



# LAUCKS FOUNDATION

## Reprint Mailing 117

As a public service, Laucks Foundation calls attention to published material that might contribute toward clarification of issues affecting world peace, equity among peoples and environmental responsibility.

**February 1992**

**Eulah C. Laucks  
President  
P.O. Box 5012  
Santa Barbara, CA.  
93150-5012**

This expanded issue of the Reprint Mailing features excerpts from MAC NEIL/LEHRER NEWSHOUR transcripts of conversations with some of the candidates running for the office of President of the United States. Senator Harkin's excerpt is from the NEWSHOUR's discussion of his speech before the Democratic National Committee.

	<u>Page</u>
Former Governor Jerry Brown	3
Commentator Patrick Buchanan	7
Governor Bill Clinton	12
Senator Tom Harkin	16
Senator Bob Kerrey	17
Former Senator Eugene McCarthy	22
Senator Paul Tsongas	26

(Permission to reprint granted by MAC NEIL/LEHRER PRODUCTIONS)

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1991

# Herald Tribune

Published With The New York Times and The Washington Post

## A Politician Needs Principles and Good Manners

NEW YORK — Please try to imagine the following, somewhat absurd situation: A literary critic known for his merciless judgment and piercing look, capable of discovering any false tone in a novel or story, is suddenly confronted with the task of writing a novel. Everyone is waiting with curiosity, and even a certain amount of malicious joy, to see how he succeeds in meeting the high targets he himself had set before, not knowing that one day he would have to make the effort to satisfy them.

For years I used to criticize practical politics as a mere technology of vying for power and as a purely pragmatic activity whose objective is not to perform selfless service to citizens in accordance with one's conscience, but only to win their favor with a view to staying in power or gaining more of it. As an independent intellectual, I was continuously developing my concepts of politics as a selfless service to fellow human beings and as morality in practice, a high-principled politics which I tentatively termed "nonpolitical politics."

Fate has indeed played a strange joke on me, as if it were telling me that after having been so smart, I should now show all those whom I have criticized the right way to do it. No wonder my present position is hardly enviable: All my political activities, and maybe all the policies pursued by Czechoslovakia, are being examined under the microscope which I once built myself.

After a year and a half of the presidency in a country ridden with problems which presidents in stable democracies never dream of, I have not been compelled to retract anything. Not only have I not had to change my views, but I have even been confirmed in them.

Despite all the political misery I am confronted with every day, it still is my profound conviction

By Vaclav Havel

*President Havel of Czechoslovakia received an honorary doctor of laws degree on Sunday from New York University. Here are excerpts from his address:*

that the very essence of politics is not dirty; dirt is brought in only by wicked people. I admit that this is an area of human activity where the temptation to advance through unfair actions may be stronger than elsewhere, and which thus makes higher demands on human integrity. But it is not true at all that a politician cannot do without lying or intriguing. That is sheer nonsense, often spread by those who want to discourage people from taking an interest in public affairs.

Of course, in politics, just as anywhere else in life, it is impossible, and it would not be sensible, always to say everything bluntly. Yet that does not mean one has to lie. What is needed here are tact, instinct and good taste. That, in fact, has been one of the things that surprised me most in the realm of high politics, where good taste is more important than all the education in political science.

All this is a matter of form: knowing how long I should speak, when to begin and when to finish; how to say something politely that the other party does not like to hear; how to pick out what is essential at the given moment and to refrain from talking about nonessential things that nobody is interested in listening to; how to remain steadfast in one's position without offending the other party; how to create a friendly atmosphere in order to facilitate demanding negotiations; how to keep the conversation going without imposing oneself on one's partner or creating in him the impression that he is being ignored; how to maintain a balance between the serious political subjects and the lighter, relaxing

ones; knowing when and where to appear, and when and where to remain absent, and what measure of candor or restraint to choose.

It is also a matter of having a kind of instinct for the period, for the atmosphere that marks it, for the sentiments of the people, the nature of their troubles, and their mental disposition. That, too, is perhaps more important than various sociological surveys.

While education in political science, law, economics, history and culture is certainly invaluable for every politician, it is not, as I can see time and again, the most important thing. Much more important are establishing contact and maintaining a sense of measure; the ability to imagine oneself in one's partner's position and to address him, and the capability of perception and the quick assessment of problems and the condition of human souls.

I certainly do not mean to imply that I possess all these qualities. But when a man has his heart in the right place and good taste, he can not only do well in politics but is even predetermined for it. If someone is modest and does not yearn for power, he is certainly not ill-equipped to engage in politics; on the contrary, he belongs there. What is needed in politics is not the ability to lie but rather the sensibility to know when, where, how and to whom to say things.

It is not true that people of high principle are ill-suited for politics. The high principles have only to be accompanied by patience, consideration, a sense of measure and understanding for others. It is not true that only coldhearted, cynical, arrogant, haughty or brawling persons can succeed in politics. Such people are naturally attracted by politics. In the end, however, politeness and good manners weigh more.

*International Herald Tribune*

CONVERSATION with Democrat JERRY BROWN, the former Governor of California

(From transcript of the MAC NEIL/LEHRER NEWS HOUR aired Oct. 23, 1991)

MS. WOODRUFF: Next tonight, the 1992 campaign for President. We have another in our series of interviews with those on the road to the White House. Our guest tonight is Jerry Brown, the former Governor of California, and now a candidate for the Democratic nomination. We'll hear from him after this Kwame Holman backgrounder.

SPOKESMAN: Please welcome the next President of the United States, Gov. Jerry Brown.

MR. HOLMAN: On Monday, Jerry Brown, former governor of California, known as the quintessential political maverick, used a traditional setting to announce his candidacy for President, Independence Hall in Philadelphia.

JERRY BROWN, Democratic Presidential Candidate: The leaders of Washington's incumbent party, both Democrats and Republicans, have failed their duty. They've placed their own interest above the national interest. They have allowed themselves to be trapped, and in some cases corrupted by the powerful forces of greed. It's time for them to go!

MR. HOLMAN: Brown condemned both major political parties, the Washington establishment, and the power of Political Action Committees. He called for limiting the terms of members of Congress and vowed he would accept no campaign contribution larger than \$100.

JERRY BROWN: This candidacy rests on a real faith in the people. That's why I won't accept any contribution over \$100. If corruption is the problem, then just don't accept it. If political money is the issue, then don't take it.

MR. HOLMAN: In announcing his Presidential candidacy, Brown chose the same strategy as other Democratic candidates, portraying himself as an outsider working against the political status quo. But, in fact, he grew up in a political, staunchly Democratic household. His father, Pat Brown, was governor of California from 1958 to 1966. Jerry Brown spent a good deal of his childhood at political gatherings -- here with the family as his father declared his candidacy for California attorney general. In 1956, the young Brown entered a seminary for Jesuit priests but later dropped out. Eventually, he graduated from the University of California at Berkeley and from Yale Law School.

SWEARING IN CEREMONY SPOKESMAN: And that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of --

MR. HOLMAN: Brown won his first race for the California governor's seat and served two terms from 1975 to 1983. As governor, his style was decidedly unconventional. He declined to use the state supplied limousine or to live in the governor's mansion. Brown, instead, rented a small room and slept on a mattress on the floor. Many of his policies defied the labels "liberal" or "conservative." Brown was known as thoughtful, even aloof, but became a passionate voice for the growing environmental movement.

JERRY BROWN: If the Clean Air Act is gutted and the Reagan administration goes ahead with the offshore drilling, we're going to really choke on the resulting air pollution.

MR. HOLMAN: Brown's lifestyle, his interest in the environment and space age technology led some critics to dub him "Governor Moonbeam."

JERRY BROWN: I anticipate a tough campaign. I'm running as an underdog.

MR. HOLMAN: Brown tried and failed to get the Democratic Presidential nomination in 1976 and in 1980. After an unsuccessful run for the Senate from California in 1982, he took a long sabbatical from politics, studying Zen Buddhism in Japan and working with Mother Teresa in India. But by 1989, Brown was head of the California Democratic Party and reportedly mulling over another Senate run in 1992. Instead, the 53 year old Brown is set on a third quest for the White House at a time when voter dissatisfaction with the political status quo is high and rising. Political analysts say that times may just be right for the fiery anti-establishment message of Jerry Brown.

MS. WOODRUFF: I spoke with Gov. Brown here in New York late this afternoon. Governor, thank you for being with us. You've run for President two times before, didn't make it. Why are you trying a third time?

GOV. BROWN: I'm trying a third time possibly following in the footsteps of my predecessor, Ronald Reagan, who tried a third time and was successful, but more to the point, because I came back after seven years away from politics, I was shocked by the depth of paralysis and corruption and distance from the people of California and from the people of America, and I believe that I can be a catalyst for change to restore the vitality to my own party and give the voters in this country a real choice.

MS. WOODRUFF: What do you mean when you say things are corrupt, that there's something wrong with the system?

GOV. BROWN: What I'm saying is that politicians have to spend inordinate amounts of time raising money, talking to a fraction of the American people, in order to get the resources to buy the TV ads, to pay the highly professional consultants, to communicate with a shrinking minority of Americans who still vote. And I believe this democratic process is declining almost in tandem with our economy and with our social structure, and that's what I want to provide, some truth, some opening, and what I call a second "American Revolution."

MS. WOODRUFF: But you talk about corruption in the system and the amount of money that has to be raised. Wasn't it that way when you ran for Governor in the 1970s?

GOV. BROWN: When I ran for Governor, it was about 2 million, less than \$2 million, to run a campaign. And my first year we never even went to a fund-raiser. We did the business of the people, of government. Now, the day you're sworn in, that moment, your first official act is to have a breakfast fund-raiser. In California, it takes \$18 million to run for the U.S. Senate. Now, the everyday American is not giving you that money. It is a narrow fraction, the top 1 percent, or paid lobbyists whose job is to advance a narrow, an interest less than the interest of the American people. I'm not saying these people are evil. I was in it. I'm just as much a part of it. But what I'm saying is it's reached a point where we have to change it, the paralysis, the gridlock. The cynicism, the anger is there and I believe based on my experience and my understanding that I can be a vehicle, a means for change, for people making that choice. They want to change it, and that's why I limit my contributions to \$100, because that can't work unless tens of thousands, probably hundreds of thousands people, claim this campaign as their own. And as they make it their own, it will truly then create something different. It'll cut the umbilical cord to a process that no longer works.

MS. WOODRUFF: You talk about this and yet up until just a few months ago, you were chairman of the Democratic Party in California, our biggest state populationwise, you were involved in this -

GOV. BROWN: I sure was.

MS. WOODRUFF: -- very sort of fund-raising that you're now railing against.

GOV. BROWN: I was very much involved in it and of course, was involved to support a party and most of these interest groups don't even want to give to a party and making the calls to the party, they'd often say, I want to give directly to the candidate. I want him to know where the money's coming from. And just day after day of doing this, and after I did it, and this is what really got to me, Dianne Feinstein lost, the party raised millions of dollars, she raised 20 million, and the conclusion of all the people around her was she didn't have enough money. They wanted more and at that point something snapped. And I just said, this is crazy. We must change it now. And that's when I began to say I don't want to be a chairman of this party. I want to go out and be a candidate and offer a restoration of the real spirit that this party was founded on 200 years ago.

MS. WOODRUFF: Why are you running as a Democrat? Because when you announced, you said there's really only one party, and that's the incumbent, the Republicans and the Democrats in Washington.

GOV. BROWN: They've merged into a Washington party. That's true.

MS. WOODRUFF: Why are you running as a Democrat?

GOV. BROWN: Because I am a Democrat, my father was a Democrat, my sister is an elected Democrat. This is our party. It has been removed from us by an evolution of dependency on special

interest groups and it's enormous. It's not even tens of millions, it's hundreds of millions, and I believe it can be changed with the President and a Congress who will require free television, franking privileges, and an arena for public discourse that allows candidates to talk to the people without becoming beggars and prostitutes, and that what the system now forces them to be.

MS. WOODRUFF: You're talking about these ideas now, and yet, as you well know, many people look at Jerry Brown and they see someone who's unconventional, who's unpredictable, even eccentric, someone who --

GOV. BROWN: Well, when you say eccentric, what would you mean by that? Is that not living in the mansion, is that not taking a pay raise.

MS. WOODRUFF: Sleeping on a mattress in an apartment when you were Governor of California.

GOV. BROWN: For paying my own rent? It's a lot better than stiffing out on tabs for food, bouncing checks like these people in Washington are in utter contempt for the people who sent them there.

MS. WOODRUFF: Someone who went off to study Zen Buddhism for several years.?

GOV. BROWN: Yes. And I studied Zen Buddhism in the Japanese culture which is our No. 1 economic adversary and where I was studying it there were two admirals in the Japanese navy. I understand the culture of Japan, the mind set, and nothing would qualify me more for the trade battles that loom ahead for this country.

MS. WOODRUFF: Why did you do that and what did you learn from it?

GOV. BROWN: Well, what I learned is that my own Catholic tradition is even more true than I could experience and that all these traditions and world religions at their base have obviously a common theme, because it's touching the ultimate reality and Buddhism, which is a powerful religion based on compassion, Christianity based on love, those, you sense it, sometimes you have to see different language, different tradition, understand your own tradition. And I also am very interested in the world and people in different countries. And I believe that is another qualification. Unlike George Bush, who rides around in luxury on Air Force One, I've seen ordinary people in Calcutta, in --

MS. WOODRUFF: You work with Mother Teresa in India.

GOV. BROWN: And I've been all over the world. I've seen the way regular people live and that is very important for a person who's going to lead this country, because we're getting very separated from the people of other nations and the world is getting much smaller and I think that's another asset, not an eccentricity, not something -- I don't think it's wrong to know other people, and just because the Japanese are different or the Chinese or the Indians, we ought to go in and share some of their culture and their tradition, and, yes, understand some of their religion.

MS. WOODRUFF: But you, of course, don't deny there's an unconventionality about Jerry Brown, about Jerry Brown's approach, the nickname "Governor Moonbeam?"

GOV. BROWN: You could say it that way and maybe it's because I have had that special gift, I've had time, I've had resources, I've had an education. I had the opportunity to study under the Jesuits for eight years and I want to give some of that back and I want -- It's not ordinary. I didn't work in a factory. I didn't have to come out of poverty. My father was Governor of California. I had these benefits. But they also gave me a deep understanding of the American political system and I believe that I can make a contribution for all the people, even learning from my mistakes and I've made a lot of them. I have my flaws. I don't in any way disavow that.

MS. WOODRUFF: You said, in fact, in the letters you wrote to your supporters last month as you looked back in your political career, you saw some things you would do differently, you recognize the mistakes you wish you had avoided. Like what?

GOV. BROWN: Well, probably the No. 1 mistake that I made, I didn't build, restore the vitality to the party in California to go out among people and build the kind of constituency that could carry policies through. Government, even if you win, the pattern of power, the pressure of lobbying is such that if you don't build almost a movement behind you, there's nothing you can do when you're elected, very little. It's very marginal. And I think the change, the level of change needed, requires

a pause, requires a mobilization of the American people beyond anything we've seen since perhaps the depression. And that's really what I'm inviting people to join. Another candidate won't solve our problems, the people themselves have to get involved, they have to take over the political process, or they'll never get their government back.

MS. WOODRUFF: Reporters who've covered you for a long time point out how you've changed your mind on a number of issues that you now espouse. For example, you talk about term limits, you're for them.

GOV. BROWN: I've never changed my mind on term limits. That was written in the New York Times; it just wasn't true. I --

MS. WOODRUFF: I saw it in several different newspaper articles, that as chairman of the state party, you were opposed to term limits in California.

GOV. BROWN: That isn't true. I was asked to sign a slate mailer opposing term limits and I refused; I wouldn't do that. The party did oppose term limits because it was the agent of the incumbents, and that's where I really saw this thing. The Democratic Party has been taken over by the career politicians who are just its candidates and the members ought to be the ones who dictate the future of this party and this country.

MS. WOODRUFF: All right. What about limiting your contributions to \$100? Last year in California, you opposed a lid on contributions to state campaigns.

GOV. BROWN: To the party, not to candidates.

MS. WOODRUFF: Isn't there an inconsistency?

GOV. BROWN: No, because parties are an institution. They're a beautiful idea. They originally were to have a platform, to pick candidates who support the platform, then to get people to vote for those candidates, and then the most important thing of all hold them accountable. And I think parties need to be built up. But what we're seeing is candidates totally without reference to any platform can buy their way into office, do chores for powerful people and even unpowerful people, and create popularity totally separate from an agenda, from principle, from anything anyone can hold them accountable to. This political process is deteriorating not just because of the money but because there's no essential choice. And even on that Thomas hearing, where were the Democrats? They didn't ask, push this guy on environmental law and labor law, on class action, on civil liberties. All the things that this party's supposed to stand for, they're scared, they're afraid of Bush!

MS. WOODRUFF: What do you say though finally to those who say, okay, Jerry Brown has got some interesting, even some intriguing ideas, but he's very idealistic, all these things that he's talking about sound great, but the fact that he's limiting his contributions to \$100, the fact that he's going about it in an unconventional way, the fact that he's attacking in many respects his own party, the party that he's seeking the nomination of, means he's going to have a very difficult time? You said, yourself, when you announced earlier this week this is not just a campaign, it's a cause, or maybe you said it --

GOV. BROWN: Yeah, it is a cause, because if I didn't limit my contributions to \$100, there would be no way to distinguish me from all the other candidates. I would be imbedded in the very system that I want to change. So I'm barking up on a path that cannot succeed unless hundreds of thousands of people take it as their own. That's what I want to do. And when I criticize my own party leadership, I'm not doing it to weaken the party, I'm doing it to restore it. I don't like the fact that it was the Democratic Party that is supporting aid to El Salvador. I don't like the fact that they're confirming Gates for the CIA, that they confirmed Thomas, that they made Anita Hill, in effect, the aggressor, instead of an innocent citizen bringing back the information. I don't like them to just be there so ineffectively. I don't like the fact that they get together with the Republicans and create a midnight pay raise to put themselves in a pay bracket higher than 99 percent of the American people and then they agree together never to talk about it in a censorship of legitimate debate. That's what needs to be changed. And I found out as California chairman of the party, people are leaving the party and somebody has to change it around, and we're not going to change it around by saying our side is not at fault. It's at fault and so is George Bush. He is culpable and we'll have a lot to say about him, but we have to clean up our own house first.

MS. WOODRUFF: Gov. Jerry Brown, we thank you for being with us.

GOV. BROWN: Thanks.

NEWSMAKER INTERVIEW with Republican PATRICK BUCHANAN

(From transcript of the MAC NEIL/LEHRER NEWS HOUR aired Dec. 13, 1991)

MR. LEHRER: Patrick Buchanan is our lead story tonight. He's with us for a Newsmaker interview about his just-announced candidacy for the Republican Presidential nomination. Patrick J. Buchanan is widely known as a conservative columnist and television commentator.

PATRICK BUCHANAN: ("The McLaughlin Group") The chickens are coming home to roost for President Bush.

MR. LEHRER: Whether he is appearing as a regular panelist on the McLaughlin Group, moderator of Capital Gang, or co-host of Crossfire, there is no mistaking where Buchanan stands on an issue.

ANNOUNCER: ("Crossfire") On the right, Pat Buchanan.

MR. LEHRER: Buchanan is 53 years old. He was born in Washington, D.C., educated in private schools operated by the Jesuit order. He was valedictorian of his high school class and attended Georgetown University on a scholarship. He has said, "My views, my values, my beliefs were shaped by being a member of an Irish-Catholic conservative family of nine children." After college, he went to journalism school at Columbia University in New York and became a newspaper editorial writer. In 1965, he became an assistant to Presidential candidate Richard Nixon, and after the 1968 election was named a White House speechwriter. He left the government during the Ford administration to begin a career as a syndicated columnist and panelist on radio and television opinion programs. He returned to the White House as President Reagan's director of communications in 1985. Two years later, he was back in private life as co-host of the CNN program "Crossfire." He has taken a leave of absence from his television and newspaper commitments to run for President. He made his announcement on Tuesday, flanked by his sister, a former Treasurer of the United States, and his wife of 20 years. And now to Patrick Buchanan. Mr. Buchanan, welcome.

PATRICK BUCHANAN, Republican Presidential Candidate: Jim, thanks.

MR. LEHRER: Why do you want to be President of the United States?

MR. BUCHANAN: Well, I think I'd like to be the individual who presided over a shift in American policy from the end of the cold war to the new era of challenges this country faces abroad. I think George Bush is basically a decent, honorable, patriotic man who is addicted to the policies of the past and some of the ideas of the past. And I think that, I think we're entered into a new era where the challenges to the United States are going to come from dynamic Asian capitalism, from Europe, and that Mr. Bush is still living, if you will, in the mid-20th century frame of mind.

MR. LEHRER: Where are you living?

MR. BUCHANAN: I think I look at the world and I think I see it more realistically than the President does. I believe the dynamic force shaping our world now in the Soviet Union and everywhere is nationalism, ethnic self-determination, and desire for freedom and independence, and I think Mr. Bush is wedded, if you will, to sort of a skull and bones foreign policy, where you deal with the leaders, be it Gorbachev or Deng Xao Ping, and you make your arrangements with them. And I think he's put us behind, behind the curb, and behind the future in Ukraine, in Croatia, in China, even in the Baltics, where we were 37th to recognize Lithuanian independence. And I think the future's going to require a new nationalism, a new patriotism in the United States, where we really begin to put our own country first. And I think my ideas, for example, phasing out foreign aid, bringing 250,000 troops home from Europe, stopping the illegal immigration in the American Southwest, whether I prevail or not, I think these ideas, Jim, are going to be the ideas of the 1990s and they are going to prevail. George Bush is a man of World War II and of a great generation, a Col. Stinson man. And that world is really ending. And the United States did a tremendous job, I think, in a cold war, winning it together. But I really think I see the world more clearly than he does. And there's another reason. I think Mr. Bush is what you might call a big government Republican. He does believe in government. Under him, we're spending 25 percent of GNP. We're running the largest deficits in history. He raised taxes, went back on his promise, because I think he believes that "the environmental President" and these things, that is the kind of President he wants to be. And I would take the party and the country in an entirely different direction.

MR. LEHRER: The phrase that has come to be the label for your position is "America first."

MR. BUCHANAN: Right. It's my own fault.

MR. LEHRER: That's an old term. It was a term that was a negative term used back in World War I.

MR. BUCHANAN: No. It was just before World War II the America First Committee was charged with having left America disarmed. You know who'd led the America First Committee at Yale? It was Gerald R. Ford. Potter Stuart was his No. 2. He got a hundred bucks from a young student from Harvard named John F. Kennedy who said your work is vital. These were people who wanted to basically keep America out of a war between Hitler and Stalin and between the Japanese and Chinese. And there were some bad people associated with that movement and there are some bad people associated with the interventionist movement. But I think when you had Pearl Harbor, the whole country united and those who were isolationists, and I am being called, and those who were interventionists came together.

MR. LEHRER: And are you, do you buy the isolationist label now? Are you in isolation? Is that part of being America first, forget the rest of the world, protect only the United States and on the United States' interests?

MR. BUCHANAN: I think it's a label the President has used on me and I think it is inaccurate in this sense. I think the United States, what do we have, almost \$1 trillion in trade, we're going to be the greatest exporting nation in the world. I do think this. America's carrying of the full burden, almost the full burden of defending Western Europe and of defending Japan, as they were sort of being rebuilt, I think more of that burden is going to have to be transferred to the Germans and the Japanese and we are going to have to focus more of our resources on rebuilding our own industry, our own manufacturing, and the rest of it. We are \$4 trillion in debt. That debt was run up by us winning the cold war. But I think now we're going to have to focus on our own country. I was up in New Hampshire. I've been out to Detroit and places like that. I mean, people are really hurting. Mr. Bush might say there is no recession or he might deny there is a recession. But New England and New Hampshire in the pits of a recession. It's lasted three years in New Hampshire, so I think we've got to focus more of our attention on rebuilding our own strength so we can be a great force in the world. The United States can't come home from the world, no.

MR. LEHRER: You mentioned immigration a moment ago. There's been much comment about a comment that you made recently. You said, if we had to take a million immigrants and say Zulus next year or Englishmen and put them in Virginia --

MR. BUCHANAN: Right.

MR. LEHRER: -- what group would be easier to assimilate and cause less problems for the people of Virginia. What did you mean by that?

MR. BUCHANAN: Well, my view is this, Jim. God created all men good and I think all men equal in their basic natural rights. But He did not create them all equally assimilable in an English-speaking society which has, you know, British institutions and has a basically a Euro-American culture. One example: The American Indians, they're native Americans that have been much longer than you and I, but they have not been assimilated in American society, whereas, the Dutch who came over are totally assimilated. And my point is in this country we have some serious problems I think of ethnic tension, rivalries, and the rest of it, and I think when you decide on legal immigration that matters of culture, of language, of religion, of ethnicity have got to be taken into consideration, you've got to discuss 'em, because we're deciding now with our immigration policy what the America of the United States or the United States of say 2020 or 2050 is going to look like. And on immigration, on illegal immigration, I would try to stop it cold. You can't do it completely, but I would try to stop it cold in the Southwest. And then I would institute a national debate. I mean, take a look at New York City, the case of Bensonhurst, Howard Beach, Crown Heights, Central Park, the ethnic hatreds and rivalries and tensions, and I would ask myself, what is happening here? One of the things that's happened, I think, is that our institutions of assimilation, public schools, churches, families and the rest, are collapsing all around us at the same time there are flood tides of immigration into the country. And I think this contributes to some of the social problems we've got in America.



MR. LEHRER: You mean, the country would be better off if there were more people like you and me, than people who are black or Hispanic?

MR. BUCHANAN: Not necessarily you.

MR. LEHRER: No, okay. But I mean people who look like us.

MR. BUCHANAN: Not necessarily.

MR. LEHRER: It's an appearance thing. It's a racial thing?

MR. BUCHANAN: It is not an appearance thing. But let me talk about the racial aspect here without stepping on any land mines, I hope. Look over our country's history. Let's take some terms, Dread-Scott, Gettysburg, Plessey vs. Ferguson, Brown v. the Board of Education, Watts. Those are all about our effort, successful by and large, but still failed, to assimilate into our society that 10 or 12 percent of Americans who are African-Americans. It has been a very, very difficult thing and we've had great turmoil and civil war over it. What I am saying is that if you are allowing immigration to pour into our country, I think these matters of background, culture, where folks come from, what they believe, religion, language and the rest of them are things we're going to have to consider in the United States. One example: I think the President's wrong when he says we ought to make Puerto Rico a state of the United States. The Puerto Ricans voted and said we are a Spanish-speaking culture, Spanish people. I think if you brought them into the United States, we would have the same problem Canada has with Quebec, where people, they have lived together a hundred and so many years, and yet, Quebec now wants to go its separate way. All over the world ethnic identity is becoming more and more important. In Yugoslavia, Slovakia, we are not immune to that.

MR. LEHRER: George Will, a fellow conservative columnist, says that you misunderstand what the United States is all about. He says, "Becoming an American is an act of political assent, not a matter of membership in any inherently privileged or especially appropriate group, Caucasian or otherwise." You're saying just the opposite, are you not?

MR. BUCHANAN: No. No, I'm not.

MR. LEHRER: That this is basically a Caucasian nation.

MR. BUCHANAN: No. No. What I'm saying is basically this. Look, anybody who comes from anywhere can be a good American. They can come here, but if you have large numbers of immigrants who bring with them their own culture and who want to create a multicultural society in the United States, I think if you look at what is happening around the world, where multicultural societies are coming apart, that you ought to consider that in terms of an immigration policy where we take 2/3 of the immigrants, legal immigrants, I think in the entire world, and we take one to three million illegals, many of whom go back, from Mexico. I think it's a problem that's got to be looked at and it is a problem, Jim, that people are talking about I think in their own homes, and it's one that really I think is going to have to be tabled in the public policy debate and will be.

MR. LEHRER: When you say people are talking about it, you mean while people are talking about it.

MR. BUCHANAN: I mean they're talking about it in California. Pete Wilson had to raise taxes and one of the reasons he did is that children of illegal immigrants are entitled to be educated in public schools there. It is a problem. People in California, some people in California are moving out.

MR. LEHRER: Another area in which you've drawn fire this week is the area of Jewish-Americans. William F. Buckley in an article in the "National Review" this week has raised some questions about your attitudes toward Jews. And he says, it is impossible to defend you against the charge that some of the things you have said in the past were anti-semitic. Have you read this article, first of all?

MR. BUCHANAN: No.

**MR. LEHRER:** Well, he cites several examples. Let's take one of them. It was your comment during the war before the Middle East War that there are only two groups beating drums for the war in the Middle East and that is the Israeli defense ministry in its Amen corner in the United States and then you went on to say later that "kids with names like McCallister, Murphy, Gonzalez and Leroy Brown" were going to do the fighting. Now, Buckley says this: "There is no way to read that sentence without concluding that Pat Buchanan was suggesting that American Jews managed to avoid personal military exposure even while advancing military policies they uniquely engineered." Now, is that what you meant when you said that?

**MR. BUCHANAN:** First, Mr. Buckley is quoting from two separate columns. The phrase "McCallister, Murphy, Gonzalez, and Leroy Brown" was in response to an editorial in the "Economist" which says the Americans have to do this even if it's going to take a million troops. And I said it's not going to be British boys. It's going to be Americans with the names of McCallister, Murphy, et.cetera. Now why isn't that anti-Polish or anti-Italian, or anti-German?

**MR. LEHRER:** My question is: What did you mean? Did you mean what he says?

**MR. BUCHANAN:** He's got two -- he takes segments of two columns.

**MR. LEHRER:** Forget what he says. What did you mean when you said that? Did you mean that Jews --

**MR. BUCHANAN:** Of course not.

**MR. LEHRER:** All right.

**MR. BUCHANAN:** What I mean, look, if you take the armed forces of the United States, I think the idea that Irish and Hispanic and blacks represent the majority of the ground troops is accurate. It's a good phrase. There's nothing wrong with it.

**MR. LEHRER:** But he's wrong when he claims that was anti-semitic, anti-Jewish?

**MR. BUCHANAN:** Yes, he is.

**MR. LEHRER:** You have also said that Congress is an Israeli-occupied territory. Now, what do you mean by that?

**MR. BUCHANAN:** I said on the McLaughlin Group in response to a question, Jim, they said, do you think that the Congress of the United States will resist this demand for further aid? I said, threw out a crack I'd heard, I said, no, the Congress of the United States is Israeli-occupied territory. What I meant by that is the most powerful lobby in Washington which Congress can't stand up to, one of the most powerful is certainly the pro-Israeli lobby. It has gotten its way in this town year in and year out, and I don't think the automatic votes of the Congress of the United States for 3 and 4 billion dollars' worth of aid to Israel are necessarily in the national interests of the United States, and that comment, which is to ridicule the subservience of the Congress of the United States is perfectly valid.

**MR. LEHRER:** Do you believe there are members of the Congress of the United States who are voting the interest of Israel over the interests of the United States?

**MR. BUCHANAN:** No. I think they're voting the interest of a powerful lobby which they can't stand up to in many cases, one of many. They cave into lobbies all over this city. I think the Congress of the United States where it's got brave men on both sides is an institutional coward and that when a powerful lobby can influence or defeat them back at home and they can't get much support on the other side for a vote, many of them who will even tell you privately, they will tell you privately, I can't stand up to that kind of heat, they will vote for it.

**MR. LEHRER:** But why have you singled out this particular -- if you say there are many powerful lobbies?

**MR. BUCHANAN:** Well, this was a question that was thrown to me on the McLaughlin Group about Israeli aid. Should I have talked about the National Rifle Association at that point?

MR. LEHRER: No. But I mean this, there's a pattern, as you know, that this is what William F. Buckley was talking about. Why don't you just state what your position is right now?

MR. BUCHANAN: With regard to --

MR. LEHRER: Toward Jews and Israel. And if you were President of the United States -- let's put it very specific -- if you were President of the United States, how would you change U.S. policy toward Israel and why?

MR. BUCHANAN: Well, my view with regard to Israel is Israel is entitled to peace, to security, to recognition, to a lifting of the Arab embargo, and to revocation of that 1975 revolting Zionism equals racism resolution. I also believe that the Palestinian people are entitled to justice, to self-determination, and not to be dispossessed from land on which they and their ancestors have lived a thousand years. I do not believe my government should subsidize Israeli socialism, which we have done. And I do not believe we should subsidize a policy on the West Bank, on the Jordan River, which denies the Palestinian people rights which I support from Lithuania to Croatia. That's my view on Israel. With regard to the American-Jewish community, I think they are entitled to every constitutional right. I think they are good Americans as I am. I would be against any kind of racial or ethnic quota that keeps them out of colleges or universities. They are entitled to political activity just as I am, but if I also believe that Pat Buchanan is entitled to stand up and speak out against any kind of political lobby, whether it's the Greek lobby, aid for Greece, or whether it's the pro-Israeli lobby, aid for Israel, without being called vile names.

MR. LEHRER: And you think that's what happened to you?

MR. BUCHANAN: Let me tell you something, Jim. When this, this little flap is 18 months old, I made this crack, I know Buckley's talking about an 18-month old column, let's forget that. When this broke, I made that wiseacre crack about the Amen corner. It was wiseacre and it was very funny. You know what happened as a consequence of that? People called my newspaper that carried my column and said, drop Buchanan. APAC listed five conservative columnists who accepted.

MR. LEHRER: That's the Jewish --

MR. BUCHANAN: The pro-Israeli lobby, right.

MR. LEHRER: The Israeli lobby.

MR. BUCHANAN: I went out to speak in the country and a little girl from the Junior League said I get these horrible calls from New York about you. People there, individuals who are pro-Israeli go around the country and speak in synagogues and say, call CNN and get Pat Buchanan taken off the air. Those kinds of tactics, in my judgment, are un-American. They are done in the name of the First Amendment and they violate the spirit of the First Amendment. You know me. I've been in this town for 25 years, 30 years. I'm controversial. I am sometimes insensitive, I am tough and I am hard, but I think that this type of thing is beyond the pale. And I will say this. When this whole incident broke 18 months ago, I have never received more public support and private support from journalists in my entire life. People called my home that I've argued with for years and said, Pat, stand in there. This is what Bill Munroe of NBC said in the Washington Journalist Review. He described this an attempt at journalistic murder of a career. And that's what it is. And I'm going to stand up to this. Well, right now I'm running the campaign, but, you know, I think I stood up to that. It was an effort to smear me, intimidate me, and silence me. It didn't do the last two. I guess it did some damage in the first count, but that's where I stand.

MR. LEHRER: Pat Buchanan, thank you very much.

MR. BUCHANAN: Thank you.

CONVERSATION with Democrat GOV. BILL CLINTON

(From transcript of the MAC NEIL/LEHRER NEWS HOUR aired Oct. 24, 1991)

**MS. WOODRUFF:** Finally, we turn to another in our series of conversations with the men who want to be President. Tonight it's Democrat Bill Clinton, the Governor of Arkansas. But first, we have this backgrounder from Kwame Holman.

**GOV. BILL CLINTON:** Mr. Chairman, I'm honored to be here tonight to nominate my friend, Michael Dukakis for President of the United States.

**MR. HOLMAN:** When Gov. Bill Clinton was asked to introduce Michael Dukakis at the 1988 Democratic Convention, it was seen as a major opportunity for a young, as yet unknown, politician to step into the national spotlight. Instead, Clinton's 33 minute speech was widely perceived as long, boring, and in the end a major political mis-step for a governor believed to have national aspirations. A few weeks later, Johnny Carson teased Clinton about the lengthy speech on the Tonight Show.

**JOHNNY CARSON:** Well, Governor, I thank you for coming here tonight and my first question is: How are you? (Putting Hour Glass on Desk)

**MR. HOLMAN:** Clinton managed to laugh at himself and later even played the saxophone with Doc Severnson's band. Resilience and style have served Clinton well in his political career. Elected to five terms as Arkansas's Governor, Clinton recently was voted the country's most effective state executive by other governors in a Newsweek Magazine poll. Clinton is a Rhodes Scholar who made his mark in education policy in his home state and nationally. In 1983, he called a special session of the Arkansas legislature to adopt a sweeping and expensive package of education reform. Seven years later, Arkansas's schools had achieved the South's highest rate of high school graduation. Later, even President Bush credited the Democrats' work on a National Education Commission. Clinton also calls for more federal funding for Head Start, a special education program for low income children, but he also insists there are limits to government responsibility. He says welfare recipients should be encouraged to work and government should crack down on parents who don't pay child support.

**GOV. CLINTON:** One of the worst social developments in this country in the last several years is the willingness of so many people, mostly fathers, but sometimes mothers, to bring children into the world and then abandon them for the government to raise.

**MR. HOLMAN:** Some observers say such political philosophy helps establish Clinton as the Democrats' great moderate hope for 1992. Clinton represents the organized moderate wing of the party. He chairs the Democratic Leadership Council, a group formed after Walter Mondale was overwhelmed by Ronald Reagan in 1984. The DLC's aim is to broaden the Democrats' appeal beyond their liberal constituencies. Last summer, Clinton spoke at the DLC chapter in New Hampshire.

**GOV. CLINTON:** I think a lot of times the Democrats have been hurt by giving people the impression that we think there is a program for every problem that automatically solves it, when anybody with common sense who has looked at the vast array of problems in America knows that many of the things that we need to do in this country cannot be done unless there are changes from the inside out, as well as from the outside in, unless we get people more power, more authority, more choice and impose more responsibility.

**MR. HOLMAN:** With his wife and daughter at his side as he announced his candidacy early this month, Clinton says he wants to help the entire country achieve that sense of responsibility.

**MS. WOODRUFF:** Charlayne Hunter-Gault spoke with Gov. Clinton yesterday in Washington.

**MS. HUNTER-GAULT:** Gov. Clinton, thank you for joining us. Welcome. Tell us why you want to be President.

**GOV. BILL CLINTON, Democratic Presidential Candidate:** I want to be President because I think our country's going in the wrong direction. We've lost our economic leadership and as a result of

that, our people are facing a pretty grim future. After 10 years of this Reagan-Bush experiment, middle class people are working harder for less money, pay more for the essentials of life and we're running the risk of raising the first generation of American children who will grow up to be worse off than their parents. I think that the next President has got to assume responsibility for our future, restore our economic leadership, recover the fortunes of the middle class and reclaim the future for our children. That's what I think the election's about.

**MS. HUNTER-GAULT:** I know you have a long time to spell that out to the American people but in brief, how are you going to do it, and how is that going to be different from what George Bush has been doing?

**GOV. CLINTON:** The central difference is this, and it doesn't really fall into neat Republican-Democratic categories. From the time Ronald Reagan was elected in 1980, he said, look, the federal government can't do anything right, except national defense, so vote for me and we'll have more defense but less of everything else, and let the market take care of it. So for 12 years, we've been the only major country in the world with no national leadership, no national vision, no national strategy to remain economically strong. Now, after 12 years, the results of that experiment are in. We've started that era with the highest wages in the world. Now we're 10th. We were the biggest creditor in the world. Now we're the biggest debtor. As I said, that for the first time in our history, middle class people are spending more hours a week on the job for smaller paychecks when they have to pay more just to get by. What we've got to do is first and foremost have a President who will take responsibility for creating opportunity, organizing this economy to compete and win, and that means every tax policy, every trade policy, every anti-trust policy, every investment policy, every research and development policy. The issue should be, what does it take for us to compete in the world economy, to have a high wage, high growth society, instead of a hard work, low wage society? That's the first thing. The second thing is, how are people going to take advantage of these opportunities? That means education. How can we have internationally competitive education opportunities? The third thing is, how can we have a government that works? We can't be the only country in the world that doesn't control health care costs. We can't ignore all these changes that are going on in the world to basically change the nature of government so people can relate to it again, give people more choices, empower them to make those choices, make it less bureaucratic, give them what they need at a price they can afford. Those are the things the government has to do. And the second part of my campaign that I think is somewhat unique, and I talked about it at Georgetown University yesterday, was, is the need to expect all the citizens of this country to change the way they look at government and to assume some personal responsibility. It's been 30 years since a Democrat ran for President saying, every American has something to do. A lot of the problems we've got are almost cultural in nature. After 12 years in an age in which we've been told that there is no such thing as community interest, you don't owe anything to your country, just get it while you can, turn a fast buck, we've got to change all that. We've got to change the behavior of people in Washington and corporate board rooms of this country, in the work places, in the classrooms, and people on welfare. We've got to change everybody's view and impose a whole different attitude of responsibility for the future. And it's only if we say, look, we were wrong, we were wrong, you can't have a national economy without a national leader, and if we can say we've got to change the way people relate to politics, then we can get this economy going again and recover a sense of common purpose. I mean, people are as mad, disappointed, as frustrated, as put out today as I have ever seen them. That's what this David Duke vote means. A lot of people who voted for him weren't racists. They were just so frustrated and so angry they'd vote for anybody who had the most anti-establishment message.

**MS. HUNTER-GAULT:** You're running though in a field right now that's five, six candidates, six, I believe, Democratic candidates. What makes you different from the others and the one to take on George Bush? I mean, why should you be --

**GOV. CLINTON:** I think there are several reasons. First of all, I'm the senior governor in the country. So I have worked longer and harder on these issues, the economic issues, the education issues, the health care issues, than anybody else who's running. As an executive, I have a much clearer sense of that. Secondly, I've put out a much more comprehensive message than anybody else. I've really thought about what I would do if I won this job. I think that's very important. And, thirdly, I'm the only guy who's saying both parties have to change. Our Democratic Party has to change and we have to not only just promise people things, we have to demand responsibility of them.

**MS. HUNTER-GAULT:** What do you think's the critical difference between you and the other traditional Democrats? I mean, you've said you have more in common, a lot more in common with

George Bush. What does that mean?

GOV. CLINTON: I haven't said -- I've said that I agree with him on some things and I don't feel constrained to disagree with him on everything. Every time I say something good about the President some Democrat attacks me and, you know, I think if the President wears a suit to work every day, I don't have to wear a dress. I can still be a Democrat and wear a suit. The difference is that I think we have to go beyond both the Republican and the Democratic conventional wisdom. You know, the Republican conventional wisdom is there is no such thing as a public interest and government has no responsibility. The Democrats I think are identified too much with entitlements, with taxing middle class people and spending the money on others as a matter of right. And what I think, I think both parties have lost sight of the first obligation of government, which is to create opportunity, which means economic growth, which means educational opportunity, which means controlling health care costs and it means that you can't cater to the established interest of either party. So if there's a difference about me that I have tried to outline for four or five years, and especially sharply since last May at the Democratic Leadership Council Convention in Cleveland, it is that I want to go beyond the choices that the Democrats and Republicans have presented, beyond left and right. The things that I advocate are not liberal and conservative. Basically they're both and they're different. And, you know, I'm for school choice, but that doesn't make me a Republican. I am for more choice for elderly people and the programs they get from the government. I think the people who are working for a living and need child care help should be able to choose among those things, so there are differences in the approach that I take.

MS. HUNTER-GAULT: Where do you stand on the proposals now circulating in Congress, for example, over how much we should cut the defense budget right now and where that money should go, to tax cuts or to expanded government programs?

GOV. CLINTON: I believe that we need to establish the 25 percent reduction between now and 1995 as an absolute ceiling for defense spending. I think there should be an aggressive effort to reduce it further through negotiated reductions in nuclear weapons with the Soviets and negotiated reductions in conventional forces in Europe and Asia and through more burden sharing by the Germans and the Japanese especially. They are now richer than we are by many indexes. I think the money then should be divided more or less evenly, depending on how much money there is, between controlling the deficit and getting the economy going again, which means that we should invest more money in our future. I do not favor spending more money on last year's programs. I favor investments in education, research and development, infrastructure, roads, bridges, airports, things of that kind, and the environment, things that will give us a bigger payback in the future than we get now. I also think we need some sort of middle class tax relief. We need to increase the earned income tax credit for lower middle class people who are, in effect, working but still poor, and we need to give some more consideration to working people who have children. We need to increase the child care deduction or convert it into a credit.

MS. HUNTER-GAULT: What about the conflict between the traditional constituencies of the Democratic Party, poor, minorities, the disenfranchised, and this emphasis now on the middle class? Do you see that as a big conflict?

GOV. CLINTON: No.

MS. HUNTER-GAULT: And how do you see reconciling that?

GOV. CLINTON: I think they're perfectly consistent, because I think what we have to do for poor people is give them the chance to move into the middle class. And what you've seen in the last decade is middle class income stagnant, is an absolute explosion in poverty. There is no way people who are poor can get into the middle class. We have always been a nation of immigrants so we've always had a lot of poor folks. We always opened our arms and took them in, but they always had a way to climb up the ladder of success through education and through work, and those opportunities are not there now. So the best thing we can do for poor people is to give them the education, the health care, the job training they need, and then give them a way to move out of poverty into the middle class.

MS. HUNTER-GAULT: Let me just ask you one final area here today. There have been a lot of published reports about problems in your personal life in the past. How much of a vulnerability do

you see that as being, and are you going to draw a line and say beyond this I will not go?

GOV. CLINTON: Well, it depends on what questions are asked, I guess. I have been, I think, more candid than others have been in discussing my life. I've said that in my personal life I have a good, strong marriage to a person who I'm deeply committed to. We've been together almost 20 years, married 16. We've had our ups and downs and I'm pretty proud that we're still together, and I think most Americans would relate to that. The rumors that circulated against me in the last election by my opponent, both before and after the election, were false. I said so. We went a very long way toward actually disproving those things, which is hard to do. So if somebody gets out and just comes up with a bunch of lies, like they did before, I'll say that, but I believe the American people are free, sensible about this. And they know there are some limits beyond which the press shouldn't go.

MS. HUNTER-GAULT: What are those limits?

GOV. CLINTON: Those are -- if I say that, then I'm doing your job. I don't want to let you off the hook.

MS. HUNTER-GAULT: Four years ago, you said you wouldn't run for President because of concerns for your family. At that time your daughter, Chelsea, was seven. She's now 11. How much, what has diminished your concern about that?

GOV. CLINTON: Mostly my child. I mean, she's an incredible person and I think she's at a point in her life now where she's establishing more independence, more involved in her own activities, and has a much clearer idea of what the political process is, what's involved in it. We have debates around the dinner table where we play different people and when I run for office she plays my opponent and she attacks me and I answer back and we do these things. I just think that she's in a much better place in her life now and she believes very deeply in what her mother and I are trying to do.

MS. HUNTER-GAULT: And what about the people of Arkansas? You promised them if they elected you to a fifth term as governor, you wouldn't run for President.

GOV. CLINTON: I did and I never dreamed I'd be here and it's -- five months ago, if you told me I'd be here, I wouldn't have believed it. I was having the best time in my life and in my job I'd ever had. I decided to run because I didn't think anybody who had the experience that I have in these areas, who had the message that I have would run and I realized there were terrific limits on what I could achieve as governor without a national partnership. Finally, we had the best legislative session of my lifetime in the last session, so I got in the car and went around the state and asked the people whether I ought to do it. A poll done by an unbiased firm last week said that by 59 to 34, the people thought that I had done the right thing to run, so I'm grateful to them and I'll try to make them proud.

MS. HUNTER-GAULT: Well, Bill Clinton, thank you for joining us.

GOV. CLINTON: Thank you.

REMARKS of SEN. TOM HARKIN at the Democratic National Committee Meeting

(From transcript of the MAC NEIL/LEHRER NEWSHOUR aired Sep. 23, 1991)

FOCUS - OFF AND RUNNING

MS. WOODRUFF: Next, the 1992 Presidential campaign which finally came to life this weekend when the Democrats produced not one, but seven firm or "maybe" candidates. In a moment, we will talk about them with two former Presidential campaign managers, but first this sampling of what they had to say from Correspondent Tom Bearden.

RON BROWN: This meeting of the Democratic National Committee is now called to order.

MR. BEARDEN: With those words, DNC Chairman Rob Brown signaled the beginning of the 1992 Presidential sweepstakes. For the party leaders and organizers assembled in Los Angeles, this was their opportunity to hear firsthand the parade of potential prospects. Tom Harkin, the populist Senator from Iowa, who formally declared his candidacy a week ago, was the lead off speaker.

SEN. TOM HARKIN, Iowa: I'm going to run as a Democrat because I know who I am, I know what I am, and I know why I'm a Democrat. And I don't intend to apologize to anyone for being a Democrat! (applause from audience) I tell you that because I believe by reasserting our core values as Democrats, what we've done for this country, to be strong and firm and resolute in who we are, proud of what we've done for America, we can take that to the American people with a message that we are resolute. We are not equivocating, we have no self-doubt, and with that strength and that conviction, we can lead this country into the future. (applause) People say, oh, Harkin's a long shot, you Democrats don't have a chance. I read it in the press every day. He's so far ahead, so popular. Let me tell you -- George Herbert Walker Bush has got feet of clay and I'm going to take a hammer to those feet in the next year! (applause) I've never yet seen a football team win by defending its goal. They've got to take the ball, and you've got to run it down field. It's time to put them on the defensive. It's time to go after them and make them defend what they've done to this country for the last four years. It's time to go after George Bush, say to the American people, what have you been hearing from the White House? What's the message been for the last four years? You know what it's been -- one simple message -- get what you can, get it in the shortest amount of time, don't worry about how you get it, get it and to hell with everybody else. It's been a message of unbridled greed, and look what it's doing this country. Let me ask you some questions, my fellow Americans. Are your roads any better? You've had four years. Are your streets safer at night?

AUDIENCE: No!

SEN. TOM HARKIN: How about your schools, are your schools better?

AUDIENCE: No!

SEN. TOM HARKIN: All right. How about your health care, have you got better health care?

AUDIENCE: No!

SEN. TOM HARKIN: How about jobs, have you got better jobs, put more money in your pocket?

AUDIENCE: No!

SEN. TOM HARKIN: The answer to my question is no. It's time to reclaim the American dream for our people, that American dream, you work hard, and study, and you save, you take care of your family, you can make it here in this country. You can have a piece of that American dream and we can leave that ladder of opportunity down there for all of our people to climb, that ladder or that ramp of opportunity for all to ascend. And that's the difference between old Bush and Harkin. (audience applauding)



CONVERSATION with Democrat SEN. BOB KERREY

(From transcript of the MAC NEIL/LEHRER NEWSHOUR aired Nov. 7, 1991)

**MR. LEHRER:** Finally tonight a conversation with another Democrat who wants to be President of the United States. He is Sen. Bob Kerrey of Nebraska. Our conversation follows this brief backgrounder by Kwame Holman.

**BOB KERREY:** (Singing) For 10 weary weeks I kept myself alive while around me the corpses piled higher. Then a big Turkish shell knocked me ass overhead and why I awoke in my hospital bed, I saw what it had done and I wish'd I were dead. Never knew there were things than dyin'. And the band played "Waltzing Mathilde" around the green bush far and near. To hunt fenentigs a man needs both legs, no more "Waltzing Mathilde" for me.

**MR. HOLMAN:** That Australian ballad about a soldier who loses his legs in World War I goes to the heart of Bob Kerrey's own war experience. A highly decorated veteran and recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor, Kerrey lost his own right leg below the knee in Vietnam. When he returned home to Nebraska, he spoke out against the war, including in this 1973 interview with Jim Lehrer.

**BOB KERREY:** (1973) It is the source of many of my current problems and certainly the source of my disability. It's certainly the source of the bad memories that I have and at the same time there are some good things that it did for me, but it's not, the good things aren't worth it.

**MR. HOLMAN:** But Kerrey's injury didn't inhibit his success. He established a chain of restaurants and health clubs. Then, at age 39, never having run for public office, was elected governor of Nebraska in 1982. After his victory, Kerrey again talked with Jim Lehrer, saying the pain of Vietnam influenced his decision to run.

**BOB KERREY:** I saw it, felt it, tasted it firsthand. It will have an impact on me and the upbringing of my parents has had an impact on me, my church has had an impact on me, lots of things have impacted me, but, yes, it will influence me.

**MR. HOLMAN:** But ultimately, it wasn't Vietnam or the Nebraska governorship that brought Kerrey national notoriety. It was highly publicized romance with screen actress Deborah Winger.

**BOB KERREY:** 76 percent said it was okay for Deborah to stay at the mansion. Only 74 percent thought it was okay for me to stay at the mansion.

**MR. HOLMAN:** If Kerrey's jump into politics had been a surprise, his decision to drop out of it was a shock. Kerrey quit after one term as governor, saying he had accomplished what he wanted and it was time to move on. But two years later, Kerrey was back, running for and winning one of Nebraska's U.S. Senate seats.

**BOB KERREY:** It's time again. It's time again in America for us to do great things.

**MR. HOLMAN:** Announcing his Presidential candidacy in front of the State House in Lincoln in September, Sen. Kerrey said he wants to lead a process of renewal in the nation.

**MR. LEHRER:** And now to Sen. Kerrey. Senator, welcome again.

**SEN. KERREY:** Thank you.

**MR. LEHRER:** Why is that you want to be President of the United States?

**SEN. KERREY:** I just see a lot of opportunity in this country that I think is being squandered. I mean, opportunity to do some things fundamentally different than they're doing them right now. And that would provide Americans with an awful lot more opportunity than we're going to have unless we make those changes.

MR. LEHRER: Is this something you've always wanted to do? Have you always wanted to be President of the United States?

SEN. KERREY: I don't think so.

MR. LEHRER: When did it happen? When did you decide I'm going to go for this?

SEN. KERREY: Well, I left here and I went home. My children and I went out to Colorado, got together and talked a bit and I made the decision.

MR. LEHRER: And what was it, was it a vision that you saw out there in the country, or your own, in other words, something that you saw you could do that nobody else could do, or the country's going to hell in a hand basket and if you didn't come to its rescue, it was going to go further? I mean, what was it that triggered this?

SEN. KERREY: Well, the first question is, do I want to be President. And that's the first question I had to answer and my answer is yes. The second question is why, and having answered the first yes, and then providing the detail of the second, I then have to say when and the things that I would like to do I believe need to be done now. I mean, I'm very worried about four more years of simply saying, let's figure out what the polls are, let's figure out what the polling data tell us to do, instead of taking the opportunity we've got right now, post containment, now that we're beyond this cloud of fear that we're going to blow ourselves up with nuclear weapons and make fundamental change in America, particularly with our structures of government, so as to be able to give us a sense in the year 2000 that our children are getting healthy and we're making progress on poverty, that our economy is going strong, that we're trying to do something about homelessness and despair in this country, give us a sense, indeed, that we're moving in the right direction. And I've got four or five fundamental things that I would do that I just feel very strongly would not only be embraced by Americans but would give us that sense of confidence.

MR. LEHRER: I want to get to your specifics in a moment, but Robin asked Sec. Brady just a moment ago about the lights going out on the American dream and he asked the Secretary, are the lights based on the piece that we had run at the beginning from Oak Park, Illinois. Do you think that the lights have gone out on the American dream for a lot of Americans?

SEN. KERREY: Yes. You know, from 1973 to 1991 the number of families between the age of 20 and 35 that own a home in America has decreased. For the first time in two generations, the net worth of the United States of America declined in 1990, the first time in two generations that that's happened. I mean, it's not just looking at 6.8 percent employment and measuring those kinds of numbers, but mothers and fathers are scrambling like mad out there to try to make ends meet and for many people they are beginning to wonder if that dream is still alive.

MR. LEHRER: Well, what do you have that George Bush and Nick Brady, for instance, don't have that could solve this, that could turn the lights back on?

SEN. KERREY: Well, the fundamental thing that I've got is quite frankly what the polls say. I'm not guided by polls. I don't care if I win the next election. What I'm prepared to do is to say here are some things that I think should be done fundamentally different. I think we do have to restructure.

MR. LEHRER: In what ways?

SEN. KERREY: I think we've got to take the number of departments in government down not just to seven, which I've proposed to do, and saving some money at the federal level, but creating a new relationship between the people, themselves, and the government. Many just feeling increasingly whether it's on the question of jobs or schools or health care or whatever, they just don't feel like there's a relationship between themselves and the government.

MR. LEHRER: Is that justified?

SEN. KERREY: Of course it's justified.

MR. LEHRER: What happened to government? Where did it go wrong?

SEN. KERREY: Well, we've been governed for the last 11 years by people who are hostile to government and tried to prove that it didn't operate and they succeeded and didn't care about whether or not, in fact, at the street level government was able to solve the problems of the people. In fact, the more frustrated people got with government, the more it made their case.

MR. LEHRER: But Ronald Reagan and George Bush said the same thing you said. They said reduce the size of government, downsize the size of government, get it out of people's minds, let the marketplace go.

SEN. KERREY: That's not what I'm saying. I think we do need to take the size of government down but not just in and of itself as an objective, I think we've got to make this government more relevant so it's helping to solve the problem of children, we feel in a sense in fact that it's improving the quality of education and it's adding value to the American workers and it's doing something to make housing affordable, that in truth that we are using our government to solve the problems we've got in our lives. It's not just, by the way, that restructuring I think needs to occur. I think we need to fundamentally change the way we finance health care in America.

MR. LEHRER: How would you do that?

SEN. KERREY: I'd just say look if you're living in the United States of America under color of law, American citizen, then you've got health care, period. You don't have to be poor, as 27 million Americans do every day, go to a welfare office and prove that they're poor enough to get health care. You don't have to get blown up in a war like I did to get health care, wait till you're old enough. You're an American, you've got health care. It change --

MR. LEHRER: You mean a national health care system?

SEN. KERREY: Absolutely.

MR. LEHRER: Paid for by the government?

SEN. KERREY: Paid for by the taxpayers, absolutely. They're paying for it now. George Bush's proposal will spend \$150 billion more than mine will. Unless you actually say you're going to create eligibility based upon citizenship, the costs are going to go up through the ceiling.

MR. LEHRER: In other words, you would scrap the current system which is based on jobs. You either have health insurance or you don't have health insurance, good health insurance, bad health insurance based on where you work.

SEN. KERREY: It creates a tremendous economic opportunity not just for businesses who are being pulverized by increasing costs but for individuals. There's 24 million Americans out there working right now, 24 million Americans who are working are saying to themselves every day do I quit my job and go on welfare where at least I know I've got health care, or do I stay in the work place where I know that I don't have it, and when health care costs were a thousand bucks a year as they were when Ronald Reagan first started, it wasn't that big a deal. This year it'll be \$2600 and growing.

MR. LEHRER: But if you extend the coverage to include everybody across the board, aren't you also going to raise the cost?

SEN. KERREY: No.

MR. LEHRER: How --

SEN. KERREY: We have an open-ended system of financing health care today, open-ended system. We just spend and spend and we spend and when the year's over we say this is how much we're going to spend. In my proposal, I say, we're going to budget it directly, I want the states to match it so I will decrease actually the federal government's involvement, we'll have more diversity of care. I like private health care. I prefer to have private health care. I want in fact more diversity out there in a delivery system and we'll have it but only if we begin by saying all Americans are in in a simplified fashion, you'll get a card and you're eligible for it. We can participate in a debate about how much we're going to spend. Once that's done, the states will manage the care and make sure

that it's done right and every American will now join the industrial world. Except for South Africa and the United States, every worker on this planet goes out there and works knowing that if they lose their job they still have health care. If they go back to school and increase their educational achievement as I tried to do in the early 1970s, they know that they're not going to lose health care. Moreover, we have to understand that the quality of health care, the availability of high quality care change your life and in America, it's the only industrial nation for all the money we spend that doesn't have continuous health care for its children. We have 11 million children in poverty right now that don't get continuous health care. They're becoming deaf, showing up at schools with serious health problems all as a consequence of the way we fund it.

MR. LEHRER: Under your plan, every child in America, no matter where he or she lives, no matter what he or she's mother, father do or do not do, will have, will be entitled to the same kind of health care?

SEN. KERREY: That's right.

MR. LEHRER: Now how in the world are you going to guarantee that?

SEN. KERREY: You can guarantee it, but you've got to be willing, as the President's not willing to do, to take on the best interest.

MR. LEHRER: Of what, the doctors?

SEN. KERREY: Insurance industry. He met the other day, Louis Sullivan meets the other day with the insurance industry, has a summit on health care with the insurance industry. Well, they've become part of the problem. I don't bash the insurance industry. In fact, I allow them to stay in business but I'm going to change the nature of their business under my system because I'm concerned about the quality of health of Americans. The President is concerned about maintaining a relationship with the health care industry and they promise sometime in the late 1990s, he said, Sec. Sullivan said, to get the costs under control. Well, by then we're lost lives. It gets back to why am I running. I mean, there are lives at stake here, human lives at stake that deserve a much different kind of environment than we've got right now.

MR. LEHRER: If you were President of the United States tonight, what would you do to jumpstart the economy? Same question Robin was asking the two economists and Sec. Brady.

SEN. KERREY: I say to Americans on the basis of equity we should get middle class tax relief.

MR. LEHRER: You support the Democratic --

SEN. KERREY: I do but it's an equity issue. What we've got to do is set our sites a little more longer term, not just in government but in the private sector as well. We've got to say, as my parents did, that we're going to give the next generation a better life and act upon that value not just talk about it in campaign time, but actually build upon that principle, because if you do that, we'll budget differently, we'll govern differently, we'll expend and we'll tax differently because we'll be conscious of the fact that you do have to make current investments, that the essence of what Americans have to do is move in the direction of increased conservation, conserving fiscal resources, human resources, national resources, because we say that we want our children to be healthier. Now I also think that we've got to change some additional structure beyond health care and it is getting tough to buy a house today.

MR. LEHRER: That's part of the American dream.

SEN. KERREY: It is part of it. And our schools are not doing the job that we want them to do. I mean, for all the money we spend, all the time we spend, a high school diploma is not worth what it ought to be. And we've got, I think we've got to look to change the relationship between the federal government and the local schools. There is a great movement --

MR. LEHRER: Change in what way, more money?

SEN. KERREY: So that I can come directly and sign a partnership agreement with the local school district and say we know you're trying to reform, we know you're trying to restructure and we know that you are willing to hold yourself accountable. We'll sign a contract. What we've got right now is every school district in America, all 16,000 of them. They come begging to Washington, D.C., to participate in some grant that we've established. You need a fundamentally different relationship. The third and the fourth areas for me is in the area of technology and in the area of information age. We've got to change the way we're doing things.

MR. LEHRER: Look, we don't have time to go through each one of these, but let me ask you this, one final question about you. The American people through polls and recent election results are showing that they're not too hot for politicians right now, whether they be Democrats or whether they be Republicans, whether they be liberals or whether they be conservatives. Are you different than all the other politicians?

SEN. KERREY: Oh, not than all the other, but I'm certainly come and say I'd serve without regard for whether or not I'm going to get elected.

MR. LEHRER: But how do they know that?

SEN. KERREY: I don't know if they know it.

MR. LEHRER: How do you convince them that you're different, that when you say I'm going to reform this, I'm going to reform that. people have been saying that forever.

SEN. KERREY: I'm going to come directly and say look, I know health care is a problem. I know what it can do for you. I know. I see children aren't getting it. I know what happened to me when I got it. I know that our schools are not doing what they ought to do. I can see an income squeeze out there. I mean, I know that people are not able to pay the bills and they want to be able to pay them and I know what's happened to this country. It's not just 10 years of neglect; it's 20 years. I mean, I think I can come to the American people and say here's where we could go, to a greater prosperity, to greater social justice, and to a greater sense of well being, if we just began to build for greatness in this country and to give ourselves to our children.

MR. LEHRER: Senator, thank you for being with us. Good luck to you.

SEN. KERREY: Thanks.

CONVERSATION with Democrat SEN. EUGENE McCARTHY

(From transcript of the MAC NEIL/LEHRER NEWSHOUR aired Dec. 30, 1991)

MR. LEHRER: Finally tonight, another Presidential candidate interview. It's with Eugene McCarthy, the former Senator and Congressman from Minnesota who sought the Democratic Presidential nomination the first of five times 25 years ago. He has filed again in the New Hampshire Democratic Primary. Roger Mudd talked to him last week. The interview follows a brief backgrounder.

MR. MUDD: The anti-Vietnam War movement propelled McCarthy into the 1968 Presidential primary as the only candidate willing to challenge President Johnson.

EUGENE McCARTHY: (1968) I've been saying I intended to stop the war and I've been I think explaining how by proceeding to negotiate a coalition government or at least to be prepared to accept a coalition government. But both the President and Mr. Nixon are talking about ending the war. They're not saying when or how or at what cost. And I think that's the issue in the New Hampshire primary.

MR. MUDD: Johnson's lock on renomination seemed secure. McCarthy's anti-war campaign made up of scores of young activists was dismissed by the political pundits. But conventional wisdom got turned on its head by the New Hampshire primary voters. McCarthy came within 7 points of defeating LBJ and overnight, he emerged as a credible candidate. Johnson was revealed as vulnerable. Four days later, Robert Kennedy entered the race. Stunned by McCarthy's showing and the growing public opposition to the war, President Johnson withdrew his candidacy 19 days after the New Hampshire primary.

LYNDON JOHNSON: (March 31, 1968) I shall not seek and I will not accept the nomination of my part for another term as your President.

MR. MUDD: Picking up the LBJ mantle, Vice President Hubert Humphrey entered the race. With Robert Kennedy's assassination on the eve of his victory in California, Humphrey's campaign picked up steam. At the raucous 1968 convention in Chicago, McCarthy's anti-war forces were in a distinct minority. The Vice President won on the first ballot with almost 1800 votes to McCarthy's 601 votes. Humphrey narrowly lost the general election to Richard Nixon. Two years later, McCarthy left the Senate to pursue teaching, lecturing and writing. But in 1972, he returned to politics to make his second bid for the Presidency, which he also lost. McCarthy ran two other times, in 1976 and again in 1988, both times as an independent. And now, at the age of 75, he's back in New Hampshire for his fifth try at the Presidential nomination. Welcome, Sen. McCarthy. I guess once a Senator always a Senator.

SEN. McCARTHY: Well, you're supposedly able to make rash judgments for the rest of your life, like once a bishop always a bishop.

MR. MUDD: It's been almost 25 years since we've sat and talked about your candidacy.

SEN. McCARTHY: I think that's about right.

MR. MUDD: And the other day I read a quote from you from the health care debate in New Hampshire in which you said the reason you're running was that you were constantly mistook for Joe McCarthy or George McGovern. Now, that sounds silly. Why would you say something like that?

SEN. McCARTHY: Well, not quite constantly. And I said it was one of the reasons I was running. But then I gave some rather good reasons after that.

MR. MUDD: But that was the quote that got picked up. It just adds to the feeling that you run for Quixotic reasons.

SEN. McCARTHY: When we used to talk that way, then you'd report that I was serious. The new kind of reporter you have now, you've got to be more careful. You've developed bad habits in me.

I could say things like that to Roger in the old days and he'd brush it aside and report the substance of my cause.

MR. MUDD: But now everybody takes you at your word.

SEN. McCARTHY: Well, some of my words but not of my absolute words.

MR. MUDD: But do you run the risk, Senator, when you have such marvelous and funny one-liners of doing your own place in history some damage? I mean, you were the man who brought down Lyndon Johnson. By saying those things, Senator, don't you really make light of your own candidacy?

SEN. McCARTHY: Well, I didn't do it in '68 because the issue was so compelling. And I think that a good part of politics is a little bit on the ridiculous side. William Butler Yates was asked to write a poem about politics and he said he couldn't do it. He said that there were too many distractions and I think that I deal with the pretty substantive issues if they'll listen to me. Maybe I distract them. I think they want to be distracted and not get to the substance of it.

MR. MUDD: You're talking about the press.

SEN. McCARTHY: The press, yeah, the press, especially the networks.

MR. MUDD: What's the matter with the networks?

SEN. McCARTHY: Oh, everything's the matter with the networks I think. I think they're really probably next to the federal election probably the most serious obstacle to kind of responsible politics in America.

MR. MUDD: You mean they get in the way of your message?

SEN. McCARTHY: They get in the way of your message. They cut it up and they make these absolute decisions about who's a candidate and who isn't a candidate. I'm dealing with NBC now, having been excluded from what they call debates, and I've been trying to get them to explain why but they don't say I said to you, do you read the entrails of chickens, or do you get up in the morning with inspiration, and who has, we can't tell you, it just happens. We've decided and you know, there were only NBC and CBS back in '76 for something like equal time, but that's gone now.

MR. MUDD: Well, I gather that you're running because you think you have a message that no one else has. So what's the message?

SEN. McCARTHY: I think, Roger, I wrote a piece right after perestroika was obvious. This was where World War II should have ended, with the Russians as open as they are now, or were when Gorbachev was in charge, and that we, it was really like picking up where we sort of left off or at least wanted to leave off back in 1968, and that I couldn't see that George Bush was responding to the opportunity. In fact, I think he fumbled it, and I don't think any of the Democrats who are running can really connect with what it was like back in the cold war period and that you really need, it could have been someone like Pat Moynihan. I say even if Bentsen had run, I would have been quite willing to support him, but there's nobody running who can make the connection between now and what the cold war thing was like.

MR. MUDD: And that's necessary, that connection?

SEN. McCARTHY: I think it is. You don't like to use heavy examples, but I think you had to have a Germany, someone like Adinar, who could go back to pre-Nazi times to put Germany back together when it was over. Of course, our problems aren't comparable, but I think that kind of bridging is necessary. And I think the same thing was true of DeGaulle. You had to have someone who went back to the time before Katan and what the French did and surrendered to the Nazis. So France is a real country and here I am and we go along from here. Now you've got it in this country.

MR. MUDD: But on the minds of most Americans of course is the economy. What would you do to jolt the economy back to life?

SEN. McCARTHY: Well, in making comparisons, Roger, my principal interest in Congress when I came was the political economy. It was out of my field of study and I was on the Ways & Means Committee and Finance Committee for 16 years of my 22 years, and we did very well between '48 and 1970. We kept the debt -- the debt rose I think \$130 billion in 22 years. Inflation was kept at about 2 1/2 percent. And we paid for the end of World War II, we paid for the Korean War. We established national health insurance in the sense of Medicare and Medicaid and we built hospitals and roads and we kept the balance of payments between the countries practically even over that period of time. And you had to make decisions and there's no reason why what happened between '70 and '90 should ever happen in our economy and well, you asked the question, we're in the emergency situation.

MR. MUDD: Right.

SEN. McCARTHY: There are about seven or eight things that I think Bush ought to do or with the cooperation of Congress should attempt to do. Some are obvious, unemployment help, relief in a sense, accelerated public works obvious. And I think he should do some other things. But I think he ought to declare a moratorium on home mortgages, for example, for the unemployed, and also a moratorium on automobile loans, and also one on credit cards. I think the President ought to say, I'm not going to dismiss any people from the armed services until this unemployment thing is straightened out. There are things we can do with them. I think he should also eliminate overtime that's being worked in the public sector, or at least Congress could help him do it. If you just took the mathematics of it and eliminated all overtime, it would take care of about a million unemployed people.

MR. MUDD: What about soaking the rich, is that a good idea?

SEN. McCARTHY: Well, I think that's the long run. I don't think you really can soak 'em; they're so rick that you just dampen them a little bit. I mean, you can't get through it. But there are three things that I've been advocating that deal with the basic disorders. You may remember in '59 I was chairman of an unemployment study committee. We filed a report which is still the best report on unemployment and we said there was evidence that the normal procedures and actions that dealt with unemployment in the past would not work, that we'd have to look to redistribution to work. And I think we ought to move in an orderly way towards a 30 hour week or a 34 hour week and distribute work among the roughly 10 million who are unemployed. The second thing we ought to do has to do with balance of payments, and I've been advocating this since the early '70s when it was evident that the Japanese and the German economies had recovered and were now in a surplus position which they were imposing on us, while we were paying practically the whole debt for their defense, a hundred billion, two hundred billion, three hundred billion, about half of which is attributed to either their actions or obligations to defend 'em. And I've been advocating what I call a defense import duty on Japanese, German, Taiwanese, and Korean imports to make up for the expenses that we were carrying because of precommitments or general obligations to those countries. And if you look at the balance of payments or the imbalance, it comes to roughly one-half of our defense budget, which suggests that the real advantage the Japanese have is not technology and not working harder, it's the fact that we are spending out of our economy this year roughly 150 billion dollars on defense, which is attributed to them and they ought to pay it.

MR. MUDD: Just to move along, other than the economy, on what issues do you think President Bush is now vulnerable?

SEN. McCARTHY: Well, I wanted to add a third thing, which is a capital tax really on accumulated wealth. 10 percent of the American people own 70 percent of the wealth.

MR. MUDD: 10 percent.

SEN. McCARTHY: Yeah. And the other 90 percent own 30 percent. And if the estimates are right, that means that the 10 percent probably control about \$12 trillion. So if you took 4 trillion away from them, they wouldn't be in bad shape. They'd still have 50 percent of all the wealth in the country. And you really apply it on the national debt which has risen to \$4 trillion because the wealthy, those who are wealthy now haven't been carrying their share.

MR. MUDD: That's not confiscation?



SEN. McCARTHY: All taxes are confiscation. They're all retroactive. If they tax you at the end of the week, it's retroactive on what you earned that week. So you've got the country, if you've got it past April 15th, it's yours forever and you can pass it on. If you read the Form 500, you say what's the major source of income of the billionaires, and they say, inheritance.

MR. MUDD: Yeah. Now tell me about Bush, and other than the economy, on what issues do you think he's vulnerable?

SEN. McCARTHY: Well, I think he's failed to respond to the opportunity with reference to Russia. This is a great opening and I think he's fumbled it.

MR. MUDD: You do?

SEN. McCARTHY: I do. I don't think he should have been running around, and talking to Yeltsin and going to the Ukraine and reciting bad poetry, that this was a great opportunity.

MR. MUDD: That was his failing, bad poetry.

SEN. McCARTHY: Well, bad poet. I was surprised he did, because the poet he quoted from has another poem which he says the American flag, the stars are bullet holes. It surprises me that George with his great admiration for the flag wouldn't have known that Yevtushenko had written a nasty poem about the American flag. He just, George is not quite with foreign policy. I don't think he's handled the Persian Gulf thing right. I thought he had, really had to go in. If what they told us was true about the threat to Saudi Arabian oil, we needed it and we're obligated under various treaties and so on to protect the oil. When he moved beyond that to Kuwait, this is where the British became responsible, because it's their holding. When he moved to breaking up Saddam Hussein's power, I thought the adjacent Arab states had primary responsibility either to do it or to occupy it. Iraq should have been occupied. If we hadn't occupied Japan, what would have happened? If we hadn't occupied Germany after World War II, what would have happened? Here is a major military commitment and George sort of defends everything by saying, they were more stupid than we thought they were. And you wonder about that, were the State Department people, the administration too stupid to understand how stupid Saddam was, or are they too smart to understand stupidity at that level? So either way, it's a gap here of misunderstanding which you have to attribute to George Bush. So I think he's failed on two major counts, one dealing with the Russians, and the other is fumbling in the Middle East.

MR. MUDD: My last question is: Are you too old to be President?

SEN. McCARTHY: Well --

MR. MUDD: Seventy-five, that would be the oldest ever, wouldn't it?

SEN. McCARTHY: Well, I don't know. How old was Reagan when he finished?

MR. MUDD: I'm talking about starting.

SEN. McCARTHY: Well, this is kind of a silly question and I couldn't --

MR. MUDD: My question was silly?

SEN. McCARTHY: No, no. It is kind of silly. I'm in good health, as I told you beforehand. George, I have all my glands, George is missing at least one, isn't that right? And I don't fall up stairs. Remember, Jerry Ford was falling up stairs or down stairs. He fell both ways, I think. My father lived to be 98, which is a pretty good age. I'm healthy. And you have some additional protection, one of which is the Constitutional Amendment on disability. So if one comes apart now you can throw 'em out. And the other real defense is I won't have a vice president like Quayle. So you've got about four levels of protection between you and Dan Quayle even if my age is a factor.

MR. MUDD: Well, it's been a pleasure always, Senator, to talk to you. And thank you for being with us.

CONVERSATION with Democrat SEN. PAUL TSONGAS

(From transcript of the MAC NEIL/LEHRER NEWSHOUR aired Apr. 10, 1991)

MS HUNTER-GAULT: Now our first candidate interview of the 1992 Presidential campaign. It's with former Massachusetts Senator Paul Tsongas. Judy Woodruff has the interview and more.

PERSON ON STREET: Tsongas?

PERSON ON STREET: Tsongas? I think it looks like it's written backwards.

PERSON ON STREET: Tsongas? I don't know. Is he in the Mafia.

MAN ON STREET: Is he on Leave It To Beaver?

MS. WOODRUFF: Paul Tsongas may not be a household word or even one that is pronounceable. But the former Massachusetts Senator hopes that by next year's Iowa caucus the Senator's name and ideas will be recognized.

SEN. TSONGAS: I am glad to be here. Coming to Iowa is sort of my test.

MS. WOODRUFF: Tsongas says he passed that test two weeks ago with a well received campaign swing through Iowa. According to Tsongas that reception was the turning point of his decision to enter the Presidential race and formally announce later this month.

SEN. TSONGAS: The President is very popular and people can be upset about that but it gives us the opportunity to rethink what we as Democrats and should stand for and in my own view is that we should maintain the traditional values that made this country and party worth while.

MS. WOODRUFF: On a less serious note Tsongas pokes fun at one of his own liabilities the inevitable comparison to the other liberal Massachusetts greek liberal politician Mike Dukakis.

SEN. TSONGAS: If you look at the Constitution there is a provision that says that you are ineligible to run for President if you are a Greek from Massachusetts.

MS. WOODRUFF: Many have already dismissed the Tsongas candidacy. IN addition to being labeled a Dukakis clone Tsongas is not known nationally and is short on campaign dollars. He also has serious medical problems. In 1984 he was diagnosed with Lymphoma cancer of the lymph nodes. The 43 the junior Massachusetts Senator decided not to seek reelection. Instead he chose to return home to be with his wife and three young daughters.

SEN. TSONGAS: To avoid sacrifice to my family I would have had to take the job of Senator far less seriously. I am not prepared to do that.

MS. WOODRUFF: Upon retiring from the Senate Tsongas returned to Boston for what he says has been successful cancer treatments. He has since resumed his law practice and serves on seven corporate boards. The Senator is here with us now. Welcome.

SEN. TSONGAS: Thank you.

MS. WOODRUFF: I think most Americans really aren't paying much attention at all at this point to the Presidential campaign that is coming up next year but those who are asking why Paul Tsongas. You have been out of the public eye for seven years why are you doing this.

SEN. TSONGAS: I think that if I had been in the Senate for these last seven years they might not ask the question. I guess what it comes down to have I learned anything by being in the private sector for these last six or seven years that would give me some sense of where the country has to go. And I think that I have a perspective that is not a Washington perspective and it really began as concern of what is happening to the country economically that I see from my perspective and wanting to change the Democratic Party to sound the alarm if you will. I am prepared to put my ideas out and let me be judged on the basis of those ideas.

MS. WOODRUFF: But you are from one part of the Country, New England, how do you know that your perspective sitting in New England for seven years is one that reflects what most Americans want?

SEN. TSONGAS: Well the fact is that when we compete with Japan we don't compete as New England against Japan we compete as a country against Japan. Same is true with Germany. So the fact is that we are not competing with Japan and Germany successfully effects the entire country. So if you have an erosion of the American standard of living it is not just going to be in New England it is going to be nationwide. And I don't see that this Administration is going to address this because they have to sell good times, they have to engage in happy talk. So it really is incumbent on the Democrats to make the country aware of these difficulties but the Democratic Party as it is now constituted would have a very hard time convincing the American people that it cares about economics, that it knows how to run the economy and that is the transition that we are going to have to make.

MS. WOODRUFF: What makes you think that you Paul Tsongas, former U.S. Senator. Former U.S. Congressman is the right person to get the Democrats of their feet and moving and potentially successful next year. What gives you that incredible chutzpa?

SEN. TSONGAS: Well one everything that I have said in this paper that I have done I said in 1980. I wrote the book in 1980 about where we should go. So I am not a revisionist, I am not some one who is in the post Persian Gulf saying well my God what do we think about how do we do this. And secondly having been in the private sector I am willing to test my ideas. I have written this here are my ideas how you can turn the economy back and others do theirs put their ideas across let's have a debate. I am very comfortable with the validity of what I have put out and it seems to me that others have the same obligation. YOU know the great criticism in 1988 was there is no substance. We that is not going to be a criticism this time and if I wasn't very confident about my ideas and about what I have learned in these seven years I wouldn't be doing it because I am the easiest person in the World to dismiss. I am Greek, I am from Massachusetts.

MS. WOODRUFF: Well what about that the conventional view would be alright here is another liberal democratic Greek American a Democrat from Massachusetts. What is to defuse people from assuming that you are another Mike Dukakis?

SEN. TSONGAS: Well first of all I want to be judged for myself. When I was here in the Senate nobody judged me compared to any one else and I guess I want the same thing. What I am saying is I recognize those are difficulties but judge me on my ideas. If I don't have the best view of where this country has to go dismiss me but please don't dismiss me on the basis of my heritage or which state I am from.

MS. WOODRUFF: Where does this country have to go?

SEN. TSONGAS: Three concerns, I mean, we have to recognize the problem we are not competing with Japan and Germany. We have this enormous debt that is being accumulated. We can't ever trade surplus and that means a severe arisen of the American standard of living. That is a given. Second job is to get the Democratic Party to be pro business. To recognize it has to care about the creation of national wealth. We have never done that before and that is change in Democratic Party philosophy I am absolutely convinced, Not just me by the way but the other candidates out there in 1992. Democrats who will begin the same process of forcing Democrats to care about economics. If we don't convince the American people that we can run this economy they will never elect a Democrat to the White House nor should they.

MS. WOODRUFF: But you say care about creating wealth. You are for a capital gains tax cut. These are some of the very same things that the Republicans are talking about. Why not run as a Republican?

SEN. TSONGAS: The President's capital gains tax is across the board. My capital gains tax cut is targeted to companies that compete. It has a better differential for start ups and has a differential based on holding periods. So the Republican attitude is that we want an across the board capital

gains because it effects our people the most. The Democrats say we don't want any capital gains because it doesn't effect our people as opposed to either party saying how do you compete. How do you have a capital gains tax reduction that goes to the issue of competing. And that is what I and others will hopefully be talking about.

MS. WOODRUFF: But there are some people who have looked at your candidacy and say alright he has a liberal, ultra liberal voting record when he was in the House and Senate. He has had some time to go off and think about. He has come back with some conservative positions for nuclear power under limited circumstance, I understand you are for the death penalty.

SEN. TSONGAS: If you go back and read my book that I wrote in 1980 you will see all the arguments for nuclear power in that book. The difference now everyone is concerned about the Greenhouse effect so there has been a shift in attitude but if you look at everything virtually that is in the paper that you have here was in my book in 1980 and the reason that I think that I have credibility is this is not a new Paul Tsongas. This is consistent with what I tried to do with my party back in 1980.

MS. WOODRUFF: But what I am saying is that some people again would look at your candidacy and see some traditional liberal positions mixed in with a few conservative positions. Which one is the real Paul Tsongas?

SEN. TSONGAS: I have been referred to as a pro business liberal. I have always been referred to that way. That is what I am. On traditional Democratic issues, human rights, civil rights, women's rights, the environment I am a liberal and I make no apology for that but in terms of energy policy and in particularly in terms of economic policy I am a realist. I may sound like a Republican but if it world I am for it. I am not locked in to the ideology. Sort of the class warfare, corporate bashing that Democrats find attractive. That is not me it has never been me. But it is not new. I have been there all this time and that is why the book saves me from your question because that book in 1980 went in to all of this. Made the arguments and I thought that at that point the Democrats would find it very attractive and compelling and move in that direction and as you know I was wasting my time.

MS. WOODRUFF: You have said I understand that you would have voted against the Congressional authorization to have the President use force. You think that the war was a mistake?

SEN. TSONGAS: No. What I said was, no one asked me the question until the war was over. When I was asked the question if I have people believe that I listened to Sam Nunn on television and David Boren and to argue that I would not have voted with them is absurd. I was trying to be honest. I was not arguing against going in as they were not but rather they felt sanctions should be given more time. I was simply not trying to pretend a position was ludicrous on its face.

MS. WOODRUFF: So you think the war was the right policy for the United States?

SEN. TSONGAS: Well I think that the President deserves great credit for what he did and I think that any Democrat that dismisses that is making a mistake. It is not fair. He did a wonderful job. Now if you could only take that popularity and apply it to the domestic issues then he can be effective but he is not in a position given the advisors around him to make the tough decisions on economics, on issues like gun control. Those kinds of things.

MS. WOODRUFF: Another question that I think that some people who look at you and your life experience. Here is some one who had a life threatening illness, cancer, who had time to consider what is really important in life. You had time to spend more time with your family. Why did then throw yourself back in to the fray of this crazy schedule that a Presidential candidate that he has to out himself or herself through?

SEN. TSONGAS: It is going to sound kind of syrupy but I survived. And there is an obligation of

that survival. If there is some body else who thought the way that I did, who has had the experience that I have had. If a Bill Bradley, for example, had run I would have supported them. But I honestly believe as strange as it may sound that I know what this country has to do and where we have to go to avoid the economic decline that I experienced as a child. So what am I supposed to do. Sit back in Lowell, Massachusetts and make my money as a lawyer, protect my family and say well the rest of you are on your on. I went through a lot and I have an obligation back and that is what I see myself doing. That is what my family sees me doing and I know that may sound unusual in the Washington context but that is how I feel.

MS. WOODRUFF: When you run for Public Office your health becomes an issue. You have said as I understand that you are cured. I read a comment and an article in the New York Times recently that your doctors have told you that you have eight to twelve years to live. Is that correct or not?

SEN. TSONGAS: That was correct eight years ago. But I have been through the bone marrow transplant since and my doctor will be at the National Press Club tomorrow and available to answer questions. They gave me the full range of examinations in January.

MS. WOODRUFF: And the prognosis now is?

SEN. TSONGAS: Is there a guarantee nobody has a guarantee. The other piece of that from a kind of political symbolism is that at the end of this month I will compete in the Masters Championships in Indianapolis. So when people see me doing the butterfly and they know that they can't do it they will be less concerned about the state of my health.

MS. WOODRUFF: So there are all sorts of contests in your life?

SEN. TSONGAS: The health issue is important and I have to give people confidence that it is behind me.

MS. WOODRUFF: Paul Tsongas we thank you for being with us.

SEN. TSONGAS: Thank you.



**LAUCKS FOUNDATION, INC.**

P. O. Box 5012, Santa Barbara, CA. 93150-5012

---

Education for Peace   Equity among Peoples   Environmental Responsibility