

— Get serious once again about nuclear arms control by

- ratifying SALT II.
- adhering to the ABM Treaty
- tightly controlling the flow of weapons grade material
- re-emphasizing non-proliferation.
- raising the nuclear threshold in Europe
- improving crisis communications with the Soviet Union
- beginning to bargain toward a mutual and verifiable freeze on strategic arms
- convening a summit conference to get the START and TNF talks back on track

The Reagan Administration has failed to build for the future.

- The future requires the best educated and trained generation in American history. But the Reagan Administration has slashed funding for education by \$ 2 billion (13 percent) in FY 1984 alone.
- The future requires American science and technology second to none, across the board. But the administration has radically skewed research and development funds toward military activities: a 24 percent real increase in FY 1984 military R & D, and a four percent decrease in the civilian sector.
- The future requires unpolluted land, water and air. But the Administration has failed to enforce environmental laws and regulations now on the books and has blatantly betrayed the public trust in its management of the Environmental Protection Agency.
- The future requires renewed movement toward energy independence. But the Administration has slashed funding for programs that promote conservation and the development of new and renewable energy sources.
- The future requires a healthy small business sector — the prime source of innovation and jobs in our economy. But the Administration's policies have deprived small business of affordable credit, reduced their access to trained personnel, and tilted the tax codes in favor of corporate giants.
- The future requires revitalized basic industries. But the Administration has presided over their decline while doing almost nothing to halt and reverse it.
- The future requires the full, fair, and equal participation of all Americans in our economy. But the Administration has backtracked on minority employment, weakened support for minority small business, and opposed measures such as the ERA that would help ensure fairness for women.
- The future requires strong alliances and diplomacy based squarely on America's values. But the Administration has weakened our traditional alliances with the world's democracies and undermined the credibility of our commitment to human rights around the world.
- Above all, the future demands effective nuclear arms control. But the Administration has moved us away from — not toward — this vital goal.

WALTER MONDALE SUPPORTS THE FUTURE -- AND ALWAYS HAS

Walter Mondale is a strong, proven friend of American higher education and research. During his twelve years in the Senate and four as Vice President, he worked on every major piece of legislation in support of colleges, universities, and student assistance.

Mr. Mondale was the original author or cosponsor of the whole range of federal initiatives in public and private higher education and research: student grants and loans; direct support for institutions; aid for libraries and laboratories; advanced study and research in the sciences, arts, and humanities; support for such federal grant-making institutions as the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation, and the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities.

Walter Mondale firmly believes we must make higher education available to students of all backgrounds, and make our research facilities the best in the world. As he said in announcing his strategy for Excellence in Education:

Too few students are able to afford quality higher education. Too much priceless talent is being wasted. Too many university laboratories are unable to replace obsolete equipment and laboratories. Too often are faculty and graduate students leaving universities for industry, squandering the seed corn for future research.

As President, Mr. Mondale will take several steps to improve higher education in America, including:

- o expanding student and institutional aid so that low and middle income students can again go as far as their talent and hard work will take them, and so that American vocational schools, community colleges, colleges and

universities will be assured of a stable financial base;

- o adopting a new national policy to foster graduate education and research through merit-based fellowships to faculty and students in areas of critical national need; and
- o launching an ambitious five-year program to refurbish laboratories and libraries, so that the tools for our academic scientists, engineers, and their students are state-of-the-art.

Walter Mondale believes that education is the key to America's future. In a recent speech at the University of Cincinnati, he said:

As President, I will lead a renaissance in education, learning, science, and training. If we wipe out illiteracy, we can strike out unemployment. If we boost student aid, we can boost our economy. If we master foreign languages, we can master foreign markets. If we study the arts, we can civilize our spirits. If we study the humanities, we can humanize our species.

Mr. Mondale's commitment to education contrasts sharply with the current Administration's record. This Administration has made drastic cuts in student aid. They have attempted to eliminate aid for graduate students and libraries. And they have failed to address our country's needs for modern university laboratories and instrumentation.

As citizens deeply concerned about higher education, we believe we must have a President who is committed to opportunity and excellence in our institutions of higher learning and research. And we believe Walter Mondale will be that President.

FACING THE CHALLENGES OF THE FUTURE

"We have been warned frequently in recent years about the dangers of technological illiteracy. However, . . . it is the danger of moral illiteracy" that worries the author as he looks ahead to the 21st century.

by Walter F. Mondale

BELIEF in the future has always been essential to America. Over 200 years ago, a small band of Americans gambled their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor on an unprecedented revolution for human freedom. Succeeding generations tamed unknown frontiers, invented new forms of production, united the globe with novel systems of communication and information, and sent a man to the moon. These deeds were performed by men and women who dared to leave their native lands in search of liberty and opportunity—a collective act of faith without parallel in human history.

Americans have always bet on change, but in one key respect we have not changed. We hold fast to the values on which we were founded and which make us great—individual freedom, equal opportunity, and self-government under the rule of



Mr. Mondale served as Vice President of the United States from 1976 through 1979.

law; we hold fast to the institutions that have served us so well—limited government, the free enterprise system, religious liberty, and the family; and we hold fast to the conviction that these values and institutions must shape America's purposes in the world.

The task of leadership in the remainder of this century is to build on our enduring values and turn the forces of change to America's advantage. We need not fear the future; we should welcome it, because the future is made for America. However, to seize the American advantage, we must see the world not through an ideological prism, not through a haze of nostalgia, but as it really is.

Nearly 40 years ago, the U.S. emerged from World War II incomparably the strongest and most prosperous nation on Earth. Our allies and adversaries alike were devastated. All of them had lost large portions of their population. Their economies had been destroyed. Many were undergoing social strife and political dislocation. Meanwhile, U.S. losses were relatively light. Our productive capacity had been enhanced during the war years, our political institutions were stable and respected, our people were united, and our morale was high. We accepted the challenge that no other nation could have met—world leadership. We democratized Japan, rebuilt Europe, and orchestrated the defense of free peoples against the Soviet Union.

Leading the West wasn't cheap. We invested a sizeable fraction of our wealth in defense. We paid out billions in foreign aid and subsidized loans. We opened our markets so that our friends could sell the products their own economies were too weak to absorb, at some cost to our domestic industries. We were willing to bear these burdens and, because our economy led the world in innovation and productivity, we could afford to do so.

Today, the postwar era is over. Europe and Japan have fully recovered from the ravages of war and now compete with us on equal terms. In most instances, the governments of these nations have used national policies to develop new growth sectors and restructure declining industries. Frequently, this targeting has come at the expense of growth in our own economy.

At the same time, the arena of global economic competition is expanding. Developing nations such as Brazil are becoming major economic powers. The energy shocks of the past decade created a vast pool of capital that moves with little regard for international boundaries. Around the world, business managers are searching for low-cost production facilities, not just in traditional industries such as textiles, autos, and steel, but also in burgeoning areas such as semiconductors and advanced electronics. Recently, this country was jolted by Atari's decision to

move a significant portion of its operation overseas.

Meanwhile, our own economy has faltered. Our productivity gains in the past decade have been lower than those of any other industrialized nation. The pace of innovation has slowed. We are in danger of losing the battle for competitiveness in many of the key growth areas of coming decades—semiconductors, microchips, advanced machine tools, fifth-generation computers, and many more. Many of our basic industries have failed to make the investments needed to retain their competitiveness in the world markets. The results are evident—widespread structural unemployment, an unending hemorrhage of manufacturing jobs, and the devastation of entire communities and regions.

Vast changes

These alterations in our international standing are intersecting with vast social and demographic changes now sweeping our society—changes that are reversing key features of our postwar experience. We have come from the baby boom to the baby bust generation. In 1940, there were nine working Americans for every retired person; in 1990, there will be just two for every retired person. We can expect this trend to accelerate, as life expectancy increases by at least four years for both men and women in the next half-century. By 2033, the proportion of people over 65 in our country will nearly have doubled, from 11.3% to 21.5%. This means that we will have fewer younger people to support Social Security, to maintain our defenses, and to power our economy.

At the same time, the percentage of children being born into poverty is rising—up from 16% to over 20% in the past few years alone. This means that a higher percentage of people may come of age with poor education and no job skills.

We are also becoming a diverse society. In 1970, blacks, Asians, Hispanics, and other minorities constituted 16.8% of the total population. By 1990, they will comprise more than 20%, and that figure will continue to rise well into the 21st century.

Simultaneously, a technological revolution is already changing the way we live and work. We are in the midst of an economic transformation as momentous as the Industrial Revolution. Manufacturing jobs are disappearing as basic industries strive to improve competitiveness with robotics, computers, and reorganized assembly lines. Service jobs are also being lost to automation. Even bureaucrats may be replaced by sophisticated telecommunications and information retrieval systems.

Meanwhile, demand for skilled workers in other occupations—engineers, laser technicians, drafters, assemblers, and computer analysts and programmers—is increasing dramatically. We are already

short more than 50,000 machinists—the people who make the robots and sophisticated electronic devices—and that figure will rise to nearly 250,000 by the end of this decade. Other new jobs will open in fiber optics, computer applications in homes and offices, and health care, as well as others that we can barely imagine today.

In addition, the social context of work is being transformed. The rapid rise in single-parent families and the increase of women in the workforce will create pressure for more flexibility in work hours and arrangements, as well as increased provision for day care and other family services.

Finally, the very nature of work is being altered, as is the structure of the typical career. In recent generations, workers expected to enter a single occupational track and to remain in it, performing more or less the same activities throughout their working lives. The next generation of workers must anticipate multiple job changes, within or between industries, and tasks that call for less repetition and more flexibility.

The postwar era is over, not just economically and socially, but also politically. Forty years ago, the Soviet Union had enormous ideological appeal in Europe and in the developing countries. Today, communist parties throughout Europe are in steep decline, and few developing countries look to the Soviets as a model. The Soviet Union now exerts its influence not through ideas and the promise of a better future, but through intimidation backed by vast and growing military force.

At the same time, the generation that remembers with admiration and gratitude America's role in liberating Europe from the Nazis, initiating the Marshall Plan, and founding NATO as a bulwark against the U.S.S.R. is now giving way to a successor generation whose views of the U.S. have been shaped by Vietnam, Chile, and Watergate. Among young people, the percentage who discern no moral difference between us and the Soviets is on the rise. Reckless talk about nuclear warning shots and limited nuclear war has even allowed the Soviets to masquerade as the apostles of peace.

Perhaps the most profound change has been the spread of Western values and hopes around the globe. A generation ago, the vast majority of the Earth's population expected neither economic improvements nor political freedom, either for themselves or for their children. Today, mass communication has brought news of a better life into even the remotest villages. Transformations in agricultural production and the spread of industrial mass-production facilities around the world have accelerated the urbanization already under way, bringing hundreds of millions of peasants into contact with new

experiences and upsetting traditional social patterns.

In short, the developing nations have entered modern history. We must therefore expect the coming decades to be a period of social stress and conflict. Our task is to encourage and strengthen the forces of moderation and social decency against extremists of the right, who will attempt to protect traditional privileges, and those of the left, who will cynically exploit the hopes of the people to achieve tyrannical power for themselves.

Challenges such as these are daunting indeed. Surmounting them requires a U.S. that is certain of its mission and confident of its abilities. However, for some years, our response to the closing of the postwar era was halting and uncertain.

This is understandable—perhaps even inevitable. From the onset of human history, after all, change has been the law of life. Nearly every generation has been surprised by the pace of change and astonished by its direction. Most generations have feared that they would be unable to adjust, and ours was no exception.

Yet, as I have traveled across this country, I find that the winter of our discontent is yielding to a springtime of hope. Uncertainty is giving way to a new public spirit of toughness and resolve. With this spirit—and with sensible policies to guide our efforts—we can not fail.

Domestic issues

Let me touch briefly on a few of our major challenges at home. Throughout the past two decades, we have sought to increase access to education for all Americans. Women, minorities, the handicapped, and many other groups benefitted enormously from these efforts, and so did our entire society.

Lately, citizens and experts have called for a renewed emphasis on educational excellence. They are right. In a modern society, the prime source of wealth, progress, and security is the trained human mind. We must be prepared to invest in it.

Recently, I have proposed a major new initiative to improve our systems of education, from grade school to graduate school. We must guarantee equal educational opportunity for every child, ensure that low- and moderate-income students can go as far as their talents will allow, improve the quality of teachers and curricula, and refurbish the laboratories and libraries in our leading centers of research and graduate instruction. These tasks will require an all-out national mobilization, from the local school board to the Federal government. It won't be cheap, but it is the best investment we can make in our future.

Formal education is but one aspect of a comprehensive emphasis on skills and talents. We must devote more ingenuity and

resources to job training and retraining—for entry-level workers, workers who wish to upgrade or shift their occupation, and workers who have been displaced by sweeping economic and technological change. The private sector has already invested billions of dollars in job training. It will have to do much more, by itself and in cooperation with government and community organizations.

With shrinking cohorts of entry-level workers, business will be compelled to focus on disadvantaged youth who have been neglected in recent decades. All Americans want to work—even (or especially) those who have never been given the slightest opportunity or encouragement to work. It was never morally acceptable to cast a single person aside—and soon it will be economically unacceptable as well.

The changing composition of the workforce will also force us to pay even greater attention to issues of fundamental fairness. Discrimination will become inefficient as well as inequitable. The principle of equal pay for equal work will be supplemented with "pay equity"—equal pay for work of comparable worth—and job assignment based on racial or sexual stereotypes will be cast aside. In coming decades, I expect the American dream of equal opportunity for every citizen to move measurably closer to realization.

To provide jobs for all Americans, we will have to fashion a balanced economic program that helps restore the competitiveness of our basic industries while encouraging innovation and entrepreneurship. Some have argued for a "sunrise" strategy that allows steel, autos, and the rest to wither. I believe that this is a fundamental mistake. Through the end of the century and beyond, basic industries will be a key source of jobs, and they already are the single most important consumer of high-technology items. Modern production lines use computers, robotics, and sophisticated precision tools—and this will spread rapidly in coming years.

A balanced program will therefore have two components: an industrial policy that mobilizes labor, management, and the public sector to restore the health and competitiveness of basic industries; and a tax policy that puts the emphasis on incentives for new business formation, research and development, and long-term strategies to increase market shares for our most innovative products. Nations that have made the greatest strides in recent years have adopted such policies. We should not slavishly imitate them. Yet we have little choice but to adapt aspects of their success to our own institutions and purposes.

Two other areas are vital to our long-term health as a nation—energy and the environment.

After a period of deep national concern

about energy supplies and prices, the issue has subsided, but we dare not confuse the current lull with the end of the storm. Economic recovery will quickly soak up surplus oil and may well send prices soaring once again. Global population growth and economic development will surely increase demand significantly by the end of the century.

We must do what we can to increase supplies of traditional energy sources—especially coal, which has been unwisely neglected. Still, the long-term hope for abundance lies in renewable sources—especially solar—and improved conservation. In my judgment, the Reagan Administration's virtual elimination of research and development in these areas is tragically shortsighted. Long-term economic growth and national security both demand the reversal of this unwise approach.

Recent controversy over the environment has made it clear that the public concern is profound, and the consensus extraordinarily broad. Our people fear for the future—and rightly so—unless toxic wastes are cleaned up, air and water purified, acid rain corrected, and nuclear by-products handled safely. And our people are demanding national parks, wilderness areas, and wildlife refuges to pass on to their children. Polls reveal most Americans believe that environmental protection is fully compatible with economic growth and that, if they were forced to choose, they would make some economic sacrifices to ensure a cleaner environment.

I believe that we should seize upon this national consensus to build the patient, long-term, bipartisan strategies we need. The wise stewardship of our resources is well within our grasp, but only if we avoid the ignorant extremism that has pervaded the Reagan Administration.

Some natural resource issues will pose special challenges. Our topsoil—the foundation of our extraordinary agricultural productivity—is eroding at an alarming rate. Water tables, particularly in the Southwest, are sinking so quickly that entire cities are endangered. In these and similar issues, uncontrolled development and exploitation are at the root of the problem. To safeguard the national interest, some individual and local prerogatives must give way. Granted, it is never easy to deal with prospective problems before they develop into full-fledged emergencies, but it is sobering to realize that the desert region of North Africa was once the breadbasket of the Roman Empire.

The international arena

Looking beyond the borders of our own country, I see four key challenges in coming decades. First, we must re-cement our traditional alliances and expand them to include the world's emerging democra-

cies. Today, these alliances are undergoing severe strains. Europeans fear that our stance on arms control is diminishing their security and increasing the prospect of war. The Japanese fear that disagreements with the U.S. over trade and defense will complicate the task of diplomatic cooperation. Latin Americans fear that our policies throughout the hemisphere, whatever their intention, will weaken the democratic center and drive genuine reformers into the arms of extremists. And, of course, the U.S. has legitimate complaints against its friends and allies as well.

These are serious difficulties, but they should not be exaggerated. I am convinced that, in the long run, the world's democracies share interests much more profound and enduring than the quarrels that from time to time divide them. The task of American diplomacy is to build on common ground, while firmly and patiently advocating our own views.

This brings me to my second point. What unites us, above all, is a shared sense of moral values. I believe that our foreign policy must emphasize them. Democratic values, social decency, human rights—these are not frills that stand opposed to our "real" interest. In the long run, only a foreign policy that rests on American values can promote American interests in the world. That doesn't mean that we should preach to the rest of humanity, but it does mean that we must make our preferences clear to friends and foe alike. It also means that we must strive to render our own policies—domestic as well as foreign—compatible with the principles we urge upon other nations.

Third, we must recommit ourselves to worldwide economic development. To cope with burgeoning populations and rising expectations, poor and developing nations will need an annual growth rate of at least five per cent. This can not be achieved without substantial and continuing infusions of capital from the developed nations. The sums required far exceed the range of prudent lending for even the largest commercial banks. Clearly, official international lending agencies must play a more central role than ever before.

If this effort is to succeed, some means must be found to ensure that the debts accumulated by developing countries during the 1970's do not strangle growth during the 1980's and 1990's. It is possible that these countries are experiencing only a temporary problem of liquidity. If so, a combination of economic growth, patience, and *ad hoc* arrangements will suffice to see them through. However, many experts believe that their problem is longer-term solvency, which can only be alleviated through significant adjustments in the terms of loans already on the books. Dealing with this in a manner that allocates burdens fairly and sets the stage for renewed growth will be one of the major

challenges for economic statemanship throughout the decade.

As more capital is deployed for development, we must avoid the mistakes of the recent past. In retrospect, it is clear that many overseas loans subsidized consumption, rather than investment. International lending institutions must now be prepared to insist on projects that will be self-sustaining in the long run. In addition, given the increased mobility of capital and goods, these institutions can no longer afford to consider development on a purely national or even regional basis. They must not encourage new investment in industries that already suffer from global overcapacity and whose growth prospects for the remainder of the century are at best uncertain.

As I have been arguing for some time, international lending is but one of the components of global economic growth. Without strong action by the world's industrialized nations to coordinate domestic economic policies, stabilize the chaotic international monetary system, and regain momentum toward a fairer and more open regime of international trade, the 1980's could be a decade of lost opportunity. The U.S. must, of course, play a leading role in bringing these changes about, but other nations must begin to make contributions in proportion to their wealth and power.

Meaningful action will not be painless, but I am convinced that the cost of inaction will be far greater—prolonged economic stagnation that could set the stage for an outburst of brutality, tyranny, and war. All nations, rich as well as poor, would suffer. The effect on the U.S. would be severe—declining exports; a massive influx of hungry, desperate people across our borders; and the loss of the hemispheric military security that we have enjoyed for generations.

The task of economic development is greatly complicated by the effects of population growth. By the 21st century, the Earth's population will total nearly 9,000,000,000. Most of the increase will occur in the poorest countries. This will place new pressures on supplies of food, energy, and raw materials. Efforts to cope with these problems in the past decade have already produced grave environmental consequences in regions from sub-Saharan Africa to the Amazon Basin. Unless we are much more careful, these trends will accelerate, endangering the capacity of our globe to support all its inhabitants.

The nuclear threat

However high the stakes of global economic development, they are dwarfed by our fourth challenge—restricting nuclear arsenals and reducing the risk of nuclear war. This task will require much more serious arms control negotiations between

the superpowers than we have witnessed in recent years. It will also require an all-out effort to block the spread of nuclear weapons. Allowing nuclear weapons to fall into the hands of irresponsible dictators, or nations likely to become embroiled in regional disputes, would be a grave threat to peace. I have been deeply disturbed by the Reagan Administration's relaxations of America's traditional leadership in non-proliferation. For that reason, I have joined a number of my fellow Democrats in proposing amendments to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act that would radically reduce exports of weapons-grade material and reprocessing equipment and encourage other nations to shift to lower-grade nuclear fuels that could not be used for military purposes. This problem can not be solved through legislation alone. It will require the unrelenting attention of presidents who understand the stakes, for our country and for the world.

As I think about the future, it seems to me that advances in human knowledge are the core of change in every area, economic as well as political, international as well as domestic. Medical breakthroughs that increase our lifespan, communications networks that permit the instantaneous transfer of huge sums across national borders, and weapon technologies that transform the very definition of security—all are produced by the restless ingenuity of the human mind.

The pace of change is already dizzying. In the next generation, we can expect it to accelerate still further. New sources of energy will be developed. Cures will be found for diseases that now ravage our species. Genetic engineering will produce new breeds of living beings and help correct a wide range of genetic birth defects. Advances in areas from metallurgy to weather forecasting will greatly increase our control over our environment. The computer/information revolution already under way will produce artificial intelligence that will transform our lives, from the home to the workplace to national defense.

As we have learned since Hiroshima, every increment of power raises the moral stakes. As science and technology reshape our world, we must not neglect the humanities and philosophy, for these are the disciplines that help check our violent instincts and give direction to the wiser use of our might. I hope that soon, as part of the normal preparatory curriculum, every scientist and engineer, every businessman and lawyer, will be exposed to history, literature, and the tradition of moral thought. We have been warned frequently in recent years about the dangers of technological illiteracy. However, as I look ahead to the 21st century, it is the danger of moral illiteracy that worries me the most.

GRENADA

MANCHESTER, NEW HAMPSHIRE, October 28--Walter F. Mondale today made the following statement on Grenada while campaigning in New Hampshire.

The United States has important interests which the President is sworn to uphold. Among them are the lives and freedom of American citizens, and the security of our country and our allies. If in fact American citizens in Grenada were in serious danger, or if Grenada was on the verge of becoming a base for Soviet or Cuban subversion in this hemisphere, then as President I would act decisively to meet these threats.

Unfortunately, we are unable to reach an informed judgment, because, possibly for the first time in our history, and without adequate justification, the Reagan administration deliberately blacked out news of its action. Moreover, Mr. Reagan failed to report to the Congress as required under the War Powers Act.

I am also troubled by issues the President ignored in his recent speech.

It's clear that Mr. Reagan did not adequately consult with our friends and allies. Their strong opposition to our venture will greatly complicate our relations with NATO and with friendly nations in our hemisphere.

Mr. Reagan ignored the non-intervention provisions of our treaty obligations, as well as opportunities for multilateral action under the OAS Charter. Our apparent indifference to international law will erode our moral authority to oppose outrages in Afghanistan, Poland, Cambodia, and elsewhere.

Finally, on the basis of facts currently at my disposal, I do not believe that Mr. Reagan adequately explored diplomatic solutions to the problems in Grenada. There are occasions on which upholding important American interests will require the use of force. But if the world comes to believe that we employ force as a first resort, we will pay a very heavy longterm price.

HANDICAPPED

June 1984

The Mondale Program for Handicapped Americans

As a nation we have finally begun to recognize the rights of handicapped Americans to fairness, equal treatment and full participation in society. Walter Mondale has been a leader in the effort to gain this recognition. While in the Senate, he co-sponsored the landmark Education for All Handicapped Children Act. As Vice President, he pressed for greater opportunities for all handicapped citizens for education, training, jobs and access to facilities. Enormous problems remain, however, especially because the Reagan Administration has reversed the trend toward equality and full participation.

1. Handicapped Americans remain victims of legal discrimination.

A blind man is denied an apartment. A woman with multiple sclerosis is denied a job. These actions, however repugnant to our sense of equality, are perfectly legal under federal law. The absence of legal protection has contributed to a poverty rate of 26% among handicapped people and an enormous unemployment rate.

The Mondale Position

Federal laws must prohibit discrimination on the basis of handicap in jobs and housing, just as the law prohibits such discrimination against women and minorities.

2. Those who cannot work are nevertheless denied benefits under Social Security Disability Insurance program.

Congress enacted the Social Security Disability Insurance program to provide workers with cash benefits and Medicare in the event they became disabled and unable to work. But in the last three years, half a million workers were cut off from benefits or denied entry into the program as a result of a conscious and cynical effort to save money.

The Mondale Position

The Social Security Disability Program is an essential part of our commitment to support those who cannot work, because of a disability. The program must be administered to carry out Congress' intent, not used to balance the budget.

3. Handicapped children are denied opportunities to become productive members of society.

When Walter Mondale co-sponsored the Education for All Handicapped Children Act he helped provide a free and appropriate education for the more than 4 million children who were then not receiving a decent education because they were handicapped. But the Reagan administration has attempted to limit the right of children to an appropriate education, to curtail the role of parents in protecting their child's education, and to avoid federal enforcement of the law. It has reduced funding for early childhood intervention programs which have been shown to be highly successful in reducing the impact of a handicap later in life.

The Mondale Position

Walter Mondale is committed to full enforcement and adequate funding of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. In addition, he believes that we must:

- achieve better coordination of medical and rehabilitative services with school programs;
- provide pre-school programs for handicapped children;
- help older handicapped students make the transition from school to work and from home to independent living.

4. Handicapped people do not enjoy a full life in the community.

As far back as 1965 Walter Mondale recognized the importance of making facilities accessible to handicapped people. But the job is unfinished. Even the right to vote in an accessible location is not certain. Fewer and fewer people are enrolled in vocational rehabilitation programs.

The Mondale Position

Mondale believes that handicapped people should have opportunities for independence in the community. He believes that we must:

- guarantee the right to vote in an accessible location;
- complete the effort to make facilities accessible;
- develop more accessible modes of transportation;
- increase vocational rehabilitation programs for adults and vocational education programs for adolescents;
- expand housing for the handicapped.

5. Handicapped persons in institutions are not protected.

Thousands of handicapped Americans live in institutions. While many of these institutions provide good care to their residents, others are characterized by abuse and neglect. While Walter Mondale was Vice President, the Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act was signed into law, which authorized the Justice Department to sue on behalf of institutionalized persons when their rights have been violated. But in the past three years, despite evidence of abuse and neglect in institutions, not a single case has been brought by the Reagan administration.

The Mondale Position

The Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act must be enforced by aggressive action of the Justice Department.

6. The mental health needs of people in the community are not met.

As a result of the development of drug therapy and community mental health centers, hundreds of thousands of mentally ill people no longer live in institutions. Federal support for community resources, however, has been reduced by 25% since Ronald Reagan became President. In addition, several million additional people have been unemployed by Reaganomics. At the same time, the research budget for mental illness remains inadequate. This administration has neglected mentally ill people.

The Mondale Position

If society places mentally ill people in the community, it must also provide the means to meet their needs in the community. And it must help put the community at ease with its mentally ill citizens. Walter Mondale believes that we must:

- eliminate existing barriers in the Medicaid program to pay for community-based care;
- expand the Community Services Program to assist communities to coordinate housing, work and social services with treatment;
- increase research concerning the causes and cures of mental illness;
- increase federal monitoring of nursing homes in which mentally ill people reside.

HEALTH CARE

ess. Only the healthy aged would select vouchers that had
erous coverage than Medicare at lower costs. But 9
of the elderly account for 70 percent of the outlays in
e. The result is that vouchers worth 95 percent of
e's average costs would bring a windfall to companies able
all the healthier aged. And so it would go, leaving the
under Medicare, the healthier using vouchers, and little
ontrol.

e Reagan Administration had made widely-noted pleas to
to accept a freeze in Medicare fees. But if doctors are
charge their patients beyond what Medicare deems reason-
freeze on the latter is no constraint on the former.
proach offers little hope for controlling physician
tures -- and none whatever for protecting the elderly.

nally, the Administration has successfully urged the
s to adopt prospective payment for Medicare's hospital
Using the method of payment with which New Jersey has
ented in recent years, the Medicare program would pay
rospective rates for specific diagnoses.

o difficulties attend this step. First, restricting
tive rates to Medicare alone permits the shifting of
l costs to other users of the hospitals. Cost-shifting
elsewhere may help reduce the Medicare budget, but it
t assure the reduction of hospital inflation. Second, the
of elderly Americans to hospitals may well be restricted
Administration's program tightens the prospective payments
ses on the nation's hospitals. We have already seen how
tive payments by Medicaid have reduced the access of many
ericans to health facilities.

short: the Reagan Administration wants to shift the
of inflated spending to patients and taxpayers, cut
s, and make Medicare beneficiaries second-class citizens.
unacceptable.

Medicine: The Mondale Vision

at we are currently spending, and what we can be
bly expected to spend for health care in the future, is
an enough to enable all Americas to get the medical care
ed.

achieve that goal, we must control medical inflation that
ns our present commitments and our future aims. But cost
is not an end in itself. It is a means to other ends.
he necessary condition for saving Medicare without cutting
s or reducing taxes. It is one important way to reduce
budget deficits. And it is a prod to reform the way we
and pay for medical care in America.

HISPANIC

MEXICAN AMERICAN DEMOCRATS

I seek your endorsement for the Democratic Party nomination for President of the United States because I am well aware of the impact M.A.D. has had in the past in determining the outcome of statewide races in Texas. M.A.D. was instrumental in the election of Governor White and several of the other progressive statewide candidates elected in November, 1982. I need Texas to win and I need M.A.D.

I have been a public servant for most of my adult life. I served as Attorney General in Minnesota and I know state government. I served two terms in the United States Senate and I know federal government. I was Vice President with President Carter and I know the White House. I know the domestic problems that need to be solved and I know how to use the government to solve them. I also know the problems we face with our neighbors to the north and south of our borders and abroad -- I know their heads of state, the problems they face, and the importance of the interdependence we share in the Western Hemisphere. I am ready and qualified to be President of the United States.

I see three major goals for my Presidency: creating a safer world; restoring competitiveness to the American economy; and ensuring a society that is fair and just to its citizens. In addition, we must scale down the Reagan budget deficits that have mortgaged the future of our children.

I have been a friend of the Mexican American community for years. I helped pass the first bilingual education program for Mexican Americans while serving as Attorney General in Minnesota. As a United States Senator, I traveled to South Texas to study and rectify problems faced by migrant workers. I co-sponsored the 1965 Voting Rights Act, one piece of legislation which helped change the course of politics in the Mexican American community. As Vice President, I made sure the Justice Department was sensitive to civil and voting rights problems, and participated in the appointment of a record number of Mexican Americans to policy-making positions in the federal government, including the judiciary.

We must retain the minimum wage to ensure an adequate level of income for working Americans.

I was one of the first Congressional sponsors of bilingual education. I held the first hearings in Congress on Hispanic American education: the education of Mexican Americans, Puerto Rican Americans and bilingual education. I support a strong bilingual education program and condemn the 30 percent cuts in the program proposed by the Reagan administration.

I believe additional funding for bilingual education is necessary if we are to ensure that the programs serve student needs adequately. I feel that linguistic diversity is an asset, not a disadvantage, and I will use the Presidency to strengthen a federal and state government partnership to ensure that programs for bilingual education are adequately funded, now and in the future.

I strongly support bilingual education as a means of enhancing educational opportunity and a federal/state partnership to ensure that students have the opportunity to earn a high school diploma.

I recommend a strengthening and expansion of bilingual education opportunities and a federal/state partnership to ensure adequate funding of programs.

I do not have a position on this specific Civil Rights Statute, but I am strongly committed to civil rights issues generally.

I have stated publicly on several occasions that I will appoint qualified Mexican Americans and other Hispanics to high-level positions throughout my administration. During the Carter-Mondale administration, we appointed more Hispanics than have ever been appointed in all past administrations combined. I wanted to better this record and will launch a nationwide search with the help of M.A.D. and other Hispanic community leaders. I will seriously consider members of the Hispanic community for a variety of cabinet level positions, the federal regulatory agencies, and the judiciary. I want to be the President who is remembered as having done more to bring the strength of America to all levels of government than any President in American history. I intend to make Hispanic Americans a very strong and powerful part of my Administration at all levels.

I will give priority consideration to the appointment of Hispanics to vacancies in the federal judiciary.

I have a strong commitment to affirmative action. As President, I will enforce affirmative action in the federal government, and will use my full authority to promote affirmative action at the state and local levels, in education, and in the private sector.

A reaffirmation of the federal government commitment to affirmative action will be part of my program to ensure that opportunity is equalized for all Americans. Appointments of Hispanics to federal government offices within Texas would evidence this commitment to the local level. I would strengthen the EEOC and the Department of Justice as well so that employment discrimination can be effectively challenged and remedied.

I do not have a position on the question of equal access to the state's judicial system, but I strongly support equal access for all individuals at all levels of the judicial system.

Minority youth have undoubtedly been the hardest hit by Reaganomics. I strongly support a significant youth training and employment initiative to target resources on hard core youth employment and, through my proposed Fund for Excellence, providing communities with the resources needed to improve the linkage between education and training and employment opportunities.

We have an obvious need to target our resources carefully, but rest assured that our campaign will be taken to the Hispanic community. New York, Illinois, Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and California are areas where large numbers of Mexican Americans are found and in each of these areas we will have Mexican American staff to assist us in our organizing efforts. Literature and electronic media will also be directed at the Mexican American community. We have already had several fundraisers sponsored by Mexican Americans to request their assistance in financing our operations.

We currently have eight:

- Bill Calderon - National Director, Hispanic Affairs
- Leo Gallegos - National Coordinator, Hispanic Fundraising
- Marty Chavez - New Mexico State Coordinator
- Larry Martinez - Advance Team
- Rita Elizordo-Thomson - Advance Team (part-time)
- Cathy Doria - Advance Team (part-time)
- Hilberto Ocanas - Field Staff
- Rick Sookiasion - Field Staff

Reagan's "New Federalism" is a sham. It has shifted the burden of support of essential services from the wealthy to the poor. While cutting federal taxes for the rich and radically decreasing federal revenues, Reaganomics has forced state and local governments to increase taxes to support essential services endangered by cutbacks in federal funding.

I do not support the "New Federalism" of the Reagan Administration.

I will appoint federal law enforcement officials, starting with the Attorney General of the United States, who are committed to the equal enforcement of the law. I will not tolerate discriminatory enforcement of the federal law and will seek to have the federal government ensure non-discriminatory application of state and local laws.

We need to expand the judicial system to meet the increased demands placed upon it; I favor the appointment of additional federal judges to provide timely justice.

I believe that a policy that effectively enforces the immigration laws is necessary but that the policy cannot be one that allows discrimination against Hispanics and other Americans. The undocumented resident deserves full protection of the rights provided

by the United States Constitution, specifically due process guarantees. Immigration reform must be achieved, however, to regularize the status of undocumented residents and create clear guidelines for their treatment.

In Central America, as elsewhere, nations that respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of their neighbors must be permitted to follow their own paths free from outside interference. However, the United States does have a vital security interest in the Western Hemisphere to maintain security. The primary goals of United States policy in Central America must be to strengthen democratic institutions, promote economic progress and social justice, and foster respect for civil liberties and for human rights. President Reagan has been leading us down the path to greater military involvement in Central America and the Caribbean by seeking to shore up military regimes with our military might. We need to work with our allies in the region to promote the development that is essential to stability in the region.

I was one of the first national public figures to call for a nuclear freeze. Negotiations to achieve a mutual and verifiable freeze would be the top international priority of my administration.

I strongly support pay equity for women. As President, I would demand enforcement of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and would be certain that appointees to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance are committed to pay equity. In addition, I would use the Office of the President to educate the public about pay equity and to establish a federal clearinghouse to conduct research and provide technical assistance to state and local governments and private employers on pay equity issues.

As a Senator, I was an original co-sponsor of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and during Senate debate spoke out strongly against all attempts to weaken it. As President, I will vigorously enforce the Voting Rights Act, which I feel is nothing less than a second bill of rights for all minorities and which is responsible for the increased political participation in recent years.

I support the amendments to the Voting Rights Act enacted by the Congress over the opposition of President Reagan in 1982. I believe these will improve the enforcement of the Act if there is a federal commitment to enforce it. Without such a commitment from the President and the Attorney General of the United States, the best law can be undermined. The Reagan Administration has failed to enforce the Voting Rights Act, a policy I will reverse as President.

I am a strong advocate of equal educational opportunity for all individuals, and I have specifically advocated increased education support for minority students.

Unemployment is a national crisis. I will get the economy moving again by reducing the Reagan deficits, restoring the competitiveness of the American economy, and putting Americans back to work to rebuild our nation. Where there is an especially high concentration of unemployment, such as among Mexican American youth, we must address the problem initially with employment programs and opportunities for training for employment in the new technologies and restored basic industries.

NALEO QUESTIONNAIRE

1. The Carter Administration, as you know, made some significant breakthroughs to increase Hispanic representation in high-level policy positions and important Ambassadorial posts. I am committed to expanding on these improvements. As President I would seriously consider Hispanics for a variety of Cabinet level positions.

2. Leadership from the top will be important in the effort to increase Hispanic representation in the federal bureaucracy. If Cabinet level officers and other policy-making members of my Administration are Hispanic or are sensitive to the needs of Hispanics, then the word will go out through the federal bureaucracy that attempts to improve Hispanic involvement is a goal of the Mondale Administration. As President, I would make certain that my appointees are accountable to me for an all out effort to increase the number of Hispanic Americans in policy-making position in the Mondale Administration.

3. I favor giving minority businesses every opportunity to enter the economic system. The Small Business Administration's Section 8(a) program, the primary federal vehicle by which federal government contracts are set aside, was an important Carter Administration initiative. But it has been undercut by the Reagan Administration in its disregard for the concerns of minority business. As President, I would ensure that the Section 8(a) program is vigorously administered in a manner that is fair to all minorities. And I would seek out appropriate Hispanics to serve in the Small Business Administration.

4. I support the present Bilingual Education Act (Title VII) and would, in fact, seek to strengthen it. Through bilingual education, we as a nation can move to eliminate educational obstacles that confront millions of individuals. I was an original co-sponsor of the Act and remain fully committed to it. I have committed myself to a major new federal effort in education, including \$3 billion annually in new funds to school districts with disproportionate numbers of poor and disadvantaged students, and \$4.5 billion annually in a Fund for Excellence to be distributed directly to local school districts.

5. I do not support the Simpson-Mazzoli bill, principally because of its provisions for employer sanctions and identification cards, which I oppose vigorously. I do favor a quota system allowing immigration under a specific formula with an emphasis on family reunification. I oppose impediments to the goal of family reunification. I also oppose expansion of the H-2 temporary foreign worker program. The Mondale immigration package will include some provision for the legalization of resident undocu-

mented aliens. I support extended voluntary departure and/or asylum for Salvadoran refugees. These victims of the civil strife in El Salvador, like other refugees, need time to stabilize their lives and seek a more certain future. We should recognize a moral commitment to assist these refugees and take steps to provide opportunities for them to resettle successfully. In the long run, our immigration policy must emphasize a tougher defense of our borders and enforcement of our laws. This will require an enhanced Immigration and Naturalization Service that is adequately funded, staffed, and trained. In addition, we need a farsighted and generous foreign policy that works for national reconciliation and economic development in the nations to our south. In the absence of such a policy, poverty and fear will continue to increase, and the pressure on our borders will become even stronger than it is today.

6. Present United States policy toward Cuba needs revision. The Reagan Administration has not been successful in altering Cuban behaviour. A more balanced approach involving carrots as well as sticks may well prove effective in the long run. It is clearly in the interest of the United States -- and I believe of the Cubans themselves -- to render Cuba less dependent upon the Soviet Union. Improved diplomatic and economic relations with the United States, even at a minimal level initially, would benefit the Cubans by giving them an alternative to total reliance on the Soviets. This would increase Cuban options and open up more possibilities for negotiating their withdrawal from Central America and Africa. We cannot move toward normalization of relations without Cuban agreement to cease military involvement in Africa and Central America.

7. The human rights policy of the Carter Administration came in for its share of criticism here at home. But it made a real difference -- in Africa, Latin America, and around the world. Governments that truly wanted better relations with us were attracted by our public commitment to human rights and social justice. And governments that starved, tortured, exiled, and murdered innocent persons were put on notice that they could not expect support from this country. It is high time that we put the United States back where it belongs -- on the side of human rights. I believe that military aid must be contingent on their human rights and political reform records for Latin American nations, and throughout the world, and we should channel this aid through civilians who support democracy wherever possible.

ISRAEL

MONDALE/FERRARO

2201 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20007 — Telephone 202-625-1600

WALTER F. MONDALE ON ISRAEL

Mondale says:

No disagreement should be allowed to obscure the fact that from the moment President Harry Truman recognized the state of Israel, there has existed a special relationship between our nations. And any American administration that threatens to reassess or reappraise or review that relationship does not understand our historic commitment to Israel. We may disagree about tactics -- but never fall out over strategy. We may quibble over the language of diplomacy -- but never brandish the codewords of intimidation. We may argue about this or that point -- but never dispute what fundamentally counts in American-Israeli relations.

In the White House:

Mondale's June 1978 trip to the Middle East, coming at a time when the momentum from Sadat's Jerusalem trip the previous November had slowed, is widely credited with having gotten the peace process moving again, paving the way for Camp David. Mondale's address to the Knesset, reiterating the American commitment to UN resolution 242 while firmly rejecting an independent Palestinian state, reassured Israeli leaders on American intentions. His private meetings with Prime Minister Begin and President Sadat help persuade those two leaders to negotiate face to face.

In the Camp David talks, Mondale insisted that solutions could only evolve from face-to-face bargaining between Israel and Egypt. His active role as a leading representative of the United States helped the parties overcome difficult obstacles and strike their historic accord.

Since January 1981:

Mondale was awarded an honorary doctorate by the Hebrew University of Jerusalem soon after he left the Vice Presidency. His commencement speech, delivered at the Mt. Scopus campus on July 1, 1981, was widely acclaimed in both Israel and the United States.

Mondale was an outspoken opponent of the Reagan administration's sale of AWACs aircraft to Saudi Arabia in the fall of 1981.

When Israel was criticized for her actions in Lebanon, Mondale called attention to PLO terrorism and shelling of Israeli communities from Southern Lebanon and defended the right of every nation to live behind secure and defensible borders.

Following reports of the tragic massacre in the Palestinian camps, Mondale endorsed President Navon's demand for an independent, impartial commission to investigate the question of responsibility. Later, Mondale praised the commission's report as proof of the "deep commitment of Israel to democracy, to the rule of law, and to the most exacting standards of conduct in public life. The Jewish people through the ages have been united and sustained by the law, and we see that this precious heritage is stronger than ever." Mondale condemned the hypocritical reactions of the Arab League, the PLO, and the government of Lebanon to the inquiry commission's report.

Principles for peace in the Middle East

Through his career in public life and experience as a negotiator, Mondale has been strengthened in his conviction that America's quest for peace in the Middle East must be guided by firm and fixed principles.

FIRST: we must continue to insist that we will neither recognize nor negotiate with the PLO until it first recognizes the state of Israel, abandons terrorism, and accepts the terms of UN resolutions 242 and 338.

SECOND: we must remain committed to a Jerusalem united forever with free access to the holy places.

THIRD: we must not sell sophisticated military equipment to Israel's neighbors that could disrupt the military balance and impair the security of Israel.

FOURTH: the basis for making peace is and should remain the Camp David accords, just as they were signed by Prime Minister Begin and President Sadat and witnessed by President Carter.

FIFTH: the leaders of the other Arab countries must emulate the courage and vision of Egypt's Sadat by sitting down face to face with Israel at the bargaining table.

Reagan's mistakes

Mondale believes that the Reagan administration has made a series of mistakes in the conduct of its Middle Eastern policy that have reduced the chances for peace and weakened our relationship with Israel.

---The administration squandered its first year in its quest for a so-called "strategic consensus" that was rejected from the start as illusory by all the major parties in the region.

---The administration's peace plan goes well beyond our proper role as honest broker, by attempting to specify terms that can only be arrived at through negotiations among the parties themselves.

- The administration has allowed the quest for a broad peace in the Middle East to become enmeshed in, and hostage to, the complex negotiations over Lebanon.
- The administration has alarmed Israel by moving toward the sale of advanced weaponry to Jordan.
- The administration has received a long list of Arab leaders in the past few months, but it has implied that Prime Minister Begin is no longer welcome.
- Worst of all, the administration has created the impression that it considers Israel the main obstacle to peace in the Middle East - a proposition Mondale completely rejects.

Steps toward peace

Mondale recommends a number of concrete steps to get American policy back on track and move forward toward peace in the Middle East:

- the appointment of two high-level presidential envoys to represent the good offices of the United States in the two separate sets of negotiations on Lebanon and the West Bank
- Israeli-Lebanese talks that aim for the removal of all foreign forces from Lebanon and restoration of Lebanese sovereignty with essential security guarantees along Israel's border, and a peace treaty between Israel and Lebanon
- broader face-to-face negotiations under the aegis of Camp David to renew progress toward the objectives specified in those accords

Mondale: Truth and Illusion

The following is the text of an address by former Vice President Walter Mondale, a candidate for the Democratic Presidential nomination, before the Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations on Sept. 20.

There are many important questions about U.S.-Israel relations and about America's policy in the Middle East. But none is more urgent than the crisis in Lebanon. Today our options in that ravaged country are few and unpleasant because the Reagan Administration bungled the conduct of American policy throughout the Middle East. From the start, Mr. Reagan's policy was built on illusion.

First, the illusion we could ignore differences between Israel and her neighbors and forge a so-called "strategic consensus." Next, the illusion that the Saudis could, or would, moderate the behavior of other Arab states. Third, the illusion that Hussein was ready to come to the bargaining table. And, most recently, the illusion that if only Israel were pressured to leave Lebanon, the Syrians would voluntarily withdraw from there as well.

For months, as Mr. Reagan's negotiators put pressure on Israel, I warned that the Syrians and the Russians were the real threat. Today, the situation, as we all know, is dangerously serious. Forces armed and backed by the Soviets, the Syrians, the PLO and the Libyans are capitalizing on civil strife and trying to take over Lebanon completely. In Lebanon today we have troops but no policy. Last week on the news I heard a Marine in Lebanon say, "I don't know why we're here." He doesn't and neither do the American people.

I believe we must define and state our objectives, our plan for achieving these objectives and our strategy for ensuring that American forces will not be in Lebanon permanently. If I were President, here is what I would do:

First, I would state that the United States will not accept a Lebanon under the control of the Syrians and their radical allies. Nor will we tolerate further offensive action on their part. I would work closely with the other members of the multinational peace-keeping force to thwart this dangerous aggression.

Next, I would make it very clear to the Syrians and their allies that their wanton attacks on the Marines are intolerable. We must leave no doubt that we will defend them to the hilt.

Third, I would press for negotiations and a compromise from Lebanon's principal political and religious groups to broaden

discuss an agreement they are prepared to honor. If so, we must seize this opportunity while it lasts. Peace-keeping is not enough. We must undertake the difficult but indispensable task of peace-making as well.

Fourth, I would begin formal consultations with the Congress under the War Powers Act. This isn't some obscure legal point, although I believe it essential for the President to obey the law. It is the best way to signal to our adversaries that our country is united behind a strong policy that our people understand and support. In fact, Mr. Reagan's refusal to enter into partnership with Congress is undermining our na-

Strategic cooperation is not a gift to Israel. It would serve our own national interest, relieve major problems facing our armed forces in meeting the Soviet challenge and send an unmistakable signal to Moscow that our will is firm.

tional consensus on behalf of effective action.

Then, we must pursue every conceivable avenue. Today, Saudi Arabia's financial aid to Syria continues undiminished. Why haven't we asked the Saudis to pressure Syria? I understand that Lebanon has asked the Arab League to withdraw the so-called peacekeeping mandate from the Syrians. Why haven't we called in the Arab ambassadors to encourage them to agree? Why haven't we had a U.N. Security Council vote calling upon Syria to withdraw? A Soviet veto would only prove our point.

Finally, I would end our go-it-alone policy in the Middle East by forging an effective strategic cooperation agreement with Israel. To promote peace and deter the Soviets and their allies, Israel must be our partner. Israel's defensive strength helps keep the Soviets in check, while Israel's ability to use that strength helps restrain Soviet proxies.

A year ago, we had a golden moment to use our strategic ties with Israel. Let us remember that at that time the PLO was out of Lebanon, the Syrians were impotent, the Russians were weak and embarrassed,

have been stabilizing the Lebanese government. We could have been the factions within Lebanon to their differences. Instead, we pressed Israel alone, we took the heat off here we are today with Arafat in Lebanon and the American Marines killed.

The Reagan Administration seems to believe that closer defense ties with nothing but a concession for him. This is a fundamental mistake. Cooperation is not a gift to Israel; it serves our own national interest. Major problems facing our armed forces in meeting the Soviet challenge are an unmistakable signal to Moscow that our will is firm. If there was ever a time such a signal it is now.

Some argue that closer cooperation with Israel will damage our relations with the region and I disagree. Strength will win us respect. The failure to act in our interests can only harm us. It is time to put aside the Reagan illusion in Lebanon and throughout the Middle East. It's time to build on our true strength, to work with our true friends. I will show the Soviets and the world what we are doing and that we must have a President who knows what he is doing. And that's the kind of President I intend to be.

There is no one who was more committed to the cause of Israel and no one who was more deeply committed to the vital stake in the region than our dear friend we have lost and my friend—Scoop Jackson. We miss him dearly and his loss is a great loss. It is so crucial that it is to restore peace and confidence to our national life.

Asked about the status of Jewish settlements, Mondale replied:

As you know, for nearly 20 years, as Senator and as Vice President, both publicly and privately it's been my position. As Vice President of the United States on behalf of our country, the capital of Israel is Jerusalem and shall remain forever undivided to the holy places. When I was in Jerusalem as Vice President, the highest honor from my country to visit Jerusalem was to sweep aside the traditional diplomatic inhibitions and Joazeiro to the Western Wall. And I knew what I was doing.

In my opinion that is an issue that has been behind us long ago. I know of no nation on earth which has relations where our embassy is in the designated capital is Israel.



MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org