

dence in his own judgments.

This has been more like Ford's presidency than a real revolution. The American people can be rallied, but not if it looks like you're in hock to the banks. Budget cuts should have been across the board—for synfuels, Ex-Im Bank—as well as welfare.

There are practical things Reagan could have done on moral issues that he didn't do. He could have taken away federal money going to Planned Parenthood, he could have cut off subsidies for homosexual and feminist groups.

HOWARD PHILLIPS is the national director of the Conservative Caucus.

"Reagan may have been too successful too fast. He was elected before there were enough people ideologically committed to his program who also had the necessary technical skills to run the government."

Richard Rahn

Reagan's big success was the reduction of high marginal tax rates, and the reduction of taxation as a percentage of GNP by 1 percent. The big problem was that he didn't go after spending as much as he went after taxes.

In September 1981, Dave Stockman came out with bigger deficit projections and called for tax increases. That piece of inconsistency right after the tax cuts, together with radical monetary policy, aggravated the recession. The Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act (TEFRA) tax increases of 1982 set back the recovery for at least a quarter and certainly increased uncertainty.

Contrary to what some of the supply-siders say, economic growth won't take care of our spending problems so long as the entitlements formulas are kept the way they are. You could have real GNP growth of 15 percent a year and still not balance the budget so long as you have a consumer price index that overstates the rate of inflation (and hence the Social Security cost-of-living adjustment) as well as the kind of entitlements program we have for Medicare. In 1981 the administration could have changed the indexing formulas if Reagan had talked about a fiscal crisis: In the short run, people wouldn't have noticed much. The president also missed an opportunity in 1981 to cut the 17 to 23 percent annual growth of Medicare expenditures. With the proper marketing, he could have offered a program that focused on catastrophic medical care and reduced major risks while cutting minor expenses.

There's a widespread belief in the business community that there's a tremendous amount of waste in the Defense budget. A public war on waste in the Defense Depart-

ment would have been useful at least for psychological purposes in building support for overall spending cuts.

When TEFRA came up for a vote, the president got on national TV and promised \$3 in spending reductions for each dollar in additional taxes. In fact, he got \$1.14 in spending growth for each extra tax dollar. By claiming they got spending reductions when in fact they didn't, the Reagan people kept playing into the hands of the liberal media.

Reagan may have been too successful too fast. He was elected before there were enough people ideologically committed to his program who also had the necessary technical skills to run the government. In addition, people who understand the issues best are often the worst ones in terms of day-to-day management.

There was a shortage, for example, of supply-side economists. There were only a handful of technically capable supply-side economists to fill a couple of hundred economic policy positions. Thus many people who joined the administration didn't understand the Reagan program and in some cases didn't agree with it. On deregulation, the administration would have been a lot better off if it had another 20 people like James Miller, chairman of the Federal Trade Commission. At Health and Human Services, there wasn't much of a pool of talent to draw on of people who understood what Reagan was trying to do. There were a lot of gaps in staffing, which means you get people who know something about a subject and use the conventional professional reasoning. That is why nothing changes.

RICHARD RAHN is a vice president and the chief economist of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

"Genuine conservatives are by and large overjoyed by Reagan, and rightly so."

William A. Rusher

Genuine conservatives are by and large overjoyed by Reagan, and rightly so. He has a great many accomplishments to his credit, and he has been remarkably loyal to the agenda of movement conservatism. What little he hasn't done, he hasn't forgotten that it needs to be done later. Just look how he kept fighting for the MX even after it looked defeated.

Reagan has put together a successful combination of economic conservatives and social conservatives that produces victories at the presidential level. He is the only man in the upper ranks of the Republican party who has understood the importance of this combination.

He has changed the whole area of the battlefield by redefining the battle. The debates are now, How much shall the budget be cut? How much shall we build our defense?

He has put conservatives into lower echelons of gov-

ernment. This means that in the next conservative administration, conservatives can go to the higher echelons. Reagan has been criticized for drawing his top people from outside the conservative ranks. But previously, there was not a single soul in the conservative movement who had been postmaster of Dogpatch, Kentucky. How can you have a reasonable agenda for redesigning the Environmental Protection Agency when no conservative has ever served there? Reagan has been like Columbus. He has led us ashore on a continent many of us have never seen or been on.

Since Reagan took over, not a single square inch of territory has been lost to the Communists, unless one counts Qaddafi's takeover of portions of Chad. The contras are stirring up trouble in Nicaragua, Afghan freedom fighters are getting equipment, South Africa is making raids into Angola and Mozambique, there is activity along the Thai-Cambodian border. This is not in my mind just a series of coincidences. What we have is a president who gets up in the morning, brushes his teeth, and asks his staff, "what shall we do to them today?"

Reagan made the right choice to lower taxes, rather than raise them. Not one dime raised in taxes would be applied to the deficit, for you can be sure that Tip O'Neill would spend every one of them, passing them out to his party's constituents.

The best criticism I've heard of Reagan, although I disagree with it, was that he was a little too victory-oriented in the fall of 1981. I think the administration would have been better off if it had asked for far more domestic spending cuts than it could get and then blamed Congress for not giving them. However, nothing succeeds like success, and I'm not sure this would have been as successful an administration if it hadn't won those early victories in 1981.

Reagan did the statesmanlike thing on Social Security; solving this problem requires bipartisan support. You can say he didn't completely solve the problem, but he deserves credit for postponing the system's collapse.

WILLIAM A. RUSHER is publisher of National Review and a syndicated columnist.

"You will not see me criticizing Ronald Reagan. He is a wonderful man with all the right instincts. Criticism of Reagan is an easy way for conservatives to get on the national media, but I think that's a mistake."

Phyllis Schlafly

You will not see me criticizing Ronald Reagan. He is a wonderful man with all the right instincts. Criticism of Reagan is an easy way for conservatives to get on the

national media, but I think that's a mistake.

Reagan has been fine on the moral issues. He has never waffled on his opposition to the ERA; he's against drafting women.

People are better off economically than they were under Carter because inflation is licked. I like the way Reagan stood absolutely firm on the air controllers' strike.

Reagan's principal problem is that he's not a tough enough administrator. He's such a nice guy. He should have fired disloyal people, and he should have fired Carter holdovers earlier, such as those on the Civil Rights Commission. He wouldn't have got as much bad press.

Social Security was mismanaged by the White House. Reagan shouldn't have talked about the subject at all. Loose talk created a fear in people who are dependent on Social Security, especially older women, and enabled Democrats to be absolutely unscrupulous in exaggerating those fears. The bipartisan commission was a good move to defuse the subject as a Republican-Democratic issue.

One of Reagan's problems is that his closest advisers don't understand politics. They aren't pragmatic politicians. They don't understand what produces votes at the precinct level.

Reagan won in 1980 because he brought in voters who had never voted before, because they don't care about politics. The advisers don't understand how Reagan's stand on such issues as abortion and gay rights and the ERA and drafting women strongly motivated so many people who normally don't vote at all. Many people pay too much attention to polls. But Gallup and Harris can't predict *who* is going to vote.

Something else the White House advisers don't understand is the need to motivate and enthuse your activists. Elections are not determined by 25 million Democrats and 25 million Republicans; they are determined by a few thousand activists on both sides who bring out the vote. Reagan's activists haven't been getting the tender loving care they need in order to duplicate in 1984 what they did in 1980.

PHYLLIS SCHLAFLY is president of the Eagle Forum.

"If we balance the budget and we still keep murdering a million and a half babies every year, there's no way we can say we're better off than we were four years ago."

Cal Thomas

If we balance the budget and we still keep murdering a million and a half babies every year, there's no way we can say we're better off than we were four years ago.

Reagan always says the right things when he talks to