

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Dolan, Anthony “Tony” R.: Files

Folder Title: TIME Magazine Program at Eureka College
02/06/1984 (3 of 7)

Box: 25

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/>

(Dolan)

February 2, 1984

1:00 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: TIME MAGAZINE PROGRAM AT EUREKA COLLEGE
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1984

This has been a day that Neil and I will long remember, a day of warmth and memory, a day when the good things that have happened in our lives all seem very close and real again.

We've just come from Dixon where I attended my biggest birthday party ever. I had what every man who has 73 candles on his birthday cake needs around him: a large group of friends and a working sprinkler system. And now we're here for Eureka's birthday. Legend has it that after Ben Major led a wagon train here, he sunk an axe into the first tree he felled and said, "Here, we'll build our school." That was more than 129 years ago and just to end any speculation going on among the undergraduates: No, I was not part of the original wagon train.

It is always wonderful to return to Eureka. People ask me if looking back at my college years, I can remember any inkling that I would someday run for president. Actually, the thought first struck me on graduation day when the president of the college handed me my diploma and asked: "Are you better off today than you were 4 years ago?" ~~No, really, I guess I first started thinking about the presidency when I was washing dishes over in the girl's dormitory . . . there I was . . . night after night . . . staring into the oval soap dish. But the truth is I never did think I would end up in the most prestigious job in the free world and -- come to think of it -- I'm still not the coach of the L.A. Raiders.~~

Besides being wonderful, coming back to Eureka is also a great temptation. Sitting in a college audience can sometimes be dangerous duty -- something about your youthfulness and the bright, fresh hope it symbolizes makes guest speakers like myself very free with their reminiscences and very reluctant to sit down. And I guess you've heard that I like to tell an anecdote or two.

I do promise to be brief today; but I don't want to miss this opportunity to share with you some thoughts on the changes that have happened to America in the 50 years since I left this campus. And to offer too, some thoughts on how we can shape those changes to serve the cause of human freedom -- to inspire, not burden those who come after us.

I can't think of a better occasion for such reflections. In addition to Founder's Day here at Eureka, we're also marking the first in a series of speeches sponsored by Time Magazine to commemorate its 60th anniversary. For 60 years, Time has lived up to what Henry Luce and Briton Hadden envisioned when they founded the magazine in 1923: a weekly digest of news put together with much more care and perspective than is usually possible under the deadline pressure of daily journalism.

2000-500
1961 5.05
Brian Doyle
Ass't to Ed.
293-4300

Well, if it's important for news organizations like Time to keep in mind the value of perspective, you can imagine how important it is for those of us in public life to remember that proximity to daily events can be as much a handicap as an advantage in understanding their meaning.

And that's what struck me when I was thinking about what I wanted to say here today: the ease, the unknowing grace with

which my generation accepted technological and political changes that so radically transformed our world.

In 1932, for example, I graduated from Eureka ^(WAS?) ~~and~~ ^{in need of} ~~for~~ a job. I found one ~~career~~ in radio. I didn't realize I would become part of the communications revolution that was shrinking the dimensions of my world even more than radio's successor, television, would shrink your own. Already my generation's sports idols, celebrities, newsmakers, and heroes had come in large measure from the world of radio. It seemed a perfect career choice.

Yet if I had only stopped to think about it, I would have remembered boyhood days a few short years before when my friends and I followed our neighborhood genius around town trying to pick up radio signals with his jerry-rigged crystals, aerial and headphone. Can you imagine our sense of wonder when, one Sunday afternoon, down by the river in Dixon, we heard the sounds of radio for the first time -- an orchestra playing over KDKA several hundred miles away in Pittsburgh?

Yet it took only a few years for that sense of wonder to dissolve; and radio -- so exotic in the 1920's -- had become commonplace by the time of the 30's when I was in college. Indeed, by the 1930's 13 million radio sets a year were being manufactured.

By that time of course, the market had crashed, the depression years were upon us and over those radio sets, now sitting in every parlor and living room in the Nation, came the rich, reassuring tones of Franklin Roosevelt. All of us who lived through those years, can remember the drabness the depression brought, but we remember too how people pulled

together -- that sense of community and shared values, that belief in American enterprise and democracy that saw us through. It was that ingrained American optimism, that sense of hope Franklin Roosevelt so brilliantly summoned and mobilized.

It was a time of economic emergency, and there seemed a certain logic to arguments that the national Government should take on to itself new and sweeping prerogatives. In the grip of that emergency, many of us could not see the enormous and oftentimes harmful political changes that this expanded role for the Government would bring.

Once again, as I look back, the rapidity of that political change was as astonishing as the change brought by technology. At the start of that era, Government was consuming a dime of every dollar earned; ~~three-quarters~~ ^{two-thirds} of that money was going to State and local governments with only a quarter to Washington. Today, Government is collecting 31 cents from every dollar and the proportion is ~~completely~~ reversed, with two-thirds of that money now going to the Federal Government.

pace

1929
Anderson
OMB
X3381

So my generation was a bit surprised to realize that the Federal Government, called upon in an economic emergency, was becoming now an obstacle to economic progress. In addition to damaging the autonomy of local and State governments and usurping the rights of the people, the public sector had grown so large it was consuming our national wealth, discouraging energy and initiative and suffocating the spirit of enterprise and resourcefulness that had always been at the heart of America's economic miracle.

X

In the depression years and their aftermath, we forgot that first, founding lesson of the American Republic: That without proper restraints, Government the servant, becomes quickly Government the master. This is an American lesson, but, actually it's much older: ~~Cicero wrote,~~ "The budget should be balanced, the treasury should be refilled, the public debt should be reduced, the arrogance of officialdom should be tempered and controlled." And since his time, many nations that failed to heed the words of that wise Roman have been brought to their knees by governments ^{that} borrowed and taxed their citizens into servitude.

But some peoples, like our Founding Fathers, revolted under such oppression. No one understood better the danger of unchecked Government power than those men: "I am not a friend to a very energetic government. It is always oppressive," Jefferson said.

The Je...
p. 386

I remember quoting a few of these warnings, long after I had left radio for films, television, and sometimes speeches on the rubber chicken circuit. And by that time this reformed New Dealer could add one observation of his own: that a Government agency is the nearest thing to eternal life we'll ever see on this earth. Yet even as the decades of the 50's and 60's went by, and more Americans shared my concern, Government grew like topsy. In the 70s, Federal spending tripled, taxes doubled, and the national debt reached almost a trillion dollars. Government ^{approached?} bureaus, agencies, and employment rolls kept multiplying and it had become too easy for politicians to promise more to win more; to spend their way to election victories.

Fortunately, that juggernaut of big Government has now been slowed. During the last 3 years, we've brought skyrocketing spending back to earth and slowed that enormous momentum towards big Government. It wasn't easy but measure the results by our ability to achieve what people once said was impossible: Federal spending growth has been cut by more than half; Government regulations have been cut by more than a quarter; and taxes on working Americans have actually been reduced and indexed to the rate of inflation. A working family earning \$25,000 has \$1,100 more in purchasing power ^{today} ~~in 1983~~ because we cut taxes and lowered the rate of inflation.

Today ^{now} Economic recovery is in full swing. But I hope we can use these moments of reflection today to understand the hard lessons we've learned since the depression about the growth of Government. We need some basic reforms, that will protect us against Government's all too powerful tendency to grow and grow.

For one thing, it's time for the Federal Government, in the best Federalist tradition, to learn something from successful experiments in the State and local laboratories of governments. The evidence from those 43 States and many municipalities is overwhelming: The Executive Branch needs a powerful weapon to cut out porkbarreling and special interest expenditures buried in large, catch-all appropriation bills. It's time the Congress gave the President the authority to veto single-line items in the Federal budget.

And, second, politicians at the national level must no longer be permitted to mortgage your future by running up higher and higher deficits. The time has come to force Government to

live within its means; and I repeat my call today for making a balanced budget a constitutional requirement.

And finally, our tax system is now a nightmare of tangled requirements and twisted priorities. The American people want and deserve a tax code that is fair, rewarding and simple enough to be understood by someone other than an army of greenshaded accountants and lawyers.

Now in addition to the technological revolution marked by the inventions like radio, and the political revolution brought on by the sweeping new scope of Federal power, there has been an additional development worth noting. That is the emergence of America's international role and our sudden designation as the champion of peace and human freedom in the struggle against totalitarianism.

Throughout World War II and most of the post-war era, there was broad public consensus on this point. Though the adversaries changed -- from Hitler to Stalin -- there was still basic agreement on the moral imperative of defending freedom and the self-evident differences between totalitarian and democratic governments.

But that broad consensus of the Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy years began to break down in the 60's and 70's. Partly in response to the Vietnam tragedy, an era of paralyzing self-doubt ruled out just and legitimate uses of American power, even acts of self-defense.

The consequences of this ~~America's~~ retreat were not long in coming. All of you can remember a few years back when the tragedy of the Iranian hostages was fresh in our minds; when

around the world, especially in Afghanistan and Central America, Soviet expansionism proceeded unchecked; when our defenses had declined dramatically; and some nations thought they could threaten or harm the United States with impunity.

We've changed this. We're trying to see to it that American citizens -- and it doesn't matter whether they are Navy pilots in the Gulf of Sidra or medical students in Grenada -- can no longer be attacked or their lives endangered with impunity.

[You know, Jean Kirkpatrick, our Ambassador to the United Nations, has a wonderful story to explain how fundamental this reversal has been. She says that when she arrived at the United Nations someone asked what would be different about a Reagan Administration's foreign policy.

Well, she said, "We've taken off our 'Kick Me' sign."

She was asked: "Does that mean if you're kicked, you'll kick back."

"Not necessarily," she replied, "but it does mean that if we're kicked, at least we won't apologize."]

Yet, it goes beyond just self-defense. When I spoke to the British Parliament a ^{year and a half} ~~while~~ ago, I said our cause was human freedom; and so it has been: in Europe, in Lebanon, in Central America. We've tried to bring a new honesty and moral purposefulness to our foreign policy, to show we can be candid about the essential differences between ourselves and others while still pursuing peace initiatives with them.

As I have said before, the democracies have their own serious injustices to deal with, but this should not prevent us from making the crucial moral distinctions between pluralist

X systems which acknowledge their own wrongs and shortcomings and systems that excuse their defects in the name of totalitarian violence.

X Our willingness to speak out on these distinctions is the moral center of our foreign policy. For us, human freedom is a first principle; not a bargaining chip. To fail to publicly enunciate the differences between totalitarian and democratic systems of government would be to foresake this moral high ground.

It's time we realize that candor about the Soviet Union and its international activities, far from hindering the peace process, ultimately enhances it. History has shown that only when the Soviets realize their counterparts in negotiations have no illusions about their system and its intentions, do they settle down to serious negotiations.

xxx Peace remains our highest aspiration and arms control isn't enough: Arms reduction must be our goal. And for just that reason this Administration has refused to satisfy itself with the old objective of arms control. But I think our new realism about the Soviets is an important means to this end, it is also a reestablishment of the broad national consensus that existed in the pre-Vietnam era; when we understood the moral imperatives of defending freedom and the importance of taking totalitarian powers seriously.

You know, I've heard mentioned an observation by a distinguished French intellectual, Jean Francois Ravel, on this point. Mr. Ravel points out that some people are embarassed to call the struggle between democracy and totalitarianism by its

own name and prefer euphemisms like the "competition between East and West" or "the struggle between superpowers," as if the superpowers were politically and morally equivalent.

And here I want to point out that the political revolutions we've seen in America in domestic and international policy are only a reflection of a deeper trend; a trend that directly concerns the world you have been part of here at Eureka, the world of ideas.

There has been a dramatic turnabout among the intellectuals. For most of my adult life, the intellegentsia has been entranced and enamored with the idea of ^state power, the notion that with enough centralized authority concentrated in the hands of the right-minded people mankind can be reformed and a brave new world ushered in. I remember one member of the Roosevelt administration writing about the commonly-held view of his day that all societies were moving towards some forms of communism.

Yet we know now that the trend in America and the democracies has been just the other way. In the political world, the cult of the state is dying; so too the romance of the intellectual with state power is over. Indeed the excitement and energy in the intellectual world is focused these days on the concerns of human freedom, on the importance of transcendent and enduring values.

In economics, for exmample, as the recent Nobel Prizes to Fredrick ^von Hayek and Milton Friedman attest, the free market is again becoming the focal point. In political philosophy, a whole generation of intellectuals led especially by French thinkers like Ravel, Jean Marie Benoit, and Guy Sorman are rejecting the

old cliches about state power and rediscovering the danger such power poses to personal freedom. ^{Russian} ~~Soviet~~ dissident intellectuals, ranging from majestic figures like Alexander Solzhenitsyn to noble crusaders like Vladimir Bukovsky have brought new attention to the horrors of totalitarian rule and to the spiritual desert that is communism.

Here in America, this revolution has been spearheaded for 30 years by intellectual presences like William F. Buckley's National Review. It's been supplemented recently by what's called the "neo-conservative" revolution led by Irving Kristol, Midge Decter, Norman Podhoretz, and others.

In many ways this counterrevolution of the intellectuals was predated by one of the most vivid events of my time, an event whose meaning is echoed in today's disenchantment with communism.

It involved, coincidentally, an editor of Time Magazine, Whittaker Chambers, who in public testimony in 1948 named former ^{U.S.} high Government officials as spys. He was not believed at first, but the inexorable power of the truth was slowly felt and overwhelming evidence led a jury to convict one of those famous officials, Alger Hiss, of perjury. ^{former}

In Chambers' autobiography, Witness, he added a sequel: Chambers marked the beginning of his personal journey away from communism on the day he was suddenly struck by the ^{steps} intricacy of his infant daughter's ear; when he realized then that such ^{intriguing} design, such precision could be no accident; he said he felt at that moment as though the hand of God had reached down ^{to} and touched him.

X That is why Chambers would write that faith, not economics, is the central problem of our age and "that the crisis of the western world exists to the degree in which it is indifferent to God." The western world does not know it, but it already possesses the the answer to this problem, he said, but only provided that its "faith in God and the freedom he enjoins" is as great as communism's faith in its denial of God.

Chambers' story represents a generation's disenchantment with statism and its return to eternal truths and fundamental values. And if there is one thought I would leave with you today it is this: For all the momentous change of the last 50 years, X it is still the great civilized truths, values of family, work, X neighborhood, and religion, that fuel America's technological and material progress and provide the spark for our enduring passion for freedom.

We are lucky to live in a time when these traditional values and faith in the future, this sense of hope, has been reawakened in our country. Yet we have so much more to achieve: from assuring continued economic growth, to developing ~~the~~ space [^] America's next frontier, to keeping the peace and extending the borders of freedom. (is this what it meant?)

X Now I know you have a sense of excitement about all of this and that's why it strikes me as odd that some people say today that college students are too conservative. I think the truth is that you've discovered early in life what it took another great X American writer, Scott Fitzgerald, many tumultuous years to discover. X Toward the end of his life, he would write to his

daughter in college about the importance of what he called the "fundamental decencies."

"My generation of radicals and breakers down," he said, "never found anything to take the place of the old virtues of work and courage and the old graces of courtesy and politeness."

I hope you'll remember that, and something else F. Scott Fitzgerald once said -- that America is "a willingness of the heart."

In the past half century, America has had its flirtation with statism but we are now recovering that willingness of the heart and returning to our roots: limited Government, the defense of freedom, faith in the future and in God. With these values as guides, the technological revolution of the years to come will be even more breathtaking than that of the last 50 years because it will hold out not only the promise of drastic improvements in mankind's material conditions but progress in the spiritual and moral realm as well.

Thank you very much, God bless you and may God bless Eureka.



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

February 2, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR: Ben Elliott
FROM: J. Gregory Ballentine (Anderson/Pelletier) ^{S.P.}
SUBJECT: Presidential Remarks: Time Magazine Program
at Eureka College

Page 3, paragraph 4:

There were 4.5 million radio sets manufactured in 1934.

Page 4, paragraph 3, sentence 1:

In 1929 the share of total taxes, including Federal, state and local, in GNP was about 10%. By 1933 this ratio had risen to 17%. If the start of the era is 1929 then the figures are correct. If the start of the era is 1933 or 1934 as implied elsewhere in the speech, the number should be raised. Also, in 1933 the share of state and local taxes in total taxes was three-quarters.

Page 4, paragraph 3, sentence 2:

The share of total taxes in GNP in 1983 was 31%. In order to reach a higher fraction, such as 44%, it is necessary to divide taxes by a smaller measure of the nation's output. GNP most nearly corresponds to the notion of what the nation earns in total.

Change to read, "Today, Government is collecting 31 cents from every dollar ..."

Page 5, paragraph 4, sentence 4:

Change to read, "... the national debt approached a trillion dollars."

The actual level of the debt in 1979 was \$834 billion.

Page 6, top of the page:

~~Change "16,000" to "2,700".~~

Page 6, paragraph 3, sentence 4:

The correct figure is \$1,100, not \$1,500.

The sentence now reads, "... if taxes and inflation had remained at their 1980 level (sic)." This clearly implies that the calculation is made by first assuming that in 1981, 1982, and 1983 tax and inflation rates remained at their 1980 levels and that this calculation is compared with the actual outcome for the hypothetical family. This is not how the calculation was made. Had we made this calculation under the assumption that the family's \$25,000 income remained fixed for all three years, the result would be much larger than the correct \$1,100 or even the incorrect \$1,500. Instead, the calculation was made by applying the growth in real per capita disposable income from Q4/80 to this income level.

The sentence should be changed to read, "A working family earning \$25,000 had \$1,100 more in purchasing power in 1983 because we cut taxes and lowered the rate of inflation."

cc: Richard Darman

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

February 2, 1984

1984 JAN 34 AM 11: 44

FOR: BENTLY T. ELLIOTT
DEPUTY ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT
AND DIRECTOR OF SPEECHWRITING

FROM: FRED F. FIELDING
COUNSEL TO THE PRESIDENT

SUBJECT: Draft Presidential Remarks for Time
Magazine Program at Eureka College

Our office has reviewed the above-referenced draft remarks and has no legal or other substantive objection to them.

cc: Richard G. Darman

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

February 2, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR RICHARD DARMAN

FROM: ANTHONY R. DOLAN

SUBJECT: Eureka Speech

Your editing changes are all made. I admire them but disagree with one (#2 below) and have a question on the final paragraph (#1 below).

1) Here is the final paragraph. Is this what you had in mind?

In the past half century, America has had its flirtation with statism but we are returning now to our roots: limited Government, the defense of freedom, faith in the future and in our God. With these values as guides, the future holds out not only the promise of drastic improvements in mankind's material conditions but progress in the spiritual and moral realm as well. And that's why I hope that 50 years from now, should Time Magazine ask you for your reflections, you'll be able to recall an era exciting beyond all of your dreams. Believe me, there are great days ahead for you, for America, and for the cause of human freedom.

2) O.K., oval soap dish and L.A. Raiders are out. But, let me explain why I was resisting. The two jokes are a bit like the Carson monologue -- not necessarily great but they build rhythm and warmth with the audience, very important early in a speech. So why not leave it up to the master, I thought; not because I'm stubborn but simply because on a number of occasions when we had similar suggestions, the President kept the jokes and they helped build rapport early in the speech.

One last note, Dick, I really do feel the Kirkpatrick story is at the heart of the speech, not because it is a statement of policy but because it's a perfect anecdote to show how common sense had gone out of style. I think you are quite right on the President quoting Kirkpatrick too much and I took out that second reference to her name while leaving the rest of the paragraph intact.

cc: Ben Elliott

(Dolan)
February 2, 1984
1:00 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: TIME MAGAZINE PROGRAM AT EUREKA COLLEGE
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1984

This has been a day that Neil and I will long remember, a day of warmth and memory, a day when the good things that have happened in our lives all seem very close and real again.

We've just come from Dixon where I attended my biggest birthday party ever. I had what every man who has 73 candles on his birthday cake needs around him: a large group of friends and a working sprinkler system. And now we're here for Eureka's birthday. Legend has it that after Ben Major led a wagon train here, he sunk an axe into the first tree he felled and said, "Here, we'll build our school." That was more than 129 years ago and just to end any speculation going on among the undergraduates: No, I was not part of the original wagon train.

It is always wonderful to return to Eureka. People ask me if looking back at my college years, I can remember any inkling that I would someday run for president. Actually, the thought first struck me on graduation day when the president of the college handed me my diploma and asked: "Are you better off today than you were 4 years ago?" No, really, I guess I first started thinking about the presidency when I was washing dishes over in the girl's dormitory . . . there I was . . . night after night . . . staring into the oval soap dish. But the truth is I never did think I would end up in the most prestigious job in the free world and -- come to think of it -- I'm still not the coach of the L.A. Raiders.

Besides being wonderful, coming back to Eureka is also a great temptation. Sitting in a college audience can sometimes be dangerous duty -- something about your youthfulness and the bright, fresh hope it symbolizes makes guest speakers like myself very free with their reminiscences and very reluctant to sit down. And I guess you've heard that I like to tell an anecdote or two.

I do promise to be brief today; but I don't want to miss this opportunity to share with you some thoughts on the changes that have happened to America in the 50 years since I left this campus. And to offer too, some thoughts on how we can shape those changes to serve the cause of human freedom -- to inspire, not burden those who come after us.

I can't think of a better occasion for such reflections. In addition to Founder's Day here at Eureka, we're also marking the first in a series of speeches sponsored by Time Magazine to commemorate its 60th anniversary. For 60 years, Time has lived up to what Henry Luce and Briton Hadden envisioned when they founded the magazine in 1924: a weekly digest of news put together with much more care and perspective than is usually possible under the deadline pressure of daily journalism.

Well, if it's important for news organizations like Time to keep in mind the value of perspective, you can imagine how important it is for those of us in public life to remember that proximity to daily events can be as much a handicap as an advantage in understanding their meaning.

And that's what struck me when I was thinking about what I wanted to say here today: the ease, the unknowing grace with

which my generation accepted technological and political changes that so radically transformed our world.

In 1932, for example, I graduated from Eureka ~~and for a~~ ^{and landed a job} ~~career in radio.~~ ^{Thanks} (I didn't realize ^{at the time, I had} I would become part of the communications revolution that was shrinking the dimensions of my world even more than radio's successor, television, would shrink your own. Already my generation's sports idols, celebrities, newsmakers, and heroes had come in large measure from the world of radio. It seemed a perfect career choice.

Yet if I had only stopped to think about it, I would have remembered boyhood days a few short years before when my friends and I followed our neighborhood genius around town trying to pick up radio signals with his jerry-rigged crystals, aerial and headphone. Can you imagine our sense of wonder when, one Sunday afternoon, down by the river in Dixon, we heard the sounds of radio for the first time -- an orchestra playing over KDKA several hundred miles away in Pittsburgh?

Yet it took only a few years for that sense of wonder to dissolve; ~~and radio -- so exotic in the 1920's -- had become~~ ^{radio} ~~commonplace by the time of the 30's when I was in college.~~ ^{which had and history became commonplace,} ~~Indeed, by the 1930's 13 million radio sets a year were being manufactured.~~ ^{In 1922, 60,000,000 all broadcast sets had been manufactured.} ~~In the 20's~~

By that time of course, the market had crashed, the depression years were upon us and over those radio sets, now sitting in every parlor and living room in the Nation, came the rich, reassuring tones of Franklin Roosevelt. All of us who lived through those years, can remember the drabness the depression brought, but we remember too how people pulled

Radio which had only 60,000 households in 1922, was heard in 13 1/2 million households by 1937, when I graduated from college.

together -- that sense of community and shared values, that belief in American enterprise and democracy that saw us through. It was that ingrained American optimism, that sense of hope Franklin Roosevelt so brilliantly summoned and mobilized.

It was a time of economic emergency, and there seemed a certain logic to arguments that the national Government should take on to itself new and sweeping prerogatives. In the grip of that emergency, many of us could not see the enormous and oftentimes harmful political changes that this expanded role for the Government would bring.

Once again, as I look back, the rapidity of that political change was as astonishing as the change brought by technology. At the start of that era, Government was consuming a dime of every dollar earned; three-quarters of that money was going to State and local governments with only a quarter to Washington. Today, Government is collecting 31 cents from every dollar and the proportion is completely reversed, with two-thirds of that money now going to the Federal Government.

So my generation was a bit surprised to realize that the Federal Government, called upon in an economic emergency, was becoming now an obstacle to economic progress. In addition to damaging the autonomy of local and State governments and usurping the rights of the people, the public sector had grown so large it was consuming our national wealth, discouraging energy and initiative and suffocating the spirit of enterprise and resourcefulness that had always been at the heart of America's economic miracle.

In the depression years and their aftermath, we forgot that first, founding lesson of the American Republic: That without proper restraints, Government the servant, becomes quickly Government the master. ^{I call it} ~~This is~~ an American lesson, but, actually it's much older: Cicero wrote, "The budget should be balanced, the treasury should be refilled, the public debt should be reduced, the arrogance of officialdom should be tempered and controlled." ^{Cicero wrote in B.C.} And since ~~his~~ ^{that} time, many nations that failed to heed the words of that wise Roman have been brought to their knees by governments ^{that} borrowed and taxed their citizens into servitude.

But some peoples, like our Founding Fathers, revolted under such oppression. No one ^{would} understand better the danger of unchecked Government power than those men: "I am not a friend to a very energetic Government, it is always oppressive," Jefferson said.

I remember quoting a few of these warnings, long after I had left radio for films, television, and ^{after dinner speeches} ~~sometimes~~ speeches on the rubber-chicken circuit. ^{and} By that time, this reformed New Dealer could add one observation of his own: that a Government agency is the nearest thing to eternal life we'll ever see on this earth. Yet even as the decades of the 50's and 60's went by, and more Americans shared my concern, Government grew like topsy. In the 70s, Federal spending tripled, taxes doubled, and the national debt reached almost a trillion dollars. Government bureaus, agencies, and employment rolls kept multiplying; ^{and} It had become too easy for politicians to promise more to win more; to spend their way to election victories.

Fortunately, that juggernaut of big Government has now been slowed. During the last 3 years, we've brought skyrocketing spending back to earth and ^{reduced} slowed that enormous momentum towards big Government. It wasn't easy but measure the results by our ability to achieve what people once said was impossible: Federal spending growth has been cut by more than half; Government regulations have been cut by more than a quarter; and taxes on working Americans have actually been reduced and indexed to the rate of inflation. A working family earning \$25,000 has \$1,100 more in purchasing power in 1983 because we cut taxes and lowered the rate of inflation.

Today economic recovery is in full swing. But I hope we can use these moments of reflection today to understand the hard lessons we've learned since the depression about the growth of government. We need some basic reforms, ~~that~~ that will protect us against Government's all too powerful tendency to grow and grow.

For one thing, it's time for the Federal Government, in the best Federalist tradition, to learn something from successful experiments in the State and local laboratories of governments. The evidence from those 43 States and many municipalities is overwhelming: The Executive Branch needs a powerful weapon to cut out porkbarreling and special interest expenditures buried in large, catch-all appropriation bills. It's time the Congress gave the President the authority to veto single-line items in the Federal budget.

And, second, politicians at the national level must no longer be permitted to mortgage your future by running up higher and higher deficits. The time has come to force Government to

live within its means; and I repeat my call today for making a balanced budget a constitutional requirement.

And finally, our tax system is now a nightmare of tangled requirements and twisted priorities. The American people want and deserve a tax code that is fair, rewarding and simple enough to be understood by someone other than an army of greenshaded accountants and lawyers.

Now in addition to the technological revolution marked by the inventions like radio, and the political revolution brought on by the sweeping new scope of Federal power, there has been an additional development worth noting. That is the emergence of America's international role; and our sudden designation as the champion of peace and human freedom in the struggle against totalitarianism.

Throughout World War II and most of the post-war era, there was broad public consensus on this point. Though the adversaries changed -- from Hitler to Stalin -- there was still basic agreement on the moral imperative of defending freedom and the self-evident differences between totalitarian and democratic governments.

But that broad consensus of the Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy years began to break down in the 60's and 70's. Partly in response to the Vietnam tragedy, an era of paralyzing self-doubt ruled out just and legitimate uses of American power, even acts of self-defense.

The consequences of this America's retreat were not long in coming. All of you can remember a few years back when the tragedy of the Iranian hostages was fresh in our minds; when

around the world, especially in Afghanistan and Central America, Soviet expansionism proceeded unchecked; when our defenses had declined dramatically; and some nations thought they could threaten or harm the United States with impunity.

We've changed this. We're trying to see to it that American citizens -- and it doesn't matter whether they are Navy pilots in the Gulf of Sidra or medical students in Grenada -- can no longer be attacked or their lives endangered with impunity.

[You know, Jean Kirkpatrick, our Ambassador to the United Nations, has a wonderful story to explain how fundamental this reversal has been. She says that when she arrived at the United Nations someone asked what would be different about a Reagan Administration's foreign policy.

Well, she said, "We've taken off our 'Kick Me' sign."

She was asked: "Does that mean if you're kicked, you'll kick back."

"Not necessarily," she replied, "but it does mean that if we're kicked, at least we won't apologize."]

Yet, it goes beyond just self-defense. When I spoke to the British Parliament a while ago, I said our cause was human freedom; and so it has been: in Europe, in Lebanon, in Central America. We've tried to bring a new honesty and moral purposefulness to our foreign policy, to show we can be candid about the essential differences between ourselves and others while still pursuing peace initiatives with them.

As I have said before, the democracies have their own serious injustices to deal with, but this should not prevent us from making the crucial moral distinctions between pluralist

systems which acknowledges their own wrongs and shortcomings and systems that excuse their defects in the name of totalitarian ^{ideology} violence.

Our willingness to speak out on these distinctions is the moral center of our foreign policy. For us, human freedom is a first principle; not a bargaining chip. To fail to publicly enunciate the differences between totalitarian and democratic systems of government would be to foresake this moral high ground.

It's time we realize that candor about the Soviet Union and its international activities, far from hindering the peace process, ultimately enhances it. History has shown that only when the Soviets realize their counterparts in negotiations have no illusions about their system and its intentions, do they settle down to serious negotiations.

Peace remains our highest aspiration and ^{that's why} arms control isn't enough, ^{but} arms reduction ^{is} must be our goal, and ~~for just that reason~~ ~~this Administration has refused to satisfy itself with the old~~ ~~objective of arms control.~~ But I think our new realism about the Soviets is an important means to this end, ^{just as} ~~it is also a~~ ^{as} ~~reestablishment of the~~ ^{the basis of that broad foreign policy} broad national consensus that existed in the pre-Vietnam era when we understood the moral imperatives of defending freedom and the importance of taking totalitarian powers seriously.

You know, I've heard mentioned an observation by a distinguished French intellectual, Jean Francois Ravel, on this point. Mr. Ravel points out that some people are embarrassed to call the struggle between democracy and totalitarianism by its

own name and prefer euphemisms like the "competition between East and West" or "the struggle between superpowers," as if the superpowers were politically and morally equivalent.

And here I want to point out that the political revolutions we've seen in America in domestic and international policy are only a reflection of a deeper trend; a trend that directly concerns the world you have been part of here at Eureka, the world of ideas.

There has been a dramatic turnabout among the intellectuals. For most of my adult life, the intelligentsia has been entranced and enamored with the idea of State power, the notion that with enough centralized authority concentrated in the hands of the right-minded people ^{can reform} mankind ^{ushers in} can be reformed and a brave new world ~~ushered in~~. I remember one member of the Roosevelt administration writing ^{on} about the commonly-held view of his day that all societies were moving towards some forms of communism.

Yet we know now that the trend in America and the democracies has been just the other way. In the political world, the cult of the state is dying; so too the romance of the intellectual with state power is over. Indeed the excitement and energy in the intellectual world is focused these days on the concerns of human freedom, on the importance of transcendent and enduring values.

In economics, for example, as the recent Nobel Prizes to Fredrick Von Hayek and Milton Friedman attest, the free market is again becoming the focal point. In political philosophy, a whole generation of intellectuals led especially by French thinkers like Ravel, Jean Marie Benoit, and Guy Sorman are rejecting the

old cliches about state power and rediscovering the danger such power poses to personal freedom. Soviet dissident intellectuals, ranging from majestic figures like Alexander Solzhenitsyn to noble crusaders like Vladimir Bukovsky have brought new attention to the horrors of totalitarian rule and to the spiritual desert that is communism.

Here in America, this revolution has been spearheaded for 30 years by intellectual presences like William F. Buckley's National Review. It's been supplemented recently by what's called the "neo-conservative" revolution led by Irving Kristol, Midge Decter, Norman Podhoretz, and others.

In many ways this counterrevolution of the intellectuals was predated by one of the most vivid events of my time, an event whose meaning is echoed in today's disenchantment with communism.

It involved, coincidentally, an editor of Time Magazine, Whittaker Chambers, who in public testimony in 1948 named former high Government officials as spys. He was not believed at first, but the inexorable power of the truth was slowly felt and overwhelming evidence led a jury to convict one of those famous officials, Alger Hiss, of perjury.

In Chambers' autobiography, Witness, he added a sequel: Chambers marked the beginning of his personal journey away from communism on the day he was suddenly struck by the ^{sight of} intricacy of his infant daughter's ear; when he realized then that such ^{intricacy,} such design, such precision could be no accident; he said he felt at that moment as though the hand of God had reached down and ^{to} touched him.

That is why Chambers would write that faith not economics is the central problem of our age and "that the crisis of the western world exists to the degree in which it is indifferent to God." The western world does not know it, but it already possesses the the answer to this problem, he said, but only provided that its "faith in God and the freedom he enjoins" is as great as communism's faith in its denial of God.

Chambers' story represents a generation's disenchantment with statism and its return to eternal truths and fundamental values. And if there is one thought I would leave with you today it is this: For all the momentous change of the last 50 years, it is still the great civilized truths, values of family, work, neighborhood, and religion, that fuel America's technological and material progress and ^{But} provide the spark ^{to} for our enduring passion for freedom.

We are lucky to live in a time when these traditional values and faith in the future, this sense of hope, has been reawakened in our country. Yet we have so much more to achieve: from ___ continued economic growth, to developing in space America's next frontier, to keeping the peace and extending the borders of freedom.

Now I know you have a sense of excitement about all of this and that's why it strikes me as odd that some people say today that college students are too conservative. I think the truth is that you've discovered early in life what it took another great American writer, Scott Fitzgerald, many tumultous years to discover. Towards the end of his life, he would write to his

daughter in college about the importance of what he called the "fundamental decencies."

"My generation of radicals and breakers down," he said, "never found anything to take the place of the old virtues of work and courage and the old graces of courtesy and politeness."

I hope you'll remember that, and something else F. Scott Fitzgerald once said -- that America is "a willingness of the heart." In the past half century, America has had its flirtation with statism but we are returning to our roots: limited Government, the defense of freedom, faith in the future and in God. With these values as guides, the technological revolution of the years ahead -- be even more breathtaking than that of the last 50 years -- will hold out not only the promise of drastic improvements in mankind's material conditions but progress in the spiritual and moral realm as well. And that's why I am certain that if 50 years from now Time Magazine should ask you for your reflections, you'll be able to recall an era that was exciting beyond your dreams or mine. I am sure of it: There are great days ahead for you, for America, and for the cause of human freedom.

Thank you very much, God bless you and may God bless Eureka.

(Dolan) ~~1/2~~
February 1, 1984
5:00 p.m.

PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: TIME MAGAZINE PROGRAM AT EUREKA COLLEGE
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1984

This has been a day that Neil and I will long remember, ^{stet} ~~a~~ ^{one}
~~day~~ of warmth and memory, ^{stet} ~~a day~~ when the good things that ~~have~~
happened in our lives all seem very close and real again.

We've just come from Dixon where I attended my biggest
birthday party ever, ~~and~~ I had there what every man who has
73 candles on his birthday cake ~~should have~~ ^{needs} around him: a large
group of friends and a working sprinkler system. And now we're
here for Eureka's birthday. Legend has it that after Ben Major
led a wagon train here, he sunk an axe into the first tree he
felled and said, "Here, we'll build our school." That was more
than 129 years ago and just to end any speculation ^{stet} ~~going on among~~
~~the undergraduates~~: No, I was not part of the original wagon
train.

It is always wonderful to return to Eureka. People ask me
¹ ~~can remember ever thinking about,~~ ^{that I would be in} ~~if looking back at my college years, I can remember any inkling~~ ^{stet}
~~of my present position~~ ~~that I would someday run for president.~~ Actually, the thought
first struck me on graduation day when the president of the
college handed me my diploma and asked: "Are you better off
today than you were 4 years ago?" ~~No, really, I guess I first~~
~~started thinking about the presidency when I was washing dishes~~
~~over in the girl's dormitory . . . there I was . . . night after~~ ^{stet}
~~night . . . staring into the oval soap dish. (But the truth is I~~
~~never did think I would end up in the most prestigious job in the~~
~~free world and -- come to think of it -- I'm still not the coach~~
~~of the L.A. Raiders.)~~

don't
think
this
works

Besides being wonderful, coming back to Eureka is also a great temptation. Sitting in a college audience can sometimes be dangerous duty -- something about your youthfulness and the bright, fresh hope it symbolizes makes guest speakers like myself very free with their reminiscences and very reluctant to sit down. And I guess you've heard that I like to tell an anecdote or two.

I do promise to be brief today, ^B but I don't want to miss this opportunity ~~-- perhaps the last one I will have before the demands of this political year grow too pressing --~~ to share with ~~you~~ some thoughts on the changes ⁱⁿ that have happened to America in the 50 years since I left this campus. And to offer too, some thoughts on how we can shape those changes to serve the cause of human freedom -- to inspire, not burden those who come after us.

I can't think of a better occasion for such reflections. In addition to Founder's Day here at Eureka, we're also marking ~~today~~ the first in a series of speeches sponsored by Time Magazine to commemorate its 60th anniversary. For 60 years, Time has lived up to what Henry Luce and Britton envisioned when they founded the magazine in 1924: a weekly digest of news put together with ~~much~~ more care and perspective, ~~than is usually possible under the deadline pressure of daily journalism.~~

^{Remembering} Well, ~~if it's important for news organizations like Time to keep in mind the value of perspective,~~ ^{is just as} you can imagine how important ~~it is~~ for those of us in public life, ~~to remember,~~ as James Reston once suggested, that ^{being close} ~~proximity~~ to daily events can be as much a handicap as an advantage in understanding their meaning.

~~Handwritten scribble~~
stet

stet

stet

And that's what struck me ⁱⁿ when I was thinking about what I ~~would~~ ^{and (S404)} say here today: the ease ~~the~~ ^{and} unknowing grace with which my generation accepted technological and political changes that so radically transformed our world.

In 1932, for example, I graduated from Eureka avid for a career in radio, ~~though I didn't know~~ ^{realize} ~~at the time~~ I would become part of the communications revolution that was shrinking the dimensions of my world even more than radio's successor, television, would shrink your own. Already my generation's sports idols, celebrities, newsmakers, and heroes had come in large measure from the world of radio, ~~so~~ ^I it seemed a perfectly ~~understandable~~ ^A career choice. Yet if I had only stopped to think about it, I would have remembered boyhood days a few short years before when my friends and I followed our neighborhood genius around town trying to pick up radio signals with his jerry-rigged crystals, aerial and headphone. Can you imagine our sense of wonder when, one Sunday afternoon, down by the river in Dixon, we heard the sounds of radio for the first time -- an orchestra playing over ~~KD~~ ^K several hundred miles away in Pittsburg?

Yet it took only a few years for ~~that sense of wonder to~~ ^(set) ~~dissolve,~~ and radio -- so exotic in the 1920's -- ~~had~~ ^{to} become commonplace by ~~the time of~~ the 30's when I was in college. Indeed, by 1934 ___ million radio sets a year were being manufactured.

By that time of course, ~~the~~ ^(set) market had crashed, the depression years were upon us, ~~and~~ ^(set) over those radio sets, now sitting in every parlor and living room in the Nation, came the rich, reassuring tones of Franklin Roosevelt. All of us who

lived through those years, can remember the drabness the depression brought, ^{of that} but we remember ~~too~~ how people pulled together, ^{their} ~~that~~ sense of community and shared values, ^{and their} ~~that~~ belief in American enterprise and democracy ~~that~~ saw us through. It was that ingrained American optimism, that sense of hope Franklin Roosevelt so brilliantly summoned and mobilized.

^{a certain} ~~certain~~ It was a time of economic emergency, and there seemed ~~a~~ logic to arguments that the national Government should take on to itself new and sweeping prerogatives. In the grip of that emergency, many of us could not see the enormous and oftentimes harmful political changes that this expanded role for the Government would bring.

Once again, as I look back, the rapidity of that political change was as astonishing as the change brought by technology. At the start of that era, government was consuming a dime of every dollar earned; two-thirds of that money was going to State and local governments with only a third to Washington. Today, government is collecting 44 cents from every dollar and the proportion is completely reversed, with two thirds of that money now going to the Federal Government.

So ~~it came as something of a shock~~ when my generation ^{was a bit surprised} ~~began~~ to realize that the Federal Government, ^{called upon} ~~brought to the fore~~ in an economic emergency, was ^{now} becoming an obstacle to economic progress. In addition to damaging the autonomy of local and State governments and usurping the rights of the people, the public sector had grown so large it was consuming our national wealth, discouraging energy and initiative and suffocating the

spirit of enterprise and resourcefulness that had always been at the heart of America's economic miracle.

In the depression years and their aftermath, we forgot that first, founding lesson of the American Republic: That without proper restraints, Government the servant, becomes quickly Government the ^{master} oppressor. ~~I say, of course, that~~ This is an American lesson, but, ^{it's} ~~it is actually much older, than that:~~ "The budget should be balanced, the treasury should be refilled, the public debt should be reduced, the arrogance of officialdom should be tempered and controlled," Cicero wrote in _____ B.C. And since that time, many nations that failed to heed ^{his} ~~the~~ words of that wise Roman have been brought to their knees by governments that ^{borrowed} ~~ran up their debts~~ and ~~then~~ taxed their citizens into servitude, ~~when the bills came due.~~

But some peoples, like ^{our Founding Fathers,} ~~those who founded the American Republic,~~ revolted under such oppression. ~~That's why~~ no one understood better the danger of unchecked Government power than those men: ~~"The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the power of all departments in one,"~~ George Washington wrote about Government's tendency to grow, "and thus to create . . . a real despotism."

"I am not a friend to a very energetic Government, it is always oppressive," Jefferson said.

I remember ~~now~~ quoting a few of these warnings, long after I had left radio for films, ~~and~~ television and ~~was working~~ sometimes ^{speeches} on the rubber chicken circuit. And by that time this reformed New Dealer could add one observation of his own: that a Government agency is the nearest thing to eternal life we'll ever

put in

see on this earth. Yet even as the decades of the 50's and 60's went by, and ~~an increasing~~ ^{more} numbers of Americans shared my concern, Government grew like topsy. In the 70s, Federal spending tripled, ~~and~~ ^{and} taxes doubled, the national debt ~~went up by 260 percent~~ ^{ended} -- ~~from 382 billion to more than a trillion dollars.~~ We were paying ~~more in a single year's interest on that debt than it had taken to run the whole Government 20 years earlier.~~ Government bureaus, agencies, and employment rolls kept multiplying and one program, food stamps, even managed to grow by an incredible 16,000 percent.

~~You can see how easy it had become for politicians to promise more to win more; to spend their way to election victories; because, after all, they weren't going to be around when the bills came due; it wasn't their future they were mortgaging -- it was yours.~~

*we learned
of doing
this, only
worse*

Fortunately, that juggernaut of big Government has now been slowed. During the last 3 years, we've brought skyrocketing spending back to earth and, ~~for the first time,~~ slowed that enormous momentum towards big Government, ~~built up over five decades.~~ It wasn't easy but measure the results by our ability to achieve what people once said was impossible: ~~the growth of~~ ^{Federal spending} ~~Federal spending~~ has been ~~reduced by~~ ^{cut by more than half;} Government regulations have been cut, ~~for an annual savings of~~ ^{by more than a quarter;} ~~manhours~~ and taxes on working Americans have actually been reduced and indexed to the rate of inflation. ^{A working family earning \$25,000 has \$1,500 more in purchasing power than if federal inflation had remained at their 1960 level,}
Today, ~~the~~ economic recovery is in full swing. But ~~let's~~ ^{let's} use ^{I hope we can} these moments of reflection today to understand the hard lessons we've learned since the depression about the growth of

government. ~~Let's resolve to bring about~~ ^{We need} some basic reforms, reforms that will build ~~into our constitutional system~~ ^{protect us} additional safeguards against Government's all too powerful tendency to ~~aggrandize itself~~ ^{grow}.

For one thing, it's time for the Federal Government, in the best Federalist tradition, to learn something from successful experiments in the State and local laboratories of governments. The evidence from those 43 States and many municipalities is overwhelming: The Executive Branch needs a powerful weapon to cut out ~~the~~ porkbarreling and special interest expenditures buried in large, catch-all appropriation bills. It's time the Congress gave the President the authority to veto single-line items in the Federal budget.

And, second, politicians at the national level must no longer be permitted to mortgage your future by running up higher and higher deficits. The time has come to force Government to live within its means; and I repeat my call today for making a balanced budget a constitutional requirement.

And finally, our tax system is now a nightmare of tangled requirements and twisted priorities. ~~It's time the Congress acted; it's time they gave~~ ^{want and desirable} the American people a tax code that is ~~simple, direct,~~ ^{fair (enough) and simple enough to} understood by someone other than an army of greenshaded accountants and ~~hungry tax~~ lawyers.

Now in addition to the technological revolution marked by the inventions like radio and the political revolution brought on by the sweeping new scope of Federal power, there has been an additional development ~~very much~~ worth noting. That ~~has been~~ ^{is} the emergence of America's international role and our sudden

peace and

designation as the champion of human freedom in the struggle against totalitarianism.

Throughout World War II and most of the post-war era, there was broad public consensus on this point. Though the adversaries changed -- from Hitler to Stalin -- there was still basic agreement on the moral imperative of defending freedom and the self-evident differences between totalitarian and democratic governments.

But that broad consensus of the Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy years began to break down in the 60's and 70's. Partly in response to the Vietnam tragedy, an era of paralyzing self-doubt ruled out just and legitimate uses of American power, even acts of self-defense.

The consequences of this America's retreat were not long in coming. All of you can remember a few years back when the tragedy of the Iranian hostages was fresh in our minds; when around the world, especially in Afghanistan and Central America, Soviet expansionism proceeded unchecked; when our defenses had declined dramatically; and some nations thought they could threaten or harm the United States with impunity.

We've changed this. We're trying to see to it that American citizens -- and it doesn't matter whether they are Navy pilots in the Gulf of Sidra or medical students in Grenada -- can no longer be attacked or their lives endangered with impunity.

You know, Jean Kirkpatrick, our Ambassador to the United Nations, has a wonderful story to explain how fundamental this reversal has been. She says that when she arrived at the United

Nations someone asked what would be different about a Reagan Administration's foreign policy.

Well, she said, "We've taken off our 'Kick Me' sign."

She was asked: "Does that mean if you're kicked, you'll kick back."

"Not necessarily," she replied, "but it does mean that if we're kicked, at least we won't apologize."

Yet, it goes beyond just self-defense. When I spoke to the British Parliament a while ago, I said our cause was human freedom; and so it has been: in Europe, in Lebanon, in Central America. We've tried to bring a new honesty and moral purposefulness to our foreign policy, to show we can be candid about the essential differences between ourselves and ~~our~~^{others} ~~adversaries~~ while still pursuing peace initiatives with ~~those~~^{them} ~~adversaries~~.

As I have said before, the democracies have their own serious injustices to deal with, but this should not prevent us from making the crucial moral distinctions between a system which acknowledges its own wrongs and shortcomings and a system that excuses such defects in the name of revolutionary violence.

Our willingness to speak out on these distinctions is at the heart of American foreign policy, indeed ^{it} forms its moral center. For us, human freedom is a first principle; not a bargaining chip. To fail to publicly enunciate the differences between totalitarian and democratic systems of government would be to foresake this moral high ground. Equally as important, it would persuade the Soviets we are once again in the grip of self delusion about their intentions. This would only tempt them to

exploit the negotiating process rather than cooperate with us in reaching verifiable and mutually beneficial arms agreements.

It's time we realize that candor about the Soviet Union and its international activities, far from hindering the peace process, ultimately enhances it. History has shown that ~~it is~~ only when the Soviets realize their counterparts in negotiations have no illusions about the ^{of} Soviet system and its ~~ultimate~~ intentions, ^{do} that they settle down to ~~the hard business~~ of serious negotiations.

So I think you can see we have come a long way from the days of "inordinate fear of communism." I think our new realism about the Soviets is a reestablishment of the broad national consensus on this point that existed in the pre-Vietnam era; I think we understood again the moral imperatives of defending freedom and the importance of taking totalitarian powers seriously.

You know, Ambassador Kirkpatrick likes to mention an observation by a distinguished French intellectual, Jean Francois Revel, on this point. Mr. Revel points out that some people are embarrassed to call the struggle between democracy and totalitarianism by its own name and prefer euphemisms like the "competition between East and West" or "the struggle between superpowers," as if the superpowers were politically and morally equivalent.

And here I want to point out that the political revolutions we've seen in America in domestic and international policy is only a reflection of a deeper trend; a trend that directly concerns the world you have been part of here at Eureka, the world of ideas.

There has been a dramatic turnabout among the intellectuals. For most of my adult life, the intellegentsia has been entranced and enamored with the idea of State power, the notion that with enough centralized authority, concentrated in the hands of the right-minded people, mankind can be reformed and a brave new world ushered in. I remember ^{how one member of the} ~~Harold Ickes, Franklin Roosevelt's~~ ~~Administration writing~~ ~~Secretary of Interior,~~ writing about the commonheld view of his day that all societies were moving towards some forms of communism.

Yet we know now that the trend in America and the democracies has been just the other way. In the political world, the cult of the state is dying; so too the romance of the intellectual with state power is over. Indeed the excitement and energy in the intellectual world is focused these days on the concerns of human freedom, on the importance of transcendent and enduring values.

In economics, for exmample, as the recent Nobel Prizes to Fredrick Von Hayek and Milton Friedman attest, the free market is again the focal point. In political philosophy, a whole generation of intellectuals led especially by French thinkers like Ravel, Jean Marie Benoit, and Guy Sorman are rejecting the old cliches about state power and rediscovering the danger such power poses to personal freedom. Soviet dissident intellectuals, ranging from majestic figures likes Alexander Solzhenitsyn to noble crusaders like Vladimir Bukovsky have brought new attention

to the horrors of totalitarian rule and to the spiritual desert that is communism.

Here in America, of course, this revolution has been spearheaded for 30 years by intellectual presences like William F. Buckley's National Review. It's been supplemented recently by the neo-conservative revolution led by Irving Kristol, Midge Decter, Norman Podhoretz, and others.

In many ways this counterrevolution of the intellectuals was predated by one of the most vivid and important events of my time, an event whose meaning is echoed in today's disenchantment with communism, ~~the God that failed~~.

It involved, coincidentally enough, an editor of Time Magazine, Whittaker Chambers, who in public testimony in 1948 named high Government officials as spys. He was not believed at first, but the inexorable power of the truth was slowly felt and aided by secret microfilms hidden away in a Pumpkin patch on Chambers farm, overwhelming evidence led a jury to convict one of those famous officials, Alger Hiss, of perjury.

But this trail, which riveted the Nation, was not the end to the Hiss/Chambers case. It had a majestic sequel: the story of the case written in Chambers' autobiography, Witness, a book the New York Times called it "one of the most important autobiographies of our time." ^{It was} ^ Important because Chambers marked the beginning of his personal journey away from communism on the day he was struck by the intricacy of his infant daughter's ear, ~~Suddenly he perceived~~ and the sudden knowledge that such design, such precision could be no accident. He said

he felt at that moment as though the hand of God had reached down and touched his forehead.

That is why Chambers would write ~~in Witness~~ that faith not economics is the central problem of our age and that the crisis of the western world exists to the degree in which it is indifferent to God. "The western world does not know it, but it already posses the the answer to this problem," he said, "but only provided that its faith in God and the freedom he enjoins is as great as communism's faith in man alone."

I recite the Chambers story ~~here not only~~ for its historical importance ^{and} ~~but~~ because ~~in micreocsm~~ -- it ^{represents} ~~was~~ the story of a generation's disenchantment with statism and it's return to fundamental values. And ~~I think~~ if there is one thought I would leave with you today it is ^{this!} ~~that~~ for all the momentous change of the last 50 years, it is still the great civilized truths, ~~these ingrained~~ values of family, work, neighborhood, and religion, that ~~still~~ fuel America's technological and material progress and provide the spark for our enduring passion for freedom.

We are lucky to live in a time when these traditional values ^{and} ~~this~~ faith in the future, this sense of hope, has been reawakened in our country. It's one reason why I ^{in looking forward to} ~~look forward so~~ ^{a few more years in Washington. We have to much more} ~~much~~ to the next 5 years, there is much to achieve: from balancing the budget, to putting up a space station, to keeping the peace, to extending the borders of freedom.

Now I know you have a sense of excitement about all of this and that's why it strikes me as odd that some people say today that college students are too conservative. I think the truth is

that you've discovered early in life what it took another great American writer, Scott Fitzgerald, many tumultuous years to discover. It was towards the end of his life he wrote to a daughter in college about the importance of what he called the "fundamental decencies."

"My generation of radicals and breakers down," he said, "never found anything to take the place of the old virtues of work and courage and the old graces of courtesy and politeness."

I hope you'll remember that, and something else F. Scott Fitzgerald once said -- that America is "a willingness of the heart." And I hope too that if 50 years from now Time Magazine should ask you for your reflections, you'll be able to recall that time the president spoke, and say how right he was when he predicted: There are great days ahead for you, for America and for the cause of human freedom.

RL by very much * God bless you + God bless America