Having been the MIT coordinator for the Anderson campaign and still an unconstructed liberal, I don't think anyone can accuse me of being left on Ronald Reagan. However, I must applaud the new president on his initial performance in office. So far, he has outshined Jimmy Carter in all respects.

First, his transition was much better than Carter's. Before he made key appointments, he consulted with everyone: Republicans and Democrats, conservatives and liberals. This is the way one goes about having good relations with Congress. Jimmy Carter had only consulted with Democrats, excluding and embittering the Republicans. How can a president hope to have the other party support his programs if he has shown he doesn't give a damn about their opinions? Reagan, on the other hand, by asking for Democrats' advice, made them feel that at least they have input into decisions.

Reagan has also very successfully sidestepped the extreme right. His appointments have generally been moderate, not extremists. The fears that people had of Phyllis Schlafly becoming Secretary of Health and Human Services did not come to pass. By not catering to his staunchest supporters, Reagan has broadened his appeal, which will undoubtedly make it easier for him to get legislation passed.

He has also stood firm on his appointments, not bowing to pressures from his right or left. In 1976, when Jimmy Carter heard that his appointment for CIA director, Theodore Sorensen, would face a tough confirmation fight, he backed off and appointed, instead, Stan Stahl. Reagan, however, hearing similar news about Alexander Haig's confirmation, stood firm. He signaled that this president is going to lead and not be led.

Most importantly, though, the administration has established that it will speak with one voice. The White House will have one opinion on each issue, not three or four. Alexander Haig will be the key foreign policy formulator. There will be nothing comparable to the Vance-Brezhnev rivalry. This has got to be an improvement for sending signals at home and abroad.

When Reagan called the Iranians "kidnappers" and "barbarians," the press asked his advisors if they wanted to mitigate the statements. They did not; they merely reiterated them. This sent a single, firm message to the world and scared the Iranians. Even Carter State Department officials admitted that the fear of Ronald Reagan created the impetus on the Iranians' part to quickly conclude the negotiations and release the hostages.

By declaring that the United States will combat terrorism around the world, Reagan has established a moral and consistent basis for our foreign relations. It will be a blow at tyranny, because those governments that encourage international murder, tend to be murderous themselves. It will also probably work better than Carter's human rights policy, because it won't run into trouble with a double standard for our friends and enemies.

Lastly, Reagan has already begun fulfilling his campaign promises. He instituted a federal hiring freeze, decontrolled oil, and abolished inflation guidelines. All of these were significant actions. To shrink the federal bureaucracy, one had to start somewhere. Immediate deceleration of oil will hopefully stimulate domestic production. Federal inflation guidelines have clearly failed in their intent; there is no sense in wanting money by continuing to monitor them.

Where our policies and programs have failed, we must not persist in them, but try something new. This is what Ronald Reagan was elected to do—to try something new. It does not matter whether a policy is liberal or conservative, what matters is whether it will work. Let us hope Reagan's policies do just that, work.