

FOIA MARKER

**This is not a textual record. This is used as an
administrative marker by the William J. Clinton
Presidential Library Staff.**

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records
Subgroup/Office of Origin: Chief of Staff
Series/Staff Member: George Stephanopoulos
Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 8034
FolderID:

Folder Title:
Zedillo Visit

Stack:
S

Row:
22

Section:
2

Shelf:
11

Position:
3

TO: THE PRESIDENT

Date: October 4, 1995 4 PM

Subject: Zedillo Visit

The bailout and NAFTA are at about the same level of approval (Nafta-44-41, Bailout-46-45). But we have an argument -- repayment plans -- that works well on the bailout, but no comparable argument on Nafta. So, oddly enough, I would advise stressing the bailout over Nafta.

When told that Mexico was allowed to borrow \$30 billion but has only borrowed less than half that amount and is now repaying \$1 billion, a year ahead of schedule, support moves to 59-34. This fact made 52% "more likely to support the loan".

So, the argument should be: SOUND BITE -- You never really can tell if a loan was a good decision or not until you see how it works out. But the fact that they only needed less than half of the loan we offered and that they are repaying \$1 billion now, a full year ahead of when it was due, is pretty good evidence that it was a good decision. It has meant that they can buy more of our products -- we've tripled our exports already -- and we may end up making some money on the interest in loan. Its turning out to be a pretty good deal for us."

We need to avoid getting into the whole argument about the bailout all over again, just say its working.

Nafta approval doesn't go beyond break even no matter what argument we use.:

1. Who got the better end of the deal: Mexico 49% US 11% Both 24%
2. Arguments: triple exports, dropped during peso crisis, now getting better again vs Mexican economy a long term wreck, bad to hitch our wagon to them 46-43
3. Argument: 340,000 jobs vs long term wreck, bad to hitch wagon 40-47
4. Argument: Mex-US drug cooperation vs not doing much on drugs 37-47
5. Mex-US cooperation on immigration and as mex eco improves, less immigration vs no cut in flow 40-47

TO: THE PRESIDENT

Date: October 4, 1995 4 PM

Subject: Justifications for American Involvement in Foreign Affairs

The superficial consensus that the US must "continue to play an active and vigorous role as a world leader in foreign affairs" is only skin deep. While by 85-12 Americans agree with that homily, they split much more deeply when argumentation is tried:

We argued that America must "live up to its obligations to lead the world" and that we need to promote "the values we cherish--freedom and liberty" and that we have a "duty to lead" and must not "avoid our responsibilities." Against that we are "too involved" in foreign policy and have "problems at home we need to take care of" and that we should "reduce our involvement in foreign affairs until our domestic problems are settled" Americans break even-- 51-44 for internationalism.

So we have to go a whole lot deeper than homilies or platitudes in defending the very notion of foreign involvement.

NO ARGUMENTATION ON US TROOPS IN BOSNIA WILL SUCCEED UNLESS IT ADDRESSES THIS CORE LACK OF A PERCEIVED REASON FOR ANY FOREIGN INVOLVEMENTS IN THE FIRST PLACE. We need to go back, intellectually to the isolationist, pre-Pearl Harbor and pre-cold war days, to create a *raison-d-etre* for any kind of foreign involvement at all.

Moral duty to stop killing and the threat of nuclear and other terrorism are the key arguments. The key metaphor is that if there is crime across town, we know we have to stop it there or it will spread over here.

RANKING OF BEST REASONS FOR US INVOLVEMENT IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS (SUMMARY)

1. Moral duty to prevent killing	80
2. Nuclear, chemical terrorism	77
3. Metaphor: stop crime across town before it spreads	76
4. Risk of domestic terrorism	68
5. Risk of Environmental damage like burning oil-Iraq	68
6. Risk of spread of disease like AIDS	65
7. Threat of China domination	64
8. Threat of global chaos	64
9. Loss of jobs due to falloff in exports	59
10. Other nation, like Iraq or Iran, might take over	58
11. Russian nationalism might take over	57

-2-

The potential for political gain is large. The following paragraph got a 79% agreement with only a 26% disagreement and made 39% more likely to vote for Clinton:

"Bill Clinton is a world leader in promoting peace and democracy. He moved Haiti to democracy without any casualties. He's gotten North Korea to stop making nuclear weapons. He got the IRA to declare a cease fire and stop its terrorist attacks. He has worked out two key agreements between Israel and the Palestinians and is working on one between Israel and Syria. And now, he seems to be winding down the war in Bosnia. He uses force when he has to, like in bombing Bosnia. He threatens force when he has to like in Haiti. And he turns away from force when it makes sense like in North Korea."

But the isolationists don't die easily. Even after all these arguments were read to the voters, they moved only from 51-44 to 58-35 in approving of foreign involvement. (We repeated the question we asked that is described in paragraph 2 above.

RANKING OF BEST REASONS FOR US INVOLVEMENT IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Detail)

% WHO SAY ITS CONVINCING

very somewhat total

1. When there is war, there is bloodshed, starvation, rape, and killing of children. We have a moral duty to step in and stop millions of innocent people, women and children, from being killed and nations from being devastated	42	38	80
2. More and more nations will have access to nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons. Unless the US settles wars, these very dangerous weapons could be turned on Americans through terrorist attacks	37	40	77
3. Its like living in a city, if you ignore violence and crime in another part of town, sooner or later it spreads closer to home and makes you unsafe. We need to promote a world of law and order to be truly safe at home	41	35	76
4. If war breaks out in foreign countries, terrorists will sooner or later start attacking America as they did when they bombed the World Trade Center. So it is better to nip in the bud through proactive foreign involvement to stop the wars from getting out of hand	31	37	68

-3-

5. When war breaks out, countries like Iraq burn oil in the gulf and cause massive pollution. Unless we can control outlaw nations like that, we risk increasing pollution world wide 33 35 68
6. Diseases like AIDS start in foreign countries and can spread to the US. We need to act to keep peace to limit the spread of disease and keep our own people healthy 38 27 65
7. China is waiting in the wings for the US to withdraw from global leadership to jump in and take our place. If we don't keep global leadership, China could become a real threat like Russia was for 40 years. 33 31 64
8. If US doesn't lead, there will be more and more war and chaos in foreign nations until the world is filled with war and bloodshed. A world in chaos and at war is a dangerous world for the US and we have to make sure that global order is promoted and wars are limited 25 39 64
9. A lot of American jobs depend on products we export to foreign countries and the goods we get back from them in return. If there were more and more war in the world, we would find ourselves with fewer people who are about to buy our products and would face a loss of jobs here at home 25 34 59
10. If US doesn't lead, some other nation, with darker motives & a desire for world domination, like Iraq or Iran, might come to Power and take over 25 33 58
11. The communists and super nationalists in Russia are waiting to take power again. Unless we assert global leadership and solve conflicts abroad, we risk opening the door again to starting up the Cold War with Russia 25 32 57