

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 (5 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 1, 1984
2:00 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, and I had there what every man who has 73 candles on his birthday cake should have 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 -- 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 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. And now Time has decided to sponsor a series of speeches by those of us newsmakers who've been on their covers.

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, as James Reston once suggested, that proximity to daily events can

be as much an 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 avid for a career in radio; though I didn't know it 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 it seemed a perfectly understandable 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 KDDA several hundred miles away in Pittsburg?

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 1934 _____ 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; 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 began to realize that the Federal Government, brought to the fore in an economic emergency, was 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 oppressor. I say, of course, that this is an American lesson but 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 the words of that wise Roman have been brought to their knees by governments that ran up their debts and then taxed their citizens into servitude when the bills came due.

But some peoples, like 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 out working some nights 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 an increasing numbers of Americans shared my concern, Government grew like topsy. In the 70s, Federal spending tripled and taxes doubled, the national debt went up by

X 260 percent --stfrom 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.

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 has been reduced by _____, Government regulations have been cut for an annual savings of _____ manhours and taxes on working Americans have actually been reduced and indexed to the rate of inflation.

Today the economic recovery is in full swing. But let's use 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 some basic reforms, reforms that will build into our constitutional system additional safeguards against Government's all too powerful tendency to aggrandize itself.

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 Congress acted; it's time they gave the American people a tax code that is simple, direct, and capable of being 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 the

emergence of America's international role ^{and} our sudden 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 was ushered in. ~~And with it came a great hesitancy to even~~ ^{ruled out} ~~consider~~ just and legitimate uses of American power, even acts of self-defense.

The consequences of ^{this America} ~~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 ~~it~~ ^{espined} around the world ~~but most notably~~ 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.

X
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 brought a new honesty and moral purposefulness to our foreign policy. We have shown we can be candid with ourselves and the world about the essential differences between ~~freedom ourselves and~~ our adversaries while still pursuing peace initiatives with those adversaries. 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 Soviet system and its ultimate intentions that they settle down to the hard business of serious negotiations.

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 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.

So I think you can see we have come a long way from the days of "inordinate fear of communism." Frankly nothing frightens me more than the remarks of certain presidential candidates who seem to want to return us to those days, the days of thinking that the only way to gain peace is to try and fool ourselves and the rest of the world about the true nature of Soviet system and its intentions. That isn't the way to peace; it's the road to weakness, self-delusion, self-deceit. I think the new realism in America about the Soviets is actually a reestablishment of the broad national consensus of the pre-Vietnam era, on this point, a return to the time when we understood the moral imperatives of defending freedom and took seriously our totalitarian adversaries.

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 equivalents.

And it's on this point I want to bring to your attention to note one final revolution. Indeed, in many ways the political revolution in domestic and international policy is only a reflection of this 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 intellesensia has been entranced and enamored with the idea of State power, the notion that with enough centralized authority, particularly if that power is concentrated in the hands of the right-minded people, mankind can be reformed and a brave new era ushered in. I remember Harold Ickes, Franklin Roosevelt's Secretary of Interior, writing of the view of his day that all societies were moving towards forms of communism.

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

In economics, as the recent Nobel Prizes to Fredrick Von Hayek and Milton Friedman attest, the free market is again the talking 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 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 Reveiw and supplemented recently by the neo-conservative revolution led by thinkers like Irving Kristol, Midge Dectar and Norman Podhoretz.

In many ways this counterrevolution in the intellectual world was predated by an event that is among the most vivid and important memories of the last five decades.

It invovled, coincidentally enough, an editor of Time Magazine, a superb writer whose personal struggle with totalitarianism is echoed today in the disenchantment of the intellectual with communism, the God that failed.

When Whittaker Chambers began public testimony in 1948 and named high government officials including Alger Hiss as spys, he was not believed.

But slowly the inexorable power of the truth was felt and aided by secret microfilms hidden away in a Pumpkin patch on

we've learned since the depression about the growth of government. Let's resolve to bring about some basic reforms, reforms that will build into our constitutional system additional safeguards against Government's all too powerful tendency to aggrandize itself.

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 Congress acted; it's time they gave the American people a tax code that is simple, direct, and capable of being 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 the

emergence of America's international role, our sudden 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 was ushered in. And with it came a great hesitancy to even consider just and legitimate uses of American power, even acts of self-defense.

The consequences of 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 all around the world but most notably 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.

X
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} brought a new honesty and moral purposefulness to our foreign policy, ^{to} ~~We have shown~~ we can be candid with ~~ourselves and the world~~ about the essential differences between ~~freedom~~ ourselves and our adversaries while still pursuing peace initiatives with those adversaries. 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 Soviet system and its ultimate intentions that they settle down to the hard business of serious negotiations.

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 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 forsake 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.

So I think you can see we have come a long way from the days of "inordinate fear of communism." Frankly nothing frightens me more than the remarks of certain presidential candidates who seem to want to return us to those days, the days of thinking that the only way to gain peace is to try and fool ourselves and the rest of the world about the true nature of Soviet system are its intentions. That isn't the way to peace; its the road to weakness, self-delusion, self-deceit. I think ^{our} the new realism in ~~America~~ about the Soviets is actually a reestablishment of the broad national ^{on this point that existed in} consensus of the pre-Vietnam era, ^{cl think today} ~~on this point,~~ ^{we have we understand again} ~~return to the time when we understood~~ the moral imperatives of defending freedom and ^{The importance of taking} ~~took seriously~~ our totalitarian ^{process seriously.} ~~adversaries.~~

*Robert
page 9*

1 meet #

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

And ~~it's on this point I want bring to your attention to~~ ^{here I want to point out that} ~~note one final revolution.~~ ^{we've seen in America} Indeed, in many ways the political revolution in domestic and international policy is only a reflection of ^a this 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 intellesensia has been entranced and enamored with the idea of State power, the notion that with enough centralized authority, ~~particularly if that power is~~ concentrated in the hands of the right-minded people, mankind can be reformed and a brave new ^{World} ~~era~~ ushered in. I remember Harold Ickes, Franklin Roosevelt's Secretary of Interior, writing ^{about} of the view of his day that all societies were moving towards ^{some} forms of communism.

Communists

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

In economics, ^(for example,) as the recent Nobel Prizes to Fredrick Von Hayek and Milton Friedman attest, the free market is again the ~~central~~ ^{focal} talking 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 Reveiw, ^{it's been} and supplemented recently by the neo-conservative revolution led by ~~thinkers like~~ Irving Kristol, Midge Dectar, ~~and~~ Norman Podhoretz ^{and others}.

In many ways, this counterrevolution ~~of~~ ^{is} the intellectuals ~~world~~ was predated by an event that is ^{one of} among the most vivid and important ~~memories~~ ^{events of my time, an event that would be echoed later} of the last five decades. ^(whose meaning) ~~by~~ in today's disenchantment with the God that failed, communism. It invovled, coincidentally enough, an editor of Time Magazine, ^{Whittaker Chambers} a superb writer whose personal struggle with ~~totalitarianism is echoed today in the disenchantment of the intellectual with communism, the God that failed.~~

^{believed in} When Whittaker Chambers began public testimony in 1948 ~~and~~ named high government officials including Alger Hiss as spys, ~~he~~ ^{was not believed.}

^{Thank he was not believed at first, it} ~~But slowly~~ the inexorable power of the truth was ^{slowly} felt and aided by secret microfilms hidden away in a Pumpkin patch on

Chambers farm, ~~the~~ overwhelming evidence led a jury to convict Alger Hiss of perjury.

But this trail, which riveted the Nation, was not the end to the Hiss/Chambers case. ^{It had} ~~There was~~ a majestic sequel, ~~to it.~~ The story of the case written in Chamber's autobiography, ~~called~~ Witness, a book

The New York Times called ~~the Chambers book~~ "one of the most important autobiographies of our time." / Albert Camus would write to Chambers about it, "You have not returned from hell with empty hands." More than 30 years later, John Leonard would write in the New York Times that the Chambers of the Witness was an existential hero. Arthur Koestler would say simply of the book after Chamber's death, "The witness is gone, the testimony will stand."

^{I important} ~~The testimony stands today because Chamber's story is the story of the modern world's drift away from communism.~~ ^{time} ~~He notes~~

^{at notice} that one day he was struck by the intricacy of his infant daughter's ear; ^{and the sudden knowledge} ~~he knew~~ that such design, such precision could be no accident. He said he felt at that moment ^{as though} that the hand of God ~~had~~ reach down and touch ^d his forehead.

^{That is why} ^(would in Witness) In Witness Chambers writes 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."

story of the case written in Chambers' autobiography called Witness.

The New York Times called the Chambers' book "one of the most important autobiographies of our time." Albert Camus would write to Chambers about it, "You have not returned from hell with empty hands." More than 30 years later, John Leonard would write in the New York Times that the Chambers of the Witness was an existential hero. Arthur Koestler would say simply of the book after Chambers' death, "The witness is gone, the testimony will stand."

The testimony stands today because Chambers' story is the story of the modern world's drift away from communism. He notes that one day he was struck by the intricacy of his infant daughter's ear; he knew that such design, such precision could be no accident. He said he felt at that moment that the hand of God reach down and touch his forehead.

In Witness, Chambers writes 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 receite the Chambers story here not only for its historical importance but because -- in microcosm -- it was the story of ^a ~~my own~~ generation's disenchantment with statism and ^{its} ~~our~~ return to fundamental values. ^{and} I think if there is one thought I would leave with you ^{today} it is that for all the momentous change of

the last 50 years it is still the great civilized truths, those ingrained values of family, work, neighborhood, and religion, that still fuel America's technological and material progress and ^{provide} ~~put~~ the spark ^{for} ~~to~~ our enduring passion for freedom.

We are lucky to live in a time when these traditional values, this faith in the future, this sense of hope, has been reawakened in our country. It's one reason why I look forward so 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 ~~getting~~ 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} lifetime 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." ^{It} "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 ^{Scott Fitzgerald} he 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} ~~some~~ reflections, you'll be able to recall that ^{time} ~~day~~ 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.

(Dolan)

February 1, 1984

12:00 a.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, and I had there what every man who has 73 candles on his birthday cake should have 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 X 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.

we've learned since the depression about the growth of government. Let's resolve to bring about some basic reforms, reforms that will build into our constitutional system additional safeguards against Government's all too powerful tendency to aggrandize itself.

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 Congress acted; it's time they gave the American people a tax code that is simple, direct, and capable of being understood by someone other than an army of greenshaded accountants and hungry tax lawyers.

Now in addition to the
~~The technological revolution brought on by inventions like~~ *marked by the inventions like radio*
~~radio and the political revolution~~ *marked by* ~~the~~ *sweeping new*
~~scope of Federal power have dominated the 50 years since I left~~
~~Eureka.~~ *has* ~~was~~ *there* ~~an additional development,~~ *very much worth*

noting ^{Chavez} that was the emergence of America's ~~new~~ international ^{role,} ~~responsibilities~~ and ~~her~~ ^{our} sudden, unexpected 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} bipartisan 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 was ushered in. And with it came a great hesitancy to ^{even} consider just and legitimate uses of American power, even acts of self-defense.

The consequences of 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 all around the world, but most notably 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.

^{i want A in} ~~We've tried to change this.~~ When I spoke to the British Parliament a while ago, I said ^{our} the cause was human freedom ^{and so it has been} in Europe, in Lebanon, in Central America, ~~our purpose has been just~~ that.

We've changed this.

I believe we're trying to see to it

Citizens

~~And one beneficial side result has been that Americans --~~

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 ^{that} ~~change~~ ^{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."

in sect A

Yet, it goes beyond just self-defense. We've brought a new honesty and moral purposefulness to our foreign policy. We have shown we ~~can~~ ^{we can be} aggressively pursue peace initiatives while being candid with ourselves and the world about the essential differences between ~~freedom and statism~~ ^{ourselves and our adversaries while still pursuing} 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 ~~that~~ ^{It's time we realize that} their counterparts in negotiations have no illusions about the Soviet system and its ultimate intentions that they settle down to the hard business of serious negotiations.

peace initiatives with those 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 forms its moral center. For us, human freedom is a first principle; not a bargaining chip, at ~~a negotiating session.~~ ~~Therefore,~~ ^{To} fail to publicly enunciate the differences between totalitarian and democratic systems of government would be to forsake 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} ~~use it to reach~~ verifiable and mutually beneficial arms agreements.

So I think you can see we have come a long way from the days of "inordinate fear of communism." Frankly nothing frightens me more than the remarks of certain presidential candidates who seem to want to return us to those days, the days of thinking that the only way to gain peace is to try and fool ourselves and the rest of the world about the true nature of Soviet ^{system and its} intentions. That isn't the way to peace; its the road to weakness, self-delusion, ~~self-~~ ^{self-} and deceit. I think ^{the} our new realism in America about the Soviets is actually a reestablishment of the broad national consensus of the pre-Vietnam era ^{on this point,} a return to the time when ^{we understood} the moral imperatives of defending freedom and ^(took seriously over) ~~taking~~ totalitarian governments ^{adversely,} ~~seriously was implicitly understood.~~

You know, Ambassador Kirkpatrick likes to mention an observation by a distinguished French intellectual, Jean Francois Revel, ^{at this point Mr. Revel points out} that some people are embarrassed to call the struggle

between democracy and totalitarianism by its won name and prefer euphemisms like the "competition between East and West" or the struggle between superpowers, as if the superpowers were politically and morally equivalents.

And it's ^{on this point} here I want to ^{bring to your attention} note one final revolution, ^{indeed,} (in many ways the political revolution ^{about} of which I spoke, domestic and international policy is only a reflection of this ~~even~~ deeper trend; ^{it's} trend that directly concerns the world you have been part of here at Eureka, the world of ideas.

There has been a ^{dramatic turnabout} drastic change among the intellectuals, ~~who~~ ^{the intelligensia has} for most of my adult life ~~have~~ been entranced and enamored with the idea of State power, the notion that ^{with} given enough centralized authority, particularly if that power is concentrated in the hands of the ^{right minded people,} intellectual or people who think like the

~~intellectuals,~~ ^{can} mankind could be reformed and a ^{brave} great new era ushered in. I remember Harold Ickes, Franklin Roosevelt's Secretary of _____, ^{writing} who ^{held in} spoke of the view of his day that ^{all societies} were increasingly moving towards ~~communism~~ ^{forms of} communism.

Yet we know ~~today~~ that the trend in America and the democracies these days is just the other way. ^{In the political world,} The cult of the state is dying ^{and so too is} and the romance of the intellectual with state power ~~is over~~. The excitement and energy ^{is} of the ~~intellectual~~ ^{intellectual} world seems focused these days on the concerns of human freedom and the ^{value importance} study of ~~transcendental~~ ^{and enduring} values.

In economics, as the recent Nobel Prizes to Fredrick Von Hayek and Milton Friedman attest, the free market is again the talking 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 ~~the innate goodness of 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 ~~one of the founders of Resistance International~~, have brought new attention to the horror ^{g of} ~~to~~ totalitarian rule and the spiritual desert that is communism. ^{of Here in America, of course,} This revolution has been spearheaded here in ~~America, of course,~~ for the last 30 years by intellectual presences like William F. Buckley's National Review ^{and} supplemented ^{recently} ~~in recent years~~ by the neo-conservative revolution led by thinkers like Irving Kristol, ~~and~~ Midge Decter and Norman Podhoretz.

^{intellectual world} In many ways, ~~however,~~ this intellectual counterevolution ^{is the} ~~was~~ predated by ~~one of the most vivid and important moments in~~ ^{an event that is among} ~~American history during the last five decades.~~ ^{memories of} It was a moment vivid to most of my generation, indeed, for several years it held the attention of the American public every bit as much as the Watergate hearings; so it's easy to forget that it all happened two decades before most of you were born.

It involved, ^{coincidentally} interestingly enough, an editor of Time Magazine. ^{re personal struggle with totalitarianism} A superb writer who had done some of Time's most famous cover stories, ^{is echoed today in the disenchantment of the intellectual with communism} he had joined the magazine in the late ^{the book that bailed} 1930's after a bitter disillusionment with the communist party.

At the time he had been a member of communist espionage ring working in Washington; when he broke with the party he had bared his breast to the government but no one at the time seemed interested.

~~Ten years later, in 1948 he was called before a House of Representatives investigation committee. It was that day~~

when Whittaker Chambers began his public testimony ^{in 1948/} and named among

~~others high government officials like Alger Hiss as~~ ^{SP45, he was not}

~~At first, of course, no one believed Chambers who was portrayed as an eccentric writer. It was Hiss, the product of America's best schools and mentors, who garnered all the~~

~~sympathy. But slowly the inexorable power of the truth was felt and aided by secret microfilms hidden away in a Pumpkin patch on Chambers farm the evidence became overwhelming and a jury~~

~~convicted Alger Hiss of perjury.~~

~~But this was not the end to the Hiss/Chambers case, there was a sequel to it. A majestic one -- it was the story of the case written in the form of his autobiography by Chambers called Witness.~~

~~When it was published The New York Times called it one of the most important autobiographies of our time. Albert Camus would read it and write to Chambers, "You have not returned from~~

~~hell with empty hands." More than 30 years later, John Leonard would write in the New York Times as Chambers the picture of the existential hero, Arthur Koestler would say simply of the book after Chamber's death, "The witness is gone, the testimony will stand."~~

~~Chambers describes his drift away from communism, the notes that one day he was struck by the intricacy of his infant daughter's ear; he knew that no such design could be by accident.~~

~~He said he felt at that time that the hand of God had reached down and touched his forehead.~~

when
believed
to

include
SP45, he was not

trial which riveted the nation,
the story of the
Chambers

(The Chambers book

just it.

of the Witness was an

The testimony stands today because Chambers' story is the story of the modern world

such precision could be no

that
moment

of the modern world

writes that faith not economics is the central problem of our age and
In Witness Chambers ~~would say that in the end the struggle~~
~~for freedom in the world would come down to basics.~~ *that* the crisis
of the Western world exists ~~he said~~ to the degree in which it is
indifferent to God. ~~Faith, he said, not economics is the central~~
~~problem of this age.~~ "The western world does not know it, but it
already possesses 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."

Here was a great thinker, a great man, who suffered much for
the truth and his Nation but whose thoughts were a prophecy of
what was to come. In our own time, the reaffirmation of
traditional values -- the new interest in and the new
appreciation for the value of concepts like family, work,
neighborhood, and religion has formed a counterrevolution.

Now to some of you, of course, some of what I have been
speaking about with regard to limited Government and foreign
policy and the renaissance of the Western intelligentsia may sound
suspiciously like my campaign themes of economic growth without
inflation, peace through strength and traditional values.

I'll admit the similarities but that's why I think it's
important to note.

(Dolan)
February 1, 1984
12:00 a.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, and I had there what every man who has 73 candles on his birthday cake should have 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 X 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 -- 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 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. And now Time has decided to sponsor a series of speeches by those of us newsmakers who've been on their covers.

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, as James Reston once suggested, that proximity to daily events can

be as much an 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 avid for a career in radio; though I didn't know it 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 it seemed a perfectly understandable 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 KDDA several hundred miles away in Pittsburg?

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 1934 _____ 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; 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 began to realize that the Federal Government, brought to the fore in an economic emergency, was 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 oppressor. I say, of course, that this is an American lesson but 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 the words of that wise Roman have been brought to their knees by governments that ran up their debts and then taxed their citizens into servitude when the bills came due.

But some peoples, like 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 out working some nights 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 an increasing numbers of Americans shared my concern, Government grew like topsy. In the 70s, Federal spending tripled and taxes doubled, the national debt went up by 260 percent --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.

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 has been reduced by _____, Government regulations have been cut for an annual savings of _____ manhours and taxes on working Americans have actually been reduced and indexed to the rate of inflation.

Today the economic recovery is in full swing. But let's use 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 some basic reforms, reforms that will build into our constitutional system additional safeguards against Government's all too powerful tendency to aggrandize itself.

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 Congress acted; it's time they gave the American people a tax code that is simple, direct, and capable of being understood by someone other than an army of greenshaded accountants and hungry tax lawyers.

The technological revolution brought on by inventions like radio and the political revolution marked by the sweeping new scope of Federal power have dominated the 50 years since I left Eureka. But there was an additional development, very much worth

noting: that was the emergence of America's new international responsibilities and her sudden, unexpected 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 bipartisan 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 was ushered in. And with it came a great hesitancy to consider just and legitimate uses of American power, even acts of self-defense.

The consequences of 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 all around the world but most notably 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 tried to change this. When I spoke to the British Parliament a while ago, I said the cause was human freedom. In Europe, in Lebanon, in Central America our purpose has been just that.

And one beneficial side result has been that Americans -- 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 that change 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. We've brought a new honesty and moral purposefulness to our foreign policy. We have shown we can aggressively pursue peace initiatives while being candid with ourselves and the world about the essential differences between freedom and statism. 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 that their counterparts in negotiations have no illusions about the Soviet system and its ultimate intentions that they settle down to the hard business of serious negotiations.

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 forms its moral center. For us, human freedom is a first principle; not a bargaining chip at a negotiating session. Therefore, to fail to publicly enunciate the differences between totalitarian and democratic systems of government would be to forsake 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 use it to reach verifiable and mutually beneficial arms agreements.

So I think you can see we have come a long way from the days of "inordinate fear of communism." Frankly nothing frightens me more than the remarks of certain presidential candidates who seem to want to return us to those days, the days of thinking that the only way to gain peace is to try and fool ourselves and the rest of the world about the true nature of Soviet intentions. That isn't the way to peace; it's the road to weakness, self-delusion, and deceit. I think our new realism in America about the Soviets is actually a reestablishment of the broad national consensus of the pre-Vietnam era, a return to the time when the moral imperatives of defending freedom and taking totalitarian governments seriously was implicitly understood.

You know, Ambassador Kirkpatrick likes to mention an observation by a distinguished French intellectual, Jean Francois Revel, that some people are embarrassed to call the struggle

between democracy and totalitarianism by its won name and prefer euphemisms like the "competition between East and West" or the struggle between superpowers as if the superpowers were politically and morally equivalents.

And it's here I want to note one final revolution; in many ways the political revolution of which I spoke, domestic and international policy is only a reflection of this even deeper trend; it's trend that directly concerns the world you have been part of here at Eureka, the world of ideas.

There has been a drastic change among the intellectuals who for most of my adult life have been entranced and enamored with the idea of State power, the notion that given enough centralized authority, particularly if that power is concentrated in the hands of the intellectual or people who think like the intellectuals, mankind could be reformed and a great new era ushered in. I remember Harold Ickes, Franklin Roosevelt's Secretary of _____, who spoke of the view of his day that

Yet we know today that the trend in America and the democracies these days is just the other way. The cult of the state is dying and the romance of the intellectual with state power is over. The excitement and energy of the intellectual world seems focused these days on the concerns of human freedom and the study of transcendental values.

In economics, as the recent Nobel Prizes to Fredrick Von Hayek and Milton Friedman attest, the free market is again the talking 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 the innate goodness of 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 one of the founders of Resistance International, have brought new attention to the horror to totalitarian rule and the spiritual desert that is communism. This revolution has been spearheaded here in America, of course, for the last 30 years by intellectual presences like William F. Buckley's National Review, supplemented in recent years by the neo-conservative revolution led by thinkers like Irving Kristol and Midge Decter and Norman Podhoretz.

In many ways, however, this intellectual counterevolution was predated by one of the most vivid and important moments in American history during the last five decades. It was a moment vivid to most of my generation, indeed, for several years it held the attention of the American public every bit as much as the Watergate hearings; so it's easy to forget that it all happened two decades before most of you were born.

It involved, interestingly enough, an editor of Time Magazine. A superb writer who had done some of Time's most famous cover stories; he had joined the magazine in the late 1930's after a bitter disillusionment with the communist party. At the time he had been a member of communist espionage ring working in Washington; when he broke with the party he had bared his breast to the government but no one at the time seemed interested.

Ten years later, in 1948 he was called before a House of Representatives investigation committee. It was that day Whittaker Chambers began his public testimony and named among others, high government officials like Alger Hiss.

At first, of course, no one believed Chambers who was portrayed as an eccentric writer. It was Hiss, the product of America's best schools and mentors, who garnered all the sympathy. But slowly the inexorable power of the truth was felt and aided by secret microfilms hidden away in a Pumpkin patch on Chambers farm the evidence became overwhelming and a jury convicted Alger Hiss of perjury.

But this was not the end to the Hiss/Chambers case -- there was a sequel to it. A majestic one -- it was the story of the case written in the form of his autobiography by Chambers called Witness.

When it was published the New York Times called it one of the most important autobiographies of our time. Albert Camus would read it and write to Chambers, "You have not returned from hell with empty hands." More than 30 years later, John Leonard would write in the New York Times as Chambers the picture of the existential hero -- Arthur Koestler would say simply of the book after Chamber's death, "The witness is gone, the testimony will stand."

Chambers describes his drift away from communism; he notes that one day he was struck by the intricacy of his infant daughter's ear; he knew that no such design could be by accident, he said he felt at that time that the hand of God had reached down and touched his forehead.

In Witness Chambers would say that in the end the struggle for freedom in the world would come down to basics: the crisis of the Western world exists he said to the degree in which it is indifferent to God. Faith, he said, not economics is the central problem of this age. The western world does not know it, but it already possesses the answer to this problem -- but only provided that its faith in God and the freedom he enjoins is as great as communism's faith in man alone."

Here was a great thinker, a great man, who suffered much for the truth and his Nation but whose thoughts were a prophecy of what was to come. In our own time, the reaffirmation of traditional values -- the new interest in and the new appreciation for the value of concepts like family, work, neighborhood, and religion has formed a counterrevolution.

Now to some of you, of course, some of what I have been speaking about with regard to limited Government and foreign policy and the renaissance of the Western intelligensia may sound suspiciously like my campaign themes of economic growth without inflation, peace through strength and traditional values.

I'll admit the similarities but that's why I think it's important to note.