

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Ronald Reagan Gubernatorial Campaign: Files,
1966

Folder Title: RR Speeches and Statements Book I
(4 of 5)

Box: C30

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

Contact a reference archivist at: **reagan.library@nara.gov**

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/research-support/citation-guide>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

Boalt Hall

125

My introductory matters will be very brief. I want to welcome everybody at Boalt Hall and perhaps I should say that if you look at the person on your left and then the person on your right, two of you will be Boalt Hall students and don't even have to be welcomed.

This is an Institute on Law and Politics and we have a lot of discussions and activities relating to law and politics at Boalt Hall. I think it was in the Spring of 1953 that we had our first Boalt Hall Conference of this type and it was on Ethics in Government. It was a very exciting conference that, in turn, has led to many others - for example the special conference on the California Legislature and many similar. I want to say though that this is the first time a conference has been taken over completely by the students. I think they have done a remarkable job. I also think it would effect the law and politics generally. Never before has a conference been packed so interesting^{ly} and so impressively and I certainly do want to congratulate them. We've had an interesting program and that is all I have to say. Thank you.

At this time I would like to present Paul _____ who will introduce our opening speaker.

Paul _____ : Former Law Students and Guests of Boalt Hall. In sitting at this Institute on Law and Politics, it begins with "Consideration of the Most Fundamental Concern of our Democracy - the Roll of the Citizen."

Our keynote speaker is _____ . His academic background centers in Sociology and Economics, but rather than delay the proceedings, citing a long list of biographical statistics, suffices to mention that

in mass communication, radio, the Armed Services, Labor Unions, and the Motion Picture Industry, Mr. Reagan's record has been one of outstanding public service and citizenship and that is the subject upon which he is going to speak to us today "The Citizen's Roll in Politics." We are honored to present such a man with experience and integrity - Mr. Ronald Reagan...

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen. You know, I didn't realize until I arrived here this afternoon that this is kind of a maiden voyage. I really thought that this was a continuing type of thing and that it was one of a series that had been going on and I was sitting in some place along the line because of some changes that have occurred in my life pattern and now I discover that I am launching this thing. I could almost expect a bottle of champagne over the brow and perhaps, before the day is over there will be some who would/like to put up with half of that - the bottle, but without the champagne. I consider it a very great honor to participate in this group. Of course, any speaker, or anyone in this position, would have a problem of trying to establish a common meeting ground and in an effort to do that I might point out that probably my profession has made more use of and had more need of the legal profession than almost any other unless we possibly include the professional law breaker and unkindly there are some people who would say "Yes, there isn't much difference," but we do have something in common also. You aspire to a profession that, as you know, gossip and talk, etc., and exchange in the man of the street is very often much maligned and of course, I too have been a member of a profession that suffers from that same thing. It was only a generation ago that the people of my profession couldn't be buried in a churchyard and that has changed - we can be buried now. As a matter of fact, the eagerness of some people to perform that service gets us righteous - but, I just say this to give you hope - you see that you too can look forward to the day when perhaps you can progress as we have and you too will bask in the warmth of your neighbor's approval and understanding. Now, there is a great risk, of course, in this matter, the risk of giving advice and you know that the best reason I can

127

give you with regard to advice is a three line essay written by a small girl in school and it was very brief but it contained that irrefutable feminine logic that is so infuriating in a family quarrel at home. She said - "Socrates was a Greek. He traveled around giving free advice. They poisoned him."

Politics, of course, which has now changed the pattern as I mentioned, and become a very exciting and complex business with me, although I have a 7-yr. old at home and he could simplify the whole business. He has been watching Death Valley Days for a couple of years. He doesn't see why we go to the trouble of all this matter of having headquarters and going around the States making speeches and being away. He just doesn't understand why I can't go to Sacramento and stand in the middle of the street and say "Pat, one of us has got to be out of town by sunup." Now that might be an oversimplification of the problem but perhaps we can over-complicate some of our problems. I sometimes think that in our modern dialogue today we are a little like the author who comes to a very difficult plot problem in his story and then discovers that the reason for the plot problem is because he has based his story up to that point on a false premise. First, let's try to cut through some of the phonetics and everyone, we have to recognize today, comes complete with a hyphen - you aren't just you - you're you with some kind of a hyphen--if you are a clergyman, of course, you are a social-gospel clergyman--and if or you are a fundamentalist - clergyman, /you are an economist you are a Keynesian-Economist, or you are a Traditional-Economist, and all of us, of course, are pigeonholed as Conservative - , Liberal -, of Ultra this or Leftwing, Rightwing -, and I think for a moment we should discuss these labels. For example, the

128

Chairman of the Democratic Party in California, Mr. Coates, answered a question the other day, and I think the question should be of interest to law students and legal minds, because it deals in that kind of wonderful hocus-pocus or double answer that seems to be so much a part of legality. The question was "How will your party deal with Extremist Groups" and Mr. Coates said "Well, at this moment I know of no single group within the Democratic Party that poses any particular kind of problem from the point-of-view of Extremism. I'm quite certain that the Right Wing influence of the Republican Party will be a major topic for most Democratic Candidates for office but then comes the double-entendre. He says - (or double-talk - I should say) - He says "The strength of the Democratic Party is its diversity and the Republicans will not become strong unless they learn to accommodate diversity". Well, we're trying. Now, basically, today a Conservative could best be described as the Radical of Revolutionary Days, and I think it is safe to say that those of the Liberal Philosophy today would have, in that era, been classified as the ^{Tory} ~~Party~~. It sounds rather strange but there has been some switch in semantics. Now, before we take exception, let me point out, of course, that the Revolutionists, as we know, were Conservatives in the Edmund Burke concept. The reason philosophy directed toward control the forces of change in such a way as to conserve the best elements of the past by blending them into an organic unity with the new elements in an ever revolving society. But these Revolutionists were Radicals and remarkably similar to today's so-called Conservatives in that they wanted as much as possible local rule. They wanted representation by the people and they very definitely wanted restraint from the power of the ultimate of the Central Government. Now the Tories of that day, of course, wanted perpetuation of rule by the King as I think it is safe to say that today the Liberals want the strong Central Government. Indeed, sometimes it

seems; that the only common denominator needed to win their support in any proposed legislation is the extent to which that legislation would empower the Federal Government to take action. Now, it is true that much of what the so-called Liberal Philosophy wants is inspired by Humanitarianism and I mean that honestly and sincerely. They have a great concern for material welfare and the lack of answers so far to many of the problems of age and disease and poverty, the problems that have plagued mankind for so long. And it has caused, of course, many of us to go out onto the thin ice of the end justifying the need and you know there can be no law and order if we ever embark on a program of this mischievous tenets so dear to the secular heart of the Soviet.

Now, I'm going to make one last comment on Extremism. If the Liberal is characterized by the belief in the Federalization of much of our Government processing, I believe that it is a fair assumption, then wouldn't Liberalism, if carried to Extremism, pass successfully through the planning and control of the great society on into advance stages of modified Marxism, as we see in the Scandanavian Countries and in England under the Labore Government, to the ultra-Extremism of the Soviet Union which I assume would be the ultimate in Left-Wingism. But now, if we go on that route, doesn't this also include the Totalitarianism of Hitler and Mussolini, much used as a periphic example of the Far Right? Doesn't Ku Klux Klonsmen, and many others of that line - wouldn't they belong over there, because wouldn't they deny individuals freedom, under law, using the Government to deny individuals on the basis of race, religion, or National origin? And now, if we go to the other side, the Conservation, and we carry this to the point of Extremism, since it made the point that (and I don't think a false point) the Conservative of today believes in individual freedom

and a limited power of Government/- If you'd carry this to Extremism you would go more and more into laissez-faire and ultimately to complete Anarchy, the complete absence of any law and order. Now, unfortunately, none of what I just said fits our comfortable cliches about the Right-Wing, Left-Wing, or even the Middle of the Road. Is there a Left or Right? I prefer to say and think that it makes more sense to say "There is no such thing as a Left or Right. There is only-up or Down". The up is toward the ultimate and individual freedom consistent with law and order, or down toward the antheap of Totalitarianism and no matter how noble or humane the motive. Those who would trade freedom for some fancied material security are embarked on a downward path. I think the Founding Fathers knew this. These men were ordinary citizens all, they were students of history, there were no politicians among them, and they had created what I believe is still the wisest and most unique experiment in the history of man's relation to man. And the declaration they signed was unequivocal in that every man had inalienable rights, the life and liberty and the freedom of choice conferred upon him, as they pointed out, at birth by the Creator, and they augmented this declaration by drawing up the United States Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Well now, somewhere I think a perversion has taken place. Our rights are now being deemed by many to be a dispensation of government and are made divisible by majority rules. Now, a majority vote is pretty good mechanism for administering our affairs but only if it is controlled by a set of ground rules and high sounding phrases "one man - one vote" or "the greatest good for the greatest number". Actually, if they're properly analyzed they mean 50% of the people plus one can do whatever they choose so the will of the people simply on the basis that they outnumber them and plain majority rule is nothing more than mob rule. We had majority rule in Hitler's Germany and then a few states majority chose to follow the mob rule and

infamous path that it did, did not make morally right what they decided was legally right because they were the majority. Well, this is the unique heritage that all of us had in this country - one's right to life and liberty, freedom of worship, to speak and do what I'm doing up here and to assemble as you've assembled. These inalienable God-given rights may not be submitted to a vote. That was the purpose of the Bill of Rights that forever put them beyond the reach of majority rule. Now it would be foolish to deny that our Country is split philosophically and very deeply today with Government Control and Planning on one hand and more volunteers into Self-Government on the other. One side is prone to charge that the other side, for the most part, is engaging in a plot in which they are going to use the Welfare State as a device to bring on Statism and Collectivism. But the other side is just as guilty because they charge that opposition to their dreams of Utopicalism should be translated as opposition to Humanitarian goal and for every charge, unwarranted charge of hate that is leveled against someone because of the Liberal philosophy there is a real kind of double on the other side that makes some people able, with a perfectly straight face, to stand up and say "How dare you infer someone is a Communist, ^{you} ^{you} Fascist ^{you} ^{you}?" I believe the time has come though to recognize that the majority of Americans want a solution to the problems I have mentioned that plague us, the age-old problems of poverty and misery, want and deprivation and I believe that there is one thing sure about the overwhelming majority today that they will settle for nothing less. The area for general debate is "How and at what Risk to the traditional concepts of Freedom and Independence?" Now there is no quarrel with the goals of the great society. I believe here that Americans are completely united and the Great Society will solve all of these problems but at what a price if the Great Society cannot at the same time remain a Free Society, then the price is definitely too high. I think we have already gone a long way in eroding our traditional safeguards.

Lowell Mason, a former Anti-Trust Law Enforcement Officer for the Federal Trade Commission as written a book called "The Language of Deceit" and in this book he says "In this Country one sees a Growing Acceptance of the thesis that Violation of the Economic Commands of the State are More Dangerous to our Material Welfare than Criminal Offenses and therefore can be punished without due process". It went on to say in this book that "Today the Government has such complexity of laws and regulations that they literally can bring a charge against any business concern upon almost any kind of count that they choose." He tells, incidentally, in this book, of a humorous moment in which he was addressing a Business Men's Convention and he made this statement and he said that they could get business men either for restraint of trade or they could get them for not joining in some practice such as violation of restraint of trade, and one man in the audience interrupted and he said "You fools have got me for both" and it was true - they had him for both. Mason, trying to get out of this, said "Well, we'll probably find you guilty of one or the other" and the poor man said "You have already found me guilty of both." The case was over. But, if you question this assertion, that without due process can take place, what of the Farmer? The Farmer today, whose property can be searched without a warrant, if he is suspected not of violating a law but of violating a regulation - a regulation of the Department of Agriculture, and a fine - they call it a penalty - but a fine can be assessed - imposed - without due process, and if the fine isn't paid the Government can seize his property, as they have done in a number of cases, and sell it at auction. The case of Wickert vs. Filburn clouds the title of everything that we own. It was the decision that the Government has the right to control what it substitutes and today you can point out that there is some measure of subsidy in almost every facet of our lives.

133

There is another ruling in that same area "Agriculture" by the Supreme Court, that the Government does have the right to tell an American Citizen what he can plant on his own land for his own use. Sometimes as Government spreads out into areas that are questionable as to whether it is the results could be laughable if it didn't hurt so much. For example, right now in Washington there is a little debate going on about a film that cost some thousands of dollars, that was made by the Government, paid for by the Government, but produced at Warner Brothers Studios. Now this film was an experiment by the Government in subliminal, now what should I say, imposing of an idea, or influencing the people. This film is a kind of American Travelogue, but running through it is a subtle thread that is never announced and disclosed but a thread that will stimulate ;the people to discover the joys of the use of tobacco, and the Government is going to put this film out all over the World to stimulate the use of American Tobacco as an aid to the Tobacco Grower. Now, that would be all right except the same Government has launched also an expensive program in San Diego County as an experiment to talk the people down there into not using tobacco because it is injurious. And now the same Government is demanding that the Tobacco Companies put statements on their packages and their advertising that the use of tobacco is injurious and it is the same government that subsidizes the growing of tobacco. You can move over to the field of cotton and you will discover that we subsidize the price of cotton but then to make it possible to sell our surplus of cotton abroad we subsidize and sell at a lower price than in America to Foreign Manufacturers of American Cotton. We sell it so low that the Foreign manufacturer can sell his new goods in America cheaper than the American manufacturer can sell his old goods in America. "We will subsidize the American manufacturer of Cotton Goods so he can sell at a low price" but then the manufacturers of

synthetic fibres said "What about us? Now cotton represents unfair - they're going to subsidize the manufacturers of synthetic fibres. The part that hurts is, when they get through with all that subsidizing it all comes out of the same pocket and you and I happen to be carrying that pocket. Now, the Government says that there are two million farmers who must leave the soil because we have out-grown the need for the family farm - we need only the large commercial farms, but that is the same government that says that any irrigated farm cannot exceed 160 acres in size and get irrigation water. Well, anyway, the alternative to the Great Society is not as some might be inclined to believe that "Just let them eat Cake". I think the time has come for Citizens to demand of Government a case study in so many of these areas where government is, at great expense, trying to solve these problems, a case study first of all to make government agencies and departments in such wide ranging fields as agriculture, as in welfare, to establish once and for all "What are the goals?" "What is the goal of each agency and each program?" And then, I think the case study must continue and say: "Is what we're doing advancing this goal?" "Is the money well spent?" "Is welfare supposed to perpetuate poverty, to create a permanent goal, or is welfare supposed to eliminate poverty and make people self-sustaining?"

Today in the midst of what is called "Unprecedented Prosperity" the Welfare load is ten times bigger than it was in the depths of depression, which I experienced first-hand and you thought up until now I was a juvenile but I did remember it and know it. Our Housing Administrators in Washington/^{that} tell us now that in Public Housing in the Area of Welfare we have come to a third generation, that it has grown up a third generation in a family, asking it for granted that this is a way of life and this is their pattern of life and they will grow up and marry and have children who will look as that as a pattern and again I say "Shouldn't we recognize the fact that dead men sleep and the rest of us, of course, that those

135

programs were designed to rehabilitate people, to tide them over in an emergency period.

Of course I'm not speaking of those people who, just, of necessity, depend upon the rest of us because of physical disability, age, or whatever. I think all of us are very proud of our ability to take care of those people and provide, if possible, not only the necessities but some of the comforts, but less have the men and women of goodwill in this country find out that we are in agreement on the goals and that we honestly seek a practical solution. And then the Conservative in this dialogue has the responsibility to rule out of order those spokesmen who would in truth settle for a kind of laissez-faire, no answer at all, sell the postoffice, let the people build their own roads, wherever they decided they wanted to put a road. But the Liberals, by the same token, must recognize and walk away from those who are using these problems as a device to achieve some master plan for the running of and the planning of the destinies of all mankind.

Now, there is no Extremist accusation and the idea that there are some people who just seem to want government for government's sake. An example, even on such a level as the Governor of New Jersey, not too long ago, prior to the passage of the Medicare Bill - several of the Insurance Companies banded together as they did in California, and it was approved, but they banded together in New Jersey and they evolved by pooling their resources and their risks a low-cost health insurance program for Senior Citizens and they required State permission to put it into effect. They were denied such permission and in the denial the Governor of New Jersey said "Why, we couldn't let them do this. It would make it more difficult for the Government to get its' Compulsory Program passed." Well, I suggest that here someone is falling into the trap, not of looking at the goal and the means of achieving it but of just accepting the government for government's sake, which must be the acceptable answer.

136

The place of the Citizen in Government is more than just a march in the polls, pay his tax, and do precinct work in behalf of a clique of professional politicians. The Founding Fathers, as I say, were ordinary citizens and they created a social and economic structure to be run by ordinary citizens and we honestly believe that there is some intellectual elite available to us that can take their place in the capital, either State or National, and ^{that} this intellectual elite is capable, has the talent and ability to meet all the multitudinous questions of our complex life, the everyday questions that come up by the millions just in the field of the marketplace. As we increase in numbers, I think the reverse is true, that as Society grows more complex, it does not mean that we have to give up freedom and turn to this intellectual elite and accept orders. I believe that, as it grows more complex, it becomes more apparent that only the people have the capability of solving these problems, the problems of limited space, the problems of human understanding and relations, the problems of the marketplace.

What fanfare greeted the announcement to compare with some other public relations announcements out of government? Sept. 1964 when Ken Private Utility Company banded together, or joined in a commercial undertaking, investing ten and a half billion dollars of private capital, in a Power Project that will produce two hundred million dollars in new payroll, that will produce seventy-five million dollars in taxes and that will also produce three times the power output of the entire TVA Complex. How well known is it that toward the end of World War II, when we were still fighting, one man, Jesse Jones, in Washington, foresaw that there would be tremendous pressure for Government Planning in the great transition from a War to a Peace Economy? And he was frightened and spurned on by some of the plans that he saw on the bureaucratic drawingboards, and he called in the Nation's business leaders and they voluntarily

137

formed a program, 50,000 of the best type business men in America, through 2000 local committees, did the postwar planning and it is still a miracle that is trying to be explained today, that we made that transition with no great dislocation and with almost complete employment at the time, and this was done with no tax money changing hands, by private citizens serving voluntarily their Government and their fellow-Citizens.

Several years ago a Federal employee was testifying before a Congressional hearing on whether the Government should broaden a particular Welfare Program, and toward the end of his lengthy ~~part~~ testimony, one of the Congressmen asked him, "Would you be able to speak now on the other side of the question? On the other possibility of solving this problem?" Rather puzzled, the man stopped and he said "I don't know what you mean by the other side." Well, I think this is all too typical.

I have chosen to describe the Citizen's role today in politics as that of an Active Participant in a Creative Society, with Government serving as an Agent to mobilize the full creative energies of the people, to solve the problems which in the last analysis only the people can solve, to let Government ask for the Leaders of Industry, the Professions, Leaders from the Campus, how modern technology can be applied to the Community Life and to the Community Problems.

A few years ago a National Magazine conducted a series of articles, even an article including one by the President of the United States and other National Leaders, on "What should be the National Purpose of the United States?" Well, many distinguished men addressed themselves to this subject and curiously no great profundity, no profound truth emerged from all of the writings. Now, I don't want to pose as having seen the monkey I can run the circus but I have believed for some time that we have had a national purpose for almost 200 years, the implementing of the original dream of the Founding Fathers that "Man has the Capacity for Self-Government," that "By our success, all men and all nations would be inspired to emulate this realization."

of Man's age-old dream to be an individual served by and not serving government. I think this dream was expressed in the Declaration and was re-affirmed in the Constitution and it is, I believe, the most limited and equitable concept that has ever been evolved in man in the history of man's relation to man. To those who would depart from it, I can do no better than quote Daniel Webster who, when there was also talk of eroding the Constitution, said "Hold on to the Constitution of the United States and to the Republic for which it stands." Miracles do not cluster. What has happened once in six thousand years may never happen again. Hold on to the Constitution for if the American Constitution shall fall there will be Anarchy throughout the World.

Now, I understand, that for a limited period of time, proving that I must have more nerve than sense, I am at your back and call for questions, and I see a hand already raised.

Question:

Reagan: You realize that I am a little puckerred up here, realizing that I am a layman, speaking in this atmosphere on a legal question and a legal problem. Yes, I have a contrary view to the reapportionment decision. The Constitution was pretty explicit that all a State had to do, or have, to win acceptance in a Federation was have a Republic form of Government, and the Civil War, of course, ruled out that any State could unilaterally break the contract once it had joined the Federation. But I believe that the Federal Government now has taken the unilaterally violating the contract. Now, this does not mean that I believe that everything was rosy, and there were no areas in which there could be better and more equitable representation. Many of the States had violated the idea of the every ten year census thing, but the severe operation that took place - I think the Supreme Court ruled in an area that was not its' proper province. We have a

Government that is based on a system of checks and balances and there is representation by people. But there was a recognition always that there are some areas with problems peculiar to the area that will, just because of their nature - agricultural areas - never have the equal in population of the rest. So we had one house in our State that was apportioned on the basis other than population. Now, of course, I see no reason or need for two houses if they are both going to be based on population. This is not a system of checks and balances at all and so I'm opposed to this.

I believe there was a reason for this other factor being evolved. It is going to be pretty bad if we turn over the running of the country, and this would be true in a number of our great populous states, that from here on the Cities and the great metropolitan complexes, simply by force of numbers, are going to be able to rule and dictate on the basis of their interests interests as against the interests of those people who provide the foodstuffs. Wow - here!

Question: I have a question about what you called the individual's inalienable God-given Rights - Do you feel then that the Supreme Court decision on permit and warrant and government shall not distract the contestant? And the other statement about the Supreme Court, for the last ten years, protecting the Rights of the Individual - or are they opposed to Individual Rights?

Ragan: No, I thought I made it pretty clear that the decision that I question is the decision in Baltimore some time ago about a Health Officer who tried to invade a man's home, claiming that he wanted to inspect the premises for rats and the man said "Get a warrant or you can't come in" and they took this case all the way to the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court ruled "Well, in the area where health might be involved, yes, an appointee or employee of the local government can invade a man's home without a warrant, which I think, particularly viewing some of the rather corruptive city machines we have in this country, this poses a considerable check, and the ones that I mentioned that had to do with

the farms - I pointed out that where today, if you are suspected of murder, they still have to get a warrant to come into your home after you but, if they suspect you of planting a half acre of corn more than the regulation allows, they don't need a search warrant - they just come in and measure it and slap a fine on you and you'd better pay it or they'll sell the farm.

Question: My name is George Friar and I'm a guest here, as you are, but I hope I'm not using my status as a guest to take permission to ask an unfriendly question. I was interested in your proposition as to "Up and Down" and the way and the way legislation should regard it, as to whether it would add more to human freedom and make for better living? I would like to ask: "How would you apply that to the Civil Rights Act of 1964?" I had something to do with that legislation and have very firm views about it. I would like to know whether you think that legislation added more or subtracted some from human freedom in the United States?

Reagan: Well, I have been known, and I'm sure you are aware, to criticize the Civil Rights Bill. I'm talking about that Civil Rights Bill that was passed, on the basis that I thought it was not as well written as it could have been and that there were, therefore, questionable areas as to constitutionality. I have at all times also made plain that I am heart and soul and all my life have been actively engaged in promoting the goal of that legislation and I believe the great bitterness of today exists, and I regret very much that it has entered into this area. I think, if I could try to explain it, what I believe is that where the Constitutional Rights of a Citizen are violated for whatever reason, race, religion, or anything else, it is the responsibility of the government, at the point of bayonet, if necessary, to enforce those rights. On the other hand, again, the end justifying the means, I think - and this requires the greatest of understanding between us, in those areas where people who are motivated by prejudice, which I think is an evil sickness, would - how should I say it - impose on

other individuals, not their legal rights but simply display this prejudice with the discomforts and the inconveniences of others, who still are faced with the soul-searching task of making sure that we, in protecting rights, do not establish a precedence and give Government some control over everyone that can be some day used against us in order to insure some problems or some segments of our society. In other words, the greatness of America, I think, is the right to be wrong. And even though we it, I for example, let me put it this way, I could not possibly and would not knowingly patronize anyone, or any business, or anything that would discriminate against anyone on the basis of prejudice, or race, or religion but, by the same token, I feel that I am duty bound to say that much as I deplore this prejudice, much as I believe I have a responsibility to try and talk him out of it, I cannot by law, tell him that he can't feel that way.

Question from the floor re Interstate Commerce and the Public Accommodations, Reagan's

Answer: I have no quarrel with that whatsoever. there is a young lady here and then I think I'll have to go Well now, there and there and there - and I think I've got the most eager one.

Question: regarding the Governor being a member of the Board of Regents.

Reagan: Yes, I think that the Governor, as a member of the Board of Regents, has a little more than a responsibility just as a member of the board. I think he must feel that he is speaking on behalf of the electorate with 13 million people. Now, I know that I am probably going to lose a lot of you on this. I am critical of one think in the handling. No. 1:- I advocate more economy for the local campuses of the State University System. I think it is ridiculous! I know we have done a great deal in that regard and I hope we do more - I think that a member is in charge of a campus such as UCLA certainly should be on the same equal footing as the President of any large Private University that, if holding that job, he is qualified to make the decision with the faculty,

of course, of the pattern and the rules that are laid down by the Board of Regents. In that regard, also, I think the Board of Regents should rule that the Faculty Committee deals in Academic Problems and that the Administratives are in charge of Administration and it should be that way.

Oh - you were the gentleman - Ma!

Question: When you mentioned the "One Man One Vote" position - I think what that refers to is with regard to our daily lives - - - - -etc.

What about the Watts area?

Reagan: It means through a package deal, I think. Well, I think there is a very definite limit with regard to how much a student should have to say in school, and I was one, I can remember very clearly. As a matter of fact, I am going to confess something to you, I was on a committee that led a strike in my college - against the administration - many years ago - but I think that over all the administration of the University- certainly that the students should have a forum whereby they can express their viewpoints but I think that the ultimate responsibility must lie with the men who have been entrusted with the job, both men and women, of administering the university and I do believe that there is some merit in suggesting that while learning, and while students, there is still something to be learned in experience before you have too much of a voice in the administering of a university.

Now, for the Watts area - in Los Angeles. Incidentally, this is - I could too off with a pretty good pattern here as to what I mean by the Creative Industry because there is something very stirring going on there. The Watts area was a splendid thing - in there are a lot of very people do have come recently from the deep South. I think several things motivated it - No.1- I think there is greater illiteracy - but I think also that like early immigrants

143

that come from other countries to this country - They had come here many times in their lack of education and knowledge, they come believing in a lot of promises that the streets were paved with gold and that all their problems were going to be solved if they once got to Los Angeles and it wasn't true, of course. Every morning they woke up and there was not a bundle of goodies on the front porch and unfortunately they had come to an area and a state that, because of deteriorating business climate ^{has} a greater proportion of unemployment than any other State in the Union and certainly much greater than the national average. So there was a difficulty of jobs - they were not trained for the jobs that were available - highly skilled jobs in industrial areas. I think there was something else that went along with this. I think that a great deal of the animosity toward the police had nothing to do with the police in our City as we know them here but had to do with the inner-feeling that they brought because so many of them coming from the deep South had come from areas where the Village Policeman or the Sheriff, particularly in the rural areas ~~was~~ was not a symbol of law and order. He was a symbol of oppression. He was not someone, all too often, as we well know, that they could go to for redress but he was the oppressor. And - when the thing kicked off I think it was the result of a lot of frustration, including in it a cancellation of promises that had been made, after they got to Los Angeles, in connection with the Poverty Program, particularly a Youth phase of that program, for Summer Training that was canceled out, canceled out because politicians couldn't agree on who should have the biggest hand in doing it out and today the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, ^{today} with an organization now of 200 business industries and they want these industries to agree that this was ~~not~~ their back, that the giving of jobs belonged to business, not government, and they moved into this area and opened an office

144

and they ^{have} had cooperation with this government, because it does require the cooperation, but they also have had the cooperation of a fine committee of responsible negro business men in providing the people and they found out, and with all of the misinformation going on, they boiled it down to 25,000 unemployed in that area. Half of them, roughly, are unemployable by reasons of illiteracy, disability, records, and daily social problems. There is not one answer but a lot of answers and all of us together are going to have to find the answer to this.

The other half are employable, particularly if given some on-the-job training in modern technology and these business men set out to put those people to work and to date the figure is half. It was only last August and to date they have put more than 3,000 of those people to work ^{for} as on-the-job training programs in private industries. Now 3000 is almost the number of poverty program administrators who are running up and down the street down there. So you can see how great the undertaking was. Now they have plans for expanding this to the entire megalopolis down there, on a permanent basis, and they believe they can solve the problem of unemployment except for the unemployable and as I say - that is a social problem.

You are next - I'm trying to keep track.

Question: Re Proposition 14 -

Reason: Well now you have given me a question I'm afraid to answer - not on a basis of anything to do with the particular proposition but I must confess that at this present, and I think that I have a reasonable knowledge which I have been acquiring regarding the structure of our State Government, but I don't know ^{legal} whether ~~that~~ particular ~~proposition~~ is in that ~~area~~. I don't know whether

that is the particular procedure or the process but I know that it is before the Court and I certainly am sitting here waiting, and all of us are, to abide by the Court's decision. Then I think it is the will of the people, through the Legislature, as to what they want to do with regard to the Bill, the Rumford Act, which would then be back, I would assume, on the books, as Law.

Question: With regard to Welfare - - - - -

You state that we should take care of those who really need help. How do you propose to do this?

Reason: Well, again the risk of over-simplification. Let me divide Welfare into two areas - - - There is the field of Welfare that cannot be denied, of people who must depend upon us - who have no other way - people of disabilities, etc. Now this is our Social Problem and I think it fits well within my philosophy that you and I can only give the Government those powers which we as individuals possess. The Government has no other source of power and I think that this is in preservation of our Pursuit of Happiness to make sure that disposition is made. . But, the other section of Welfare - this is what I think is more of a temporary measure. Here are the people that we are tiding over in an emergency period - or offering some program of rehabilitation so that they can get into the mainstream of society and productive work and employment and I think here we have let the philosophy of the one lap over into this other. An example - the other day, I'm sure many people didn't think it would happen in this State, we discovered when it was brought up as a case by the Retail Clerks Union that yes, a woman could draw both Disability Compensation and Unemployment Insurance - so a woman who injured her elbow sweeping up cereal out of the aisles in a Super Market is now drawing both a check as Disability Compensation and Unemployment Insurance. And the other day - a friend of mine - I know the personal examples are not good in discussion or debate, but I can't resist this one. This friend of mine is an accident

146

skier and he came back from a Colorado Skiing Resort and was still kind of wide-eyed and slap-jawed because having cocktails after the afternoon of skiing, he discovered that most of the people that he was enjoying himself with were drawing California Unemployment Compensation, including the ski instructors. Now, in this area, where I say we provide even as much as we can afford for luxuries or comforts for the disabled, in the other I think that your sick philosophy must prevail. There must always be some inducement for a person to get onto the payroll and off of the dole and if you make it too high, remembering that such things as unemployment insurance are tax free - you know, it is pretty easy. Well, I think this was a part of the reason in the recent Bracero fiasco - we thought that here was a man who could make a minimum wage of \$70 per week in the field and he was drawing compensation of \$65 per week and it doesn't take a genius to figure out that for 40-odd hours in the field, stooping over in the sun, in his mind, he was not earning \$70 - he was only earning the difference between that and the \$65 he could get for doing nothing - and I think this is the reason why these things must be tightened up to the place where you and I who are paying this; the working man I mean, have a right to some rule that can apply the pressure of the stick from behind to urge someone to get back on the productive payroll.

Now I've been neglecting you over here because that light is in my way and I haven't seen any heads - but I'll start here with this one, then back and over.

Question: You say that you had no quarrel with the Public Accommodations portion of the Civil Rights Act but you still have difficulties with the Voting Rights Act --- Can you explain the reason for this.

Answer: No, I didn't mention the Voting Rights Act. As a matter-of-fact -

147

if I have any criticism of the Voting Rights Act at all, it was only that in my un-legalistic mind I always figured we had a Voting Rights Act, if the Federal Government had ever gone in and done what they should have done and enforced it. Now the Constitution subscribes that States can have tests or requirements for voting, but it also provides those must be equitably, evenly administered, there cannot be a double-standard, and you and I know there has been a double-standard in a number of States. At the risk of being extremely a Partisan, I feel some justification in it, because now running for an Office as a Republican when I spent all of my life as a Democrat until recently, I claim that back through the years perhaps one of the things that has led the Federal Government to not doing more in many Southern States than it could, to make sure that the Constitution was upheld, was because in that one party South it was the bulwark and the backbone of that the Democratic Party's power and they weren't - there was a limit as to how far they would go to offend that one party South - that bulwark. But, when the Voting Rights/first came along I said "But why - we've got one - what are we waiting for - why haven't we been standing there right now and ask them to vote both the same question and if neither can answer it, neither one votes, and if they both can answer it, both vote. But I'll tell you, I bristle inside when, not too long ago, and this I couldn't understand at all, in one Southern State, and I was in that area, they went to the polls and voted and each party in that particular state is allowed to put a slogan, if they want to, up above the handle on the voting machine and the democratic party put their slogan up "white supremacy" and in that area I never was able to figure out how 80% of the negro community went in and pulled that handle averse-ly. In my book, they all should have been pulling the Republican handle.

Back there - Yes -

Question: My concern is with regard to your statement about Dole - The amount of money people are getting off of welfare reduces their inclination to go out and seek a paying job and then - you cited the farm county. My interpretation of the farm county is that their wages are top low. Would you care to deal with that problem - perhaps in relation to unification, the problems in Delano and Bracero problems?

Reagan: Well, now you are linking a couple of things together there that I don't think I linked together. I didn't couple Welfare and the Farm Problems. In California there are about 324,000 permanent employees in farming counties and this is augmented by about another 100,000 at the peak harvest season, 70,000 of which in the past, up until now, have been Braceros. Now, noone is going to deny that in any area of society there are people who take advantage and who grip a little bit and chisel and that is why we have a Screen Actor's Guild -- There were Producers that did that and I believe completely in Organized Labor and the Right of Collective Bargaining - I couldn't have spent 20-odd years as a Board Member and an Officer of a Union if I didn't believe that, and I was in charge, throughout those years, of Contract Negotiations with the Producers. We don't have any Jimmy Hoffas - we do it ourselves. When we get mad and shake our fists, and pound the table, we're shaking our fists at the fellows we work for on the other side of the table.

I had some serious questions though in the farming county about - and some opposition to imposing industrial type unification on the farm worker and on the farmer because it stands to reason there can be no legitimate collective bargaining if a man has the power to stand there on the eve of the ripening of the crop and they say "I'm on strike." The other fellow hasn't got much to bargain with, he's had the way a problem of this kind would have to be solved and my criticism of what is going on in Delano is that this is not as it was when the secret formed a union. This is not a spontaneous thing from the people working in the fields. This is the effort on the part of

149

professional labor organizers to impose an industrial union on them regardless of their will or willingness to have it and this is an acute problem. I believe that you can also find for every low paying job in the farm community - and you can point to some Braceros that manage to put themselves through law school on their Summer earnings in this Country. I know one man, a one-armed man, who is in the field and doing piece work and had worked his rate up to \$27.50 a day and he said "What's wrong with this? This is great!" The minimum wage was \$1.40 for California and the Government set it at \$1.15 in the rest of the Nation. The average minimum wage paid by California Farming has been \$1.33 up until this last year and the average wage in the rest of the country was a little less than 95¢, so the California Farmer has not only had to overcome this but he has had to overcome the fact that freight rates in shipping to an Eastern Market to remain competitive with farmers closer to the market and at a lower labor rate and he has done a pretty good job because today 98% of California's farming is not regulated or subsidized by the Federal Government and we provide half the table vegetables and fruits for the entire United States and 70% of all the tomatoes that go into the cans and bottles.

Now, I'll recognize the gentleman here and then back there and then I'll come back to the middle section.

Question: You mentioned the increase of our Government Power which, in recent researches, as connected with Federal, was endangered. I wonder whether the same danger does not exist with increased power of private institutions? We'd like you to address yourself to the controversy read by Mr. William Bennett as to the assertion by the FT-- of the right to arbitrate - - - - - .

Reagan: Well, I don't know that I have enough information and knowledge on that last part to remark on that specifically but I can make it very plain where I stand with regard to powers. I felt this way when I was a Democrat and I feel this way now as a Republican, that whether it comes from the Right, the Left, or the Middle, whether it is from business, from labor, or from Government, anything that imposes monopolistic control, or imposes unfairly on the rights of the individual is tyranny and must be opposed. Now, I believe that prior to 1929, to the crash, that business in this Country, because organized labor did not have its present strength, that business had imposed unjustly and had more or less monopolistic controls in many areas, on the people and on the economy and it was right that this should be overthrown. But, I think what has happened since is that the medicine of the New Deal which I approved and supported when my first vote was cast for Roosevelt, that this medicine was applied to a sick patient and medicine was applied to help labor get up to where it could bargain on more even terms with management but incidentally, I will call to your attention that ^{what} Franklin Delano Roosevelt's premise often stated was that he believed that this was only Government function to get them to a place where they could fight on equal terms and then Government stood back as a Referee and was not a Participant. But I say that today there are people who have come from that same era who are continuing to apply the medicine and the patient is well but they just like the medicine again for the medicine's sake and today we have the danger of the same kind of monopolistic imposition ~~on the people~~ on the people of the combine of labor and government that we once had from management of business and the thing that is wrong is not who is doing it but what they are doing - monopoly is wrong and therefore, I think the pendulum has come to a point

151

where it might swing the other way. I don't care who makes me unfree - I don't want to be unfree.

Now back there - then there - and then there.

Question: I'm sure that any of us would agree that it is bad. I was wondering if the solution for this isn't for the President of the United States or perhaps a Congress to step forward and organize things and make sure that the taxpayers money is not wasted in cost services - in other words, centralization.

Reagan: Yes, I agree completely. It is the answer and this is what I mean by Creative Society - that the answer cannot come with Administrative edicts handed down by saying "This is wrong. Cancel it out." The time has come to turn to the best brains in these various areas and to form councils of those to come back with proposals and plans as to how the problems have brought about, these programs can be solved, if these problems still exist, and at the same time how we can get back to this kind of a footing....

I realize that I have probably been confusing in the trying to just pick out some examples of what I meant, that this has led to some of you ranking them together and thinking I was trying to tack them together, and I was - I hope you realize - just trying to establish a principle and pointing out some glaring examples of why I felt there was a need for this imposition of this principle. When we get into of just the Congress and the President, what I think is needed again is a similar thing to the Hoover Commission some years ago that was appointed by Presidents of both Administrations to research and study for a complete re-organization of the Federal Government. You know they found out - if you ever want to have some laugh - it is like a comic book to read some of the things they found - like the Federal Government was three typewriters for every employee that uses one - because they have no central buying system. They've got no stock-piling, or what is avail-

152

Then they find that the Navy is selling sun-glasses as a surplus, at \$1.25 and the Army is buying them now for \$5.00. There were millions of these cases - but now I'll recognize this gentleman and then one over here in the back, and they tell me that's all I've got time for.

Question: What would your position be pertaining to Viet Nam Day on this Campus and others?

Reagan: All I can say is that the answer to that should be very simple. I think it is confused again. In show business it has always been known, that when you file in to the old tried and true principals like stealing the audience's emotions, you get in trouble and you get into trouble when you tell a lie.. And I think sometimes that here again we ~~are~~ on a large scale, are saying that the President has called a War and yet we have neglected the legal processes provided by the Constitution for what takes place once you commit men to combat, so that legally we are in kind of an untenable position. I think it is as simple as ruling that a division has to be made on this basis. Of course, we have freedom of speech and of course, we have the freedom of people to make their feelings known and to protest the policy of government. But once you have committed some young men to fight and die, then freedom of speech must stop short of lending comfort and aid to the enemy. We have a responsibility, everyone, to do whatever is necessary to lessen their chances of dying and to insure their chances ~~will~~ or help them to complete their mission and return home as quickly as possible.

Now, there is a hand there - and maybe I can shake another one in on him before he runs me out.

Question: If they are fighting ^{and dying} for that free speech, what good is the War in Viet Nam and what is it all about?

153

Reagan: Did I not say "I do not dispute their right"- I said "When the implementation of that Free Speech passes a certain point that it now makes it easier for them to die, or get killed, then you have passed the point but, up to that point, they have a right to demonstrate, they have a right to speak, they have a right to protest - noone denies this, but I think when it reaches the point of ~~interfering~~ interfering with the shipment of supplies and ammunitions, when this reaches the point of interfering with the sending of replacements or re-inforcements, you have now gone over the point to where you are lending aid and comfort to the enemy and there is a very blunt word that describes what that is." Now, let me also say one other thing - You are now only fighting, of course, for all the freedoms that we want and that we believe in in this Country but I believe that there is one fundamental basic tenet of government that cannot be denied and that is the only excuse the government has for even existing is the willingness of the people banded together in a society to pledge their collective strength to defend the rights of even the least individual among us. This is why I am questionable and challenged a national policy that will pretend its a Peace in one place and say it is all right as long as the War is below a certain size and I say that as soon as one American is put in a position where he must fight and die, then we must recognize we are in a position where collectively the United States has now agreed, by that responsibility of collective action, that we are all on one side. - - One more question - -

Question: What about the controversies surrounding the Watts riot? I'm interested in your reaction to the Attorney General's request that the organization - - - - -

Reagan: Well now, I have no way of knowing what a Democratic Attorney General based his findings on but I believe there has been certain responsibility in the government in the past on the organization - - -

14
154
DETROIT ECONOMIC CLUB
LUNCHEON

CREATIVE OPPORTUNITIES FOR GOVERNMENT
AND BUSINESS

I have been protesting the growth of government for a number of years, expressing the concern less the permanent structure of government will become so trite and complex as to become unmanageable. This concern is not unfounded. There is a door with the inscription

The taxpayer who has the courage to open the door will find himself in the broom closet. In addition, there is a 20-man Pentagon Unit still functioning in that complex house, whose title has more words than the staff has numbers: "INPUT PREPARATION SECTION OF THE REPORTS PREPARATION BRANCH OF THE OPERATIONS DIVISION OF THE ARMY INFORMATION STAFF SYSTEM COMMAND OF THE OFFICE OF THE ARMY CHIEF OF STAFF."

Knowing Washington tension for reducing such agencies to initials, then coining abbreviated titles like NATO or SAC gives one cause to wonder how some proud wife is going to get on the phone and tell an old school chum the title of where her husband works. I realize the subject is controversial but today one political party controls the White House, the entire Executive Branch, a two-thirds majority in both Houses has appointed the majority of the Supreme Court Justice and controls more than 60% of the Nation's government. The philosophy, the leadership of that party, leads toward centralization of authority in the National Government, with the ways of traditional concept in local authority in individual fields. Terms like centralization and

are like a fellow in a dark theater says "Which is the Green Girl?"
A new Executive has become the Green Girl and will change is no general

the goals, or any doubt as to its ability to achieve those goals, I do deny that it offers the only, or the best solution for the age old problem besetting mankind. If the great society cannot also be a free one, the price is too high. Already we have seen an unprecedented Federalization of our American life. Therein lies implementation. In 1978

, speaking of the United States and said "I do not dread industrial corporation and its difference in powers to destroy this country but there is one corporation we may all dread - that corporation is the Federal Government. If this great ambitious ever-growing corporation becomes oppressive, who shall check it? If it becomes unjust, who shall trust? Watch it guard with sleepless dread that corporation which can make all property and the rights of all States and People, all Liberty and Hope its plaything in an hour, its victims forever. If it grows oppressive, in recent weeks we have seen the Government drop her blood from the military stockpile to force the market price down, use the anti-trust laws, the harrasing power of the Internal Revenue Service, Defense Spending, and the threat of Withholding that Spending, and even the threat of withdrawing Federally-owned Electric Power, to punish Business Men for meeting increased production costs with an increase in price. It has happened in Copper, Steel, and Aluminum. The Press described one business man as heart-sick and dejected when he said "This is no longer a free, competitive economy" and the great ambitious corporation continues to grow. In the free Enterprise System we have multiplied the gross National Product 33 times over since the turn of this Century. In that same period of time, the Federal Government has multiplied its size 234 times and now assaults on private initiative are on the bureaucratic drawing board in this era of instant legislation. An Official of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has said "I'm telling people here to plan big. The Under Secretary of Labor, at a meeting of State Employment

156

State Service said that ~~ALL~~ lines are being wiped out, as far as the Department of Labor is concerned. The United States Director of Employment, whose four million dollar budget during the depths of the depression has grown to two hundred million dollars a year in this era of prosperity, announces the goal is to make his service the manpower agency for the entire Nation. Indeed, a Congressman from a nearby State did introduce a bill to outlaw Private Employment Agencies. The Ways and Means Committee of Congress has before it Legislation which would authorize a Federal Takeover of Unemployment Insurance, on the pretense that the State has failed in this Social Welfare Program. Well, they can't mean my State. The California/^{State} Department of Welfare has issued a pamphlet and on Page 17 it explains the Social Philosophy of this administration. It says "Unemployment Insurance should be increased so substantially that for a time a man thrown out of a job would receive more than/while he did on the job to compensate for the pain of having to look for work."

Congress has before it Legislation which would give Government the Power to lay down the rules, the shape, the size, and the printing on all packages. It would authorize the Office of Consumers to investigate the production capacity, the distribution system, the quality and degree of customer satisfaction, with the power to demand the businessmen annual and special reports. Already it is estimated that the business man spends 35% of his working time filling out Government paper work. Are you in the Insurance Business? A Federally subsidized Disaster Insurance Program is before Congress, which would provide \$22,500.00 for Residential Damage, \$75,000.00 for Business Damage, and the insured wouldn't pay one penny of premium. A Lawyer, from the United Planning Agency for the Poverty Program, has opened offices in several cities, providing free legal service by a staff of Government Lawyers for people with take home pay of up to \$100 per week. Nothing has escaped the eyes of the planner. American communities maintain more

157

than 1400 Symphony Orchestras. This is more than the entire rest of the world put together. We have more than 9000 amateur community theatres, books are a two billion dollar a year business, but the Government has decided we are a Desert Land with regard to culture, that's so we have a Culture Czar, empowered to spend millions, tending up the cultural side of our lives.

Some of our newly drafted G. Is have slept this winter in tents because we can't spend the money for housing but Miami, Florida gets a 9 1/2 million dollar center. The new Secretary of Urban Affairs says "In the beginning, the Government gave the people the use of the land in order to seed and develop it."

Now, I didn't learn history that way. I thought we were here on the land and we created a government. Now, however, he says "The Goal of the Government is to regain complete control of the use of the land." Thirty-nine Government Agencies are buying up land under a variety of programs for a Government that already owns a third of the real estate in this Nation.

The latest is the Agency for Outdoor Recreation, Using the Population Explosion as their Excuses. We are told that very shortly there won't be adequate space outdoors for us to find recreational space. How imminent is this emergency? Well, at the moment, more than 50% of our population are living on less than 2% of the land. That your State of Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, then add in Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia. You will still be 2 1/2 million acres short of the land now owned by Government, Counties, States and Federal, and designate it for outdoor recreational recreation. That same Agency, incidentally, worked out a 104 page book to make sure that you and I will know how to enjoy ourselves outdoors. It's full of proficiencies -

158

For example, your campsite should have a drinking fountain, and the drinking level should be at a height that is convenient for the person using the fountain. There is an exciting chapter on wildlife, insects crawling into the ears of outdoorsmen, which sometimes create painful conditions. Well, I have news for them - It's no fun when it happens indoors. But, wait 'til you hear this item on wildlife - If your recreation area has a bathhouse intended for the use of both men and women, it should be divided into two parts by a tight partition. Now, you know we would never have thought of that by ourselves.

We have a window on what happens when Government goes beyond its legitimate function. For more than thirty years our Government has sought to regulate and control the farming economy. Born of the Depression, the program was originally intended to save the farmer from the result of producing a crop surplus. So - the Government met the problem by guaranteeing a market for such a surplus. For every dollar we were spending on that program in 1948 we are now spending \$25.00. The result - three million fewer farmers, but for those remaining, a debt in relation to net income higher than it was even on the eve of the '29 crash, and the farmer today, with the highest food prices in history, receives the lowest percentage of market basket dollars he has ever received. The Government says two million more farmers must leave the soil and move to the City. An anonymous question remains unanswered. Who decides which two million? The same Government that insists we only need a million large commercial farms is the Government that violates a 30-yr old contract and holds the farmer in California's rich Imperial Valley that they must sell off their land and reduce to 150 acre size or there will be no more land for them. The Government is buying up the title in California, parcel by parcel, and holding it in a fully paid trust of Government surplus. It is to be distributed

Worldwide and while it extensively is a kind of Travelogue, it contains subliminal advertising. The aim of the film is, without the viewer realizing it, to promote the use of tobacco, the enjoyment of tobacco, in the mind of the-use-of the viewer. That same Government has an equally expensive experiment going on in San Diego County, trying to convince the people they should cut down on the use of tobacco. The Government advocates a warning on packages and in advertising of tobacco products, designating tobacco as detrimental to health but the same Government subsidizes the growing of tobacco and it just pressures the manufacturers out of a price increase.

An air of permanence has begun to settle around the idea of Federal interference ⁱⁿ wages and prices. A Senator introduced a bill proposing the creation of a Federal Price and Wage Review Board. A Congressman would empower the Congressional Joint Economic Committee to review proposed price increases and Company Officers, under this bill, could be subpoenaed, forced to bring in the books, confidential correspondence, and other records. This is advanced as a program to ward off inflation but no meaningful action is taken by the real cause of inflation, the Government, to bring us back from the edge of what may turn out to be a dark future. Instead, we are told that gradual inflation* is good for us, that only by eroding the purchasing power of the dollar 1 1/2% to 2% per year can we maintain prosperity. They say there is no cause for worry as long as wages and income keep pace, no worry, unless we are stupid enough to ask what happens when we retire on that fixed income, that pension, or insurance, or Social Security, which cannot keep pace with inflation. In the last 20 years inflation alone has eroded the value of our savings by 100 billion dollars.

Lord Maynard Keen said "Inflation is a mighty tax gatherer." Of course, perhaps we could take some satisfaction for what inflation has done for our ego. We've all grown up in these-great years of emphasis on science, accepting that the chemicals of the minerals which make up our bodies are actually, if laid out

160

on a scale, worth 93¢. Now, Montano Chemicals says that 93¢, due to inflation, would weigh out at \$600.00 worth. Well, I'd just ~~have~~ as soon have my chemistry back at 93¢ and the \$300 in my pocket. Inflation is no longer a threat - it's a problem. Today American business men are asked to forsake their traditional role of trading in the World Market Places, a stop-gap measure to hold the outflow of gold but again Government refuses to take the check which can solve the problem.

I remember as a kid when we used to put pennies on the car tracks and let the streetcars flatten them out for us. Now the Great Society is doing it and selling them for a quarter. The United States Citizen is already denied the right to hold gold and now he will no longer know the ring of silver as he jingles the coins in his pocket. We're to have imitation money. The Government reaches something of a new high in absurdity when, in announcing this imitation money, it said "We have nothing to fear. The Government stands behind this money and will exchange it any time for paper." Lowell Mason, former Anti-Trust Enforcement Officer, in his book "The Language of Deceit" says "In this Country one sees the growing acceptance of the thesis that Violation of the Economic Commands of the State are more dangerous to our material welfare than Criminal _____ and therefore, can be punished without due process." In this passage he acknowledges that Governments don't produce Freedom. People have to take Freedom from Government and continually struggle to keep it. It is becoming clear that Big Government is not only incompetent to deliver many of its promises but must resort to force and coercion under the guise of helping the people.

Quote: "The Doctrine of Regulation, Legislation by Master Minds in whose judgment and will all the people may gladly and quietly acquiesce has been too glaringly apparent in Washington. Were it possible to find Master Minds so unselfish, so willing to decide unhesitatingly against their own personal

161

interests, such a Government might be to the interest of the Country but there are none such on the political horizon." Now, what meanderthal man of the McKinley era spoke those words? Well, those were the words of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

We are running out of time. One out of six of the Nation's work force is a Government Employee. Where is the breaking-point? When it reaches one out of five, one out of four, or three? How many of us does it take to provide the full salary and the fringe benefits for another employee?

We're told that every family below a \$3000 a year income is Poverty Stricken but each family's share of the tax is \$3000. The tax takes 37¢ home out of every dollar earned and yet we haven't balanced our budget in 29 of the last 35 years and another deficit will be announced on the coming June 30th.

What is the alternative? Sell the Postoffice? Cancel the Highway Program? Return to complete Voluntarism, with no Government involvement at all? Perhaps there are some Purists who would recommend such a course but there is a far more sensible third alternative to either the Great Society, or such complete laissez-faire. Have we forgotten our own abilities, our

past accomplishments? At the end of World War I, Belgian Relief saved millions of lives. It was a foreign aid program that was, for the most part, the voluntary effort on the part of the Citizens, aided and guided by Government.

At the end of World War II the Secretary of Commerce, Jesse Jones, alarmed by the plans that he saw on the Bureaucratic drawing board in Washington and realizing there would be tremendous pressure for Government Control of the transition from War to Peace, called in the Nation's business leaders and he challenged them to accept and evolve a plan. Top Corporation leaders

162

through 2000 local committees, did the post-war planning. The profits of economic boom turned out to be wrong. The massive transition from a war economy to peace was guided by an independent effort because one man knew that America's human resources are far greater than the Power of Government. For two hundred years this country has been fighting the most successful War on Poverty in the recorded history of man. The West would still put out Area Redevelopment. Cities were built, destroyed by fire or floods, and rebuilt without becoming Federal Disaster Areas and without Urban Renewal. If there were men in Government capable of running the Nation's business better than it is now being run, you would long since have hired them away from Government. Those who place their faith in Government Planning would point to the present prosperity as proof that Government intervention in these recent decades has been helpful to business. It is no such thing. It is only proof of the great virility of the Free Enterprise System that it has been able to survive, the nit-picking, the harassment, the meaningless regulations, and the regretted taxation, but it is not a virility that can survive forever. Even the Giant Gulliver, was eventually rendered helpless by the pigmies of Lilliput when he dove and when, without suddenly applying chains or shackles the pigmies simply laid thread after thread after thread over his dozing body until finally the last thread that was added had rendered him helpless.

First, let us recognize that additional purchasing power and hence prosperity, is not created by re-distributing burinings on hand but by increasing production. One of the basic laws of economics not guaranteed to help anyone in an English class, but definitely the basis of all economics, is the rule "no one should be given anything for free lunch." Then, let us restore the full power of the sciences we have guaranteed the most liberal and equitable

163

Government ever known to man, the Constitution, keeping in mind that the very purpose of the Bill of Rights was to forever put our right to control our own destiny beyond the reach of majority rule. Then, let us recognize there is a legitimate area for Government cooperation, but Government works best when kept close to the people. Influential political minds in Washington would eliminate State Sovereignty as outdated and they would make the States administrative districts of an all-powerful central Government.

Well, our historic States Rights are a built-in guarantee of freedom, as long as the Citizen can vote with his feet - as long as he is free to move across the border a State is restrained from becoming Tyrannical. A few years ago the people in the State of Michigan, faced with a deteriorating business climate and an increasing exodus of industry, did something about it. Every problem that besets us, from dropouts to disease, from job re-training to student loans, is being solved somewhere by some group of citizens at this moment.

We need an intercommunication system between us and then an early warning system, a way of anticipating the public problems of the future. Yes, there is a roll for Government, particularly in the Local and State level, not as a substitute for the people, but as a leader in the development of a creative society, mobilizing the full resources of the people. There are 18,000 organizations like yours, 6400 private foundations worth \$15 billion dollars, three hundred and twenty thousand churches, one hundred thousand groups like The United Funds. Here is more talent than Government can possibly watch. Here is the power to fight a thousand Wars on Poverty. This is no retreat into the past. This is taking the ideas we once had and bringing it forth to the Twentieth Century level. "We've had enough of Nineteenth Century Rule Philosophy, with its Rule of the Many by the Few, even if we pretend this

164

as well as for the people. Is your problem Needy Students? How about expanding the United Student Loan Fund, a private Voluntary Program, underwriting Bank Loans for Students, Slum Clearance, how is U.S. Gypsum doing with its million dollar investment in a Harlem Slum, an experiment in rehabilitation? A Negro group on Long Island bought and remodeled a run-down hospital and now can provide training, jobs, and hospital beds. How many Cities could ~~xxxx~~ profit by learning your own step program? We stand on the only island of freedom left in the world - there is no place to run - we make our stand here. If we fail, we face telling our children and our children's children what ~~is~~ it was we found more precious than freedom. I'm sure they'll ~~xxxx~~ ask. Thank you.

ORANGE COUNTY

March 30, 1966

1165

After our Candidate has finished speaking, he will be glad to answer any of the questions you care to ask him? Mr. Reagan - -

Reagan:

I'm going to take advantage of this, as I've been standing up most of the day doing this. I started out early this morning - I hear somebody dropped a pin right back there. Now, I know that it is not polite to talk with something in your mouth but maybe if I request your sympathy by telling you how long it could go today if I tell you what is in my mouth right now is a throat lozenge so if you'll let me go ahead and try to talk around it, pretty soon it will be dissolved and quit rattling. Let me just set the stage because I think that if there is any meat to this it would be in questions and answers but let me make a few remarks first - general philosophy - I have had the pleasure of speaking to your group before, as you know, and at that time you were pretty safe in getting a bet out of me that I would never be - while I looked forward to being back with you, I'd never be back in this capacity. But things change and here I am! You know there is a big controversy and I suppose many opinions here in this room and I think it is something that America can't afford too well that is going on and that is a kind of philosophical split and a difference of opinion that has been roughly classified into the Liberal vs. the Conservative side. But, in reality, what it comes down to is the question of solving the problems that have beset mankind for a great many years and which I think we have come closer to solving in this country under our citizens than anyone ever has, I used the expression before but we have, in this country for a couple of hundred years, fought the most successful war on poverty that the world has ever seen and I sometimes worry that we have labeled ourselves and split ourselves to the place where we no longer give credit for having done what we have done. I think it is safe to say, for example, that on the Conservative side there has come to be a great suspicion of the so-called Liberal and those of us who fancy ourselves on that side are prone to suspect the motives, and yet

166

that even in the attempt to cure some problem of age, poverty, or unemployment, that it really is only a step in a plot of conspiracy leading to something else. But by the same token, the Liberal, all too often, has been pretty guilty of just blanket indicting everyone who disagreed with his solution to the problem as being opposed to the humanitarian goal. I think it is high time that people of goodwill got together in this country and sat down and discovered that we all can think and share the desire to solve the problem, that noone is opposed to the humanitarian purpose. I, for example, would say "I believe in the humanitarian purpose to the great society and I have no question in my mind but what the great society can solve the problem, if it can be solved, but I will also tell you that I don't think we're going to like the price we have to pay in loss of freedom, exchange of our traditional structure but now, isn't it possible that we can sit down and if people like myself are wrong then we can be shown that we are wrong and if the people who advocate the great society are completely confident of its ability to do the job and do it without a loss of freedom, shouldn't they be fearless and willing to ^{defend} ~~explain~~ their position and explain why it will work? In other words, if they are wrong they can't afford to take the attitude they have taken but if they are w right, or they have nothing to fear, there is no need to get upset about opposition. Well, anyway, this is getting down, by way of introduction, to my own philosophy - believing that these problems can and will be solved - ^I ~~we~~ believe that there is one thing that is consistent with the American people today. I believe that the American people have made up their minds throughout this country that these problems must be solved. I think the American people are not going to be tolerant any longer of getting by and knowing that sections of the population are going to be miserable, or denied some of the good things in life.

So they want a solution and they are not going to hold still for anyone who simply opposes what has been proposed without bring up something else as an alternative. My own alternative that I suggested very briefly, and I'll be going into more detail on it as time goes on in the coming weeks - my solution I have chosen to call "The Creative Society" and beginning at a State level, because that is what we are talking about, I believe that every one of the problems that I have mentioned to you are the problems that baset us , is being solved some place in this country today by some group of citizens. What we maybe need is an intercommunication system and an early warning system to know when the problems are going to come due. Now, we know for example that the Federal Government is concerned and debating about hundreds of millions of dollars in money to be loaned to college students, needy students, with college loans to be repaid after graduation, with low interest.

How many people know that today there are some 65,000 students on 700 and some campuses, going to school on loans from banks, totalling more than 35 million dollars and all of this was the result of one man who went to the private bank and said "Why don't you lend money to students and let them pay it back after they get out of school?" The banks understandably pointed out that the money they could lend is depositors money - they need a little security - so this same man started out with his idea and has gotten literally thousands of people in this country to underwrite the loans that the banks make to the students. They have almost 100% record of success in the reclaiming and repayment of the loans. ~~Something~~ - This is called the United Student Loan Fund. They believe they can expand this to a sum of 500 million dollars and the government won't be involved at all. It will be a legitimate business deal between the individual student and the bank where he borrowed the money.

168

Now, there are any number of these solutions to problems. Portland, Oregon had a drop-out program - they had been working ^{on} for years, again with almost 100% success. The kids that they salvaged and had started in careers have also done something that was never envisioned when they started the program. So grateful are they for having been salvaged that they have contributed back to the program almost every cent that was spent on their salvaging so that the program can continue.

Now the quarrel with many of us who oppose government so close to the problem centers on this, that when government evolved a drop-out program, they didn't go to Oregon and say "What can we do to help? Is there something we can do to prevent it?" No, they've done their best to put Portland's program out of business because now they say it is the Government's job. Sometimes you wonder if people aren't doing things in Government just for the sake of Government. Well, my creative society idea is based on the belief that if the State Administration of California would accept the fact that there is more talent and ability among the 19 million Californians than Government can possibly muster, it just stands to reason - You and I know that no matter how carefully you appoint, or hire through Civil Service, or Elect, Government cannot possibly match the creative ability of the sum total of all the people of the State, so instead of an Administrative edict being handed down, ^{take in} ~~the~~ the problem of unemployment now in our own State, let the State govern it. Take a man in this State, ^{from} ~~in~~ the Industrial Community, and tell him to pick the best brains he can and tell them to sit down as a Commission or a Committee, at no State expense, and for them to come to State's Government with a program they have evolved as to what the State can do and Industry can do ~~and~~ ⁱⁿ cooperation to improve the business climate and make an example for industry to make it attractive for them to expand, and then, to the limit of the State's ability, cooperate in removing needless harassment of paper work and regulations,

169

progressive taxes, offer tax incentives - now, I'm not suggesting we go this far. I don't think we have to. Some States like Louisiana will offer any/^{new}industry establishing there ten years of complete freedom from property or real estate tax and then they have written in a guarantee that at the eleventh year they won't suddenly hit you over the head to try and get back the ten years they have given you free, that your tax will have to be comparable to everybody else in the vicinity. Well, as I say, we don't have to do that, but very possibly California could find that through tax exceptions we could stimulate job training. We could give an inducement to industry to go into the minority areas where there is an excess over and above the normal amount of unemployment, a tax stimulant for however much they will do in that particular area to put those people into training and put them to work.

There are any number of programs that call for the same thing. One right now is taking place in the Watts Area, called the Family to Family Program. It is not just some little do-good stunt that started with a few clergymen going out and talking to people and a feeling of goodwill. They ran through a computer for an experiment and came out with 2000 families and these 2000 families now have enlisted an experiment in which, on weekends, six people, no less than six people, meet in a home, but the six people must be representatives not of just one group but of a majority of the minorities and they exchange weekend visits in each other's homes simply to get to know each other and get acquainted and find out what are the human problems that have separated us for so long. Well, if this experiment proves successful and does something to alleviate the misunderstanding and bring us closer together and allay some of the prejudices that sicken our society today, would it be too far fetched to envisage the State using the prestige of the Governor's office and of the entire State Administration, to spread this word and help where it can and get this

started on a complete State-Wide basis? Well, these are a couple of the examples as to what I mean by the Creative Society. What I think I have been trying to say to you, before I turn you loose in questions (I'm just stalling) - What I've been trying to say is that I think it is time for us to recognize that the overwhelming majority of the American people, regardless of the party lines or philosophies that separate them, are probably pretty close together with regard to what we want to do for people. And - I think it behooves us, if we are of goodwill, to sit down and examine our differences as to the methods we would employ in solving these, without just blanket insisting in advance anyone who is opposed to our approach to the problem and I felt constrained to say this before opening the questions because I realize that in the political dialogue of this modern day there is very little challenging and disagreeing with someone politically on the basis of their views and what they honestly believe. There is instead, a great ^{business} ~~image~~ of image making in which the opposition decides what image they are going to plaster you with and then if they are successful in creating that image, they can run against that false image and it doesn't make any difference whether it matches the truth or not so what I'm trying to do is get out from behind the plaster right now as I have uncomfortable feelings already being applied. In short, I do not eat my young. Now, before I get any deeper - Questions -

Question: I would like to know what image you feel you have, as far as your political aspirations are concerned - and what image you feel you would like to present exactly?

Reagan: Well, the image I try to present is just the plain simple basis of what I believe and to do that I have already evolved an idea that in campaigning, I am going to campaign in this way - In other words - no canned speeches, say more than introductory remarks enough to necessitate whether it is a market place, a factory gate, a bandstand, or where.

I'm going to do questions and answers with the people. I think they have a right to know whatever is on their mind and I figure this is the best way for the truth on issues to come out as to the image that I think & perhaps is (I'll never give in that it has been successful yet - of course it's early) best described by a sentence the Governor spoke to a meeting of the young democrats several months ago, wherein he flatly stated "We are going to hang ^{the} ^(back) Right Wing / Extremist image on Ronald Reagan and I feel that in all justice that you first should establish whether that is the proper image. Honesty requires that you say "If we determine that he is a Right Wing Extremist, we will then reveal this to the people, not "We're going to hang the tag on him" and find out later whether it is bohunk or not.

Question: Would you tell us, please, what really happened in Santa Monica. Speak to them too..We weren't there - -

Reagan: I made a statement - I grant you it would not receive wide examination - and I got mad. I felt that there were hints, whether intended or not, in answer to some of the questions - - I had no quarrel with the convention at all - and I waited until the final question had been asked and answered by the other two and I was therefore the last one speaking to the final question and I expressed my displeasure at what I thought had been ^(omitted) and contained in some of the other answers, and I talked....

Question: ^{Answer:} Were the remarks made by the other two candidates? Well, that has to be although I would rather not pursue it any farther because at the same time I also said that I still adhere to the 11th Commandment and believe implicitly in the unity of our party and would try to do everything I could to promote it and support whoever was a nominee of the party...

Question: But your opponents are making capital of it - at least today I believe something was released about it - -
 Reagan: Well, I'm still willing to let it stand - The 11th Commandment means -

172

I will say once again that I will support the party nominee and that I will speak no as a Republican.

Question: It was said at some of the Democratic Circles that Ronald Reagan lost his box office to the extent that he won't pick up any additional strength in California than he has now. Do you care to comment on that?

Reagan: Well, I think that that first came to light in the New York Times, whichever one recognizes an authority on things in California and that it recently appeared in California in an interview that was done with me but the opening line of the interviewer was to the effect that he had read it in the New York Times and what did I think about it....

All I can say is that I think the campaign is really now just beginning. As a matter of fact, I thought, in spite of my having declared in January, I thought of April 1st as really the campaign starting time, as when your organization gets under way and goes down the stretch and I just don't think there is anything prepared to say now in advance of who is or is not going to win. I'm content to wait until June 7th to let the people decide.

Question: Do you feel that you will pick up additional strength as you go on in this campaign?

Reagan: Why, I have to believe so..First of all, the latest polls indicate that I'm out in front - but they also indicate that there is a very sizable undecided group. Now, any campaigner has got to figure that he can present his case to that undecided group and get a share of them. Certainly that is going to be my effort and I hope that I don't lose anyone I've already gotten in the machine and I won't throw anyone away that has already committed the other way and decides to change.

Question:

Will Laughlin Waters be very active in the Primary? - What do you think?

Reagan: Will Laughlin Waters be very active in the Primary - Well, I don't know. He announced his support of George Christopher after he withdrew from the race. His chairman had announced his support of me. I know his chairman is going to be active on our committee and I assume that Mr. Waters will probably do what he can in the campaign.

Question: What specific issues can you foresee if you are a Republican Nominee when it goes down to our November voting? Can you pinpoint any specific issues? Oh yes, I think we have a dollar sign on almost every issue and I think it is kind of a funny thing to try and describe - I'm not satisfied myself that I am describing them correctly but I think there is one overall issue and it is kind of an umbrella to all the others that are under that umbrella:

No. 1 - It has to do again with the philosophy of this administration in Sacramento, which I think it has shown a tendency to abandon State Sovereignty and turn to Washington for the answer to all problems and thus make our State a kind of administration to the Federal Government. Now, in order to do that, it has meant, of course, an increased bureaucracy at the State level, so we have a government that has grown four times as fast as the population increase, the cost of government has multiplied even more than Local half and our share of the cost of State/Government here in California is \$100 per capita higher than the National Average and I think from this, to come down to the other problems that have stemmed from this centering of all the authority in Sacramento. I think it is back of the fact within the Democratic Party right now, the attempt on the part of the Executive Branch to completely bypass the Legislature. Again, who will buy Administrative edicts? There is

a mad manner in which they have pre-empted local communities' authority to have ordinances in the area of law enforcement, on the basis that the State has pre-empted that area and thus the police have their hands tied in so many ways from enforcing law and thus we have 9% of the population and 17% of the crime. And you can go on down - Welfare - Welfare is increasing in cost much faster than the increase in the cost of education and while it has not passed the total amount spent on education, it is the second biggest item in our state. Now, here again it touches back to my subject of Creative Society. I think there are two divisions in welfare. You have the permanent group and I don't think again, this crosses the party line, but I don't think there is any responsible person who would suggest that we should not do everything we can for those people who through no fault of their own, either aged or permanently disabled but who must depend upon us for their subsistence. I think every one of us would like to be able to do not only bare subsistence but some of the luxuries that make life worth living for them. But, there is another larger element of the whole welfare package which is a kind of temporary thing. This was the welfare that basically began in the depression days and was originally intended to be a temporary measure to put people back on their feet and back into the productive economy and we have gone so far afield in that that even the administrators of public housing at the Federal level are now admitting that we have perpetuated poverty and we have created a segment of society in which we have now come into a third generation of people - a third generation that in the family has never known anything but living on public subsistence, but they grow up, get married and have children, expecting to live the same way and live in public housing. I think there is

need for a great study in that area, to determine first of all, to re-determine what is our goal - and the goal obviously is not to perpetuate poverty with dole but to use those funds to get people either retrained, or do whatever is necessary to get them on their feet and earning again. In this regard, I think there are any number of new and challenging things that we can look at. For example, in the area of Public Housing. Why is it that noone has ever thought that as long as you are going to put up the money for public housing, I don't know that this will work, but I say that this is a challenging area to investigate. But, why has noone ever thought of the possibility, in say an apartment structure, to do what we do now so often in private apartment house building, to say to the individual, "Here is the deed - you own this apartment. It's yours. You now have an asset with \$_____ . This is yours." Naturally, you are going to have to protect yourself with rules that say, "Now, you can't go out and sell this. You can't move into the apartment next door and start all over again, but you now are the possessor of a piece of property". Or even if it should be a private individual dwelling and approach public housing from this standpoint of putting people back into control of their own housing. Take, for example, we've heard the stories that so many large housing developments have a lack of interest or care, with a run-down condition, the destruction that goes on, and the vandalism by the people, the tenants within the building. Just think how this would make everybody in the building automatically a kind of policeman and custodian. If one fellow in an apartment next door is throwing trash out in the hall, he has two property owners on either side of him and one across the hall who are going to say "Hey, buddy, a little care about what you are doing with our property. We own a chunk of it."

This is just one of the areas we could explore.

I think basically the Californians are terribly concerned about the size of government, the cost of government, and I think today the man on the street is very concerned about where is this welfare problem taking us - is it not approaching the point in which the people on welfare are beginning to outnumber the people who are paying the bills.

Question: Pardon this question - First of all, do you consider Mr. Christopher your prime opponent in this primary?

Reagan: Well, I think he is the closest and the toughest contender to beat but I've tried to not think of any Republican as an opponent. I figure this is kind of a tryout to see which one of us can run the fastest so we can decide which one is going to run in the track meet after ^{June 7th.} ~~June 7th.~~ In other words then, assuming that

are you still going ahead with the "Slaveish Commandment?"

Reagan: Sure - I'm running against the present administration in Sacramento.

Question: Before you can run against the present administration in Sacramento, don't you first have to get past Mr. Christopher? Is it a matter of campaigning?

Reagan: Well, I honestly believe that a primary should be conducted on the basis of running not against your primary opponent but that you run against the main opponent and that the people make up their minds on the basis of how the various candidates and their party appear against that eventual opponent to see which one of them they are going to put in the main goal. I use as an example the example of the track meet. I think it is Wednesday afternoon that you turn them loose down the track for 100 yards and the winner is going to run on Saturday against the other school. Now, I don't see any need - all you are supposed to do is to see which one can run the fastest - there is no need to spike the other fellow on the day that he tries because any one of us might turn out to be the no-show and if he does, all the rest of us should be in his camp, trying to get him elected.

17

We had such a primary between Murphy and Kaiser the last time out. Here were two men that pledged their complete support to each other in advance and Kaiser wound up as a Finance Chairman for Murphy.

If I can prove to the people's satisfaction that I'd make a better case against the Brown Administration than the other Republicans, then they will vote accordingly.

Question: It sounds rather magnanimous that you want to be Governor first of all. .

Reagan: Very much so!

Question:

Question: Does this have anything to do with your not appearing before the California Republican League Convention in San Francisco, in which endorsements will be made, in April? You are the only candidate who will not be there and -

Reagan: Well, I'll be there the next day - what happened was that we had a schedule before we ever received this invitation and a whole scheduled days activities in another area, and we begged them - this is another case of all the candidates appearing at once - and we asked if they could not change it from Saturday to Sunday, which I think was the days - because I can be there on Sunday - and they swear they cannot change it because of the other candidates schedules, so I'm appearing there on Sunday - but in case there is any suspicion that this is avoiding a joint appearance with any of the other candidates, two days after that, here in Orange County, I will be appearing with the other candidates before the Federated Women's Republican Clubs in exactly the same kind of a meeting. Now - there was

Question: Yes, I have a question, Mr. Reagan, about the - education has been one of my biggest daily expenses and everything has socialized education. There has been a lot of controversy in the last five or ten years about local control being usurped by state control. In other words, the people in Sacramento will tell us how our children are going to be educated. Should there be a stand on - or how do you feel about the controls of Sacramento as opposed to Newport Beach?

Reagan: I have a very definite stand on this. It is true - one of the greatest dichotomies in our system is the Public School System that here the Founding Fathers had figured everything out except that they realized a system like ours wouldn't work with a literate informed public and so we have adopted a Public School System. It is a strange paradox, with our complete tradition of individual freedom, parents being forced to educate children, we've made it work - ^{been} a rather clumsy compromise - but the clumsy compromise has been local control of the schools - but as long as you have kept the control close to the parents and the local community, you could overcome the problems that went along with the compulsory features of education. I am very definitely opposed to the centralization of authority in the School System. I think that unification of school districts is only good if the people in those districts have decided that they want it unified because it would make their problems easier. I do not believe in it being forced upon them - I do not believe in Mr. Unruh's Assembly Bill No. 145, with its every two year vote and its holding out tax bills and holding out a penalty, withholding money to try and force the Districts in California to unify. I believe in it being kept close to the local level and I think that I think that the main reason behind the unification is the bulwark of freedom but if you remove it too far from the local or the parents' control, it becomes a

the State get out of the Text Book System. I would like to see local authorities have more control over the selection of text books. It is a funny thing that so much lip service is paid by the aggregate of the Great Society to being a land of diversity and we must make the World and our Nation safe for diversity for differing viewpoints, except that they don't like that diversity when it comes down to their idea of imposing blanket rules from the top of the Federal Society. I would do everything I could to ask for legislation to restore authority as much as possible to the local school system.

Question: To follow that a step further. If you were Lt. Governor, let's say, and it came to your attention that the City of Anaheim was providing a good education for their kids, or the City of Santa Ana, or say Garden Grove was providing a very poor one, would you then feel any compulsion on your part to try to do something with the cities that are providing a poor education?

Reagan: Well, now you have certain basic standards of education that have been laid down but if you are talking about where they fall below those standards then, of course, it is automatic that you've got some responsibility. .

Question: You feel the State should - -

Reagan: Well then, you have a State School Board - Yes, this has always been traditionally true. Yes, we have always done that to maintain a certain level of education but I think as long as that is being done - I'm talking about such controls as the State imposing on the School Systems, let us say, the second language idea. . Sounds like a good idea - I think all of us would like to be able to think that - sure, every child should start school and learn not only his own but another language - but the State imposes this and makes no provision whatsoever for how the various school systems are

going to find the teachers, finance the program, and suddenly here they are encumbered with a debt and burden and no provision made for meeting it and the State last year passed changes and rules for legislation for requirements with regard to our elementary schools, filled 270 pages, and they were suddenly dumped on local school administrators and said "This is the new law." Good Lord, the school year is over before they can wade through 270 pages. I made a suggestion to some school administrators the other day that we needed a year's moratorium, that there ought to be a year's gap before the enforcement of the new legislation so they will have time to study it and find out what it means, because in many instances when they study it they find it has been a very impractical thing that has been forced onto them. Now, some of these views I'm expressing I know I hold in common with the State Superintendent of Education, Mr. Coffey. For one thing, I'll tell you right now, I'd like to see a State Administration and I'd like to be in charge of an executive branch that would take some steps to end that relationship that was created by this administration between the duly elected Superintendent and the Governor's appointed board, in which his hands were tied, and I'd like to see him be more free to do some of the things the people elected him to do - - - - -

Question: You then favor the elected superintendent and the appointed board?

Answer: Well, no, if you ask me, I'd tell you that if it could be done. I don't want all of them appointed. I would say that it would make more sense to have an elected board and an appointed superintendent than the present system. That would really bring it that much closer to the people.

Question: ...

Do you have any preference for any Governor at present?

Reagan: Oh no! Good Lord, I'm in no position to have any coat tails -
Whoever the people decide is the one, - I will say this - I am not one
who believes in independent, individual campaigns, similar to some we have
had in the past, in which we call the head of the ticket to go their own
way. I don't believe you ought to send the General without the truth.
Once it is decided, if I am a nominee on that ticket, I'm campaigning for
the entire ticket, top to bottom. (Considerable applause)

Question: Could I have your candid opinion of the recent
magazine articles - one by Jim Murray in Esquire about two months ago
and the current one Newsweek. . Inside your own reaction to those,
do you have a - - (much laughter) -

1 and 2 - how about the Murray piece?

Reagan: Well, you see there is a little story that precedes the Murray
piece - a woman named Jessica Mitzik, was first approached by Esquire,
to write the profile on me. I didn't feel that I wanted to talk to her
or be interviewed by Jessica Mitzik as I didn't think we had much in
common and besides you know she and her family were probably so busy in
the perfect demonstration that we couldn't have gotten together anyway.
The next thing I know - I know she was going to do the profile anyway -
she was talking to a lot of people - and the next thing I know Jim Murray
contacted me and said that Esquire had asked him to do such a thing and
I said "What happened to the Mitzik piece and he told me that Esquire
didn't feel it could use it." It turned up in the magazine "Ramparts"
so Mitzik got her piece printed. Murray came and said he was to do a
piece - and I had been a fan of his - I love his writings - and I was
disappointed. It was not an honest piece and I really was disappointed.

... in Newsweek I could more or less expect such - I thought the cover picture was fine and happy about that. There were some more or less fictional things running through the Newsweek but all in all I think some of them were so subtle that they went over most people's heads - But, it isn't true that I wear makeup when I want make speeches, even occasionally. As a matter-of-fact, I don't even wear makeup when I do Death Valley Days. I discovered the studio years ago that I had an allergy and got hives if I wore makeup. I managed to get away with it all these years - besides, it wouldn't do any good any more. There were a few other things in there that I thought were inaccurate but, as I say, I wasn't too surprised by that.

Question: - - - - -

?

Reagan: Well, yes, I don't think I got around with a grand speech in which I have bland paragraphs that don't say very much of anything at all. I think I've said some pretty pointed things - as a matter of fact - a lot of people have gotten pretty mad at me for some of the things I've said, including one government agency that tried to get me fired off my TV show. Now, you can't arouse that kind of action and be bland - so - no, I don't think they were again at a premium, the exact issues that I ever said. But I love it - the Press, and I want you to know - I even attend the Eleventh Commandment. . . (Much laughter)

Question: Among the Democrats - a lot of the people state that you don't have the administrative bearing. - - - - - ?

Reagan: Well, you know there were two teachers once, applying for a job in the educational system and one had 25 years experience while the other had one year. The superintendent would be hitting the person who had one - and the other one protested - basing her claim on her 25 years experience - and the Superintendent said "No, you've had one year's experience repeated 25 times."