

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 78-7 through 78-9 (1978)

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

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

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

RONALD REAGAN
RADIO COMMENTARY

Taped: 5/15/78
AIR: 5/29-6/10/78

Disc. 78-7

78-7A

Generic Promos

1.	Japan I	2:42
2.	Japan II ✓	2:54
3.	Japan III ✓	2:55
4.	Taiwan I	3:00
5.	Hong Kong	2:54
6.	Women	2:51
7.	Education	2:58

78-7B

1.	Alger Hiss	2:56
2.	Rhodesia	2:58
3.	The Pacific	2:48
4.	Seal Hunt	2:54
5.	Dulles Airport	2:50
6.	Castro's Prisons	2:42
7.	Miscellaneous	2:53
8.	Health Care ✓	2:56

PLEASE NOTE:

1. These programs are provided for airing from May 29th through June 16th inclusive. Maintaining this schedule will enable your station to air all newly recorded programs as received.
2. Please be advised that our office DOES NOT fulfill requests from listeners for copies of Governor Reagan's radio commentaries. The enclosed copies are provided to you for this purpose.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Japan I"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

For the last few weeks you've been hearing commentaries I pre-recorded before setting off on a 'round-the-world trip that was definitely not non-stop. In the next few broadcasts I'd like to talk about some far away places that have a great bearing on our security and economy.

Nancy and I flew to Honolulu for an overnight stop where I participated briefly in an economic conference before flying on to Tokyo the next day. That flight took us across five time zones and the international date line which has always intrigued and sometimes confused me.

Out there in the vast and trackless Pacific on a Friday afternoon we came to that dividing point at which a day was taken out of our lives. Friday instantly became Saturday. Of course, if you turn around and return by the same route you'll get the day back again. We've done this a few times before, but this time we would continue on West until we finally reached California. As far as I'm concerned we've permanently lost a day unless sometime we do the trip in reverse. I found myself wondering all sorts of things such as, wasn't there a split second when it was Saturday for those in the front of the plane and Friday for those in the rear? Or what would happen if a ship were becalmed--astraddle the line--and passengers could walk back and forth from Saturday to Friday and back to Saturday.

Well, enough of that. I want to make one thing clear--we were not on a vacation. The four-day schedule in Tokyo included two speeches, a question-and-answer session with the Foreign Correspondents Association, a full round of meetings with business and industrial leaders, meetings with leaders in Japan's legislature, the Diet, meetings with cabinet ministers, and with Prime Minister Fukuda. We had previously met in 1971 when he was the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

An American visiting Japan can't help being impressed by the vitality and energy of the people. You come away with an uncomfortable feeling that they have something we once had and took for granted but which, if we haven't lost entirely, we are in danger of losing. Their per man hour productivity far exceeds ours and the rate at which it is increasing is almost double ours.

A shopping trip or even a coffee break in a cafe leaves you with two impressions. One is of unfailing, cheerful courtesy on the part of everyone you do business with and the other the full reality of how anemic our American dollar has become. I'd like to meet an American who couldn't be shocked by a \$40 price tag on a cantaloupe. At that rate it's cheaper to eat money.

Incidentally, the next time I'm caught in rush hour traffic I'm going to remember the all-day-long, curb-to-curb traffic in Tokyo where we never saw a bent fender or an unwashed car.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Japan II"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

When we left the U.S. on our recent 'round-the-world trip the matter of our unfavorable balance of trade with Japan was an almost daily headline in the news. In a number of circles there was a growing animosity toward Japan; charges of dumping product on our market at less than cost; and demands for protectionism--tariffs, quotas or outright bans on some imports.

Let me give you another view of this problem; how it looks from the other side of the Pacific. I met with Japanese business leaders who are also concerned about the trade imbalance even though it is in their favor. They are worried about the voices demanding protectionism and not from the selfish view that it will be directed against them alone. They hear Japanese voices demanding protection against our exports to Japan. Protectionism is a two-way street and they know that once started it ends in a demand for retaliation.

Japanese industrialists believe in free trade and they are not building their export supremacy on slave labor wages. While they have not yet reached our own wage scale they are not far from it and their wages are higher than in such other industrial nations as Britain, France and West Germany.

Not too long ago if you'll recall, Japan sent a trade mission to our country to buy several billion dollars worth of American goods to help reduce our trade imbalance. But they said to me "Why should we have to do that? Why aren't your business men over here trying to sell us these things?" That's a pretty good question.

The truth is, they don't see us "Yankee Traders" trying as hard as we once did, aggressively seeking a market in Japan for our goods. Let me give a couple of examples I saw for myself. The Japanese, like the English, drive on the left hand side of the road. Naturally their automobiles are built with the steering wheel on the right. Now take a look at those Toyotas, Datsuns and Hondas you see every day on our streets. They were built with a left hand steering wheel for American style driving. In Japan when you see a Japanese driving an American car he does so with the inconvenience of a steering wheel on the wrong side for Japanese roads. By the way, it's also true in Hong Kong, Singapore and Thailand. One of the Japanese business leaders said he had asked our auto makers about that and they said it was too much trouble to build cars with a right hand drive.

The Japanese make every effort to understand us and our American ways. What effort have we made to understand the Japanese and their way of doing things? Every graduate of a Japanese high school has had six years of English. In our country our students will not only learn no Japanese--a lot of them will have to take a college course called "Bonehead English" so they can understand our own language.

The men I talked with have the friendliest feeling for us and hope desperately that we can solve our energy problem by reducing our dependence on imported oil. Japan is totally dependent on imported oil which should make us skeptical of those who blame the Arabs for our falling dollar.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Japan III"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Renewing the acquaintance of Prime Minister Fukuda of Japan, former Prime Minister Kishi, leaders of the majority party, members of the cabinet and legislature and, of course, meeting some government officials for the first time was an enjoyable and rewarding experience for me. On one evening we had dinner with some half-a-hundred members of both houses of the Diet--the Japanese congress.

It was a remarkable experience. We each had a microphone and headset for the lengthy question-and-answer session so there was instant two-way translation. For many it was unnecessary because they spoke our language. This was true of the other individual meetings also, though an interpreter was present for some. In my speaking engagements we simplified the process by providing Japanese language copies of my remarks to everyone present. I'll guarantee you I didn't do any ad-libbing on those occasions. But I couldn't help notice how many in the audience were obviously listening and understanding what I said without referring to the text.

In all these meetings one topic was uppermost in the mind of each person I met. That is, is the United States withdrawing from the Western Pacific? They quoted statements by our leaders, which seemed to indicate such a withdrawal was possible. They brought up our troop withdrawal from South Korea, the talk of normalizing relations with the mainland of China at the expense of Taiwan, and the growing strength of the Soviet navy in the Northwest Pacific.

These were not uninformed citizens worrying about things they had read in the paper. These were leaders of a nation of 115 million people. And since World War II have depended on the United States for its national security. This was a responsibility we assumed in return for Japan's disarming and disavowing militarism.

I was to meet this same question in other countries friendly to us, but deeply concerned about a U.S. foreign policy that seems unrealistic and incomprehensible to them. I tried to tell them of polls showing that Americans want an improvement in our military capability, that the American people do not support a policy that would abrogate our treaty with the Republic of China on Taiwan and that our people want us to maintain a presence in South Korea. On that last point I had my fingers crossed because frankly I wonder if our government does intend to maintain such a presence or, for that matter, pay attention to the expressed desire of the people.

It was frustrating to hear national leaders friendly to the United States asking for some assurance that our country has the will to accept leadership of the free world. And they made it very plain there was no other nation with the strength to do so if we abdicated that responsibility.

Our presence in Japan, South Korea, Taiwan and the Philippines is absolutely essential to the stability of the Western Pacific and, actually, to peace and freedom in the world. We must be prepared to maintain the Seventh fleet at a level of strength capable of keeping the sea level open in the northern Pacific and in the Indian Ocean. Do our own leaders understand that?

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Taiwan I"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

We flew to Taiwan from Tokyo in a China Airlines plane and that in itself was an advertisement of what was to come.

Taipei is a modern, prosperous city complete with luxury hotels, smart shops and congested rush hour traffic. Industries flourish and exports are counted in the billions of dollars. In fact, like Japan, Taiwan has a surplus in its balance of trade with us and recently sent a trade mission to the U.S. to buy more than \$250 million worth of American products to reduce the imbalance. Another such mission is planned soon, and for the same reason--to be helpful to us.

There were meetings with the Foreign Minister, the Minister of Economic affairs and a dinner given by the President of the Republic. Always there was an undercurrent of concern about what U.S. foreign policy really is. But also there was a feeling of pride and confidence in their own capability. They reminded this American of a quality we once had and which I hope we haven't completely lost.

I renewed acquaintance with President Chian Ching-kuo, son of the late Generalissimo Chian Kai Chek. He is a remarkable leader, dedicated to the welfare of his people. Others told me of how this quiet, unassuming man journeyed to the countryside visiting farmers and workers in their homes without warning or publicity. He is utterly realistic about the impossibility of mixing freedom and communism.

We visited a modern steel mill adjacent to a new shipyard fully automated and capable of building the largest super tankers. The average age of the workers was 27 in the shipyard and 29 in the steel mill. They were recruited from local high schools, given two years training by the companies and provided with new housing and recreational facilities. Incidentally, all students in Taiwan start learning English in seventh grade.

Those Americans who visit the mainland of China and return with glowing reports of how much better off the people are under their Communist rulers should also visit Taiwan. They justify their enthusiasm about Communist China, explaining away rationing and scarcity by saying "but the people are so much better off than they were".

Are they? The Communist regime started in 1949 and that year the nationalist Chinese retreated to Taiwan. Taiwan had been a Japanese military staging area and as such as heavily bombed by our B-29's. Power plants and railroads had been destroyed. As the Foreign Minister put it, they had five things--a little brown sugar, some rice, a panniken of tea, an earthquake and a typhoon.

Today the mainland is totally regimented. There is no personal freedom and it can't feed its people without importing foods. The other part of China--Taiwan--has a prosperous, free economy. It has one of the highest per capita income in Asia. Private farms supply the people's needs and contribute the nation's exports. Roads are jammed with cars and motorcycles, the people watch TV on three networks, listen to about 100 radio stations and work in dozens of modern industries. Their military is superb and has very high morale. They have half a million men in uniform and can mobilize two and a half million on short notice, realizing they may one day have to fight to keep their freedom.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Hong Kong"

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Visiting Hong Kong was not really part of the business that had us going around the world. It was intended as a stopover between Taipei and Iran, a one-and-a-half hour flight for an overnight stay. However, thanks to the Acting Governor of Hong Kong, we had a helicopter tour around the colony and along the Communist Chinese border-- that barrier to freedom which is penetrated constantly by refugees from the worker's paradise. So much so that Hong Kong is bursting at the seams with a population of four and a half million.

We flew over three locations back in the picturesque hills surrounding the city to see three "new towns"--being built from the ground up. We also visited the Red Chinese department store where many luxury items unknown to their citizens are used to boost their balance of trade. Hong Kong could, of course, be swallowed by Communist China in a second, but it is a necessary window to the outside world. You can't help but wonder how the Communist leaders can look through that window at the miracle of free enterprise without realizing how stupid they are to stick with the idiocy of Karl Marx.

That night at 11 o'clock we climbed aboard a 747 and started our 11½ hour flight to Iran, where I learned it is pronounced "Iron". We crossed three time zones and arrived in Teheran at 8:30 in the morning, more than a little sleepy. Here, again, we were surprised. Ancient Persia is becoming as modern as tomorrow in an industrial way but still retains much of its cultural heritage. The people are proud, independent and more than generous in their hospitality and courtesy.

We visited the unbelievable beauty of the mosque at Isfahan, the ruins of Persepolis at Chiraz and the resort areas on the Caspian Sea. At the same time we met with government officials and the Shah and Shahbanou. As in the other countries we'd visited, the first indication of their modernization was rush hour traffic jams. In Teheran the rush hour seemed to last around the clock. The skyline is studded with huge construction cranes and the Shah told me they were building 300,000 housing units a year.

Iran must receive the worst press of almost any nation. Where have we read of the effort the government is making to upgrade the standard of living and eliminate poverty? A great reforestation program is turning barren hills and valleys into green forest lands. American industry is encouraged and there is a growing colony of American engineers and technical experts living in this ancient land. But, above all, we should know that Iran has been and is a staunch friend and ally of the United States. It has a clear understanding of the Soviet threat. And it has the second longest border with Russia. Consequently, it maintains a combat-ready army and air force as well as naval forces on the Persian gulf. But, it, too, worries about the United States and what appears to be a foreign policy based on miscalculation of Soviet intentions.

From Iran we flew to London and then over the Pole to Los Angeles. We found friendship for America in every land we visited and a hope that America would indeed lead the free world in resisting Russian imperialism.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Women"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

In spite of all the jokes men like to tell about women drivers, I think almost all men know in their hearts that women have been the single most civilizing influence in the world.

Years ago I read of an incident that took place in India during the days of British colonial rule. It is not a make believe legend but an actual happening. I was reminded of it on our recent trip to Asia and thought you might like to hear it.

The scene of this story is a dinner party in one of the palatial homes in India, a typical cosmopolitan gathering including a British colonel of the old school and a visiting American businessman. The rest were colonials, Indian notables and so forth.

Somehow the conversation had gotten around to heroics, courage and what makes individuals perform noble deeds. The British colonel was holding forth on the idea that men have an extra bit of control which, in time of stress, makes them able to resist panic and with courage do the dangerous things that have to be done. Women on the other hand, according to the Colonel, are not gifted with that measure of control and therefore grow hysterical, faint or stand helpless to act in the face of danger.

As he was going on in that vein the American happened to notice the hostess signal to one of the servants who leaned over her chair while she whispered something to him. The American thought nothing of this til he saw the servant returning to the room carrying a saucer of milk. Passing the table he set the saucer on the floor just outside the glass doors which opened to the patio. Suddenly the American remembered. In India, a saucer of milk is snake bait -- Cobra bait to be exact!

He saw the servants standing against the dining room wall and it was obvious they were frightened and tense. Quickly he looked around the room. There was no furniture that could conceal a snake. He looked overhead thinking possibly it could be on a beam, but there were no beams; it was a tile vaulted ceiling. Then he realized there was only one possible place a snake could be--under the table. His first instinct was to push his chair back and run, but he knew this could cause the snake to strike one of the other guests. The Colonel was still holding forth. The American interrupted him and said, "Colonel, let's have a test and see who has the most control. Let's see how many of us can remain absolutely silent and motionless for five minutes. I'll count to 300 as a measure of time and no one must move or utter a sound."

Everyone went along with the idea and the countdown started. It had reached 280 when a King cobra slithered from beneath the table and through the patio doors to the saucer of milk. The servants slammed the doors with the snake on the outside. In the excitement that followed the Colonel shouted, "That proves my point, this man could have saved himself but he thought of a plan to save the rest of us." The American said, "Just a minute, Colonel". Turning to the hostess, he asked, "How did you know there was a Cobra under the table?" She said, "It was on my foot."

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Education"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Tens of thousands of independent and parochial schools--elementary, secondary and college level--have gone broke in recent years. Unable to charge tuition high enough to keep pace with rising costs they've had to close their doors. This is a tragic loss. The very existence of independent schools helps preserve academic freedom and diversity.

To reverse this trend two Senators sponsored a bill providing for an income tax credit for half the tuition up to a ceiling of \$500 per child. A credit, of course, means you subtract that amount from the income tax you owe. This would apply to both public and private schools. Now I realize public school tuition only occurs at the college level, so the benefit at elementary and secondary levels would only go to parents whose children were enrolled in independent or parochial schools.

The education lobby has risen up in wrath, calling this a plot to destroy the public schools. That's a bit hysterical when you consider that 90 percent of all students attend public schools. Only 10 percent are in private schools. Incidentally, they have seized upon that word "private" to make this seem like a tax break for the rich. The word "private" does conjure up an image of exclusive prep schools and Ivy League colleges and, while there are, of course, some of these, there are far more local parochial schools and small independent liberal arts colleges existing in genteel poverty.

In the heated debate little has been said about the fact that the tax credit would probably help the schools more than the parents. Hard-pressed to meet increased costs, a school could raise tuition with the assurance that it wouldn't mean any actual increase in price to the parent. The result would be salvation for many otherwise doomed educational institutions. Nevertheless, the Washington Post editorially predicts destruction of the educational system if the tax credit is adopted. And, in a particularly ridiculous bit of demagogery, Albert Shanker, President of the American Federation of Teachers, who numbers among his contributions to education a vast increase in the number of teachers' strikes, says the tax credit, "would amount to taxpayers subsidizing private schools". He is echoed by the president of the National P.T.A. who declares, "the public would be taxed twice--once to support public schools through existing programs and a second time to subsidize the private schools through tuition tax credits." They must be using the New Math, to come up with that distortion.

The parent paying tuition to an independent school is paying his full tax also to support the public school, but his children are not adding to the cost of public education. They pay for something they don't take. What do Mr. Shanker and Madam P.T.A. president think will happen if the independent schools close down and the 10 percent attending them are suddenly enrolled in the public school system? Mr. Shanker will probably call for a teachers pay raise because of the added burden. School boards will demand bigger budgets to handle the increased enrollment and, presto, your local taxes will go up again. Is that really better than giving a break to people who are now supporting two school systems?

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Alger Hiss"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

From the Academy Awards performance (by way of one Oscar winner) to well-written dramas and documentaries on TV, feature motion pictures, novels and articles there is an orchestrated campaign to revive the term "McCarthyism" and to rewrite history. We are supposed to believe there was no Communist subversion, no use of Communist fronts to lure innocent dupes into supporting Communist causes and no effort by Communists to infiltrate government, industry and the news media.

Being a veteran of the battle to keep the motion picture industry out of the hands of the Communists back in the late 40's when their power was such that by use of a jurisdictional labor dispute they almost closed the industry down, I find the documentaries shamefully dishonest and the dramas based on falsehood.

A recent campus incident triggered this indignant outburst. At dear old Rutgers a visiting speaker on campus held hundreds of students spellbound with his account of the horrors of McCarthyism. Then a questioner in the audience broke the spell. He stood and asked the lecturer if it wasn't true that three different defectors from the Soviet secret police (now known as the KGB) had identified the speaker in sworn testimony as a Soviet agent?

Had the speaker not been found guilty of perjury by a jury and his conviction upheld by our entire judicial review process? And hadn't a renowned scholar, sympathetic to the speaker studied the entire file on his case and concluded that he was indeed guilty? Ashen faced, the speaker, Alger Hiss, refused to comment.

Now Alger Hiss had paid his debt to society (as the saying goes). He served his time in prison and therefore should be given his chance by society to "go straight".

The truth is society has done very well by Hiss; no one has tried to persecute him or hound him. But he has become one of the focal points of the present campaign to rewrite the history of that era. He is being presented as an innocent victim of the thing called "McCarthyism", martyred by intolerant witch hunters.

But, wait a moment -- the late Senator McCarthy hadn't even been heard from when Alger Hiss was charged with being a member of the Soviet underground.

But the scholar mentioned by that questioner at Rutgers should end the myth of martyrdom. Professor Allen Weinstein of Smith College believed so much in the innocence of Alger Hiss that he invoked the Freedom of Information Act to get all the trial records and secret government files on Hiss. Painstakingly he studied more than 30,000 pages. Then in 1976 he informed Hiss that he had spent four years re-searching the case because he believed in his innocence, but that he was now convinced of his guilt.

Professor Weinstein's book entitled "Perjury: The Hiss-Chambers Case", should be read by all who want the truth about that era. It is especially credible coming as it does from one who wanted the answer to be different. It's also exciting as a "who-done-it" and most informative. "Perjury: The Hiss-Chambers Case" is published by Knopf.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Rhodesia"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

The other day in the mail I received a full page ad from the St. Louis Globe Democrat. It had been taken out by a man who had just returned from his 24th trip to Rhodesia.

The ad consisted of photos taken in Rhodesia with identification and explanation printed beneath each one. They were not pleasant to look at and the printed word was even less pleasant to read. There were pictures of Rhodesian citizens--always black and always dead--their hands tied behind their backs. They lay sprawled on the ground where they had fallen when Russian made automatic weapons mowed them down.

In one photo the innocent victims had been burned alive. There was a hard-to-look-at picture of a village chief. He was still alive. His lips, ears and hands had been cut off. The caption said his wife had been forced to cook and eat them.

There was only one picture of a white Rhodesian, a tiny baby girl, the only child of a young farm couple. Her parents were at work in the fields when the guerillas, perpetrators of all these horrors, came to their farm home. The nursemaid, a young black girl, tried desperately to save the baby. She was clubbed to the floor and the baby was then bayoneted a dozen times.

These guerillas are the forces of Joshua Nkomo and Robert Mugabe who call themselves and their murderous gangs, "The Patriotic Front". They claim they are fighting for majority rule in Rhodesia and one man, one vote. Since 1972 they have killed an estimated 9,000 of their fellow Rhodesians--mainly blacks.

In the meantime three black leaders of more than 85 percent of the black population of Rhodesia have joined with Prime Minister Ian Smith to bring about majority rule based on one-man, one-vote. These four have such support from the people that our Secretary of State on his recent visit to Rhodesia was greeted by large crowds of black Rhodesians bearing signs proclaiming their support of the present plan.

But our government says it will not accept the agreed upon interim government of Rhodesia unless it includes Nkomo and Mugabe. And so we continue the ridiculous economic sanctions prescribed by the United Nations, bringing hardship and more guerilla killings to the citizens of Rhodesia, black and white.

What makes our governments attitude impossible to understand is that Nkomo and Mugabe still claim they are fighting for majority rule and one-man, one-vote. But the new interim regime has not only proclaimed majority rule and one-man, one-vote, it has invited Nkomo and Mugabe and their guerillas to return to Rhodesia and take part in the elections. There will be total amnesty, no reprisals, release of all political retainees and government help in reuniting the marauders with their families. Nkomo and Mugabe have been asked to participate in forming the new government. They've refused. It boggles the mind to hear our government in the face of all this refusing to accept the interim government because Nkomo and Mugabe cannot have it on their own terms.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "The Pacific"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

A few days ago I spoke of the concern I observed on my visits to Japan and Taiwan about the uncertainty of our commitment in the western Pacific. This has been compounded by the growth of Soviet naval strength in the area.

Here are some of the facts that contribute to Asia's decreasing confidence in Uncle Sam. Secretary of Defense Harold Brown has said there won't be any more reductions in the Seventh Fleets' strength. But defense experts in Japan and some of our own Seventh Fleet officers are concerned about the cuts that have already been made in a fleet that has responsibility for the Pacific from the Kamchatka Peninsula to the Persian Gulf.

Officers, who for obvious reasons can't be named, say that in a global war we would have to shift Pacific fleet units to support our undersized naval forces in the European Theatre. That would reduce our Pacific fleet to maintaining lines of communication to Hawaii and Alaska, plus some essential military traffic to the Western Pacific. But fleet spokesmen make it plain we wouldn't be able to take an offensive action in the Western Pacific and commercial air and sea traffic would be halted. This, of course, is of great concern to Japan and the Republic of China on Taiwan.

It confirms the testimony last February of Admiral Holloway-- Chief of Naval Operations, before the House Appropriations Defense Subcommittee that Soviet strength threatens our capability of mounting an action in support of our Asian allies such as the two I've mentioned plus South Korea, the Philippines, Australia and New Zealand. We have defense alliances with all those nations.

Our Ambassador in Japan, former Senator Mike Mansfield, told a press conference in Tokyo last March that he had reminded the President that 70 percent of the earth's surface was ocean and the Seventh Fleet had responsibility for patrolling 80 percent of all that water. He is firmly opposed to any further reduction in America's western Pacific forces.

But the fleet right now is incapable of dealing with more than one regional crisis at a time. For example, trouble in the Indian Ocean and war in Korea would leave us with having to choose between one or the other. We can't handle both.

Admiral Weisner, commander of U.S. forces in the Pacific, has warned that continuation of the present trends will give the Soviet Union supremacy in the Pacific within a decade. And, he adds, it will even threaten the United State's ability to defense itself. Some Seventh fleet officers think the balance could tip within five years and they say the West coast is already less than impregnable.

One of Japan's leading defense experts says that in 1976 the Soviet Union fired two experimental missiles which had a 5,000 mile range. This means Soviet submarines--without even leaving the sea of Okhotsk--might be able to hit some strategic targets in the United States.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Seal Hunt"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

A few weeks ago a writer in the Los Angeles Times, Parker Barss Donham, did an article on the 1978 Canadian baby seal hunt. One line in his article was quite thought provoking; "If seal pups were as ugly as lobsters, their harvest would go unnoticed".

Accompanying his article was a photo that proved his point. It was a snow white baby seal with its black nose and round dark eyes looking like something you'd put in the nursery for the children to cuddle. Add to this horrifying accounts of men clubbing these cuddly creatures to death in a mass slaughter with the inference that death comes slowly and agonizingly and it's easy to understand the protests and demonstrations every year.

Now for the record, I couldn't hit one of those seals with a club. I couldn't hit a hog with a club and I squirm when I think about live lobsters being chucked into that boiling pot. Still, I enjoy eating lobster and I love a good steak, but I wouldn't want to work in the packing plant.

Now let me go on with what Mr. Donham had to say about the annual harvest of real pups. How many of us know how sophisticated the protestors are in their annual crusade against the Newfoundlanders who carry on the hunt? There is an international organization which stays in business year round primarily to raise money to protest the seal harvest. A \$40,000-a-year executive rides around in the organization's own helicopter. All of that would stop if they ever succeed in halting the seal harvest. It does give you something to think about-- particularly if you are one of the contributors to the organization.

Time won't permit all the facts disclosed by Mr. Donham but here are some that shed light on what has been portrayed as blood thirsty brutality. In the first place, use of the word, harvest is appropriate. The Canadian government sets the quota of how many seal pups can be taken. The Harp seal is not in danger of extinction. It is one of the most abundant species in the world and the herd is growing, not shrinking. Elimination of the seal pup harvest would have a disastrous effect on the already depleted Atlantic fishing grounds. Each year the seals consume two million tons of small fish that are a vital link in the food chain for cod, sea birds and whales.

So much for that. Now, for the charge that the seal pups suffer a painful and lingering death. Careful research has been done by the Canadian Federation of Humane Societies, Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, the Ontario Humane Society and the Canadian Audabon Society. They have studied the best means of killing seals, such as guns, drugs, gas. Their conclusion is that clubbing with a hardwood bat on the Norwegian hokapik is the most humane method and brings on instant death or deep, irreversible unconsciousness.

According to these researchers, the seal hunt in terms of humane-ness compares favorably with the method of dispatching domesticated animals which provide us with our daily food supply. I'm sure Mr. Donham knew he was bucking an emotional tide when he wrote his article. It took courage, but he performed a useful service.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Dulles Airport"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

American commercial aviation has a safety record unequalled in all the world, but even so we still occasionally hear that dreaded news flash of a plane that didn't make it. Occasionally I fly into Washington's Dulles Airport, so a recent story in Electronic Engineering Times worried me more than a little bit.

The air traffic controllers, those gentlemen who sit with their eyes glued to a radar screen, "talking" planes into a safe landing at Dulles have a complaint--a very legitimate complaint. It has to do with the performance in wet weather of the Federal Aviation Administration's surface detection system.

What we're talking about is the radar called the A.S.D.E.-2 which is used in bad weather to track aircraft after they drop to altitudes of 40 feet or less. The radiating antenna is housed in what is called a spherically shaped radome. That means it's in a round, ball-shaped shelter. That ball is made of rubberized canvas. When it rains or snows (which is when it's needed most) the moisture settles on the ball and is soaked up by that rubberized fabric. This reduces the power of the signal returns and the air controller sees a white spot on his screen instead of the moving blip made by the airplane he's tracking. Incidentally, this system is in use at about a dozen other airports and the same complaint is made at all of them.

F.A.A. engineers have been experimenting with different designs and shapes for the radome to find an answer to the problem. They have come up with one that looks like an upside down tea cup. John Curran, Chief of the Dulles airwave facilities field office, says this shape they've found is the answer. "The moisture drops roll off the dome like rain falling off an overhanging roof" he says.

Well, you'd say that solves the problem--we trade in the oversize tennis balls for over-size inverted tea cups and we're all safer on a rainy day. But hold on. Dulles airport is a federally-owned facility. The change of shape is being blocked for aesthetic reasons by the Department of Interiors Advisory Council of Historic Preservation. Washington's Fine Arts Commission also objects to the proposed new dome shape.

How did they get into the act? Well, it seems that the Dulles Airport terminal building was recently nominated for the National Register of Historic Places by the Secretary of Transportation upon the advice of the Advisory Council of Historic Preservation. This is a group that oversees the care of such designated buildings. So anything that threatens to change the appearance of the airport building is carefully looked at.

I hope by the time you hear this sanity has come to someone in Washington, but at the moment the new and safer dome has been rejected and the F.A.A. controllers who help get the big birds safely down has lost to the Fine Arts Commission.

For me, I don't care whether it looks like an upside down tea cup or an upside down garbage can. I'm for giving those controllers what they want--especially when the weather is bad.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Castro's Prisons"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

While American businessmen continue to visit Cuba dreaming of trade deals to come, one has recently returned from a 14 year Cuban visit. His dream was a nightmare, as he described it to a group of reporters.

Franc Emmicle had a successful business in pre-Castro Cuba. Then, when the United States severed relations with the new government, he closed down his operation. Five militiamen seized him, beat him and threw him in the ocean for dead. He was alive, however, and made his way to the Swiss Embassy. A Swiss official took him to the airport, but he was refused permission to leave Cuba.

He was subsequently charged with being a C.I.A. agent. (This allegation, incidentally, has never been substantiated by any evidence.) Nevertheless, he was thrown into a dark, refrigerated room where, stripped to his underwear, he stayed for five months, sleeping on the bare floor.

Removed from there, he was told his sentence was death and transferred to a dungeon where he spent 9 months during which time 159 of his fellow inmates were executed. Then he was given a full-dress trial with Geneva observers and western correspondents present. Still charged with being a U.S. agent, he was sentenced to 30 years in prison.

For six years he was in Las Cabannas fortress where approximately 5,000 men were crammed into a building built for 500. There were no sanitary facilities and little medical attention. In 1970 he was assigned to another prison where conditions were better, but in spite of a known history of heart trouble he was required to climb 40 stairs three times a day. And, as could be expected he had a heart attack that almost caused his death. Two years later he was back in Las Cabannas where conditions had not improved. It was here that he had his second heart attack. He waited a week for hospitalization.

In December of 1977 he was transferred to a new prison which looked modern and beautiful on the outside but on the inside was a boiler in summer and a freezer in winter. The sewage from the fourth floor leaked through to the first floor. By now, however, treatment was better because the Cubans thought they could make a deal with the new administration in Washington.

This last January a visiting Congressman interviewed him and obtained his release. He had spent 14 years and three months in Castro's Gulag. He says there are four American businessmen still there.

The morning after his lunch with the reporters one of the Congressmen who had arranged his release phoned him and tore him apart for talking about his experiences. They he asked, "Are you going to keep your mouth shut?" Emmick quietly answered, "No. I no longer will be intimidated. I am now free and in America." God bless America.

RONALD REAGAN

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

After being gone for three weeks my desk has blossomed with some interesting little items. For openers we're indebted to National Review. It seems that the school authorities in St. Petersburg, Florida decided to test applicants for teaching jobs instead of just looking at their diplomas. The test was pretty simple: they wanted to find out if the applicants could read, write, add and subtract. Out of the first 15 tested, four flunked.

The New York City fire department has a minor problem to solve, too. One of its retirees won a race up the stairs of the Empire State Building in February. In April he entered the Boston Marathon--26 miles--and finished 133rd out of 4,600 entrants. The problem is, he's retired on a nearly \$12,000 a year pension for a back injury he sustained several years ago. Department officials think maybe he's well enough to return to active duty.

Meanwhile in Washington they are still trying to straighten out bureaucracy's language problem. The Secretary of Transportation sent out this memo: "Regulation means a statement of general or particular applicability and future effect for publication in the Federal Register and designed to implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy or describing the organization, procedure, or practice requirements of the initiating office of the department, except that if such statement implements a financial assistance program, it need not be published in the Federal Register to come under this definition." Did you follow that? Well, you'll be interested to know the Secretary sent it out as a memo on how to write clear and simply regulations.

You know it could be that all Washington really needs is a good plumber. The Bureau of Standards received a letter from a New York plumber who wrote to tell them, "I find hydrochloric acid good for cleaning out clogged drains."

The bureau wasted no time in telling him by mail that "The efficacy of hydrochloric acid is indisputable but the corrosive residue is incompatible with metallic permanence."

The bureau got a fast reply. The plumber wrote: "So glad you agree with me." To which the bureau responded: "We cannot assume responsibility for the production of toxic and noxious residue with hydrochloric acid and suggest you use an alternative."

The plumber replied with enthusiasm that he was tickled pink they agreed with him. This time the bureau answered in the kind of language that real people use. They simply wrote: "Don't use hydrochloric acid--it eats the blankety blank out of the pipes." Of course they weren't on radio so they used a shorter term than "blankety blank".

Just in closing--the President received a wire signed by some 40 popular musicians and singers including names familiar to those who follow radical movements, telling him nuclear power is a grave threat to life on this planet. Scientists they are not.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Health Care"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

By saying it over and over and over again, proponents of government medicine have tried to make us believe that health care costs are spiraling out of sight. And, I'm afraid they have been fairly successful. If a pollster asked about medical costs the average citizen would probably respond that "yes they were rising faster than prices of other commodities." But the average citizen would be wrong because like all the rest of us he's been subjected to a snow job put together by the busy planners in the Department of H.E.W.

It is true that a dollar's worth of medical care ten years ago costs \$1.85 today. But a dollar's worth of plumbing repairs ten years ago costs \$2.10 today. I'm not picking on plumbers; for auto repairs it's \$1.90 and the same figure for blue jeans. A dollar's worth of postage stamps ten years ago costs \$2.22 today, shingling your roof \$2.33 and, to top it off, social security costs have gone up twice as much as the increase in health care costs.

Now how does H.E.W. justify its contrary opinion about medical care? Well, it does it by proving that Disraeli was right when he said, "these are lies, blankety-blank lies and statistics."

H.E.W. doesn't take ten-year figures. H.E.W. just tells us how much medical costs jumped in 1975 and '76--and forgets to tell us that the recession inspired price controls weren't lifted on medicine until 1975--a year after they were lifted on everything else.

When price controls are removed there is a thing called a "bulge". The consumer price index jumped as much for other commodities in 1974 as it did for medical care a year later. It continued to rise for two more years and in the third year leveled off. The bulge in the consumer price index for health care leveled off in the second year.

If we wanted to play H.E.W.'s game we could take just the period between 1965 and 1973 and find that, yes medicine costs rose faster than other prices--and government was to blame. That was the period when government went into medicine by way of Medicaid and added tremendously to the total expenditures for health care.

Secretary of H.E.W. Califano has said Britain's national health care program should be our model. He should take another look. Over an eight year period hospital staffs in Britain increased by 28 percent while the number of hospital beds occupied dropped by 11 percent. Typical of any government program is this next figure--the number of administrative and clerical staff jumped 51 percent. There was talk of a shortage of nurses but the ratio of beds per nurse fell from two to one-and-a-half. Amazingly in view of all this the greatest growth was in the lineup of patients waiting to be admitted to the hospitals. The input of resources went up and the output of services went down.

The Secretary should find a better model--perhaps the system we already have.

Taped: 6/5/78
Airing: 6/19 - 7/7/78

RONALD REAGAN
RADIO COMMENTARY

Disc 78-8

78-8A

Generic Promos

1.	Taxes Again	3:05
2.	National Security	2:37
3.	Hearst	2:52
4.	Spending	2:49
5.	Energy	2:49
6.	Oil	2:39
7.	Russia	2:44

78-8B

1.	Planes	2:42
2.	Drugs	2:42
3.	Foolishness	2:48
4.	Money	2:54
5.	New Talk From A Labor Leader	2:38
6.	Salaries	2:50
7.	Davis-Bacon Act	2:53
8.	Education	2:44

PLEASE NOTE:

1. These programs are provided for airing from June 19th through July 7th inclusive. Maintaining this schedule will enable your station to air all newly recorded programs as received.
2. Please be advised that our office DOES NOT fulfill requests from listeners for copies of Governor Reagan's radio commentaries. The enclosed copies are provided to you for this purpose.

RONALD REAGAN

(reprint of a radio program entitled "Taxes Again"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

By the time you hear this Congress and the Administration may have reached some agreement about taxes but I doubt that will be good news. Congressmen such as Jack Kemp of New York and William Steiger of Wisconsin (with a lot of bipartisan help) have been trying to give all of us a real tax break, but the White House is arm-twisting the leadership in the House and Senate to block them.

Congressman Steiger wants to encourage more capital investment by rolling the capital gains tax back from 50 percent to the 25 percent it was before 1969. Secretary of the Treasury Blumenthal, fresh from addressing business leaders in Florida where he promised to encourage more investment capital, says "no" to Steiger's proposal. He claims it will reduce government revenues from that tax by \$2 billion. That's funny. In the year before the increase the government collected \$7.2 billion from a 25 percent capital gains tax. In the first year at 50 percent the government only collected \$4.7 billion.

As for general tax relief, the White House wants to increase the progressivity of the income tax so there will be little of no relief for anyone making \$20,000 or more. This is known as getting the most feathers possible from the fewest geese in order to minimize the quacking.

Take a family of four with \$20,000 earnings. The President's plan would give them a \$270 income tax cut - offset by a \$261 increase in social security - net tax reduction \$9 maybe. The same family at \$25,000 would have a tax increase of \$119 and again, maybe. Incidentally, at \$25,000 they are in the top 10 percent of taxpayers.

The "maybes" are because the tax reform they are talking in the White House would involve a little "loophole" closing. I doubt you'd call them "loopholes" the deductions you take for local and state taxes including property and special gasoline taxes; your deduction for medical expenses and casualty losses not covered by insurance - those are hardly loopholes.

But about that progressivity - can we steepen the tax brackets any more than they are without being totally unfair to those who work and earn and make this country go?

Right now the bottom one-fourth of all earners pay less than one tenth of one percent of the total tax. Indeed the bottom 50 percent only pay six percent of the total. At \$10,000 you become part of the top 50 percent who are paying 94 percent of the tax. 48.6 of that 50 percent earn between \$10,000 and \$50,000 a year. Closing of those so called loopholes would really hurt because you pay 71 percent of the tax. The 1.4 percent who earn \$50,000 and up pay almost one-fourth of the total tax - 23 percent.

When the President told his party's platform committee our "tax structure is a disgrace - it must be made more progressive" - he was only right about one thing - it is a disgrace.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "National Security"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

For some time now we have made it increasingly difficult for the F.B.I. and the C.I.A. to gather information about the Soviet Union. Now a security windfall drops in our lap and it seems as if we are trying to pretend it hasn't happened.

The top ranking Soviet official at the United Nations, Arkady Shevchenko, a 47-year-old protege of Foreign Minister Gromyko has defected and refused to return to Russia. Shevchenko is privy to the Kremlin's foreign policy secrets and its espionage efforts aimed at us and our allies.

Our experts in this field say this could be the biggest and most important breakthrough for us since World War II. In their opinion Shevchenko is probably fully informed of Russia's strategy and its worldwide goals. He is, in addition, fully informed as to what the Soviets hope to achieve in the strategic arms limitation talks - SALT II.

From what he has revealed so far we can demolish Russia's claim that the Backfire bomber is only a medium range, not a strategic bomber. He has knowledge of Russia's use of Cuban troops and its plans for Africa. How much is it worth to us to have laid out for us the Soviet plans for using Cuba as a base?

The concern of our intelligence forces is that policymakers in the State department may try to hush up Shevchenko's revelations possibly because they'll expose the weakness of our own policies - expose them not to the Russians who already know about them, but to us - the American people. There is also the possibility that we can't continue trying to buddy up to the Russians if we learn too much about what they have planned for us. There have already been off-the-record statements that this neatly tied gift of great value couldn't have come at a worse time. It's almost as if someone was complaining that he'd almost made friends with a fellow and was sorry to learn the fellow was stealing his wallet.

I suppose we must always be on guard against a Soviet plant who will feed us misinformation, but surely we can check this against our own knowledge of KGB agents and operations. As a matter of fact since his defection we have arrested two Soviet United Nations employees as spies.

Who knows, Shevchenko might have information of possible ties between the Weathermen Underground and the Soviet Union which could prove that the F.B.I. agents the Justice department is prosecuting were right in doing what they did a few years ago. Those agents have based their defense on proving the Weathermen were working closely with Soviet agents.

With defense budgets being debated, arguments going on about the B-1 Bomber and the neutron weapon why shouldn't the American people hear Shevchenko's story?

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Hearst"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Patty Hearst is back in prison to serve a term for participating in a bank robbery and other crimes.

There is no question about her participation in these events. She freely admitted it and apparently identified her fellow participants. Her only defense was that she had been kidnapped by a terrorist band calling itself the Symbionese Liberation Party and frightened by them into doing the things she did. That kidnapping occurred four years ago. She was in the hands of her kidnapers or with them, however you want to put it for almost two years. Since then, she has of course been involved in the trials which resulted in her conviction.

During this latter period we were treated to frequent newsreel shots of Patty and her family and those high-priced lawyers. We saw her being pushed through crowds of press and photographers on her way to court appearances. There were countless columns, editorials and articles and always the drumbeat that as a rich little girl she was getting favored treatment.

Is this really true? Would a girl from a family of modest means have been thrown into prison willy nilly without a fair trial?

Let's recast the scenario and see how it looks if Patty Hearst is played by Patty "almost poor" who is brutally dragged from her home and spirited away by terrorists. We see news photos of her grief-stricken family in their modest home, but as months go by the press turns to other stories. The police, F.B.I. all the agencies of our justice system are helpless to find her.

Then her suffering and bewildered family receives a message that she has renounced them and joined her kidnapers in their revolution. A photo months later shows her apparently engaged with them in a bank robbery. She is subsequently arrested and charged with this and other crimes.

Her family hires the best lawyer they can afford (possibly after mortgaging their home) and the case comes to trial. Patty "almost poor" takes the stand and admits to her participation in the crimes. Then she goes back to the kidnapping (which a lot of people seem to have forgotten).

Her lawyer asks her to tell in her own words what happened to her in those almost two years prior to her arrest. A jury listens intently as this lone girl tells how she was bound, blindfolded and crammed for an interminable time in a closet so small she sat for hours on end with her knees tucked beneath her chin. She told of being moved from one hideout to another, sexually abused, beaten, threatened over and over again with death because her parents were somehow enemies of society.

Yes, she finally did as they ordered--because she was afraid; too afraid even to try and escape because she thought they'd find her and kill her. After all they were able to escape capture by all the power of the law.

In our society the accused must be proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Every day rapists, muggers and even killers are freed because of technicalities or some questionable evidence. Isn't there a possibility that Patty "almost poor" was telling the truth? Is Patty Hearst in prison because her family has money?

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Spending"

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

It's impossible anymore to itemize the Federal budget to see how it managed to grow to its present size but you might be interested in a few scattered bits of extravagance. For example the cost of running 41 Federal regulatory agencies has gone up 115% in five years.

I suppose it's foolish to mention anything in less than millions and billions when you are talking about a half trillion dollar budget. But then maybe that's why the Secretary of Energy doesn't feel extravagant when he decides to spend \$32,000 for private restrooms in the new departments quarters. The Federal Home Loan Bank tops him by spending twice that much to tear out its new washrooms and replace them with private rooms and showers for its executives.

Then over in Congress, the House Administration committee will double that amount, spending \$126,000 for 450 17-inch color tv sets for its members. The committee chairman says they are doing it to help correct the deficit in our balance of trade with Japan. They are buying American-made sets.

This one I'm sure will touch your heart. The health planners in Washington are determined to cut public health care costs by reducing QUOTE - "Unnecessary surgery" - UNQUOTE - . According to them, that term fits such things as cataract operations and hysterectomies. However if a man agrees to dress in women's clothes for a year the Public Health Service says Medicare should pay for his - QUOTE - "gender reassignment surgery" - UNQUOTE - .

On the subject of health, the House Appropriations committee has discovered that Labor department employees in the Office of Worker Compensation, filed 10 times as many injury claims for themselves as did employees in other government offices. Maybe it's all in knowing how. Anyway, their take came to half a million dollars tax free.

Some time ago on one of these broadcasts I mentioned some of the short comings of the C.E.T.A. program. Those initials stand for Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. It has \$11 billion to spend and where the money is that big, a little scandal is not an unusual thing.

In Dade County, Florida, a grand jury has found waste, false record keeping and criminal violations in the federally-funded programs. One C.E.T.A. employer turned out to be a pool hall operator who hired his nephew with the federal money.

In another Florida county I don't know whether it's dishonest or not but the Federal money will be used to pay \$2.65 an hour (the minimum wage) to illiterate students for going to school.

Is it any wonder that Senator Jesse Helms suggested that the Senate recess for one minute on May 6th in honor of the taxpayers. May 6th was the day the average worker started working for himself. From January 1 until that date he's been working to pay his share of the cost of government.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Energy"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

I've been waiting to see if Washington would be rocked by another "scandal of the tapes" but so far all is quiet. Of course the tapes I'm talking about are computer tapes, but even so there may have been monkey business in the marble halls.

A state representative from Louisiana, according to a wire story several weeks ago, charged the new federal energy department in Washington with computer rigging. The idea, he said, was to produce false data proving that the Administration's energy plan would work.

Billy Tauzin, chairman of the Southwest Regional Energy council says--QUOTE--
"The plan doesn't and can't work. It will fall far short of its projections in all forms of energy production--oil, natural gas, coal and nuclear"--UNQUOTE--

Now if this were just an expression of opinion representing one side of a debate we could wait to hear the other side. It's far more than that and it follows on two or three other cover-ups regarding our energy situation. The council had to invoke the Freedom of Information Act to get the computer tapes from the Department of Energy. According to Tauzin, the computer model was tampered with or--QUOTE--
"manipulated 21 different ways between December, 1976 and last April so it would coincide with what the planners wanted this country to believe about the plan"--UNQUOTE--
The Congressional delegations from the council's five-member states and the White House have been advised of this. So far no comment that I've heard or read from the Department of Energy on the charge that in addition to the manipulating, three unusable tapes and one that was blank were delivered to the council before the department eventually yielded the information. The allegation is that the idea had been to hide basic information about the energy plan until Congress had acted on it. Acted of course on the basis of false information and figures.

Projections of energy production between now and 1985 were falsified. The plan before Congress would result in a big shortfall and major economic and political problem in the country. A federal audit advisory team said that changes in the computer model were made by persons in the Department of Energy. The audit team said no outside agencies or experts were consulted about the changes. It sounds as if it was a nice cozy in-house operation.

I'm no expert in the field of producing natural gas and oil, but for those who are, two major changes contributed to the false conclusion. Data was projected that no additional natural gas would be produced if the price was allowed to rise to \$1.75 per 1000 cubic feet and that the equivalent of 30 barrels of oil is produced for each foot a well is drilled. That last one sounds fishy to even an amateur such as me.

But of even greater importance than the monkey business with our need for oil and gas is the arrogance of bureaucratic officials who would distort the facts if the facts didn't support their theories.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Oil")

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

In 1976 during the primary campaign in California I had been talking about the failure of Congress to do anything constructive about the "energy crisis". Oh Congress had done something but it couldn't be called constructive. The energy bill they came up with didn't encourage the increased production of oil by a single barrel. In fact scores of rigs drilling oil had closed down all over the country.

One day I was invited to visit an oil field in the Long Beach harbor area. The reason for the invitation? - Every well was closed down. Thousands of barrels of oil not being pumped because our government had set a wellhead price on those wells of \$4.50 a barrel and it costs more than \$4.50 to bring that oil to the surface.

But standing there in the midst of those silent pumps we could look across a pier and see a Japanese tanker unloading Arab oil at \$13.50 a barrel. Well, a few days ago I ran into the gentleman who had invited me to that oil field two years ago. He told me those hundreds of pumps are still closed down because our government price ceiling is still \$4.50 and the cost of pumping oil is six. So each and every day 37,000 barrels of oil have to be replaced by that high-priced Arab oil. Since my visit two years ago the total is more than 27 million barrels of oil we could have had for the pumping.

In 1973 at the time of the embargo we had only been importing 23 percent of our oil; now it's 47 percent. The administration has told us we must learn to conserve and thus reduce the amount of oil we have to import. Well economists have it figured out that for every 5 percent increase in price we allow, we'll increase domestic supplies by one percent. They also tell us that because we are maintaining our domestic price at 30 percent less than the import price we are consuming about three million barrels per day more than we otherwise would. Now add three million barrels we'd save if the price were allowed to go higher and two million barrels more per day we'd pump domestically if the price were higher and you have a five million barrel a day reduction in our imports. At \$13.50 a barrel that just about wipes out the deficit in our balance of trade.

I know that's a lot of arithmetic to absorb by radio, especially if you are driving. But when you stop to think that gasoline at our present rate of inflation will rise by 82 percent over the next five years if that inflation rate continues and food will only go up 54 percent it makes you wonder why government has such a blind spot with regard to oil and natural gas.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Russia"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

No one can make a headline by proclaiming that "travel is broadening". But in the sense of adding to ones knowledge and understanding it really is.

Congressman John Wydler (WIDE-LER) of New York just possibly has re-discovered the truth of the old adage. Recently, he returned from a trip to the Soviet Union and has told his constituents the trip was an eye-opening experience.

When Congressman and Mrs. Wydler arrived in Moscow, American officials there gave them a kind of checklist. It was a security briefing that told them a great deal about life in the worker's paradise. There were five specific points. Number one - All telephone calls, they were told, were monitored by the Soviets. Number two - They were to assume that all rooms have electronic eavesdropping equipment, and that all conversations will be monitored. Number three - Assume that all drivers understand English and are required to report all conversations. Number four - Assume that any luggage or briefcases in your rooms will be searched while you are absent. Number five - Assume all trash thrown in wastebaskets will be examined.

The Wydlers had an experience that made them believers in the check list. They returned to their hotel room one day to find that all the window drapes had been removed. Mrs. Wydler pointed out to her husband that there was no way to cover the windows and have any kind of privacy.

The Congressman turned toward the chandelier and yelled - Quote - "Bring back those drapes - right now" - Unquote - . And they did. Now you know that would be a funny scene in a movie; the door bursting open with a half dozen people rushing to the window, hanging curtains as fast as they can.

That part of the checklist having to do with drivers who all understood English reminded me of an experience in Sacramento a few years ago. A delegation of Soviet journalists was touring America and our State department called to say they wanted to interview me. We had a kind of press conference with an interpreter translating their questions to me and my answers to them. I got a little curious so at one point I told a joke. About two-thirds of them laughed before the interpreter opened his mouth.

Another Congressman returned from Russia with a little "travel-is-broadening" experience he related to the American Security Council. John Breckenridge told of a meeting with Soviet deputy defense minister N.V. Ogarkov (OH-GAR-KOFF). The Marshal told him, - QUOTE - "Today the Soviet Union has military superiority over the United States and henceforth the United States will be threatened. You had better get used to it." - UNQUOTE -

Congressman Breckenridge told the Council: - QUOTE - "The United States - not its people - in spite of an economy unmatched in the world has either accepted or bungled into a position of inferiority predicated on budgetary insufficiency." - UNQUOTE -

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Planes"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Many of us have had our say about the B-1 bomber, the neutron weapon, cruise missiles, and so forth. Now there is the case of another type of aircraft and I doubt if many of us know about it or its importance. Congressman Bill Dickenson of Alabama knows about it, probably because he's a member of the House Armed Services Committee. And, thanks to him, you're going to hear about it if you'll stay with me for a few minutes.

Now, one of our major defense areas is the Western front in Europe - the NATO line. The Soviet Union has a vast offensive force with tens of thousands of tanks arrayed against the combined American and European contingents. Part of our strategy is based on our ability to move forces swiftly across the Atlantic in the event of an attack. This means aerial transport of men and equipment. And equipment means armored vehicles and tanks the Soviets already have, combat-ready and in place.

Our initial force would be the mechanized brigade which has 21 different vehicles including tanks. In-all, the brigade consists of 4,295 troops and 1,130 vehicles. The C-130 transport is our present aircraft for moving this force. It can only carry seven of the 21 vehicles and cannot transport tanks. I'm sure the Soviets are well aware of this.

An amazing new type aircraft is under development. It bears a great many initials in the description of its characteristics but they all boil down to "Advanced Medium Short Take-Off and Landing Transport." It will carry heavy out-sized cargo - tanks and armored vehicles. And it can travel long distances and can land and takeoff from short runways. I'm talking about the Boeing YC-14. Two "wings" of these aircraft could transport an entire brigade and equipment to Germany in 12 hours. It would take a combination of C-130's and ground or sea transportation a lot longer. The C-130 can only land on 93 of Germany's airfields - the YC-14 can land on 306.

All of this sounds reassuring, doesn't it? But there is a kicker in the story - Last December the administration cancelled the YC-14 program in one of its "national security" or perhaps I should say "insecurity" decisions.

Meanwhile, by some strang coincidence the Soviet Union just happens to be going full-speed-ahead on an airplane building program. And the plane they are building looks for all the world like a mirror image of the YC-14. Well, why not? The YC-14 is the most advanced idea in cargo transport of combat forces and equipment in the world today.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Drugs"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Back in 1962 the late Senator Estes Kefauver tacked an amendment onto the Food, Drug and Cosmetics act. It was the time of near-hysteria over the Thalidomide tragedies in Europe (no one paid much attention to the fact that Thalidomide had been banned in the United States since 1938.) The seemingly innocuous amendment was passed and we're still suffering from the unexpected repercussion.

The Federal Drug administration exists to protect us from drugs or medicines such as Thalidomide that could prove harmful to our health. Senator Kefauver's amendment stated that - in addition - the F.D.A. had to establish that the drug was effective. This is a nearly impossible task. What is effective for one patient may do nothing for another. So long as the medicine is not a menace to health, the doctor discovers which patient responds to what medication.

The result of the Kefauver amendment was a toboggan slide for the United States pharmaceutical industry which, till then, had led the world in the discovery and production of health-giving medicines. The average time for developing a new drug went from about two years to eight or 10 - or more. The cost jumped from an average of about \$1 million to \$20 million and sometimes twice that. The time between application for a licence and approval jumped from seven months to more than two years. We dropped from about 56 new medicines a year to 17 in the first year the amendment was in effect.

Smaller firms were forced out of the market and only a few major corporations could carry on. The F.D.A. protests that we haven't been denied any "important" drugs because of the 1962 amendment. Is that true? Hardly.

All but one of the 11 drugs introduced for epilepsy in the United States since 1962 were first introduced in England by margins up to a dozen years. Half of the drugs for epilepsy in use there are still not available here.

I chose this particular illustration because the F.D.A. has just gotten around to approving Sodium Valpurote, the most effective drug known to medical science in the treatment of epilepsy. It's been in use in Europe for 10 years. The Commission for the Control of Epilepsy says it can prevent a million epileptic seizures a year.

FDA's claim that Americans have not been denied access to important drugs is just not true. In addition to Sodium Valpurote there are medications for high blood pressure, hypertension and asthma which were proven successes in Europe for years before they were made available in the United States. And many are still banned here.

A Congressman from Idaho, Steve Symms has introduced a bill to simply repeal the Kefauver amendment. He has 113 co-signers. He needs more, and we need the result that repeal of the amendment would bring.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Foolishness"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

The scene is an emergency room in a large midwest metropolitan hospital. An ambulance pulls in to the emergency entrance. Now if you instantly pictured in your mind attendants flinging open the doors, a stretcher being wheeled in and doctors being paged on the loudspeaker, forget it.

An elderly woman disembarks under her own power and walks into Emergency to see a doctor about her chronic sinus condition. The doctor treats her and writes three prescriptions, fuming all the while. Ambulance rental is about \$40 or \$50. It costs \$35 just to walk into the emergency room. Then the lady calmly called for an ambulance to take her home. Total bill? Probably \$115 to \$135. No, she was not an eccentric individual of great wealth. She is on Medicaid. You and I paid the bill.

According to the doctor, this should have been an office call - it certainly was not an emergency. Cab fare would have been about three dollars. The doctor says this is not an unusual thing. One man arrived in an ambulance and his ailment was a toothache. Ambulance arrivals get priority so there is no waiting as there might be in the doctor's reception room.

Sometimes (if anyone cares enough) they can send the patient home in what's called a medicar - that only costs about half as much as an ambulance.

This next item has nothing to do with medicine, except that after you hear it, you might want to take a tranquilizer. Do you remember that our government sometime ago appropriated money to go into the automobile business - well at least for one car? The idea was that Washington would build a safe, non-polluting, economical, low-gas-mileage car to prove the automobile industry could (if they would) produce such cars using existing technology.

Well, Secretary of Transportation Brock Adams has unveiled the department's \$250,000 ideal car. There was quite a ceremony to show off the re-built Impala. It gets 27-and-a-half miles to the gallon with a Volov engine mounted crosswise and meets all the long term clean air laws.

As for passenger safety it protects them in the event of a 40-mile-an-hour head-on collision and a broadside of 30-miles-an-hour.

According to the Secretary and Joan Claybrook, administrator of the National Highway Transportation Safety agency, the government had proven that the automobile industry could achieve all of the federally mandated requirements if it really wanted to. Indeed Ms. Claybrook made a speech to the Economics Club of Detroit claiming the \$250,000 car could be produced at roughly present day production costs.

But guess what? The magic car has never been tested to see if all those accolades and statistics are true. The California company that did the job for the government says there was no money in the budget for testing.

The Secretary is blaming Mrs. Claybrook and Mrs. Claybrook's staff says she was not fully briefed and that her claims were - well - exaggerated.

Oh well - at \$250,000 it'll look good in the Smithsonian.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Money"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

It is easy to dismiss anemia of the dollar as due to the high price of imported oil, but don't look too closely at that excuse if it gives you comfort to believe it. West Germany and Japan import all of their oil, not half and their currencies are very robust.

It won't make you feel better to know that an editor of National Review magazine more than 10 years ago - long before there was an oil crisis - wrote a book called Death of the Dollar. In it he prophesied exactly what was going to happen to the dollar - and it has.

Among the causes he listed for the dollar's predicted problems were inflation, government hobbles on enterprise, payment for not working and punitive taxes on saving, investment and honest labor. All of these and more have been standard during these past 10 years.

Incidentally, for whatever part that high-priced imported oil has played in our spiraling inflation, here is one example of how we've dealt with that problem. A federal judge in Massachusetts issued an injunction prohibiting the sale of oil exploration leases for the Georges Banks off Cape Cod on the grounds that "irreparable" ecological harm would follow such exploration. What are the facts? In 25 years, from 1950 to 1975 the total annual catch of fish in Massachusetts dropped from almost 600 million pounds to less than 300 million without any oil or gas drilling activity. In Louisiana where there was great offshore drilling and production the fish catch increased 400 percent.

But look at the evidence of some of those other factors and their inflationary effects - government regulation for example. A new car this year will cost almost \$700 more than it should because of federal regulations. This was listed in a report by the Joint Economic Committee of Congress along with a finding that government red tape at all levels was adding about \$2,500 to the cost of a new home.

The study set the total cost to business (and therefore the public) for complying with federal regulations alone at 20 times the cost of operating the multitude of agencies. It will come to about \$100 billion this year.

Some time ago on one of these broadcasts I told of how the Renegotiation board, slated to go out of business in 1976, had made itself virtually permanent by way of its backlog and by taking upon itself tasks it was not set up to perform. It is, by the way, a temporary board set up during the Korean war to renegotiate contracts where it is believed there have been over-charges to the government.

Senator Lugar of Indiana has reported to a Senate appropriations subcommittee that the board in the last two years has cost the government from three to \$10 for every dollar in excess profits it recovers.

It's a small agency. If Congress can't kill it why should we believe Congress can save us from the entrenched leviathons of bureaucracy? It will only do so when we the people tell our Congressmen the agencies go or they go.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "New Talk From A Labor Leader"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Jerry Wurf is President of the nation's largest union of public employees, the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal employees. He has long been a leading liberal in national politics, and was an important campaign ally for President Carter in 1976. But now some of the advice Mr. Wurf is giving Mr. Carter sounds a lot like what Republicans have been saying for quite a while.

For several years now liberals in Congress have urged that the government become the "employer of last resort". That philosophy was predominant among supporters of the Humphrey-Hawkins bill. Apparently, though, Jerry Wurf is not among them, at least not any longer.

Recently, he told the National Press Club -- QUOTE --" I reject the concept of government as the employer of last resort. This theory is a sure and proven loser." UNQUOTE--

"The availability of private sector jobs is a prerequisite for the health of American cities as well as the foundation of a prosperous American society...Private sector employment must be the linchpin of true urban recovery--and incentives for private investment are the key to a workable program of urban progress.

And, Mr. Wurf continued, --QUOTE--"By and large, we have taken a ward-of-the-state approach to solving the urban crisis. If we choose, we can continue to follow that course...That kind of system may keep the cities breathing. But there will be no life there, no vitality, no share in the commerce, pride, and dignity of our national community. The long range solution demands more. It demands the revival of self-sufficiency in our once great urban centers. Private investors have abandoned the cities in droves, taking jobs and opportunities with them. Government policy has encouraged and rewarded this trend. It is a trend which must be diverted. That is why the stimulation of commerce, industry, jobs, and a reasonable safe, environment in the hardship cities is crucial to urban recovery."--UNQUOTE.

Labor leader Jerry Wurf goes on to recommend several key elements to revitalizing older cities. Significantly, the first is not higher pay raises and benefits for his own union members. It is, he says, --QUOTE--"federal tax policies capable of encouraging private, job-producing investments."--UNQUOTE--. No one could take issue with some of the elements of Mr. Wurf's program, both as to the cost of the taxpayer, and Washington's increased power over the cities. But in his basis analysis, I'd say Jerry Wurf is right on the mark. The vitality of our cities does depend on their ability to attract job-creating private investment. The federal governments policies on the other hand have helped to discourage that investment. Let's hope that Jerry Wurf's analysis hits home with his friends at the White House.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Salaries"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

According to the census bureau there are 218 million men, women, children and babies in America--of which more than half--124 million--are dependent on tax dollars for all or most of their income. Let me hasten to say we shouldn't rise up in wrath automatically assuming they are all parasites. Many are legitimate pensioners, social security recipients and, of course, government employees.

But, with less than half the population supporting more than half (in addition to themselves and their own dependents) we need to make sure there are safeguards against extravagance, waste and/or cheating. What it comes down to is a work force of roughly 70 million or so in business and industry paying the whole bill out of their earnings. Remember that the private business is government's only source of revenue. True, government employees pay taxes but even those dollars first had to be taken from the 70 odd million.

What I'm going to say now should not be taken as an attack on public employees. There are about 14½ million of them with some 32 million dependents of their own and I'm sure all of us feel they too are entitled as we are to a fair days pay for a fair days work. Indeed we have insured that this will be so by passing statutes that government workers will be paid at a rate comparable to pay in private business for similar work.

The President has proposed a five to five-and-a-half percent pay raise for all federal workers, but the increasingly powerful federal unions say this isn't enough. It's possible those union leaders are trying to justify their own existence by making a lot of noise.

The fact is federal salaries through the upper-middle levels are well above private business salaries. The Commerce department says the average federal salary in 1976 was \$16,201 about \$4,700 higher than the \$11,483 business and industry average. And the federal employees received a seven percent plus increase in 1977. It is apparent that comparability has been replaced by political considerations with regard to federal salaries.

We can no longer afford unrestrained growth in the size of government or retention of personnel not absolutely essential to our needs. Government is the biggest growth industry in America. A \$38 billion payroll in 1973 has become \$68 billion in 1978.

The old days of government employees talking about getting out of government to make money are long gone. In 1973 there were 5,000,000 inquiries about Federal jobs--last year there were 12,000,000. Government workers get twice as many holidays, have the best retirement program in the nation, pay raises are automatic and there is no question about job security. And, as federal salaries go up, the pressure at local and state government levels for comparable increases becomes almost impossible to resist.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Davis-Bacon Act"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

If someone proposed a law that raised the cost of building school buildings, city halls, sewer projects and other civic works, you'd probably say he was crazy. What would you say if such a law also raised construction costs for housing, increased federal taxes, added to the bureaucracy, dumped a load of excess paper work on business and industry and had the effect of limiting job opportunities for minority workers?

You'd probably say I was putting you on, but I'm not. There is such a law on the books -- the Davis-Bacon act. According to the United States General Accounting office, it results in increased costs in public construction of some one to three billion dollars a year.

The Davis-Bacon act requires employees on all federally-assisted construction projects to be paid what are known as "prevailing wages". This amounts to a sort of "super-minimum wage". When it was passed in 1931 the Act was meant to discourage migrant contractors from undercutting wage rates in higher-wage areas. Today, with migrant contractors a thing of the past, the Davis-Bacon act has the opposite effect from what was intended. Because the "prevailing wage" determinations are based mostly on union wage scales in large urban areas, the act tends to "import" those high rates into rural areas where wages -- and the cost of living -- are lower. This insures that construction costs in rural areas will be higher than they otherwise would have been and local contractors are often excluded.

Let's look at an example. Let's say Small Town, Minnesota decides to build an addition to its library with the help of a few dollars it gets from federal revenue sharing. The federal government tells the town officials that they may not do business with any contractor who does not pay his employees wage rates which have been set by the Labor department.

Typically, the Labor department will look to collective bargaining contracts made in Minneapolis, several hundred miles away from the library project. If bricklayers and carpenters are being paid \$13 an hour in Minneapolis, this will be the wage set for Small Town's library, even though the normal going rate there is \$10 an hour.

In a stroke, wage competition is outlawed and the town's taxpayers pay more than they normally would for the library addition. And, the local contractor may not even bid on the job, for he doesn't want to tell half his work force that they'll receive \$10 an hour for private projects while the other half receives \$13 for working on the federally-assisted project.

Even in large metropolitan areas, the Davis-Bacon act poses problems where volunteer and neighborhood groups want to restore and upgrade substandard housing. These groups, which often want to provide jobs for minority workers, find themselves unable to pay the wages mandated by Washington.

I used that Minnesota example because one of its Congressman, Tom Hagedorn, has called the Davis-Bacon act "a perfect example of regulatory legislation that has outlived its time" and he's introduced comprehensive legislation to reform it. If the President is serious about reforming federal regulation, he should take a good look at this new "Federal Construction Costs Reduction act".

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Education"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

This won't be another installment in the story of our recent travelogue I did about our trip to Asia but it is about one of the nations we visited. It just happens to be about someone else's trip.

Last fall a group of west coast editors visited the Republic of China on Taiwan. One of them, Joe Gendron of Pomona, did an article on the tour they made of an elementary school on their final day in Taiwan.

For almost 10 years now free public education has been compulsory for all Chinese children through the 9th grade. Japan is the only other Asian nation where such educational opportunities are offered. Beyond 9th grade, high school and college education is provided on the basis of competitive exams. This does have a tendency to make the children a bit serious about their school work.

The school day starts at 8 a.m. and ends at 4 p.m. The students also go half a day on Saturday. There is, of course, a summer vacation such as we have here in our schools but with a slight difference. Once each week during the summer the children return to school to hand in their homework and keep the teachers posted on what they are doing during the summer.

The teachers get about \$200 a month and are paid year round even though their summer work is only part-time. But hear this--there are very few administrators, unlike our own schools where non-teaching employees have been increasing twice as fast as the number of teachers. There are no custodians in the Taiwan schools. Mr. Gendron says all the housekeeping chores are done by the students and teachers during the noon break. Incidentally, they all bring their lunches. There is no cafeteria in the school.

Great emphasis is placed on physical education. The school has a large outdoor swimming pool and the students swim every day during the school year. The pool, by the way, has no heating system--just sunshine.

Mr. Gendron says their group arrived at the school just in time for the start of the day's routine. On a voice command, 5,000 boys and girls poured out of classrooms and lined up in the outside corridors facing on the school yard. Another command and they started marching to the music of "It's a Small World". Gendron said it was a moving experience to see this number of children take their positions in ranks in the school yard. Students all wear a distinctive uniform which keeps down the clothing expense for parents.

Standing at attention they doffed their hats and sang their national anthem as the flag of the Republic of China was raised to the top of the flag pole. Then an instructor led teachers and children in calisthenics.

I know the picture of uniformed students marching and obeying commands will be denounced by some as regimentation and authoritarianism. It really isn't when you recall the news photos of Chinese children on the mainland, also in uniform but learning how to throw hand grenades and use a bayonet.

Taped 6/5/78
Aired 7/10 - 7/28/78

RONALD REAGAN
RADIO COMMENTARY

Disc 78-9

78-9A

Generic Promos

1. Normalization	2:50
2. U. S.-China Relations	2:39
3. District of Columbia	2:51
4. Fraud	2:43
5. SALT Talks	3:01
6. Cities	2:52
7. Stamps	2:31

78-9B

1. Asia	2:45
2. Asia II	2:52
3. Free Press	2:33
4. Alexander Solzhenitsyn	2:39
5. Alexander Solzhenitsyn II	2:46
6. Inflation	3:18
7. Malibu	2:53
8. Miscellaneous	2:42

PLEASE NOTE:

1. These programs are provided for airing from July 10th through July 28th inclusive. Maintaining this schedule will enable your station to air all newly recorded programs as received.
2. Please be advised that our office DOES NOT fulfill requests from listeners for copies of Governor Reagans's radio commentaries. The enclosed copies are provided to you for this purpose.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Normalization"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

One result of the Brzezinski trip to Peking in May seems to be an accelerated timetable by the Carter administration to complete the so-called "normalization" of diplomatic relations with Peking. The purpose of all this, we're led to believe, is to checkmate Russian expansionism and to make the Soviets more agreeable at the bargaining table.

Whether the strategy works remains to be seen, but it is a chancy game. Why wouldn't the Russians be just as likely to insist on better arms terms for themselves on the grounds that a new U.S.-Peking alliance would be a case of two against one. And, lest we forget, the leaders of Communist China say over and over again in their speeches that the United States is simply the lesser of two evils. We have something they want: technology and sophisticated industrial equipment. Once they get it so they can industrialize by the end of this century, what will they do then? Meantime, it's beginning to look as if our government is willing to pay the price Peking has put on "normalization", though it is hard to see what is in it for us. Their price has three elements. These are, that we break relations with the Republic of China on Taiwan; that we break our 24-year-old mutual security treaty with that government; and that we withdraw all military advisers from Taiwan.

Following the Brzezinski trip, word comes that the administration has been quietly promoting its own "three conditions" for "normalization". Mr. Carter is said to have told some members of the Trilateral commission last month that the U.S. will insist on maintaining trade and military assistance with Taiwan; that it would set up a trade office in Taipei; and that it would ask the Communists to make it clear they would not use force to gain control of Taiwan.

As to the last point, the Communist Chinese are in no position to attack Taiwan militarily at this time. Taipei has more to fear from economic strangulation.

By "normalizing" relations with Peking we would be acknowledging that Taiwan was merely a province under Peking's jurisdiction. What then if Peking were to impose impossible restrictions on outsiders wanting to trade with Taiwan. We could complain, but legally it would be none of our business.

Some China scholars in this country are so anxious to complete the so-called "normalization" that one of them, a well known law professor, has put forth a legal formulation to scuttle our treaty with the free Chinese. He says that if we recognize Peking the treaty with Taipei would simply lapse since we would no longer have formal relations with its government.

It we treat an ally that way, what good is our word anywhere? What will the Japanese think of our reliability, or the Israelis, who rely on our moral commitment and have no defense treaty with us?

One rumor making the rounds is that Mr. Carter may announce "normalization" by next February. Now that his former advertising man is a sort of Secretary of Symbolism in the White House, would it surprise you if they picked February 28, the anniversary of the signing of the Shanghai Communique?

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "U.S.-China Relations"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

In my last broadcast I talked about what seems to be the White House' determination to go through with so-called "normalization" with the Communist Chinese in the next few months.

Now, most Americans (according to many public opinion polls) favor being friends with the mainland Chinese, but they don't want to do it at the expense of our longtime allies and friends of the Republic of China on Taiwan. But the trouble is, we can't have it both ways. Peking has set three demands as the price for so-called "normalization". One is that we break diplomatic relations with Taipei to open an embassy in Peking. Another is that we break our mutual security treaty with the Republic of China; and the third is that we withdraw our military advisers from Taiwan.

Ever since Mr. Brzezinski came back from visiting Peking, the administration seems to be nudging its way toward accepting the Communists' terms. First, our government announced the closing of two popular U.S. information libraries on Taiwan, though they had been in business for many years. Then, the word went out that our government would not object to our European allies selling Peking armaments even if these included American technology.

Understandably, our allies on Taiwan are wondering what they have done to deserve the increasingly cold shoulder they are getting from Washington.

But, while official Washington is ignoring American public opinion in favor of moves which may turn out to be both expedient and mistaken, there isn't much question but what the people of these United States are strong friends of the Chinese on Taiwan.

Our trade with Taiwan last year -- a not-so-large island with 17 million inhabitants -- was nearly \$6 billion, while our trade with the mainland and its nearly 900 million people amounted to a little more than \$300 million worth.

To underscore the importance it attaches to good trade relations with us, the Republic of China in June sent over its second trade mission this year with a \$750 million shopping list of American goods it wants to buy. They'll be sending a third delegation over in September. The purpose is to help balance the balance of trade.

Meanwhile, friendship is being expressed in other quarters. The Democratic National Committee, at its meeting in Washington last month, passed a resolution urging the President and Congress to continue "maintenance of our historical policy of supporting the independence and freedom of the Republic of China".

And, in Plains, Georgia a delegation from Kaohsiung, its sister city on Taiwan, dedicated a Chinese garden to the people of Plains, as a gift from its citizens. A group of the visitors even called on the President's mother, "Miss Lillian".

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "District of Columbia"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Thirteen colonies have become 50 sovereign states each with its own capitol, its own government, with powers firmly fixed by the Constitution. And these states are joined together in a federation.

Which colony or which of the 50 states should be the locale of the national capitol? The founding fathers solved that problem with great common sense. Wanting to make sure we preserved the system of sovereign states, an idea unique in the world, they created a district separate and apart from the states to serve as the site for the nation's capitol. That very simply is the "D.C."--District of Columbia.

By doing this the issue of conflict of interest was neatly solved, the federal government cannot in any way be charged with favoring one state over the others. Federal employees living in the national capitol cannot have an undue influence on the congress with regard to their own interests because they don't vote for representatives in Congress. It is all spelled out in Article One, Section Eight of the Constitution that the seat of government would be exempt from the political process so that federal government would remain the servant of the people and not become their master.

Over the years, as the national government has taken on more and more tasks and thus assumed greater and greater power, Washington has become the fastest growing city in America probably because it created the fastest growing industry--government. The citizens of the District elect officials of city government and also vote for President and Vice President. The district receives an annual grant from the federal government--no strings attached--which makes up 38% of its budget. Federal aid amounts to more than \$1000 per capita per year. No state receives that level of handout from Washington. Incidentally, Washington is the richest metropolitan area in the United States. Problems in the rest of the country mean more prosperity for Washington, where the government will happily try to solve anything. Per household income averages \$10,000 higher than in New York City, possibly because 38 per cent of those working in the district are employed by the federal government and another 25 per cent work in related service industries.

But now comes Senator Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts who says the citizens of the District of Columbia are victims of taxation without representation and that possibly they also suffer racial discrimination. His answer is to make the District our 51st state. Properly lobbied, his bill soared through the House 189 to 127 and moved to the Senate for hearings.

If this were implemented, the District of Columbia would have two United States Senators and one or two representatives in the House. Their constituency would be for the most part government employees and there is no way that the 51st states' representatives would free themselves from a built-in conflict of interest. They would undoubtedly vote for higher taxes and expansion of the government payroll, claiming that was in the best interest of their constituency.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Fraud"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Are we deluding ourselves with ideas such as Proposition 13 and tax limitation? Are the doomcriers and Chicken Littles correct that we can't have economy in government without chaos and elimination of basic government services?

Suppose we forget about eliminating non-essential programs as a means of achieving economy and we didn't even talk about waste or extravagance in the programs and services we think should be retained. Instead, let's look at one area for potential savings on which we can all agree--fraud. Surely, no one will accept stealing as a legitimate government expense.

It's regrettable but true that when vast sums of money are being sloshed about in the public bucket there are individuals who'll want to get their hands wet. To them, the money just doesn't seem to belong to anyone.

Prosecutors, government officials and Congressional investigators estimate that fraud in the multitudinous federal aid programs amounts to about \$12 billion a year. John Ohls of the General Accounting office doubles that estimate and puts the figure at nearer \$25 billion. Come to think of it that's about the size of a tax cut Congress turned down a while back.

Mr. Ohls says the fraud ranges from nickel-and-dime chiseling on food stamps to million dollar rip-offs. There is the daughter of a Civil War widow who collected widows benefits for 20 years after her mother died. There was the phony barber college operating in a store front that took the Veterans administration for five million dollars in G.I. educational benefits.

Very little is being done about fraud. The Labor department with a \$23-and-a-half billion budget devotes less than one-third of one per cent of it to fighting fraud.

The Department of Transportation has only four investigators riding herd on the six billion dollar-a-year federal highway program. The Veterans administration has only one auditor for every \$238 million it hands out. One spokesman says there isn't much enthusiasm for eliminating fraud. No one wants to find his program full of fraud so there is a tendency to look upon fraud as an accident.

Then, too, in some of the aid programs administrators concentrate on the social problems they are trying to alleviate and fraud controls are looked upon as a hindrance. Maybe that's why a woman with a \$170,000 home and four cars has been charged with paying for all that with welfare checks she collected under several different identities.

Maybe tax limitation is the answer to fraud. If there is a ceiling on the money an agency or department or special program can have, the administrators--out of a sheer concern for survival will plug the leaks in the bucket. As it is and has been they just send the bill to the people.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "SALT Talks"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Apparently, some of our team now in Geneva talking reduced arm-aments with the Russians have forgotten Public Law 92-448. This is still on the books and it has not been altered or diluted by Congress since it was enacted.

The law recognizes that the present agreement known as SALT I was an interim one offering guidelines for a "more complete strategic offense arms agreement", to be called SALT II. The law specifies that any agreement we sign must provide the principle of equality in strategic forces. It also calls for the maintenance of a vigorous research, development and modernization program for U.S. strategic forces. That, it so happens, is virtually nonexistent.

It's time we looked at that law, at SALT I and at our understanding of what SALT II should be. What are the facts concerning the Soviet Union? Are they what we thought they were in 1972? Do the Russians subscribe to our belief in "mutual assured destruction" as a deterrent to war? Apparently we think so, but--just as apparently--the Russians do not. We say "thermo-nuclear war is unthinkable by either side." The Russians have told their own people that while it would be a calamity it is not unthinkable; that it very well might happen and if it does, the Soviet Union will survive and be victorious.

Brezhnev (who a recent American visitor described as a gentle old man) has admonished the Russian people that "it would be extremely dangerous if the opinion became firmly established in public circles that the threat of war has become illusory."

To then Secretary of State Kissinger's statement that neither the U.S. or the Soviet Union could escape 100 million dead in a nuclear exchange, Russian Admiral Shelyag's answer was "Nyet". He said: "In the West it is claimed that humanity, world civilization, would parish in the event of such a war, that everything living on earth would be annihilated. Communists harbor no sentiments of hopelessness or pessimism."

Marshal Krylov denies our concept that in nuclear war there would be no victory. He says: "Victory will be on the side of world socialism." And lest there be any doubt of their unanimity General Altunin, in charge of Russia's civil defense program, says "the preparation of the country's rear for defense against mass destruction has become, without a doubt, one of the decisive strategic factors assuring the ability of the state to function in war time and in the final analysis the attainment of victory."

Our own experts write a scenario in which an attack is leveled against NATO at the same time civilians in Russia are evacuated from urban areas to prepared positions in the country. In the nuclear exchange that follows they lose five per cent of their population--we and our allies lose 50 per cent or more.

Needless to say, our negotiators are not abiding by Public Law 92-448. Perhaps they should be sent a copy before they say another "good morning" to their Russian counterparts.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Cities"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Whenever anyone brings up cutting government costs, the inevitable question is "what programs do you want to eliminate?" Well, without getting into a discussion of whether or not there are programs that should be eliminated, I suggest there may be ways to reduce the cost of government without eliminating services.

I've spoken before about Scottsdale, Arizona's fire protection costs running at two-thirds less than for other cities of the same size. Scottsdale has no city fire department. It contracts out to a private, profit-making fire fighting company for protection.

Now, through a Santa Barbara based research group which studies means of lowering spending we learn that many cities have found free enterprise solutions to a number of costly problems. The president of the research group, Robert W. Poole, writing in the paper HUMAN EVENTS, tells of Camden, New Jersey's experience with 90 garbage collectors operating 16 trucks. Today a private firm does it with 35 employees and nine trucks.

That same firm has branched out. Last January it took over the trash collection job in Collingswood, New Jersey and replaced a dozen public employees with one man and a side-loading truck. In another nearby community three men and one truck replaced 14 city employees and five trucks.

Other cities have found they can maximize their investment in highly trained police officers by using guards from a qualified protection agency for building security--including even the police station. This frees higher priced police for crime fighting duty.

Several weeks ago when the debate over Proposition 13 was at fever pitch in California, a T.V. newscaster reported the results of a little private sleuthing in one California city. He had witnessed the planting of a tree along one of the city streets. The tree was sapling-size in a 15-gallon can. It arrived at the planting site in a truck along with six city employees. The newscaster who, like all of us, has done a little home gardening, checked with the city and found the charge for labor on that tree planting by public employees came to more than \$150. He then called several nurseries and inquired what they would charge for planting such a tree and how the job would be handled. All of them said they'd have a fellow bring it over in a pickup truck and plant it. The charge? Well, the lowest estimate was \$7.50 and the highest \$15.00.

Private contracting eliminates the need for cities to have inventories of expensive equipment often sitting idle for long periods and even more expensive personnel for whom work must be found at times.

A year ago, Mr. Poole says, an economist at the University of California in Santa Barbara carried out a statistical analysis of contract versus non-contract cities in Los Angeles county. On the average, he learned, that street maintenance in cities that contracted out had costs 43 per cent lower than those maintaining their own departments. There were many more examples than I have time for but maybe your home town might want to get some information from the "Local Government Center" in Santa Barbara, California.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Stamps"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Ben Stein, an author and former columnist for the Wall Street Journal, currently writes for the Los Angeles Herald Examiner. He offered an interesting bit of information in that paper about a month ago.

Two years ago he wrote a book in which he described a hypothetical economic diaster befalling America in the early '80's. In writing the book, he had done extensive research on the economic collapse of the Weimar Republic in Germany. That was a time in the early 20's when people literally hauled money around in wheel barrows when they shopped, and very often the wheel barrow was worth more than the money.

In those five years, Germany went through an inflation of one trillion per cent. Yes, I said one trillion. Employers paid workers every hour so they could rush out and buy things before the prices went up. I remember, as a boy, being given a 50 million mark note by a visitor returning from Germany. It was worth about one American penny.

In his research, Ben Stein learned that the denominations on postage stamps increased so rapidly that to avoid the expense of constantly changing them, the German government decided to issue stamps bearing simple letters of the alphabet. This not only avoided the psychological upset of putting out stamps bearing a price of one billion marks or so, but they could sell the A or the B stamp for whatever the new price might be each day and save printing new stamps.

I know it seems impossible that any nation could go through and survive such a wild and unbelievable inflation, but it happened. And, possibly because of the post-war bitterness we felt toward Germany, Americans joked about what was happening over there.

Right now I don't particularly feel like joking -- certainly not about postage stamps without prices and just letters of the alphabet on them. Take a look at our new 15 cent stamps. It doesn't say 15 cents; there is just the letter "A".

Ben Stein reached two members of the White House press office by phone. That isn't hard to do because the White House press aides outnumber the National Security Council. When he asked why the stamps bore the letter "A", the answer was "Well, it's so that if we have to raise the price we won't have to print a lot of new stamps."

Now I'm sure Ben Stein wasn't trying to frighten the readers of his newspaper with images of billion dollar stamps, but he was, in a sense, uttering a warning. Indeed, he quoted an old family friend, an Austrian economist who had lived through that German inflation, who said of us "You are going down that path, too."

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "ASIA I"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

An executive with what must be the world's biggest news agency recently made a trip to Asia where, because of his position, he met with government officials, industrial leaders, publishers and others able to contribute sound views on the countries he visited. He has returned with information that does not always jibe with the doctrinaire views we get from diplomats and some commentators who often see things only in the light of their own bias. He was protected against indoctrination by the variety of his contacts; he could check the things he gathered from one source against the views of others.

He told me that he found, as I had this spring, an almost universal anxiety over our foreign policy. Everyone in South Korea was convinced that North Korea would attack if the United States presence was reduced. He was astounded to learn from qualified sources in detailed briefings that North Korea is capable of producing its own armor. Also that most of its artillery is concentrated in hardened positions along the demilitarized zone, capable of shelling Seoul and the surrounding area in which is located most of South Korea's industry.

In all of his contacts in Korea he found no hostility toward the United States. He also found a resolve on the part of the people to counter communism at any cost. That's a little contrary to the view we're so often given that South Koreans are unhappy with their own leaders. The two questions he was asked most often were--QUOTE--"What must we do to show you that we are your true friends? and, "Doesn't your President know that a Communist attack on South Korea will eventually engulf all of Asia?"--UNQUOTE--.

His next stop was Taiwan where he met with many of the same officials I had met with, plus others in business and the press. He came away with a feeling that many on Taiwan felt that we could pursue closer relations with the mainland of China without renouncing our close ties with the free Republic of China. Our State department should discover that.

He found, as we did on our visit, that the Chinese on Taiwan are hard working and very proud of their economic achievements and their constant progress toward more democratic government. Being there on an election day he visited polling places and watched not only the voting but the counting of ballots. He suggests we might have a few precincts in some of our own cities where that wouldn't be possible.

On Taiwan he ran into one frequently repeated question, namely, "Why must you slap your friends in the face while kowtowing to those who have never shown their friendship toward you." UNQUOTE--. Do any of us have an answer to that?

The windup on Taiwan was his briefing on "intelligence operations". Mainland Chinese manage to get hundreds of reports a week over to Taiwan on conditions in Red China. Some are written by members of the military. All present a picture quite different from the canned tour Americans are given when they visit Peking.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Asia II"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Today I'd like to tell you what the Philippines looks like to an observer who had an opportunity to meet with leaders in every field with journeyman members of the press and -- for several hours -- with President and Mrs. Marcos.

Marcos is very sensitive to the wave of criticism he and his administration are receiving in the American press following his declaration of martial law. We here in America have been given a story of repression, arrest of political prisoners and torture. The man I quoted last broadcast and who I quote today regarding the Philippines said --QUOTE-- "Maybe there have been human rights violations and torture. I don't know. I can tell you, however, that a close friend who has been in the Philippines as a representative of the Drug Enforcement Administration for five years, told me that he has never seen or even suspected mistreatment of prisoners by the police. I questioned him closely and he told me that he had been to numerous prisons, including those for political prisoners. He said that some of the prisons having political prisoners are 'country clubs' compared to United States prisons." Then he added, "I trust my friend implicitly." --UNQUOTE--

He found both President and Mrs. Marcos still staunch friends of America and as anti-Communist as ever. They know that their insistence that our military bases there be leaseholds under Philippine sovereignty has been interpreted as anti-Americanism but President Marcos said--QUOTE--" The people of the Philippines must be given some national pride and shown that their country is running its own affairs". --UNQUOTE-- That shouldn't be so hard for our government to understand after the way it bled over Panama's desire to feel national pride by obtaining sovereignty over the Canal. The President went on to say that the payments he was asking for the bases would be applied toward the purchase of an early warning radar system.

Now, brace yourself for a slight surprise. My friend expressed the opinion that this was hardly necessary since obviously the United States already had such a system in operation there. President Marcos laughed and said that was the response of both President Carter and Secretary Vance. Neither of them were aware that we had no such long range warning system in the Philippines.

Other surprise revelations--the average man in the street said living conditions had improved more in the five years of martial law than in the previous 50 years.

There are stories about Mrs. Marcos "putting her arm" on industry for money with which to build some of her pet projects such as the Philippines Cultural Center. She said frankly that she did exactly that. She added that there isn't public money for such construction so she asks industry to contribute and smilingly agreed that maybe--QUOTE--"there was more leaning than asking"--UNQUOTE--but what usually isn't reported is that all such contributions are tax deductible just as they are here in America.

The U.S. news agency executive I have been quoting summed up by saying that in the Philippines as elsewhere in Asia he found only friendship for the United States but worry as to what our foreign policy really was. Well, that last point we certainly have in common.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Free Press"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

The Soviet Union's two most important newspapers--both government operated--are Pravda and Investia. Now the word "Pravda" means "truth" and "Investia" means "news". There is a joke the Russian people tell, but not out loud. They say "There is no 'Investia' in 'Pravda' and no 'Pravda' in 'Investia'."

But one thing is certain, when the Russians put on a propaganda effort it succeeds. There is no one to blow the whistle on them and cry foul.

They have created a national hero in the Soviet Union, using an American prison inmate you probably never heard of. Russians are flooding Pravda and Investia--as well as the office of the Governor of Alabama--with mail. Alabama is where the man is in prison awaiting execution.

He is going to be executed, the Russians say, because he is "an eloquent pointer to the violation of human rights, the lawlessness of arbitrary rule that has become part of American today." A member of the Presidium of the Soviet Women's committee sees in the impending execution an indication that, "U.S. racists want to electrocute the young worker for adhering to progressive views." The rector of a Soviet university says "American talk about human rights is worthless if a person can be sentenced to death for daring to protest against oppression and lawlessness."

The Soviet media, on orders of course, have produced an instant celebrity. From the Ukraine to Siberia, the Russian man and woman in the street knows that a "young worker" is about to be slaughtered for his beliefs, after trial in a rigged court on prefabricated charges.

A team of Soviet reporters came all the way to Alabama to interview the man to whom they had given nationwide celebrity status in their own land. The interview never took place. Alabama, like a number of other states, has a policy forbidding interviews with death row inmates.

One of the Russian reporters was given a tour of the prison and a look at the electric chair, which hasn't been used in 13 years. Then the entire Soviet news delegation interviewed "civil rights" activists in the state.

Interestingly, the man who has been the object of so much attention in Russia has had his execution postponed pending an appeal. That probably wouldn't be of interest to the Russian journalists. They'd have to explain to their readers about the right of appeal, which isn't much of a commonplace in the Soviet system of justice.

And you can be sure they won't tell their readers at home why their celebrity is really on death row. It isn't because he's a fighter for human rights or is a martyr for his beliefs. He murdered a guard while serving a life sentence for robbery and rape.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Alexander Solzhenitsyn-Part I"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Remembering the anti-Vietnam war sentiment of the late '60's and early '70's, some might find a bit of irony in the fact that Alexander Solzhenitsyn was this June's Harvard University graduation speaker. It is always good to see ourselves as others see us, so I'd like to quote just a few paragraphs from his address which dealt uncompromisingly with, what he called "the decline of courage in the West".

He saw that decline in all of the Western world; in each country, each government, each political party and in the United Nations. He said, "It is particularly noticeable among the ruling groups and the intellectual elite causing an impression of loss of courage by the entire society." He made plain, however, that possibly there was courage to be found among our people, but they were not making their influence felt in government.

He said, "Political and intellectual bureaucrats show depression, passivity and perplexity,"..."in their actions and in their statements to explain how reasonable and even morally warranted it is to base state policies on weakness and cowardice." He went on to say that they can be inflexible and even angry when dealing with weak countries. But "they get tongue-tied and paralyzed when they deal with powerful governments, aggressors and international terrorists".

He reminded his Harvard audience of our own Declaration of Independence; that "when the modern Western states were created they proclaimed that governments are meant to serve man and man lives to be free and to pursue happiness".

Saying they are "meaningful warnings which history gives a threatened and perishing society", Solzhenitsyn described the fight for our planet earth, physical and spiritual, as of cosmic proportions. And, he said, "it was not a vague matter of the future; it has already started. The forces of evil have begun their decisive offense, you can feel their pressure, and yet your screens and publications are full of prescribed smiles and raised glasses." Then he asked: "What is the joy about?"

For those who think hopefully that Angola might become the Soviet Union's Vietnam or that Cuba's adventuring in Africa can be stopped by being polite to Castro, he has an answer. He describes their failure to understand the Vietnam war as, "the most crucial mistake. Members of the U.S. anti-war movement wound up being involved in the betrayal of Far Eastern nations in a genocide and in suffering today imposed on 30 million people". And he asked, "Do they understand their responsibility today? Or do they prefer not to hear?"

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Alexander Solzhenitsyn-Part II
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

On the last broadcast I quoted from the June Harvard graduation address by Alexander Solzhenitsyn. It was a very frank description of how our society appears to this man who lived through the horror of the Soviet Gulag and still had the courage to defy the slave masters of his homeland. I've quoted him because he does not see in us the same courage.

Speaking of the Vietnam conflict he said: "The American intelligentsia lost its nerve and as a consequence thereof, danger has come much closer to the United States. But there is no awareness of this. Your short sighted politicians who signed the hasty Vietnam capitulation seemingly gave America carefree breathing pause; however, a hundred fold Vietnam now looms over you." He continued, "That small Vietnam had been a warning and an occasion to mobilize the nation's courage. But, if a full-fledged America suffered a real defeat from a Communist half country, how can the West hope to stand firm in the future?"

If the West doesn't have the will to stand firm, Solzhenitsyn says, nothing is left then but concessions and betrayal to gain time. He criticized our diplomats at the Belgrade Conference who backed away from any confrontation over Soviet violations of the Human Rights provision in the Helsinki pact. This is the provision for which men like Orlov have gone to Siberia and others have died. It reminds us of the arrogant statement by the chief Soviet delegate at Belgrade who said, "If you take out everything we don't like, it's quite a good document."

Then he said that while the next world war would probably not be an atomic one, still it might very well bury Western Civilization forever. He said he wasn't "examining the case of a world war disaster and the changes it would produce in society. There is a disaster, however, which has already been under way for quite some time. "I am referring," he said, "to the calamity of a despiritualized and irreligious humanistic consciousness. We have lost the concept of a Supreme Complete Entity which used to restrain our passions and our responsibility. We have placed too much hope in political and social reforms, only to find that we were being deprived of our most precious possession: our spiritual life."

Solzhenitsyn told the Harvard graduating class that since our bodies are all doomed to die, our task while on earth must be of a more spiritual nature. He left them with this charge, "that one's life journey may become an experience of moral growth, in that one may leave life a better human being than one started with."

Isn't it too bad that young men and women graduating from the University of Moscow can't have a speaker like Alexander Solzhenitsyn.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Inflation"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Not long ago I gave a figure on one of these broadcasts about what a tankful of gasoline would cost five years from now if we continue the rate of inflation we've had for the last five years. Right now a tank of regular runs about \$13.28; five years from now it could be \$24.16.

That line from a broadcast I did on energy started me thinking about what other items in our daily living might cost if we don't use common sense and end inflation before it ends us. A \$50.00 shopping cart of food, for example, will cost \$77.00. I should point out that while we have a cost-of-living index, not all items making up that index increase at the same rate. Gasoline went up 82% in the last five years and food went up 54%.

A new house at \$55,000 today will cost \$89,600 in five years. In Los Angeles or Washington, D.C., you'd have to multiply those figures quite a bit. A \$5,000 car will be \$6,875. A year in college will go from \$5,200 to \$7,740.

But the most telling figures have to do with how our earnings must increase in order to maintain the same level of living we had five years ago and today. I've done some broadcasts on how much our taxes increase every time we get a cost-of-living increase, so the salary figures I'm going to give you are for maintaining your buying power after you've paid your federal taxes. There is, of course, no way to project local and state taxes because they vary from town to town and state to state.

If you were making \$5,000 a year five years ago, you have to be earning \$7,011 today to have the same buying power after you've paid your federal taxes. If we continue inflation at the same rate for another five years, you'll have to be making \$11,108.

Now if the federal income tax were indexed to allow for inflation, we could simply multiply to get the figures for other levels of earning. But the tax isn't indexed, so that won't work. You're going to move up into higher surtax brackets. If your income was \$10,000 in 1973, it has to be \$14,601 today to keep even, and five years from now it must go to \$22,530; that's \$422 -- more than double the figure for the \$5,000 income. At \$15,000 in 1973, you must be earning \$22,452 today, and if inflation continues, \$35,280 in 1983.

Were you in the \$20,000 a year range in 1973? Well, if you aren't earning \$30,195 today, you are worse off than you were then and you'll have to earn \$48,056 five years from now. \$25,000 in 1973 calls for \$38,211 today, and \$61,744 in 1983. Let's jump up to that standard of affluence, the \$50,000 income. If you were making that in 1973, it has to be \$79,463 now and -- brace yourself -- \$124,038 five years from now. As an example of the part the federal income tax plays, inflation over the ten years amounts to 65 percent. But you have to increase your earnings 150% to stay even at a six-and-a-half percent annual inflation rate.

Those are some of the prices we pay because the federal government continues to spend more than it takes in.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Malibu"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Several years ago the people of California voted for the creation -of a commission to come up with a comprehensive plan for coastal development. In the interim (while a plan was being studied) the commission, aided by several regional commissions--would have zoning authority over the entire coast from waters edge to 3,000 feet inland.

It was said this was needed to prevent the beaches of California from being so developed that the public would no longer have access to the ocean.

California has 1,000 plus miles of coastline ranging from broad sandy beaches to mountains dropping steeply into the surf, and in the north redwood forests coming almost to the waters edge.

What most Californians weren't aware of was that almost half--some 400 miles of ocean front--is already owned by government. Cities, counties and the state own and operate miles of bathing beaches.

During my own administration the state added more miles, based on projections of population increase. So much was added that on any hot, sunny, summer weekend you could find long stretches of state beach with virtually no bathers at all.

In spite of all this the Coastal commission, made up of appointees, and not elected representatives, almost from the very first assumed dictatorial powers and displayed what can only be described as hostility to any private ownership of ocean frontage. Owners of summer cabins and beautiful year 'round homes discovered they were greatly restricted as to what they could do on their own property once the commission came into being. One homeowner, for example, was denied the right to install a small whirlpool plunge in his yard. Others have been denied permission to add rooms, change driveways or even lay out patios.

Last winter it was California's turn to have unusual weather. Roaring Pacific storms brought mountainous waves which at high tide tore out bulkheads, damaging and undermining beach homes. The level of sand on some beaches was lowered by as much as eight to ten feet. There were round-the-clock battles as homeowners and their friends attempted to sandbag and save the structures. Student volunteers from Pepperdine University worked heroically (sometimes throughout the night) to save the homes of people they didn't even know.

Now those homeowners have started to repair the damage. But the Coastal commission says, not without its permission. The commission says more--that permission will not be given unless the homeowners agree to give up a strip of their beach front for public use. That is blackmail. The Constitution is very clear in its guarantee that government cannot take private property without fairly compensating the owner.

If there is a real need--and there is not--for public ownership of this additional beach frontage, government should buy it. It has no right to deny these homeowners permission to repair storm damage or remodel if they choose unless they submit to confiscation of some of their property. I repeat that is blackmail and like a blackmailer, if they get away with it they'll be back for more and every homeowner's rights, ocean front or inland, will be endangered.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Miscellaneous"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

I have just read a little statement by the majority leader of the House. He said, "Last year the House was in session on 24 of the 38 Fridays when the House was in session." How's that again?

The public affairs department at the Interstate Commerce commission has formed a group to simplify government talk. But, even though they call themselves, "The I.C.C. Zero Base Gobbledy Gook Commission", it's hard to be optimistic about their chances. Not when you read in the same news story a U.S. postal service memo containing the following, "if you are going to process under the old procedure, it better be done under the old procedure, otherwise the position will have to be reannounced under the new procedure". Is there a clue as to why postal rates went up? Or is it just that postal employees are asking for more annual holidays including all state and local holidays, Inauguration Day, Martin Luther King's birthday and a day off for each employee to celebrate his own birthday? What! No more office parties?

Here is a little inflationary item you might have missed. The Senate is going to have another new building. This will make it three. Now, so far as I know, we still have the same number of Senators -- two for each state -- totaling 50. This new building, it is said, will cost \$105 million. That's \$2,100,000 per Senator, even if they do build it for the estimated cost, which Congress hasn't been able to do since the British burned Washington.

In the last one they built, they had to remove every door and shorten it. It seems that none of the doors would open or close after the carpet was laid. This new building will have a T.V. studio, recreational facilities and a rooftop care, which you can bet won't break even without a subsidy. Now the members of the House say they need a new building also, and there are almost 10 times as many of them.

To change the subject, the bill to grant an income tax credit for private school tuition was killed in Congress. Some of the arguments used to kill it were a little more than demagogic. It was charged that private schools were expensive; therefore, only for the rich, and they are against the minorities -- a touch racist.

Private schools spend from one-sixth to one-third of what public schools spent per pupil in their areas. In 1975 almost half (42%) of all private schools, elementary and secondary students, were from families earning below the median income. Twelve per cent came from families with incomes below \$7,500.

Only one-and-a-half percent of Catholics are black, and one percent are Luthernas. In Catholic schools, seven percent of the students are black and in Luthern schools, 10% in elementary and 18% in high school. That averages higher minority enrollment in private schools than in our public school system.