter
- 4) Declinism/State of the Economy (Hill/Snow) Barbara Franklin
- 5) Rio/Environmentalism (Crampton/Snow) Bill Reilly

Pieces that should be ready for authors tomorrow:

- 1) Deregulation (Roth/Snow) author TBD
- 2) Congressional reform (Snow) Dan Quayle
- 3) Health Care reform (Wilensky/Snow) Gail Wilensky
- 4) Military reform (Jehn/Snow) Dick Cheney
- 5) NAFTA -- Martin
- 6) NAFTA -- Reilly

Pieces ready to go, waiting for the "right time"

- 1) Iraqgate (Snow) Henry Hyde -- Wall Street Journal
- 2) Iraqgate (Snow) McCollum

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF
REC'D TOO LATE TO
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

New Programs

create a "future budget"

investment tax credit

capital gains for selected investments, and with a long holding period

create a civilian research agency

Budget reform

everything on the table

eliminate nonproductive programs

achieve defense savings

reform entitlement programs to control soaring health care costs

cut federal administrative costs by 3 percent annually for four years

limit increases in the present budget to the rate of growth of the average americans paycheck

apply a pay/go rule to new non-investment spending

make the rich pay their fair share in taxes

Defense conversion

early notice of program changes to give communities planning time

job retraining for departing military personnel

continuing education, placement and relocation assistance

early retirement benefits

incentives to enter teaching, law enforcement and "other vital civilian fields."

redirected national laboratories, working with the new civilian research agency

technical assistance, transition grants, and loans to help small businesses convert to civilian markets.

technical assistance, transition grants and loans to help communities adapt to civilian-based economies

support civilian space program, esp. on environmental missions.

Cities:

summer jobs initiative and training program for inner city youth

stronger community development and targeted fiscal assistance to communities most in need.

national public works investment and infrastructure program
targeted enterprise zones

incentives for private and public pension funds to invest in urban and rural projects.

a "revitalized" Community Reinvestment Act -- require banks to fund entrepreneurial ventures in their business area.

national network of community development banks
microenterprise lending for poor people seeking self-
employment as an alternative to welfare

Agriculture:

public/private partnership to ensure farmers get a fair
return for their labor and investment
investments in basic research, education, rural business
development, market development and infrastructure

Workers' Rights:

reform job safety laws to "empower workers with greater
rights and to hold employers accountable for dangers
on the job."
expand earned income tax credit so no one who works and has
children at home will live in poverty
striker replacement legislation

Education:

invest in educational technology
adopt a national apprenticeship-style program for non-
college students
Domestic GI Bill
make college affordable to all qualified to attend by
offering loans repayable as a percentage of income
over time, or through "national service addressing
unmet community needs."

Health care:

controls on health costs
vague everythings
national crackdown on deadbeat parents
systematic effort to establish paternity for each child
family medical leave
"preventive services and foster care to families in crisis"
for seniors: hunger prevention, guaranteed income, transportation
access, abuse prevention.

Welfare reform

education and job training

child care and health care
community service alternatives

Environment

civilian conservation corps
reduce dependence on toxic chemicals
reduce solid waste by encouraging the use of recycled
materials; discouraging excess packaging.

Government:

same-day voter registration
D.C. statehood

Crime:

More cops
a Police Corps
transfer military personnel to police
expand drug counseling and treatment for those who need it
curb drug demand
waiting period for gun purchase

Sentencing reform

community service and boot camps for first-time offenders
victim impact statements and restitution
tougher penalties for rapists
safe schools, incl. alternative schools for disrupting
children.

"Empowering the poor"

slower phasing out of Medicaid and other benefits to
encourage work.
special savings account to help low-income families build
assets
fair lending
indexed minimum wage
expanded Job Corps
welfare reform

Housing:

affordable mortgage credit
renovate, preserve and expand affordable low-income housing
tenant management and ownership

National service:

unclear what it means

Economy

"national plan for restoring our economy through a
partnership of government, labor and business.

International:

create a Democracy Corps
create a South African/American enterprise fund

International enviro:

CO2 stabbilization
biodiversity treaty
developing nation initiative
restrain population growth

Op-ed strategy:

Target op-eds: hit important states, and discuss the issues important to them.

California

agriculture, labor, environment

Los Angeles Times
Orange County Register
San Diego Union/Tribune
San Francisco Chronicle

authors: Hills, Martin, Reilly, Yeutter

Florida:

environment, agriculture, ties with Hispanic neighbors

Miami Herald
Orlando Sentinel
St. Petersburg Times
Tampa Tribune

Authors: Madigan, Hispanic writers, Franklin

Illinois:

labor, environment, Hispanic relations:

Chicago Tribune/Sun Times

Madigan, Martin, others.

New York:

agriculture, labor, environment

New York Times
New York Post
Newsday
Wall Street Journal

authors: all (Franklin, Hills, Madigan, Martin, Reilly, Yeutter)

Ohio:

labor, environment

Cleveland Plain Dealer
Cincinnati Enquirer

authors:
Franklin, Hills, Martin

Pennsylvania:
environment, labor

Philadelphia Inquirer
authors: Reilly, Martin

Texas:
environment, labor, U.S.-Mexican relations

Dallas Morning News
Houston Post/Chronicle
San Antonio Express/Light

authors: Hills, Franklin, Mosbacher, Reilly, Yeutter

AUGUST 26, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR BOB ZOELICK
MARGARET TUTWILER
DENNIS ROSS
DORRANCE SMITH
BILL KRISTOL

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT CAMPAIGN THEMES, STRATEGIES

We have ridden the crest of our convention "bump": Now comes time to give people a reason to vote Republican at all levels.

Strategically, this entails three goals:

First: Build on our themes: We have identified important themes: 1) Get America moving again, with a President who guided us through the most dramatic transition the modern world has seen; 2) Elect a President you can trust with your future (and who trusts you); 3) elect a President who shares your values; 4) Elect a Congress that wants to do the people's business; 5) Boot out the old-thinking, tax-and-spend, bureaucratic, managerial state Democrats and inaugurate a new era of innovation and entrepreneurship. Bring out the best in America, so we can offer hope to those in the worst straits.

These ideas place the President on a promontory inaccessible to Clinton. That's crucial. We must make this an election about History, knowing that only George Bush can answer history's call.

We must realize that we need to offer a sustained argument to the American people, who still regard the President as an enigma. Sound bites alone won't cut it. Neither will quick reactions to snap polls. We must initiate a real, substantive debate about what government should do in the post Cold-War, post Great Society world -- where we should go in the future as a nation, and what the President will do to guide us to the kind of future we want and know we can achieve.

Second: Keep Clinton on the Defensive. The governor has proved wonderfully inept in responding to hot fire since our convention -- testy, sanctimonious, unfocused. We should keep him off balance.

Third: Paint a picture of America four years from now. Americans feel apprehensive about the future (it's a new, post-

Cold War world out there, with none of the old certainties); they want action; and they feel nostalgia for old American values. They don't want to have to throw off their pasts in order to build a better future. And they want to know who George Bush is and what he believes.

This memo offers a strategy for achieving these objectives without forcing George Bush to become an election-year Mr. Hyde.

I) BUILD ON OUR THEMES

A) Overview

Our rhetoric has become sharp -- and weightless. On the economy, we have said that we will cut taxes -- without saying which taxes, how much we'll and how it will effect the average working American. On spending, the same -- we have not said what programs, how much we'll cut, or what priorities we have set. We have said: Wait until after the election. That means: Wait until we can negotiate with Congress. And for many Americans that means: Oh, no -- here comes the Budget Summit again.

We must flesh out our taxing and spending proposals. This will inflame special interests and attract hostile political fire, but so what? If we're serious about adopting a Trumanesque defiance toward Congress and the special interests, we'll make enemies. We just need to make the right ones.

B) Congress

If we want to deride the do-nothing Congress, we must do several things.

First, we must assemble a comprehensive list of administration initiatives that have gotten spiked on the Hill. Darman knows more about this stuff than anybody else: He's the guy to call for the facts and figures. Once we have assembled the list, we should figure out some device for tallying the opportunity costs. What, for instance, has Congress' inaction on the State of the Union growth plan cost American workers in terms of jobs, new homes, earnings, savings, etc.? When you throw together nearly four years of inaction, you can roll up some pretty awesome costs for Congress' behavior.

This should provide a litany that we would use in speeches, ads, surrogate appearances, you name it. In the end, we should be able to attach a dollar figure or a job figure to Congressional inaction. We also must stand ready to defend our calculations: No funny business.

Second, we must stop sending conflicting signals. Our "wait until next year" approach on taxes and spending boils down to a "we'll work it out with Congress" pledge -- which utterly muddles our Give 'em Hell rhetoric.

Third, we must take action. Consider some options:

* Veto the legislative branch appropriation and hold it hostage for a growth package. We cannot afford to shoot for anything small and technical in the bargain. We must insist on something big, something that creates a who-blinks-first challenge to Mitchell, Foley, Gephardt and Clinton-Gore. The confrontation must crystallize the differences between a conservative Republican president and a liberal Democratic party, with such high drama that no one can muddle the lines. That kind of stand off can galvanize our own constituents and persuade Reagan Democrats that we're for real. If we settle for fine points that will thrill techno-wonks at the GSA, we will forfeit any chance of impressing the American public.

* Call a special session on the economy: Dickey, and truly Trumanesque. This would serve the same purpose as the legislative branch appropriation veto. Indeed, we could do the two in tandem. The point: Make Democratic leadership squirm.

* Rescissions: Submit new packages of rescissions every week, and take up House Republicans on their offer to demand a vote for each and every one. Don't hesitate to take after Republican pork: We should make it clear that when it comes to pork, we'll serve as an equal opportunity butcher.

* Reprogram funds: Where possible, reprogram funds in order to bolster pilot initiatives or help out programs that really can produce results. I don't have any specific suggestions here, but we should have enough latitude in reprogramming to dramatize our commitment to action -- and Congress' determination to rest easy.

* Recess appointments: Congress continues holding good people hostage. The President could unleash a raft of recess appointments, and blast Congress for its refusal to fill crucial government positions.

* New initiatives: The taxing and spending stuff clearly would fall into this category. If we want to get truly radical, the President could call for a flat tax, with only crucial deductions (home mortgages, health care, pensions, vouchers, etc.) remaining.

* Executive orders: The President could do all sorts of stuff through executive order. We should identify priorities and ask the Office of Legal Counsel to come up with alternatives.

One official (not in OLC) has recommended, for example, that we take Boyden Gray's proposal to eliminate quotas in the federal government and twin that with an announcement that we plan to double the budgets of EEO officers in our agencies, the better to prosecute cases of discrimination.

Another example (again, highly controversial within the administration) is the proposal to index capital gains taxes by means of regulatory fiat.

The point is, executive orders provide a device for creative, unilateral action on the part of the President. He should make full use of that and other powers at his disposal.

* Veto strategy: If Congress decides to test the President's promise to veto bills that exceed administration requests, we should pounce -- not just with vetoes, but with events that enable us to pummel the Congress at some length (and with some thoughtfulness). We should use our Statements of Position to lay the groundwork; write veto messages that make our points sharply and forcefully; and let the press get a good look at them both.

* Dramatic gestures: Put Congress on call by showing up somewhere where inaction has exacted a toll -- Los Angeles, for instance. Show Americans what Congressional inaction costs.

* Congressional Reform: Run hard on the need for Congress to reform itself -- obey the laws it imposes on everybody else; eliminate PACS; slash staff; cut perks; clean up its own act; etc. We have talked sporadically about this. We should push it hard. The President, as a believer in good government, should demand a Congress equally committed to government of, by and for the people.

The President should link Rubber Stamp Clinton to the Rubber Check Congress. A concerted effort to build a fire under Congress also will build one under Clinton. We also must build a sense of confidence, determination and motion on the part of the President. By November, we should see a President moving rapidly forward with the makings of a second-term agenda, while Clinton's standing still, calling George Bush names.

C) The economy: The key here is not to get too cute or too technical, but to engage in broad strokes that a) capture the public imagination; b) put the Democrats on the defensive; c) promise real results that people can understand; and d) shows a real commitment to action.

It is not enough to cite the State of the Union short- and long-term plans, or the March 20 challenge or any of the other stuff. We must define our stand and fight hard for it. People

won't take us seriously until we define our principles and wage a hard fight for them.

D) Foreign policy

This divides into two areas: the economy and security.

1) The economy

The President must continue making the case for NAFTA and GATT, in terms people understand. We believe in free trade because we believe in the power of imagination and the strength of the American worker. We know we can outwork, outcompete and outproduce anybody. In pushing for free trade, the President wants to create good jobs for American workers (we can cite wage differentials for export-based manufacturing, the growing power of our export industries, and the fact that most of our export "base" consists of high-tech industries with incredible applications in the developing world) while also placing the best the world has to offer at the fingertips of American consumers. Trade, fair and free, enables us to make the most of ourselves, and enjoy the benefits of trade with other nations.

* Dramatize benefits: Visit some site that now offers good jobs because of increased free trade with Mexico.

* Dramatize NAFTA innovations: Visit the Tijuana/San Diego wastewater treatment facility that Congress won't fund, and point out that this Congress won't help us address environmental issues or promote international enviro cooperation.

* Dramatize the Clinton Campaign's Imagination Deficit: Clinton has adopted the cramped, fearful attitude of the protectionist who cannot cope with change and does not understand that we have entered the age of the microchip. This new world, created by free trade and free markets, beckons with incredibly rich opportunities. It will challenge our imaginations and reward those who do and dream. Clinton meanwhile wants to climb into a bunker with a batch of professors and chart the Best Course for Americans to follow. Meanwhile, our entrepreneurs will set off another revolution in business.

2) Security

George Bush understands the challenges of international security. Bill Clinton does not. At best, Clinton acts like a Bush wannabe when it comes to security policy. But in times of crisis, who you gonna call?

* We may want to dramatize the President's achievements with a simple act: Abolish peacetime draft registration. The Cold War's over. I know DoD has put the kibosh on this suggestion,

but it has the right kind of drama and appeal. It enables the President to take full credit for managing change in a treacherous time. At the same time, he could stress the importance of continuing preparedness by stressing the importance of retaining a highly trained and qualified military.

E) Values: We should run this as much as a sub-theme as a theme. For instance, our proposals all rely on several key values:

1) We trust the people: We have asked the American people which candidate they trust, but that's only half the equation. We also should ask: Who trusts you? We must invite citizens to play active roles in forging America's future. Create a movement, full of idealism and excitement -- or at least try to. When we say: Trust me, and let me manage this government efficiently, they yawn and become cynical. We must renew Americans' faith in themselves by putting the people at the center of our campaign -- and letting the President ride the tide of public idealism and enthusiasm.

2) We share your goals and values: We believe in rewarding hard work and punishing bad behavior. We believe in letting parents make the crucial decisions -- about schools, child care, health care, etc. Our 10 percent check-off proposal lets people raise their own voices in opposition to government spending. We don't want more bureaucracy, we want less. We believe in the institutions that foster and protect values: family, home, community, church, school, country.

3) We speak your language: The Democrats, for all their posturing, have engaged in Newspeak. For them, the family ranges from the Cleaver family to any batch of people who share the stage on the Donahue show. They use familiar words -- but in weird and unfamiliar ways. We should point that out, repeatedly.

4) We want government off your backs -- and in your hands. A folksy way of talking empowerment.

II) KEEP CLINTON ON THE DEFENSIVE:

A) Overview:

The Clinton/Gore ticket runs on high-octane vanity. Like Jimmy Carter, Clinton sports a huge messianic streak, and he cannot resist the temptation to engage in gratuitous moral lectures. That's why he started ranting about his wife and God after the Republican convention. A close study of his speeches over the past year reveals a man who wants not only to be President, but also sees himself as a kind of secular Boy Gandhi -- jogger, intellectual raconteur, healer, sax man and world leader.

If we want to destroy Clinton, we should not attack him in anger. We should patronize him as someone who vaguely understands the changes in the world, but can't break away from that old-time Democratic liberalism.

If we can make the American people laugh in a good-humored sort of way at Clinton and Gore, the Democratic team will go nuts. They will get whiny, nasty, moralistic and screechy. They will self-destruct.

We should expose their faults patiently, ratcheting up the pressure for them to define what their gauzy platform means. Does Al Gore really believe all that woozy stuff in his book? Does Bill Clinton really believe in a 40 mpg CAFE standard? Do they really intend to tell Reagan Democrats that they will make abortion a litmus-test issue for court candidates? Do they seriously believe that anyone wants to pay another \$150 billion in taxes? And don't they understand that their "new" ideas were moldy 20 years ago? We must develop a strategy for squeezing them tighter and tighter -- until they race forth and destroy themselves.

* As part of our surrogate operation, assemble a Republican truth squad, and debunk Clinton at every stop. Rent a van to follow him. Make sure we have the communications apparatus to turn things around quickly. Do not be snotty, as we have been wont to do. Be serious. Let our manner contrast with Clinton's rather over-optimistic and overbearing hoards. If we play it right, we can transform the glib and effective Carville (in the minds of the public) into a puerile bore who can't look someone straight in the eye.

* Work the press: Many in the press have a sinking feeling that they've been taken in by the Clinton team. There's a great willingness to entertain tough stories against Clinton, provided we don't package them as rants. Mary Matalin has been right to go after Clinton at every turn, but tone counts, and our tone has made us sound bitchy and frightened, rather than confident and determined to set things straight.

* Work the public by taking on the press deftly. The press has truly served Clinton's cause. We should document the double standards to the hilt, and then ask -- again, in tones of sweet reason -- for some basic fairness. That will appeal to a public that has no respect for the media. It also will gnaw at the consciences of editors everywhere with the possible exception of the Washington Post.

Whatever their faults, newspaper editors do try to be fair and they take pride in holding no person sacred. Effective press bashing works, mainly because most reporters and editors have

incredibly thin skins. We might want to draw on the stuff Brent Bozell & Co. do. It's pretty accurate -- and increasing numbers of reporters will admit it.

B) Issues:

1) The economy: Clinton promotes the kind of industrial policy that wrecked Massachusetts in the Dukakis era, and has hamstrung Japan more recently.

The New Covenant isn't new and it isn't a covenant. The only thing new is the math. From a policy standpoint, it's the same old tax-spend-and-issue-orders government. It's old whine, repackaged: a monstrous tax increase; draconian regulations; economic isolationism; declinism founded upon falsehood.

We should lay out the costs, flaws and intellectual shabbiness of the enterprise, firmly and seriously. Let surrogates to do the heavy mocking.

2) Values/Foreign policy

You know what to do with these.

3) Race

A surprise issue. Clinton wants to pose as the great healer. He understands that this appeals to a great many Americans of all backgrounds. But George Bush was working to advance racial harmony before Bill Clinton was even born.

If we appeal to black voters, Clinton's Moral Superiority alarms will begin to wail. He will rant about our divisiveness, and he will talk sanctimoniously about his own contributions to the cause of racial harmony. He will go too far, and we will be able to win the issue through sweet reason and calm perseverance. The President should appeal for black votes not by pandering, but by talking about meat-and-potatoes Republican issues: school choice, HOPE, tough anti-crime laws, enterprize zones, deregulation, civil rights enforcement without quotas, etc. When the Crips and Bloods go out and endorse school choice and welfare reform, you know the tide has turned -- our way.

From a political point of view, this is crucial: Democrats lean heavily upon the crutch of moral superiority. A good run for the black vote will prompt crippling crises of the Democratic Soul. It won't net us a vast amount of votes now, but it could create the basis for great improvement in years to come -- and greatly strengthen us in the Midwest and Northeast.

III) America in 1996

A) Overview

We must paint a detailed picture of the America George Bush wants to deliver. This, more than anything else, will serve as the Vision Thing. This picture should not focus on Washington, with its bills and legislation and deals, but on families sitting around the kitchen table.

The picture would look something like this: America in four years will enjoy lower tax rates, and more robust economic growth. People who want a good job will be able to find them, and people who want to upgrade their skills will have a chance to learn new trades.

Parents will have freedom to make all the important decisions: schools, child care, health care, etc. -- without having some bureaucrat bark out orders. The schools will offer better educations, and our children will do at least as well as the kids in other nations in all basic areas -- math, science, humanities, language skills.

Our inner cities will come back to life, not because we have flooded them with federal dollars, but because investors have flooded them voluntarily with their own investments. Home ownership can become a reality for every working American. Our welfare system will help those who cannot help themselves, and it no longer will punish poor people who work hard and save and try to get ahead.

We will remain the world's leader in manufacturing, in exporting, in innovation, and in economic growth.

We will remain the world's sole superpower, and we will lead the Freedom Revolution forward, so that nations still impoverished by tyranny and despotism will enjoy the chance to thrive in an atmosphere of freedom.

We will heal the wounds in our own society, so Americans of different colors and backgrounds no longer will look upon one another with suspicion; cross the street to avoid one another, or engage in games of taunting and baiting. Our children will look upon each other as -- children, and not Black children and White children and Asian children. As Teddy Roosevelt said: No more hyphenated Americans!

The America four years from now will build upon the growth of the 1980s and early 1990s, and push us forward to new confidence, greatness, optimism and opportunity.

* We should illustrate the future by visiting places that have pioneered the innovations we support. We can make school choice tangible by visiting choice schools and explaining the

concept. We can give a hint of what HOPE might achieve by visiting inner city sites where foundations have made it possible for the poor to own apartments and homes. We can visit religious child care centers that might not exist were it not for our child care plans, etc. People must be able to envision George Bush's America -- and they must be able to draw a contrast between that bright and optimistic America and the oppressive, high-tax, moralistic and malaise riddled America of Bill Clinton.

B) Concerns

We must be careful not to make the President the point man on too many anti-Democrat assaults. God created surrogates for that task. Our man must do everything he can to remain larger than the opposition, and when possible to deflate them with the most ruthless weapon of all, gentle humor. Let him kill them with gentle kindness. When they become especially mendacious, let him show the firm anger of an adult -- and not the sneering retort of an enraged peer.

George Bush is a larger man than the sanctimonious Clinton and the over-earnest Gore. Let the President separate himself from the Pander Twins through his actions. He should show humor, confidence, and a sense of ease in leadership -- not anger, frenzy or desperation. He should lay off the "Elvis Economics" stuff. It's tinny, and it isn't him. If we get personal, we compromise his greatest strength, his character. We also strengthen the public fear that George Bush becomes the evil twin Skippy during campaigns.

Presidential elections almost invariably boil down to referendums on a person -- on his character, experience, values and views. George Bush remains an enigma to most Americans. We need to make him larger than life, by having him lead a determined movement to restore momentum and integrity to government. He can do it, but only if he acts, and if his actions fit a real pattern of personal commitment and leadership. If he can do these things, and pass the twin tests of credibility and consistency, he can win big -- and provide coattails for Republican hopefuls ten weeks from now.

#

AUGUST 27, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR ROBERT ZOELICK
DORRANCE SMITH
MARLIN FITZWATER

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT CAMPAIGN THEMES, STRATEGIES

We have ridden the crest of our convention "bump": Now comes time to give people a reason to vote Republican at all levels.

Strategically, this entails three goals:

First: Build on our themes: We have identified important themes: 1) Get America moving again, with a President who guided us through the most dramatic transition the modern world has seen; 2) Elect a President you can trust; 3) Boot out the old-thinking, tax-and-spend, bureaucratic, managerial- state Democrats and inaugurate an era of innovation with a Republican Congress.

These themes place the President on a promontory inaccessible to Clinton, and that's crucial. We must make this an election about History, knowing that only George Bush can answer history's call.

Second: Keep Clinton on the Defensive. The governor has proved inept in responding to hot fire since our convention -- testy, sanctimonious, unfocused. We should keep him off balance.

Third: Paint a picture of America four years from now. Americans feel apprehensive about the future; they want action; and they feel nostalgia for old American values. They also want to know who George Bush is and what he believes. They remain inclined to trust and respect him more than they trust and respect Clinton.

This memo offers a strategy for achieving these objectives without forcing George Bush to become an election-year Mr. Hyde.

I) BUILD ON OUR THEMES

A) Overview

Our rhetoric has become sharp -- and weightless. On the economy, we have said that we will cut taxes -- without saying

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

which taxes, how much we'll and how it will effect the average working American. On spending, the same -- we have not said what programs, how much we'll cut, or what priorities we have set. We have said: Wait until after the election. That means: Wait until we can negotiate with Congress. And for many Americans that means: Oh, no -- here comes the Budget Summit again.

No amount of rhetoric will calm the widespread fear that we don't believe in anything and don't really mean to do anything. We must flesh out our basic proposals and act on them.

B) Congress

If we want to deride the do-nothing Congress, we must do several things.

First, assemble a comprehensive list of administration initiatives that have gotten spiked on the Hill. Darman knows more about this stuff than anybody else: He has the facts and figures. Once we have assembled the list, we should figure out a way to tally the opportunity costs. What, for instance, has Congress' inaction on the State of the Union growth plan cost American workers in terms of jobs, new homes, earnings, savings, etc.? Four years of inaction add up to an awesome sum. We should be able to attach a dollar figure or a job figure to Congressional inaction. We also must stand ready to defend our calculations: No funny business. And we should use the tally sheet as a hardy perennial in speeches, surrogate speeches, etc.

Second, stop sending conflicting signals. Our "wait until next year" approach on taxes and spending boils down to a "we'll work it out with Congress" pledge -- which utterly muddles our Give 'em Hell rhetoric.

Third, take action. Consider some options:

* Veto the legislative branch appropriation and hold it hostage for a growth package. We must insist on something big and dramatic, something that creates a who-blinks-first challenge to Mitchell, Foley, Gephardt and Clinton-Gore. The confrontation must crystallize the differences between a conservative Republican president and a liberal Democratic Congress, and do so with such high drama that no one can muddle the lines. That kind of stand-off can galvanize our constituents and persuade Reagan Democrats that we're for real.

* Call a special session on the economy: Dickey, and truly Trumanesque. This would serve the same purpose as the legislative branch appropriation veto. Indeed, we could do the two in tandem. The point: Make Democratic leadership squirm.

* Rescissions: Submit new packages of rescissions every week, and take up House Republicans on their offer to demand a vote for each and every one. Don't hesitate to take after Republican pork: We should make it clear that when it comes to pork, we'll serve as an equal opportunity butcher.

* Reprogram funds: Where possible, reprogram funds in order to bolster pilot initiatives or help out programs that really can produce results. I don't have any specific suggestions here, but we should have enough latitude in reprogramming to dramatize our commitment to action -- and Congress' determination to rest easy.

* Recess appointments: Congress continues holding good people hostage. The President could unleash a raft of recess appointments, and blast Congress for its refusal to fill crucial government positions.

* New initiatives: The taxing and spending stuff clearly would fall into this category. If we want to get truly radical, the President could call for a flat tax, with only crucial deductions (home mortgages, health care, pensions, vouchers, etc.) remaining.

* Executive orders: The President could do all sorts of stuff through executive order. We should identify priorities and ask the Office of Legal Counsel to come up with alternatives.

One official (not in OLC) has recommended, for example, that we take Boyden Gray's proposal to eliminate quotas in the federal government and twin that with an announcement that we plan to double the budgets of EEO officers in our agencies, the better to prosecute cases of discrimination.

Executive orders provide a device for creative, unilateral action on the part of the President. He should make full use of that and other powers at his disposal.

* Veto strategy: If Congress decides to test the President's promise to veto bills that exceed administration requests, we should pounce -- not just with vetoes, but with events that enable us to pummel the Congress at some length (and with some thoughtfulness). We should use our Statements of Position to lay the groundwork; write veto messages that make our points sharply and forcefully; and let the press get a good look at them both.

* Dramatic gestures: Put Congress on call by showing up somewhere where inaction has exacted a toll -- Los Angeles, for instance. Show Americans what Congressional inaction costs.

* Congressional Reform: Run hard on the need for Congress to reform itself -- obey the laws it imposes on everybody else; eliminate PACS; slash staff; cut perks; clean up its own act;

etc. The President, as a believer in good government, should demand a Congress committed to government of, by and for the people.

The President should link Rubber Stamp Clinton to the Rubber Check Congress. A concerted effort to build a fire under Congress will heat up Clinton as well. By way of contrast, we should build a sense of confidence, determination and motion on the part of the President. By November, we should see George Bush moving rapidly forward with the his second-term agenda, leaving Clinton behind -- calling George Bush names.

C) The economy: The key here is not to get too cute or too technical, but to engage in broad strokes that a) capture the public imagination; b) put the Democrats on the defensive; c) promise real results that people can understand; and d) show a real commitment to action.

It is not enough to cite the State of the Union short- and long-term plans, the March 20 challenge or any of the other stuff. We must define our stand and fight hard for it. People won't take us seriously until we define our principles and wage a hard fight for them.

D) Foreign policy: I don't need to tell you about this. The keys are to highlight Clinton's conviction gap on trade and his imagination gap on security. At best, he's a George Bush wannabe. At worst, he's a pawn for the trade unions and Democratic interest lobbies.

The President should seek ways to call greater attention to his own accomplishments.

* We may want to dramatize the President's achievements with a simple act: Abolish peacetime draft registration. The Cold War's over. I know DoD has put the kibosh on this suggestion, but it has the right kind of drama and appeal. It enables the President to take full credit for managing change in a treacherous time. At the same time, he could stress the importance of continuing preparedness by stressing the importance of retaining a highly trained and qualified military.

* We may want to find some way to honor servicemen and women who have been demobilized, and at the same time illustrate our own commitment to retraining, etc. by opening up a new center for job training. I'm a little uncomfortable about the idea: I'm just searching for ways to dramatize our own achievements in transforming the world -- and preparing for the new world that has begun taking form.

E) Values: We should run this as much as a sub-theme as a theme. For instance, our proposals all rely on several key values:

1) We trust the people: We have asked the American people which candidate they trust, but that's only half the equation. We also should ask: Who trusts you? That enables us to create a movement, full of idealism and excitement. We talk too much about ourselves and not enough about the people -- in whose reflected glory we should bask.

When we promote choice, we say we believe in our people. Our 10 percent check-off proposal does the same thing by letting people cut government spending.

2) We share your values: We don't want more bureaucracy, but less. We believe in the institutions that foster values: family, home, community, church, school, country.

3) We speak your language: The Democrats, for all their posturing, have engaged in Newspeak. For them, the family ranges from the Cleaver family to any batch of people who share the stage on the Donahue show. They use familiar words -- but in weird and unfamiliar ways.

4) We want government off your backs -- and in your hands. A folksy way of talking empowerment.

II) KEEP CLINTON ON THE DEFENSIVE:

A) Overview:

The Clinton/Gore ticket runs on high-octane vanity. Like Jimmy Carter, Clinton sports a huge messianic streak, and he cannot resist the temptation to engage in gratuitous moral lectures. That's why he started ranting about his wife and God after the Republican convention. A close study of his speeches over the past year reveals a man who wants not only to be President, but also sees himself as a kind of secular Boy Gandhi -- jogger, intellectual raconteur, healer, sax man and world leader.

If we want to destroy Clinton, we should not attack him in anger. We should patronize him as someone who vaguely understands the changes in the world, but can't break away from that old-time Democratic liberalism.

If we can make the American people laugh in a good-humored sort of way at Clinton and Gore, the Democratic team will go nuts. They will get whiny, nasty, moralistic and screechy. They will self-destruct.

retains a good reputation, largely because he was working to advance racial harmony before Bill Clinton was even born.

The President should appeal for black votes not by pandering, but by talking about meat-and-potatoes Republican issues: school choice, HOPE, tough anti-crime laws, enterprize zones, deregulation, civil rights enforcement without quotas, etc. When the Crips and Bloods go out and endorse school choice and welfare reform, you know the tide has turned -- our way. If we appeal to black voters, Clinton's Moral Superiority alarms will begin to wail. He will rant about our divisiveness. He will talk sanctimoniously about his own contributions to the cause of racial harmony. He will go too far, and we will be able to win the issue through sweet reason and calm perseverance.

A good run for the black vote won't net us a vast amount of votes now, but it could create the basis for great improvement in years to come -- and greatly strengthen us in the Midwest and Northeast.

III) America in 1996

A) Overview

We must paint a detailed picture of the America George Bush wants to deliver. This, more than anything else, will serve as the Vision Thing.

The picture would look something like this: You will pay less in federal, state and local taxes. We will push Tax Freedom Day from May 5 to ---.

People who want a good job will be able to find them, and people who want to upgrade their skills will have a chance to learn new trades.

Parents will have freedom to make all the important decisions: schools, child care, health care, etc. -- without having some bureaucrat bark out orders. The schools will offer better educations, and our children will excel in math, science, humanities, and language skills. We hope it will add to the diversity of our educational system, too -- adding new and innovative schools.

Our inner cities will come back to life, because investors have flooded them voluntarily with investments. We want to create xx million new jobs in our inner cities.

Home ownership can become an reality for every working American. Our welfare system will help those who cannot help themselves, and it no longer will punish poor people who work hard and save and try to get ahead.

We will remain the world's leader in manufacturing, in exporting, innovation, and economic growth. We want our export business to grow xx percent. We want patents to increase by xx percent. We will cut the capital gains tax, and aim at an explosion in new businesses -- come up with a good number. We will push for new home construction, and put a home within the reach of every working family -- get estimates on home construction numbers from State of the Union proposals.

We will keep inflation low, and interest rates low.

We will heal the wounds in our own society, so Americans of different colors and backgrounds no longer will look upon one another with suspicion; cross the street to avoid one another, or engage in games of taunting and baiting. Our children will look upon each other as -- children, and not Black children and White children and Asian children. As Teddy Roosevelt said: No more hyphenated Americans!

* We should illustrate the future by visiting places that have pioneered the innovations we support. Invite people to compare and contrast to Clinton's plans for nationalizing everything from economic planning to vocational high schools.

B) Concerns

We should not make the President the point man on too many anti-Democrat assaults. God created surrogates for that task.

George Bush is a larger man than the sanctimonious Clinton and the over-earnest Gore. He should show humor, confidence, and a sense of ease in leadership -- not anger, frenzy or desperation. He should lay off the "Elvis Economics" stuff. It's tinny, and it isn't him. If we get personal, we compromise his greatest strength, his character. We also strengthen the public fear that George Bush becomes the evil twin Skippy during campaigns.

George Bush remains an enigma to most Americans. We need to make him larger than life by having him lead a determined movement to restore momentum and integrity to government and imparting direction to a nation unsure about where it's headed. He can do it, but only if he acts, and if his actions fit a real pattern of personal commitment and leadership. If he can do these things, and pass the twin tests of credibility and consistency, he can win big -- and provide coattails for Republican hopefuls ten weeks from now.

#

AUGUST 28, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR ROBERT ZOELICK
MARGARET TUTWILER
DENNIS ROSS
DORRANCE SMITH
MARLIN FITZWATER

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT CAMPAIGN THEMES, STRATEGIES

We have ridden the crest of our convention "bump": Now comes time to give people a reason to vote Republican at all levels.

Strategically, this entails three goals:

First: Build on our themes: We have identified important themes: 1) Get America moving again, with a President who guided us through the most dramatic transition the modern world has seen; 2) Elect a President you can trust; 3) Boot out the old-thinking, tax-and-spend, bureaucratic, managerial- state Democrats and inaugurate an era of innovation with a Republican Congress.

These themes place the President on a promontory inaccessible to Clinton, and that's crucial. If we can make this an election about History, we win because only George Bush can answer history's call.

Second: Keep Clinton on the Defensive. The governor has proved inept in responding to hot fire since our convention -- testy, sanctimonious, unfocused. We should keep him off balance.

Third: Paint a picture of America four years from now. Americans feel apprehensive about the future; they want action; and they feel nostalgia for old American values. They also want to know who George Bush is and what he believes. They remain inclined to trust and respect him more than they trust and respect Clinton.

This memo offers a strategy for achieving these objectives without forcing George Bush to become an election-year Mr. Hyde.

I) BUILD ON OUR THEMES

A) Overview

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

Our rhetoric has become sharp -- and weightless. On the economy, we have said that we will cut taxes -- without saying which taxes, how much we'll and how it will effect the average working American. On spending, the same -- we have not said what programs, how much we'll cut, or what priorities we have set. We have said: Wait until after the election. That means: Wait until we can negotiate with Congress. And for many Americans that means: Oh, no -- here comes the Budget Summit again.

This approach deprives us of a crucial line of attack against Clinton -- his own vagueness about his cuts and taxes. At any rate, no amount of rhetoric will calm the widespread fear that we don't believe in anything and don't really mean to do anything. We must flesh out our basic proposals and act on them.

B) Congress

If we want to deride the do-nothing Congress, we must do several things.

First, assemble a comprehensive list of administration initiatives that have gotten spiked on the Hill. Darman knows more about this stuff than anybody else: He has the facts and figures. Once we have assembled the list, we should figure out a way to tally the opportunity costs. What, for instance, has Congress' inaction on the State of the Union growth plan cost American workers in terms of jobs, new homes, earnings, savings, etc.? Four years of inaction add up to an awesome sum. We should be able to attach a dollar figure or a job figure to Congressional inaction. We also must stand ready to defend our calculations: No funny business. And we should use the tally sheet as a hardy perennial in speeches, surrogate speeches, etc.

Second, stop sending conflicting signals. Our "wait until next year" approach on taxes and spending boils down to a "we'll work it out with Congress" pledge -- which utterly muddles our Give 'em Hell rhetoric.

Third, take action -- but do not do so abruptly. We should set up actions through speeches and public appearances, so that presidential initiatives meet the crucial tests of continuity and credibility. Otherwise, it will look as if a desperate President has resorted to election-year gimmicks.

Consider some options:

* Veto the legislative branch appropriation and hold it hostage for a growth package. We must insist on something big and dramatic, something that creates a who-blinks-first challenge to Mitchell, Foley, Gephardt and Clinton-Gore. The confrontation must crystallize the differences between a conservative Republican president and a liberal Democratic Congress, and do so

with such high drama that no one can muddle the lines. That kind of stand-off can galvanize our constituents and persuade Reagan Democrats that we're for real.

* Call a special session on the economy: Dickey, and truly Trumanesque. This would serve the same purpose as the legislative branch appropriation veto. Indeed, we could do the two in tandem. The point: Make Democratic leadership squirm.

* Rescissions: Submit new packages of rescissions every week, and take up House Republicans on their offer to demand a vote for each and every one. Don't hesitate to take after Republican pork: We should make it clear that when it comes to pork, we'll serve as an equal opportunity butcher.

* Reprogram funds: Where possible, reprogram funds in order to bolster pilot initiatives or help out programs that really can produce results. I don't have any specific suggestions here, but we should have enough latitude in reprogramming to dramatize our commitment to action -- and Congress' determination to rest easy.

* Recess appointments: Congress continues holding good people hostage. The President could unleash a raft of recess appointments, and blast Congress for its refusal to fill crucial government positions.

* New initiatives: The taxing and spending stuff clearly would fall into this category. If we want to get truly radical, the President could call for a flat tax, with only crucial deductions (home mortgages, health care, pensions, vouchers, etc.) remaining.

* Executive orders: The President could do all sorts of stuff through executive order. We should identify priorities and ask the Office of Legal Counsel to come up with alternatives.

One official (not in OLC) has recommended, for example, that we take Boyden Gray's proposal to eliminate quotas in the federal government and twin that with an announcement that we plan to double the budgets of EEO officers in our agencies, the better to prosecute cases of discrimination.

Executive orders provide a device for creative, unilateral action on the part of the President. He should make full use of that and other powers at his disposal.

* Veto strategy: If Congress decides to test the President's promise to veto bills that exceed administration requests, we should pounce -- not just with vetoes, but with events that enable us to pummel the Congress at some length (and with some thoughtfulness). We should use our Statements of Position to lay

the groundwork; write veto messages that make our points sharply and forcefully; and let the press get a good look at them both.

* Dramatic gestures: Put Congress on call by showing up somewhere where inaction has exacted a toll -- Los Angeles, for instance. Show Americans what Congressional inaction costs.

* Congressional Reform: Run hard on the need for Congress to reform itself -- obey the laws it imposes on everybody else; eliminate PACS; slash staff; cut perks; clean up its own act; etc. The President, as a believer in good government, should demand a Congress committed to government of, by and for the people.

The President should link Rubber Stamp Clinton to the Rubber Check Congress. A concerted effort to build a fire under Congress will heat up Clinton as well. By November, we should see George Bush moving rapidly forward with the his second-term agenda, leaving Clinton behind -- calling George Bush names.

C) The economy: The key here is not to get too cute or too technical, but to a) capture the public imagination; b) put the Democrats on the defensive; c) promise real results that people can understand; and d) show a real commitment to action.

It is not enough to cite the State of the Union short- and long-term plans, the March 20 challenge or any of the other stuff. We must define our stand, explain what it means for working Americans, and fight hard for it.

D) Foreign policy: I don't need to tell you about this. The keys are to highlight Clinton's conviction gap on trade and his imagination gap on security. At best, he's a George Bush wannabe. At worst, he's a pawn for the trade unions and Democratic interest lobbies.

The President should seek ways to call greater attention to his own accomplishments.

* We may want to dramatize the President's achievements with a simple act: Abolish peacetime draft registration. The Cold War's over. I know DoD has put the kibosh on this suggestion, but it has the right kind of drama and appeal. It enables the President to take full credit for managing change in a treacherous time. At the same time, he could stress the importance of continuing preparedness by stressing the importance of retaining a highly trained and qualified military.

* We may want to find some way to honor servicemen and women who have been demobilized, and at the same time illustrate our own commitment to retraining, etc. by opening up a new center for job training. I'm a little uncomfortable about the idea: I'm

just searching for ways to dramatize our own achievements in transforming the world -- and preparing for the new world that has begun taking form.

E) Values: We should run this as much as a sub-theme as a theme. For instance, our proposals all rely on several key values:

1) We trust the people: We have asked the American people which candidate they trust, but that's only half the equation. We also should ask: Who trusts you? That enables us to create a movement, full of idealism and excitement. We talk too much about ourselves and not enough about the people -- in whose reflected glory we should bask.

When we promote choice, we say we believe in our people. Our 10 percent check-off proposal does the same thing by letting people cut government spending.

2) We share your values: We don't want more bureaucracy, but less. We believe in the institutions that foster values: family, home, community, church, school, country.

3) We speak your language: The Democrats, for all their posturing, have engaged in Newspeak. For them, the family ranges from the Cleaver family to any batch of people who share the stage on the Donahue show. They use familiar words -- but in weird and unfamiliar ways.

4) We want government off your backs -- and in your hands. A folksy way of talking empowerment. Here's a good way to talk about family values without sounding preachy. Government control strips the family of its dignity and authority. When schools can dispense condoms against parents' wishes, something's wrong. Initiatives on everything from choice to welfare reform restore family authority, and enable families to function without fear of interference or contradiction from the state.

II) KEEP CLINTON ON THE DEFENSIVE:

A) Overview:

The Clinton/Gore ticket runs on high-octane vanity. Like Jimmy Carter, Clinton sports a huge messianic streak, and he cannot resist the temptation to engage in gratuitous moral lectures. A close study of his speeches over the past year reveals a man who wants not only to be President, but also sees himself as a kind of renaissance titan -- jogger, intellectual raconteur, healer, sax man and world leader.

If we want to destroy Clinton, we should not attack him in anger. We should patronize him as someone who vaguely

understands the changes in the world, but can't break away from that old-time Democratic liberalism.

If we can make the American people chuckle about Clinton and Gore, the Democratic team will go nuts. They will get whiny, nasty, moralistic and screechy. They will self-destruct.

We should expose their faults patiently, ratcheting up the pressure for them to define what their gauzy platform means. Does Al Gore really believe all that woozy stuff in his book? Does Bill Clinton really believe in a 40 mpg CAFE standard? Do they really intend to tell Reagan Democrats that they will make abortion a litmus-test issue for court candidates? Do they seriously believe that anyone wants to pay another \$150 billion in taxes? And don't they understand that their "new" ideas were moldy 20 years ago? We must develop a strategy for squeezing them tighter and tighter -- until they race forth and destroy themselves.

* As part of our surrogate operation, assemble a Republican truth squad, and debunk Clinton at every stop. Rent a van to follow him. Make sure we have the communications apparatus to turn things around quickly. Do not be snotty, as we have been wont to do. Be serious. Let our manner contrast with Clinton's rather over-optimistic and overbearing hoards. If we play it right, we can transform the glib and effective Carville (in the minds of the public) into a puerile bore who can't look someone straight in the eye.

* Work the press: Many in the press have a sinking feeling that they've been taken in by the Clinton team. There's a great willingness to entertain tough stories against Clinton, provided we don't package them as rants. Mary Matalin has been right to go after Clinton at every turn, but tone counts, and our tone has made us sound bitchy and frightened, rather than confident and determined to set things straight.

* Work the public by taking on the press deftly. The press has truly served Clinton's cause. We should document the double standards to the hilt, and then ask -- again, in tones of sweet reason -- for some basic fairness. That will appeal to a public that has no respect for the media. It also will gnaw at the consciences of editors everywhere with the possible exception of the Washington Post.

Whatever their faults, newspaper editors do try to be fair and they take pride in holding no person sacred. Effective press bashing works, mainly because most reporters and editors have incredibly thin skins. We might want to draw on the stuff Brent Bozell & Co. do. It's pretty accurate -- and increasing numbers of reporters will admit it.

* Look for surprise issues. I have a favorite -- race relations. Clinton talks the talk, but blacks still fume over his Sister Souljah hijinks. The President meanwhile retains a good reputation, largely because he was working to advance racial harmony before Bill Clinton was even born.

The President should appeal for black votes not by pandering, but by talking about meat-and-potatoes Republican issues: school choice, HOPE, tough anti-crime laws, enterprize zones, deregulation, civil rights enforcement without quotas, etc. When the Crips and Bloods go out and endorse school choice and welfare reform, you know the tide has turned -- our way. If we appeal to black voters, Clinton's Moral Superiority alarms will begin to wail. He will rant about our divisiveness. He will talk sanctimoniously about his own contributions to the cause of racial harmony. He will go too far, and we will be able to win the issue through sweet reason and calm perseverance.

A good run for the black vote won't net us a vast amount of votes now, but it could create the basis for great improvement in years to come -- and greatly strengthen us in the Midwest and Northeast.

III) America in 1996

A) Overview

We must paint a detailed picture of the America George Bush wants to deliver. This, more than anything else, will serve as the Vision Thing.

The picture would look something like this: You will pay less in federal, state and local taxes.

People who want a good job will be able to find them, and people who want to upgrade their skills will have a chance to learn new trades.

Parents will have freedom to make all the important decisions: schools, child care, health care, etc. -- without having some bureaucrat bark out orders. The schools will offer better educations, and our children will excel in math, science, humanities, and language skills. We hope it will add to the diversity of our educational system, too -- adding new and innovative schools.

Our inner cities will come back to life, because investors have flooded them voluntarily with investments.

Home ownership can become a reality for every working American. Our welfare system will help those who cannot help

themselves, and it no longer will punish poor people who work hard and save and try to get ahead.

We will remain the world's leader in manufacturing, in exporting, innovation, and economic growth. We want our export business to grow xx percent. We want patents to increase by xx percent. We will cut the capital gains tax, and aim at an explosion in new businesses -- come up with a good number. We will push for new home construction, and put a home within the reach of every working family -- get estimates on home construction numbers from State of the Union proposals.

We will keep inflation low, and interest rates low.

We will heal the wounds in our own society, so Americans of different colors and backgrounds no longer will look upon one another with suspicion; cross the street to avoid one another, or engage in games of taunting and baiting. Our children will look upon each other as -- children, and not Black children and White children and Asian children. As Teddy Roosevelt said: No more hyphenated Americans!

* We should illustrate the future by visiting places that have pioneered the innovations we support. Invite people to compare and contrast to Clinton's plans for nationalizing everything from economic planning to vocational high schools.

B) Concerns

We should not make the President the point man on too many anti-Democrat assaults. God created surrogates for that task.

George Bush is a larger man than Clinton or Gore. He should show humor, confidence, and ease in leadership -- not anger, frenzy or desperation. He should lay off the "Elvis Economics" stuff. It's tinny. It isn't him. If we get too personal, we compromise his greatest strength, his character. We also strengthen the public fear that George Bush becomes the evil twin Skippy during campaigns.

George Bush remains an enigma to most Americans. We need to make him larger than life by having him lead a determined movement to restore momentum and integrity to government and imparting direction to a nation unsure about where it's headed. He can do it, but only if he acts, and if his actions fit a real pattern of personal commitment and leadership. If he can do these things, and pass the twin tests of credibility and consistency, he can win big -- and provide coattails for Republican hopefuls ten weeks from now.

#

AUGUST 31, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR ROBERT ZOELICK
MARGARET TUTWILER
DORRANCE SMITH

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT 10 PERCENT CHECK-OFF

Voters have warmed to the President's proposal that we let them check a box on their federal tax returns mandating a cut equalling 10 percent of their taxes. This proposal gives us a great chance to sharpen the differences between the President and Clinton, while stealing Perot's most potent theme: Take your government back.

The check-off proposal contains the seeds of two important differences: 1) We trust the people to make important choices, including the choice to slash spending. This idea gives government back to the people, with no strings attached. It offers a real covenant, in which taxpayers -- not members of Congress -- dictate the terms; and 2) We believe in balancing a budget by keeping taxes low and cutting spending, not through real spending and tax hikes and bogus spending restraints.

This idea becomes even more powerful if we link it to our proposals to limit Congressional terms and seek genuine Congressional reform. Whatever further actions we take to restrain spending, cut taxes or put heat on Congress -- such as forcing Congress to vote on a line-item veto or finding a regulatory way of indexing capital gains -- can give this theme added credibility and generate enthusiasm in a restive public. It will provide the kind of bold but responsible leadership people expect to see from George Bush.

Someone should find some way to persuade independent committees to spend time and money hyping the idea -- "You can cut \$140 billion in unsightly fat!" -- in order to push home the "take your government back" theme. A campaign of that sort would woo former Perot voters back into the fold while putting Clinton further on the defensive.

The 10-percent check-off can help galvanize Republicans, generate new enthusiasm among undecideds, and highlight the real differences between the candidates and parties. It gives us a potent weapon. We should use it.

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

SEPTEMBER 1, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR BOB ZOELICK
MARGARET TUTWILER
DORRANCE SMITH

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT THE CLINTON TAX INCREASES

Yesterday's faxes from the campaign brought what looks to be an op-ed about Michael Kinsley's mendacious assault on our tax-and-fee list. (attached) I took the liberty of rewriting the piece a bit in order to achieve two objectives: 1) sharpen the case against Clinton (and weed out some technicalities, such as bill numbers, that don't matter to readers) and 2) slam the media for its duplicity in helping the Clinton campaign.

An attached Post story hints at one of the dirty little secrets of this year's campaign: Many reporters are getting sheepish over the press's treatment of Clinton. Some feel used and have begun looking for ways to balance their coverage (i.e., for ways to hit Clinton with tough reporting). A piece that catches a prominent columnist red-handed will have a ripple effect within the press -- and it has the benefit of putting us on the offensive. Kinsley, with his reputation as a clever debunker, has fallen hook, line and sinker for a shabby analysis passed on by the Clinton camp.

I'd suggest finding some top campaign official, such as Teeter, to serve as the author. That would give our counterattack the prominence it deserves.

One caveat: David Tell has begun working on a list to expand (maybe even double) the count of Clinton tax hikes. If that's the case, we might want to hold a response in lieu of a splashier roll out of a more extensive list. Either way, we should respond to Kinsley with appropriate fire, and soon. Otherwise, his libels will harden into received wisdom, and we will have trouble taking advantage of our own good research.

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

AUGUST 28, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR ROBERT ZOELICK
MARGARET TUTWILER

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT OP-ED OPERATION

The White House op-ed operation consists of me, with an occasional supporting cast of fellow Media Affairs employees, interns, and a part-time assistant (Diana Furchtgott-Roth) from the Domestic Policy shop. I produce op-eds for national and regional newspapers, providing some counterweight to the overwhelming anti-Bush sentiments expressed on the nation's opinion pages.

So far, the shop has not functioned according to any particular plan. Most of the op-eds have come on my own initiative, and I have made it known that I will help administration officials and cabinet members write, rewrite and/or place op-eds in appropriate newspapers.

Right now, we have drafts of pieces on the following topics:

Health care reform -- Gail Wilensky
Welfare reform -- Gail Wilensky, Tommy Thompson
Defense reform -- author TBD (Cheney?)
Clinton tactics -- Haley Barbour (will run in NYT next week)
Congressional reform -Vice President Quayle, for Roll Call

We also have in progress pieces on:

Clinton -- New York Times (author TBD)
Line-item veto -- Boyden Gray (Washington Post)
Women's issues -- Connie Horner
Hurricane Andrew -- author, paper TBD

In this effort, we labor under several constraints: 1) Most newspapers, and all newspapers of consequence, have rules that prohibit the publication of pieces by active candidates for office, at least on overtly political topics. As a rule of thumb, most papers will not accept political pieces from White House, campaign or RNC officials -- although they gladly accept pieces from former employees of all the above. When we do such

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

pieces (and I have done them for Ronald Reagan, John Sununu, and Haley Barbour in recent weeks), it's important not to do them on company time: I do them at home. 2) Our own bureaucracy sometimes moves at a glacial pace: It would be helpful to get someone at the top pushing aggressively to secure the proper sign-offs.

As we begin to sharpen our objectives and strategic aims in the campaign, the op-ed operation can serve as an effective skirmishing force, serving not merely to repeat what the President says in speeches, but to advance lines of argument that can prove useful in the weeks to come.

SEPTEMBER 3, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR DORRANCE SMITH

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT OP-EDS

Attached you will find all the op-eds in the pipeline:

- 1) Haley Barbour on the Clinton tactics -- accepted by the New York Times
- 2) A response to Michael Kinsley, for the Washington Post -- someone at the campaign must agree
- 3) A generic Clinton piece, sent to the campaign
- 4) Health care, by Gail Wilensky -- final edits and placement to go with health-care rollout
- 5) Line-item veto piece for the Washington Post, by Boyden
- 6) USA WEEKEND questionnaire.

(I've dumped the Hurricane Andrew stuff: Neither Andy Card nor our superiors acted with any dispatch. The issue has passed.)

I'm also working on several others, which I hope to have drafted by COB Friday:

- 1) A pro-Bush piece for John Sununu's signature -- solicited by the LA Times
- 2) An assault on Gore's environmentalism, Sununu's signature -- The Washington Times
- 3) Welfare reform, by Gail Wilensky -- everything TBD
- 4) A series of op-eds in support of Ed Carnes' judicial nomination. We're targeting key states, and should have authors lined up sometime today. The pieces must be ready no later than the first thing Tuesday morning, and we should pitch them in advance to the important papers by COB Friday.

We're targeting The New York Times, the Washington Post, the Philadelphia Inquirer, Atlanta Constitution, Hartford Courant, Richmond Times-Dispatch, Arkansas Democrat, and either the Boston Globe or the Augusta, Maine paper.

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

(George Bush Library)

| Document No. and Type | Subject/Title of Document | Date | Restriction | Class. |
|-----------------------|--|------|-------------|--------|
| 31. Memo | [Tony Snow] to Dr. Louis Sullivan, Judith Smith, Interested Parties, Re: Presidential Address on Race Relations. (2 pp.) | n.d. | P-5 | |

Collection:

Record Group: Bush Presidential Records
Office: Speechwriting, White House Office of
Series: Snow, Robert Anthony (Tony)
Subseries: Subject File
WHORM Cat.:
File Location: [Snow Memoranda 2/92 - 1/93]

Open on Expiration of PRA
 (Document Follows)
 By car (NLGB) on 4/15/05

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Date Closed: 12/28/2004 | OA/ID Number: 13899-005 |
| FOIA/SYS Case #: S | Appeal Case #: |
| Re-review Case #: 2005-0485-S | Appeal Disposition: |
| P-2/P-5 Review Case #: | Disposition Date: |
| AR Case #: | MR Case #: |
| AR Disposition: | MR Disposition: |
| AR Disposition Date: | MR Disposition Date: |

RESTRICTION CODES

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]</p> <p>P-1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA] P-2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA] P-3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA] P-4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA] P-5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA] P-6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]</p> <p>C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.</p> <p>PRM. Removed as a personal record misfile.</p> | <p>Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]</p> <p>(b)(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA] (b)(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA] (b)(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA] (b)(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA] (b)(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA] (b)(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA] (b)(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA] (b)(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information</p> |
|--|--|

MEMORANDUM FOR DR. LOUIS SULLIVAN
JUDY SMITH
INTERESTED PARTIES

SUBJECT PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS ON RACE RELATIONS

The election clock ticks, and we have one last chance to persuade the President to deliver a heartfelt speech on the deteriorating state of race relations in our nation.

We face many obstacles, including the fact that the people who pull the campaign strings have absolutely no interest in broaching the subject. We will never win their hearty assent. At best, we may produce a draft that they will find palatable. If so, my guess is that they would schedule a speech at a lousy time on a busy news day, in hopes that the speech might find a warm reception in the specialty press (i.e., BET and black newspapers), and remain invisible elsewhere.

Naturally, we're far more likely to get coverage if we have something to announce, so here are a few possibilities:

1) Dust off Boyden's executive order banning quotas in the federal government; at the same time, issue a second order that doubles the number of EEO enforcement officers in the federal government; also, announce plans to unveil more comprehensive anti-discrimination legislation with harsher punishments than present law.

2) Figure out some way to revive the civil rights commission, which has been paralyzed by political infighting for the past decade. Perhaps commission some studies on important stuff -- mortality rates among young black men, etc.

3)

If we want to minimize opposition from the Baker Five, we should think of utilizing some of the themes that underlie the Agenda for American Renewal:

a) If we want to win the peace, we must field the best team possible. That means eliminating inequalities that beset poor blacks, hispanics and other minorities.

b) Racial harmony fits into our destiny as a nation united not by its optimism and vigor, but also by its commitment to openness, tolerance and decency. For Americans, freedom remains the ultimate value. Prejudice remains the most formidable barrier to future

greatness.

c) Note that George Bush alone has the personal background and character to serve as a healer and uniting force. He won't blow his own horn, but we can make him do it implicitly.

Finally, we need to think carefully about what kind of audience and venue we want. If we agree to proceed, we should find some way of wiring the event before it even goes to long-term scheduling. My suggestion is to have Secretary Sullivan sell it personally to the President. At the same time, we should assemble a few key folks to support it. We'll need to identify cabinet members and senior staff.

SEPTEMBER 4, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR RICHARD PORTER

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT SAN DIEGO SPEECH

First, and apology: I have spent the entire morning in meetings or on projects, so the comments here will be sketchy and the language unfocused. Nevertheless, here's a hastily rewritten redraft:

This year Americans will choose between presidential candidates and parties. I can't think of any better way of framing this historical choice than by challenging you to think about how the candidates answer one simple, crucial question: How do you create a job?

Before I lay out our answer to the question, let me set the scene, for this year's election really is an election about history. In three years, America's determination, ideals, example and people finished off the Cold War -- and sent imperial communism to its rightful place in the dustbin of history. Now, the old military confrontation between superpowers has given way to a much more diverse competition for economic supremacy.

With that change comes incredible uncertainty. You know that all too well. The peace dividend has proved a bitter blessing for many Californians who once enjoyed secure jobs in the defense industry. Our administration has devoted nearly 20 billion dollars to defense conversion and worker adjustment, and

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

we'll do more. But we have kept the important things in focus: We know we cannot afford to weaken our defenses, for weak defenses invite aggression and humiliation.

The United States now spends 66 billion dollars less each year on defense that it would if the Soviet Union had remained a threat. Yet Bill Clinton, despite his promises to the contrary, wants to create a hollow defense force. He wants to cut another 62 billion dollars from our defense budget. Now, he may tell you that he will protect your jobs. He may tell workers in every other state that he will protect their jobs. But when you propose to cut out 62 billion dollars, you mean to eliminate tens of thousands of jobs. And once he has finished promising, the pink slips would begin to fly.

President Bush has managed our defense transition by cutting defense without gutting it. At the same time, he has tried to lay the foundations for a post-Cold War economic order that will provide jobs and opportunities for all Americans.

And that gets us back to my main question: How do you create jobs? I want to answer it with four Cs: Congressional reform, capital, competition and choice.

Let's begin by thinking practically: When you set out to do any chore, the first thing you do is clear away obstacles. The biggest obstacle in our economy's way is a government that is too big and spends too much.

The combination of high government spending and high deficits steals money from our dreamers and doers. It robs the

small shopkeeper of the capital he or she needs to open a second store. It prevents the investor from finding that extra bit of money to support the can't-miss idea. It even makes it tough for lots of people to keep current on mortgages or car payments.

Unfortunately, Washington doesn't get it. The Democratic Congress demands more money every year. Each time the President has tried to restrain spending, Congressional Democrats have cried foul. Every time our administration tries to get things under control, they declare a budget "Dead on Arrival." Their so-called compassion bleeds the American economy dry and socks the worker who just wants to get ahead.

When Congress can't even get rid of special-interest payoffs for mink reproduction research, you know things have gotten bad. A President needs two things to keep spending under control -- a willing Congress, and a line-item veto. We don't have either. This year, voters should demand both.

President Bush knows that a government of the people, by the people and for the people should do what people want. It should live within its means -- and your means. He has proposed one way of giving government back to the people. He wants you to have the freedom to check a box on your taxes that says: Cut spending by 10 percent of my tax bill. If every American taxpayer were to check such a box, we'd save \$140 billion overnight.

But other obstacles clutter our way. Our bureaucracy generates literally hundreds of billions of dollars in regulations that do not pass a simple test: Do their benefits

outweigh their costs? Everywhere around the world, nations have begun tearing away the red-tape that binds their workers. We should do the same. I am proud that the competitiveness council, which I chair, has helped save Americans more than \$20 billion this year. We don't want to eliminate regulation: We just want regulation to make sense.

By the same token, I think it's time we took dead aim at nuisance lawsuits. Today, it's hard to make any normal daily decision without worrying about a lawyer. Should I coach Little League? I may get sued. Should I help this person in need? I may get sued? Should I talk to my colleagues? I may get sued.

Something's wrong with this country when doctors who want to deliver a baby first must worry about a lawyer. The lawsuit has become a sword that divides friend from friend, neighbor from neighbor. It threatens to turn us into a nation of combatants, rather than a community of neighbors and friends.

When I see Bill Clinton earning the warm approval of the trial lawyers, I shudder. I know them. And any friend of the trial-lawyer establishment is no friend of the average American.

We need to get government off people's backs and back in their hands. We need Republicans in control of the White House -
- and Congress.

But that's just a start. We also need to let our economy operate according to the laws of reason and common sense, and not the whims of elites and special interests.

When you start a business, you begin with an idea, but you also need capital. You need someone who can invest in your idea, who will show their faith in you the old-fashioned way -- by putting their money where their mouth is.

Our system too often punishes people who believe in other people. We operate under Depression-era banking laws that prevent banks from offering inventive new financial products. We impose high taxes on capital gains -- thus punishing everyone from the retiree who wants to sell the family home to the investor who wants to support a good idea. And we have a Congress that places envy ahead of enterprise.

When Bill Clinton sneers about the rich, just who does he mean? Well, if you look at his economic plan, he means 800,000 small businesses, and every middle-class couple in the nation. And when he wages class warfare, who does he propose to punish? He wants to punish those who invest, those who sweat and toil and create successful businesses. He wants to punish the little investor and the brave entrepreneur. He wants to punish those who risked their own wellbeing because they believed in the American dream.

Bill Clinton's economics is an economics of envy and division. It will make us poorer and poorer in spirit.

We must stop discouraging those who supply capital to businesses. We should thank every investor who shows faith in this country by getting back into the marketplace.

Our administration has tried to unleash capital. Give us a Democratic Congress, and we'll let resources flow to where they do the most good -- and not just where they will generate the largest campaign contribution.

Once we have capital, we move on to the next "C," competition. We live in an age more competitive than any in our history. If you really want to gauge changes in the world, look at how businesses operate these days. In my home state of Indiana, it used to be enough for a farmer to haul in a bigger crop than his neighbor. Then, it used to be enough to grow the largest crop in the county, or the state.

Tdoay, Hoosier farmers switch on their computers before the sun rises. They check out the European commodities markets before they head out into the fields. At lunch, they return to their computers, and check out the action in New York or Chicago. And before they go to bed, they consult the Tokyo exchange.

We're in an international marketplace, and no protectionist can change that. The most important commodity in our economy these days isn't a pork belly -- or a pork-barrel giveaway from Washington. It's information. Good information and good ideas have reshaped the world, and they will continue to.

Whoever tries to deny competition simply makes a decision to give up and fall behind. Bill Clinton flirts with protectionism, while Al Gore rants about the evils of the internal combustion engine. These are voices of failure and self-doubt. They are voices of a failed past.

We're in for competitive fights from now on, and we should welcome the challenge. But we also need to know that quality demands moving forward at full speed all the time. No one will be able to take leadership for granted. Every company in every industry will have to acquire success the old fashioned way. It will have to earn its reputation each and every day.

Consider the computer industry. The computer revolution began in this state 15 years ago, and already we've had five different industry leaders. That's our future -- and as tough as it is for business, it's good for consumers. When you go to the store today, you have more choices than anybody has ever enjoyed. And it's amazing.

Competition creates the next "C," choice. We live in an age of awesome and wonderful choices. I heard a story recently about a young woman who emigrated to the United States from the Soviet Union. A family decided to take her to a suburban grocery store. The first thing she saw was a long aisle with dry dog and cat food. She broke down crying -- because dogs and cats in America had more food and more choices than people in her Republic.

We have choices -- and we will only have more in years to come. And we will win so long as we maintain a real commitment to quality. If we spread the best products and encourage the best ideas, and insist on the very best in everything we do -- we will win.

An economy needs clear sailing, capital, competition and choice, but it also needs one other intangible ingredient. It

needs the one ingredient that alone makes nation great, and inspires men and women to test the limits of their own powers. That ingredient is confidence.

Democrats see everyone as part of a vast lump that must be perfected by planners. You and I don't view life that way. When we grow up, we don't dream of becoming small cogs in a vast machine, or a small entries on and vast computer scroll. We dream of doing great things. We dream of curing cancer, or inventing the revolutionary computer. Some may dream of winning the Triple Crown -- like Gary Sheffield -- or like me, playing point guard for Bobby Knight. (By the way, I prefer playing point for George Bush.)

What's important is that the dream belongs to you. You choose your destiny. You set your sights on the future. You have pride in your work because it is your work -- not an order handed down by a pipe-and-tweed professor who believes he knows what you should be doing with your life.

The greatest difference between Republicans and Democrats is this: Democrats have white papers and plans, full of promises and charts and rhetoric. But they don't have faith in you. They believe in regulation, taxation, redistribution. They believe that government should make the important choices -- and that you should pay.

We look at the world the other way: We appreciate the genius of the individual inventor and the hard work of the immigrant who comes here, opens a small shop, works, saves and creates a

business. We believe that the American dream depends upon American dreamers -- men and women set free from the narrow blueprints drafted by a handful of planners in a small room.

Government doesn't create jobs. It creates laws. It creates regulations. It creates obstacles. You create jobs -- if politicians and bureaucrats will just stay out of your way. You just need room to dream, freedom to acquire capital, the confidence to compete, and encouragement when you succeed.

A good economic plan should do more than impress journalists and provide additional employment for Ivy League professors. A truly good plan must appeal to the tiny voice that whispers in the ear of anyone who runs a business. It must ring true. It You should be able to understand it without having to consult an outside expert, and know that it will make your life better. In short, it should make sense.

Bill Clinton and Al Gore have proposed a 22-page economic plan that will raise spending by \$220 billion, raise taxes by \$140 billion, theoretically cut spending by \$145 billion, and will rely on the economy to grow at a 4.5 percent clip each year.

Their plan reminds me of the old joke about two economists who, making their way across country, suddenly encounter a vast gorge. "Now what do we do?" asks one. "Well," says the other, "assume a bridge."

On the spending side, Gov. Clinton proposes only two cuts - - the elimination of a \$3 million honey bee subsidy that Albert

Gore has voted three times to retain (most recently, this spring), and \$4 billion in reduced Medicare premiums.

That leaves nearly \$141 billion in cuts he assumes he will make.

He also assumes that he'll get \$220 billion in new taxes, but there's a funny thing: He doesn't tell you what tax rates he plans to charge. He just plans to take aim at "the rich," a group that looks a whole lot like Working America.

He assumes the United States would reap \$45 billion by taxing investments by foreign owned companies and their subsidiaries. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that this tax would generate at most \$1 billion, while threatening businesses -- including auto plants in Michigan, Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee and South Carolina -- nationwide.

His tax projections ignore the costs of his play-or-pay health-care plan, which by some estimates will cost \$130 billion or more; his mandate that employers devote 1.5 percent of their pre-tax income to worker training; and other mandates that fall within his National Economic Plan. It takes some fancy assuming to believe that one will set the economy into a higher orbit after fitting entrepreneurs for a fresh set of shackles.

Even using his numbers, along with estimates of the indirect costs of health care and worker-training mandates, it seems likely his taxes hikes will saddle American taxpayers with at least \$400 billion in new burdens over four years.

Now, I don't know about you -- but that plan just doesn't make sense. It's not new -- it's McGovernism taken out of the deep freeze. It won't work -- Boris Yeltsin would get hooted out of Moscow for proposing such a thing. And it in no way addresses the fundamental issue of how you get government off people's back. Gov. Clinton, who has raised 128 taxes and fees in his home state -- and has raised taxes on 58 different occasions -- talks like a young guy, but his plans look like the moldy New Deal.

Well, Americans should tell him: No Deal. We want someone who can contend with the future -- not someone who wants to defend the past.

#

SEPTEMBER 16, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR MARGARET TUTWILER

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT ATTACHED OP-ED

This op-ed, drafted at the President's request, responds to a piece that appeared on yesterday's Washington Post op-ed page. The President has seen the piece, and approves. Ditto for Marlin and Dorrance. Please give this a read, and send along any comments, suggestions or recommendations. I'd like to fax it to the Post by early afternoon.

Thanks.

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

SEPTEMBER 24, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

THROUGH DORRANCE SMITH

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT ENCLOSED OP-EDS

Persistence pays: We're beginning to enjoy some success in getting pieces placed in the major dailies on a regular basis. The New York Times already has accepted a Haley Barbour piece about Clinton tactics, the Los Angeles Times plans to run a major piece by Gov. Sununu either this Sunday or next, and we hope the Post will accept several pieces that we're shipping their way within the week. As the election nears, we may find it easier than before to get our point of view on op-ed pages.

Here's one good indicator why: At an op-ed editor's convention this week in San Francisco, editors from around the country admitted that they were not running enough pro-administration pieces. According to a friend at the New York Times, some even issued an open plea for good pro-George Bush material. Naturally, we'll do our best to make them happy.

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

OCTOBER 1, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR DORRANCE SMITH

FROM TONY SNOW
SUBJECT OP-EDS

Here's the latest:

- 1) The New York Times has accepted a piece written in early July under Haley Barbour's byline, and blasting Clinton's smear campaign against the President. (Latest copy attached). The Times will run it this Saturday (October 3).
- 2) The Washington Post is looking over Boyden's opus on Iran-Contra. The President has asked Boyden to be the signatory. Boyden, as the lawyers say, did not refuse. I suspect the Post will accept it, but demand that we shorten it. This will require protracted mud-wrestling with our lawyers, but we'll get it done. This should be a big Sunday piece.
- 3) National Review will run a slim version of my Devil's Dictionary, which you have seen. The magazine should hit the stands by Monday.
- 4) I'm also working after hours with Sununu on a piece that should run soon in the L.A. Times. It sets out the positive case for George Bush, with a few swings at Bill Clinton. We have an outside chance of getting it in this Sunday's paper.

Also in process:

- 1) Boyden has signed off on a line-item veto piece that I will pitch first to the Wall Street Journal, and then to wherever it can make a splash. I'll probably hold on to it for a week or so.
- 2) NAFTA: I'm trying to finish two pieces by COB tomorrow, and I'll let legislative affairs find "authors."

I think that's all for now...

OCTOBER 5, 1992

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

THROUGH DORRANCE SMITH

FROM TONY SNOW

SUBJECT OP-EDS

I suspect you have seen these, but in case you didn't, here are the offerings from what turned out to be a pretty good weekend, op-ed wise. We've got lots of other pieces in the works, and I'll send along copies when they get published.

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE-
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

a. walinsky: defense-vol. stuff

212/841-6090

two issues: privilege, etc. -- hit hard, etc.
franks, etc.: structural reform

taxpayers pay for reelection: king caucus;
12,000:1;
obey study: obey study re: Congress.

easier on w rogers
obey commission
4:

electoral immunity

POTUS gotta earn re-election....
caucus: beltway interests; want to know why congress out of touch
democracy to reign in; arrogance comes from invulnerability.

people prepared to give up on constitution; some talking about
parliamentary system

tenured congress. surrender party to extremists; all we need is
democracy...

some turnover in senate: free television; too expensive to fight:
40 percent of staff back in districts.

gerrymander

January 13, 1993

Dear Mr. President,

I hereby submit my resignation as Deputy Assistant to the President for Media Affairs, effective on noon, January 20, 1993.

The past 22 months have been the most extraordinary of my life, and I have you to thank. I will draft a more personal note later, but for now I would like to thank you for the extraordinary privilege of being able to serve you.

Very Truly Yours,

Tony Snow
Deputy Assistant to the President for Media Affairs

REC'D TOO LATE TO FILE
FILED BY BUSH LIBRARY STAFF

TONY SNOW:

Career objectives:

I want the same job that everybody else in Washington wants, and only George Will seems to have. It really combines four jobs:

Establish an opinion column at a major newspaper
Build a television career
Write books
Public speaking.

Although this sounds like routine pundit stuff, it's not. Today's pundits do too little reporting, and therefore sound too often like pompous windbags. I would like to spend more time out on the road