

# CLARK PRESIDENT

Ed Clark for President Committee  
2300 Wisconsin Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20007  
(202) 333-8263

Ray Cunningham,  
*Chairman*  
Jule R. Herbert Jr.,  
*Treasurer*  
Chris Hocker,  
*National Coordinator*  
Edward H. Crane III,  
*Communications Director*  
Kristina Herbert,  
*Headquarters Manager*

## PLAYGIRL QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

1.) What general steps would you take to cure the economy?

A.) I would reduce the role of the federal government in the economy as much and as quickly as possible. Inflation is caused by the federal government's expansion of the money supply, which reduces the value of each dollar in relation to what it can purchase, and I would stop the Federal Reserve System's expansion of the money supply. I would propose substantial cuts in both taxing and spending, to allow the private sector to retain the earnings that are rightfully theirs and to stimulate economic growth and the creation of new jobs. I would reduce or abolish federal regulatory agencies, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, which only perpetuate the domination of certain industries by large firms and which restrict entry by new entrepreneurs, particularly minorities. I would end federal subsidies and other forms of welfare for business, such as the recent Chrysler bailout, which only reward inefficiency and unresponsiveness to consumer demands while penalizing efficient and profitable enterprises.

2.) What sort of control should the federal government have over the oil industry? Can you conceive of any circumstances in which you would advocate nationalizing the oil companies?

A.) Like any other commodity, oil is subject to the basic economic laws of supply and demand and, as with any other commodity, the attempts of government to ignore these economic realities will only guarantee shortages and a continuation of the present oil crisis. At present, government both regulates and favors large oil companies, and it should do neither. So long as oil prices are kept at artificial levels, substitute energy sources, such as solar, have no chance to develop. Therefore, I favor decontrol of all energy production, and I would not consider nationalization of the energy industry under any circumstances.

3.) Should environmental standards be lowered to allow more use of fuels now considered too polluting?

A.) Present governmentally-imposed standards for pollution control are arbitrary, haphazard, and inconsistent. I favor a totally different system whereby individuals and groups can file suit against polluters, prove damages, win compensation and enjoin polluters from continuing to pollute; such a system is based on a strict enforcement of property rights. At present, government has the sole power to determine the acceptable level of pollution. This fails to protect consumers, who have no recourse if the level is set too low, and it fails to protect industry, which is often forced to comply with unnecessary and costly regulations. The question of whether or not certain fuels are "too polluting" should be determined through private legal action to uphold property rights, not government standards.

4.) Over the next 10 years, should nuclear power continue to be emphasized or should other, renewable energy sources receive the most federal encouragement?

A.) Neither nuclear power nor any other particular form of energy production should be subsidized by government. Our present government has chosen to impose nuclear power on the American people; this policy must stop. The American people are being victimized in a number of ways. As taxpayers they are being forced to subsidize companies with nuclear investments. At the same time they are being irradiated by facilities operated by these same companies, thanks to the lax safety standards and lack of one hundred percent liability fostered by government intervention. All special favors presently extended to the nuclear power industry must stop immediately, and the common law notion of one hundred percent liability for damage caused -- past, present, and future -- must be reintroduced into the legal code. If nuclear energy is to be developed, power companies must do so at their own expense and risk and must assume full responsibility for any damage they may cause.

5.) Should the percentage of the national budget spent on defense go up, down, or remain basically at its present level?

A.) The portion of the federal budget spent for military purposes should be substantially reduced. Over 60% of the military budget goes to protect other countries, most of whom are perfectly capable of protecting themselves. I would systematically reduce our military support for other nations, and concentrate on a defense system that will truly defend the United States instead of the present interventionist system which permits us to become involved in armed conflicts all over the world.

6.) Should SALT II be ratified?

A.) SALT II should be ratified as a necessary step down the road toward more significant mutual arms reduction agreements. The alternative is to continue the insane contest between the superpowers to see who can bring about the highest level of destruction. I fully support all verifiable steps toward reducing the threat of nuclear disaster.

7.) Should ownership of guns, especially handguns, be controlled in any way? If so, in what way?

A.) Private ownership of guns should not be controlled. Inexpensive handguns are often the only available means of self-defense for people in low-income areas, and public knowledge of handguns possession by women has proved to be an effective deterrent against rape and other sexual crimes.

8.) Some 25 million Americans now live below the federal poverty level. What would you do to help them to achieve minimum financial security?

A.) Government attempts to alleviate poverty have failed. Inflation, taxation, regulation, and paternalism have combined to create a system which locks poor people into perpetual poverty. Reduction of government's role in the economy would stimulate the creation of new wealth and jobs. In addition, I favor the use of tax credits for services, such as education, which individuals provide privately to benefit low-income people.

9.) Should federal funds be available to provide abortions to indigent women?

A.) I favor the right of women to choose whether or not to have an abortion, free from harassment from government or other citizens. I do not, however, favor the use of tax money to finance abortions. Many people oppose abortion on moral or religious grounds, and they should not be forced to pay for what they profoundly believe is immoral.

10.) Should federal funds be used to extend child-care facilities available to low-income women?

A.) I do not favor federally funded child-care centers; I would not expect the government to perform any better in providing quality child-care than it already has in providing education, which has become a national disgrace. I favor the use of federal dollar-for-dollar tax credits for child care and non-government education, as well as the removal of the many legal obstacles presently preventing the development of wide spread, low cost child-care facilities. Entrepreneurs willing to care for children in their homes should not be stopped by onerous licensing fees or the fact that their ceilings are one inch short of bureaucratic standards. The innumerable bureaucratic obstacles placed before low cost child-care facilities rob thousands of Americans, particularly older people who are experienced in fulfilling the needs of children, of productive work while they prevent millions of others from being able to find work outside of the home. These arbitrary and unnecessary "standards" are imposed by government in order to maintain its present monopoly power over the lives of children -- through the oppressive and sexist government school system -- as well as to keep women dependent and "in the home." These obstacles are vicious, they are sexist, they are paternalistic; they must end.

PLAYGIRL QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Page four

11.) Should the Equal Rights Amendment be ratified by the states?

A.) I favor the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. It would sweep away thousands of sexist laws and much of the widespread discrimination and oppression women face from government.

12.) Was it proper to allow more time for possible ERA ratification?

A.) The extension of time for the ratification of the ERA was proper. Equal treatment of women by law is a matter of right, not legislative manipulation.

13.) Should the United State reinstitute the peacetime draft?

A.) The draft in any form is unacceptable, regardless of the time or circumstances. The draft is simply short-term slavery.

14.) Should women be drafted if men are?

A.) Asking if women should be drafted if men are is like asking if Hispanics should be enslaved if blacks are. The draft is unacceptable, period.

15.) Should women serve in combat units?

A.) I see no reason why women who meet objective criteria should not serve in combat units if they choose to do so.

16.) What should be done, specifically, to accelerate the integration of women into government and big business?

A.) One of the goals of the Libertarian party is to significantly reduce the number of federal employees, male or female, and return these people to productive jobs in the private sector. The ERA, however, will do much to end discrimination against women by government, which is why I favor its passage. I would sign an executive order banning all discrimination in federal employment on the basis of sex or other job-irrelevant criteria. I believe that those of us concerned with the fundamental rights and dignity of women have for too long neglected the tremendous power of the boycott as a tool for social change. I favor its use against sexist business enterprises as a means of pressuring them to advance female employees and end job-oriented sexual discrimination and harassment.

17.) What specific actions have you taken in your public service career to support equality for women?

A.) As a supporter of the ERA, an advocate of equal treatment of women before the law, and an opponent of paternalistic government, I have made these positions fully clear in my past and present political activities.

18.) Would you feel uncomfortable for any reason running with a woman Vice President candidate? What liabilities do you see in doing so?

A.) My running mate, David Koch of New York, has already been nominated. However, I would have had no hesitancy accepting a woman on the ticket. The only woman in American history to receive an electoral vote -- Tonie Nathan in 1972 -- was the first Vice Presidential candidate of the Libertarin party.