

# Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

---

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

---

**Collection:** Reagan, Ronald: 1980 Campaign Papers,  
1965-1980

**Series:** XV: Speech Files (Robert Garrick and Bill Gavin)

**Subseries:** A: Bob Garrick File

**Folder Title:** July 1976-December 1976

**Box:** 431

---

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](mailto:reagan.library@nara.gov)

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

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

*Last Updated: 10/06/2023*

OFFICE OF THE HON. RONALD REAGAN  
10960 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 812  
Los Angeles, California 90024  
For information: Jim Lake, Press Secretary  
or Jan McCoy  
(202) 452-7606

FOR RELEASE:

TUESDAY, JULY 6, 1976

10:30 P.M. EDT

Nationally Televised Address by The Hon. Ronald Reagan,  
on ABC-TV Network, Tuesday, July 6, 1976, at 10:30 p.m.

Good evening from California and happy birthday.

Just two days ago, on Sunday, you and I achieved a milestone in the history of mankind and in the history of freedom. We the people of the United States of America have been free for 200 years plus two days and we've proven to the world that freedom works.

Now, this might not sound like much of an accomplishment to those of us who were born here and accept freedom as the natural state of mankind. But it should. The places and the periods in which man has known freedom are few and far between; just scattered moments on the span of time. And most of those moments have been ours. In this land, in these 200 years.

The original colonists came here driven by a hunger for freedom. They've been followed down to the present by modern-day immigrants possessed of that same hunger and courage it takes to tear up roots and start anew in a strange land. Some of those immigrants are better described as refugees. They crawl over walls, make their way through mine fields and barbed wire and risk their lives in leaky, makeshift boats to escape the new tyranny of the police state.

Those original colonists were unique. In all the world the march of empire, the opening of new lands was accomplished by military forces, followed by adventures and soldiers of fortune. Only here did the people precede for force of arms. Those who came to this untamed land brought the family. And families built a nation. I'm convinced that today the majority of Americans want really what those first Americans wanted -- a better life for themselves and their children, a minimum of governmental

authority. Very simply, they want to be left alone in peace and safety to take care of the family by earning an honest dollar and putting away some savings. This may not sound too exciting, but there is a magnificence about it. On the farm, and on the street corner, in the factory and in the kitchen, millions of us asking nothing more but certainly nothing less than to live our own lives, according to our own values, at peace with ourselves, our neighbors and the world.

We have come from every corner of the world, from every racial and ethnic background and we've created a new breed. Yes, we have our faults -- plenty of them -- but selfishness isn't one of them. We are a generous people, with our friends, our neighbors and with strangers throughout the world, as victims of catastrophes in most every country can testify. There is a great deal to love and to be proud of in our land.

But there seems to be a discontent in the land today. Government, which once did those things which strengthened family and traditional values, now seems to have lost faith in us. And, many of us seem to have lost confidence in ourselves.

There's a story told about the early days of the automobile -- the horseless carriage. A motorist, complete with linen duster and goggles, pulled up in front of a farmhouse. He called out to the old fellow on the porch and asked, "Do you know where this road takes me?" The old boy said, "Nope." "Well", he asked, "do you know where that road back down there behind the cornfield goes?" Again, "Nope." Annoyed, he said, "You don't seem to know much of anything do you?" The old boy said, "I ain't lost". And he wasn't -- not him or those other Americans of that day. They knew who they were and where they were going. Some would have us believe those Americans are no longer relevant -- that there is no place for them or their rugged individualism in today's world. And some who think that are to be found in government.

The Americans who keep this country going -- the ones who fight the wars; drive the trucks and raise the kids; the farmer and fireman, craftsman and cop, they are wondering -- for the first time -- if the governmental institutions they have upheld and defended really care about them or their values.

Oh, they haven't fallen for the line of a few fashionable intellectuals and academics who in recent years would have us believe ours is a sick society -- a bad country. They know better. Someone said to me the other day, tis a great country for the Irish. I'll personally testify to that. Indeed, it's a great country for Americans of Polish ancestry, German, Scandinavian, Greek, Chinese, Italian and all the scores of ancestries that go to make this breed we call American. We aren't giving up on America. But we are beginning to wonder if the American government is giving up on us.

We've worked and made this the most prosperous, productive land in all the world. But now the dollars we earn don't increase in number as fast as they decrease in value. The savings we counted on to see us through our non-earning years melts away like ice in a summer sun. And we're told that's due to inflation, as if inflation were some kind of plague or natural disaster for which no one is to blame. Well, it is a killer, it kills jobs, it kills savings. It kills hopes and dreams, but someone is to blame.

Inflation is theft-by-legislation. It is government's way of getting more tax revenue without raising the rates. Don't raise the tax rate on your home -- just appraise your home as worth more than it was the year before. Income tax rates can stay where they are, but a cost-of-living increase in pay moves you up to a surtax bracket where you pay a higher percentage of your earnings in tax reducing your standard of living.

Every time a piece of inflationary legislation is passed by Congress, the American family's ability to plan for the future is hurt. Every time the buying power of a paycheck is reduced because the government is pursuing inflationary policies, government is acting against the values of thrift, of honesty, of savings -- the values that our people brought with them to this country, the values they instilled in their children. Government programs that can't be paid for out of a balanced budget must be paid for out of your pocket.

Our society is now one in which, increasingly, older Americans live away from their families. And there is no group in this country which has been more viciously savaged by anti-family governmental action than America's elderly. Inflation can quite literally kill someone who is living on a fixed income. The big spenders in Washington have brought us to the place where older Americans are slowly -- but surely being pushed to the wall. And their suffering is shared by their children, who may be married with children of their own.

Inflation isn't a vague term from some economic textbook. It is a bitter, government-created fact of life the American family has to live with. Is it any wonder the American people are asking if anyone in Washington really cares?

Oddly enough, they probably do. Those we call bureaucrats are not evil people. They really are trying to be helpful to those they've decided need their help. But this means imposing on others; using the power of taxation to confiscate and redistribute earnings; restricting freedom. In short, making government the master, not the servant.

One of government's legitimate functions is to protect us from each other; to see that no one is discriminated against or denied one's God-given rights. To that end, we have adopted legislation to guarantee civil rights and eliminate discrimination of all kinds. Certainly no one of us

would challenge government's right and responsibility to eliminate discrimination in hiring or education. But in its zeal to accomplish this worthy purpose, government orders what is in effect a quota system both in hiring and in education. They don't call it a quota system. It is an "affirmative action" program with "goals and timetables" for the hiring of particular groups.

If you happen to belong to an ethnic group not recognized by the federal government as entitled to special treatment, you are a victim of reverse discrimination. Goals and timetables are in reality a bureaucratic order for a quota system. For example, if your ancestry or national origin is Czechoslovakian, Polish, Italian or if you are of a Jewish faith, you may find yourself the victim of discrimination contrary to the Civil Rights Law. No American should be discriminated against because of religion, sex, race or ethnic background in hiring, in schooling or in any other way; and I'd like to have the opportunity to put an end to this federal distortion of the principle of equal rights.

There have been other decisions of government -- some still pending -- which strike at basic values and, indeed, at the very heart of the family.

One of the pending measures is a legislative proposal which in the name of child care would insert the government in the very heart of the family's making of decisions with regard to children; decisions which properly are totally the right of the parent.

I realize there is a great difference of opinion regarding the subject of abortion. I personally believe that interrupting a pregnancy is the taking of a human life and can only be justified in self defense -- that is, if the mother's own life is in danger. But even those who disagree must certainly be concerned about one facet of government's involvement in abortion. The pregnancy of an underage girl automatically makes her eligible for welfare, on the Aid to Dependent Children program. This, in

turn, makes her eligible for Medicaid and a free abortion regardless of her family's means. To add insult to injury, welfare rules forbid government from informing her parents. Thus, government is in the position of conspiring with an underage child to provide her with an abortion, while keeping knowledge of her situation from her parents.

Let me read you a letter I received from a mother while I was still Governor. She wrote: "Who do they think they are -- not telling the parents? Who in God's name gave them the right to keep the health and welfare of your own child from you. I, as a mother, have the right to carry in my body my unborn child. I have a right to stay up night after night holding and pacing the floor with this child, feeling the pain of fear. I have a right to look into her tiny face and love her so much that I could squeeze her to death. I have a right to watch her grow day after day, year after year, and then one day to look up and see a 15-year-old young lady standing in front of me. A 15-year-old who might some day find herself in trouble and some fool standing there saying I don't have a right to know. I repeat -- who do they think they are?"

I wonder what the early immigrants who came to this country would say if they knew that their descendants live in a society where their children are forbidden by government to pray in schools.

I could offer other examples -- unfortunately too many -- of government action against rather than for the strengthening of family life; governmental actions which not only harm the family but also destroy the sense of neighborhood and community that means so much to all of us. Forced school busing comes to mind immediately. It is so obviously wrong that overwhelming majorities of Americans, black and white, are against it. Yet, courts continue to impose it.

Parents have a right -- and a responsibility -- to direct the education of their children. This should include the choice of school their children attend. I have said repeatedly that as President I would propose legislation -- in keeping with the 14th Amendment -- to eliminate forced busing. Should that prove inadequate, then I would propose a Constitutional Amendment declaring that no state nor the federal government shall refuse admission to a public institution to any person, otherwise qualified, solely on account of race, color, ethnic origin, sex or creed.

That does not mean I am opposed to all federal action in the field of education. But such action should be so indirect as to avoid any possibility of federal bureaucratic control.

For too many years a philosophy of government has dominated Washington and especially the Congress -- a philosophy that works against the values of the family and the values that were so basic to the building of this country. I believe this is the central issue of this campaign and of our time.

After eight years as Governor of a state that is literally a cross section of America; great cities teeming with industry, small towns and sprawling suburbs; a rich agricultural economy and 22 million people of every race, religion and ethnic background -- after those eight years, I know that government can work for the family and not against it. I know that economic justice can once again become a reality instead of a dream for hard-working Americans.

I know that government can be energetic without being intrusive. Helpful without being domineering. Efficient without being dictatorial.

Some weeks ago on a TV broadcast similar to this, I told of how our administration had found California on the verge of bankruptcy and how we had been forced to raise taxes in the face of that emergency. I also spoke of the measures we then employed to make government more responsive and efficient and how, as a result, we were able to return more than



\$5-1/2 billion to the people in tax cuts and rebates.

But there is more to government than just practicing economy, important as that is. Here are a few things we did as we straightened out the fiscal mess. The state income tax had begun at the first \$2000 of earnings. But when we left office, a family had to be earning more than \$8000 before it was subject to any income tax.

We subsidized local governments to provide a \$1750 exemption in the homeowners tax. And, we provided a rebate for renters.

We increased supplemental aid to the elderly, the blind and disabled to make it the highest of any state in the Union. And, we gave additional property tax relief to senior citizens, based on their income, ranging up to 92% of the tax on their homes.

We increased state support for schools 24 times as much as the increase in enrollment. The state scholarship fund for deserving young people is nine times as big as it was and we put more young people 21 and under on boards and commissions than any other administration in California history.

More members of minority communities were appointed to executive and policy-making positions than in all the previous administrations put together. We moved from 11th to third among the states in the rehabilitation of the handicapped and their placement in private enterprise jobs. And, we increased support for alcohol and drug abuse programs, rehabilitation of juveniles and adults and treatment of the mentally ill.

More than 800,000 needy Californians on county health care were included in Medicaid, and 43 of our 58 counties were able to reduce property taxes two years in a row. The second year, there were 45.

We had a problem in California that is also a national problem -- the constant increase in welfare. It continues to go up in good times and bad in numbers of recipients and in cost. Voices in Washington -- Democrat and Republican -- refer to it as "the welfare mess". In California, it

more--more--more

was a mess, with the caseload increasing by some 40,000 people a month. Every attempt at controlling its growth was resisted and frustrated by bureaucrats who seemed to be actually recruiting to increase the rolls.

Finally, with the help of a citizen's task force, we designed a program to reform welfare; to eliminate cheaters; to encourage the able-bodied to work; to find runaway fathers and make them responsible for their family's support. In less than three years, we not only halted the runaway growth, we reduced the rolls by more than 300,000 people, saved the taxpayers \$2 billion and were able to increase the grants to the truly deserving needy by an average of 43%.

We learned, of course, that there are people who'll cheat and there are those who'll accept a lower standard of living in order to get by without working. But we also learned that the overwhelming majority of welfare recipients would like nothing better than to be self-supporting, with a job and a place in our productive society. They may be fed and sheltered by welfare, but as human beings, they are being destroyed by it.

There is a giant bureaucratic complex that thinks of them as "clients", to be permanently maintained as government dependents. This complex measures its own well being and success by how much the welfare rolls increase. To be truly successful, the goal should be to reduce the rolls by eliminating the need for welfare. This is the kind of common sense that's been lacking in Washington for much too long. I believe what we achieved in California can be done at the national level if government will once again have faith in the people and their ability to solve problems.

There are those who want to approach the nation's problems on a politics-as-usual basis. A little government help here; a shrewd political move there. A little special treatment to this group or that group. A political "strategy" of one kind or another. But we are not going to get out of the mess we are in simply by doing the same old things in a new way.

And then there are those whose approach to government combines soothing rhetoric, pleasant smiles and reorganization gimmicks. Well, you can't get to the heart of an issue by being vague about it. And you don't discipline an irresponsible and wasteful congress by putting an indulgent friend in the White House. You don't fix bad policies by rearranging or replacing one bureaucrat with another. You have to replace bad ideas with good ones.

I'm not a politician by profession. I am a citizen who decided I had to be personally involved in order to stand up for my own values and beliefs. My candidacy is based on my record and for that matter my entire life.

I'm not asking you to help me because I say, "Trust me, don't ask questions, and everything will be fine". I ask you to trust yourselves; trust your own heads -- hearts. Trust your own knowledge of what's happening in America. And, your hopes for the future.

Let me be completely candid: No Presidential candidate has a patent on virtue. But I believe I offer something more than words, and that is my record as Governor of a state which, if it were a nation, would be the seventh ranking economic power in the world. I believe I can do the job that has to be done.

Many of you -- perhaps most of you -- who are watching this evening consider yourselves Democrats.. I'd like to say a few words to you directly.

During the six months I've been campaigning, I have had some wonderful moments. But I must say that among the most satisfying were those in which I discovered I had received votes not only from members of my own party, but from a great many Independents and Democrats as well. This happened in the industrial north, in the south and in the west.

more--more--more

It indicates the issues I was talking about -- our basic values, Washington's excesses, our declining national defense -- all go beyond party lines; that there is a new coalition, a new majority across this land ready to answer the nation's needs.

I was once a Democrat myself and believed that party represented our values faithfully, I don't believe I changed. But the intellectual and political leadership of the Democratic party changed. The party was taken over by elitists who believed only they could plan properly the lives of the people. We were sheep and they were the shepherds. And, if we don't watch out, the shepherds are going to outnumber the sheep. I am a former Democrat and now a Republican. Millions of you have decided neither Party faithfully represents what you believe. The answer is for all of us to vote for our values and not for labels next November.

There are those who say what we are attempting to do cannot be done. But when I hear that I remind myself of a famous moment in American history.

The British had been defeated at Yorktown in the last great battle of the War for Independence. As General George Washington marched out to receive the surrender of the British commander, the British musicians solemnly played a tune entitled, "The World Turned Upside Down". And, against all odds and the predictions of all the experts, that's just what the colonists had done.

Well, we can turn the world right side up; the world of the family and the neighborhood and the America we love.

It may take a struggle and some sacrifice, but isn't it worth it? We can do it for ourselves, for our children and in repayment for all those who did the back-breaking jobs that built this nation. They worked their hearts out to give us a country where the right to be left alone, to pursue happiness as we defined it, would be respected by men and by the law.

more--more--more

12--12--12

We ask nothing of freedom but freedom itself and that means the right to control our own destiny without undue interference by an arrogant officialdom.

There are those who no longer have faith in our ability to do this. They still believe in government for the people, but of and by themselves; that, given freedom of choice, we'll choose unwisely; that ours is a sick society, salvageable only by their omnipotence.

Well, let them explain how a sick society produced the men who journeyed out into space and set foot on the moon; or those other men, the ones we waited for a few years ago, who came back to us proud and unbroken after enduring torture at the hands of savage captors for a longer period than any men in our history.

Have we forgotten how we waited in front of our TV sets through the long night hours for that first plane to land at Clark Field in the Philippines? We were filled with hope and fear; fear of what we might see; of what the years of torture might have done to those we called the P.O.W.s

Finally, the moment arrived. The plane was on the ground and we waited -- it seemed forever -- for the door to open and the first man to appear. Then, with some difficulty -- but on his own -- Jeremiah Denton, now Rear Admiral Jeremiah Denton, made his way down the ramp. He saluted our country's flag, thanked us for bringing them all home and then asked God's blessing on America.

As the planes continued to bring our men home, Nancy and I were to share an experience that will live in our hearts forever. We were permitted to officially welcome the more than 250 who were Californians by having them as guests in our home. Not all together, but in groups, on four such occasions in all, until we had been privileged to meet and know all of them.

more--more-more

It was an unforgettable and inspiring experience. On one of those evenings, we watched two of our guests come together in our living room, apparently strangers until they heard each other's names. Then they threw their arms around each other. They were the closest of friends, knew the most intimate details of each other's lives and families. Their friendship had been built over the years of imprisonment by tapping coded messages on the mud and bamboo wall that separated their cells. They had never seen each other until they came face-to-face there in our living room.

On those four occasions, we heard tales of indescribable torture told without any attempt at dramatics, with no rancor or bitterness and definitely no attempt to beg sympathy. One man, for trying to escape, had been buried up to his neck and left for weeks, his food thrown on the ground before his face.

We heard of men tortured beyond the breaking point until lying on their cell floors, they wanted to die because they had eventually told their captors some of what they wanted to know. But in the adjoining cells, others who had the same experience at one time or another took turns hour after hour just tapping on the wall to let them know they understood and to hang in there and not give up.

When they were asked why, if they knew they'd eventually break, why they didn't give their captors the information they wanted without undergoing the torture, they seemed surprised. They said, "We were prisoners. The only way we had left to fight the enemy was to hold out as long as we could."

One young man (a fighter pilot who looked as if he should be a cheerleader, maybe on a college campus) had shattered his arm and shoulder when he bailed out after his plane was hit by anti-aircraft fire. They wanted him to talk to two of our anti-war protesters who were guests in Hanoi. He refused. They stood him on a stool, tied his shattered arm to a

hook in the wall and then kicked the stool from beneath his feet -- not once, but time after time until he gave in. In the meeting that followed, knowing his words were being carefully monitored, he said he tried in every way he could to indicate to these fellow Americans they weren't hearing the truth, but he said, "I spoke to ears that refused to hear".

One night after our guests had gone and Nancy and I were alone, I asked, "Where did we find them, where did we find such men?" The answer came to me almost as quickly as I'd asked the question. We found them where we've always found them when such men are needed -- on Main Street, on our farms, in shops and stores, in offices, oil stations and factories. They are simply the product of the freest society man has ever known.

In the dark days following World War II, when we alone, with our industrial power and military might, stood between the world and a return to the dark ages, Pope Pius the XII said, "the American people have a genius for great and unselfish deed. Into the hands of America God has placed the destiny of an afflicted mankind."

God Bless America.

# # # # #

OFFICE OF THE HON. RONALD REAGAN  
10960 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 812  
Los Angeles, California 90024  
For information: Jim Lake, Press Secretary  
or Jan McCoy  
(202) 452-7606

FOR RELEASE:

TUESDAY, JULY 6, 1976

10:30 P.M. EDT

Nationally Televised Address by The Hon. Ronald Reagan,  
on ABC-TV Network, Tuesday, July 6, 1976, at 10:30 p.m.

Good evening from California and happy birthday.

Just two days ago, on Sunday, you and I achieved a milestone in the history of mankind and in the history of freedom. We the people of the United States of America have been free for 200 years plus two days and we've proven to the world that freedom works.

Now, this might not sound like much of an accomplishment to those of us who were born here and accept freedom as the natural state of mankind.

Crossfiled Under:

*Inflation - General 3-4*  
*Discrimination - 5-24*  
*Abortion - 5-6*  
*Busing - 6-7*



LOU CANNON: Since this is a very close race, how do you, I mean, obviously if you win it, you've come back against very great odds...you know, what about if you don't quite make it, does that...do you...has it been worthwhile for you, has it been worthwhile for the country, for the party...I mean, is the only way it will be worthwhile is if you are nominated?

GOV REAGAN: Oh no. Let's take a look at just a few things that have happened in this campaign. First of all, let's picture this whole thing in all these months past, all the way back to November, and picture no contest in the Republican Party, just a contest leading up to Jimmy Carter on the Democratic side. The word "Republican" wouldn't even be mentioned. If there were anything mentioned at all, it would be the same thing we heard in '72, and that was, if you'll remember, there were frequent mentions of the Republican humdrum convention will be the dull rubber-stamping of an incumbent. Well, here would be the dull rubberstamping of an appointed incumbent, not even someone who was elected by the party. And this is all the attention we'd be getting.

The second thing is I think that a great many issues that are going to have to come before the people have been brought out, would not have been brought out at all in this contest.

The third thing is I believe that by my candidacy Mr. Ford has been pushed into positions that he would not have taken. There's no question in my mind that President Ford would have signed the common situs picketing bill. He had promised he would; his own Secretary of Labor resigned in protest at his vetoing it. I think I caused that veto. Now Cuba. What's happened to the negotiations to recognize Castro? Before the Florida primary he was down there declaring "no way." I think that was because it became an issue in the campaign. There are a number of things of this kind. Now, how far back he'll swing if he becomes a candidate and there is not an imminent threat now from another Republican candidate, but things as the Republic of China and relationships of that kind, I don't know. But no, I think it has been worthwhile.

OFFICE OF RONALD REAGAN  
10960 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 812  
Los Angeles, CA 90024

For information:

Jim Lake, Press Secretary  
(traveling with Governor Reagan)  
Jan McCoy (202) 452-7606

July 13, 1976

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Statement of Governor Ronald Reagan  
Regarding the Olympics

I am concerned about a serious threat to the future of the Olympic Games -- the injection of politics.

The action of the Canadian Government to bar the team of the Republic of China from competing at the Games in Montreal is disappointing, to say the least. This action is contrary to the agreement which Canada accepted as a condition of holding the Games in Montreal. That agreement calls for the admittance of all teams in good standing with the International Olympic Committee. The Republic of China team from Taiwan is a member in good standing.

The IOC should hold Canada to this agreement and require it to admit the Republic of China's team. If Canada should refuse to do so, the IOC should immediately consider the feasibility of holding the games in alternate facilities in the United States.

The Olympic spirit fosters better understanding among peoples and nations. There is no place for politics in the Games. The IOC should have the courage to meet this problem directly so that politics can be taken out of the Olympics once and for all. If it does not, the situation will undoubtedly get worse in the future, and the Games themselves may be jeopardized.

# # # #

Special to the New York TIMES  
attention: Howard Goldberg  
Op-Ed Page, 10th floor

July 22, 1976

Opportunity in Asia

by Ronald Reagan

Washington's attention is permanently fixed, it seems, only on half the world -- primarily on the Soviet Union and on our traditional European allies. Toward Asia its attention seems sporadic. Intermittently in the recent past there have been sudden and distinct policy shifts, the most profound of which the Japanese have labeled "shocks".

Continued insensitivity may cost us an opportunity which could contribute to a restored global balance. The 1972 rapprochement with Peking first raised it. Initially it brought a flurry of trade, but that reached a peak in 1974 and fell by nearly one-half last year. The opportunity is still there, and there is reason to believe we can have it without making undue concessions, but time may not be on our side much longer.

Washington appears to have been inattentive to various signals from Peking indicating a desire to expand our relationship. Perhaps messages have been ignored because they did not come through official channels. That may have been the State Department's expectation, for its diplomatic techniques are rooted in Western tradition. But the Chinese way is different. Typically, their messages are indirect, sent by means of symbols or hints to non-official visitors.

Richard Nixon's visit to Peking early this year is an example. Clearly, the Chinese overestimated his ability to serve as an intermediary for expressing their desire for an expanded relationship.

more--more

But the visit, in part, reveals their frustration at Washington's inattention. Contacts with other public figures, journalists and businessmen have also been used to communicate their messages.

Not wishing to risk their prestige in possible rebuffs, the Chinese have historically gone through middlemen. This method provides them the choice of being publicly silent or disavowing a matter if the other side ignores the message.

The Chinese message now seems to be that they want to explore with us and Japan an expanded relationship. While we recognize the ideological gulf that separates us from the Chinese (and we should remain aware that they will continue to disdain our free society), nevertheless they share with us and Japan some common and complementary goals in the Pacific.

All three nations wish to bring stability to the region. As leading free world economies, the U.S. and Japan can offer China advanced technology and industrial development. For its part, China could increase sales from its substantial oil reserves to Japan and the U.S. And, Japan, which seeks access to natural resources and food supplies, could expand its trade with China and the U.S. in these sectors.

A broadened relationship could also serve to provide a barrier to Soviet expansionism. The Chinese have long distrusted the Russians, with whom they share a long border. Their ability to keep a million Soviet troops tied down in the border regions discourages the use of them elsewhere. The expanded relationship might include the sharing of information relating to the Soviet forces on the Chinese border.

Proposals to sell arms to Peking, on the other hand, should be treated with exceptional care.

Closer three-way communications could make it possible to head off, at the diplomatic level, potential troubles and tensions in Asia.

The Chinese signals should not be ignored. Although the so-called moderates within China are believed to be dominant now, forces that are more pro-Soviet may gain the upper hand after Mao is gone.

To take advantage of this Asian opportunity, we must regain credibility in Peking's eyes. Paradoxical as it may seem, this means honoring our commitments to South Korea and Taiwan.

Washington may again be misreading the situation, though, for it recently withdrew its handful of advisers on Quemoy and Matsu Islands, possibly as a hint of things to come. It is true Peking regards itself as the only legal government of China, and Taiwan as a province. But it does not necessarily follow that Peking would expect us to sever our ties with Taiwan as the price for an expanded relationship. Things are not always as they appear. For example, Peking has said it wants us to withdraw our troops from South Korea, but to remain in Japan. Yet, Japan regards her own defense as being buttressed by the presence of U.S. troops in Korea. Peking is well aware of this.

Progress can and should be made to develop our relationship with Peking. At the same time, we must neither jeopardize the safety of our long-time ally on Taiwan, nor sever our ties with it. Vigorous and productive, Taiwan has become a major U.S. trading partner. Last year, our \$3.5 billion worth of trade with Taiwan was more than seven times the volume of our trade with Peking.

In the last analysis, a firm approach by us may enhance Peking's view of our reliability.

OFFICE OF RONALD REAGAN  
10960 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 812  
Los Angeles, CA 90024  
For information:

Jim Lake, Press Secretary  
(traveling with Governor Reagan)  
Jan McCoy (202) 452-7606

July 25, 1976

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Statement of Governor Ronald Reagan  
Regarding the California Cannery Strike

The strike by California's cannery workers at the peak of fruit harvesting season threatens to bring disaster to California agriculture and fuel a new round of inflated food prices.

Each day the strike goes on increases the damages the strike is inflicting on California farmers, farm workers and the nations consumers.

For that reason it is essential that the President invoke the Taft-Hartley Act immediately. I respectfully request him to act now in the national interest.

OFFICE OF RONALD REAGAN  
10960 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 812  
Los Angeles, CA 90024

For information:

Jim Lake, Press Secretary (213) 477-8231  
Jan McCoy (202) 452-7606

July 26, 1976

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

### STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE RONALD REAGAN

Since I became a candidate for President I have been questioned by newsmen and by delegates from every section of the country as to who my choice might be for Vice President.

I have had serious concerns about the Vice Presidential selection process, and I have concluded that the convention delegates should know well in advance who I would select as my running mate.

Some time ago, along with my staff, I began to compile a list of persons both in and out of government who might be potential nominees and whose basic beliefs were compatible with my own.

My purpose this morning is to tell you that the task of finding a person who meets my qualifications for Vice President and who also has a broad general appeal has been completed.

After long hours of study and discussion I have selected a man who believes in the same basic values in which I believe: in a strong America able to preserve the freedom of its people; in a compassionate America willing to care for those of its people unable to care for themselves; in a moral and decent America dedicated to the preservation of the values that have given greatness of this nation; in an America governed by the rule of law, not by men, law which exists to preserve each man's freedom, not to restrict it.

more--more

2-2-2

I have selected a man of independent thought and action, with a background in business and 16 years in public service. He is respected by his colleagues, but he has not become a captive of what I call "the Washington buddy system."

He has an awareness of the shortcomings in our foreign policy and the domestic threat to our security in continuing the present policies of inflationary deficit spending.

I have spent several hours in conversation with him and we have fully discussed the issues and principles by which we would lead this nation.

Since I feel that the people and the delegates have a right to know in advance of the convention who a nominee's Vice Presidential choice would be I am today departing from tradition and announcing my selection.

I have chosen the distinguished United States Senator from Pennsylvania, the Honorable Richard Schweiker.

I am convinced that this is a ticket behind which all Republicans can unite and which will gain the support of the American people in November.

####



For information:  
Jim Lake, traveling  
with Governor Reagan

August 4, 1976

IMMEDIATE RELEASE

STATEMENT BY RONALD REAGAN, NEWS CONFERENCE  
JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI

I have spent more than eight months crisscrossing the country, giving hundreds of speeches to tens of thousands of people and answering scores of questions. I have spoken out on the issues regularly and as clearly and unequivocally as I could. My positions are well known.

The Democrats have now shown, by their choice of nominee and by their platform, where they stand on the issues. When you boil it down to its essentials, it means more government control, higher taxes and less individual liberty.

In a few days the Republican Party will have an opportunity to make it clear that it offers a more progressive, more humane, more effective approach. It will demonstrate this by its choice of a nominee and its platform. I expect to be the nominee and I expect that the Republican Party will put forth a platform that meets the challenge laid down by the Democrats. That platform must be nothing less than a banner of bold, clear colors. A platform that will tell the American people how we, as a party, would deal with the issues facing our country.

This platform should call for a program that will insure that our national defense is Number One in the world. It should call for a program to insure that inflation is finally brought under control

Ronald Reagan  
2-2-2

and that millions of well-paying jobs are created by our private economy. And, it should call for action by the federal government to support state and local law enforcement agencies in their job of controlling crime.

It must show the families of America where we stand on those issues that most affect their daily lives. Issues such as forced school busing. Abortion. Gun control. School prayer. Costly welfare abuse. A swollen, insensitive bureaucracy.

A recent national poll showed that 52 per cent of the people consider Jimmy Carter a conservative. He of course is not, but if Carter were to face Mr. Ford in November he would no doubt be able to make this mistaken belief about his views stick. And, if he were to win, America would be faced with eight years of more government, more spending, more inflation and fewer jobs. I believe the only way to beat Carter is on the issues, clearly and directly. That is exactly what my running mate and I intend to do, day in and day out till we have been elected.

###

## Ronald Reagan's Farewell

# 'Will They Say We Kept Them Free?'

*On the evening Gerald Ford accepted the GOP presidential nomination which Ronald Reagan had sought so long and so hard, victor invited vanquished to address the convention. Reagan's speech, distilled from the acceptance speech he would have given had he been nominated, follows.*

Mr. President, Mrs. Ford, Mr. vice president, Mr. vice president-to-be, the distinguished guests here, you ladies and gentlemen.

I was going to say fellow Republicans here but those who are watching from a distance [include] all those millions of Democrats and independents who I know are looking for a cause around which to rally and which I believe we can give them.

Mr. President, before you arrived tonight, these wonderful people here when we came in gave Nancy and myself a welcome. That plus this plus your kindness and generosity in honoring us by bringing us down here will give us a memory that will live in our hearts forever.

Watching on television these last few nights I've seen also the warmth with which you greeted Nancy and you also filled my heart with joy when you did that.

May I just say some words. There are cynics who say that a party platform is something that no one bothers to read and it doesn't very often amount to much. Whether it is different this time than it has ever been before, I believe the Republican party has a platform that is a banner of bold, unmistakable colors with no pale pastel shades.

We have just heard a call to arms, based on that platform.

And a call to us to really be successful in communicating and reveal to the American people the difference between this platform and the platform of the opposing party which is nothing but a revamp and a reissue and a rerunning of a late, late show of the thing that we have been hearing from them for the last 40 years.

If I could just take a moment, I had an assignment the other day. Someone asked me to write a letter for a time capsule that is going to be opened in Los Angeles a hundred years from now, on our Tricentennial.

It sounded like an easy assignment. They suggested I write about the problems and issues of the day. And I set out to do so, riding down the coast in an automobile, looking at the

blue Pacific out on one side and the Santa Inez Mountains on the other and I couldn't help but wonder if it was going to be as beautiful a hundred years from now as it was on that summer day.

And then as I tried to write — let your own mind turn to that task. You're going to write for people a hundred years from now who know all about us, we know nothing about them. We don't know what kind of a world they'll be living in.

And suddenly I thought to myself, "If I write of the problems, they'll be the domestic problems of which the President spoke here tonight: the challenges confronting us, the erosion of freedom taking place under Democratic rule in this country, the invasion of private rights, the controls and restrictions on the vitality of the great free economy that we enjoy."

These are our challenges that we must meet and then again there is that challenge of which he spoke that we live in a world in which the great powers have aimed and poised at each other horrible missiles of destruction, nuclear weapons that can in minutes arrive at each other's country and destroy virtually the civilized world we live in.

And suddenly it dawned on me: those who would read this letter a hundred years from now will know whether those missiles were fired.

They will know whether we met our challenge.

Whether they will have the freedom that we have known up until now will depend on what we do here. Will they look back with appreciation and say, "Thank God for those people in 1976 who headed off the loss of freedom? Who kept us now a hundred years later free? Who kept our world from nuclear destruction?"

And if we fail they probably won't get to read the letter at all because it spoke of individual freedom and they won't be allowed to talk of that or read of it.

This is our challenge and this is why we're here in this hall tonight. Better than we've ever done before, we've got to quit talking to each other and about each other and go out and communicate to the world that we may be fewer in number than we've ever been but we carry the message they've been waiting for.

We must go forth from here united, determined and what a great general said a few years ago is true: There is no substitute for victory.

August 9, 1976

Special to the Los Angeles Times

Ronald Reagan on Education

For 200 years, education has played a crucial role in the growth of this nation. It has had a spectacular growth in a speck of time as measured against the span of human history.

Not too long ago, most Americans could view their public schools and the products of those schools with great pride. Some still can, but for a growing number, it has been a case of schools in decline, especially in the cities. And, there is no end in sight.

A case in point is last year's College Entrance examinations. Test scores dropped for the 12th year in a row. The high school class of 1975 scored 10 points lower in verbal skills and eight points in mathematical skills than the graduates of 1974. And, the average scores were the lowest in 20 years.

What is causing the decline?

There is plenty of evidence to support the belief that a decided shift in control of school affairs from local communities to the federal bureaucracy deserves much of the blame.

There can be remedies, but they will take decisive action.

America's belief in the importance of education goes back a long way, even before the Republic was founded. The Northwest Ordinance, adopted by the Continental Congress in 1787, while it was laying the ground rules for the governing of the new country, proclaimed (in Article 3) the "schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged". It reasoned that "Religion, morality and knowledge" were "...necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind..."

Religion, of course, is not taught in our public schools. No one argues that it should be, for one of our basic principles is separation of church and state. But morality -- sound ethical attitudes and behavior -- was regarded as a basic

more--more--more

component of education until not long ago. In recent years, however, a new view has come to prevail in the schools; the view that little differentiation should be made between right and wrong and between good and evil because such distinctions are irrelevant. This has coupled with the idea that schools should neither establish nor enforce clear rules of conduct. We have been told that schools should be neutral or permissive and should not even try to instill in their students "old fashioned" and presumably obsolete norms or discipline or moral values which the new theories regard as repressive.

New textbooks disregard and sometimes ridicule American tradition. They distort the picture of the American past and present, and disdain the maintenance of standards by adopting what they call a non-judgemental approach.

Many view with serious concern the prospect of federalized textbooks. The National Science Foundation has developed, at a cost to the taxpayers of six-and-a-half million dollars a social studies course for Fifth Graders ("Man -- a Course of Study") which is now being taught in 728 schools in 47 states and is feared by some as a prototype for federalization of curriculum.

Recently, even the third precept named in the Northwest Ordinance -- the transmission of knowledge -- has been weakened. Many still remember the slogan that was broadcast under the auspices of the U.S. Office of Education after World War II: "We don't teach subjects, we teach children".

The question is: What do we teach these children? Do we teach them the essentials they will need in life? Or, do we teach them what social engineers want them to learn? Should we let children exercise judgement of what -- at any given point in their development -- they regard to be relevant? "Relevant" is a fashionable word today and it could be translated as meaning a more entertaining sandbox.

There is evidence that our young people are acquiring fewer skills and less knowledge in the public schools today than ever before. I have mentioned

declining scores in achievement tests. When these are available they show a falling curve. Many school administrators have even discontinued the taking of tests, or at least their publication, presumably because the results aren't what the bureaucrats wanted.

SAT's (Scholastic Aptitude Tests) administered to college applicants, have dropped steadily over a dozen years. Employers complain that high school graduates who apply for jobs lack adequate mastery of the "three Rs". Colleges complain that they have to teach many freshmen the basic skills they should have learned in high school. Parents are bewildered by their children's inability to function at the level they should.

In 1974, the U.S. Office of Education surveyed 19 million American adults. It found about 12 percent of them to be functionally illiterate. Yet, nearly all American children have been attending school, at least between the ages of seven and 15.

Shouldn't we expect that, after attending school for nine years or more, a child should be able to read, if the school really teaches the essentials? That "if" has become a very big "if" with the abandonment of standards of grading and promotion and the handing out of diplomas for mere attendance rather than for real achievement.

Under the Constitution, education is a power and responsibility of the states, not the federal government. Though highly regarded by the Founding Fathers, education is not mentioned in the Constitution. Yet, the federal government -- especially since the establishment of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare -- has injected itself increasingly into local schools, prodding, harassing, molding them according to bureaucratic ideas of what schools should be like in an age of group dynamism.

It is within the power of the President to issue strict instructions to the Department of H.E.W. and other federal departments to get off the back of state and local school systems; to leave the setting of policies and the administration of

school affairs to local boards of education.

Schools governed at the local level by boards elected by the voters are one of the finest examples of grassroots democracy. Only if a school system were to discriminate among students on the basis of race or religion or national origin would there be a reason for the federal government to intercede.

It has been claimed that educational deficiencies are due to lack of money; that schools have been starved because many states do not have adequate fiscal powers to raise the money needed. Therefore, the claim goes, only more federal action can improve education.

But Americans have faithfully supported their schools with sufficient funds. Whatever shortcomings exist in the system cannot be blamed solely on the lack of money.

Over a recent 20-year period (1952-72), while enrollment in the public schools and colleges throughout the nation increased by 87 percent, the staffs of those institutions expanded by 200 percent and their expenditures by 704 percent.

During a period when the general price level rose 58 percent, expenditures per student in public education went up 330 percent.

In California, during the eight years I was Governor, some education administrators made eloquent pleas of poverty, as enrollment went up at the University of California by 43.9 percent and budgets soared by 101.9%. In the grade schools and high schools, enrollment increased by five percent and expenditures by 118.6 percent in all sectors of public education.

If money alone could improve education, the skills and knowledge of the students throughout America should have reached dizzying new heights by now.

But, to all appearances, just the opposite is true. In terms of the "three Rs" and other achievements, the knowledge and skills of graduates has been deteriorating at the same time education budgets have soared to new records.

Despite the claimed inability of the states to raise their support of education,

more than 90 percent of the income of public education institutions has been coming from state and local sources. The federal government contributes less than 10 percent. It does it, however, through more than 100 different programs, and these give the bureaucrats the leverage they need to browbeat schools and colleges.

Federal interference has been a major adverse influence in the schools. Millions of youngsters leave high schools with diplomas, but with no marketable skills that would enable them to land jobs. It's little wonder that more than one-fifth of our young people between 16 and 21 years of age are unemployed.

Among the most pernicious actions on schools -- well-intended, but ill-conceived -- have been the pressures and court orders to bus large numbers of children to distant schools against their will and their parents' will, in a futile attempt to create an equal racial mix at every school.

Public schools and colleges -- and all other public institutions, for that matter -- should treat all citizens alike, without discrimination on account of race, ethnic origin, sex or creed. Schools should be "color blind" and treat every student alike with regard to admission, promotion, grading, graduation and in every other respect, except for reasons that bear directly on his or her qualification.

At the same time, every student should have the right to enroll at any public school he or his parents wish, provided he is qualified for that particular school or grade.

The United States Supreme Court, in the 1954 decision Brown vs. Board of Education, sought to outlaw deliberate segregation of students by race. I agree. I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of Americans feel that public schools should not be allowed to treat students differently -- or to segregate them -- simply because they are white or black or red or any other color.

A black child, for instance, should not be denied admission to a school for no reason other than the number of black or white children there. Nor should a white child.



By a strange twist since 1954 the principle of racial nondiscrimination has been turned around and perverted to do exactly the opposite of what it was intended to do. Black children, as well as white children, are being denied admission to schools of their choice -- mostly neighborhood schools -- for no reason other than their race. They are required to be bused to distant schools in order to provide something called "racial balance".

This has not worked because many parents, when faced with busing, try to move elsewhere, if they have the means to do so, or they enroll their children in private schools. As a result, only parents who cannot afford to move or to pay for private schooling suffer the full impact of mandatory busing. Many of the politicians and judges who favor forced busing to achieve racial balance send their own children to private schools or move into neighborhoods unaffected by it.

Forced busing has caused friction, conflict, and violence in many schools and cities throughout the country. In the process, it has adversely affected the education of thousands of children. There is no evidence that forced busing has improved education for children, black or white. This was shown in an article by Richard J. Armour entitled "The Evidence on Busing" in The Public Interest four summers ago. And, it has been shown in several statements by Dr. James Coleman, the sociologist who in 1966 conducted the most extensive survey of American public schools ever and who has often been called the "father" of busing.

Numerous polls continue to show that a large majority of Americans, black and white strongly oppose forced busing. While racial segregation simply has no place in American public schools, neither has forced busing. Is it only coincidence that achievement levels in the public schools were falling -- as measured by test scores -- exactly in the years when compulsory busing was fanning controversy in so many communities throughout the land?

Parents have a right and a responsibility to direct the education of their children. This should include the choice of school their children attend.

It is time that Congress considered legislation in keeping with the 14th Amendment -- that would eliminate forced busing. If it does not, then we need a Constitutional Amendment along the following lines: No state or the federal government shall refuse admission to a public institution to any person, otherwise qualified, solely on account of race, color, ethnic origin, sex or creed.

I am not opposed to all federal action in the field of education, but I believe that such action should be indirect so as to avoid any possibility of bureaucratic control. The federal government might, through vouchers or tax credits, aid students to enroll in schools of their choice. There need be little, if any, connection between the federal department and the educational institution. Indirect aid would improve the ability of parents with limited means to enroll their children at schools which they regard as best for the children.

It is by the principle of local control that American education achieved eminence and strength. By the abandonment of that principle, education has deteriorated. It is time we put it back on the right track.

# # #

RONALD REAGAN NATIONAL TV SPEECH

Sunday, September 19, 1976

Good evening.

A few days from now, on Thursday evening, September 23, to be exact, I'm going to be in front of my television-set at home, watching the first debate between President Ford and Jimmy Carter.

I'd rather be debating than watching -- but a funny thing happened to me on the way to the nomination.

Important as these Presidential debates are, they are, in a sense, only one part of an even greater debate. I'm referring to the national debate between the principles of the Republican Party and those of the Democrat Party. In this campaign season wherever candidates confront each other, whether in the contest for the office of President or for a Senatorial or House seat, these principles will be the issue. They can be found in the platform each party drafted at its convention this year. There have been times in the past when party platforms were noted less for what they said than for what they avoided saying. But in this year of our bicentennial we find the philosophies of our parties clearly stated and clearly visible for all to see. The ideas and programs and promises in these platforms can have a decisive impact on you and your family and our country.

You are the only judges in this debate. You alone will decide the winner. All I can do tonight is to try to show, as clearly as I can the way each party deals with subjects that affect your life and mine.

I don't pretend to be speaking as a neutral observer. I believe that the election of President Ford is of great importance to each of us, to our families and communities, to our nation and to the cause of freedom. And I believe just as strongly that we need, and

have needed for many years, a Congress that is responsible and responsive to the American people. And, to me, that means the election of Republicans to the House, the Senate and to the State Houses across our land.

In other words I'm speaking to you as a partisan. I want you to know where I stand. But what really matters is not where I stand but where you stand. I am convinced a discussion of the two party platforms can help you reach a decision.

One scholar who has done a great deal of research in studying American politics says:

"Party platforms are the official statements that exist of party principles and policies . . . , the platforms are evidence of what those party leaders who draft the declarations believe to be the important issues of the year . . . recent research has revealed that very significant numbers of party pledges have achieved reality in legislation and public administration and that promises made frequently are carried out."

That last part is something I ask you to keep in mind. A party platform is an actual guide to the course a party will take if and when it comes to power.

If that is true, then the 1976 platform of the Democrat Party charts the most dangerous course for a nation since the Egyptians tried a short-cut through the Red Sea.

Each platform, after its preamble, first discusses economic issues, so let's see what each says about money. Your money, your paycheck and if you're lucky these days, whatever you've been able to save. Trips to the supermarket have become adventures in high finance, you wonder how you're going to send the kids to college. Or if you

are retired on a fixed income you watch helplessly as inflation reduces your standard of living day by day.

These things don't just happen. They are made to happen and the Republican platform lets you know why and, most important, who is responsible. The platform reads:

"It is above all else deficit spending by the federal government which erodes the purchasing power of the dollar . . . We believe it is of paramount importance that the American people understand that the number one destroyer of jobs is inflation. We wish to stress that the number one cause of inflation is the government's expansion of the nation's supply of money and credit needed to pay for deficit spending . . .

Inflation is the direct responsibility of a spendthrift Democrat-controlled Congress that has been unwilling to discipline itself to live within our means . . . Individuals, families, companies and most local and state governments must live within a budget. Why not Congress?"

In the 92nd Congress, five Democratic Senators between them introduced measures that would have added \$323 billion to the budget.

In the 93rd Congress, eleven Democratic Senators, including our two from California, broke all records by sponsoring a total of more than \$1 trillion in additional spending.

They call it "progressivism" these days. But, more and more Americans are calling it the biggest rip-off in history. And too many Americans are showing their resentment and disgust by staying home on election day, refusing to participate in the political process.

Well, that won't solve anything.

If you think that politics is something that is no concern of yours, that you can live your life the way you want to and not bother with what the politicians are doing, forget it. Either we run politics or politicians run us. You are suffering economically, your children's future is at stake and our nation is in trouble because of the philosophy of government that now dominates the Congress. That philosophy is reflected in the Democrat platform and their candidate for President cannot disavow that platform because he was, in large part, its principal architect.

The platform commits every Democrat candidate, from Mr. Carter on down, to support of the principles of the Humphrey-Hawkins bill, a bill so badly conceived, so disastrous in its consequences to the national economy, that the Democrat leadership in the Congress dares not bring it up for a vote in this election year.

That bill is supposed to cure all our economic ills, you might say it's Carter's little liberal pill.

Ask your local Democrat candidate for the House or Senate why he isn't demanding that the Humphrey-Hawkins bill be brought to a vote. No one, not even its Democratic drafters can figure out how much its going to cost; one estimate puts the cost at somewhere between 13 and 21 billion dollars a year. That's quite a spread -- \$8 billion. But, that is typical of the economic irresponsibility of this Congress under Democratic leadership. As Senator Humphrey said one day, "A billion here; a billion there; it all adds up". They've taught us all to talk in terms like that, as if a few billion more or less won't make much difference. Well, every single dollar makes a difference to the ones who have to earn it. A billion, is to most of us, something like a "light-year". We know such things exist but we

have difficulty in comprehending their enormity. Let me give you an example. A four inch stack of \$1000 bills in my hand would be a million dollars. A billion would be a stack as tall as a 50 story building. All of us would have to contribute, between us, as much as 23 such stacks just to pay for the Humphrey-Hawkins bill alone.

But cost alone isn't the biggest economic scandal of this platform. For the first time in American political history, a major political party has openly called for complete and total control of the nation's economy from Washington.

The Democrats pledge to -- and I quote -- "set annual targets for employment, production and price stability". All of this must be -- and again I quote -- "co-ordinated within the framework of national economic planning". In the next paragraphs they talk of "national economic planning capability". This "planning capability" will demand "roles for the Congress and the Executive as equal partners".

I was governor of a large state for two terms; and have had an interest in national politics for many years; I think I'm somewhat informed on political matters. Never before have I seen such frightening, ominous words in an American political document.

The Democrat Party is openly and blantly stating that it wants to take-over the economy of this nation. This isn't a charge I'm making against them as part of campaign rhetoric. This is the astounding pledge they have made in their platform. National economic planning means just what it says. When you say the government is going to set a target for production, that has to mean Washington deciding what you make and how much of it. Where you work, how you work, what you get paid, what you produce, what you can sell it for -- that will all be decided for us. And, remember, the Congress and the Executive will be equal partners. No other "equal" partner is mentioned. There

is one reference to "full participation" of the private sector and state and local government. But the only possible role that can be envisioned for the rest of us is to do what they tell us, when they tell us and how they tell us.

There is no way that such a central plan for every job, every position, every company, every business, every price, every cost, every cent in wages paid can be implemented without a great number of bureaucrats to keep tabs on things. But as if they live in some kind of never-never land, the Democrat platform says -- all of this will happen "without the creation of a new bureaucracy". If you believe that, I'd like to sell you some real estate as soon as the tide goes out.

\*One estimate I have seen states that 33 of the programs mentioned in the Democrat Platform -- would cost an additional \$183.5 billion in federal spending annually.

And, whatever else that astronomical figure might mean, it quite definitely means inflation. Their platform does pay lip service to the concern over inflation. It admits "the economic and social costs of inflation have been enormous". For Democrats to warn against inflation is like getting a lecture on fire prevention from Mrs. O'Leary's cow. It is the Democrat Congress which has given us the shrinking dollar and the expanding bureaucracy that are so grievously damaging our lives and our nation. In his acceptance speech, Jimmy Carter promised to work in "harmony" with that Congress.

Their platform pledges "a government that will be committed to a fairer distribution of wealth, income and power". It is an appeal only to those who believe they'll be on the receiving end. It means more confiscation and redistribution of the earnings of all those who work and produce.



The great American philosopher Thoreau once said that if he heard that a man was coming to his home to do him good, he would flee for his life. I get the same feeling when politicians tell me that they know what's fair; that they will see to it that "government" -- and that means the coercive power of the state, the federal muscle -- is committed to what they see, not what you see or I see, but what they see as "fairer distribution" of our money.

Four years ago, you'll remember something of the kind was proposed as a thousand-dollar give-away to every man, woman and child. When the question was asked "where will the \$1000 gifts come from?", the idea was dropped.

But here it is again, the same old shell game. Some call it a give-away program but shouldn't we be calling it a "take away".

New language doesn't hide old facts. Four years ago millions of Democrats and Independents repudiated the course set for them at the convention and this year the same thing is going to happen. This platform may bear the name "Democrat" on its cover but what's inside doesn't reflect the common sense, the values, the hopes and the dreams of millions of registered Democrats who work hard for every dollar, and who think in terms of next month's rent or mortgage payment.

A great Democrat; a former Presidential candidate, Al Smith, 40 years ago saw his party taken over by a leadership elite of impractical theorists. He went on radio and told the nation \*he was going to take a walk. May I respectfully suggest that millions of Democrats and Independents should do the same this year. Take a walk over to a party that truly reflects their dreams and their values. As proof that it

\* Smith said this in 1936.

does, I offer the platform of the Republican Party. It was not handed down by party leadership. It was created out of a free and frank and open debate among rank-and-file party members; men and women who share the same basic principles. It not only says, "Here we stand" but also, "Come and join with us". It is a voice speaking for the great majority of Americans, the productive majority, the strong and vital center of American life. It speaks in plain language of plain facts. Here is what men and women of the Republican Party are saying about jobs and earnings and savings, about you and me and government: Page six of the platform:

"The American people are beginning to understand that no government can ever add real wealth (purchasing power) to an economy by simply turning on the printing presses or by creating credit out of thin air. All government can do is confiscate and redistribute wealth. No nation can spend its way into prosperity; a nation can only spend its way into bankruptcy."

"Every dollar spent by government is a dollar earned by you . . . Government must always ask: Are your dollars being wisely spent? Can we afford to leave your dollars in your pocket?"

"We believe that your initiative and energy create jobs, our standard of living and the underlying economic strength of the country. Government must work for the goal of justice and the elimination of unfair practices, but no government has yet designed a more productive economic system or one which benefits as many people . . .

The story is told of a mighty ruler in the sixteenth century who tired of the cares of government. Retiring to a monastery after resigning his crown to his son -- he amused the evening of his life by regulating the movements of scores of clocks he had with him in his bare monastery room. He tried to keep them all at the same time, but found himself unable to make even two strike the hour together. He sadly reflected on the follies of his reign as King. He couldn't make two clocks act exactly alike yet he had spent his life trying to make all his people think and act alike.

"National economic planning" is a modern version of this same ancient folly. Our national economy is one of the great wonders of history. And it works because it operates in freedom. It can only operate in freedom. The great political temptation of our age is to believe that some charismatic leader, some party, some ideology or some improvement in technology can be substituted for an economy in which millions of individual human beings make free decisions as to how they want to live.

The frightening part of the Democrat Platform is not in its calling for a plan that cannot work but in the fact that those who wrote and support that platform think it can work and should work. No president, even with a staff of geniuses, no Congress with the collective wisdom of Solomon, no sophisticated computer can create an economy to match the one we create each day as free men and women going about our own business.

It only takes one man in power with the wrong ideas to ruin an economy, and a nation. And this brings us to an area possibly even more important than what happens to our tax dollars. What happens to our freedom under the defense and foreign policies presented by each party?

On the subject of foreign policy, both platforms urge the continued reduction of tensions with the Soviet Union. However, the Republican platform takes a strong stand for basing policy on moral standards and commends "that great beacon of human courage and morality, Alexander Solzhenitsyn".

The Democrat platform calls for cutting the defense budget by, from five to seven billion dollars. At the same time, it demands that we maintain an adequate defense which is a little like patting your head and rubbing your tummy at the same time. The Republican platform calls for a "superiority in arms" and advocates the development of the B-1 bomber, the Cruise Missile and the Trident submarine to insure that "superiority".

The Democrats call for "redeployment and gradual phase out of the U.S. ground forces... now stationed in Korea". Republicans reaffirm commitment of those troops "so long as there exists the possibility of renewed aggression from North Korea".

The Democrat platform advocates establishing peaceful relations with the Peoples Republic of China -- "including early movement toward normalizing diplomatic relations in the context of a peaceful resolution of the future of Taiwan".

The Republican platform also supports contacts, trade and normalized relations with China but bluntly and explicitly maintains our treaty obligation and friendship with a long time friend and ally -- the Republic of China on Taiwan.

While both platforms pledge continued support of Israel, the Republican platform also pledges "support for the people of Central and Eastern Europe to achieve self-determination". And, it specifically and by name supports continuation of the Voice of America, Radio Free

Europe, and Radio Liberty with adequate appropriations. It also is specific in demanding an immediate halt to the microwave transmissions aimed at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow which endanger the lives of our people.

Just before the battle of Waterloo, the Duke of Wellington looked over a particularly disreputable-looking group of his own soldiers said to an aide, "I don't know if they will scare Napoleon, but, they scare me". I feel a little the same way about the Democrat platform and what it says about our national security.

Nations are defended by ideas as well as by weapons. Wars are won -- but more importantly avoided -- by what goes on in the minds of men as much as by the weapons in their hands. The record of foreign policy under Democrat leadership is easily summed up -- four wars in my lifetime. In Vietnam, fifty-five thousand Americans gave their lives in a war started under the new frontier and escalated by the great society.

The Republican Platform plainly states that American troops will never again be committed for the purpose of our own defense or the defense of our allies unless we intend to achieve our stated purpose.

As you can see, there are fundamental differences in many areas. And, certainly, there is one major difference in the approach of the two parties on the matter of national defense:

We are not really faced with a question of how much to spend when it comes to national defense. You either spend now in money or you spend later in the loss of freedom or the lives of our young men; quite frequently, in both. There is simply no alternative to necessary spending on defense. We pay the necessary cost in terms of tax dollars now or in freedom and lives later on. I don't like it. You don't like it. No one likes it. But that's the way it is.

The Democrat Party says it is going to cut from five to seven billion dollars from the defense budget. If you're with your children, take a look at them. They're very much involved in this decision. If the Democrats make a mistake in how much to spend for defense, our children will pay the ultimate price.

In what precious coin will that price be paid? Their freedom? Their lives? Unfortunately, we are not told in the Democrat platform. Don't you think we should be? Don't you think Congressional candidates and the Democrat Presidential candidate owe it to you and to me and to our children to explain cutting our defense budget at the very time the Russians are engaged in building an aggressive force of staggering size? A mistake in estimating our defense needs will only become known when it is too late to correct it.

Just one more point: Why this curious silence in the Democrat Platform with regard to Radio Free Europe, Radio Liberty and the Voice of America? Solzhenitsyn once said that the only way he, a Russian, could find out what was really going on in his own country when he lived there, was to listen to Radio Liberty and the Voice of America. The Republican platform spells out in black and white our commitment to these voices of the free world. Millions of Americans of European ancestry have a right to ask just how deep is the Democrat Party's commitment to the rights of Central and Eastern Europeans. And with good reason. These -- and other questions -- remain to be answered on foreign policy. We are entitled to answers from candidates in our Congressional and Senatorial elections. Undoubtedly we'll learn the positions of the Presidential candidates in their debates.

One other area of major concern to be examined is what kind of government will we have in Washington? What do the platforms tell us about each party's approach to other issues? What about energy?

We desperately need to be freed of reliance on foreign sources of energy and that means development of new sources of energy. The Democrats are pledged to break-up -- and economically cripple -- those energy companies that are the only hope we have for developing new sources and continuing to explore for oil. The Republican Party pledges to increase supplies of oil and natural gas by eliminating wasteful price controls and ending unwarranted government interference in the free market

On welfare -- the Democrats say the current system is bad (well they should know, they invented it). But they would replace it with something worse. Their proposal is to federalize welfare which can't help but take more of your earnings in higher taxes. To turn welfare completely over to the Federal Bureaucracy is to give it to those who have already made it virtually unworkable. Republicans say no to federalization of welfare and no to a guaranteed annual income. We say yes to strengthening local and state administration of welfare and yes to giving able bodied welfare recipients an opportunity to work at useful community projects in return for their welfare grants.

When it comes to education, the Democrat answer is the same -- increased federal funding -- more money from you but less control by you as to your children's education. Now if there is one fact that has emerged in recent years it is that massive, increased federal interference in education has been an utter failure. By every test the quality of education in our public schools has on the average declined over the last 20 years. A case can be made that the decline in quality has been proportionate to the increase in federal aid. One thing is certain -- the increase in cost of public education has not been matched by any improvement in quality.

If you feel those who have given us lower test scores, low reading scores and violence in the schools should have more control over education -- then the Democrat platform has something for you. But if you'd like your children to learn reading, writing and basic arithmetic, the Republican platform stresses a return of authority to state and local school districts, which means you will have more to say about your child's education.

The Democrat platform proposes a national health insurance program in which everyone will be compelled to participate. It would be funded by payroll and general tax revenues. Recently we have learned about billion dollar fraud and abuse of the medicaid program, which only covers about 12% of health care. This should give us some idea of what would happen if we attempt to provide government medicine for all our people.

The Republican party is directly opposed to such a program and maintains that it would, if enacted, increase federal spending by more than \$70 billion a year and require a personal income tax increase of approximately 20 percent.

To sum up, the Democrat platform, despite a passing reference to "effectiveness and efficiency" means only a continuation and expansion of big government philosophy. The Republican platform states:

"We believe that Americans are fed up with and frustrated by national government that makes promises and fails to deliver."

And when you come right down to it, that's what its all about. The leadership of the Democratic Party, its candidate for President and most of its candidates for other offices, really believe that they can make big government even bigger and at the same time cut



down the bureaucracy and stop inflation. I don't doubt their sincerity for a minute. But they ignore the unbroken record of failure in their social experimenting over the last 40 years. We can't square the circle and we can't have government that is going to redistribute wealth, plan the economy, set goals for how many of us will work, how much we will produce and how much we can sell it for and at the same time say we aren't asking for a governmental system different from the one we were given two hundred years ago.

And after all the rhetoric and all the arguments question: do you want what the Democrat leadership promises, or do you want a government that acts out of common sense and common decency with belief in the ability of the people to control their own destiny. If the latter, then you have chosen what the Republican platform stands for.

On the cover of the official printing of the Democrat platform appear the words: "The platform is the party's contract with the people." And that's just what it is. Therefore we the people should be very sure we really want what the contract offers before we become a party to it.

Next Thursday on television, two candidates, President Ford and Jimmy Carter, will debate the major issues of this campaign. Each man will represent not only himself and his own views, but a philosophy of government which is enunciated in the platform of his party. Whatever the cynics may say about party platforms, those platforms tell you (more so in this election year than any in a long time) the course each will

more--more--more

try to chart, if entrusted with the high office he seeks.

You will choose the contract which best expresses your own hopes and dreams for yourself and for America.

We will choose to build our own lives in freedom, to help our family and neighbors, to build and create a community of freedom. Or we will agree with those who say that we need someone in Washington to help us to live our lives, to guide us and to decide how we will exercise charity, how we will teach our children and what values we will live by. And, we will have entered into the contract offered by the Democrat leadership in its platform. I'm sure they'll keep their promise to provide all manner of government programs. I'm also sure these will be paid for by increasing payroll and income taxes. There will be more confiscation of the earnings of those who work and the re-distribution to those who do not produce.

I don't believe the great majority of Americans, Democrat, Republican, or Independent will knowingly make such a choice. All across America these past several months I met Americans who were demanding a halt to the waste, the stupidity and foolishness that is so characteristic of the Washington Establishment. They want to spend a greater share of their earnings themselves instead of having it spent for them by a multitude of bureaucrats. They want buses to be used for transportation not as instruments of social reform. They ask nothing of government but to be left alone. Nothing of freedom except freedom itself. And, what they want is spelled out in the platform, the contract offered by the Republican Party, by President Ford and by all Republican candidates.

There's an important way you can help those candidates. Please have a pencil and paper handy so you can take it down. You know, without a Republican President in the White House and enough Republican

senators and congressman in Washington there will be no way to stop all the big federal spending programs the Democrats propose. The information about how you can help is coming up right now. Remember, only you can decide who wins that great debate. It's been good talking with you. Goodnight and God bless you.

ANNCR VO SLIDE WHICH SAYS: Republican National Committee, Washington, D.C.  
20003)

ANNCR:

You can help keep President Ford on the job and elect more Republicans to the House and Senate right now with your contribution to the Republican National Committee. Under the new election laws, a contribution to the Republican National Committee is the only way you can legally help President Ford and Republican congressional candidates all at once. Please, send your check tonight. Any amount will be appreciated -- \$15, \$25, \$50, \$100, whatever. Make your check out to the Republican National Committee and mail it to the Republican National Committee, Washington, D.C. 20003. That's the Republican National Committee, Washington D.C. 20003.

And, thank you for investing in a better tomorrow for America.

# # # # # # # # # # # # # # #

10/76

---

SLIDE: #1 Ronald Reagan (4 sec.)

RR: Hello, I'm Ronald Reagan. In the course of my campaign for the Republican Presidential nomination this year, I referred to many vital issues that confront our nation.

Those issues are as important today as they have ever been. Issues such as the defense of our nation against would-be aggressors; retention of the Panama Canal; a halt to ruinous budget deficits; an end to the protracted agonies of forced school busing. Above all, there is the issue of human freedom, under attack both from within and from without. Freedom, in this Bicentennial season, is ours to win or lose, for ourselves and our posterity.

In my travels across America, I was greatly encouraged by the number of men and women who wanted to take up this challenge; to fight the good fight for our American traditions of personal freedom, limited government and responsible defense of our national interests. I was especially encouraged to learn that many of them were planning to run for public office, and for the United States Congress in particular.

I was delighted to learn that they had made this critical decision. For it is the big-spending, liberal-dominated Congress that is ultimately responsible for so many of our problems. It is Congress that has us spending more than \$1 billion a day. And, it is Congress which refuses to bring the budget into balance. It is Congress that pumps out ever-bigger sums for social welfare programs while cutting back on vitally needed defenses. It is Congress that has given us the largest peacetime deficit in the nation's history.

more--more--more

If we are to reform abuses in the present "buddy system" in Washington, D.C., it is urgently necessary to change the make-up of the Congress. To get the busing halted; to bring the bureaucracy under control; to start an amendment on its way to protect the right to life of the unborn -- it is essential that we replace large numbers of liberal-minded lawmakers with common sense conservative Americans.

If you are as concerned about these matters as I am, you have a chance to do something about them on November 2nd. In states and Congressional districts all over America, concerned conservatives of the sort I met in my campaign are running for the U.S. House of Representatives and also for the Senate.

Together with the proven band of sound conservatives already in Congress, these dedicated candidates can make a crucial difference in the conduct of our national policies. Each and every one of them deserves our support.

In a brief broadcast of this type, it is impossible for me to name all of these excellent candidates, or to point out the individuals who are running in your particular area. But I am happy to be able to tell you that there is a way that you can help them and to insure that your efforts in this campaign are targeted where they will have the maximum impact.

The mechanism for doing this is the Conservative Victory Fund -- or CVF, for short. CVF is an independent organization, headquartered in Washington, D.C., and created for the sole purpose of raising vitally needed campaign funds for conservative candidates for Congress. In the past few years, CVF has distributed more than half-a-million dollars to candidates, including such conservative leader

as Senator Jim Buckley of New York and Senator Jesse Helms of North Carolina.

Among the Senate candidates CVF has helped already this year -- and would like to help still further, if it gets the funds -- are my good friends, S.I. Hayakawa in California; Stan Burger in Montana; Orrin Hatch in Utah; and Sam Steiger in Arizona.

If you would like to elect more people such as Buckley, Helms, Hayakawa and the others; and, if you would like to pinpoint your efforts for maximum impact, I hope you will support the Conservative Victory Fund. Under the campaign law, CVF can receive individual contributions up to \$5,000.00, but any amount up to that limit will be appreciated, whatever the size. Money is vitally needed from all those who believe the present drift toward collectivism must be reversed.

So, I hope that right now -- in time to help these deserving candidates to the fullest -- you'll send your contributions to the Conservative Victory Fund, at the address that will appear on the screen in a moment. You won't regret it. Thank you, and good night.

SLIDE: #2            CVF  
                      422 First Street, S.E.  
                      Washington, D.C. 20003

(followed, for final 4 seconds, by):

SLIDE: #3            The preceding prerecorded program was authorized  
                      and paid for by the Conservative Victory Fund.

DRAFT

RONALD REAGAN SPEECH - Thursday, October 7, 1976

In an election year 40 years ago, an American of unquestioned patriotism, onetime Presidential candidate Al Smith, Mr. Democrat himself, went before a nationwide radio audience. Sadly he told his fellow Americans that after a lifetime in the Democratic party he could no longer follow the leadership of that party as it took this nation down a path that led to socialism and a loss of freedom. His final words were, "I am going to take a walk".

Four years ago Democrat leaders took the party down a path that millions of patriotic Democrats could not follow. And now that same leadership is charting the same course. Rank and file Democrats will "take a walk" once again, a walk to our party if you and I will make them see that what the Republican party offers is what they themselves want for America.

If I may paraphrase our first President, George Washington, we have raised a standard around which the brave and the honest can rally. For the first time in my memory our party has a platform fashioned at the grass roots level by party members which makes clear what the Republican party represents.

Our opponents have a platform replete with promises fashioned by the party leadership and tailored to the specifications of their presidential candidate. Indeed, Jimmy Carter was its principal architect.

The cover of the Democrat platform proclaims, "it is a contract with the people". Those who become a partner in that contract are pledged to more and bigger government, more spending and more inflation. On page after page it calls for Federal solutions to all the problems besetting us, federalization of welfare, compulsory socialization of medicine and federal regulation of the economy.

more--more--more

That last probably spells out better than anything the fundamental difference between our parties and our candidates. They endorse "the Humphrey-Hawkins" bill, which would give the federal government the power to set production and employment goals, allocate resources and labor and control marketing. Their platform pledges to give Washington full power to engage in national economy planning, deciding where we work, what kind of work we do, what we are paid, what we produce, and what price the product will bring. A man named Mussolini did this in Italy and it was called Fascism.

Their platform proposes over 60 new or expanded federal spending programs and the expansion or creation of some 22 Washington agencies, offices and bureaus. And, then implies there will be no added cost to government.

The Republican platform calls for less government spending and less inflation. And, a return of authority to levels of government closer to the people in such fields as welfare and education; to freedom in the market place for the worker, the farmer, the shop-keeper and particularly for the energy industry to reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

In the Democrat convention, where their platform was born, we heard speaker after speaker deplore the unsolved problems of human misery with no acknowledgement of their own 40 year record of failure in dealing with those problems. They denounced inflation and unemployment and expressed their anger with us for causing both.

Our platform contains a reply to their hypocrisy. It says, "It is above all else deficit spending by the federal government which erodes the purchasing power of the dollar". And, then goes on to explain that the number one destroyer of jobs is inflation and the number one cause of inflation is government's expansion



of the money supply and credit (created out of thin air) to pay for deficit spending. Inflation is the direct responsibility of years of Democrat control of a spendthrift Congress.

There hasn't been a day in the last two decades that they couldn't have curbed the spending, ended the inflation, and in so doing reduced unemployment, if they wanted to or knew how. But, this would have gone counter to their doctrinaire liberalism.

When Jimmy Carter bleeds on TV for all to see about inequities and loopholes in the tax structure, would he also tell us which Republican Congress is responsible for that tax structure? There has only been one Republican Congress in the last 40 years, and that was 22 years ago.

The position of our two parties on the urgent problem of defending freedom in an increasingly hostile world is also spelled out in the platforms. Again -- compare -- for the difference is there for all to see. The Democrat platform speaks of adequate defense at the same time it pledges to cut the defense budget \$5 to 7 Billion. That's like the young man on the phone telling his girl he loves her so much he'd climb the highest mountain, swim the deepest river to be by her side -- he'll be over Wednesday night if it doesn't rain.

The Republican platform states unequivocally our belief in military superiority as the best way to keep the peace. And it is specific in its promise to develop new weapon systems to achieve that superiority. It does more. It counters the dangerous wording in the Democrat platform which could tempt aggressors as North Korea was tempted one-quarter of a century ago. We paid with the lives of 33,000 young men in Korea.

Our platform renews our allegiance to our allies stating that, "American troops will never again be committed to the purpose of our own defense or that of our allies unless we intend to achieve our stated purpose". In other words, no young Americans will be asked to fight and die for their country unless it be for a cause this country intends to win.

On November 2nd Americans will go to the polls. Before November 2nd you and I must bring to their attention the real choice they have; increased spending, increased inflation with all that it means, increased control of our daily lives by a government grown beyond the consent of the governed. Or, the right to choose, to control our own lives and destiny, to raise our children as we think best, to have government once again the servant -- not the master. In other words, we can choose freedom with Ford and Dole.