

To: David, Bob
Fr: Todd
Re: SOTU SIX
Da: January 22, 1994

I like the way you have retooled this and I think the new first page is quite good. A few points:

- **Sticking national security in the middle of the section on the economy strikes me as a big mistake.** Most important, it is very confusing and jarring to go from economy to national security and then suddenly find oneself back on jobs. In addition, it is weird to make National Security a subheading under the Economy, if that is what you're really intending. It's fine to move economic issues onto the center stage of our foreign policy, but it's not fine to suggest that national security occupies a lower rung on the Clinton ladder.

- We have a line on p. 10 that says "You'll pick the health plan and the doctor of your choice." This sounds great and I know that it's just what people want to hear. But can we get away with it? Isn't the whole thrust of our health plan to steer people toward cheaper, HMO-style providers? It's one thing to say we'll preserve your option to pick the doctor of your choice (recognizing that this will cost more), it's quite another to appear to promise the nation that everyone will get to pick the doctor of his or her choice. And that's exactly what this line does. I am very worried about getting skewered for over-promising here on something we know full well we won't deliver.

- Maybe it doesn't fit, but I'd love to see a little more in the values section about how devastating the explosion of illegitimacy is. How we know that nothing is more destructive to the development of solid American values like respect, responsibility, care for others, hard work, etc. than the breakdown of traditional two-parent families. And that we must therefore put government on the side of fighting against that breakdown, rather than encouraging it. There's a little bit in welfare section on this, but not big and clear and direct.

- In the conclusion, when we recap the challenges facing us, we have to mention something foreign. Otherwise, we're just feeding the notion of the Potus as a domestic President who defines his challenges strictly in domestic terms. I think this would be a major error.

cc: Gergen
Gearan