

# Ronald Reagan Presidential Library

## Digital Library Collections

---

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

---

**Collection:** President, Office of the: Presidential  
Briefing Papers: Records  
**Folder Title:** 03/28/1984 (Case File 292228)  
**Box:** 42

---

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Inventories, visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

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

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/research-support/citation-guide>

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

*Last Updated: 11/19/2024*

**WHITE HOUSE  
OFFICE OF RECORDS MANAGEMENT  
WORKSHEET**

☐ **X-MEDIA**

☐ H-INTERNAL

**Name of Document:** BRIEFING PAPERS  
FOR PRESIDENT'S  
SCHEDULED  
APPOINTMENTS FOR

M A R 2 8 8 4

**Subject Codes:**

P R 0 0 7 - 0 1

PR 016-01

PR 016-

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ - ☐ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ - ☐ ☐

9-  
2

□ □ □ □ - □ □

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ - ☐ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ - ☐ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ - ☐ ☐

□ □ □ □ - □ □

□ □ □ □ - □ □

□ □ □ □ - □ □

□ □ □ □ - □ □

☐ ☐ ☐ - ☐ ☐

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	-----

□ □ □ □ □  
□ □ □ □ □

☐ ☐ ☐ - ☐

[illegible]

1) Subject: Interview with KTSP-TV for special broadcast on Senator Barry Gordwater.

2) Interview with New York Times correspondents Steven Weisman and Frank Clines

ROUTE TO:	ACTION		DISPOSITION		
Office/Agency (Staff Name)	Action Code	Tracking Date YY/MM/DD	Type of Response	Code	Completion Date YY/MM/DD
RMHENL	RSZ			C	

**Referral Note:**

THE SCHEDULE OF  
PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN



Wednesday, March 28, 1984

9:00 am (30 min)	<u>Staff Time</u> (Baker/Meese/Deaver)	Oval Office
9:30 am (15 min)	<u>Meeting with Harry Shlaudeman</u> (McFarlane)	Oval Office (distributed separately)
9:45 am (15 min)	<u>National Security Briefing</u> (McFarlane)	Oval Office
10:00 am (60 min)	<u>Personal Staff Time</u>	Oval Office
11:00 am (30 min)	<u>Interview Briefing</u> (Speakes)	Oval Office (TAB A)
11:30 am (30 min)	<u>New York Times Interview</u> (Speakes)	Oval Office
12:00 m (60 min)	<u>Lunch</u>	Oval Office
1:15 pm (10 min)	<u>Interview with KTSP TV Phoenix for</u> <u>Special on Senator Barry Goldwater</u> (McManus)	Roosevelt Room (TAB B)
1:30 pm (30 min)	<u>Meeting with Secretary Shultz</u>	Oval Office
2:00 pm (30 min)	<u>Meeting with Ambassador</u> <u>Arthur Hartman</u> (McFarlane)	Oval Office (distributed separately)
2:30 pm	<u>Personal Staff Time</u> <u>Remainder of the Day</u>	Oval Office/ Residence

UNP 03/27/84  
4:00 pm

Received SS

1984 MAR 27 PM 5:46

THE SCHEDULE OF  
PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN



Wednesday, March 28, 1984

9:00 am (30 min)	<u>Staff Time</u> (Baker/Meese/Deaver)	Oval Office
9:30 am (15 min)	<u>Meeting with Harry Shlaudeman</u> (McFarlane)	Oval Office (distributed separately)
9:45 am (15 min)	<u>National Security Briefing</u> (McFarlane)	Oval Office
10:00 am (60 min)	<u>Personal Staff Time</u>	Oval Office
11:00 am (30 min)	<u>Interview Briefing</u> (Speakes)	Oval Office (TAB A)
11:30 am (30 min)	<u>New York Times Interview</u> (Speakes)	Oval Office
12:00 m (60 min)	<u>Lunch</u>	Oval Office
1:15 pm (10 min)	<u>Interview with KTSP TV Phoenix for</u> <u>Special on Senator Barry Goldwater</u> (McManus)	Roosevelt Room (TAB B)
1:30 pm (30 min)	<u>Meeting with Secretary Shultz</u>	Oval Office
2:00 pm (30 min)	<u>Meeting with Ambassador</u> <u>Arthur Hartman</u> (McFarlane)	Oval Office (distributed separately)
2:30 pm	<u>Personal Staff Time</u> <u>Remainder of the Day</u>	Oval Office/ Residence

UNP 03/27/84  
4:00 pm

## REQUEST FOR APPOINTMENTS

To: Officer-in-charge  
Appointments Center  
Room 060, OEOP

Please admit the following appointments on March 28, 1984, 1984

for President of \_\_\_\_\_:  
(NAME OF PERSON TO BE VISITED) (AGENCY)

V. P. Bush

Secretary of State George P. Shultz  
Ambassador Harry Shlaudeman

Internal

~~Robert C. McFarlane~~

~~Raymond F. Burghardt~~

JB

EM

PNKD

## MEETING LOCATION

Building White House

Requested by Raymond F. Burghardt

Room No. Oval Office

Room No. 348 Telephone 3552

Time of Meeting 9:30 AM

Date of request March 27, 1984

Additions and/or changes made by telephone should be limited to five (5) names or less.

APPOINTMENTS CENTER: SIG/OEOB - 395-6046 or WHITE HOUSE - 456-6742

THE SCHEDULE OF  
PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN

DCF



Wednesday, March 28, 1984

9:01 - OVAL

9:00 am  
(30 min)

Staff Time 9:02  
(Baker/Meese/Deaver) 9:25 BUSH

Oval Office

9:30 am  
(15 min)

Meeting with Harry Shlaudeman 9:29 - 9:40  
(McFarlane) (distributed separately)

Oval Office

~~9:45 am  
(15 min)~~

~~National Security Briefing  
(McFarlane)~~

~~Oval Office~~

10:00 am  
(60 min)

Personal Staff Time 9:40 - 11:00

Oval Office

11:00 am  
(30 min)

Interview Briefing 11:00 - 11:42  
(Speakes) *Sp. Baker, Deaver, McManus, Danman, (TAB A)*

Oval Office

11:30 am  
(30 min)

New York Times Interview  
(Speakes) 11:42 - 12:21 *Speakes, Sims, Boreddy, Courtemanche, Fitzwater, Russell*

Oval Office

12:00 m  
(60 min)

Lunch 12:25 - 1:15

Oval Office

1:15 pm  
(10 min)

*Kenna Small (1313-1315)*  
Interview with KTSP TV Phoenix for  
Special on Senator Barry Goldwater  
(McManus) 1:15 - 1:23 (TAB B)

Roosevelt Room

1:30 pm  
(30 min)

Meeting with Secretary Shultz  
1:28 - 1:40 *McFarlane 1:39 -*

Oval Office

2:00 pm  
(30 min)

Meeting with Ambassador  
Arthur Hartman 1:40 - 1:38  
(McFarlane) *VP, SECSTATE, McFarlane, (distributed separately)*  
*Hartman, Hatlock, Deaver*

Oval Office

2:30 pm

Personal Staff Time  
Remainder of the Day

Oval Office/  
Residence

2:40

*RR departed for Residence*

UNP 03/27/84  
4:00 pm





THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

March 27, 1984

INTERVIEW WITH KTSP-TV FOR SPECIAL ON  
SENATOR GOLDWATER

DATE: Wednesday, March 28, 1984  
LOCATION: Roosevelt Room  
TIME: 1:15 p.m. (10 minutes)

FROM: Michael McManus *MM/PS*

I. PURPOSE:

To give your impressions of Senator Barry Goldwater for a one-hour special produced by KTSP-TV, Phoenix, Arizona.

II. BACKGROUND:

Senator Goldwater requested that you take a few moments to appear in this special program tracing his career from his boyhood, his experience as a merchant, his political career as well as his lifestyle and hobbies of flying, being a ham radio operator etc. The questions in the interview will deal only with your impressions of Senator Goldwater, how you first met him, how you feel about him and his various positions, and how you see him as a man, as a Senator, as a Republican.

III. PARTICIPANTS:

The President  
Bill Close, Interviewer  
Bonnie Leverton, Producer  
Plus one cameraman and one lighting man  
Karna Small  
Jann Duval

IV. PRESS PLAN:

White House Photographer only

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS:

You will enter the Roosevelt Room where the camera will be set up; after initial introductions the interview will begin.

VI. REMARKS:

No formal remarks; anticipated question areas and background information on Senator Goldwater are attached.

Recall ISS

1984 MAR 27 PM 2:40

## Anticipated Question Areas

How and when did you first meet Barry Goldwater?

We first met in 1948 or 1949 in California. I was at that time President of the Screen Actors' Guild. A good friend and fellow actor, George Murphy introduced us. It was the beginning of a long and close friendship.

What influence has Goldwater had on the Nation?

Well, I can tell you what Barry considers his greatest accomplishment, and I have to agree: When he was the GOP nominee in the 1964 Presidential race, his policies and vision got the youth of America involved in politics. The young conservatives found a banner to follow, and it didn't stop in 1964. The young people stayed involved in politics, and many are adults now working in this GOP Administration. He certainly influenced this youth!

Barry's conservative views have influenced a wide spectrum of policies. He has always spoken out for state's rights and a strong defense, to name just two. With this Administration's victory in 1980, we have seen a strong movement toward both.

Senator Goldwater doesn't always support you. How do you feel when he goes against you?

There probably isn't a single person alive, much less a politician, who agrees with anyone 100 percent of the time. When Senator Goldwater and I disagree, we talk about it -- sometimes I convince him, sometimes I don't. Honest and honorable individuals can disagree. When Barry disagrees, I may not like it at the moment, but I can accept it. Tomorrow is another day, and there will be agreement more often than not. No grudges are held at either end of the street.

Do you think Senator Goldwater is predictable?

If there is any word that doesn't describe Barry Goldwater, it's predictable!

Received SS

1984 MAR 27 PM 2:41



## THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

### INTERVIEW WITH THE NEW YORK TIMES

DATE: Wednesday, March 28, 1984

PLACE: Oval Office

TIME: 11:30 am (30 minutes)

FROM: Larry Speakes

#### I. PURPOSE

To give the President an opportunity to contribute to the public's understanding of both the Administration's record and the issues, at the beginning of the election year.

#### II. BACKGROUND

The New York primary is Tuesday, April 3, and this will provide the chance for the President to make his views known on issues of concern prior to the primary. The Times has also had interviews with Democratic Presidential candidates.

#### III. PARTICIPANTS

The President

Steven Weisman

Frank Clines

New York Times White House correspondent

New York Times White House correspondent

#### IV. PRESS PLAN

The interview will be for publication in the Times on Thursday, March 29. The New York Times will bring their own photographer for pictures at the beginning of the interview.

#### V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

After introductions and pleasantries, the interview will proceed.

---

#### Attachments:

Talking points

Transcripts of New York Times interviews with Mondale and Hart

1984 MAR 27 PM 3:50

Rec'd S.S.

March 27, 1984

NOTES FOR WEDNESDAY INTERVIEW WITH THE NEW YORK TIMES

General points

- o As this year 1984 began:
  - The recovery, already a year old, was continuing on a strong, solid path;
  - Unemployment was falling fast with people finding jobs at fastest rate in 30 years;
  - Inflation had been under 4% for two years running;
  - Gasoline prices were lower than on inauguration day and gas lines an unhappy memory, not reality;
  - Tax rates were 25% lower than in 1980 -- for everyone.
- o Many -- even those who wished RR well in 1980 -- were sceptics back then. Didn't think progress like this could be made that fast; said it couldn't be done.
- o Couldn't turn around the mess we inherited overnight. The country's been through a lot because that mess was so bad -- but we have turned things around.
- o Really have made a new beginning. Choice for the country to make this year is whether to build on the progress we've made in restoring opportunities for people, or trade it in for a re-run of old policies that failed us in the past.



## DEFICITS

- o RR determined to get them down and hopeful we can get support from Dems in Congress for plan to cut the deficit by \$150 billion in next three years.
- o If not cooperation, then confrontation. RR prepared to use veto if necessary, to keep spending under control.
- o But -- \$150 billion plan is prudent, realistic and balanced. Approximately one-third from higher revenues, one-third from lower defense spending, and a third from lower non-defense spending.
- o Cuts red-ink without higher tax rates, and without cuts in any one program that are unacceptably large.
- o RR was always very serious about deficit cuts and about the SOTU request for bipartisan cooperation.
- o Democrats were sceptical then; some still are and are proposing politically inspired plans they say would cut as much or more from deficit.
- o RR not playing a game of "can-you-top-this?" Confident that when Democrats realize this, we can find basis for agreement in \$150 billion compromise worked out two weeks ago.

### MEESE CONFIRMATION

- o RR made views known in statement of last week.
- o Ed Meese a trusted adviser for 17 years; is fully qualified to be excellent Attorney General.
- o RR wants and expects him to be confirmed and, while we all await outcome of pending inquiries, not appropriate to go beyond this.

### Dems trying to make issue of widespread wrongdoing by Administration officials. Comment?

- o RR's proud of the overall quality of people who staff this Administration. Many who serve in government (now and in past Administrations) do so at considerable personal sacrifice.
- o Unfortunate but true that every Administration has a few who overstep the bounds of propriety, or abuse public trust.
- o A few cases involved serious, proven abuses. Those people are no longer with us.
- o Dems say "questions have been raised" about appointees but they don't point out that in many cases the questions have been answered -- and the people involved given clean bill -- after thorough investigation.
- o Basic point is obvious: It's an election year. Dems are having trouble finding issues to run on.
- o They thought they could run on the economy, but recovery got in their way. They're toying with the deficit as an issue, but their own lack of credibility on fiscal restraint keeps getting in the way.
- o So this month, this is the issue.

## CAMPAIGN '84

- o RR to campaign on two basic points:
  - record of what's been accomplished -- of which we Republicans are proud;
  - what's left to be done and our plans for doing it.
- o Makes little difference, in that kind of campaign, whom Democrats choose as their nominee.
- o Any of the present possibilities is quick to criticize RR's record; suppose that's politics.
- o OK with RR if Dems keep making speeches on what they're against.
- o RR's campaign will tell people what he's for.
- o Voter will decide whether to go with Democratic "aginnners" or go forward with RR's more positive agenda.

### Surprised by Hart rise, Jackson strength?

- o Don't want to comment on "horse-race" aspect of their contest for the nomination.
- o Seems to RR, though, that each of remaining Dems is offering narrow appeal and getting support from only certain narrow segments of the population.

### Doesn't Jackson's success getting blacks to polls hurt RR?

- o For too long, declining voter participation put cloud over U.S. political process.
- o Strong evidence that younger voters getting ready to register and vote -- whether black or white.
- o That's good for the country and the political process.
- o We are going to point out how growing economy, increasing job opportunities, lower inflation helps all and especially helps minorities.
- o One goal of campaign is to add to base of black voters that's -- frankly -- been too small in recent years.

## FAIRNESS

- o Expect we'll hear the unfairness charge from now to November.
- o But it doesn't stand up.
- o Take one example: A working class family making \$8000 at start of 1979 and still making \$8000 at end of 1980.
- o That family started out about \$500 above the official poverty line and -- because of an unfair economic mess that included 25% inflation -- in just two years it ended up almost \$500 below the poverty line.
- o Inflation forced the family into poverty -- nothing fair about that.

## ECONOMY -- OUTLOOK FOR FUTURE

- o Recovery is strong, sustainable.
- o Biggest threat to continued expansion would come from return to tax and spend failed fiscal policy of past. Would refuel inflation, confirm fears still out there that Congress not serious about inflation.

### Does rise in prime signal slowdown?

- o Not at all. Prime went up because of this uncertainty about inflation and because other rates had been edging up in recent weeks.
- o Rates will fall in future provided:
  - Fed continues to provide sufficient money growth for recovery without inflation (Fed agrees with us on GNP growth expected for this year -- just want them to supply enough money to meet expectation;
  - also need Dems to agree work seriously with us on deficit reduction.
- o No one expects GNP growth to remain at 1st quarter "flash" level of 7.2%. But indicators for first two months of 1984 give reason to believe recovery will stay strong -- in expected 4.5% range -- for the rest of the year.
  - Housing starts are way up. Averaged a healthy 1.7 million last year; a booming 2.2 million last month.
  - Auto sales also up; domestic production running over 8 million annual rate;
  - Unemployment drop very encouraging. Growth putting people back to work as we said it would;
  - Factories now running over 80% of capacity;
  - Business investment expected to rise 12% this year, in real terms.

March 27, 1984

FOREIGN POLICY TALKING POINTS FOR  
NEW YORK TIMES INTERVIEW MARCH 28

General points:

- o America is stronger, safer than four years ago.
- o Where we were:
  - Defense spending in real terms was permitted to erode over 20% in the 1970's.
  - Weapons like the B-1 bomber were unilaterally cancelled.
  - Military morale and readiness were way down.
  - Our intelligence capability was guttled.
  - Allies had lost confidence in us, and we had lost confidence in ourselves.
  - The Soviet Union was engaging in adventures with no concern about a Western response.
- o That's all changed:
  - First, our economy -- the basis for our international standing -- was turned around.
  - Military strength is steadily being rebuilt.
  - Strategic programs -- B-1; MX; TRIDENT -- are all on track.
  - Morale, readiness, and intelligence capability have been restored.
  - Allies are firmly with us, particularly in responding to the Soviet SS-20 deployments.
- o We are now able to deal from strength, rather than weakness, and the world is a more stable place because of that -- democracies don't get into wars by being too strong.

What are our national security policies for the future?

- o Much has been accomplished to strengthen the basis for our foreign policy, but much remains to be done.
- o We must keep America's economy strong, leading in a world economic recovery -- look forward to China trip and to economic summit to further our international economic progress.
- o We must keep America's defense rebuilding effort underway -- have cut our own defense budget as part of deficit package, but must not cut further -- efforts to reduce our MX program are particularly disturbing and send the wrong signal.
- o We must reduce the risk of nuclear war and the levels of nuclear armaments.
- o We must strengthen our efforts to maintain stability in key regions of the world -- Central America has pressing needs right now, but we need long-term, dependable programs for that region and for others -- Middle East and Africa, for example.
- o We must strengthen the basis for the expansion of democracy and democratic values in the world.
- o Key to our foreign policy objectives for the next four years is a restoration of the bipartisan consensus in support of U. S. foreign policy.
- o We've done well in some cases -- Scowcroft Commission and other arms control efforts -- Kissinger Commission. Must examine the whole issue of bipartisanship in foreign policy and find ways to keep national security above partisan politics in a way that works. Hope to have more thoughts to put forward on that in the future.

What steps will you take to reduce tensions with the Soviet Union, and what concrete proposals will you have for reacting on arms control agreement with them?

- o Potential for meaningful arms control has to be based on confidence and trust, and where that confidence and trust is called into question, it must be restored, or we risk undermining the process of arms control itself.

- o RR committed to preserving and building upon the arms control process. To make better agreements in the future, we have to learn from the past.
- o U. S. is ready to engage in talks with flexibility and openness. If the Soviets are interested in any respect, they will find us willing to meet them half way.
- o We have said that an agreement based on equality at any level, preferably zero, but anywhere between zero and our ultimate deployment, is fine.
- o In both START and INF, RR already exhibited considerable flexibility. Made a serious effort to meet and incorporate particular areas of Soviet concern into the negotiations, in the hope of reaching a fair and balanced agreement.
- o The need to preserve and strengthen the peace is the heart of U. S. deterrent policy. The U. S. will defend its interests, but it does not seek to threaten the Soviet Union.
- o Although profound and obvious differences exist in values and political systems, we do have common interests such as the avoidance of war and the reduction of existing levels of arms and of tensions generally. Next steps are up to them, and there is promise that they will ultimately respond.



# An Interview With Former Vice-President Walter F. Mondale

Following are excerpts from the transcript of an interview with Walter F. Mondale by Bernard Weinraub:

**Q.** What do you think is the most important problem facing the United States over the next decade? What new ideas do you have for dealing with it?

**A.** The overarching problem is one of the survival of humanity in the face of the growing nuclear menace. If those bombs go off, nothing else would matter. I was the first to propose, to support a negotiated mutual verifiable freeze, and I have proposed institutionalized summit conferences to try to get some agreement with the Soviet Union that will reduce the risk of many things — major power confrontations, but also proliferation — and in other ways try to reduce tensions.

Now that can be tough. They're a police state — I understand all of that. But there hasn't been a serious discussion with the Soviet Union, with heads of state, between the Soviet Union and the United States, really since '74. And that's very, very dangerous.

Obviously the domestic need is to shape an economic policy that assures long-term healthy economic growth and a reassertion of American competitiveness in international competition.

## The Federal Deficit

**Q.** How serious is the Federal deficit, and specifically what would you do to reduce it?

**A.** I see Reaganomics, the deliberate creation of that deficit — it is the worst deliberate economic policy mistake in modern history. It has given us deficits at \$200 billion a year and growing as far as the eye can see, even if there's reasonable economic growth.

It has saddled our children with a trillion-dollar debt, which will continue to grow. And it has driven America in full retreat from international competition, and stunted both savings and investment in new plant and equipment. In short, a disaster.

The deficit must come down. I would do it by several steps. One, scaling the defense budget to reality. Two, managing the farm program sensibly to bring down farm program costs. And I can do that and improve farm income. Three, a national health care cost containment measure to prevent the hemorrhaging of health costs. Four, deletion of turkeys like the Clinch River breeder reactor. And fifth would be the reduction of interest charges by raising revenue and getting some growth. There's a dirty little secret in this Administration

A. Social Security's in good shape and I wouldn't touch it. I want that anxiety lifted off the backs of the senior citizens. The predictions now are that the Social Security trust fund's going to be in surplus during the next decade. There are some questions about demographics in, say, about 2015. Those can be handled when the figures are clearer. But I wouldn't touch Social Security at all.

On health care, which is a coming crisis, I'm for national health care cost containment. And for the introduction of more competition in health care delivery like H.M.O.'s. These programs are being ripped off. Last year Medicare went up by 19 percent, at least three times inflation. And we need a major program to restrain those costs. That's the most important thing right now. But I'm not going to take it out of the quality care for the old folks.

**Q.** In terms of the deficit, would you raise taxes, cut domestic spending, or what? And in each case, by how much? What specifically would you cut?

**A.** I have said several things in the general outline. First, scaling the defense budget to reality. I want a strong defense, but it has to be a sensible defense. And you have to make choices. For example, I would cancel the B-1, but I would move ahead more rapidly with Stealth. I would cancel the MX, but I'd move ahead more rapidly with Midgetman. We need a stronger Navy, but it can't be one that tries to do the impossible. And to seek to project surface naval forces against the land mass of the Soviet Union is a nonstarter. And I would scale the Navy in a way that we didn't seek to achieve that. There's a substantial saving.

Next, I would demand a much higher proportion of procurement be out on bids. There, the Secretary of Defense estimates between 10 and 30 percent of the procurement is waste. And I would put a very strong program in there to reintroduce competition, strengthen the Joint Chiefs and so on. And so the out-year savings there are very substantial.

Let's take the agriculture budget. That has never exceeded \$5 billion a year. And properly administered, keeping supply in relationship to demand, you can both improve farm incomes and keep program costs reasonable. This year, because they let the program go haywire through colossal mismanagement in '81 and '82, they've managed to spend \$31 billion

ings are, you'll breach them. And you have to pay for it. I think far more important right now is weapon choices. And that's why I emphasize my choices.

**Q.** You don't know overall how much it would cut the budget?

**A.** Well, roughly the House figure.

**Q.** That figure being?

**A.** Well, people argue between 4 and 5 percent now. And I would move, incidentally, very rapidly to try to negotiate with the Soviet Union to slow down that rate substantially.

## Relations With Soviet Union

**Q.** What steps would you take to reduce tensions with the Soviet Union, and what concrete proposals do you have for reaching an arms control agreement with them?

**A.** First of all, on arms control, I would try to negotiate a mutual, verifiable freeze. I would resubmit SALT II. I would resume negotiations on a comprehensive test ban. I would reassert controls over the distribution of weapons-grade material. I would leave the ABM treaty intact. I would start negotiating an antisatellite-space-war treaty. And I'm not confident myself I know yet how to do it, but I would try to negotiate some kind of chemical and biological warfare agreement, which is verifiable, which is a very tough area. I'm not claiming to know how to do it yet, but I would do that.

The most important thing I would do is to try to institutionalize U.S.-Soviet summits.

**Q.** Year by year?

**A.** Annual, annual summits. Just like we do with the industrial nations: once a year sit down and grind away. I know how difficult it is; I know the differences. I'm tough enough; I've had relations with the Soviets before. The Soviet is a system that's a police state, power flows from on top, and the tragedy is there hasn't been, as you know — Carter met with Brezhnev in '79, but Brezhnev wasn't capable of conducting business at that time.

**Q.** You mean he was ill?

**A.** I believe, I wouldn't say it publicly, I think he was senescent. He wasn't able to handle details, anything. If it ever got in details, he had to read it.

**Q.** On the Middle East, what would you do differently than President Reagan to seek an overall settlement there?

for two and a half years, based on their policy with at least three illusions. The first illusion was that if you just beat up on Israel and make concessions for her, you will lure Hussein into negotiations. I never thought that was true and it proved not to be true. I don't think that's the way it's done and it shakes confidence in Israel. Secondly, that the Saudis will become a strong, assertive force, even risking Palestinian extremism in the Middle East, and I don't believe that has ever been true.

*Q. Do you mean the Saudis will never become an assertive force?*

A. An assertive, strong force for moderation in the Middle East even if it exposes them to extremism, Shiites, Palestinians, so on? I don't believe it's true. And the third is that Lebanon would moderate if you just beat up on Israel. The fact of it is that — has Syria told anybody they're getting out of Lebanon? And you can add another one, that so-called strategic consensus that they've tried for a year, that I think anybody who'd been around there believes it was a non-starter. So for nearly two years, they pursued policies based on illusions that have now disappeared on them.

In Lebanon for a year after the collapse of the Syrians, the P.L.O. and the Soviets, there was a chance that we could have used that period to try to build a central Lebanese Government. I wouldn't say country-wide, but at least there was a period there. And instead of using that year to press Gemayel and to work with him — and incidentally, the Israelis were at that time occupying the Shuf — we used that again to crowd Israel out of Lebanon and the heat was entirely off Syria and now we've got Syrians back in town and we're pleading with the Israelis not to leave. I think, in all respects, for at least three years this Administration was afraid to be seen in public with the Israelis, and I think that's a mistake. I think we need a public, strategic, cooperative relationship with Israel. They may be moving that way, finally. And I think steadfastness will be respected from the Middle East.

#### Marines in Beirut

*Q. Specifically, what's your position on the deployment of the Marines in Beirut?*

A. I initially supported it. I now think that several steps have to be taken. First of all, we must move as quickly as possible to redeploy American troops and replace them with United Nations forces, other Third World forces and certainly with Lebanese Army forces. After all, it's their country. And I've said for months that those Lebanese forces should be providing perimeter defenses and the rest for us. Our kids

until recently has not been pressed at all. He should be useful.

I would serve notice on Gemayel that there is not an open end on American presence. And as a matter of fact, it's clear that whatever we think of ourselves, we draw fire because we're considered partisan. And so the quicker we can be substituted with Third World, other neutral-type forces, the better. I'd start raising more public hell with Syria. It's clear the Syrians are behind a lot of this terrorism.

*Q. What would you do about Syria?*

A. Well, I'd do two or three things. First of all, I would publicly keep making the points about what they've been doing. I would table a U.N. Security Council resolution and ask them to get out of there, it's not their country. I would go to the members of the Arab League and say, Why don't you respond to Gemayel's requests that you withdraw the Arab League invitation? And I'd be looking around for other ways to put the heat on them.

#### Central America Policy

*Q. What do you think of the Reagan policy in Central America, and what would you do differently?*

A. They Americanized, widened and militarized our policy in Central America. And I would reverse the emphasis in every respect. First of all, it has to be regional and I would work with our friends, the Mexicans, the Costa Ricans, the Panamanians, the Colombians, the Venezuelans, the Contadora group. We need friends in that region for many reasons, including historical reasons. Secondly, I would restore a much stronger sense of human rights. When they went in there they dumped our whole human rights emphasis. They started putting the money through the military side that was responsible for these terrorist squads in El Salvador and everything's gotten worse. They were supporting the Government that was doing this with no strings attached, and now the President has vetoed the human rights amendment, which I think is an outrage. This is another day, but what in the hell was in their mind when they granted that military approval to the outgoing military junta in Argentina, I'll never know. That's another point I'd like to get into. There's some big fish frying in Peru and Chile and Argentina that we should be working on. We're totally concentrated on Central America, but there's a lot more work down there.

Secondly, I would terminate the covert action in Nicaragua. It's counterproductive. I would interdict any efforts on their part to intervene in El Salvador, but above all, I'd push diplomatically for a non-intervention

What an obscenity, it was nearly five years ago that our nuns and labor leaders were killed down there and they still insult our intelligence by saying that some day they'll be brought to justice. This is humiliating and counterproductive and we've got to get much tougher on human rights down there.

*Q. Are you saying the Administration has not been tough on human rights down there?*

A. Absolutely they have not been. As a matter of fact, for two years the implication was that we were wrong in pressing human rights. When they took over, we had a policy in El Salvador of working with the moderates, the church, Social Christian Democrats and the aid that we provided was principally economic; there was some military, but all of it went through civilians, because we were using our money to strengthen moderation. When they took over, they dumped all that and put the money through the military again, and many of those same people make up these death squads that are running around killing people, and the signal was out that the heat was off. And now the President vetoes this amendment requiring human rights reports, and everybody that I've read, experts, says this is now a signal to d'Aubuisson and the crew to get going again. And mind you, apparently this Kissinger commission went down there and met with d'Aubuisson and were horrified by what d'Aubuisson told them. Because he in effect apparently said that yes, he was doing it and it was important for the civilized world to continue it.

#### Nicaragua and the Sandinistas

*Q. In terms of Nicaragua, would you accept the presence of the Sandinistas?*

A. Here's a case where the Reagan definition almost self-fulfills itself. Three years ago there was a hope, albeit a minor hope, that moderation could occur in Nicaragua. There were some business elements, the editor of La Prensa, and others. By trying to emphasize moderation and de-emphasizing outside threats there was a chance — I won't overargue it — but there was a chance that moderating influences would gain strength in Nicaragua. Instead of that, by making an all-out covert action that threatened the survival of the Sandinistas, they provided the perfect excuse for the extremists to get rid of the moderates, to silence dissent, to excuse all of the substantial failings of that Government by the best of all defenses, and that is, we're under threat by outside forces. Now we've got a lot of wreckage to undo. I would not tolerate Nicaraguan infiltration.

that rule, and I'm convinced that it will be very counterproductive.

*Q. In '74 you took yourself out of the race. Your biographer said you didn't have the lust for power. And Hubert Humphrey wondered whether you had at that point "fire in the belly." Why the change?*

A. First of all, in 1974, as I said then, I didn't think I was ready. I had done a lot of work seeking the Presidency and I came to the conclusion I wasn't ready. Not either in terms of what I wanted to do with the country, or ready in terms of what I had to do to seek the Presidency. I just wasn't ready. And I did the right thing in getting out, and I feel good about it.

Now, I am ready. I'm ready because I've had a lot more experience, both in the Senate and the White House, and I know it. And I've conducted two and a half years of very intensive campaigning, and I think it's working very well.

#### **'Cautious Attitude' on Grenada**

*Q. You have been criticized within the party and even among some of your supporters for generally taking a very good, cautious attitude toward the Administration's Lebanese policies and Grenada.*

A. The fact of it is, on Lebanon I have been very critical from the start of the policies. They have made a hash of Lebanon and I've said so from the start. So there's nothing to that at all. The Grenada situation was first complicated by the censorship that surrounded it. It is now clear that many of the claims that the Administration made for justifying their intervention were speculative and in many cases not bound in truth.

#### **Q. Speculative?**

A. Well sure, they said that the Cubans and the Soviets were about to set up a base. Or that they were asked in by the neighbors. All of those things and other facts, alleged facts, at the time — you know, we got there just in time, I think was the argument. I think it's very dubious. The thing that, however, bothers me is that if I as President of the United States came to the conclusion that Americans were in trouble and that force were necessary to protect them, which just might have been the case in Grenada, I may have had to move in on a rescue effort and so I have restrained myself from drawing a conclusion that's different from that realization. Now the evidence there is problematical. It goes both directions. But when people like Mike Barnes whom I greatly respect and

#### **Emulating Earlier Presidents**

*Q. Was there or is there a President that you would most like to emulate, that has been most effective?*

A. There are bits and pieces of Presidencies that I'd like to stitch together. Johnson's feel for the poor and for civil rights was deep and superb. Kennedy's sense of history and capacity to inspire Americans was thrilling. Truman's grip and spunk and feel for working Americans. Carter had a sincerity of faith and values that I found very impressive. Roosevelt had a boldness that we need again. They all had weaknesses as all human beings, but those are elements of those Presidencies that I found.

*Q. How do you deal with the criticism that some of the policies and even some of the personnel that are working actively for you are a re-tread of the policies that were repudiated in 1980?*

A. First of all, I've fought my whole life for a nation where discrimination is gone, an American life where people can aspire to the same goals regardless of who they are. And I find the fact that a black is now seeking the Presidency to be a sign of a more mature nation. Reverend Jackson could in fact prove to be a contributor to the Democratic victory. If, as may well be the case, more people are encouraged and in fact do join the public process, registering to vote, that could very well help me in my election. I strongly believe that, I'm almost certain I'm going to be nominated. I've got to win it on my own but I feel very good about that now. And I'm certain that we're going to have a unified convention. Just how it's going to be done right now isn't clear, but here's where a lot of people lack historical insight. This is one of the sweetest primaries there's ever been. It's inevitable that candidates seeking the same office are going to be negative from time to time, but as I talk to Democrats and even to the

---

## Where They Stand/*Walter F. Mondale*

---

# Mondale Leads in Party, But Needs to Win Voters

By **BERNARD WEINRAUB**

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Dec. 25 — Former Vice President Walter F. Mondale leads the Democratic Presidential race in national polls, money raised and straw votes won. But as the election year nears and the campaign accelerates, Mr. Mondale and his staff remain nervous about the question that has dominated the campaign.

Can the Minnesota Democrat stir the voting population as skillfully as he has won the endorsement of the party establishment?

"It's going very well, it's scary it's going so well," said one of Mr. Mondale's aides.

Other Democrats acknowledge that Mr. Mondale's successful efforts to gain the support of a wide array of special interest groups such as organized labor and feminists may lead to his triumph at the Democratic convention in July. But in "making promises to everyone," said one Democrat, Mr. Mondale leaves himself vulnerable to the Republicans in the general election.

Beyond this, even some Democrats supporting Mr. Mondale voice concerns that, despite his elaborate organization, the candidate's stolid, low-key personality and his cautious, pragmatic approach have left many Democrats uninspired.

In the meantime, Mr. Mondale's rivals concede that his ambitious campaign and almost flawless performance have been impressive.

Mr. Mondale is descended from Scandinavian farmers. His father, Theodore, was a relatively poor Methodist minister and farmer in Minnesota; Walter Mondale, in his stump speeches now, repeatedly calls himself "a minister's kid."

"He believed Christ taught a sense of social mission and this was heavily given to me throughout my childhood," Mr. Mondale said several months ago.

Mr. Mondale's ideological roots can be traced directly to the Middle Western New Deal liberalism of the 1930's and 1940's and the popular currents that helped shape the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota. Mr. Mondale helped Hubert H. Humphrey's 1947 campaign for Mayor of Minneapolis, and the following year, while at Macalaster College in St. Paul, he was an organizer for Mr. Humphrey, who became his mentor.

After serving in the Korean War as an Army corporal, Mr. Mondale graduated from the University of Minnesota Law School and then practiced law for four years before Gov. Orville L. Freeman appointed him state Attorney General in 1960. Four years later, Mr. Mondale was appointed to the United States Senate to replace Mr. Humphrey, who was elected Vice President.

Mr. Mondale's Senate career was marked by a careful and pragmatic liberalism. His friends said he was a "political realist," but he has been criticized for the fact that no major legislation bore his name.

### 'Fire in the Belly'

In 1973, Mr. Humphrey said in a newspaper interview that he wondered whether Mr. Mondale had "the fire in the belly" it takes to become President, and when he dropped out of the Presidential race in 1976, Mr. Mondale himself said he did not "have the overwhelming desire to be President which is essential for the kind of campaign that is required."

At this point Mr. Mondale and his advisers are buoyed by their campaign over the last year.

Their strategy, according to one aide, was to "set a fast and vicious pace, declaring our financial goals and meeting them, declaring our endorsement goals and meeting them, creating the image of Mondale as a winner and exhausting the resources of most of the others."

Mr. Mondale has raised \$9 million in 1983 compared with John Glenn's

# An Interview With Senator Gary Hart, Democrat of Colorado

Following are key questions and answers from an interview with Senator Gary Hart by Frank Lynn:

**Q. What do you think is the most important problem facing the United States over the next decade and what new ideas do you have for dealing with it?**

**HART.** Three most important, I would say. I'd like to restructure this country's economy to accommodate the twin revolutions — the internationalization of our economy and the transition from an industrial to a post-industrial economy; second, to achieve genuine equality by removing the remaining barriers to minorities and for women. And third is to reverse the nuclear arms race. I'll touch on other issues that I think are important, like serious environmental problems and education problems. But I would list those three.

In restructuring the economy, I believe we have to direct private investment into modernization of our basic manufacturing industries and training of our workers so that by the end of the 1980's we are as efficient, productive and competitive as any industrial nation on earth.

Second, I think we need a long-term jobs program both to re-employ structurally unemployed people and to accommodate a serious national problem, and that is in rebuilding and repairing our infrastructure — the basic public facility for the nation. The transportation system, the urban facilities, transportation, water and its treatment facilities that have been permitted to decay because of under-investment.

The bad news is that it will cost us a lot of money, the good news is it will re-employ millions of people. It's a long-term, 15-to-20-year program.

The third thing is to have a separate set of policies to stimulate the growth sector of the economy, which is services and technology, where we presently have leadership but will not retain that leadership unless we invest in education. Here I disagree fundamentally with President Reagan. It will require dollar investments at all levels of Government. But also make education our No. 1 domestic priority in more than dollar terms. The President emphasizes to Americans how important this is going to be for our economic security in the future. I'd open an aggressive trade policy. I resist the protectionist trends in our party. And tax reform with an emphasis on capital formation. I've put forward my own specific tax reform proposal. It's a progressive tax on income with a bias toward savings and investment.

## Three Tax Reform Goals

**Q. You mention the tax reform program. Is the idea getting more revenue or is it being more just?**

**A.** It would seek to achieve two goals — really three. Simplicity and equities, making the tax system simpler and fairer, but it would also seek to achieve the other goal, capital formation. My tax reform idea is real supply side economics. Kemp-Roth said we're going to cut your taxes and hope you save the money. I reverse that. I say if you save and invest your money, then you don't pay taxes on it during a period of a bad investment.

**Q. When you were talking about nuclear arms reduction and a freeze, could we defend ourselves?**

**A.** Yes. Now that does not mean that there does not need to be modernization to achieve or maintain stability. Stability is not just a phrase. What it means is preservation of a deterrent. To preserve the deterrent you have to make it survivable to a first-strike attack, which means, in some cases, such as the land-based missiles, you have to make them mobile.

Now you can achieve two results by shifting to a mobile land-based system. You can make it more survivable, less vulnerable to a first-strike attack, and you can reduce its own first-strike capability by making it a single warhead missile, rather than a multiple warhead missile.

If you're going to start World War III you don't do it with a single warhead mobile system.

## 'Monumentally Serious' Deficit

**Q. How serious is the growing Federal deficit and specifically what would you do to reduce it — would you raise taxes, cut domestic spending, cut defense spending or what? In each case where and by how much?**

**A.** It's monumentally serious. The reason is that if you are \$200 billion in debt every year, that sooner or later will prevent the kind of private borrowing and investment necessary just to restimulate this economy and get beyond just getting it back on its feet, but making it really expand as it did in the 1960's.

I as a Democrat think that's serious because I don't think our country will achieve our social goals that the Democratic Party has laid out for itself until we increase revenues. And the only way to increase revenues is to have a growing, expanding econ-

omy. My argument is unique. It is that Ronald Reagan, by procuring all these new nuclear weapons systems, is not only unhinging the Federal budget with these deficits but also making us weaker by plundering these two accounts of personnel readiness. So the Hart budget re-invests funds in those two accounts of personnel readiness and sharply reduces the procurement of unnecessary weapons systems and saves us about 100 billions of dollars over the next two to three years.

Second, is to reform the entitlements programs, particularly Medicare and Medicaid, to provide for cost effective alternatives for delivery of medical care and services to the indigent and the elderly.

The third is to reduce interest rates along the lines proposed by Senator Moynihan and myself a year and a half ago to require the Federal Reserve Board to target its interest rates sufficient to permit private investment to accommodate the growth that I'm talking about. We use a formula that was — we had helped him devise it, which essentially would be a monetary system providing sufficient supplies of money to achieve the rate of growth of the growth periods since World War II. We get all the growth periods since World War II, average them out and then would require the Federal Reserve Board to target its money supply to achieve that rate of growth.

The way you were able to do that is to have an alternative anti-inflationary policy. Mine is a tax-based incomes policy which essentially rewards business and labor for holding wage and price demands below an inflationary guideline through the tax laws. If you have that kind of system, which is stronger than jawbones but not as restrictive as wage and price supports, then you can have an expanding monetary supply which does permit the kind of private investment necessary to achieve that rate of growth.

The third or fourth thing that I would do is that public works job program focused on the infrastructure that would expand the revenue base by expanding, not just increasing, taxes on people who are working today but increasing the number of people who are working.

So the four points are:

¶ Scale in military.  
¶ Reform the entitlements programs.

¶ Bring interest rates down to achieve more private investment.

¶ And put people back to work repairing the infrastructure.

**Q. You mention a scaleback. Do you put any kind of a figure on that?**



2 of 3

A. You save. That's the whole point. All of these are designed to prevent people from going into hospitals and doctors' offices for every minor ailment. What's driving up the cost of the system, Medicare and Medicaid, is that people have nowhere to go but hospitals and doctors' offices to take care of minor illnesses.

*Q. What about other areas of entitlement, Social Security and Federal pensions?*

A. Social Security has been reformed in the session of Congress. The reforms we adopted on a bipartisan basis that accelerate revenues and also reduce some benefits for those in the upper income brackets put the system on its feet, make it fiscally sound for the next 10 to 15 years at least.

It is estimated now there will not have to be any major reforms in Social Security until we approach the latter part of the century.

*Q. How much growth after inflation should there be in the military budget? Which weapons programs proposed by the President would you alter or delete and why?*

A. In reverse order I've mentioned the MX, which I am a principal opponent of, the B-1 bomber, which other Democratic candidates support.

#### More Conventional Weapons

*Q. You'd take these out?*

A. I'd take those out. I would replace the two new nuclear aircraft carriers and their task groups with smaller conventional aircraft carriers. I'd build more conventionally powered submarines instead of the \$1 billion nuclear powered submarines. I would replace F-18 with F-16's and A-6's and A-7's, and I would shift investment defense over toward readiness and manpower on to procurement. So I'd reorder the priorities within the defense pie.

*Q. Is there any growth factor in that?*

A. The Hart budget averages out, I think, at about  $4\frac{1}{2}$  to 5 percent growth.

*Q. What steps would you take to reduce the tension with the Soviet Union, and what concrete proposals do you have for reaching an arms control agreement with the Soviets?*

A. One relates to the other. Tensions will not be reduced until we're achieving progress in reducing nuclear weapons. To believe we can have better relations while we're having an arms race is a fool's paradise.

I put forward my arms control agenda two years ago that called for an across-the-board negotiated halt to production of new systems. It called for a 50 percent reduction in the most destabilizing weapons, mostly the multiple warhead land-based systems. It called for a joint crisis monitoring system between ourselves and the Soviet Union so that we could on a high level, military basis share information about movements the other side is making to prevent the accident.

A. It's necessary. Given the pace and drive behind this military buildup — the nuclear buildup — unless it's attacked first at the summit level I don't think you're going to get real arms reduction.

#### Relying on Self-Interest

*Q. What degree of trust do you have in the Soviet leadership?*

A. On a scale of 10, about 2. But arms control, in my judgment, shouldn't be based on trust. It should be based on self-interest, mutual self-interest and independent verifiability. I would not negotiate an arms control agreement the compliance with which this nation itself could not verify.

*Q. So then following that, would they ever agree for independent verifiability? They haven't so far.*

A. They did in SALT 1 and they did in SALT 2. Both those treaties provide for what is called national technical means verification. Essentially what that was — surprisingly very little is understood on this side — was an agreement between both nations that we would not cover up what we were doing enabling each side in effect to watch the other side. And we do that primarily through overhead satellites.

*Q. On the Middle East. What would you do differently than Reagan in seeking an overall Middle East settlement and specifically what is your position on the deployment of Marines in Beirut?*

A. Well, I would first of all try to get the nation back to the mainstream of our relationship with Israel, which is a solid, dependable, reliable relationship. It is totally dependent upon trust and good will, common values and common understanding. And I would base that on United States national self-interest. Our relationship with Israel is not just the right thing to do, it's in our interest to do it and perpetuate it.

What criticisms I have of individual Israeli governments I would primarily discuss behind the scenes, whether it has to do with settlements or the reduction of the refugees in the camps in Beirut or whatever.

Lebanon is a stumbling block to that now. We will not pacify Lebanon nor do we have the strategic capability of reconstructing Lebanon. We don't have the military capability. We don't have the diplomatic capability. It will have to be resolved by Lebanese. Our role ought to be diplomatic. If the furtherance of that role requires a military presence, that presence ought to be on ships and our planes at sea and not our marines on shore. The U.N. can replace the marines. The marines ought to be gotten out. They should have been gotten out a year ago.

*Q. How about Syria's role in this? Do you think we should try to negotiate with Syria and take into consideration their interests?*

A. They see Lebanon as a client-state of theirs and they wish to reserve a dominant influence in Leba-

ated settlement of the conflict there. I would remove American military forces from Honduras, which the Reagan Administration promised the Congress it would in December of 1983, and there are 5,000 American military forces in Honduras and no plans to get them out. And I would terminate the military financial support to the counterrevolutionaries operating against the Government of Nicaragua.

#### Decay in U.S. Cities

*Q. On American housing, the decay continues in the big cities. Do you think there's a need and a capability of the Federal Government to do a massive program?*

A. There is certainly the need and urban problems, and urban housing particularly, would be high priorities. Having said that, that doesn't mean that there are going to be massive resources available. It's going to take four to five years — the end of this decade to achieve reductions in the Reagan deficits that we the public have to afford.

*Q. This whole area of social welfare. Do you think we're entering an era now where the best we can hope for is maintenance of present programs?*

A. No. My Administration will try to do two things. One is reconstruct after the decimating cuts by the Reagan Administration the absolutely necessary programs for the well-being of those who cannot help themselves. That is disabled people, children, dependent children and the elderly. We can do all of that just by cutting out the MX missile, transferring a fraction of those dollars.

You get a separate category. Here's where I differ from traditional Democrats. Those are the physically and mentally capable people who are denied access to the economy — mostly the minority — women and young people. There what we have to have is the full ladder of opportunity, not just the safety net but a ladder of opportunity: job training, educating the poor, new entrepreneurs, access to capital at a quarter of the cost, and some training and education on how to operate a business.

What able-bodied people want is not only the chance to have a job but by owning and operating their own businesses. What I propose for minority people for women and others is a set of policies designed to help him get into the business marketplace.

#### State of Hart Campaign

*Q. The general perception is that your campaign is lagging, that it hasn't taken off as some people expected it would. Do you agree with the assumption?*

*Q. Another thing said about you is that you are neither ideological fish nor fowl. The conservatives think you're a liberal, and the liberals don't think you're liberal enough. Is it fair and is it an advantage or disadvantage?*

*A. I think it's an advantage. My roots in this party are very deeply into the principles of equality and justice, which makes me a liberal. My voting record on civil rights and civil liberties, rights of women, environment, education, the traditional Democratic agenda are as good as anyone else's in this race and better than most. Issues change. Principles don't change. The economy is different today. What I'm trying to do is just figure out how to make a new economy grow. That requires new programs. That's different from John Kennedy, that's different from Franklin Roosevelt. What makes my candidacy is that I am going beyond the traditional agenda. We have to have new programs, new programs to make this economy grow, to offer that opportunity to achieve that equality and to achieve that justice.*

*So it's not a question of ideologically being fish or fowl, it's a question of a traditional Democrat, a person committed to the traditional values of the Democratic Party seeking new ways in a changing time to achieve those values.*