

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:** I: HANNAFORD / CALIFORNIA  
HEADQUARTERS

**Subseries:** A: Ronald Reagan Files

**Folder Title:** Radio Commentaries / Broadcasts:  
Disc 76-1A through 76-4 (1976)

**Box:** 14

---

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/>

9/1/76

RONALD REAGAN

76 - 1A

Generic Promos A, B & C

Programs:

|    | <u>Titles</u>                          | <u>Time</u> |
|----|--|-------------|
| 1. | Convention #1                          | 3:01        |
| 2. | Platforms A                            | 3:01        |
| 3. | Platforms B                            | 3:12        |
| 4. | Platforms C                            | 3:12        |
| 5. | Panama Canal                           | 3:10        |
| 6. | Getting Back at the Bureaucrats<br>(A) | 3:16        |

76 - 1B

|    |  |      |
|----|--|------|
| 1. | Bureaucrats (B)                        | 3:26 |
| 2. | Congress' Automatic Pay Raise          | 3:08 |
| 3. | Women's March                          | 3:16 |
| 4. | China                                  | 2:46 |
| 5. | Shaping the World for the<br>100 Years | 3:00 |
| 6. | Tax Reform                             | 3:14 |

Note: Correspondence from listeners should be forwarded to:

Governor Ronald Reagan  
Suite 812  
10960 Wilshire Blvd.  
Los Angeles, California 90024



O'Connor Creative Services  
Box 8888, Universal City  
California 91608/(213) 769-3500

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled CONVENTION #1 - Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Roughly nine months ago, I signed off on one of these broadcasts and the next day announced I would be a candidate for my party's Presidential nomination. For nine months, I've been meeting many of you all over this country, starting in the snows of New Hampshire, through the South, the Midwest and the West. The trail ended in Kansas City on August 19. I have no regrets, only a great feeling of gratitude toward millions of my fellow citizens and memories that will warm my heart all the years of my life.

In campaigning, you meet people in a way that is unique and different. Just traveling, whether on business or pleasure, even out on the speaking circuit, doesn't compare to a campaign where people gather together to exercise their responsibility as citizens. The candidate is the job hunter, the people are the prospective employers. And, you find the great majority take their responsibility very seriously and are truly conscientious. Only the world's worst scoundrel could intentionally let them down. The campaign trail is no place for the cynic. I am more than ever convinced of the greatness of our people and their capacity to determine their own destiny.

It has been an inspiring experience and, at the same time, a humbling one. To see young people come to California from all over the country and then, at their own expense, ride 48 hours in busses to Kansas City with no assurance they can even get into the convention hall, simply because they want to help in any way they can. They man telephones, drive cars, run errands, all for a candidate or a cause they believe in. And then, when victory doesn't come, they stand with tears streaming down their cheeks as if somehow they hadn't done enough. You stand looking at those faces and hope you can say something to ease their grief and reward their dedication.

Among the memories will be those of landing at airports in the middle of hot, steamy days or cold, icy nights to find crowds of people, young and old, patiently waiting to greet you and bid you welcome to their state, their town. Sure, there are other memories, not so pleasant, of some states where machine politics prevail; where delegates to the convention say you would be their choice but they have to go along with the organization. There is less of that than in the past and, hopefully, more than there will be in the future.

My belief has been strengthened that if government would someday quietly close the doors; if all the bureaucrats would tip-toe out of the marble halls; it would take the people of this country quite a while to miss them or even know they were gone.

I'm going to continue talking about the issues and problems confronting us. Tomorrow and possibly the next day, I'd like to tell you about the choice the two major parties have given us. I'm not talking about candidates, obviously that wouldn't be proper or permitted. I'm talking about platforms adopted by the parties -- two different ways to solve the problems we're faced with.

In the past, platforms were platitudinous, bland generalities. We've made progress. Today, they make specific proposals as they should and I'm going to tell you about them.

## RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "PLATFORMS A" Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

We've all tended to be cynical about party platforms and with good reason. All too often they represented nothing more than generalities expressing in a way overall party philosophy, but watered down to compromise the differences between the factions within each party so as to present something of a show of unity.

Maybe we're improving or perhaps the two major parties are polarizing as to philosophy. At any rate, the voters in this election should look closely at the platforms, for they give a distinct choice as to methods for resolving our problems.

There is no question but that the Democratic leadership tried to express its true philosophy in its platform. Curiously enough the Republican platform reflects the grass roots sentiment of Republicans. The national committee's original draft appeared to be the old-fashioned idea I've mentioned of platitudinous generalities. Then the convention committee made up of rank and file members from throughout the country had its say and the changes were drastic, to say the least.

Obviously time won't permit a reading of the complete platforms. That would require about 20 of these sessions so I'll do some summarizing, no editorializing, and I'll do my best to honestly report the facts.

On the economy, the Democratic platform says, "the Democratic Party is committed to the right of all adult Americans willing, able, and seeking work to have opportunities for useful jobs at living wages". The platform then advocates government employment plans and "direct government involvement in wage and price decisions", which may be required to insure price stability". It also calls for making the Federal Reserve a full partner in national economy decisions.

The Republican platform says, "If we are permanently to eliminate high unemployment, it is essential to protect the integrity of our money. This means putting an end to deficit spending". It opposes wage and price controls, supports the independence of the Federal reserve system and rejects government jobs as an answer to unemployment.

On labor, the Democratic platform seeks repeal of Section 14-B of Taft, Hartley canceling out the right of states to pass "right-to-work laws". The platform also supports common site picketing.

The Republican platform favors keeping 14-B and opposes common site picketing.

On taxes, the Democrats pledge a complete overhaul of the tax system to ensure that "all special tax provisions are distributed equally". They pledge also to reduce the use of unjustified tax shelters in such areas as oil and gas, tax loss farming and real estate.

The Republican platform says, "The best tax reform is tax reduction". It then supports policies to ensure "job producing expansion of our economy", more capital investment and an end to double taxation of dividends.

The Democratic platform urges breaking up the oil companies and barring them from owning other kinds of energy such as coal. It advocates a minimal dependence on nuclear energy. The Republicans oppose breaking up the oil companies and urge elimination of price controls on oil and newly discovered natural gas in order to increase supplies. Their platform also favors increased use of nuclear energy through processes that have proven safe.

Tomorrow, I'll start with welfare. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.



RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "PLATFORMS B" Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Yesterday I summarized the Democratic and Republican platforms on the economy, labor, taxes and energy. Today we'll start with welfare. The Democratic platform calls for federalizing welfare with a guaranteed annual income for both the non-working and working poor.

The Republican platform in direct opposition says "no" to federalization of welfare and to a guaranteed annual income. It calls instead for a strengthening of local and state administration of welfare and the involvement of able bodied recipients in useful community work projects.

On abortion, the Democratic platform opposes a constitutional ban on abortion. The Republican platform supports the efforts of those who would amend the constitution to prohibit abortion on demand.

On compulsory school bussing the Democrats concede this is a judicial tool of last resort. Republicans declare segregated schools are morally wrong and unconstitutional, but oppose forced bussing to achieve racial balance and favor consideration of an amendment to the Constitution forbidding the assignment of children to school on the basis of race.

On the whole subject of education the two platforms are on opposite sides. The Democratic platform wants increased Federal funding and control. The Republican platform stresses state and local school district control with the Federal government returning tax sources instead of grants to help in funding local education.

On gun control the Democratic platform advocates laws to control the manufacture, distribution, and possession of hand guns, especially the low priced so-called "Saturday night specials". It does uphold the right of sportsmen to own guns for hunting and target practice.

The Republican platform supports the right of citizens to keep and bear arms and opposes Federal registration. The Democratic platform proposes a comprehensive national health insurance program in which everyone will be compelled to participate. It would be funded by payroll and general tax revenues.

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

In the all-important field of agriculture, the Democratic platform is less specific and generalizes, with pledges for the adoption of an agricultural policy which "recognizes that our capacity to produce food and fiber is one of our greatest assets". Again, in generalities it speaks of doing more in the way of government loans, health care, transportation and rural development.

The Republican platform speaks in general terms of these same points -- (services comparable to Urban areas) -- electricity, telephone service, transportation, available and adequate financial credit and employment opportunities to supplement small farmers' incomes. Then it specifically opposes government controlled grain reserves and unrealistic regulation imposed by OSHA & EPA. It demands a stronger grain inspection program; a government guaranty of access to the world market; protection against government subsidized foreign produce; labor laws that prevent work stoppages during the critical harvest season; better insurance protection from natural disasters, draught -- flood, etc., and legislation to increase inheritance tax exemption to \$200,000 for farms and small businesses.

Tomorrow we'll have one last go at the platforms and how they differ on foreign policy. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "PLATFORMS C" Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

I've spent these three days discussing the Democratic and Republican platforms because it seems to me that this is the first time in many years that the platforms have clearly set forth the difference in philosophy between the two parties. Frankly, I believe the voters should insist on their candidates making plain their stand on the respective platforms.

Harry Truman, in 1948, said, "To me, party platforms are contracts with the people, and I always looked upon them as agreements that had to be carried out."

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 our policy on moral standards and commends "that great beacon of human courage and morality, Alexander Solzhenitsyn." Further, the Republican platform, in a rare rejection of policy previously pursued by the Republican administration, says, "in pursuing detente must not grant unilateral favors with only the hope" of future reward.

The Democratic 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. 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.

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

The Democratic 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 Democratic platform supports a new treaty with Panama and indicates that it could include the terms already negotiated which, of course, means giving up sovereignty and eventual ownership of the canal itself. The Republican platform has to be accepted as repudiating the previous negotiations and quotes the language of the 1903 treaty that our rights are, "as if we were sovereign in the canal zone." It goes on to say that "the U. S. should in no way cede, dilute, forfeit, negotiate or transfer any rights, power, authority, territory or property vital fo the U. S. and the defense of the Western Hemisphere."

Both platforms pledge continued support of Israel. The Republican platform pledges "support for the people of Central and Eastern Europe to achieve self-determination." And, it supports continuation of the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, and Radio Liberty with adequate appropriations. It also is specific in demanding that the microwave transmissions aimed at the U. S. Embassy in Moscow be terminated immediately.

There is much, much more than I can comment on here. I recommend that everyone get copies of the two platforms and read them. For once, they mean something. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled PANAMA CANAL - Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

It's been two-and-a-half years since Secretary of State Kissinger signed a memorandum with his Panamanian counterpart declaring our intention to negotiate a new treaty which would have the effect of turning over the Canal and the Canal Zone to the Republic of Panama.

Very quietly (until it became a campaign issue last spring), representatives of the two nations negotiated terms of a new treaty to replace the one signed in 1903. Under the original treaty we acquired the rights of sovereignty in the Canal Zone.

General Omar Torrijos, the Panamanian dictator, sets early 1977 as the deadline for resolving the matter to his satisfaction. If we don't, he hints that he will no longer be able to control the passions of nationalist "students" and that violence might break out. And, if it isn't students, it might be guerilla bands making sneak sabotage attacks on the Canal.

Since Torrijos governs not by elected mandate of the people but rather by the armed strength of the Panamanian National Guard, it is hard to imagine groups of so-called students rampaging without at least his tacit approval. And, as for guerillas, published intelligence reports indicate there are no such bands operating in Panama. They would have to be invented.

An overwhelming number of Americans (some 75%) in a mid-summer public opinion poll said they didn't want to give up the Panama Canal. Historically, we paid Panama for those rights of sovereignty; then we bought every inch of land in what is now the Canal Zone from private owners in fee simple. Then, we built the Canal at our own expense.

Now comes an ironic twist. Our State Department is helping finance the Panamanian propaganda campaign. This summer two Panamanian journalists were invited to visit the United States, subsidized by the State Department, to "explain" the Panamanian position on U. S. college campuses and to civic groups. Naturally enough, the two journalists, active participants in the propaganda barrage (Camilo Perez, a columnist, and Luis Noli, a newspaper editor) used the free forums to beat the drums for Torrijos' demands.

Noli, in a speech at the Center for Inter-American Relations in New York, said there would be a --QUOTE-- "violent reaction" --UNQUOTE-- in Panama if present negotiations don't succeed and a new treaty isn't ratified by the U. S. Senate. Odd as it may seem, a newsman from a country of fewer than two million people is paid by our government to come to our country to threaten us if we don't roll over.

As if by magic, Senator Dick Clark of Iowa, a few days later, made public an estimate from the Pentagon (which he had requested) indicating that 100,000 U. S. troops would be needed to defend the Canal against an all-out attack.

As if to underscore this scare talk, Torrijos in Panama and even some U. S. officials talk sweepingly about all Latin America standing behind the Torrijos demands. Curiously, though, there has been no public support expressed by the major countries of Latin America for a Torrijos takeover of the Canal. And, privately, visitors to these countries and even to some critical of us find widespread support for continued U. S. control and operation of the Canal.

This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled BUREAUCRATS-A - Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

The Mayor of Midland, Texas, Ernest Angelo, will see that Midland never suffers the problems of New York City. As a matter of fact, New York would never have suffered the problems of New York City if it had had a few Ernie Angelos in City Hall these past 20 years.

As a former Governor, I can testify as to the ridiculous demands inflicted on state and local government by the paper pushers of the Potomac. And, I know any of you listening who are in business or who farm can reel off personal horror stories of the hours spent filling out government required paper work and bowing to the demands of senseless regulations. Well, give a listen -- you'll enjoy the Mayor of Midland's revenge.

Mayor Angelo struggled through a bureaucratic jungle of red tape in the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development to obtain for his city some Federal funds that were due. It took him eight long, frustrating months of paper work, questionnaires in duplicate, triplicate and quadruplicate before he broke through into daylight.

Then one day the regional office of H.U.D. (that's bureaucratese for the Housing and Urban Development Agency) requested a reserved parking space at the Midland municipal airport. Mayor Angelo was delighted to comply with the request -- if H.U.D. would do a little complying.

He sent a letter to the Dallas regional office of H.U.D. with copies to the President, Secretary, Carla Hills, and a few others in Washington. His letter requested three executed and 14 confirmed copies of their application. It further said, "Submit the make and model of the proposed vehicle to be parked in the space, together with certified assurance that everyone connected with the manufacture, servicing and operation of same was paid according to a wage scale in compliance with the requirements of the Davis-Bacon Act.

"Submit a geneological table for everyone who will operate said vehicle so that we can ascertain that there will be a precisely exact equal percentage of whites, blacks and other minorities as well as women and the elderly.

"Submit certified assurances that all operators of said vehicle and any filling station personnel that service same will be equipped with steel-toed boots, safety goggles, and crash helmets, and that the vehicle will be equipped with at least safety belts and an air bag in compliance with the Occupational Safety and Health Act.

"Submit environmental impact statements" -- well, you get the idea. His letter went on for quite a few additional paragraphs citing all the red tape requirements (so dear to the hearts of those who toil and spin on the banks of the Potomac) that would have to be complied with before favorable consideration could be given to their request for a parking space.

Then Mayor Angelo added a postscript. He told them they could have their parking space without complying with all the aforementioned red tape.

I hope he made his point, because the General Accounting Office in Washington estimates the yearly cost of regulations at \$60 billion. The Federal Trade Commission puts it at \$80 billion -- all waste due to regulatory overkill. Probably the correct figure is nearer the \$130 billion the Council of Economic Advisors estimates is prorated out at \$2,000 per family.

Maybe we'll talk some more about this tomorrow.



RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled BUREAUCRATS-B - Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Yesterday I talked of how government regulation and paper work is adding to the cost of government and to the cost of living. There are some Congressmen who need our help. They too are concerned about the effect of Federal regulations on economic activity, jobs, prices and the tax burden. They have found a task force called "GEAR" -- for "Government Executive Agency Review".

So far their findings support the complaints of both business and consumers. For example, they price government regulation of the airlines as adding \$1 billion a year to our travel costs. The Rock Island Railroad went bankrupt after waiting 13 years for the I.C.C. to answer their request for a merger which could have prevented the bankruptcy. Two years ago the American taxpayer put up \$2 billion to foot the payroll for the regulators. Today the tab is \$3 billion. That's a 50% increase in just 24 months.

The Environmental Protection Agency and The Occupational Safety and Health Administration's conflicting rules and requirements have forced the closing of 350 foundries and thousands of small businesses according to Congressman John Myers of Indiana. He also adds that Federal paper work cost has gone up 150% in eight years.

There are, however, greater dangers to all of us than just this waste of money. For a number of years now the Federal government has tried to get control, if not ownership, of privately owned land in America. A decade ago they pushed the panic button on the supposed lack of recreational land and began gobbling up mining claims and other property. At that time a Federal official announced that in the beginning the government had to encourage private ownership to get the land developed but now the goal was to regain government control of land.

More recently the device has been "land planning". Never does Washington state the true purpose. Land planning would leave you with the deed to the property plus the right to pay taxes on it, but government would dictate its use. When proposed openly as land planning it was defeated, thanks to public pressure.

Now there is another plan. The E.P.A. has come up with something called "significant deterioration" standards for purity in ambient air. Very simply this means that any part of the United States where the air is cleaner than the air quality required by national standards can be prevented from doing anything to lower air quality even though it equals or excels the standards set for air anywhere else in the United States. There has been no public debate. This is no law passed by Congress. It is regulation, pure and simple, imposed on us by permanent civil servants.

What it means is that up to two-thirds of the United States will be permanently barred from any kind of growth or development. Suppose you live in a rural area of high unemployment, and an industry wants to build a branch plant on the edge of town? E.P.A. can arbitrarily say "no". In fact, even a school building with its heating plant and adjacent parking lot could be ruled out by those omnipotent elitists along the Potomac.

This is nothing more than back door land planning; getting under the guise of environmental protection what they couldn't get openly. And the public works committees of both the house and Senate have proposed enshrining these bureaucratic proposals in Federal law. It is time to write your Congressman.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "CONGRESS' AUTOMATIC PAY RAISE" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Wallace Johnson of Berkeley, California, isn't one to shrink from a tough job. He was mayor of that city during the turbulent Sixties when the University of California campus was often in turmoil. He never lost his cool.

A successful businessman who long ago took his employees into part ownership with him, he now devotes virtually all his time to public causes.

A few years ago, when more people voted in his city than were eligible to vote, Wally Johnson began a campaign to detect and eliminate vote fraud.

Last year, as he was returning from an overseas trip, he learned about the passage of HR 2559, which grants to Members of Congress automatic annual pay increases. He was incensed. He decided to do something about it. Of all things, he wound up running for Vice President of the United States in order to get this bill repealed.

But I'm getting ahead of my story. First, the background of the bill. The details began to surface after it had passed. It seems that back in February, 1975, some Congressmen began looking quietly for a way to vote themselves a pay increase that would insulate them from the effects of inflation. They conferred with members of the President's staff. Finally, they settled on an obscure postal workers' safety bill as the "vehicle" to carry their pay increase. They attached it as a rider to the bill, which moved through the early steps in both houses easily and without attracting attention. On July 29, the Senate passed it. The next day it came before the House of Representatives for the final vote. Although the Congressional Record for that day records several strong statements in opposition, the House voted 214 to 213 for passage.

What did Wally Johnson do about it? First, he filed a law suit in Federal District Court to have the bill declared unconstitutional. Then, he filed as a candidate for Vice President in the New Hampshire Republican primary. New Hampshire is the only state that has a separate Vice Presidential primary. Johnson made it clear as he crisscrossed the snow-covered Granite State, that he was on the ballot to draw attention to the Congressional pay raise bill and to get it repealed. People listened. They asked the Presidential candidates about it frequently. On election day in February, Wally Johnson got 75 percent of New Hampshire's votes.

In August, at the Republican convention in Kansas City, Johnson presented his case to members of the Platform Committee. The convention adopted a plank calling for repeal of the bill. Now, there is legislation in Congress to do just that.

Johnson sums it up this way, "We are not opposed to salary adjustments for legislators from time to time in accordance with the historical precedent of adequate public discussion, and if enacted by their predecessors, not by themselves. What we are opposed to, is (1) legislators raising their own salaries during their current term; (2) Representatives using maneuver instead of candor with their constituents; and (3) policy makers legislating themselves, with respect to inflation, into a favored status not shared by most other citizens."

October First, the President must decide whether to activate the automatic Congressional pay raise for another year. Let's hope he doesn't. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled WOMEN'S MARCH - Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

There is a savagery loose in the world. While we can claim peace on the technical grounds that no nations are in a state of declared war, people are being kidnapped, highjacked, blown up and mowed down by rifle and machine gun fire. Innocent people going about their daily work killed simply because they are targets of opportunity.

Those doing the killing claim to serve a cause; redress of ancient wrongs, political differences, economic imbalance and even religious differences. The innocents die on Cyprus, in Latin America, Lebanon, Africa and in the North of Ireland.

We are naive indeed if we accept the bloodshed as resulting solely from the local causes proclaimed by the terrorist bands and guerillas. Behind the scenes, an evil power helps provide the weapons, feeds the fires of hatred and intolerance because continued strife brings closer the dream of a Communist dominated world. Of course, the only killing in the Communist world is the official execution of those who dream too much of freedom.

One of the most tragic trouble spots is Northern Ireland where, for seven years, neighbor has taken the life of neighbor and done so in the name of God -- the same God prayed to by both sides. There is a non-sectarian issue to be sure; the argument as to whether Northern Ireland should remain under British rule or become a part of the Irish Republic. But, the religious difference is very real and lends a special bitterness to the dispute.

Just when you would think the killing had become so commonplace as to be endured, something happened a few weeks ago that resulted in a kind of miracle. During these seven years, bombs have been exploded in crowded taverns and department stores, cold blooded executions have taken place and continual sniping has added to the toll. Then, a few weeks ago, three children of one family were killed by the I.R.A. Ironically, killer or killers and victims were on the same side. The children weren't the targets as far as is known. They just happened to be in the way when the guns talked.

One woman -- aunt to the three children -- spoke to another woman. Then the two set out to speak to others. Only days after the funeral, a meeting of two or 3,000 women took place. They demanded an end to the killing and called on women everywhere to join them.

It has always been my belief that women brought civilization to the world. Without their influence, we males would still be carrying clubs and, in recent years, we've come pretty close to doing that again.

Just days ago, 30,000 women from both sides, Catholic and Protestant, marched through Belfast voicing one demand; "stop killing our children". In Dublin, 20,000 marched in sympathy, smaller groups did so in other Irish towns. In Belfast, stones were hurled at them -- by men, of course; young men. They kept on marching. Women stepped off the sidewalks to join them. They ask their sisters all over the world to join them, to rally for an end to the killing.

What if it happens? Imagine the men in the Kremlin if they looked down on Russia's women marching in the streets demanding peace. Why not? Does anyone have a better idea?

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled CHINA - Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Back in 1972, former President Nixon signed a document called the Shanghai Communique with the late Chou en-Lai. It called for "continued normalization" of relations between the U. S. and the People's Republic of China, the Communist regime which has controlled China's mainland since 1949.

This opened the door for each government to establish an office in the other's capital city. And, it led to a flurry of trade which has since declined. But, there is still an opportunity for increased trade between our country and Peking. China has large oil reserves and U. S. technology could help develop them, for example. And, our relationship with the mainland of China can act as a deterrent to Soviet expansionism. As it is, the Soviets keep something like a million troops in the region of the Chinese border. So long as they are there they can't be used for adventures elsewhere.

The Peking government insists that there is only one China. On this, the Republic of China on Taiwan agrees. That is about the only thing the two governments agree on. Peking says that Taiwan is a province of China and that it rightfully should control the island. The ROC on Taiwan, on the other hand, still claims to be the legitimate government of all China.

It has a vigorous economy and is an important trading partner of the United States, about seven times more important right now than the mainland.

The carefully worded Shanghai Communique made it possible for the status quo to remain in effect indefinitely. But, a message of congratulations from President Ford to the new Peking premier, Hua kuo-Feng, this spring raised questions as to our government's intentions. The message referred to "completing" normalization of relations with Peking. By Peking's definition, this would mean dropping recognition of the ROC government on Taiwan, closing our embassy in Taipei and opening one in Peking. And, it would mean dropping our 22-year-old mutual defense treaty with the government on Taiwan.

Some in academic and U. S. diplomatic circles have been pressing for a so-called "Japanese formula" in the China matter. Japan withdrew its recognition of the Republic of China and gave it to Peking, but kept its important economic and trade ties with Taiwan. But, it had no mutual defense treaty, so the situation is not the same as ours. Taiwan represents the vital southern link in our western Pacific defense line. And, if we tore up our treaty, of what value would our word be to allies anywhere in the world?

Little by little, there has been talk lately of what might be called the "German formula". In the case of Germany, we acknowledge that there is one German nation, but two German states. This has permitted us to have diplomatic relations with both, realizing formally that the two would one day reunite, according to the will of the German people. Whether or not this approach to the China problem will prove to be the right one remains to be seen, but it is worth studying.

This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.



RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled SHAPING THE WORLD FOR 100 YEARS TO COME -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Sometimes it's very easy to be glib about how decisions we are making will shape the world for a hundred years to come. Then a few weeks ago I found myself faced with having to really think about what we are doing today and what people (not history) like ourselves will say about us.

I'd been asked to write a letter for a "time capsule" which would be opened 100 years from now. The occasion will be the Los Angeles Bicentennial and of course our country's Tricentennial. It was suggested that I mention some of the problems confronting us in this election year. Since I've been talking about those problems for some nine months this didn't look like too much of a chore.

So, riding down the Coast Highway from Santa Barbara -- a yellow tablet on my lap (someone else was driving) -- I started to write my letter to the future.

It was a beautiful summer afternoon. The Pacific stretched out to the horizon on one side of the highway and on the other the Santa Ynez mountains were etched against a sky as blue as the ocean.

I found myself wondering if it would look the same 100 years from now. Will there still be a Coast Highway? Will people still be traveling in automobiles or will they be looking down at the mountains from aircraft or moving so fast the beauty of all this would be lost?

Suddenly the simple drafting of a letter became a rather complex chore. Think about it for a minute. What do you put in a letter that's going to be read 100 years from now -- in the year 2076? What do you say about our problems when those who read the letter will know what we don't know -- namely how well we did with those problems? In short they will be living in the world we helped to shape.

Will they read the letter with gratitude in their hearts for what we did or will they be bitter because the heritage we left them was one of human misery?

Oh, I wrote of the problems we face here in 1976 -- the choice we face between continuing the policies of the last 40 years that have led to bigger and bigger government, less and less liberty, redistribution of earnings through confiscatory taxation, or trying to get back on the original course set for us by the Founding Fathers. Will we choose fiscal responsibility, limited government, and freedom of choice for all our people? Or will we let an irresponsible Congress set us on the road our English cousins have already taken? The road to economic ruin and state control of our very lives?

On the international scene two great super powers face each other with nuclear missiles at the ready -- poised to bring Armageddon to the world.

Those who read my letter will know whether those missiles were fired or not. Either they will be surrounded by the same beauty we know or they will wonder sadly what it was like when the world was still beautiful.

If we, here today, meet the challenge confronting us, those who open that time capsule 100 years from now will do so in beauty, peace, prosperity and the ultimate in personal freedom.

If we don't keep our rendezvous with destiny, the letter probably will never be read -- because they will live in the world we left them -- a world in which no one is allowed to read of individual liberty or freedom of choice.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled TAX REFORM - Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

It has been said that nothing in life is certain except death and taxes. Well, we can add the certainty of Congress talking about reforming taxes every election year.

They are at it again with months and months of arguing in committee, then a bill on the floor of each house and now a conference committee trying to reconcile the differences between the Senate version and the House effort. All you and I can be certain of is that the income tax will still be too complicated to figure without legal help and the government will get more money, not less.

Why can't Congress get the message the people are sending; that the income tax needs to be simplified, that the progressive surtax brackets need to be adjusted so that a cost of living pay raise doesn't put you into a higher tax bracket and that we are paying too much in taxes?

The Congressional approach to tax reform is to talk loudly of loopholes, creating the idea that everyone's burden can be lightened if only a mysterious "they" can be prevented from escaping their fair share of taxes. The result is that when Congress finishes its loophole closing, some taxpayers pay more, none pay less and government gets more money.

I know it's difficult to follow figures reeled off by a voice on radio but, let me try to shed some light on the whole matter of loopholes.

Taking 1972 figures, the total earnings and income of the American people was \$945 billion. Of that amount, \$500 billion was exempt from income tax. Aha, you say; \$500 billion worth of loopholes. Who got the break? The answer is, you did.

\$155 billion was that \$750 personal exemption we all get for each member of the family. Another 70 billion was what those of us take who use the Standard Deduction. Then \$93 billion was income from Social Security benefits, welfare grants and unemployment insurance. None of these, I'm sure you'll agree, can be termed loopholes and they amount to 318 of that \$500 billion of untaxed income.

Alright -- but what about the remaining \$182 billion -- that's a lot of loophole. Not quite. Surely none of us believe we should pay a tax on a tax so 36.2 billion is the deduction we take because of other taxes we pay, such as property tax on our homes. Then there is interest -- \$27.3 billion -- and 20 of that is interest on our mortgages. If we had to pay tax on that, a lot of us couldn't afford to own a home.

Charitable contributions -- money we give to church and worthy causes plus deduction for medical expense -- bring the total to more than \$400 billion. The balance covers all the other deductibles -- casualty loss from accident, fire, flood, tornado, earthquake, investment loss, robbery, depreciation, etc. Sure there is room in there for someone to take advantage of a legal technicality and get an undeserved break but those who do so are far fewer in number than political demagogues would have us believe. The truth is, to change the regulations just to catch the occasional few would deny a legitimate deduction to the many.

7/22/76

RONALD REAGAN

76 - 2A

Generic Promos A, B & C

Programs:

|      | <u>Titles</u>             | <u>Time</u> |
|------|---------------------------|-------------|
| * 1. | The Median Is The Message | 3:00        |
| * 2. | Panama's Press            | 2:50        |
| 3.   | Mao's China               | 3:14        |
| 4.   | About the Press           | 2:50        |
| 5.   | Education (A)             | 3:05        |
| 6.   | Education (B)             | 3:08        |
| 7.   | Herman Kahn, Futurist     | 2:45        |

76 - 2B

|    |                                       |      |
|----|---------------------------------------|------|
| 1. | Paperwork & Bureaucrats               | 3:09 |
| 2. | Institute for Contemporary<br>Studies | 3:02 |
| 3. | Humphrey-Hawkins Bill (Jobs A)        | 3:07 |
| 4. | Humphrey-Hawkins Bill (Jobs B)        | 3:11 |
| 5. | Forbes on "full" Employment           | 2:45 |
| 6. | President Coolidge                    | 3:05 |
| 7. | Nuclear Wastes                        | 2:56 |
| 8. | The Hope of Mankind                   | 3:05 |

- \* NOTE: Programs number 1 and 2 on side A are topical in nature, and should be aired prior to other programs on this disc.

Please retain your RONALD REAGAN program reprints. Reprints may be xeroxed to meet listener requests for copies of program scripts. Please do not forward these requests to us.

Correspondence from listeners should be forwarded to:

Governor Ronald Reagan  
10960 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 812  
Los Angeles, California 90024



O'Connor Creative Services  
Box 8888, Universal City  
California 91608/(213) 788-3500



RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "The median is the message" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan).

You've heard the phrase, "He didn't mince words". Well, in this election season there's been a recent case that's turned that phrase around. I'll be right back.

Politicians are supposed to be masters of the well-turned phrase, but it doesn't always work out that way. Take the case that began about two weeks ago involving Presidential candidate Jimmy Carter.

He was being interviewed by writers and editors of the Associate Press. At one point he said he would want to shift a large increase in the tax burden--QUOTE-- ". . . toward those who have the higher income and reduce the income tax on the lower-income and middle income people."--UNQUOTE. There's nothing startling about that sort of statement during an election campaign, but what followed must have brought the reporters up with a start.

The first question was, "What do you mean when you say shift the burden?"

Carter answered, "That means people who have a higher income would pay more taxes at a certain level."

Question: "In dollar figures, what are you thinking of as higher?"

Answer: "I don't know. I would take the median level of income, and anything above that would be higher and anything below that would be lower."

There it was--or seemed to be--a blockbuster of a tax shift, all wrapped up in one word, "median." Webster's New collegiate dictionary defines "median" as "Being in the middle", and "designating a point so chosen in a series that half of the individuals in the series are on one side of it, and half on the other." According to the Treasury Department, the median family income in the U.S. in 1974 was \$12,836 and slightly higher last year. That means, by candidate Carter's definition anyone earning more would pay more taxes than he now does; anyone earning less would pay less.

At a time when big government and high taxes are under attack by large numbers of working Americans, the idea of bumping up taxes for half the population has all the appeal of Typhoid Mary.

The first thing that happened of course was that newsmen--being curious and competitive by nature--wanted more elaboration from Mr. Carter and staff. And, Republican campaigners chimed in with their own comments on the significance of the median level of income. Next day, Carter went all out to reverse course. In a speech in St. Luis, armed with a four-volume copy of the tax code, he insisted that he would not ". . . add a tax burden on working families and the medium-income categories, \$15,000 income." Therein lies Mr. Carter's dilemma. Is it "median"--the word he first used--which will decide who gets a tax increase under a Carter administration, or is it "medium" income that is to be protected (and President Ford has defined that as \$8 thousand to \$80 thousand).

Perhaps Mr. Carter didn't understand the word "median", but that's unlikely since he's an engineer by training and that's a word engineers use. And, if he says he wasn't aware that the median income is somewhere between \$12 and \$14 thousand, someone will accuse him of not doing his homework. So, you see how important little words can be in politics. Meanwhile, "median" is being minced, chopped and shredded by everyone in sight. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.



RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Panama's Press" -  
Commentary by Ronald Regan.)

You can't judge a book by its cover, and, in some countries you can't judge what's going on by the press coverage. I'll be right back.

Every few days an English language summary of the press of the Republic of Panama crosses my desk, often with some actual clippings of stories in Spanish for further reference.

If you read this with no knowledge of the situation, you'd believe that all Panamanians think as one: that they are solidly behind military strongman Omar Torrijos; that every man, woman and child considers the American presence in the Canal Zone and "imperialist" intrusion and that it is high time the United States "gave back" the Canal to Panama (though this would be imposible, semantically, since the Canal never did belong to Panama).

You come away from these press reports convinced that the entire Republic of some one-and-a-half million persons is obsessed with the idea of taking control of the Canal. Reviews of plays, movies and books all seem to revolve around the theme. Engineering conferences are called to insist that Panama is capable of running the Canal complex tomorrow morning, if necessary. Visitors from other countries extol Torrijos' virtues and what is usually referred to as the "struggle" to oust the so-called "colonia" power. Torrijos scoots off to international conferences in distant lands to drum up support (the most recent was a convocation of Third World countries in Sri Lanka .

As I said, if you knew nothing else about the subject, you'd come away from a stack of these clippings thinking that Torrijos was universally loved by his people and his positions were wildly popular.

But, there's a clinker. The press of Panama isn't free to print what it wants. It is controlled by the government, both the English- and Spanish-language newspapers. It has been that way for eight years, since Torrijos and the National Guard overthrew the elected government. It's probably just as well for Torrijos that he censors the press, for if he didn't some bold writer might start demanding that free elections be held in Panama (Torrijos hasn't allowed any elections since he came to power).

Despite his control of the press, however, Torrijos is finding that all is not well in his propaganda paradise.

Torrijos, who until recently talked coyly of not being able to keep Panama's ardent students from invading the Canal Zone unless we turned it over, is now finding that quite a few of the students have something else in mind.

Beginning with high school students on September 10th, demonstrations have been mounted in protest of increased food prices. A few days later university students joined them, throwing rocks at National Guardsmen who fired tear gas at them and hit some with rubber truncheons. Though U.S. press reports of the on-going demonstrations have been brief, visitors back from Panama say that dictator Torrijos has some real trouble on his hands and that the picture there is far different from what the press of Panama portrays.

Another reason to read between the lines. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Mao's China" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

For 26 years Mao Tse-tung kept the mainland of China in a state of "perpetual revolution", but did it really work? I'll be right back.

Though it had been expected for months, the death of Mao Tse-tung, when it came, was a profound event not only for China and Asia, but probably for the world.

Mao was an overpowering figure in China, where he ruled for 27 years. He kept his country in a state of constant turmoil for it suited his theory of "permanent revolution". Thus, when he died, he left behind uncertainties and the possibility of much political intrigue by those who would succeed him.

Mao's brand of leadership was unique, not so much because his dictatorship was so personal or because he schemed endlessly against friend and foe alike, but because of his basic conviction that the revolution never ends. His political career began in 1920 when he attended an organizational meeting of the Communist Party of China in Shanghai. Back home, he formed his basic ideas of the perpetual revolution of the peasants, a strategy he held till the day he died.

By 1934, Mao had managed to build a military force of nearly 100,000. That year, his Communist army was almost eliminated by Chiang Kai-shek's government army, but he managed to break away, and, at the cost of 80 percent of his troops, reached distant Yenan province after a celebrated Long March of 6,000 miles. His base remained there till after World War II when the United States attempted to use "shuttle diplomacy" to mediate between the Nationalist and Communist groups and influenced the Nationalists to make concessions which led to their undoing in the civil war. Mao's forces won in 1949, and Chiang fled to Taiwan.

Through a succession of purges to eliminate potential rivals, Mao kept an iron grip as the mainland's ruler. After a series of six different "revolutions", the leadership of the Communist Party still revolved around Mao and Chou En-lai, who died earlier this year.

Administrative continuity and economic progress suffer, of course, when leadership is unstable. The mainland's relatively poor industrial production level and agricultural output -- especially contrasted to Taiwan's free economy -- seem to be directly related to Mao's "perpetual revolution" strategy.

Mao had wanted to destroy the ancient Chinese system which was based on the family as the center of political and social relations. He wanted to replace this and Confucian philosophy with a new collective concept of leadership and a revolution of the "masses" coming from the bottom up. He died without realizing this goal. In his last poem, to the dying Chou En-lai, he wrote, "We will go; our mission unfinished may take a thousand years".

A guerilla fighter to the end, he launched one campaign after another, retreating if he had to; attacking again and again, often without regard for the cost. Through the Great Leap Forward; the Cultural Revolution; and this year the campaign against so-called "capitalist roaders".

The job remained unfinished, for human nature, it seems, yearns not for permanent revolution but for stability. When Mao came to power he eliminated the specialists and technocrats, but new ones came to take their place.

Mao's "perpetual revolution" swept his temporary successors, such as his widow and Hua Kuo-feng, to the surface, but ironically, it is just as likely to sweep them away. It may be quite awhile before stable leadership comes to the Mainland of China. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "About the Press" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

I'd like to talk about what happened to a plane load (sometimes bus load) of press people, campaign staff and a candidate between January and August of this election year. I'll be right back.

I've always believed that a lot of problems could be solved by people talking to each other instead of about each other. Now I realize that in a way the job of those who report the news is to talk about the rest of us. And a lot of us who are or have been in public life do a lot of talking about the press. Usually we are complaining, (sometimes with good reason), but maybe we need to have a little more understanding of the other fellow's job.

Last January I climbed on one of two chartered buses and began campaigning in New Hampshire. For the next few weeks I alternated between the two buses, riding part of the day in each bus. This I was told was necessary to the happiness and contentment of the traveling press. Most of the passengers on the buses were just that -- the traveling press. The rest of the passenger list was made up of campaign staff, volunteers, and one candidate -- plus wife. Later, as the campaign swung out into other states, the buses became a chartered 727.

There were network news commentators with names and faces as familiar as those of your next of kin; stars of the print media -- both magazine and daily papers -- whose faces weren't familiar, but whose names were. And, TV camera crews and photographers. Most of them were representing Eastern-based news media. I'll confess -- to me they were the hostile press. But, we were even because to most of them I was that Neanderthal reactionary from out West.

I knew many of them had written pre-campaign commentaries about me, questioning my stomach for the battle, my staying power and whether I was "for real". Now we were on tour together through the snow-covered hills of New Hampshire doing as many as 12 towns a day.

In each town the procedure was the same; press off the bus first so they could cover everything from stepping off the bus to greeting the local committees, and so forth. Then the town meeting, sometimes in an auditorium, sometimes in a fire station; once out in the snow here I stood and spoke from atop a stack of feed bags and took questions from the audience. Every so often there would follow a press "availability" where they could have at me with reference to my remarks or my reaction to something the opposition had said in campaigning. In bus and plane between stops we met in one-on-one interviews.

Over the long months and the thousands of miles you get pretty well acquainted. I saw the rough side of their work, the long hours when the day was done for me but they were still filing stories. In some instances, with a special feature their producers or editors had called for, their work went on through the night. Yet, there they were on the bus or plane the next morning ready for the day's work ahead.

I have to say their treatment of me was fair. They were objective, they did their job and their pain was real when a shot or a paragraph was cut in the home office which lessened the objectivity of what they had done. More important, we parted friends and I'm richer for their friendship. I even think they found the end of the trail not an easy story to write. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Education (A)" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

For sometime now a lot of us have been asking, why can't little Willie read or do arithmetic, and the answer is, he isn't being taught to do that. I'll be right back.

The story is told of the new young school master telling the old timer about progressive education. He was enthusiastic about how the children were allowed to express themselves, play games, draw pictures, visit with each other, etc. The old boy heard him out and then said, "We had that when I was in school". The young teacher said, "You did?" and he said, "Yep, we called it recess".

~~A few weeks ago~~ a national magazine carried a one page story by a lovely young lady 24 years of age. She titled her story, "Confessions of a Misspent Youth", but don't let the title fool you. She was in no way a juvenile delinquent. She is instead a victim of some of the modern ideas in education that have been around for a couple of decades or so.

Her parents were of that era when permissive education seemed to be the wave of the future. At age four (in 1956) she was enrolled in a small private school which she describes as a school without pain. It specialized in freedom - the freedom not to learn. The idea was to cultivate the innate creativity each child was believed to have.

According to this graduate of the educational sand box that had different hours for each subject, but they were free to dismiss anything that bored them. School policy forbade them from being bored, miserable, or made to compete with each other. In studying history by re-creating its least important elements. In early American history they made tepees, pounded corn and ate Buffalo meat. Another year they were maids and knights in armor and drank orange juice from tin foil goblets. As she says that was "the middle ages", but they never found out what the Middle Ages were.

There were other examples -- copying hieroglyphics on brown wrapping paper without ever knowing what the hieroglyphics stood for. They spent a lot of time being creative because they were told that was the way to be happy. At age 10 they were functionally illiterate. Reading hadn't begun until 3rd grade. I have a set of the old McGuffey Readers -- back when education was old hat. The first volume is for kindergarten.

Sadly this young lady says that upon graduation, all the happy young children "fell down the hill". No matter what high school they went to they were the under achievers -- more handicapped than any under-privileged children. One of her fellow students killed himself after flunking out of the worst high school in New York at age 20. Others have put in time at various mental hospitals. Her own mother was advised to give her psychological tests to find out why she was blocking out information. She wasn't blocking it out -- she didn't have any information to begin with. Rejected by all four-year colleges she finally got a degree by way of a start in Junior College.

She rejoices that her 8-year-old younger brother was yanked out of the "same" "progressive" school when her mother finally saw the light and didn't want him to be like her.

Her poignant closing line should be over the door of every teachers' college in America. "And now I've come to see that the real job of school is to entice the student into the web of knowledge; and then, if he's not enticed, to drag him in. I wish I had been". This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.



RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Education (B)" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Today I'm going to talk a little bit more about education -- just to get something off my chest. I'll be right back.

In this political season there has been some talk about the need to increase federal aid to education. Indeed, the National Education Association proclaims a crisis in education which can only be met by massive infusions of billions of federal dollars.

Well, however you define "crisis" we can at least agree in the last 20 years the quality of education has declined by anyone's standard. Scores in college entrance exams have fallen continuously, until last year they reached an all-time low.

But can this be laid to inflation or reduced spending? In these 20 years inflation has raised the cost of things 57.2%. The average cost of educating a pupil in the public schools has gone up 211%. The total cost in constant dollars has gone up four times as much as enrollment. The number of school employees has increased two-and-a-half times as much as the increase in enrollment, but significantly the increase in non-teaching employees, administrators, et cetera, it up four times as much. There are fewer pupils per teacher and fewer per classroom.

In what has been called the most thorough study of the public schools ever made, Dr. James Coleman of Johns Hopkins University says there is no relationship or ratio between the quality of education and class size or the number of pupils per teacher or cost of teacher's salary.

Well, if the National Education Association is wrong and a shortage of money isn't to blame, how do we explain the drop in quality? May I suggest the possibility that educators tinkering with the system -- their eyes on a brave new world which they were going to build right in the classroom -- just may have tossed out some pretty tried and true fundamentals. We've all been aware of the educationists' claims that the old fashioned "readin, ritin, and rithmatic" was no longer relevant. School was going to mold the "now" generation into world citizens, free of prejudice, hostility or even a competitive instinct.

Why did we let their theories go without argument? Why did none of us point out that mankind has made more advances in virtually every field in the last 25 or 30 years than in all of history up to the present? It doesn't take a genius to figure out that the men and women responsible for those advances got their education in the "old fashioned" system the educationists are so determined to scrap. Are we to believe those who harnessed the atom, took us to the moon, gave us the miracles of computers, electronics, jet travel, and an end to so many crippling and death-dealing diseases did all of this in spite of their education? Someone in those old fashioned schools that are so despised by today's elitists must have done something right.

Let me add a postscript. Yesterday, I mentioned the old fashioned McGuffey's Readers that were standard in our schools for more than half a century. Fourth graders read the sermon on the mount, King Solomon and The Ants by Whittier, Alfred the Great, and the History of the United Netherlands. Little Johnny could read then. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Herman Kahn, futurist" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

The headline on his magazine interview said, "Good News from Mr. Bad News", and that tells the story of how thinker Herman Kahn sees our future. I'll be right back.

The lot of the futurist is not an easy one. It has been physicist Herman Kahn's profession for many years, but when he was at the Rand Corporation in California, studying the consequences of a possible thermonuclear war, he made a lot of people uneasy.

No wonder, this was the sort of thing no one wanted to think about. A few years later, in 1961, Kahn was a co-founder of the Hudson Institute in New York, a "think tank" that survived the Sixties and today concentrates on developing a clear view of what's in store for mankind for many decades to come.

Today, it's fair to say, Herman Kahn is bullish on tomorrow.

His latest book, titled The Next 200 Years, is full of hope for civilization and it is squarely at odds with the so-called limits-to-growth people.

Kahn's wide-ranging mind covers everything from solving the world food crises to the possible melting of the Arctic Ocean ice pack. He even has some hints for future investors in "postindustrial" America: stocks in hotels, communications, entertainment, spices and flavors, recreational equipment and real estate companies with holdings in the Southwestern U.S. will flourish.

In those next 200 years, according to Kahn, we are going to be faced with some tough personal, social and political choices. Parents may be able to select the sex of each child. Hibernation may become possible for future drop outs. Genetic engineering may mean that parents can select traits for their children, such as I.Q. level, height, physique and so forth. As Kahn says, "Can society tolerate a generation of children with I.Q.'s over 200?" By 1985, he says, plastic surgery will be so sophisticated that it could completely alter appearances. "Can persons be allowed to assume the appearance of other persons?" he asks.

This is just a sampling of the dilemmas Kahn raises for the future American.

He talks about the possible uses of many kinds of energy forms, including nuclear fission, windmills, bioconversion, solar radiation, ocean thermal power, geothermal energy, fusion, flywheels and something called photovoltaic power.

Step-by-step Kahn refutes those pessimists who insist that our resources are running out; that the world's population will outstrip those resources and the food supply.

Kahn puts his rebuttal this way when he explains his theory of a "growing pie" in the world's economies: "No one knows accurately what the earth holds or can produce--or what new uses may be made of new or old materials...The "growing pie" is a good metaphor, for the currently localized increases in productivity, wealth and affluence will encourage similar increases almost everywhere."

There's plenty to think about in The Next 200 Years. About a lifetime's worth, I'd say. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Paperwork & Bureaucrats" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Sometimes giving a bureaucrat a new rule is like handing a pyromaniac a lighted match in a haymow. I'll be right back.

A congressman from Connecticut is upset, and properly so. It seems the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has told Wethersfield school officials their all-boy 6th grade choir violates sex discrimination guidelines. Under their rules, musical groups can be separated only by vocal range. I hope by the time you hear this the Congressman has been successful in his fight to restore common sense.

Congressman Charles Thone of Nebraska is waging the same fight on another front. He's trying to save paper. If he succeeds, a lot of business people and farmers can cut down on tranquilizers.

Congressman Thone co-sponsored the legislation which created the Commission on Federal paperwork, a temporary body dedicated to reducing the quantity of forms and reports the federal government demands of us. He tells of the testimony to the Commission by the head of a large drug firm, revealing that paperwork alone adds 50¢ to the cost of any prescription using his firm's medicines.

Just listen to these figures: this firm spends \$100 Million a year on reserach in five fields, two of which are cancer and heart disease. Government paperwork requires them to spend more personnel hours than they can invest on cancer and heart research.

A medicine for arthritis is on the market only after submission of an application that consists of 120,000 pages in the original. They had to send two additional copies. You don't just drop 360,000 pages in the nearest mail box. No when you are sending over a ton of paper.

The Commission has learned that the Environmental Protection Agency requires a technical data report submitted quarterly. Then for the 2nd quarter you must submit in addition to the 2nd quarter report a copy of the 1st quarter report. And, of course, in the 3rd quarter you re-submit the reports for the 1st and 2nd quarters. And, yes, with the 4th quarter report you re-submit the 1st, 2nd and 3rd quarter reports. These reports to E.P.A. usually have to do with chemical weed killers and such. They can run 3,000 pages each.

Now, I know that the government workers responsible for this foolishness aren't evil people. They just get carried away with trying to solve every facet of every problem and they believe the country will come unglued if they don't.

The June issue of the American Political Science Review published a study by two eminent scholars in 1970. They had interviewed senior employees in 18 federal agencies. Regardless of who was President in 1970 he was faced with 83% of all super-grade employees who supported and believed in the philosophy of big government. In H.E.W., HUD, and OEO, 92% of the top bureaucrats opposed every effort to reduce the social service agencies. More than 70% wanted to expand them. Of the political appointees who were holdovers from the "Great Society" era, 75% wanted to increase the size of federal government and most indicated they wanted a major increase.

Our problem is a permanent structure of government insulated from the thinking and wishes of the people; a structure which for all practical purposes is more powerful than our elected representatives. Only you and I can change that. We must send Congress a mandate to restore government to the people.

This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Institute for Contemporary Studies" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

When it comes to research foundations, you usually think of big, well-endowed ivory-tower type organizations. There's a new one, though, that has lately been playing David to these Goliaths. I'll be right back.

One reason that bills keep cropping up in Congress to regulate land use; to lock the nation into centralized economic planning; or to foist compulsory national health insurance on us all is that the proponents for such measures are often armed with favorable scholarly reports from some well-endowed foundation or "think tank".

But, what passes for conventional wisdom in some Washington circles on these and other important social and economic issues is finding itself challenged these days by a small research foundation working out of a modest suite in an unremarkable office building in San Francisco.

It's called the Institute of Contemporary Studies. It is not quite four years old, but already it has published seven books which constitute major studies on public policy issues, ranging from government allocation of credit to public employee unions which threaten to overwhelm elected officials.

The Institute's success, according to its President, Monroe Browne, lies in its "ability to produce studies with the integrity of the academician, yet boiled down to the layman's language."

Typically, the Institute will work with a group of about 15 scholars who are specialists in the field to draw up each study it commissions. Altogether, it now has a "cadre" of more than 100 academicians on whose talents it draws.

Because it sees itself as presenting "the other side of the coin" on many issues, the Institute for Contemporary Studies doesn't give itself the luxury of long time spans to respond to what it considers left-of-center intellectual initiatives in public policy debates.

For example, take its response to the Ford Foundation's energy study, A Time to Choose, which was launched with fanfare early last year. The Institute commissioned a group of scholars to analyze the \$4 million Ford Foundation opus. Then, it brought out their findings 90 days later in a book called No Time to Confuse.

It didn't mince any words, either. Here is a sample of its views about A Time to Choose: --QUOTE -- "... (it) regrettably confuses energy and environmental issues, enters the Guinness Book of World Records for most errors of economic analysis and fact in one book, is arrogant in assertions of waste and inefficiency, is paternalist in its conception of energy consumption management, is politically naive, and uses demagoguery." These conclusions are backed up by 156 pages of tightly-reasoned discourse by 10 scholars.

Does this take-off-the-gloves approach work? Well, No Time to Confuse has become something of a best-seller; 15,000 copies in three printings and it's now going into a fourth. So far, it's the Institute's biggest success, but its other studies are drawing compliments -- and fire -- from well-known names. "When people take notice," said Mr. Browne, "we know we're beginning to have an effect. Nicholas von Hoffman, Marianne Means and the Wall Street Journal have had some good things to say about our studies, and that's encouraging. On the other hand, Senator Hubert Humphrey has had some no-so-nice things to say about us, and that's encouraging, too." This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.



RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Humphrey-Hawkins Bill (Jobs A)" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Sometimes in the halls of Congress it seems as if "old bills" unlike old soldiers neither die nor fade away. They just live on under different titles. I'll be right back.

Congress has before it Senate Bill 50 House Resolution 50, entitled, "The Full Employment & Balanced Growth Act". We first knew of this as the Humphrey-Javits bill. Fortunately, it didn't get far under that title but now, unfortunately, it's back, renamed the Humphrey-Hawkins bill.

It is as persuasive and grandiloquent in its promise as the label on a bottle of patent medicine. It declares that every adult American has the right to, "opportunities for useful paid employment at fair rates of compensation". Surely, no one wants to quarrel with that. But it sets a goal of 3% adult unemployment to be reached by 1980, which is better than full employment.

During times of peak employment, the percentage of workers temporarily and voluntarily between jobs and those looking for a first job total more than 3%.

Humphrey-Hawkins, as it's called, requires the President to submit a complete plan every year for achieving "full employment and balanced growth". That, too, sounds alright. He's supposed to use fiscal and monetary policy (which I'm sure can only mean deficit spending and printing press money), tax revision and other tools. Here there seems to be some fuzziness because Washington estimates the cost of the bill at anywhere from \$16 billion a year to \$44 billion.

But that phrase "other tools" is the one we should watch out for. To begin with, Congress has to approve the President's plan or, presumably, come up with one of its own. Then, if joblessness isn't reduced to the magic figure, all sorts of employment and grant programs go into effect, including public service employment and job training. We already have about 50 government agencies charged with training and assisting the unemployed. Make that 51 -- the bill calls for a new "full employment office" in the Labor department to administer a reservoir of "last resort" federal jobs (Right now, there are only four-and-a-half workers for every public job holder).

The bill makes sure that these make-work jobs pay equivalent to wage scales in private industry. This means a built-in inducement for some to quit their present jobs for the guaranteed public job because it would mean a raise in pay.

In our experience so far with these emergency public job programs we've learned that they actually decrease employment because, in many instances, government entities only use the program to hire those they already intended to hire.

But there is much, much more to fear in Humphrey-Hawkins. Actually, it follows a pattern once used in Italy by a fellow named Mussolini and then it was called Fascism.

The annual plan would involve the government allocating resources, including labor. It creates government machinery for planning virtually every aspect of American life, projecting national goals for production, purchasing power, and so forth.

These words may not sound frightening, but think of their meaning and application. Government, not the customers would decide how much of what should be produced. You may think you want a new car but, if government decided refrigerators were more important, steel and other materials would be denied an auto maker. That, of course, would mean layoffs, which also means government would begin telling free Americans where they would work and what kind of work they'd do. Maybe it is a full employment program -- but so was slavery. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Humphrey-Hawkins Bill (Jobs B)" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

No one who grew up in the Great Depression can be indifferent to the suffering that goes with wanting to work and not being able to find a job. I'll be right back.

Yesterday, when I was talking about the threat to freedom inherent in the Humphrey-Hawkins bill, I was aware of the danger that I might appear callous to the plight of the unemployed. This is not so. I don't question the intentions of Senator Humphrey or Representative Hawkins. They mean well and are sincere in their concern for the plight of the jobless.

I hope they and you will credit me with the same sincerity and the same measure of sympathy for the unemployed. I say this because I'm going to ask some questions about the present unemployment rate and whether, in our desire to eliminate suffering, we haven't, in truth, added to the problem.

During the recent primary campaign, an article appeared in the press quoting a man who was reported to be president of the nation's largest employment agency. His firm has more than 500 offices nationwide. He claims that three million jobs are going begging. His agency had opening listed for unskilled workers, secretaries, medical personnel, file clerks, salesmen and even marketing specialists and management trainees.

Maybe his story caught my eye because, for some time now, I've been keeping count of the number of full pages in the classified section of the Los Angeles Sunday Times wherein employers advertise for workers to fill job vacancies. L.A. has an official unemployment rate of around 10%, but every Sunday there are some 30 full pages of help wanted ads. Take a look at your own metropolitan paper. The Long Beach office of the California State Labor department was seeking applicants for secretarial jobs at \$870 a month, cooks at \$1,000, security guards at better than three dollars an hour and craftsmen at \$6.50 an hour. And, the unemployment rate was 10.3%.

To get back to the article, the president of the employment agency said that politicians who sound off about unemployment figures tend to scare job seekers out of looking for a job. He also said that we had gone so far in unemployment benefits that we've made it too easy not to work. He gave examples.

In Plainfield, New Jersey, a man unemployed for five months, came to their office. They found him a job at \$20 a week, better than the job he'd lost -- same kind of work. In 90 days, his pay would go up another thirty dollars a week. He turned it down. He and his wife were receiving \$9,880 a year in unemployment insurance, were moonlighting for another \$5,200 and were eligible for food stamps. At better than \$15,000 a year, plus food stamps, he couldn't afford to take the job they'd found for him. In another case, a secretary turned down a job saying, "I'm going to take a 26 week vacation on \$90 a week unemployment benefits, tax free."

Now, let me ask a question. I'm not making this as a statement -- just asking? Why shouldn't anyone unemployed have to take a job which he or she is capable of performing? Why shouldn't the unemployment check be reduced by the amount of the pay check? In the meantime let the state employment office be assigned to find as quickly as possible the right kind of job. Was unemployment insurance ever intended to fund 26 week vacations? This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "FORBES on "full" employment" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

American politicians who talk warmly about achieving full employment by way of having the government "create" jobs, should look across the Atlantic before they leap for the Humphrey-Hawkins bill. I'll be right back.

Recently, FORBES magazine made some points in an editorial which supporters of centralized economic planning schemes such as the Humphrey-Hawkins bill might find instructive.

FORBES put it this way, "A major factor in rupturing the pound and bankrupting Britain is its nationalized industries, including steel, coal, air transport, railways and electricity and gas. Once workers know they're working for the government, they figure it's going to be for life, no matter what productivity, no matter what efficiency. No matter what.

"Last year, British Steel Corp., nationalized in 1967, lost some \$600 million, and its productivity by U.S. and other steel standards is mostly less than half. When its chairman suggested that the company should fire 50,000 unneeded employees, he was bounced.

"When it was suggested to shipyard workers (shipbuilding was nationalized this summer) by the Secretary of State for Industry that 65% of 'em would be unneeded because of lack of orders, the union in effect told him what he could with and to himself.

"Indeed, governments have a responsibility to the unemployed. But there is absolutely no way that problem can be solved by nationalizing industries and adding to their payrolls all the unemployed.

The magazine goes on to say, "As full employment becomes more and more an election year promise, it's important to keep in mind that trying to achieve it by expensively foolish means will lead only to an ever-greater number of jobless."

FORBES then discusses some concepts in the Humphrey-Hawkins bill with which it agrees, such as job programs for teenagers and the disadvantaged, and it hints that it might like to see a guaranteed minimum income program, something with which I disagree for I am convinced such a program would be self-defeating and would make welfare rolls and costs skyrocket.

Their conclusion, however, makes a telling point about nationalized businesses and why they are such failures. QUOTE--"Nearly full employment will come about in the future as it has in the past--both here and abroad--when business must keep competitive by developing new products, improving the old, and being tested in the marketplace. Nationalized corporations have no such necessity, no such incentive and in the long run add to the problem rather than the solution."--UNQUOTE

Unfortunately for the American economy and, for that matter, everyone who works, those do-gooders in Washington who see centralized economic planning (which amounts to nationalization of business) as the solution to all our ills, don't seem to have bothered to see how badly it has worked elsewhere. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "President Coolidge" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Right now, we're concerned with who will be our next President. For whatever it's worth, I'm going to talk about a President from the past. I'll be right back.

The names of some Presidents are invoked by spokesmen of both political parties as "men for all seasons", epitomizing the greatness of America. Names such as Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson. Then, there are Presidents whose names are brought up in party circles, hailed as great but, if acknowledged by the other party at all, with not quite the same enthusiasm.

There are also two lists of Presidential names -- one for each party, usually held up to view for strictly partisan purposes. Each party lists past Presidents of the opposing party as examples of that party's terrible record.

The Democrats, for example, get laughs by mentioning silent Cal Coolidge. And, truth is, many Republicans chuckle a little and go along with the idea that he was a do-nothing President. Sometimes I wonder if he really was a "do-nothing" or was he a little like a lifeguard on the beach who also seems to be doing very little when there is no emergency. If you take a closer look, he is quietly being watchful.

Cal Coolidge is good for laughs, but not all of them are at his expense. There was the press conference where a persistent reporter asked the President if he had anything to say about Prohibition. Cal said, "No". "Any comments on the World Court?" "No." "What about the farm situation?" Again, the answer was, "No." The reporter said, "You don't seem to have any comment about anything". Coolidge said, "No comment and don't quote me".

Probably no President has ever lived in the White House and changed so little his previous life style, which in Coolidge's case was the simple -- even frugal -- life he had lived on a New England farm.

Shortly after he became President, he sent his teenage son into the tobacco fields to work in the summer as he always had. One of the other workers, surprised at this, said to the young Coolidge, "If my father were President, I wouldn't be out here working in the field". Young Coolidge said, "If my father were your father, you would".

But, while "Silent Cal" seemed to be doing nothing as President, the federal budget actually went down and so did the national debt. Consumer prices fell, but unemployment stayed at the figure we only dream of -- 3½% -- which means that everyone who wanted a job had one. Federal taxes were cut four times.

The number of automobiles on our streets and highways tripled during his years in the White House and radio sales went up 1400%.

In just the five years from 1922-1927, the purchasing power of wages rose 10%. It was a kind of "Golden era" in other ways. Hollywood would never again be more glamorous and there were giants in the sports arenas whose names were still legend -- the Manassa Mauler, Jack Dempsey, Knute Rockne, The Four Horsemen, Red Grange, Babe Ruth and Big Bill Tilden. Now, I'm not saying that President Coolidge was responsible for them but they were larger than life figures that went with America's place in the world.

So what if he was a "do-nothing" President. Do you suppose doing nothing had something to do with reducing the budget, reducing the debt and cutting taxes four times? This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.



RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Nuclear wastes" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

One day we may get rid of nuclear wastes by putting them to work to improve our environment. I'll be right back.

Though most of the arguments over safety in nuclear power plants have been settled, what to do with radioactive wastes is still a question that bothers many people.

A small firm of scientists in California, and the Sandia Laboratories in New Mexico have come up with a promising approach to solving this problem while, at the same time, working on five others that might surprise you.

According to Aqueonics, Inc., the California company, and officials of Sandia, the technology exists to use spent nuclear fuel to virtually eliminate water pollution, cut the cost of making fertilizer, reduce the amount of energy needed to treat waste water, make the recycling of water more feasible and cut in half the cost to our cities of operating sewage treatment plants.

It's been known for quite some time that when you take the water out of sewage and purify it, you can reuse that water. When you disinfect the sewage and extract toxic chemicals, the dried sludge can be used as fertilizer or even as feed for animals. But, the whole process is expensive. Expensive enough that it hasn't found much commercial application so far.

Meanwhile, it's costing more than \$100 per dry ton to get rid of sludge, and we're spending millions trying to dispose of nuclear wastes which, according to scientists, could be put to use solving these other environmental problems.

Cesium 137 is radioactive and makes up about 70% of nuclear fuel waste. Strontium 90 makes up most of the rest and produces great heat. In New Mexico, Sandia scientists are carting batches of city sewage to their laboratories where they use a combination of radiation and heat to process it into a food supplement for cattle. They are testing this supplement side-by-side with a herd that feeds on soy bean meal, the conventional supplement. If their test proves successful, it might lead to widespread use of the sludge as cattle food, thus making it possible to divert the soy bean meal to human uses.

In the city of Morgan Hill, California a demonstration plant should open in a few days which will show how nuclear wastes can effectively purify city waste water so it can be recycled for irrigation and other uses.

But, you ask, if nuclear power plant waste materials have so much potential to remove pollution from water and to turn sewage sludge into fertilizer and animal feed, why aren't they being used extensively now?

Mr. Niel Nielson of the Aqueonics firm says the reason is that government officials--who really could be giving the green light--are fearful of public reaction to the idea of using nuclear wastes.

But, the fact remains, he says, that if we did we could use up these wastes and, in the process, the water and sludge would not themselves become radioactive. The process is safe. In fact, if you sat on top of the sewage treatment plant using the wastes, you'd absorb less radiation than you do sitting in your living room 15 feet from your television set.

Here's one chance where the bureaucrats could help become problem-solvers instead of problem-creators. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "The Hope of Mankind" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Sometimes I think we need to remind ourselves of what it is we're trying to preserve in this country. I'll be right back.

Every once in a while all of us native born Americans should make it a point to have a conversation with one who is an American by choice. It can do a lot to strengthen our resolve to be free for another 200 years.

In a dinner at Mt. Vernon back in revolutionary times, Lafayette turned to his host and said, "General Washington, you Americans, even in war and desperate times have a superb spirit. You are happy and you are confident. Why is it?" Washington answered, "There is freedom, there is space for a man to be alone and think and there are friends who owe each other nothing but affection." So simple an answer and so true.

Now -- 200 years later -- our self respect as a nation has undergone a strain. At times it has seemed as if the symbol of American power has become our departing ambassador, flag under his arm, boarding a rescue helicopter.

But, there is an awful lot of that other America still around. Like beauty, it may be in the eye of the beholder. A few years back a woman who had fled from Poland wrote a letter and said, "Among some of our American born friends it is not fashionable to be enthusiastic about America. There is Viet Nam, drugs, urban and racial conflict, poverty and pollution. Undoubtedly this country faces urgent and serious problems. But we newcomers see not only the problems but also solutions being sought and applied."

She goes on to say, "I love America because people accept me for what I am. They don't question my ancestry, my faith, my political beliefs. When I want to move from one place to another I don't have to ask permission. When I need a needle I go to the nearest store and get one. I don't have to stand in line for hours to buy a piece of tough, fat meat. Even with inflation I don't have to pay a day's earnings for a small chicken.

"I love America because America trusts me. I don't have to show an identity card to buy a pair of shoes. My mail isn't censored and my conversations with friends aren't reported to the secret police."

On July 5th the London Daily Mail filled its editorial page with an article by Ferdinand Mount in which he sharply criticized his fellow Britons and other Europeans who delight in lambasting the U.S. He said, "What the world needs now is more Americans. The U.S. is the first nation on earth deliberately dedicated to letting people choose what they want and giving them a chance to get it. For all its terrible faults, in one sense America still is the last, best hope of mankind, because it spells out so vividly the kind of happiness which most people actually want, regardless of what they are told they ought to want. He concluded by saying, "We criticize, copy, patronize, idolize, insult, but we never doubt that the United States has a unique position in the history of human hopes. For it is the only nation founded solely on a moral dream. A part of our own future is tied up in it and the greatest of all the gifts the Americans have given us is hope."

Thank you Mr. Mount -- we needed that. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

Tagged 10/18/76

RONALD REAGAN

76 - 3A

Generic Promos A, B & C

Programs:

|         | <u>Titles</u>                  | <u>Time</u> |
|---------|--------------------------------|-------------|
| *1.     | The Ford Strike                | 2:36        |
| **2.    | Election Day, November 2, 1976 | 2:52        |
| ***3.   | Vietnam                        | 2:47        |
| ****4.  | Reporters, Sources & Laws      | 2:49        |
| *****5. | The Fate of 14(b)              | 3:00        |
| 6.      | The Speedy Trial Act           | 3:17        |
| —7.     | Welfare                        | 2:53        |

76 - 3B

|    |                             |      |
|----|-----------------------------|------|
| 1. | Running Fence               | 3:20 |
| 2. | "Bread Machine" and Janeway | 2:45 |
| 3. | Soviet TV and America       | 2:44 |
| 4. | Government Forms            | 3:02 |
| 5. | Milton Friedman - #1        | 2:31 |
| 6. | Milton Friedman - #2        | 2:53 |
| 7. | Sweden 1                    | 2:43 |
| 8. | Sweden 2                    | 2:28 |

Please retain your RONALD REAGAN program reprints. Reprints may be xeroxed to meet listener requests for copies of program scripts. Please do not forward these requests to us.

Correspondence from listeners should be forwarded to:

Governor Ronald Reagan  
10960 Wilshire Boulevard - Suite 812  
Los Angeles, California 90024

- \* Should be aired on Monday November 1, 1976
- \*\* Should be aired on Tuesday November 2, 1976
- \*\*\* Should be aired on Wednesday November 3, 1976
- \*\*\*\* Should be aired on Thursday November 4, 1976
- \*\*\*\*\* Should be aired on Friday November 5, 1976



O'Connor Creative Services  
Box 8888, Universal City  
California 91608/(213) 769-3500

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "The Ford Strike" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

The United Auto Workers strike against the Ford Motor Company drove economic indicators down in the crucial closing days of the Presidential campaign. Was the timing of the strike the result of coincidence or calculation? I'll be right back.

All across the United States people have told me that the things they fear most are Big Government, Big Business and Big Labor. Bigness robs the average citizen of his rightful voice. The Big Government official ignores the average voter; the Big Business executive ignores the average stockholder; the Big Labor leader ignores the average union member. Often, these three powers play their own political games, for high and important stakes, as if the rest of us did not exist.

The recent United Auto Workers strike against the Ford Motor Company is a case in point.

At the Democrats' national convention last July, Leonard Woodcock, president of the UAW, was much in evidence as a supporter of Jimmy Carter. And, Jimmy Carter was saying how bad the economy was, even though the economic indicators showed otherwise.

Then, in August, the Republicans nominated President Ford and he countered Carter by insisting that the economy was getting stronger.

In September, Woodcock's UAW struck the Ford Motor Company, and 170,000 auto workers walked away from their jobs. In addition, the jobs of millions of other workers all over the country were threatened as Ford curtailed orders for material and parts.

There had been no immediate strike voted and, judging from the news media coverage of the start of the strike, it was hard to find any workers who supported it. They had, after all, just begun to make back what they had lost in the previous year's recession, and they wanted to keep working.

Leonard Woodcock, it seemed, had ignored the wishes of his union members and engineered a massive strike. Why?

I don't know the answer for sure. Perhaps only Mr. Woodcock knows. But I can certainly document political coincidences.

Jimmy Carter said the economy was weak. Gerald Ford said the economy was strong. Mr. Woodcock supported Mr. Carter. In September the auto strike began--the strike the workers apparently didn't want. By mid-October the Federal Reserve Board had to report that the nation's industrial output had failed to grow in September for the first time in 18 months, as a direct result of the strike.

Coincidence or calculation? You be the judge. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.



RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Election Day, November 2, 1976" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

The one thing you can be certain of on election day is that there will be a lot of predictions. I'll be right back.

Before the day is out we'll have heard predictions from every corner. Candidates--from alderman to President--will be predicting victory. City and county clerks will predict record turnouts (probably low ones this year), and the three television networks will be predicting the national winners just as the polls close in the east, and three hours before they close on the Pacific Coast.

That much, like death and taxes, is a certainty. But what of the significance of the voter turnout? For months, newspaper editorialists and television commentators have joined various political pundits and civic-minded types in deploring the probable low turnout. We are told that as few as 46 per cent of the nation's eligible voters will go to the polls to elect a President and Vice President, a new House of Representatives, one-third of the U.S. Senate, many state legislators and scores of local officials.

In recent months the idea has come in vogue of putting a line on the ballot marked "none of the above". But, other than its ironic comment on the low esteem to which politicians seem to have fallen, any serious push for that kind of option on the ballot is really a copout.

It says, in effect, that neither candidate is good enough for my vote, so serve me up some better ones. Well, that says something else, too. It says that the person expressing such thoughts wasn't interested enough in the democratic processes of our nation to get out and have an effect on the original selection.

Imperfect though it may be, our system for selecting candidates is still probably the best in the world, as thousands of grass-roots participants in both major parties can tell you. They may lose by the time they get to their national convention, but at least they go down swinging. They know they may not win by participating, but they're sure they won't if they don't.

Now, some of those who have been wringing their hands about low voter turnout cling to the notion that if only we can make it easier to register, we'll add sharply to the number of registered voters and these new voters will then go to the polls. That's a myth, and now that there is some postcard registration. I think the hand-wringers are going to be wringing their hands at the results. Postcard registration isn't going to make a person better informed or more highly motivated to study candidates' records and promises, let alone complicated ballot measures such as bond issues.

Yes, it takes a little work to be a voter. It takes some planning to get to the polls or send for an absentee ballot. And it takes some active use of our gray matter--and maybe at least an evenings reading of the sample ballot and discussion with relatives or friends--to arrive at decisions. That's a small price to pay for freedom. In fact, it's probably the best bargain in the world today. If you haven't already, I hope you'll pay your "dues" today. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Vietnam" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

A soft but ugly sound is beginning to filter through the bamboo curtain surrounding what once was free South Vietnam. I'll be right back.

More than a year ago on one of these broadcasts, I said a curtain of silence was falling over Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos as the conquering communists established their rule. At the same time I predicted that one day sound would filter through the curtain of silence. We would learn piece by piece the story of what had happened to people whose only sin was a yearning for freedom and human dignity.

The time has come. When the wind blows in from the west across the Pacific one has the feeling that it carries the sound of soft moaning such as we once heard when an East wind blew across Dachau, Belsen, Auschwitz. Perhaps one day soon we'll add other names to those symbols of horror, names easier to pronounce -- NV16, L17.6 -- the communists are very practical.

North Vietnam call their camps "Trai Cai Tao", which means "re-education camps." The South Vietnamese call them "Trai Tap Trung" which means concentration camp.

Just as in that earlier time the horror story is beginning to come to us piece by piece from escapees, refugees whose loved ones have disappeared into the camps and now and then a European Journalist.

It's still far from complete but some where between 200 and 300,000 South Vietnamese are being purified in the "re-education camps". The picture is one of inhuman, hard labor, starvation ration's, disease and little or no medical care. And of course, there is stern discipline we can call torture for short.

Our own returned P.O.W.'s are familiar with what that torture might be. There is kneeling on a hard surface until it becomes agony. Also, being beaten while you are kneeling. Some placed in metal boxes which we probably left behind. They are cargo containers we called covexes.

The idea is that with the prisoner in the sealed metal box, his captors beat on the metal sides with clubs until the din for the man inside becomes excruciating. Former army Captain Ngo Dinh Ly escaped this summer after undergoing this torture. He says it can drive a man insane.

In the line of work there is clearing mine fields in which many die, but then what's a life if a mine is eliminated. A job reserved for soft city dwellers or people of some education is making fertilizer by mixing soil and human excrement with your bare hands. This can be fatal too because no soap is provided for washing and you must eat with your bare hands. Dysentery is wide spread and often fatal.

North Vietnam wants admission to the UN.N. We vetoed their request. Now a North Vietnamese official says confidently the veto was due to our election. They'll try again after November 2nd. He's confident they'll be admitted then. I hope he's wrong. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Reporters, Sources & Laws" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Do some reporters answer to a higher calling than us ordinary mortals and should they take the law into their own hands? I'll be right back.

Twice in recent months, issues involving news reporters and the law have themselves made headlines. The cases had something in common and they tend to show that the media may have a blind spot when it comes to reporting the doings of their colleagues.

The most celebrated of the cases involved Danil Schorr, the CBS Washington correspondent who received a copy of Congress' CIA investigation report which Congress -- at the President's request -- had voted to withhold from publication till certain national security secrets could be removed or protected.

Schorr, whose later public statements involved a great deal of high-toned rhetoric, decided that he must obey at once a higher authority than either Congress or the President. Using as a front a so-called "reporters' committee", Schorr passed the pilfered report to New York's Village Voice which used it and then basked in the subsequent furor.

Schorr was placed on leave by CBS. (He later left their employ, but is plenty busy these days on the lecture circuit.) The House Ethics committee investigated the matter and recently concluded that it would not punish Schorr, though it apparently did consider several possible actions.

What is most significant about all the coverage by the news media of the Schorr affair is that the central figure in the matter was so successful in diverting attention away from the question of whether or not he should have published a pilfered document which legally constituted authorities were holding for legitimate purposes -- and diverting it to the question of who had leaked the document to him and whether he should reveal that source. This shift very deftly caused the news media to leap to Schorr's defense, for no self-respecting journalist would favor forcing a colleague to divulge a source. There was scarcely no discussion publicly of the other question.

In Fresno, California, something similar happened. Four reporters were sent to jail. They had received a leaked grand jury report and published it in their newspaper.

The news media raised a rumpus. Editorial writers thundered about the right and responsibility of reporters to protect their sources. Indeed, if this were the only issue, they would have been right, for protection of sources is essential to maintaining a free press. But I followed that case closely in the media and I cannot recall hearing or reading a single word about the propriety of those reporters publishing a grand jury report that, under law, was secret. The reason for keeping such reports secret prior to any indictments is to protect the rights of the citizens involved.

Reporters should protect their sources alright, but should they play God? This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "The Fate of 14(b)" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

When it comes to being forced to join a labor union, most Americans are mavericks. I'll be right back.

It's too early to tell whether there will be a major push in Congress next year to repeal Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, but it's safe to say there will be plenty of discussion of the subject in the coming months.

Section 14(b) is the provision that permits the individual states to pass so-called right-to-work laws; laws which ban compulsory union membership. Today, 20 states have right-to-work laws, including all the Southern states (which may account partly for the South's attractiveness to industry in recent years).

National labor hierarchies in general, and the AFL-CIO's George Meany in particular have railed against Section 14(b) for years and have demanded its repeal. I, for one, favor each state's right to make its own decision in the matter. What's good for the goose, may not be best for the gander. My own state, California, decided against right-to-work a number of years ago when the late William F. Knowland was overwhelmingly defeated for governor, campaigning for right-to-work.

This year, the two major party platforms took opposite courses. The Republicans favored retention of 14(b). The Democrats went along with George Meany's wishes and called for repeal. But, if anyone tells you that organized labor is solidly behind the idea of repealing Section 14(b), don't you believe it.

Earlier this year, the Opinion Research Corporation issued the results of a very revealing national poll it had conducted.

Overall, 75 percent of the national sample agreed that a worker in industry should be able to "hold a job whether or not he belongs to a union." Even union families registered 56 percent agreement on this point. Significantly, young people -- 18-to-29 years of age -- registered the highest score in agreement, 82 percent. And, that may spell trouble for the compulsory unionism advocates in the years ahead.

The researchers also asked people if they favored keeping Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act. Nationally, 68 percent said "yes". Among union members it was even 62 percent. Among the age groups, the 18-to-29 year olds again had the highest percentage of agreement, 73, but no group fell below 60 percent.

And, as pollsters do, the Opinion Research people came around the other way to cross-check their other questions. They asked those interviewed if they believed that "employees who do not want to be represented by a labor union should have the right to bargain for themselves."

This time, 71 percent nationally said they agreed. Among union members, 52 percent agreed, and young people agreed by a whopping 80 percent.

If the union members of the new Congress read that survey, they may decide that it's better to leave the whole matter just where it is now -- in the laps of the state legislatures. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.



RONALD REAGAN

(Réprint of a Radio Broadcast entitled "The Speedy Trial Act"

Commentary by Ronald Reagan).

Congress, in its desire to solve a problem, sometimes passes bills that create new problems. I'll be right back.

A basic principle of our system of criminal justice is that a defendant has a right to a speedy trial. As crime rates have gone up, court calendars have become more crowded. In some parts of the country, it may take months for a case to come to trial.

So, Congress passed the Speedy Trial Act which requires that a defendant in a federal court must be released from custody if he has not been brought to trial within 90 days of his arrest.

Sounds reasonable, and in most cases it is. But there are exceptions that can cause serious problems. Chief Justice Warren Burger explained it this way in a recent speech: "A bill which emerged as the Speedy Trial Act was introduced some years ago, and on every occasion it was submitted to the Judicial Conference of the United States it was unanimously disapproved. Of course, that was not because speedy trials were disapproved (of), but because we had already developed our own speedy trial rule (Rule 50 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure).....

"We opposed the legislation," he continued, "because we were apprehensive that the rigidities it contained would lead to unfortunate consequences, particularly in those cases that, by their nature, do not lend themselves to trial in 90 or even 180 days or into any such inflexible patterns. It does not seem unreasonable to me that judges should be thought to be as capable of drafting sound rules of management as the Congress is capable of making rules for its internal affairs and procedures..."

"The bill became law, and even with the deferral of the effective dates of some of its provisions, the cost to date has been about \$5 million..... One specific, concrete example of what we feared has now come to pass, and it is worth noting."--UNQUOTE

It certainly is worth noting. It is the case of United States versus Tirasso, involving two foreign nationals who had been arrested and indicted for attempting to smuggle drugs into the U.S. They were not brought to trial within 90 days and, when the federal district court refused to release them, they went to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals to invoke the Speedy Trial Act. The court had no choice but to let them go. I quote from its ruling:

"We are fully aware of the dangers inherent in today's decision. The charges against these defendants are serious. We are not dealing with a haphazard attempt by amateurs to run the border with a small quantity of controlled substance, but rather with a sophisticated enterprise for importing wholesale quantities of dangerous drugs...the value of the 20 kilogram shipment alleged in the indictment was estimated between 500 and 600 thousand dollars. The government's case...alleges a series of six such transactions involving these two appellants. (One) has been identified as 'the head of a huge organization responsible for sending large quantities of cocaine into the United States.'.....

"In light of these facts, the wisdom of the result Congress has decreed is questionable. We release a man alleged to be the head of a foreign criminal organization dedicated to the smuggling of large quantities of illegal drugs, so that he may quickly cross the border and resume operating his business. We are also releasing his alleged right-hand man, as if to make certain that the enterprise continues to operate at top efficiency. But this result is the only one open to us under the plain terms of the statute."--UNQUOTE

The court's prediction came true. One day after he was released, the principal defendant fled across the border to Mexico. It's time that Congress took another look--thorough look--at its Speedy Trial Act. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Welfare" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

A news item about welfare foolishness has brought back some campaign memories I'd like to share with you. I'll be right back.

The other day a news item told of a woman on Aid To Dependent Children who came into \$14,544 cash through an accident claim. On the advise of welfare workers, she went on a six week spending spree to get rid of the money so she could remain eligible for welfare.

That brought to mind an example I cited during the primary campaigns of a Chicago woman who was reported to be receiving welfare under 80 different names at 30 different addresses. Even though the story had been widely carried in the press, campaigns being what they are, I would run into cynics who thought I'd padded the story for private purposes.

Well thanks to the chief investigative reporter of the Chicago Tribune, I can verify and update my story, and it won't do anything for the image of welfare workers who tried to hush the story up. They had been testing controls which they said made welfare fraud a minor problem when the "welfare queen", as she's now called, suddenly burst on the scene.

It all started with a reported theft of \$18,000 in jewels and furs. Two Chicago detectives ended up arresting the robbery victim for filing a false police report. Apparently there had been no robbery. But, their investigation had turned up in the victims plush apartment bundles of public aid checks and records. When they reported their findings to the public aid office, officials there passed the buck to the States Attorney Office, he shoved it off on the Attorney General who promptly told the detective to take it up with the Feds. The Feds didn't want it at all so the detective told his story to the Chicago Tribune. Be grateful for a free press -- it made the front page.

A State Senator, chairman of the advisory committee on public aid, termed the case unbelievable and put two fraud investigators on it. They stated, "We could spend the rest of our lives checking out all the cases on her, but it would be worth doing because she's taught us every possible loop-hole in the welfare regulations.

I said I would up date my story of 80 names and 30 addresses. Here goes! The trail extends through 14 states. She has used 127 names, posed as a mother of 14 children at one time, 7 at another, signed up twice with the same case worker in 4 days and once while on welfare passed as an open heart surgeon complete with office. She has 50 social security numbers and 50 addresses in Chicago alone, plus an untold number of telephones. She also claims to be the widow -- let's make that plural -- of 2 naval officers who were killed in action. Now the Department of Agriculture is looking into the massive number of food stamps she's been collecting. She has 3 new cars, a full length mink coat, and her take is estimated at a million dollars!

I wish this had a happy ending, but the public aid office, according to the news story, refuses to cooperate. She's still collecting welfare checks she can use to build up her defense fund. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Running Fence" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Would a piece of white nylon in the ocean disrupt the environment. Not likely, but it caused a furor in California. I'll be right back.

It was only up for two weeks in September, but thousands of Americans saw it from automobiles (and a few from airplanes), and probably millions more saw it on the evening news. It was called "Running Fence", and that's just what it was: a white nylon fence, designed by the Bulgarian-born artist Christo Javacheff (YA-VA-CHEFF). It snaked its way westward for twenty-four-and-a-half miles over the gentle farmland of Northern California's Marin and Sonoma Counties to the headlands above the Pacific Ocean. There, it dipped down and disappeared beneath the waves.

Christo, who sold two-and-a-half-million dollars worth of his own drawings and sculpture to pay for building and taking down his "Running Fence", is what is called a "conceptual" artist. Last year, he strung a bright nylon drapery across a canyon in Colorado and draped several miles of Australian cliffs. People will argue whether all of this is "art". And, though I didn't see "Running Fence", some who did tell me it was a beautiful sight.

While the artistic arguments go on, most can agree it was an impressive job of engineering. It took some 400 workers to erect the more than 2,000 steel poles that held 165,000 yards of nylon. Christo had to go through 17 public hearings and a 450-page environmental impact report. The legal tangle, including three sessions with the state Supreme Court, involved more than \$300,00 in legal fees.

Two weeks after it went up, "Running Fence" began coming down. "This is the secret of the fence," he said. "It goes up like the mysterious black tents of the Sahara nomads and comes down again. We give the poles, the wire the fabric to the ranchers (some 59 landowners had given permission for it to cross their land). The land returns to its original state. The fence exists only in memories and in a film and a book being made of the project," --UNQUOTE.

That's not the way the California Coastal Commission sees it though. They were the only group which refused Christo permission to build his fence. They had commanded him to stop the fence 1,00 yards inland from the ocean -- the width of their jurisdiction.

Christo ignored them on the grounds that his fence wouldn't damage anything and would be gone two weeks later. So upset were the commissioners, though, that even as the fence was being dismantled, they sued for damages.

Some other states are considering establishing coastal commissions such as California's. It was created in 1972 by a statewide ballot initiative. Its purpose was to prevent California's thousand-mile coast from being harmfully overdeveloped. In the process, the Commission gained control over virtually all private property within 1,000 yards of the coast. It has the power to tell landowners what they may or may not do with their own land, but it does not have powers of eminent domain to acquire and pay for the land and, of course, it leaves the taxpaying to the owners.

Some of the Commission's decisions have been sound ones; others have been worthy of comic opera bureaucrats. One, reported recently in a San Francisco newspaper, was a ruling that the owner of a beach house who had leveled the sand dunes in front of his house could have a retroactive permit to do so, provided he first restore the dunes to the way they were before he leveled them! And, speaking of fences, the Commission debated for 30 minutes recently on the color a land-owner should paint his fence. They finally decided it should be "neutral". So much for sanity-by-the-sea in California. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "'Bread Machine' and Janeway"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan).

When it comes to basic economics, personal and general, there are two slim volumes out that may tell you more than a shelf full of college texts. I'll be right back.

Not quite two years ago, I first read The Incredible Bread Machine. It made a lot of sense. It gets right down to the basics of our economic system. But, instead of being a dry recitation of theory, it is a bright, witty, fast-paced account written by a group of young people--some of them previously radical in their politics--who has set out to find out for themselves just what our private enterprise system was all about.

Working under the auspices of the World Research Institute in San Diego, California, they produced a small book that has become a best-seller many times over. Now, it has been made into a popular motion picture and a television special, too.

The Incredible Bread Machine is as good a primer on economics for young people as I've ever seen, but it's also a great "refresher course" for anyone in business or in public life. Read it and you'll appreciate anew the genius of our system. In fact, I wish every elected official in America would read it. We just might get better government if they did.

More recently, I've been reading another slender volume, a new one, that is also packed with useful basic information. This one would be excellent reading for any young man or woman about to go out to tackle the world on their own. It's called Musings on Money and it's by that seasoned observer of the political and economic scenes, Eliot Janeway.

Musings on Money has aphorisms, axioms and anecdotes. It is good-humored and provides plenty of food for thought about work, pleasure, money and the state of the world. Here are some samples:

Janeway says, "Like it or not, believe it or not--money is the root of all success."

And, "Your feelings about money reflect your feelings about yourself...Learning to think objectively about money is the key to making yourself free."

Here's one worth thinking about: QUOTE--"The choice of a lifestyle in any part of the country is only as free as the ability to finance it. Finding the money to enjoy a lifestyle--whether in a big city or the great outdoors--is a critical part of that lifestyle."--UNQUOTE

Janeway advocates middle-income earners forcing themselves to save. He says, "First you need a savings fund of at least six months' after-tax income to protect yourself against emergencies. On top of that, you need to put enough money together for investment or speculation. Building a reserve of \$10,000 is a good beginning."--UNQUOTE

Now, that may sound impossible to anyone who has trouble staying ahead of inflation, but Janeway makes a good point when he says you can begin on a small scale by withholding some money from your paycheck and putting it away before you pay the bills. It's all a matter of getting in the habit.

Musings on Money has advice on charitable contributions, insurance, buying bargains, owning land--and a good deal more. Much of what Eliot Janeway writes might come under the heading of "good old-fashioned horse sense"; some may seem completely new. In either case, it's good reading.

This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.



RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Soviet TV and America" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

What television series comes in nine installments, has 80 million viewers and you won't be able to see it? I'll be right back.

Unless you're headed for Moscow soon, you won't get a chance to see Soviet television's latest special -- really a super-special, since it involves a series of nine programs.

It is a Communist's-eye view of America in her Bicentennial and Presidential election year. And, it's called "America in the '70's."

Commentator Valentin (VALEN-TEEN) Zorin (ZOE-EEN) and a Soviet television crew wandered at will about the United States. (A U.S. television crew in the USSR would find a good part of the land off-limits and would have a hard time shaking the Intourist guides in the approved areas.)

Zorin, not surprisingly, quotes from Karl Marx and saw the U.S. as the Kremlin would like its subjects to see it.

New York City, Zorin noted, has--QUOTE--"all the problems that are tearing American apart--crime, unemployment, pollution, racial prejudice and crumbling cities."--UNQUOTE.

Problems we have, but it will come as a surprise to most of you that our country is coming apart at the seams. Whether or not one likes New York City (and we know its financial problems are huge and were caused by mismanagement and bad political decisions)--it is hard to visit there without being impressed by its strength. It has assimilated countless immigrants--not a few of them from Mr. Zorin's Communist paradise--and it still builds upward with a frenzy that suggests that, despite its problems, plenty of people there have faith in the future.

Zorin's comments about other cities have a lot of that quaint Marxist quality about them, too. Chicago, he says, is a center of capitalist exploitation that to an industrial worker who has his kids in college, two cars in the garage, and a camper in the driveway.

Standing by the Hudson River, Zorin makes his last comment, and it's a lulu. "America," he says, "has accumulated many riches, but have these riches made the people any happier, any more confident of their future? No they haven't, because the riches of a few can't bring happiness to the whole of society, because money can't replace justice, spiritual happiness, joys of human warmth, great ideals or noble aims."--UNQUOTE.

This television series is probably all that most Soviet citizens will ever see of America. It might as well have been titled "Uncle Valentin's Fairy Tales of America", for if it were true it is hard to believe that Alexander Solzhenytsyn and thousands of others would have wanted to trade their Communist paradise for what we have to offer. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Government Forms" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Congress has just passed a new tax reform bill. I don't think it will be greeted by dancing in the streets. I'll be right back.

More than 200 years ago, we said of George III, "He has sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance." I wonder what the Founding Fathers would say about the modern day swarm who harass and eat of our substance?

I know I've talked to you before in broad, general terms about the "blizzard of paper" we are asked (demanded is a better word) to send to Washington. The other day, I was reading a roundup of stories about individual victims of the paper blizzard. And then I read of the final passage and signing into law of the tax reform bill. It is five inches thick (1500 pages) and economists who have studied it say that they don't understand it. Happy next April to us all! The one thing we should understand is the Congress, which talked for so long about helping the taxpayers by reforming the system has helped itself in this reform to an additional 1.6 billion dollars.

The National Chamber of Commerce has done some research on the paper blizzard and finds that, of the 20 reports most frequently demanded by Washington, 13 are by the Internal Revenue Service. Next in line is O.S.H.A. -- the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. The Chamber was trying to help the Commission on Paperwork which is supposed to be eliminating red tape.

Not only does the I.R.S. have the most forms; theirs also take the most time and effort to fill out. By coincidence, I.R.S. is the only agency exempt from any effort to reduce or simplify its paperwork.

The Chamber found the citizenry in almost the same revolutionary mood our ancestors were in 200 years ago. One businessman in the Northwest told of providing a 74-page report in 1973 for the Equal Employment Opportunity inspector who personally visited his plant. In 1974, a second inspector refused to accept the report approved by his predecessor but finally settled for 145 pages. You are probably already ahead of me on this one -- yes, in 1975, a new inspector refused to accept the program until the report reached 395 pages.

The same news source told of a banker who filled out a form writing "none" where that was the appropriate answer. The form, with its six required copies, was returned to be redone, using a zero where the word "none" appeared.

A Midwest manufacturer reports he can only spend half his time running his business. The rest of the time, he's doing government paperwork.

A small engineering firm completed 1,342 state and federal forms in one year. On a five-day-a-week basis, that's more than five forms to be filled out every working day.

I'm not advocating an overthrow of the government by force and violence. But, isn't it time to buttonhole our Congressmen when they come weekend home? Let's ask them for proof that these reports do anything more than provide jobs for a bunch of bureaucratic paper shufflers. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Broadcast entitled "Milton Friedman - #1"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan).

The Nobel Prize for Economics was recently awarded to Professor Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago. Let's see why he deserves it. I'll be right back.

Every so often the recognition that individual enterprise is better than government interference comes from a surprising source. So it was with this year's Nobel Prize for Economics. The Swedish Royal Academy of Science awarded the economics prize to Professor Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago, a lifelong advocate of individual liberty and the free enterprise system.

The prize is also, however, for his ideas and beliefs, and I'm sure that Professor Friedman would be the first to say we were remiss to honor him personally without recognizing the importance and value of what he stands for.

Apparently, the Swedish Royal Academy recognized this. We are told that the award followed an unprecedented and heated two-hour debate among the members of the Nobel committee. No one can seriously question Professor Friedman's character of intellect, so they must have been debating his ideas. And, to the Swedes who, for 43 years, have lived with Socialism, free enterprise must indeed seem a strange and fearful idea.

To those of us raised on it, however, free enterprise is hardly fearful and is much more than an idea. It is the economic mechanism by which the United States, in only 150 years as a nation, achieved the highest standard and quality of living in the world. And despite constant assaults from Socialism and the ever-increasing constraints of government regulation, the free enterprise system in America remains the chief protection for individual liberty and the best hope for future national progress.

The Swedes apparently became quite emotional over the selection of a free enterprise advocate. And yet, Professor Friedman's advocacy is not based upon emotion. It is based upon a lifetime of sound, scientific research and analysis, a body of scientific work which the Nobel committee, in good conscience, could no longer overlook. The Swedish Royal Academy of Science deserves congratulations for its recognition of Professor Friedman, his work and his ideas.

Next time I'll explore some of these ideas and how they affect our daily lives.

This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Broadcast entitled "Milton Friedman - #2"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan).

Nobel Prize winner Milton Friedman's latest book is titled There's No Such Thing As A Free Lunch. He's absolutely right and, I might add, government serves the most expensive meal in town. I'll be right back.

Last month Professor Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago was awarded the Nobel Prize for Economics. In making the award, the Swedish Royal Academy of Science chose to honor a lifelong advocate of free enterprise capitalism and individual liberty.

That it did so is a credit to the wisdom and integrity of the Swedish Royal Academy.

That it felt obliged to do so is a much greater credit to the wisdom and integrity of Professor Friedman and to the virtue of his ideas.

Professor Friedman was born in Brooklyn in 1912 of immigrant parents. He was schooled in economics at Rutgers, the University of Chicago and Columbia, and he has had an extraordinarily full and honored academic career.

But Professor Friedman is no cloistered academician. He has involved himself in rigorous and constant analysis of the real world, the every day world of our getting-and-spending, and his thinking is important to all of us as we struggle to maintain our liberties and our standard of living.

Here, for instance, is his analysis of inflation.--QUOTE--"Inflation is always and everywhere a monetary phenomenon...The basic source of inflation is faster growth in the quantity of money than in output."--UNQUOTE Now, we know the government controls how much money is printed. So government--not business or labor or the consumer--is the only force that can produce inflation, and for politicians to pretend differently is gross deception.

And, here is Professor Friedman on corporation taxes. "The elementary fact is that 'business' does not and cannot pay taxes. Only people pay taxes. Corporation officials may sign the check, but the money that they forward to Internal Revenue comes from the corporation's employees, customers or stockholders."--UNQUOTE Politicians who advocate higher business taxes are really hiding the fact that they mean to raise the taxes of all of us as employees, consumers and stockholders.

Professor Friedman is usually referred to as a "monetarist". But his basic belief is not in money; it is in people and their inherent right and ability to choose. He envisions a world in which individuals have the widest possible variety of choices as to how they will live; a world in which government restricts those choices only to the degree necessary to make society safe.

As an economist and as a man, Professor Friedman certainly enhances the Nobel Prize as much as the prize enhances him. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.



RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Sweden 1" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Why don't we take warning from what has happened in other countries before we get as deep in the swamp as they are. I'll be right back.

When the English pound went into decline, every fraction of a penny loss in value was and is reported each day in all the media. Not so widely heralded are the words of the socialist Prime Minister of England who has been betraying socialist gospel and doing penance. Having taken the "Right little, tight little Isle" down the road to a socialist Utopia, which turned out to be a crooked palster, quonset hut with a double mortgage, unemployed tenants and a roof blown off by inflation, the present leader of the labor, socialist party is calling on private enterprise and the free market place for help.

Then there is Sweden, the socialist show place. They have lived for some 40 years according to the gospel of Karl Marx. In any argument about the short coming or merits of Socialism, our own liberals would fall back on Sweden citing its high standards of living, lack of unemployment, and general economic health. About any of us who don't trust socialism could come back with, was the element of free enterprise Sweden still allowed to exist. We'd say that was really what kept Sweden afloat but it wasn't a satisfactory argument because they'd say that was the kind of socialism they wanted for America. Come to think of it, we're pretty well on our way to that kind of mix right now.

Maybe we'll be saved in spite of ourselves if the British Prime Minister will keep talking and if we'll pay a little heed to the recent election in Sweden. If we ask why -- why after 40 years did the Swedes vote the socialist government out and the conservatives in.

Maybe a motion picture director can help us understand. Ingmar Bergman, virtually a national hero in Sweden and pretty popular with movie goers in our own country wants to leave Sweden and live in America. He has good reason. His government charged him with tax avoidance. The government wants him to pay taxes of \$1.39 on every dollar he earns. That's kind of a losing proposition. Ingmar just handed them his fortune and walked away with only his talent.

Swedens average man earns \$8,800 a year and pays \$3520 of that in tax. His boss pays \$2200 for social security dues and payroll tax.

To try and curb the 10% inflation rate, the government passed a new tax law last year that made the rate for those earning \$33,000--102%. A Distinguished author wrote a fairy tale which ended with her supposedly stealing money from the national treasury to pay the 102% tax on her royalty for the book plus something to live on.

The Secretary of Finance told parliament, "taxation was none of her business." Now they've had an election and there's a new Secretary of Finance.

Tomorrow I'll tell you some other things in Swedens socialism that made them vote as the did. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Sweden 2" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Yesterday I talked about Swedens tax policies as something that might have had something to do with the recent election. I'll be right back.

Whenever government tries to do things that aren't properly governments province, the people pay in the loss of freedom and individual rights. Yesterday I told you about Swedens tax policies which ranged from 40% of the average workers income to more than 100% of earnings above \$33,000. I suggested this might have had something to do with the recent election when Swedens 40 years of socialism were repudiated by the voters.

But it wasn't just money in my opinion. Socialism exact a price for dearer than money. In an effort to ease the tax burden, the people of Sweden have resorted to barter. A dentist or doctor needing a few house repairs will exchange treatment for carpenter or plumbing work with a patient skilled in those crafts. The shoe merchant and the grocer trade in each others stock. Government, of course, responded. The Secretary of Justice took the position that crimes against society are more dastardly than crimes against individuals. In other words it's worse to be a tax dodger than a thief or a burgler. So under this philosophy and with government's nature tendency to invoke emergency as an excuse, Swedens civil liberties began to erode.

A law was passed to "rescue evidence in taxation cases". Tax authorities suddenly had the right to search any office or factory at any time without offering the usual evidence necessary to get a warrant. They did get a court order to search private dwellings but the citizen is not notified he's under suspicion nor is he warned of the coming of the tax authorities.

Professional privacy -- the traditional relationship between doctor and patient no longer exists where the tax police are concerned. In one case which fortunately got wide publicity, the tax police not only checked a doctor's files, they then went through the files of thousands of patients back through the years.

Maybe it's time for us to ask if we are still safe in our books and records -- one of the basic rights we fought for in the American Revolution. Internal Revenue doesn't think so and certainly there is violation of the private relationship between banker and depositor where questions of income tax are concerned.

It was probably the indignity of government invading their privacy more than the actual tax burden that prompted the people of Sweden to vote against 40 years of Socialist rule. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

Tape 11/2/76

RONALD REAGAN

Disc 76 - 4

Side A

|                           |                        |      |
|---------------------------|------------------------|------|
| *Generic Promos A, B, & C |                        |      |
| 1.                        | Diamond Lanes          | 2:47 |
| 2.                        | Tax Reform I           | 2:55 |
| 3.                        | Tax Reform II          | 2:31 |
| 4.                        | Hoover's American Plan | 2:59 |
| 5.                        | Africa                 | 3:15 |
| **6.                      | Freedom Train          | 2:50 |
| 7.                        | Glomar Explorer        | 2:55 |

Side B

|    |   |              |
|----|---|--------------|
| 1. | Katyn Forest                              | 3:06         |
| 2. | Big Government and the Cities             | 2:31         |
| 3. | San Francisco                             | 3:16         |
| 4. | Berkeley's Street Tax                     | 2:55         |
| 5. | The Politics of the Federal<br>Government | 3:15<br>2:25 |
| 6. | The Alaska Gas Pipeline                   |              |
| 7. | The Communes                              | 3:15         |
| 8. | New Directions                            | 2:45         |

\* Please note that these promos contain new material.

\*\* This program is to be aired on Thanksgiving Day, November 25, 1976.

Programming note: each program on the Ronald Reagan discs should be aired in order for your station to remain on schedule with the series.

Please retain your program reprints. Reprints may be xeroxed to meet listener requests for copies of program scripts.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled DIAMOND LANES - Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

There are always plenty of government Goliaths ready to bully us into living the way they want us to. Fortunately, we still have a few freedom-loving Davids around to out them in their places. Here is a modern David-and-Goliath story that took place recently in Los Angeles, where I live and work. It is a classic example of how government can become an arrogant bully, and an equally classic example of how a few courageous citizens, armed with a knowledge of their rights, can put the bully to flight.

Goliath in this case was the State of California, of which I used to be Governor. It seems that my successor doesn't like automobiles or freeways, so last March he closed two lanes, one each way, on the Los Angeles-to-Santa Monica Freeway. He had big diamond markings painted on those two lanes and decreed that during rush hours only buses and cars carrying three or more persons could operate in them.

This 25 percent reduction in the carrying capacity of the state's busiest freeway was designed to reduce gasoline consumption and air pollution, and thus to enhance the environment. But no one bothered to study the facts. People in Los Angeles who work close to each other don't often live close to each other, and the city is so spread out that it seems to take half a day to get anywhere by bus. So the program caused cars to jam the remaining lanes of the freeway and spill on to the adjacent surface streets. Accident rates, fuel consumption and air pollution all rose. Buses ran empty down the otherwise vacant diamond lanes. Ninety thousand free bus tickets were passed out; 315 were used. To demonstrate the absurdity of the program, enterprising youths stood at freeway entrances and offered themselves as instant carpools at one dollar a head.

The people of Los Angeles organized protest groups. The City and County of Los Angeles pleaded with the State to end the program. But the State refused to listen. It knew better, and the people of Los Angeles would just have to learn to do what the State knew was right.

Enter "David", a small, non-profit public interest law firm called the Pacific Legal Foundation. Its attorneys filed suit to end the Diamond Lane program because the State had not properly assessed the program's environmental impact. And, they proved they were right. In 11 days of carefully prepared and thoroughly documented testimony, they proved that the program had actually deteriorated, not enhanced the environment, and that the State, in its haste to impose its will had neglected to get the public input required by law for any such program.

On August 9th the court issued a permanent injunction to stop the Diamond Lane program. Normal traffic resumed on the Santa Monica Freeway, and Goliath crawled back into his State Capital bureaucracy to nurse his wounds. But we who live in California are glad to know that the next time he comes out the Pacific Legal Foundation will be ready for him. You can fight City Hall..you can even fight the State House and that's good to know.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled TAX REFORM I - Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

When is tax reform not tax reform? When it's a tax increase, and we've just had one.

In this election season we've been told the income tax structure is a disgrace; that it falls heavily on some and provides loopholes for others. Well, the income tax is a disgrace, but not necessarily for the reason I've just given. It costs all of us too much because government costs too much. It is so complicated even the person of modest earnings must get legal or professional help to find out how much he or she owes each April 15th. And the Internal Revenue Service employees can't help us because they don't understand the rules and regulations either.

A man in Atlanta, Georgia took all of his records to the Internal Revenue Service office, where the staff on duty at the time worked out a final figure on what he owed the government. He then took the same records to the I.R.S. office in Rome, Georgia, where he got a different answer. More than a little curious by this time, he crossed state lines with these same records, visiting all in all five different I.R.S. offices. He wound up with five different answers as to how much he should send the government. I hope he paid the lowest amount. Maybe to play safe he added them up and divided by five.

We need tax reform that will simplify the process of finding out how much tax to pay. Ah! But haven't we just had a tax reform? Well, in a way, yes! What else can you call 1,500 pages of new income tax laws, a book five inches thick? If we are honest, we'll call what's just been cooked up by Congress a tax increase, because the government is going to get \$1.6 billion more than it was getting under the old rules.

It is true most of the increase will come from income on investments, which means there will be less investment and therefore slower economic growth, fewer jobs and less income to tax down the road away. The new tax reform, 1500 pages, has been studied by some pretty sound economists who claim they can't understand it. So tax reform turns out to be no tax cut for any, a tax raise for some and more headaches for all.

Oh yes, about those loopholes. It's time we recognized this as the big, perennial fairy tale it really is. About 60% of total deductions are non-taxed Social Security payments, pension income and unemployment insurance, plus the \$750.00 exemption we all take for ourselves and our family. On top of that comes the standard non-itemized deduction the average earner takes, interest on mortgage payments, medical costs, local and state taxes and contributions to church and charity. Actually 95% of all income tax deductions, the so-called loopholes, are taken by people of average income or less. We still need tax reform.



RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled TAX REFORM II - Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Yesterday I talked about tax reform that wasn't tax reform. Now hear where some of your tax money is going.

The other day a news story caught my eye and in case you missed it, here are the highlights. We all are familiar with that curved glass building on the Hudson in New York City, the modern tower of Babel where the U.N. delegates toil so much and produce so little. But I was surprised and maybe you will be, too, to learn there are some 10,000 U.N. employees in what is called the United Nation's European Headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland.

I know it's customary to give some bonus or extra pay to overseas personnel, but I always thought that was to compensate for the hardship of living in primitive or unattractive areas, climatewise, etc. Geneva, Switzerland hardly qualifies as such. Let me assure you the 10,000 U.N. employees there are not exactly under-privileged.

Messengers who push a cart through the corridors doling out inter-office mail receive \$413.00 a week. According to the news story, a press officer who serves as liaison with the "German speaking press" gets \$1,000 a week. Secretaries struggle along on \$350.00 and junior executives draw \$555.00.

All 10,000 get at least six weeks paid vacation a year. And among the other fringe benefits are allowances for their childrens schooling, extra pay for speaking foreign languages and extremely good pensions. Just one other thing I shouldn't overlook; because they work for an international organization, they don't have to pay any income tax at all.

The director of the U.N. Press Division in New York explains that under General Assembly Regulations, they must pay the best prevailing rate in any community where they are stationed. Yes, I can understand that a delegate or employee from an underdeveloped nation, where living costs and salaries are very low, must be paid commensurate with the pay scale of the land where he'll be stationed, but this still doesn't explain what's going on in Geneva.

An official at the Swiss Embassy in Washington says the average messenger working for the Swiss government in Geneva earns between \$135.00 to \$212.00 a week, which is considerably less than the \$413.00 the U.N. pays. He adds that by any standard U.N. pay scales are tops.

Perhaps you already know, but in case you don't, Uncle Sam still picks up one fourth of the total tab for the cost of the United Nations. Not too long ago Congress didn't feel that was enough and proposed increasing our contribution by \$44 million. We are a generous people.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled HOOVER'S "AMERICAN PLAN" - Commentary by  
Ronald Reagan)

The French have a saying that translates to, "The more things change, the more they stay the same." You know something? They're right.

His political opponents succeeded in blaming Herbert Hoover for America's Great Depression. It was a "bum rap", as they say, but it stuck. Despite this, he saw the nation's future as involving a choice between two very different courses. The other day, I came across a speech he gave in June, 1931, when he was President. I'd like to share some of it with you.

Hoover said, "We have many citizens insisting that we produce an advance "plan" for the future development of the United States. They demand that we produce it right now. I presume the "plan" idea is an infection from "the five-year-plan", through which Russia is struggling to save itself from 10 years of starvation and misery.

Some groups believe this plan can only be carried out by a fundamental, a revolutionary change of method. Other groups believe that any system must be the outgrowth of our character and traditions. They believe that we have established certain ideals over 150 years, upon which we must build rather than destroy.

If we analyze the ideas which have been put forward...they fall into two main types. The first holds that the major purpose of a nation is to protect the people and to give them equality of opportunity. It holds that the basis of all happiness is in the development of the individual, and that we should steadily build up cooperation among the people themselves to this end.

The other idea is that we shall, directly or indirectly, regiment the population into a bureaucracy to serve the state. It holds that we should use force instead of cooperation in planning, and thereby direct every person as to what may or may not be done.

Shall we abandon the philosophy and beliefs of our people for 150 years by turning to a belief that is foreign to our people? Shall we establish a giveaway from the federal treasury? Shall we undertake federal ownership and operation of public utilities instead of regulating them? Shall the government, except in temporary national emergencies, enter into competition with its citizens? Shall we regiment our people by extending the arm of bureaucracy into a great many affairs?

Our immediate task as a people is to defeat the forces of economic disruption that have swept over us. The duty of government in these times is to use its agencies and influence to strengthen our economic institutions; to inspire cooperation in the community so as to keep up good will and keep our country free from disorder and conflict; to cooperate with the people so that the deserving shall not suffer; and to strengthen the foundations of a better and stronger national life." -- unquote from the late President Hoover.

In his day, the utopians, who thought that mankind could be perfected if only they could run things, looked across the ocean for experiments in central planning, such as the Soviet Union's five-year-plans. Today, their successors ignore the failures of such planning in countries all over the globe and trot out something called the Humphrey-Hawkins Bill which would have the net effect of one day regulating every American's life from birth to death. I guess they've never heard that French saying, or the remark of the 19th Century English historian, Thomas Carlyle, who said, "Those who do not learn from the mistakes of history are doomed to repeat them."

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled AFRICA - Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

I don't know about you, but I'm concerned -- scared is the proper word -- about what is going on in Africa.

Many Americans have interpreted our interest in Africa as an extension of our own desire to achieve racial equality and elimination of injustice based on race. I'm afraid that is a naive over-simplification of what is really at issue.

First of all, much of the conflict is between people of the same race. Blacks are killing blacks in the guerilla war in Rhodesia and Angola, where peace has not really come as yet. Africa's history is one of tribal divisions and warfare going back over the centuries. Ancient hatreds still exist.

I have a letter from a Rhodesian Senator who opposes majority rule. He says the country's black population is divided between two major tribes who would be at each others throats if it weren't for the buffer offered by the Ian Smith regime. Well, of course, you say, that's a white Senator trying to preserve the status quo. The Senator is black and a chief of one of those two tribes -- 50% of Rhodesia's Senate is black.

Then the Senator says, "We are facing the brunt of a communist backed insurgency, the sole purpose of which is to overthrow our constitution, our way of life, and above all our freedom".

Democracy, majority rule, is a desirable thing for people everywhere. But, on the basis of freedom to vote and choose between rival political parties as we do, democracy is not a common thing in the almost half a hundred new and emerging nations of Africa. Only five (and that includes Rhodesia and South Africa) have more than one political party. The rest are military or civilian dictatorships allowing no civil liberties. In most of Africa they believe in one man, one vote--once. Whoever gets in power cancels out the opposition.

Mozambique is the staging area for the terrorist attacks on Rhodesia. It is completely totalitarian and communist. Religion is outlawed and thousands of its people (including an American missionary) are in concentration camps.

What does the Soviet Union have to say about the African problem? Well, Moscow defines the goal as the use of black power to "strangle the imperialists (that's us) economically".

Pravda reveals very clearly what the African problem is all about, and we'd better pay attention. Here it is translated from the Russian -- outlining the "losses they hope to inflict on the United States" -- Pravda says, "In United States imports the share of strategic raw materials imported from Africa amounts to 100% of the industrial diamonds, 58% of the uranium, 44% of the manganese, which is used in the steel smelting industry, 36% of the cobalt, essential for aircraft engines and high strength alloys, 33% of its oil and 23% of its chromium used in the manufacture of armor, aircraft engines and gun barrels".

The African problem is a Russian weapon aimed at us.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled FREEDOM TRAIN - Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

For about a year now, we've celebrated our bicentennial with just about everything and in every way possible. I'd like to tell you about one of those ways.

I don't know whether the Freedom Train has come your way yet or not. It's made well over 150 stops and traveled more than 25,000 miles. And, if my schedule is correct, it has Georgia and Florida to go before year's end. In California, it played overtime nearly every night to accommodate those who wanted to see the mementoes of 200 years of freedom which is its cargo.

The Freedom Train isn't entirely an original idea. We had one after World War II to sustain the wartime patriotism as a help in the cold war. But, now in peace time, it is something of a miracle and has proven that, while Americans may be fed up with excesses by government, there is still, deep in our hearts, a reverence for this blessed land.

The Train started out in March of 1975 and almost immediately found that even without stopping, it drew crowds. People gathered at all hours, even far into the night, just to see the big steam locomotive and red, white and blue cars roll by.

When it stops, people line up and wait hours in the rain or dark of night to walk through the cars and see the exhibit of freedom's accomplishments; the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Liberty Bell. There is no end to the variety because ours is a land of variety. There are space vehicles, exhibits having to do with great national heroes, including those famous in sports and entertainment, as well as science and statesmanship.

One little town of less than 400 argued so convincingly that the train stopped out in a corn field while more than 40,000 Americans from miles around visited it in a two-day period.

More than five million Americans have gone through the train and its managers believe their figure may be almost doubled before it pulls into its final station in December. And there is no counting the people who turned out just to see it go by.

I said there was something of a miracle in the reaction of people all over America to this particular bicentennial observance. There is another miracle in this day of government organized, planned and managed activity; a miracle that could maybe only happen in America.

You see, the Freedom Train is privately run on a non-profit basis. It has no connection whatsoever with government, federal, state or local. The originator of the idea is a railroad buff; a commodities broker named Ross E. Rowland, Jr. He is also the engineer running the train. He raised the funds as well as two steam locomotives from whatever graveyard old trains retire to. His crew is made up of private citizens who felt the call of duty. One man sold his business to make the trip; another left his photo shop and there are wonderful young people who volunteered because of pride in and love for their country.

Where else but in America could this happen? Come to think of it, how many places are left in the world where there is that much freedom to celebrate?

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled GLOMAR EXPLORER - Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

What's 600 feet long, is worth about \$60 million, eats submarines and is about to be encased in a plastic cocoon?

When it dredged a large part of a Soviet submarine up from the Pacific, the Glomar Explorer made history. The 600-foot-long deep sea mining vessel had withstood the stresses of the ocean to lift the submarine up from a depth of 16,000 feet.

Built ostensibly as a mining ship, and the only one of its kind in the world, the Glomar Explorer holds some exciting research and industrial possibilities for future use. It could be used as a means for conducting advanced engineering tests for sub-surface oil and gas wells at great depths; for test work in deep sea mining; for oil drilling, pipelaying and assistance in building offshore structures; as well as ship and aircraft salvage. The huge lifting mechanism was the largest single piece of steel ever made, and last spring it avoided the scrapcutter's torch with only 24 hours to spare.

Glomar Explorer's center well is two-thirds the length of a football field. The federal Energy Research and Development Administration foresees the possible use of Glomar's system either as a test bed hastening their investigation of ocean thermal energy conversion, for the disposal of nuclear wastes deep into the ocean; or for exploration of oil and gas in areas that are otherwise inaccessible.

Unfortunately, for U.S. science and industry, politics got in the way. The CIA was the behind-the-scenes owner of the Glomar Explorer. It was built to recover that Russian submarine, but it was ostensibly being operated by the Howard Hughes organization for deep seabed mining.

When the CIA was caught in the crosscurrents of political debate over clandestine activities--whatever their merits or demerits--the Glomar Explorer became an incidental victim. Not enough funds had been authorized for long-term maintenance so the General Services Administration offered it for lease. Getting no takers, the federal government has since treated it as just another piece of no-longer-useful equipment and is preparing to mothball it -- at a cost of more than two million dollars -- and anchor it with the reserve fleet at Suisun Bay, California.

What are the alternatives? The National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmospheres suggests several. For one, they suggest creation of a federal commission to allow time for scientists, industry and government to come up with a sound long-range plan for the ship. Meanwhile, the Commission would prevent competing government agencies from getting "dibs" on various pieces of the Glomar Explorer (several put in such requests earlier this year). The advisory committee also says that a government holding company, such as the one that governed the use of the nuclear freighter Savannah, might take charge. The board of such a corporation could have representatives from government, industry and the academic world. A third alternative would be to have one agency, such as the Energy Research and Development Administration, take over the ship. Whichever it is, the Glomar Explorer and the American people deserve better than they've been getting in this matter this year. With the elections a thing of the past, it's time for government leaders to come up with a solution.



RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled KATYN FOREST - Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Not all memories are pleasant, but we shouldn't put the unpleasant ones out of our mind. At least not all of them.

In a tiny cemetery in Gunnersbury, England on September 18th, 7000 people from all over the world gathered for the unveiling of a monument. It is a 21 foot pyramid bearing the inscription, "Katyn 1940" and a carved Polish eagle with a crown of barbed wire. Katyn is a name we should all remember. It is the name of a forest in Poland. But the monument does not memorialize a place. It is dedicated to 14,500 Polish officers who served in the defense of Poland when the Nazis were invading from the West and the Russians from the East. The officers disappeared when the invading forces met and divided Poland.

A few years later a mass grave was found in the Katyn forest. It contained the bodies of forty-five hundred of those Polish officers who had been executed and buried there. What of the other 10,000? It is believed they were put on barges that were towed out into icy arctic waters and sunk -- drowning all on board.

For a time this massacre was thought to be just another Nazi atrocity, but with the Nuremberg trials the truth was finally revealed. The 14,500 officers had been captured by the Russians and murdered in 1940 -- the date now inscribed on the memorial. As a matter of fact, the Germans had found the grave in 1943 in what had been Russian occupied territory following the partition of Poland. The 4,500 had dug the grave and then standing on the pit's edge had been machinegunned.

The selection of Gunnersbury cemetery is an interesting sidelight on relations between the free world and the Soviet Union. Maybe we need to be reminded there is still a Polish government in exile in London.

In 1971, the movement to honor the murdered officers was started and, because London is the home of that exiled Polish government, it was decided London should be the site of the memorial.

The British government was subjected to bitter and constant pressure from Moscow to prevent the raising of such a monument. Year-after-year the British government blocked every location selected by the memorial commission. Finally in some way the tiny, obscure Gunnersbury cemetery was found and ended up as the only possible location for the memorial.

Lord Oswald, vice chairman of the commission, spoke at the dedication but let it be known there was no official representative of the British government nor of the Church of England present. He declared, "Intrinsic also, and essential is the date 1940 engraved upon the face, because that relates in stone another element of the truth, which only the guilty, the ignorant, and the ignoble still crave to deny".

A Member of Parliament and former Conservative cabinet minister, Julian Amery, made known that he had invited representatives of other countries in letters to 42 embassies. Only seven sent representatives to the little cemetery for the memorial ceremony and only one was a major power. There was Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Liberia, South Africa, Uruguay, and you'll be proud I'm sure to know -- the United States of America.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Big Government and the Cities" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Governments live in their own fish pond. The federal government tries to swallow the states. The states try to swallow the cities. And who do the cities try to swallow? I'll be right back to tell you.

The most responsive government is the government closest to the people. The farther away a government gets from its people, the greedier and less responsive it tends to be. It is this greed and callousness that characterize what I call "big government."

The federal government is a case in point. Since 1960, it has tripled its take of our money.

And the states, particularly the large ones, are little better. Last year New York took \$1,270,000,000 more from its residents than it had only two years before.

And the cities? New York and Detroit stand out as very large examples of mismanagement, but they certainly are not unique. All cities are feeling the conflicting pressures of inflation, citizen demand for more services, and tax protests. And, many of them are turning to big government solutions, even if it's big government on a local scale.

For big government is not a place, or even a size. It's an attitude, and it can afflict the smallest units of government as surely as it does the largest federal agencies.

In many states, local government is made up of multi-purpose cities and single or special purpose districts. Each district is a separate government, with a separately elected board of directors and a mission to supply water, fire protection, or some other necessary public service to its citizens. These districts - and there are more than 2,000 of them in my state, California, alone - are, in truth, the level of government closest to the people, and because they are at the bottom of the government totem pole, they seem to harbor fewer big government aspirations than Washington, D.C., the states, or even the cities.

But districts pay a price for their responsiveness. Often the more efficient of them find themselves the targets of takeover attempts by cities with big government ideas. An efficient water district, for example, can be an inviting source of revenue to a city facing future fiscal problems. What is often overlooked by big government advocates is that a district, made a part of a less efficient city, will itself become less efficient and more costly to the taxpayers. The rule of the lowest common denominator applies with a vengeance in government.

Thus, big government is where you find it, whether it is in the dreams of a social planner in Washington, the computer programs of a tax collector in Albany, or the plans of a city manager in California. And wherever it may strike next, deserves our vigilance.

This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "San Francisco"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

In the recent campaign season, "help for the cities", was kicked around quite considerably and the demagoguery was ankle deep. I'll be right back.

When politicians at the federal level bleed for the inner city and demand that federal dollars be funneled into the skyscraper-walled canyons to stave off disaster, some obvious questions go unanswered. For example, 75% of the taxpaying citizenry lives in the cities. Is it being suggested that the other 25% be taxed to help the majority? Or, if all the cities are in trouble, does it really make sense for Washington to extract taxes from the city folk and send it back as somehow new and additional financing?

There might be more than one answer to these questions. Obviously, the one quarter of our people in rural America can't underwrite the cities. Just as obviously, two cities in trouble can't help each other by exchanging tax dollars taken from their own inhabitants. It is true that part of our troubles stem from Washington's confiscation of tax sources which should properly be left at state and local levels, but more money is not as good an answer as less spending by the cities themselves.

While Roger Boas, a three term supervisor in San Francisco's combination city-county government, was up for ratification as the city's chief administrative officer a few weeks ago, that "less spending" answer was frankly confirmed. What makes this newsworthy is that Roger Boas was -- and note I speak in the past tense -- an enthusiastic big spender during his time in government as a legislator. He says, "I was just like all the giveaway artist...labor would come along with some proposition -- and it was probably brought in by a fellow who had been hanging your house signs during the campaign. It usually got through and was put on the ballot and nobody could understand it including the people who had put it on. We're paying for that now."

But times have changed. Boas says, "I'm very conservative now. I think it's the only way to survive." He gives figures that are probably typical of many -- if not most -- big cities which are crying for someone to bail them out. San Francisco's general expenses have increased 193% in the past 11 years. The breakdown of that cost increase is more shocking. Pension payroll costs have risen 528%, the municipal railway 409%, and health and hospitals 312%.

Boas says, "Before there was a recognition that the cities were in financial trouble, there wasn't too much thought given to containing what were often excessive demands from labor." And he adds, "I voted for every one of them." He describes some demands as tremendous greed and crazy and says there should be, "no give at all in financial matters." "Equitable, yes. Fair, yes. But no featherbedding."

San Francisco with a gross receipts tax on small business and excessive labor costs has seen an exodus of small business from the city. The story is probably typical of many cities faced with the problem Boas describes as "avoiding bankruptcy and still giving citizens decent services for their money."

Now, if we can just have a few more converts. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Berkeley's Street Tax"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Elected officials come and go, but on the shores of the Potomac the bureaucrats keep right on thinking up zany ideas. I'll be right back.

Recently, I talked about the Diamond Lane project on a heavily traveled California freeway. This scheme reserved a lane in each direction to buses and car pools during commute hours. The stated purpose was to force people out of their cars and into the buses in order to relieve congestion and ease air pollution. In other words, government was telling the people what was good for them. The results weren't surprising. Congestion on surface streets and on-ramps increased, and so did air pollution. Finally, a judge wisely ruled that the experiment had to be abandoned until and unless an environmental impact report had been filed and approved.

California's state Department of Transportation was the creator of that mischievous attempt at coercing the citizens, but egging them on with encouragement (and money) was its federal counterpart.

Now, Washington's transit "experts" from UMTA--that's the Urban Mass Transportation Administration--have come up with an idea so far-fetched that it makes the Diamond Lane look like a model of civic virtue by comparison.

UMTA's new idea has been to get some city council to take leave of its senses long enough to institute a plan to charge its citizens a daily tax to drive on the city's streets! Behind this rock - solid article of faith of all mass transit zealots, is the notion that people should stop driving cars and ride buses. The UMTA bureaucrats figure that if a city charges a dollar or two a day as a "street tax", people will be happy to park their car at the city and hop a bus.

I have news for them. People don't behave that way. Their travel patterns are as individual as they are, and they won't fit into neatly compartmentalized schemes. Not to mention the fact that the UMTA scheme--if it ever is put into practice--amounts to double taxation.

They're not discouraged, though. They think they've finally found a taker. The other day, the mayor of Berkeley, California announced that his city would study the UMTA wizards' proposal.

He described Berkeley as "special". It's "special" alright. Whatever else it has been though, it just happens to have a federal Interstate Highway and at least one state highway crossing through it. Millions of people beyond the city's own citizens paid for and use those highways. And, in California, as in many other states, the state gas tax is partly apportioned out to the cities for street work. So, Berkleyans and non-Berkleyans have already paid for those streets.

Apparently, though, the UMTA experts expect all the traffic to queue-up at the toll gates on the city line to pay their daily tax. Consider how many thousands of gallons of gasoline will go up in smoke as all those cars idle. Ridiculous? Of course it is, but both Berkeley and UMTA seem to be taking themselves seriously. One official, comparing this scheme to a controversial program to divert some Berkeley traffic issue with street barricades during the last year, said, the street tax "is going to make the controversy over the barricades seem like child's play."

But the city's director of transportation was quoted in one news report as saying that the federal government would be asked to put up the money for the parking lots, shuttle buses and toll gates, as well as the money to run the street tax system.

Pass the cream; I think I'm at the Mad Hatter's Tea Party. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "The Politics of the Federal Government"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Is the federal government a hot bed of political liberals? You bet it is, if you have anything left to bet after taxes. I'll be right back

I want to use these three minutes to recruit as many of you as I can to go into government service.

No, I haven't lost my marbles or my principles. But you who listen to my views and find them worthwhile, are the very people who can straighten out a badly tilted government, and it's time we started.

Here's the problem. Many of us have long felt that the great majority of high level federal bureaucrats favor government expansion and centralization, and that they put these biases into action in spite of the wishes of the people. Government programs are seldom designed by presidents and congressmen, and never by the man-on-the-street. They are designed and carried out by career bureaucrats with a desire to feather their own nest, and their nest is Washington, D.C.

Now, there's hard evidence to support our belief. Documented in a recent issue of the American Political Science Review, and given wide public exposure by columnist Patrick Buchanan, the evidence is based upon a fresh analysis of interviews with 126 senior civil servants in 18 federal agencies. Although the interviews were originally conducted in 1970, these same civil servants and their proteges are still running the bureaucracy.

What did the evidence show? Eighty-three percent of the super-grade career employees were political liberals. Ninety-two percent of the senior bureaucrats at HEW, HUD, and OEO opposed any reduction of social service agencies. Seventy percent favored an increased rate of expansion of the programs of these agencies. And this despite overwhelming evidence of the desire of the people to scrap the unworkable programs of the '60s and reduce the encroachment of government into their lives.

Nor is this bureaucratic bias toward liberalism a temporary phenomenon. It has been building for 40 years, and it will continue to build till enough persons who value liberty above uniformity make government their business.

Where do we find such people? I believe they must come from among those of you who are fed up with big government. So I am recruiting you who are looking for a career to go into government service. Your ultimate career goal should be not to end up with a good job in Washington, but to start in Washington and end up with a good job in your hometown, leaving behind a much smaller federal city.

I must warn you that you won't get along with your bosses, at least not at first. But give it time. With enough of you coming along, they won't be able to hold out forever.

This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.



RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "The Alaska Gas Pipeline"

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

As winter winds whip across Alaska's Prudhoe Bay, American utilities and gas pipeline companies are battling for the right to bring us its riches. I'll be right back.

As it wound its way through environmental arguments toward final approval, the huge Alaska oil pipeline project was much in the news, but many people still haven't heard of a similar project which will one day carry large amounts of natural gas from Alaska to the "lower 48" states, supplying something on the order of 10% of our needs.

There are three competing proposals for the gas pipeline, the Arctic Gas Project, the Alcan Project and the Trans-Alaska Project. All three begin where the oil pipeline will begin, at Prudhoe Bay. But there the similarities end.

In seeking necessary government approvals, backers of the three plans cite timing, economics, environmental impact and security.

The Trans-Alaska pipeline would parallel and make use of the oil pipeline's work roads, pads and camps for most of its distance; the Alcan pipeline for part of it. Trans-Alaska's pipeline would terminate at Gravina Point on the Pacific Ocean. There the gas would be liquified and transported by a fleet of eleven special ships to a new terminal in Southern California. Backers cite U.S. Coast Guard reports that Liquid Natural Gas shipment is among the safest ocean-going operation today. At the special terminal, the liquid gas would be converted back to a gaseous state and transported throughout the United States over the gas pipeline network.

The other two projects both rely on long pipelines across Canada to transport the gas back into the United States.

Both would carry gas to the Midwest, near Chicago, for further distribution. In addition, they would have a spur running south from Alberta into the Pacific states.

The Trans-Alaska project will require laying 809 miles of pipe alongside the oil pipeline. The other two projects will require up to 5400 miles of new pipeline as they cross Canada.

Construction time and environmental concerns aren't their only problems, though. The trans-Canada proposals between them face a battery of approval processes with Canadian, as well as United States agencies, along with competition for time and attention from two Canadian projects and unsettled native land claims in the Yukon and Northwest Territories.

Candidates in the recent elections talked a great deal about jobs, but so far as I know didn't touch on these projects. The all-Alaska project would contract for all goods and services within the U.S., while the other projects must do a large amount of it in Canada. And, Trans-Alaska is expected to have direct employment in the U.S. at the peak of construction of 22,500. That's more than double one of the rival projects and about 50 percent greater than the other. The same ratios are projected for permanent employment on the competing systems.

Supporters of the two trans-Canada systems argue that by bringing the gas pipeline straight into the midwest that area will have first crack at the gas, but that ignores the fact that the Federal Power Commission is the final authority on who gets how much additional gas. They make the determination on the basis of need, not availability. The U.S. pipeline network does the rest, distributing the gas wherever it has to go.

There are arguments for each project, of course, but in terms of U.S. interests, the weight of the evidence seems to be coming down on the side of the Trans-Alaska project, the only all-U.S. one of the three. This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "The Communes"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

The "counter culture" of the 60's is far enough behind us to allow, with the perspective of history, some evaluation and judgment. I'll be right back.

We remember the decade of the 60's as a time of riot in our streets and schools. It's easy to lay it all to the war in Vietnam and the struggle for civil rights, but this can't explain the social revolution entirely; the generation gap, ("Don't trust anyone over 30") or the rejection of virtually every custom, tradition and rule of the adult world. There was rebellion against something called The Establishment.

One of the symbols of the revolution was the rejection of the lifestyle in which those rebelling had been raised and in which their parents still lived. Professing idealism, love for everyone (which still didn't keep them from stoning anyone in authority) they rejected privacy in their living arrangements and took up communal living. There were no more couples, just groups called communes, a rejection of the work-a-day, selfish, money grubbing world of their elders.

The communes aren't entirely a thing of the past. Some of the alienated still live that way, even though they approach or have passed that dividing line of age 30.

Recently two members of the counterculture set out on an eight month tour to find out how their contemporaries were doing. They visited communes around the country and wrote of their findings in a book published by Doubleday titled, "THE CHILDREN OF THE COUNTER-CULTURE." The children they write about are not the children who took up communal living in the 60's. They are now parents and the book is about their offspring. Remember now, the authors started their project while still as anti-Establishment as the people they were writing about. One of them allowed her own pre-school children to puff on marijuana joints when they were being passed around. In their own words, they believed that "regular schools were prisons and Americans strangle their children with rules, routines and expectations." They seem to have changed a little and, if you worry sometimes about being old fashioned in the way you raise your children, read their book, even though it isn't very pretty.

There is a 10 year old commune lad whose mother seduced him when he was six so he wouldn't have any Oedipus complex or hang-ups. A 12 year old scrounges for pennies to pay for a mind control course. On the whole, they found commune children illiterate, suffering emotional disturbances and unaware of even such things as flush toilets. Mainly, their parents wanted them out of sight and mind.

By contrast, some communes demanded a harsh conformity. Individualism -- even crying -- was put down as childish self-indulgence. This from parents who had chosen their drug-drenched lifestyle as a rebellion against conformity. In one such commune, they had their own school, a bare and ugly place with straw mats on a floor littered with orange peels and garbage. The authors saw a child with chicken pox pulled up off his straw mat and forced to attend a class. They wrote, "The children of the flower children emerge less as human beings than experiments in radical philosophy."

The story of 10 year old Nina is the most poignant. She lives in the slovenly litter of the adults and her "freaky" mother is baffled by her. Somewhere Nina must have seen a picture of how little girls live in that square, outside world her parents have rejected. In all the squalor, her room is an immaculate island complete with neat bedspread, mirrors, curtains and teddy bears. Or could it be that, in an odd moment, mama revealed how she had lived when she was little?

This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "New Directions"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Hang on to your hats. There's a new special interest group that's been launched in Washington, and its ambitions are big. I'll be right back.

Common Cause, which has played to mixed reviews for about four years now, has concentrated its efforts on what it considers election "reform". It's had some successes; some failures, but it has limited its scopes to the United States.

But, a brand new lobbying group called New Directions, launched in Washington, D.C. this fall, has no such limitations on its ambitions. It's motto might as well be, "Today America, Tomorrow the World," for it plans to tie into an international network of like-minded groups, meanwhile -- according to its brochure -- lobbying actively in Washington.

New Directions, according to the brochure, will -- QUOTE--"...attempt to influence the non-governmental shapers of national policy--corporations, banks, universities and trade association. It will organize people in local communities to respond to local manifestations of global injustice or irresponsibility. And, when necessary, it will take its case to court."--UNQUOTE

The rhetoric continues with phrases such as "workable world order", "a revolution of human decency and global fairness", "world problems call for world action" and "we will work with citizen groups of like interest wherever they may exist, and we will encourage their emergence where they do not."

Now, they don't spell it out, but the New Directions people --in their choice of language and their choice of leaders-- sound very much as if they are going to have a familiar left-liberal tilt in their ideology and their lobbying activities. Can we expect them to push for big cuts in U.S. defense spending; for warmer relations with leftist dictatorships, coupled with stern rejection of rightest governments? Will they plump for massive new "aid" programs for the so-called Third World nations? Probably.

The organization has a Governing Board which will set its course. Russell Peterson, formerly chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality is president of New Directions. Jack Conway, a former United Auto Workers' official and Common Cause executive is its "chairperson". Also on the Governing Board are a co-director of a radical think-tank, a former U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, former Yale Chaplain William Sloane Coffin, darling of the anti-war movement; and assorted ultra-liberals and leftists from the academic world, along with one-world advocates.

Just how far the new organization will go in its efforts to lobby for a U.S. foreign policy and national defense posture of weakness instead of strength is hard to guess, but a not-too-many-years ago quote from Coffin may be a clue. He said, "We have to realize that Enemy No. 1 is nuclear warfare, not the Communists. And enemy No. 2 is poverty." He added that he thought that the Soviet Union wouldn't go about supporting "reactionary" and "oppressive" governments. He said that in 1969. Maybe he's been sleeping under a tree ever since. I wonder about his comrades on that New Directions governing board.

This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.