

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 78-13 through 78-15 (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/>

Taped: 9/19/78

Air: 10/2-10/20/78

RONALD REAGAN
RADIO COMMENTARY

DISC 78-13

78-13A

Generic promos

1. Mexico's Oil	2:32
2. Olympics	2:54
3. Prop. 13 Fallout	3:05
4. Terrorism	2:52
5. Land	3:04
6. Pot	2:57
7. Nuclear Power	2:50

78-13B

1. Needed--Better Use of National Forests	2:54
2. Mail	2:42
3. Africa	2:52
4. Utilities	3:02
5. Bugs	3:04
6. Government Payroll	3:05
7. Free Enterprise	3:10
8. Miscellaneous	2:55

PLEASE NOTE:

These programs are provided for airing from October 2nd through October 20th inclusive. Maintaining this schedule will enable your station to air all newly recorded programs as received.

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 "Mexico's Oil"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Eyes and ears were turned toward Camp David during much of September, but while the summit was going on another story was announced that could have major, long-range significance for us and our neighbor, Mexico. It was the announcement by Mexico's President Jose Lopez Portillo, that his country's possible oil reserves were being revised upward to 200 billion barrels. This could put Mexico in the Saudi Arabia class as an oil supplier.

Developed with care, the oil reserves could not only bring economic strength to Mexico and generate jobs for its exploding population, but they could also provide us with a major alternative to Arab and other OPEC oil.

Another byproduct of Mexico's development of its oil reserves could be a reduction in the flow of illegal immigrants into the U.S. The Mexican "campesinos" leave the land because it can't support them. They flow into the cities of Mexico and into the U.S. in a steady stream. It is said that five million of the estimated eight million "illegals" in the U.S. are Mexican.

Why didn't the administration take the Mexican reserves into account when Mr. Carter launched his energy program in spring, 1977? Nobody is talking for attribution, but various press leaks by Department of Energy officials suggest that the administration withheld CIA data which verified the Mexican reserves.

Those who believe in conspiracy theories may attribute all this to the big U.S. oil companies, which are deeply involved in Saudi Arabia and several other oil producing nations, but which can't touch Mexican oil (which was nationalized in 1938). But, I think the reluctance to reveal this information stemmed more likely from the assumptions of the energy ideologues who developed the Carter program. They had convinced themselves we must live in a world of lowered expectations and shortages and they wanted nothing to interfere with their conclusions. Certainly the Carter energy legislation bore this out. It was designed to raise taxes and manipulate people--not produce oil.

Will the Mexicans give us access to the oil? That remains to be seen, but it will take patience and diplomacy on our part, plus an understanding of Mexico's fierce sense of national pride and its worries about foreign exploitation. The opportunity is there, as one magazine put it, to make it the "Oil of Ole".

RONALD REAGAN

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

On August 8th the California State Legislature--both houses, Assembly and State, in a rare example of bipartisanship--passed a joint resolution unanimously. In the interest of human rights and because of the oppression of dissidents in the Soviet Union, they urged that the 1980 Olympics be removed from Moscow. They further resolved that their resolution should be sent to the President and Vice President of the United States, to every California Senator and Congressman, to the U.S. Olympic committee, the International committee and to the Soviet Ambassador to the U.S.

Among the "whereas's" was this one: "The holding of the 1980 Olympic games in Moscow severely politicizes the ideals of the Olympic games." Whether they knew it or not, the California legislature was part of what seems to be a growing movement worldwide. Formal protests have been filed in Congress. The issue has become a subject of debate in Latin America, Western Europe and even some Third World countries. The London Times during the Soviet show trials editorialized that a boycott might be in order. Most of the talk, however, is not of no Olympic games in 1980, but of a transfer of the games to another country which does observe human rights.

It might be well to recall the 1936 Olympics which were held in Hitler's Berlin. It was a propaganda tour de force for the Nazis which dazzled the world and contributed to the belief that surely Hitler wouldn't set the world aflame. But he did--just three years later. And now we know they were building the ovens at Belsen and Auschwitz while the crowds were cheering in the Olympic Stadium.

Leaders in the Western World have spoken out strongly against the Kangaroo court trials of men such as Shcharansky and Ginsburg, who are now rotting in the labor camps--the Soviet Gulag. They'll be rotting there in 1980 when the Olympic Torch, the symbol of sportsmanship and honor, is lighted to open the games.

What would happen if the leaders of the Western world told the International Olympic Committee and the Soviet Union that torch must be lit in some other country unless and until the Soviets honor the Helsinki agreement?

In a letter to the London Times a former pacifist--a liberal Beverly Nichols wrote "The West has very few cards left to play in the shabby game that now masquerades as international diplomacy. But we still hold the Ace of trumps. It may be battered and dogeared, but it is imprinted with the Olympic torch of freedom, and it cannot be outbid. If only someone had the courage to play it."

Mr. Nichols has said it all. How would the Kremlin rulers explain the cancellation of the games to their people? And being unable to, what if they were to come out of their dark world and agree to join their world neighbors in the sunlight of the Helsinki pact which they signed but which they have refused so far to observe?

If they don't and we participate in the games anyway, what do we say to our young athletes about honor?

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Proposition 13 Fallout"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Recently an article appeared in California about a "White paper" issued by Civil Service Commissioner of San Francisco, Darrell Solomon. It seems no one in the San Francisco City Hall seems to be serious about cutting waste.

Mr. Solomon opens by stating, "there are 50 janitors in the City Hall. Each janitor is supervised by an assistant supervisor (who receives complaints and sees to it that schedules are met.) Each assistant supervisor is supervised by Custodial Supervisor I (who receives complaints and sees to it that schedules are met.) Each Custodial Supervisor I is supervised by a janitorial service assistant supervisor (who receives complaints and sees to it that schedules are met), who in turn is supervised by a janitorial services supervisor who also receives complaints and sees to it that schedules are met." Then Mr. Solomon points out that a private janitorial service company which provides service for many of San Francisco's commercial buildings, has said it would contract to do the City Hall with one third of the labor now being expended.

At San Francisco General Hospital the same number of meals are served each day as are served at the private Presbyterian Hospital. But it takes 113 employees to prepare those meals at San Francisco General and only 42 at Presbyterian.

There are 16 steamfitters and plumbers at the 22 acre San Francisco International Airport. At the 300 acre Los Angeles International, there are only seven.

Moving on to the Department of Social Services in San Francisco, Mr. Solomon says a social worker at \$15,000 is supervised by a unit supervisor (\$19,000) who in turn is supervised by a division supervisor (\$26,000) who in turn is supervised by one of two assistant directors (\$28,000) who in turn is supervised by one of two directors (\$32,000) who in turn is supervised by the general manager of the Social Security's Department (\$43,500).

The San Francisco Civil Service Department by the city charter is the personnel department for the city--but several departments have set up their own. The Public Utilities Commission has a personnel officer supervising 17 employees (and here we go again). He is supervised by a senior departmental personnel officer (\$29,000) who in turn is supervised by the director of the Bureau of Personnel of the Public Utilities Commission (\$31,800).

The Civil Service Commission, before there was a Prop. 13, did away with \$200,000 worth of excess supervising layers and earmarked the savings for an outside survey of city employee practices. The proposal was killed in the Mayor's office. San Francisco, incidentally, has responded to Prop. 13 not with economies, but by adopting new taxes to substitute for the reduction in property tax. I don't think that's what the voters had in mind.

Mr. Solomon says, "Our government is not a social action institution. Its prime function is not to employ people. The object is to efficiently provide the services requested and paid for by the taxpayer." Amen.

RONALD REAGAN

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

International terrorism is on the increase and it's not nearly as random as it might seem from watching the evening news or reading the daily headlines.

Let me quote you a few sentences from a sobering new book just published by the American Council for World Freedom. It's titled "International Terrorism: The Communist Connection" and it was written by Dr. Stefan Possony of the Hoover Institution at Stanford; and Francis L. Bouchev, executive director of the Council for Inter-American Security. Here's how their study begins: "There is virtually no terrorist operation or guerrilla movement anywhere in the world today, whether communist, semi-communist, or non-communist--from the Irish Republican Army to the Palestine Liberation Organization to our own Weather Underground--with which communists of one sort or another have not been involved. This includes non-communist operations and movements, for communist parties and governments always stand ready to exploit disorder in Europe, the Middle East, Latin America and elsewhere, however and by whomever it is fomented.

They then set out, in 172 pages, to document their claim. They caution against jumping to the conclusion that all terrorism is centrally planned and controlled. Instead, the authors say, it is more a matter of cooperation between diverse terrorist groups, all of whom have one thing in common--the overthrow of organized society in favor of chaos and disorder.

Their case study of the late and notorious German terrorist Ulrike Meinhof is a case in point. They also have chapters on "Moscow's Support of International Terrorism", "The Ideology of Terrorism", and "The Psychology of Terrorism" among others.

Authors Possony and Bouchev cover the alphabet of terrorist organizations, not quite from A-to-Z, but at least from Al Fatah to the Weather Underground.

As for terrorist groups in the United States, they make the point that most have foreign contacts and most of these are left-wing. The Weather Underground, for example, which has claimed credit for many bombings over the last dozen years, has an "above-ground" support apparatus called the Prairie Fire Organization committee, which has developed "close personal and political ties with the Puerto Rican Socialist Party", a Castroite Communist group.

What can be done about terrorism? Noting that "Congress has become even more negative on internal security", the authors also cite resulting deficiencies that exist in the area of police work, pointing out that "even if one accepts criticism of past FBI practice, the fact that there have been no arrests for scores of bombing incidents in the San Francisco Bay area alone, argues for better, more scientific surveillance, not less." They also call for closer international cooperation, including more aggressive efforts to ferret out false passports. "International Terrorism" isn't easy bedside reading, but it should be must-reading for our lawmakers.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Back when territories were first becoming states, the rule was that federal lands became the property of each new state to be disposed of as the state saw fit. Someplace along the line that policy just went the way of the buffalo. As the nation moved west and the younger states were admitted, Uncle Sam held on to the land. In the case of one of the latest, Alaska, the federal government holds about 96 percent. Federal lands range anywhere from 43 percent of California to 70 percent of Idaho and on up to 80 and 90 percent of the others. Uncle Sam is the biggest land lord in the country.

Some dozen years ago, Washington pushed the panic button, claiming it was necessary to acquire land for outdoor recreation. We were told of the population explosion and how if we didn't provide for future recreational areas, our children would grow up in a paved over, totally urban America. Well, the population explosion fizzled, we have more schoolrooms than we need and you have to wonder about those mining claims in the mountains the government cancelled on top of all the other land grabs in the name of outdoor recreation.

It was during that period that one of the Washington officials involved made a statement we should keep in mind. He said "In an earlier time the government encouraged private ownership of land in order to get it developed. Now it is necessary for the government to regain control of the land."

When the recreation story ran out of steam, the environmental issue built up. We've had federal land planning bills presented and voted down in Congress, but our land-hungry bureaucracy never gives up. It is back with another bill, this time called the Land Diversity Bill.

Up in Colorado, the Bureau of Reclamation intends to build a dam and reservoir for an irrigation project. It will harness the La Plata and Animas rivers. There is no quarrel with the project which will be of great benefit to agriculture. But the land that will be taken for a reservoir belongs to the Colorado Division of Wildlife and is used as winter range for anywhere from 50 to 200 elk, depending on who is talking. The Division of Wildlife insists on an acre-for-acre replacement and has set its sights on a group of ranches. It has declared that if the ranchers won't sell voluntarily, their property will be taken by condemnation. The ranchers don't want to sell. One of the largest ranches has been in the same family for 78 years and is a haven for elk, wild turkey and other game because no hunting is allowed. In fact, the elk use the ranch as a migration route.

There are ranches of good size for sale in the area, but the Division of Wildlife refuses to consider them. All seven or eight the Division has zeroed in on have been owned by the same families for 30 years or more. It would seem this is another example of the "arrogance of officialdom." This type of acquisition is going on in a dozen western states all in the name of a need for more wilderness areas. In such areas there are no roads or structures or vehicles or any kind allowed--only a few backpackers will ever see them. Yes, there are natural beauty spots which should be so protected, but how many covering how much of our land? I hope the Colorado ranchers win this one.

RONALD REAGAN

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

In discussions with young people about the possible health hazards from smoking marijuana I never cease to be amazed at how familiar they are with reports downplaying the danger. They have no comparable knowledge of the scientific studies which tell a different story. I don't believe they are deliberately closing their eyes to these contrary studies, there just isn't wide circulation of such reports in the media.

Let me try to even up the coverage. Not too long ago, 41 scientists representing 13 countries met in France to present new research findings. Now, first of all, let me point out that scientists don't have a grudge for or against "pot". They seek the truth. They have no prejudice which makes them want to find it harmful or harmless for that matter. It so happens that these scientists have found pot, grass, weed--whatever you want to call it--definitely bad news.

They linked its use with harmful effects on human reproduction, the brain and other organs, including the lungs. Past studies have been criticized on the grounds that dosages of marijuana were used which were far greater than a pot smoker indulges in. Not so this time. Rhesus monkeys were used in the experiments because their systems metabolize Marijuana similar to the way humans do. They are also similar in their reproductive systems and hormonal control. The dosages used were comparable to those humans are subjected to in light, moderate and heavy smoking.

The scientists reported significant tissue breakdown in the lungs after exposure from three months to a year; and, structural brain changes adversely affecting emotions and behavior.

What is the extent of the problem in our own country? Well, a recent study by the National Institute on Drug Abuse reveals that one out of 11 high school seniors smokes marijuana on a daily basis. Three years ago it was only one in 17. In the month preceding the survey, 29 percent of the 16 and 17 year olds had smoked pot. So had 15 percent of the 14 and 15 year olds and four percent of the 12 and 13 year olds. It is estimated that about 11 million Americans now use it at least weekly.

At the meeting in France, Dr. Carol Grace Smith of the Uniformed Services Medical School, Bethesda, Maryland, expressed particular concern about the steady use of pot by teenagers. She said the effect on the developing reproductive system of teenagers is particularly vulnerable to disruption by drugs. One or two "joints" a day will inhibit sex hormone development.

To sum it up, the International Narcotics Control Board--this is the board elected by the United Nations Economic and Social Council--reported to the meeting in France that "Marijuana is far from being a harmless substance, either for the individual or for society."

I've only touched on the full findings of the scientists, but is anyone listening? Why aren't our young people made to read this scientific evidence before they wreck the bodies and minds they are going to have to live with the rest of their lives?

RONALD REAGAN

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

We continue to be treated to the spectacle of anti-nuclear power zealots demonstrating at sites where nuclear power plants are being built or planned or even where they have been in operation. The scene is always the same: a mass rally with speakers warning of a nuclear threat to the human race, then trespass and disruption followed by mass arrests. The arrests are for misdemeanors and are not taken seriously by the demonstrators, many of whom enjoy clogging the criminal justice system and refusing to leave the jails where they are held.

I'm sure many of these demonstrators are true believers in their cause, sincere in their belief that nuclear power constitutes a great danger to the world. I'm also sure they are unaware that their movement is run by strategists who are cynical and not sincere and who have a motive not announced to the ground troops who go out and get arrested. Indeed some time ago the press carried stories of a coalition being put together to promote unilateral disarmament by the U.S. and opposition to further development of nuclear power in the U.S.

Those two causes aren't as far apart as it might seem at first glance. A study by the Heritage Foundation finds that unless we go forward and fast with the building of more nuclear generating plants we may face the early 1980's with unemployment soaring above the seven million mark and around \$90 billion a year in lost wages. Our industrial might would be severely crippled by brownouts and power shortages. Where does this tie into disarmament? Well, obviously our industrial capacity is the greatest thing we have going for us in the contest with the Soviet Union, which is not only going forward with its military build up, but is plunging full speed ahead in the development of nuclear power. I wonder how many of our demonstrators would like to protest in Red Square.

The people of California voted two years ago--by a majority of more than two to one--to go forward with nuclear power. So far Governor Brown has blocked virtually any such development. The opponents of nuclear energy claim they only want it made safer. In truth they just don't want it. Period.

A Congressman from California, Bob Badham, has called attention to something that has gone unnoticed in all the recent demonstrations in New Hampshire and California. The San Onofre nuclear power plant in Southern California just passed its 10th anniversary. In these 10 years it has produced 26 billion kilowatt hours of electricity. Every day it operates it saves 16,000 barrels of oil. And when the two new units the demonstrators are protesting about go into operation, the savings will be 30 million barrels of oil a year. But most important to those who have built up the false threat of danger is the San Onofre plant's 10 year record of perfect industrial safety. Not one employee in all these 10 years has ever experienced a lost time industrial accident.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Needed-Better Use of National Forest" - Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

That phrase, "as sound as a dollar" may come across with a dull thud in some parts of the world right now, but the American economy-- and the system that fosters it--continues to be the envy of the world. Sheiks, Greeks, Germans and Japanese are all investing in the United States. It's still the land of opportunity.

We gained our position among nations by being highly productive: a combination of hard work, widespread ingenuity, enthusiasm and the willingness to use our abundant natural resources. If we expect to retain this economic prominence based on productivity, we must ask -- and answer -- a couple of hard questions: Can we afford to let our productivity decline? And, is it possible to meet the rising expectations of the poor among us if we reduce the willingness of people to work and if we inhibit the use of our natural resource endowment?

Our national forests dramatize that last question. They are now being managed much less effectively than they could and must be if we are to meet rising demands for wood and paper products. Forests, unlike many other raw material resources, can be renewed. When properly managed, as is being demonstrated on the lands of more progressive forest industry companies, the productivity of forest lands can be doubled.

But there is no government policy to encourage this kind of increased productivity from forests, public or private. It is clearly profitable for industry to grow its raw material resources at an efficient and rapid rate. But, for some reason, it is considered improper for the public to realize comparable profit returns from its own timber-growing lands.

Not only do public forests lag behind well-managed private ones in productivity, but the government is also adopting measures that remove large areas of land and volumes of timber from our industrial resource base. Under one program alone, now in process on the roadless lands of the national forests, some six billion feet of timber (enough to build half-a-million homes a year) may be put into the National Wilderness Preservation System and thus lost forever to productive use.

One study of the economic impact of this land--withdrawal program estimates that within a few years it could cause the median price of a single family house to go up almost \$1,800. The same program could cost some 29,000 forest industry employees their jobs and increase the general inflation rate nationwide by one per cent. And these effects relate to the timber volumes withdrawn from use. In addition, under these lands are coal and oil and natural gas and mineral deposits which, turned to productive use, could improve our economy and help strengthen the dollar. The unavailability of these public resources to provide jobs, wages and yes, taxes, undermines the whole system that has made us prosperous. Though the issue is not quite so simple as being a matter of wilderness for the few versus a good standard of living for the many -- it's not far from it.

RONALD REAGAN

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

If prices in general had gone up at the same rate postal rates have climbed, we'd probably be marching on Washington. Certainly it would be cheaper to eat our money than to buy groceries with it.

But Americans aren't complaining as much about the skyrocketing cost of stamps as they are about the nose diving quality of service. Already, substitutes of various kinds are popping up as alternatives to the post office. Every time, however, that one of these substitutes involves itself with First Class mail--delivery of letters or post cards--the law is invoked by postal authorities and each such operation is closed down.

I reported to you some time ago about the young housewife in Rochester, New York, who built a thriving business delivering business letters in downtown Rochester for 10¢ each--delivery the same day guaranteed. The Post Office obtained an injunction and halted this invasion of its monopoly on First Class delivery even though it can't match price or delivery time.

Now we get a story that suggests the postal authorities can truly see the sparrows fall. Millions of Americans grew up in this land getting their first lessons in free enterprise by mowing lawns, selling lemonade on the sidewalk or running errands. That may be going the way of the buggy whip and the village smithy.

In Charleston, South Carolina, there is an enterprising young 14-year-old named Kenny Maguire. He was learning in that old fashioned way about working and earning, but now he's had a lesson about the arrogance of big government. Congressman Eldon Rudd of Arizona has brought the story of Kenny Maguire to light and I'm grateful to him for doing so.

Astride a bicycle, Kenny earned \$10 delivering 80 wedding invitations. That was the beginning and the end of his delivery service. Postal authorities jumped in and grounded him for interfering with their legal monopoly over mail delivery. Kenny did the job faster than the post office can do it and he was certainly less expensive--by \$2.00 for 80 invitations.

Does this mean that Mom can't ask Johnny to run next door with a note to a neighbor for a recipe? Congressman Rudd says that Congress should break the Postal Service monopoly, so that not only youngsters like Kenny but enterprising Americans of any age can provide the American people with the mail service they have a right to expect and which they are not getting.

About 35 or 40 years ago you could make a transcontinental phone call for about \$25.70. And for that amount of money you could send almost 1,300 letters from one coast to the other. Now you can make that phone call for 54 cents or thereabouts and for that amount of money you can only send three letters. So the government keeps checking on and even suing the Bell System because they charge it's a monopoly.

RONALD REAGAN

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

A citizen of one of the new African states once assured me that Africans believe in one man, one vote--once. The newly elected then make sure there will be no need for another election by eliminating the opposition.

Just recently there was a little news item which you might have missed. It didn't exactly wind up on Page One.

It seems that Sierra Leone, once considered one of Africa's few relatively free nations, has verified that statement about one man, one vote, once. President Sioka Stevens has rammed through a new constitution for his country. It outlaws opposition parties.

The only party permitted henceforth is his All Peoples Congress party known as A.P.C. Opposition members of parliament have been given 24 days to change their registration. The leader of the APC party (who happens to be President Stevens) is the only person eligible to run for President. No opposition is permitted. The counterbalancing office of Prime Minister has been eliminated and the President can only be removed for "gross violations" of the new constitution.

There is word from another of the continent's new nations which has been largely ignored. Equatorial Guinea, the only Spanish speaking nation in Africa is, or, perhaps I should say, was 95% Catholic. It had a population of 350,000, give or take a few when it became independent in 1968. Now there are 90,000 refugees in Spain and neighboring African nations and no one knows how many did not escape and were slaughtered.

Some time ago the President of Equatorial Guinea issued an edict that his picture would hang above the altar and that when crossing themselves the citizens would say his name as well as that of God. When the church refused, the persecution began.

The church has been outlawed, foreign priests expelled from the country. Native-born priests and nuns are in prison. News of their fate as well as the extent of the slaughter is not known because the only embassies in the country are those of the Soviet Union, East Germany, Cuba, The People's Republic of China and North Korea. It is possible that the population has been reduced by half.

Catholics for Christian Political Action has called upon all faiths and races to join in protesting this inhumanity. This laymen's organization is trying to get information to the public, but says it has so far been largely ignored.

It forces us to ask ourselves, when we add this to Cambodia and to the persecution of the dissidents in the Soviet Union, if the world has lost its conscience. Certainly one group has. The World Council of Churches has given Joshua Nkomo's guerillas in Rhodesia a grant of \$85,000. You remember Nkomo's guerillas--they're the Patriotic humanitarians who recently shot down the civilian passenger plane and slaughtered the survivors.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Among the arts or professions, actors--down through the years--have lived with a false image that they are somehow lacking in what might be called normal attributes. Plumbers have put up with the stock jokes that they always forget their tools and the customer has to pay by the hour while they make the round trip to pick up the missing items. In the industrial world, utility companies rank high on the villain list. Always the myth prevails that they produce a necessary item in a monopolistic manner, cheaply and easily and extract a horrendous profit from the helpless customer.

I'll leave defense of actors and plumbers till another time and plead the case of the utilities today. How many of us have stopped to think that in this long era of inflation electricity is one of the only major commodities that has gone down in price? Now before you scream and say look at my last month's bill, hear me out. We actually pay less per kilowatt hour of electricity than we did 20, 30 or 50 years ago. Our bills are up because we use electricity for many more things.

When I was a boy we cooked with a wood burning stove and kept warm with a coal furnace. There was no air conditioning, we had an ice box, not a refrigerator, and electricity was used only for lighting. Now we shave, brush our teeth, watch TV, have all manner of electrical tools--we even carve the Christmas turkey with an electric carving knife. If it still costs as much per kilowatt hour we couldn't afford the electrical gadgets that today we can't seem to live without.

And we aren't being ripped off by the producers of that electricity. Just let me read you some figures from the report to the stockholders of the Middle South Utilities, Inc. Last year the company reported total operating revenues of \$1,251,600,000. That was a 25.7 percent increase over the previous year. More than a billion-and-a-quarter dollars sounds like a good business and a 25 percent is something to cheer about.

The report, however, also shows operating costs of more than a billion dollars, leaving a net profit slightly over \$100 million which figures out to \$1.72 a share for the stockholders--six cents less per share than they received the year before. Nevertheless, it is a normal, respectable return. It is hardly a windfall or, as some demagogues love to declare, "an obscene profit".

Fuel to generate the electricity cost more than twice as much as the total profit, which makes another part of the report very interesting. The stockpile of uranium which opponents of nuclear energy say is a great threat to life on earth would be the fuel used to generate electricity once we finished developing the breeding reactor. The current administration in Washington, as you know, does not want to continue its development. But that present stockpile lies there for the taking. No one would have to find it, or go into a mine to dig it out; it would meet our energy needs literally for centuries. It represents a fuel value of between \$10 and \$20 trillion. I respect the right of the opponents of nuclear power to dissent, but with that right goes a responsibility to know what they are talking about.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Our movie screens have been horrifying audiences with stories of monstrous fish biting people, little fish chewing on people and a variety of things biting and stinging people. Now, while the press hasn't really made a big thing of it, we learn the movies aren't too far from the truth.

Swarms of locusts and grasshoppers, a plague of crickets, cutworms and ants and swarms of mosquitos are making life miserable and even impossible in many parts of the world. In California, pet owners are distressed by an increase in the flea population. In Colorado, grasshoppers have swept across a half million acres, defoliating trees and munching on crops. In the East, one town claims that by official survey 100 mosquitos were landing on each human being every 60 seconds. But that is nothing to what is happening in some of the less developed countries. In India, malaria carried by mosquitos killed a million children last year. In Somalia and Ethiopia, swarms of locusts numbering in the billions have eaten crops, grassland and forests bringing hunger and even famine to the people of those lands.

Some experts are treating this as an unexplainable mystery. Actually, there is no mystery about it. We can blame it on what I've called political pollution. The environmental movement, with the best of intentions, has engendered political reaction by its demand for action. Pesticides have been outlawed as being more dangerous than the pests they were designed to control.

As the decade of the 60's began, the insects that carried malaria, typhus, sleeping sickness, and so forth, had been reduced in number by pesticides produced mainly in the U.S. DDT, for example, had virtually eliminated malaria worldwide. In India by 1962 the cases of malaria had dropped over a 10 year period from 100 million to 60,000. The locust swarms that had plagued Africa for as long as man can remember were wiped out by sprayings paid for by our Department of Agriculture. Then in the late 60's malaria returned to India. In Ceylon where there had only been 17 cases in an entire year, there were two-and-a-half million and 10,000 deaths. In Africa the locusts returned to strip the countryside bare.

What happened in that decade of the 60's to bring back these insect plagues? Well, for one thing, a talented author, Rachel Carson, wrote a book called "The Silent Spring". All of us became alarmed that perhaps we were interfering with nature. An Environmental Protection Agency became a part of the federal government. The most effective pesticide, DDT, was outlawed, but we were told we'd have others as effective, but much less hazardous. Unfortunately, as fast as the substitutes came on line, they were outlawed.

The grasshopper plague in Nebraska could have been halted when it began according to Nebraska agricultural director who said, "We just don't have the chemicals to do the job." It is ironic that the hearing examiner for EPA back in 1972 said that DDT was harmless to human beings and that properly used, it posed no threat to animal, bird or marine life. Yet it is banned by the EPA on the theoretical grounds that it might, under some circumstances, someday harm someone or something.

RONALD REAGAN

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

According to accepted figures about 16 million of the nation's work force is employed by government at all levels--federal, state and local. The federal government is the employer of nearly three million (these are non-military) and that payroll is increasing by about 28,000 a year. I seem to remember there was some campaign talk about reducing the total.

We can be pretty sure of these figures because the Civil Service Commission publishes the total every month. But can we be sure? The answer to that is "no". The federal government doesn't really know how many people it has put to work. Unknown numbers are paid indirectly through government contracts, research grants and even payments to state and local governments.

The Secretary of H.E.W. has 144,000 employees in his agency, but the other day he told a Congressional committee that H.E.W. probably pays the salaries of an additional 980,000 who don't appear on the federal roster. Other government departments and agencies admit this is true of them, too.

The Washington POST did some surveying and came up with an estimate that puts the actual federal civilian work force at around six to seven million. If the three million we know about are increasing by 28,000 a year, we must assume that the other three to four million is also growing in numbers.

It's easy to see why Congress had to go through what has become an annual ritual--the raising of the debt limit a few weeks ago. In just eight years the debt has gone from \$377 billion to \$814 billion. If the present trends continue, we will have a trillion dollar debt, a trillion dollar budget, and \$200 billion of that will be for interest on that debt--and all by 1985. Anyone for a national Prop. 13?

This is a slight change in subject, but a research project called "Unraveling the Congressional Security Blanket" reveals an interesting co-relationship between the number of staff members and the number of bills introduced in the House and Senate.

In the last 20 years the staff for House Members has tripled and in the Senate more than doubled. In those same 20 years the number of bills introduced has increased by 77 percent. In 1958 there were 13,876. In the 94th Congress which adjourned in '76--24,583. The present Congress is faced with more than 20,000 already.

In the first Congress which adjourned in 1790, only 142 bills were introduced and 108 became law. From my own experience as Governor, I know that legislative aides and Congressional staff author most of the legislative proposals. They have to justify their existence.

Now suppose that last Congress with its 24,583 bills had held no committee meetings, no floor sessions, the members had spent eight hours a day, five days a week at their desks reading those bills 50 weeks of the year for the two year session. (we'll give them a two week vacation each year.) They could give each bill less than 10 minutes time. Some of those bills are hundreds of pages long. That sure does explain some of our problems.

RONALD REAGAN

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

I'm usually near the head of the line in pointing out the miracle of the market place. I never cease to be amazed at how new products come into being or what new service is provided for our convenience by someone just getting an idea and having a go at it.

Right now, however, I have a direct mail advertisement offering a new service, and I'm filled with mixed emotions--admiration for the fellow who thought of it, but anger that the opportunity he seized exists at all.

The ad opens with a colorful picture of a hand holding money and a blazing caption which reads--"Are you getting your share of the \$5,276 per family--tax free--that the government will give out this year alone?" In smaller print, underneath the picture, it goes on to say--"If the answer is 'no' and you'd like to start getting, right now, your fair share of the \$5,276 per year--tax free--perhaps for life--then simply read the startling information inside!" Well, of course I looked inside where a letter started out--"For example--Dear Friend", which puts things on a cozy basis right away.

But then you learn that our government has set aside a "mind boggling" (their words, not mine) "\$286 billion to be paid out to people just like you and families just like yours." That's \$1,319 per person.

The letter goes on to explain that while the money is put aside, it is not necessarily being paid out, because we're not asking for it. Then follow about five pages of black type, alternating with red describing the funds available; giving examples of individuals who are receiving checks and explaining that we who aren't don't realize that the way to get the money is buried in over 100 different government documents where the ordinary person can't find it.

In a box under a red headline you are urged to think about "these startling facts": "In one program 31 million of your fellow Americans are getting a U.S. government check every month." Then it tells you there are 19 million more in another program, 11 million in another and five million in a fourth and these are only four of 137 programs. The ad is leading up to a service for a fee. Send in \$8.98 for a confidential report which will come in a plain paper wrapper. Read it from cover to cover, the ad says, and see how much money is waiting for you without gambling a penny. If you don't think any of that money is for you, return the report and get your \$8.98 back. Then there is an ongoing newsletter called "New Government Cash For You". You subscribe to that but somehow, except for the first three issues on a dollar trial basis, they don't tell you the price.

Now, I'm not going to name this advertiser or give an address because the whole thing points up the extent to which our government has departed from reality. Obviously, if every family could collect \$5,276 then every family would have to pay the government \$5,276. The only money government has is the money it takes from us. Right now it is true, 124 million Americans--more than half our population--are receiving all or most of their income from tax dollars. Right now the total unfunded obligations of our government pro-rate out to more than \$30,000 for every man, woman, and child in the nation. We all get splattered when the bubble bursts.

RONALD REAGAN

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

This is another one of those desk cleaning days. For starters, a prophecy with a catch.

It has been predicted that within the next 10 years you won't be able to buy a pound of meat anywhere in the U.S. The temperature in mid-June will hover in the mid 30's and the average woman's waist measurement will be 61. Now before you call for the men in the white jackets let me explain; the author of those predictions is convinced we'll switch to the metric system where things aren't measured in pounds, degrees, Farenheit and inches.

It would be nice if some of the other items could be explained away so easily. For example, in spite of all the Washington talk about streamlining, the federal payroll increased by 17,224 employees between April and May of this year.

The labor department has approved an \$800,000 grant to Caesar Chavez' United Farm Workers earmarked for English language and job training programs. The American Farm Bureau Federation called the grant a "massive abuse of tax funds and a serious violation of the public trust by the Administration."

Speaking of language training, a nationwide survey authorized by H.E.W. and carried out by the American Institute for Research in Palo Alto, California brings us bad news about the cost bilingual education programs in our schools. It seems the programs are successful in teaching students their native language but not English. The report goes on to say that student achievement in general is no higher than it would have been in regular classrooms.

Another eye opener. We all cheered when the House of Representatives broke with tradition and deleted an appropriation to continue building the half finished but unneeded new U.S. Senate building in Washington. Then it was discovered that Architect of the Capitol George M. White has a master plan for the U.S. Capitol calling for five new Senate buildings and six more for the House plus additions to the present Capitol building and 7,000 new parking spaces for employees.

Maybe this one will make you feel better. The Justice Department owns a topless go-go bar about a block from headquarters. It was seized by the government from the "Transportation department embezzler who used mass transit money to buy it. What we don't understand is why the Justice Department refused to sell it to a willing buyer and is continuing to operate it--or do we?

For closers, a memo from the U.S. Customs Service. "The designated Acting Branch Chief will be responsible when I am absent or disabled. When the current Acting Branch Chief is also absent or disabled the previous Acting Branch Chief will be responsible. If the previous Acting Branch Chief is unable to act for the current Acting Branch Chief due to absence or disability, the next designated Acting Branch Chief will act for the previous Acting Branch chief who was unable to act for the current Acting Branch Chief who would have been Acting Branch Chief in my behalf--the real Branch Chief during my absence or disability." Do you suppose that explains some of those other items?

Taped: 10/10/78
Aired: 10/23-11/10/78

RONALD REAGAN
RADIO COMMENTARY

DISC 78-14

78-14A

Generic Promo

- | | |
|-------------------------|------|
| 1. District of Columbia | 2:51 |
| 2. Amtrak | 2:50 |
| 3. Bi-lingual | 3:04 |
| 4. Federal Lands | 3:00 |
| 5. Ocean Mining | 3:04 |
| 6. Rostow I | 3:02 |
| 7. Rostow II | 3:01 |

78-14B

- | | |
|-------------------------|------|
| 1. Rostow III | 2:48 |
| 2. Rostow IV | 3:00 |
| 3. Rostow V | 3:07 |
| 4. Rostow IV | 2:55 |
| 5. End of an Emergency | 2:56 |
| 6. Argentina | 3:12 |
| 7. Environment | 2:57 |
| 8. Soviet Nuclear Power | 3:20 |

PLEASE NOTE:

These programs are provided for airing from October 23rd through November 10th inclusive. Maintaining this schedule will enable your station to air all newly recorded programs as received.

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 "District of Columbia"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

In the process prescribed for amending our Constitution, the Congress has passed and sent to the legislatures of the 50 states for ratification an amendment to give the District of Columbia representation equal to a state in the U.S. Congress. A potent lobby pushed this through the Congress using high-flown phrases such as "taxation without representation", "end the second class citizenship of those who dwell in the district" and so on ad nauseum.

We have a nation unique in all the world. It is a federation of sovereign states and that is probably our greatest guarantee against tyranny by a centralized national government. Those Founding Fathers, whose likes the world hasn't seen since, thought of just about everything. They said,--QUOTE--"if federalism is to work how can any of the sovereign states be the locale of the national capitol without opening the door to possible conflicts of interest?" So the District of Columbia was established on land ceded by Maryland and Virginia.

To say that residents of the District, who vote for city officials and for President and Vice President, are without representation is ridiculous. The District is represented by the entire Congress of the United States. Washington is a one industry city and that industry is the federal government. It is a company town--look at the population figures for 1976. Some 223,900 employees in the District worked for the federal government; 149,200 for industries servicing government; and only 16,100 were employed in manufacturing.

The Congress has been most generous to the district in handing out federal grants. It is the most affluent city in America. And the district is a city--a 70 square mile enclave--with a population smaller than 11 other cities.

But if 38 state legislatures ratify this latest congressional foolishness, Washington will be the only city to have two United States senators and at least one representative in the house. They'll have no stake in agricultural problems. Their constituents' demands will be for more government growth and for the perquisites that go with government employment. And those two new senators are the reason for the lobbying effort.

If they aren't and if the promoters of this idea sincerely mean they only want representation for the citizens of the District, there is a very simple answer and an established precedent: cede back to Maryland the residential portion of the city, just as Alexandria was returned to Virginia in the last century. Then, they'll be represented by Maryland's two senators and they can vote in Maryland's senatorial elections.

One thing's certain, the American people should be contacting their state legislators and telling them to vote no on ratification.

RONALD REAGAN

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

In 1971, with most of our railroads pleading that passenger rail service had become so costly that freight traffic could no longer subsidize it, the U.S. government stepped in and created Amtrak. This of course was the nationwide network of passenger lines which would service the most popular routes with a government-run railroad.

In that first year Amtrak required a \$40 million subsidy to keep the wheels turning. By last year that subsidy had grown to \$500 million a year and it is estimated that will be a billion dollars if Amtrak is still around in 1984.

Now I'm a train buff. For many years into the jet age I traveled exclusively by train out of personal choice. Becoming Governor changed that and jet travel became a necessity. Nevertheless, I'll admit to a great nostalgia for the conductors "All aboard" and for seeing the country through a pullman window. But the numbers don't add up anymore and maybe we should settle for nostalgia.

The average Amtrak passenger takes a 226 mile trip. This costs Amtrak \$44 but the passenger pays \$16, leaving \$28 to be anted up by the taxpayers. Amtrak could save two dollars by buying the passenger an airplane ticket or could save \$27 by putting him or her on the bus. The fare there is only \$17. As a matter of fact, Amtrak could pick up the whole fare, buy the passenger lunch and still save money.

Of course, some may bring up the matter of energy and point out that rail travel must save a lot of scarce oil. I'm afraid that argument is worth about as much as my nostalgia. On the average, Amtrak is only about one-half as energy efficient as those buses we see out on the highway. Worse yet, with the exception of what is called the "Northeast corridor", where commuter type traffic is heavy--Amtrak uses more energy per passenger mile than does the automobile. And, before you bring up the environmental argument about air pollution, trains pollute more than buses.

It is true that trains have a safety record with regard to fatalities that is better than the automobile. But so do planes and buses. No, there are only two reasons for Amtrak: one, I've already mentioned, nostalgia; and I'm afraid the other is politics. Too many of us, even though we don't take train rides anymore, just like to think they are there. As for the other reason, they run through too many congressional districts to even expect Congress to say, "Enough already". If it wasn't for this, the money losing routes could be eliminated and possibly the crowded Northeast corridor retained where the losses aren't so great.

It will take something of a miracle to keep us from buying a lot of railroad tickets for other people to use--so sit back and enjoy nostalgia.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Bi-lingual"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

From the very first this nation has been made up of a collection of minorities forming a majority we call Americans. We hyphenated ourselves, yes, to explain the origin of family, calling ourselves German-American, Irish-American, Italian-American, whatever. And, as first generation Americans, the success of the melting pot became evident as more and more of us described our heritage as French and Dutch, or Irish, Scotch and English, Austrian and Italian. You name the mix, we had them all.

Our ancestry traces to every corner of the world but with one common characteristic which makes us Americans. Those forefathers of ours, and, yes, today's modern immigrants, had and have an extra love of liberty and an extra ounce of courage which made it possible for them to tear up roots and journey to a far-away land in search of more personal freedom and better opportunities for themselves and their children. Yes, we keep our pride of origin, perpetuate the memory of ancestral song and custom, dress up in ethnic costume for certain ceremonial days. We also carry the Stars and Stripes and sing the Star Spangled Banner on those occasions.

Of late however, and possibly for political purposes, we seem bent on doing away with the melting pot, recreating strict ethnic divisions. A few weeks back I commented on bi-lingual education and its failure to do anything toward improving the ability of students speaking a foreign tongue to master English.

The other day, a typical American drove me to the airport in a town where I'd been speaking. He decreed our law which requires the printing of our ballots in two languages. Then he told me how he had come to this country from Italy when he was ten years old. Like millions before and since, he learned English without the help of special programs and he said at home in the evenings he and his brothers and sisters would help their parents learn English. He's still a fairly young man and as American as baseball.

A California news item the other day reported on the cost of printing ballots in two languages and the waste because hundreds of thousands of them were thrown away, or uncalled for at the polling places in our neighborhoods.

Now, from the "National Review Bulletin", I glean the following item. The federal government has ordered three counties of North Carolina to print ballots in the language of the Lumbee Indians. There is a problem--there is no Lumbee language. There was once, but when white settlers moved into the area, the Indians abandoned it in favor of English.

County officials are considering asking for a federal grant to invent a Lumbee language and teach it to the Lumbees so they can carrying out the law requiring dual language ballots.

Washington isn't doing well in English these days. Here is an H.E.W. working paper: --QUOTE--"In terms of heads who worked, as one would expect, the proportion of heads who worked is greater for total poor heads compared to poor heads eligible for welfare, greater still for non-poor heads eligible for welfare."--UNQUOTE-- Try that in Lumbee.

RONALD REAGAN

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

A short time ago I commented on what seems to be the federal government's determination to acquire even more land than it already owns. In that commentary I gave some rough estimates of the percentages of land in some Western states which remain in under federal ownership. Since then, I've received a few queries as to those estimates and even some suggestions that I might have exaggerated. Actually my estimates were modest by at least a few percentage points.

Anyway, here is an accurate listing of several states. Of Alaska's total acreage, 96.4 percent is federally owned; California 45 percent and Arizona 43.9 percent. That, of course, is only a partial listing. The federal government owns one-third of the United States--that would be equal to all the land east of the Mississippi River.

In my previous commentary I spoke mainly of those private land owners who were being persuaded by bureaucrats to give up their land, thus increasing the federal preserve. But there is more at stake than that, and all of us have reason to be concerned about Uncle Sam as a land baron.

The Dean of the University of Arizona College of Mines has written some articles for the Arizona DAILY STAR summarizing the situation. He tells us that 50 percent of all known energy sources are in these federal lands. Yet, in 1976, they only accounted for 10 percent of our total energy production.

According to Dean William Leshner, the federal government has been locking these lands up as fast as new energy sources are discovered on them, thereby preventing production which could make us less dependent on foreign sources. In 1968 only about one-fourth of federal lands had been withdrawn from use. Six years later that had become three-fourths, and no one knows the current rate of withdrawal.

Under the Ford Administration, a study was made when it became known that a number of federal agencies had been withdrawing such lands piecemeal, not coordinating with each other. That study was made public just before the new administration took over. It revealed that no one in Washington knows how much of the federally-owned mineral lands have been removed from use. And it doesn't look as if we're going to find out because the Secretary of the Interior in this administration, Cecil Andrus, has suppressed the report.

Now the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service, under their own interpretations of the Wilderness Act, are trying to look up an additional 90 million acres in Idaho, Montana, Wyoming and Colorado. One of the richest natural gas strikes in years was made within recent months in that area. Why is the government so anxious to lock up this land--much of which is barren? Is it a fear that more strikes will be made? Hard as it may be to believe that, is there any other explanation?

We're so used to calling this one-third of our nation, federal land, isn't it time we remembered that the very term means it belongs to us--to the people of America?

RONALD REAGAN

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

For more than a decade the U.S. has been patiently negotiating with member nations of the U.N. trying to work out a treaty covering the development of the vast mineral riches hidden at the bottom of the sea. But as the years have dragged on, the U.N. Committee on Sea Bed Mining moved closer and closer to an international sea bed authority to control and manage the world sea beds.

In fact, Third World nations had moved for a U.N. controlled deep sea mining company called the Enterprise. A private company wanting to explore and mine the sea bottom would be required to get a contract from the Enterprise, by which the company would have to accept production controls, turn over its technology to the U.S. and find and evaluate mine sites for Enterprise.

Finally, (and this should be an occasion for hoisting the flag) Uncle Sam's patience wore thin. A thirty-nine year old lawyer on our negotiating team, Leigh Ratiner declared no national interest of ours could justify handing sovereign control of two-thirds of the earth's surface over to the Third World. The House of Representatives voted 312 to 80 to set up a temporary licensing system whereby private companies can go prospecting in the world's ocean. The bill is before the Senate and will undoubtedly pass, if it hasn't already. Once the bill is signed into law, consortiums of some 17 American companies are willing to lay out nearly 1.5 billion dollars to go exploring in the Pacific between Hawaii and Mexico.

What they are after are metal-oxide nodules that lie on the ocean floor as much as three miles deep. They have been photographed and they have been brought to the surface. We know they contain several metals and will run about \$100 to the ton. In the Pacific area to be mined, the nodules are expected to yield about 30 percent manganese, 1.4 percent nickel, one-fourth of one percent cobalt, and 1.9 percent copper. We presently depend on imports for most of these metals. Indeed, we are totally dependent on import for manganese and cobalt and 90 percent dependent for nickel. Copper isn't quite as critical; still we import about 15 percent.

It is estimated the Eastern Pacific alone can provide enough of these metals to last the world for hundreds of years. In other words, the U.S. can become self-sufficient through deep sea mining.

No one has ruled out the idea of a treaty--one which makes sense--but after long years of fruitless negotiating, it became apparent that the underdeveloped nations who now control the General Assembly were looking for a free ride at our expense--again. This time, thank heaven, we said "No". In fact, Congress was told by our negotiators that we should go it alone whether the Third World likes it or not. Sea bed mining will go forward with or without a treaty, and it was even added--right out loud--QUOTE--"We have the means at our disposal to protect our oceans' interests and we shall protect those interests if a comprehensive treaty eludes us."--UNQUOTE--

I wonder why we couldn't have used the same team in the Panama Canal negotiations. There is still time to run them in on the SALT talks.

RONALD REAGAN

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

I know you've heard or seen news reports of warnings by former Defense Department officials, retired military personnel and others, that our nation is in danger, our defenses inadequate and our attitude about Russia unrealistic. I know, too, that many Americans, including members of Congress, dismiss these warnings as coming from advocates of the military industrial complex and, therefore, suspect.

But on July 25th in this year of our Lord 1978, a man of unquestionable liberal credentials--Sterling Professor of Law, former Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs under the Johnson Administration--Eugene V. Rostow addressed a conference on U.S. Security and the Soviet Challenge.

There is no way Eugene Rostow could be called a Hawk or a tool for military interests. That's why his address should be heard by every American. He opened his remarks saying:--QUOTE--"My assignment today is to examine the SALT II agreement now in prospect and to consider whether it is in the National Security interests of the United States."--UNQUOTE--

He acknowledged the desirability of having a treaty that abolished nuclear weapons and he recalled an episode we all recall with pride, the 1947 offer of the Baruch plan. That was the proposal we made to put our nuclear weapons and nuclear knowledge in the hands of an internal agency which would develop nuclear energy for peaceful use. We had a nuclear monopoly at that time. We could have commanded the world to do our bidding.

The Soviet Union rejected the Baruch plan, signaling us that it intended to embark on an imperial course rather than join in peaceful, post-war cooperation.

Professor Rostow then addressed himself to the subject of SALT II and to the political and public relations experts led by Hamilton Jordan who are trying to explain SALT II to the American people. He referred to them as the "SALT Sellers". And he said, --QUOTE--"they claim too much for the agreement. The administration and its supporters portray those who question SALT II as monsters of inequity who oppose arms control and lust for nuclear war with the Soviet Union."--UNQUOTE-- And he cautioned against accepting political mythology.

--QUOTE--"For nearly a century", he said, "there has been a current of opinion on the English speaking countries that arms limitation agreements are an important instrument of peace--and it is tenaciously held, resisting the challenge of contrary experience."--UNQUOTE-- He described the arguments on behalf of "SALT" as the same used on behalf of Washington Naval Treaty of 1922, when we sank scores of our warships and Britain did the same. Professor Rostow said,--QUOTE--"The Washington Naval Treaty and its progeny led straight to Pearl Harbor."--UNQUOTE-- He cited several other such post-World War I agreements as helping to bring on World War II. Now we are told that without SALT II, he said,--QUOTE--"We'll bring back the 'Cold War'."--UNQUOTE--

Well, listen to Rostow on the notion that Soviet-American relations have improved in recent years and that the Cold War is over.--QUOTE--"The fact is the Cold War is not over. To the contrary, it is worse than it has ever been, featured by Soviet threats and thrusts on a far larger scale than those of the simple days of the Berlin Airlift and the Crisis of Greece."--UNQUOTE--

RONALD REAGAN

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

Eminent, liberal scholar Eugene Rostow in his July 25th assessment of SALT II, which he called "a soft bargain, a hard sell", said--QUOTE--"we have had a SALT agreement with the Soviet Union since 1972." And he added, "Far from stabilizing world policies, SALT I has been a part of the most turbulent and dangerous period of the cold war."--UNQUOTE--

What are some of the episodes in this period which was to have been stabilized by that study? Well for one, "the Soviet Union defaulted on its obligations as a guarantor of the peace agreements of 1973 in Indo-China." Those arguments which were so hailed by the world after the long years of bloodshed in Vietnam, that Henry Kissinger was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, were treated by the Soviets as scraps of paper. As Rostow points out--QUOTE--"The final North Vietnamese invasions of South Vietnam in 1974 could never have taken place without Soviet equipment and other help."--UNQUOTE--

Another episode was the Soviet promise in May of 1972 to cooperate with the United States in seeking peace in the Middle East. Again, as Rostow points out--QUOTE--"It violated those promises by supplying, planning, encouraging, and even participating in the Arab aggression against Israel of October 1973". He goes on to say, "The intention was not only to crush Israel, but also to outflank NATO, to neutralize Europe and to drive us out of Europe and the Mediterranean. For the moment, the Soviet plan was defeated by the brilliant victory of Israel's armed forces, backed by supplies from the U.S." But Rostow adds, "The Soviets patiently pursue their strategic goal."--UNQUOTE--

Secretary of State Rogers testified to our Senate that we had made a number of unilateral interpretations of the first SALT treaty and that we should regard any breach of these policies by the Soviet Union as a violation of the "spirit" of the treaty. All these unilateral interpretations of the treaty were violated by the Soviet Union, and we did nothing.

Professor Rostow says--QUOTE--"The point is obvious and by now beyond dispute. The Soviet Union is engaged in a policy of imperial expansion all over the world, despite the supposedly benign influence of SALT I and its various commitments of cooperation in the name of detente. The Soviet Union is pursuing that course with accelerating momentum."--UNQUOTE--

He called attention to the most recent manifestations of that momentum in Yemen and Afghanistan--far away places many of us might not be able to locate immediately on a world map. but places of unquestioned importance to anyone bent on world conquest. Rostow says the Soviet moves in those countries result from two related forces--QUOTE--"the startling buildup of Soviet strategic and conventional forces during the last 16 years and the paralyzing impact on American policies of our collapse in Vietnam."--UNQUOTE--

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Rostow III"

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

For two broadcasts now, I've been quoting from an address by Eugene Rostow on the declining position of the United States in the face of the growth of Soviet military power. That growth over the last sixteen years is,--QUOTE--"without parallel in modern history. Both our government and the British government, according to Rostow, have said formally that the Soviet military posture and dispositions are offensive in character, and cannot be explained by considerations of defense."--UNQUOTE--

The Soviet military budget is 40 to 80 percent more per year than our own in real terms. Our Secretary of Defense has described the situation as the fable of the tortoise and the hare. We sat back deceived by the belief that we had "overhill" capacity. We cut our military budgets by half while the Soviets increased theirs. --QUOTE--"Now, as Rostow says, we are behind in almost every relevant category of military power--behind in production, behind in research; and behind in programming." --UNQUOTE-- The American people are clearly in favor of regaining the military position of number one, but like the hare, officialdom is still sleeping in the tree.

According to the Professor, there is still time to head off a collision between the Soviets to ourselves. It means stepping up our own rearmament and a vigorous, active diplomacy with our allies to restore a pattern of world order based on the charter of the United Nations. But this is only possible if we participate as the leader of such an effort. And our nuclear arsenal is as Rostow says--QUOTE--"the indispensable foundation for any such program."--UNQUOTE--

He sums up this necessary effort to head off a disastrous collision with this paragraph which I shall quote:--"The success of such an effort will depend not upon SALT treaties but upon the reality of the military balance and the energy, self confidence, and imagination of our diplomatic campaign. In that process, arms limitation agreements with the Soviet Union could play a modest part, if they are genuinely fair, balanced, and verifiable, and are not allowed to induce euphoria about 'detente'. But such agreements cannot significantly alter the cost of our defense programs. We must undertake now to spend quite a lot of money to restore the military balance. For years to come, the presence or absence of SALT II would not increase the cost of defense for the U.S. by up to \$100 billion as proponents of SALT claim. Those figures of extra costs, if the SALT negotiation fails, or if the Senate refuses to consent to the treaty, are just as fanciful as the claims of "detente".--UNQUOTE--

RONALD REAGAN

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

For the last three broadcasts, I've been excerpting and quoting from an address by Eugene Rostow on our defense posture and the significance of the continuing SALT talks.

It must be understood that strategic nuclear weapons play a role in modern politics and have a bearing on the entire process of world politics. It is often said that the goal of our nuclear forces is to deter or make less credible the possibility of war. It is, however, a mistake to believe that deterrence is also the goal of Soviet nuclear policy.

As Rostow says,-- "Effective American nuclear deterrence cannot alone keep the Soviet Union from using conventional forces, at least against targets they think we regard as secondary, like Vietnam or Ethiopia. Except for massive attacks on our most vital interests, like Western Europe or Japan, defense has to be provided by conventional forces, at least in the first instance. But the absence of effective nuclear deterrence would have a disastrous effect, denying all credibility to our conventional force deterrent."

To understand what he means, we must review our experience back to 1945, when we had a monopoly on nuclear weapons. In Greece, Turkey, the Berlin Airlift, Korea and the Cuban missile crisis, the nuclear weapon was always a decisive factor in the background. The Soviets knew that in a nuclear exchange, our casualties would have numbered ten million, their's 100 million. By the middle '60's, their buildup had brought us to a stalemate. We could no longer hint at the use of nuclear weapons in places like Vietnam.

Now, "There can be no question", says Rostow, "that our position has slipped from stalemate to the borders of inferiority. The strategic force relationship which dominates the Cuban missile crisis will soon be reversed, unless we undertake a crash program immediately--that in the event of a nuclear exchange we should risk 100 million casualties and the Soviet Union 10 million."

Rostow correctly points out that if we let such a situation develop: "our foreign policy and conventional forces would be impotent and we should acquiesce." And, of course, by acquiesce he means surrender and end this great experiment in freedom which has, from its beginning, held out hope to a downtrodden mankind all over the world.

"It is the first objective of Soviet policy to achieve such a situation", says Rostow, "Soviet leaders believe it would enable them to determine the future course of the world politics."

"This", he says, "is what our nuclear weapons program and the SALT negotiations are all about." To those who dismiss the vision of nuclear war as unthinkable, he says, "The vision of Soviet political coercion backed by astronomical nuclear and conventional forces is far from unthinkable. No President of the United States should ever be put into a corner where he would have to choose between the surrender of vital national interests and nuclear holocaust."

RONALD REAGAN

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

In evaluating the SALT II agreement now being negotiated and the SALT I we've lived under for several years, Professor Rostow points out some frightening possibilities. He raises the question of whether, under SALT II, we would be able to threaten the Soviet Union with a second strike capability if it should attack us or our allies.

The answer he gives is that the draft of SALT II as we've indicated in the press deals only with nuclear weapons which could reach the United States and that is like a dam across half the river. "We have," as he says, "vital interests in Western Europe, Canada, Mexico, Japan and other allied nations. It does no good for us to spend thousands of hours fussing over whether the Backfire bomber can reach the United States while it also threatens Western Europe and the Middle East."

"The Soviet Union was allowed in SALT I to have more and larger missile launchers than we because we thought we could stay ahead in mirving and in accuracy." But six fundamental developments have taken place since 1972. First, the Soviet Union has made extremely rapid progress in mirving their missiles. Where ours have three warheads, theirs have eight to 10, and they have greater throw weight--20 times the destructive power of ours.

Our "SALT sellers", as Rostow calls the Administration spokesmen, continue to claim our warheads are the equivalent of the Soviet weapons. They are not.

The second basic change since 1972 is the Soviet improvement in accuracy of missiles designed to destroy our missiles, planes on the ground and ships in harbor. Hear Mr. Rostow on this-- "Soviet science has achieved a great breakthrough, that as a result the Soviet Union is now superior to the United States in military power; and that the effects of the breakthrough will soon be apparent in world politics."

Third, our dependence on submarines (now that we've cancelled the B-1 bomber) should give us little comfort for the Soviets have made equal breakthroughs in anti-submarine warfare.

Fourth, the Soviet Union has made some of its Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles mobile. When SALT I was announced, assurances were given the Senate that this was not true. Now the Administration confirms it is true.

Fifth, the Soviets now have killer satellites. They can knock from space our communications and spy satellites, leaving us blind.

And sixth, there is the Soviet civil defense program. Our leaders continue to tell us that if the Soviets cross certain lines we can kill millions of them without danger to ourselves. This was a plausible answer at the time of the Cuban missile crisis, but it has "long since lost even the appearance of conviction", says Professor Rostow. He states that, "Our fixed site missiles are outclassed in number, size, destructive power and survivability by Soviet missiles; we have tossed away our advantage in bombers and our citizen population remains unprotected while the Soviet Union has perservered in air defense and evacuation procedures."

RONALD REAGAN

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

Our Secretary of Defense has tried to reassure us by saying that a successful Soviet nuclear strike against our missile silos would be followed with an attack by our submarine-launched missiles against Moscow, Leningrad and other cities. The assumption is that Russia would never launch a first strike and risk our follow-up attack. This is hardly a credible assumption since the Russians have enough nuclear forces for a second strike against our cities.

Dr. Rostow, in the address I've been quoting for the past five days, sums up our present policy with these words-- "Our first new bomber in many years--the B-1-- has been cancelled. The neutron warhead which might have given NATO a firm shield for 10 years has been remitted to the shades. The U.S. has closed down the Minuteman III production line and delayed the initial operating capability of the missile which was supposed to replace it. MX is on ice for the time being. Furthermore, the Trident (submarine) program has been stretched out." Then he says that, while the President assures us our treaty obligations are still firm and we stand behind our allies in the Pacific and Atlantic, our former chief of naval operations has testified that our navy can't guarantee the sea lanes beyond Hawaii. Secretary of Defense Brown has told the Japanese we cannot assure the naval defense of Japan. We're further reducing our navy and we haven't introduced a new missile system since 1960. The Soviets have unveiled five. Just what is SALT II supposed to do for us?

Rostow says-- "Around the world, people are seriously worried about our state of mind. They wonder whether we have the understanding and will to defend ourselves and our interests in world politics, or whether we are in a mood of suicidal appeasement. As the brilliant leader of a moderate sized country in Asia said recently, "the greatest external threat (to his nation) is the weakness of the West. The West is paralyzed and divided."

Our goal is a stable peace. Who has ever met an American who favored war with the Soviet Union? Rostow concludes with the warning that the Soviet rulers will expand their power as long as the risks are not excessive. His closing lines should be heard by every American. "The kind of SALT agreement the administration is so frantically trying to sell the country is not a step toward detente or toward peace, but an act of appeasement which can only invite more Soviet pressure and more risk. It would freeze us in a position of inferiority, deny us the opportunity to redress the balance, weaken our alliances and isolate us.

It would be a step toward war, not peace."

Those are the thoughts of an unquestioned liberal, a scholar who desires peace above all and who finally spoke out because he thinks we could be on the road to war.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "End of an Emergency"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Until September 14 this year, the power of virtual dictatorship was lodged in the Office of the President of the United States. The President had full emergency power to seize the property of private citizens--to organize and control the means of production--to seize commodities from their owners--to institute martial law throughout the nation--to seize and control all transportation and communication--to restrict the right to travel of American citizens--and to control the lives and actions of supposedly free Americans in countless other ways.

Where, you ask, did this outrageous grant of power to the President come from? It came not in one big Presidential Powers Act of Congress, for of course such a measure would have been shouted down in Congress, in the news media, and in every town hall and meeting place across the land. That fearsome concentration of power in the Presidency came from no less than 470 separate statutes enacted by Congress over the past 46 years to empower him to deal with "national emergencies".

Each of these statutes spelled out how something was to be done. But each also provided that the President could take further action in case of a "national emergency"--proclaimed by the President. All any President had to do was say the word, and these extraordinary powers were his to use pretty much as he saw fit.

Once a President declared a national emergency, he rarely thought about terminating that state of affairs later on. The emergency became history, but the President's power to act continued in full legal force. Thus, until September 14 of this year, the nation was in a national emergency proclaimed by President Roosevelt in 1933 to cope with the banking crisis. We were also in a state of national emergency because of the Communist invasion of South Korea in 1950, and because of the 1970 postal strike, and because of the 1971 decision by President Nixon to close the gold window to foreign central banks. And during any of those emergencies, the President had the full powers conferred by all 470 separate statutes accumulated since 1933.

On September 14, however, the National Emergencies Act of 1976 took full effect. On that day all preceding national emergencies were declared terminated by Congress, and the President of the United States can no longer make use of those sweeping powers. The President may still declare a state of national emergency, but under the new act Congress will continually review the emergency and the actions of the President to deal with it, and may end the emergency by concurrent resolution at any time. For the first time in nearly half a century, Americans are not living in a formal state of national emergency.

Let us hope that it will be a long time before another one is declared.

RONALD REAGAN

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

There is an old Indian proverb: "Before I criticize a man, may I walk a mile in his moccasins." Patricia Derian and her minions at Mr. Carter's Human Rights Office apparently haven't heard of it. If they had, they might not be making such a mess of our relations with the planet's seventh largest country, Argentina, a nation with which we should be close friends.

No sooner had President Carter made his early and strong statement on human rights principles than born-again McGovernites began infesting various foreign policy-making levels in the new administration, with an eye toward forcing any nation they could to tow the mark. And, they defined the mark.

Nearly any charge made against nations such as Argentina, Brazil and Chile was assumed to be true. As a result, the Carter Human Rights Office has managed since to hold up export licenses for important sales to these and other nations.

Now comes a man whose moccasins Ms. Derian & Co. should try: Dr. Jose A. Martinez de Hoz, minister of economy of Argentina. He came to the U.S. for the recent annual meeting of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, but a few days before that he addressed San Francisco's Commonwealth Club. He also put Argentina's story in perspective.

Martinez de Hoz is the architect of what may turn out to be one of the most remarkable economic recoveries in modern history. By March, 1976--the tail end of Peronism under the widow of Juan Peron--Argentina's people were being crushed by a 920 percent inflation rate. The central bank was nearly broke; there was a foreign trade deficit; tax collections were dropping and the government was shot through with corruption, sliding toward chaos.

The armed forces stepped in. As Martinez de Hoz explained, as a last resort, to keep the country together. He said that his country had been facing a well-equipped force of 15,000 terrorists who were "destroying the social fabric" of the country. "What the government had to do was to protect the human rights of 25 million people against a minority of people who had gone ideologically haywire," he said.

Though the situation is virtually under control today, some terrorists have quietly slipped back "above ground" and others have gone into exile, and Martinez de Hoz says, "it is a sad reality that there will be a certain number of people that the government will never be able to account for."

When this quiet, Cambridge-educated man speaks about a return to democracy he speaks with conviction. Argentina's economic recovery shows every sign of making that day come sooner rather than later. Inflation, though still sky-high by our measurements, is down from that 920 percent to 102 percent. Tax collections have doubled (always a sign of increased confidence in government). The deficit has been forced down almost to zero and no more printing press money is needed. Central bank reserves are up from \$23 million to \$6 billion; there was a trade surplus for the first half of 1978. To top it off a \$1 billion standby credit from U.S. and Canadian banks has been cancelled by Argentina as not needed. That must have had the sweetest taste of all to Dr. Martinez de Hoz and his colleagues.

Ms. Derian, would you care to try on a new pair of moccasins?

RONALD REAGAN

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

If you've ever heard of the Whydah bird--you're ahead of me. As a matter of fact, I'll have to look at an atlas or encyclopedia to find out where Digue Island is--the only place where the Whydah bird is found. But apparently we are supposed to be upset because an ornithologist says the Whydah bird may become extinct in 15 years.

Maybe CETA--the Comprehensive Employment & Training Act--could help a little. In Wisconsin, CETA workers are being paid to record the sounds of Quail calls. Why not the Whydah birds?

But in California we have an environmental problem which could pit environmentalists against environmentalists. The Pacific Legal Foundation, a non-profit organization consistently found on the side of common sense and fairness, has filed suit against the Environmental Protection Agency. It seeks an injunction to stop E.P.A. activities which violate the Endangered Species act. To make this action even more unusual, the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service is also named in the suit.

All this started with an E.P.A. order banning Los Angeles and other nearby cities from waste disposal in the ocean. E.P.A. would have them switch to a land disposal system at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars. Now, you must understand, we're not talking of raw sewage or sludge but treated effluent which is piped out to sea. Scientists have not found this to be polluting so much as it is fertilizing. They say that the Santa Monica bay area is rich in plankton because of the nutrients brought into the sea by this waste disposal.

Plankton, it so happens, is an important food supply for the Gray Whales and for anchovies. Brown Pelicans feed on anchovies. Now the whales and the pelicans are both on the endangered species list. The Pacific Legal action committee is asking whether the E.P.A. order which would reduce the food supply of plankton would not subsequently endanger the whales, the anchovies and the pelicans.

Curiously, the Fish & Wildlife people, who rushed to stop dams that threatened the Snail Darter, the Furbish Lousewort and the Daddy Longlegs Spider, aren't so anxious to buck the E.P.A. The Legal group actually has a serious and worthwhile purpose. They are trying to establish the absurdity of the present endangered species law which gives priority to tiny fish, weeds and spiders regardless of the merits of any proposed project.

Through confrontation they hope to achieve a balance between environmental concerns and economic values important to the American people. They advocate that no new species be put on the endangered list until environmental impact statements have shown what the loss to society would be in comparison to the loss of projects such as dams and reservoirs. I told you they were on the side of common sense.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Soviet Nuclear Power"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

According to Thomas O'Toole, writing in the Washington Post, the Soviet approach to safety is quite different than our own. All 71 nuclear plants in the United States have containment domes. The purpose of the domes is to isolate any dangerous radioactivity. Almost all of the 151 nuclear stations operation in 20 countries around the world have such domes. But until this year, none of the 29 Soviet nuclear installations had this protection.

O'Toole described a visit to a small nuclear reactor in Moscow's Kurchatov Institute. The only thing that separated the journalists from the reactor's uranium was 15 feet of water. The workers in Soviet plants don't wear protective garb familiar to American nuclear power plants nor do they wear dosimeters to measure accidental exposure. Visitors in the Soviet Union are routinely brought into the rooms which have the reactors. The worst possible accident for which the Soviets equip their nuclear plants is a single break in the large pipe carrying cooling water to the reactor. U.S. plants are built with complete emergency cooling systems to handle single or multiple breaks.

Nuclear plants in the United States are usually miles from large population centers. The new plants the Soviets are building will be located near major cities--within on and one half miles of the boundaries--and they will not have containment domes...The Russian goal is to replace 30 percent of the organic fuel the country now uses for space heating with nuclear fuel.

Another major difference in the Soviet and American nuclear scene is that in the U.S.S.R. you won't find anyone protesting the use of nuclear power. Dissent isn't tolerated. Period. To the extent the trade union movement exists in the Soviet Union, it exists not to advance the interests of the working man and woman, but to advance the goals of the five-year plan, or in this case the Soviet intention to go nuclear. And, another thing you won't find in the Soviet Union is literature which opposes the construction of nuclear facilities. It simply doesn't exist in the popular press. Although there has been some success in getting the Soviets to incorporate environmental safeguards in the facilities, the concern doesn't dominate Soviet planning. The Soviet Union lost bidding battles to two non-Communist firms recently, because the Communist countries did not think the Soviet nuclear design was safe. And, as for their safety record, who knows? The Soviets boast that they have the equivalent of 2000 years of nuclear operating experience without a single major failure. But, since statistics and supporting material are all the property of the government, no one really knows what the Soviet experiments with nuclear power show.

While the Soviets move ahead at full speed in the field, nuclear power is the center of controversy at home. Various estimates have been given concerning the cost of the harrassing delays in the construction of nuclear facilities in this country. In the celebrated Seabrook case, one study by the Heritage Foundation reported that delays in licensing added \$419 million to the cost of the plant.

The Soviets are clearly planning to outstrip us in the nuclear arena. Since nuclear power has considerable military significance, Soviet dominance in this area could add to their lead in many areas of both conventional and strategic weaponry. Those who protest what must be--at least judging by Soviet standards--a meticulous regard for nuclear safety and environmental concerns by American companies are the unwitting victims of Soviet designs.

RONALD REAGAN
RADIO COMMENTARY

Taped 10/31/78
Air 11/13 - 12/1/78

DISC 78-15

78-14A

Generic promos

1. Letelier I	3:04
2. Letelier II	3:09
3. Intelligence and the media	2:38
4. Welfare	3:00
5. The escalator	2:41
6. Nuclear Power I	2:49
7. Nuclear Power II	2:56

78-15B

1. Crime	2:26
2. Waste	2:39
3. Nuclear Carrier	2:43
4. Pensions	2:54
5. Self-help in the neighborhood	2:53
6. Chinese Libertarians	3:05
7. Davis-Bacon Act	2:24
8. Miscellaneous	2:48

PLEASE NOTE

These programs are provided for airing from November 13th through December 1st, 1978 inclusive. Maintaining this schedule will enable your station to air all newly recorded programs as received.

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 "Letelier I"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

In Washington, on September 21, 1976, Orlando Letelier, who had been Chile's ambassador to the United States in the leftist Allende government, died in a bomb explosion in his automobile. A woman co-worker died with him. Letelier, living in exile in Washington, had been working out of a radical leftist think tank, the Institute for Policy Studies. More about that later.

First, the question of who killed Letelier has not been answered, though an American living in Chile, one Michael Townley, has confessed to U.S. authorities that he placed the bomb under the car. Townley implicated five Cuban anti-Castro exiles (who have been indicted) and in exchange for a promise in advance of a light sentence, he has claimed that the parties responsible for Letelier's death are the former head of Chile's disbanded security agency called DINA and two of his subordinates. A Washington grand jury has indicted them and asked Chile to extradite them. There, a court will decide whether or not to go along with the request. General Contreras, that former head of DINA, is close to General Pinochet, head of the Chilean government, and, as a report just released by the Council on Inter-American Security points out, the real objective of Letelier's leftist comrades is to discredit Chile's government in order to make it fall.

Virginia Prewett, a veteran award-winning journalist who has specialized in Latin American affairs, is the author of the new report and she raises some important points that have received very little attention in our news media, especially the media in Washington on which members of Congress depend for much foreign affairs information.

She says, "Washington TV stations flashed bulletins on the (Letelier) assassination, and then groped in unfamiliar subject matter for follow-up news. Within hours, the IPS (Letelier's radical think-tank), taking advantage of this news vacuum, staged a demonstration at Washington's nearby DuPont Circle, to which TV newsmen flocked. There, activists in pale-pink paper masks flourished placards accusing the DINA, Pinochet, U.S. imperialism and the fascist military-industrial complex."

Miss Prewett says that over the next three days, Letelier's widow and two IPS directors filled the media with statements blaming Chile's government for the deaths. They were seen on Washington television 14 times, compared with four brief appearances by Chile's ambassador to deny the charges.

This set the tone for most media coverage since, but Miss Prewett doubts that the Pinochet government had anything to gain by engineering the assassination of Letelier. On the contrary. The very day Letelier was killed, Chile's finance minister arrived in Washington to confer with then-Secretary of the Treasury William Simon on financial aid Chile needed to pursue its economic recovery plan. In fact, the Chilean embassy had scheduled a press conference to kick-off the plan. The Letelier murder wiped it out. Virginia Prewett asks, "Why would Pinochet tell his right-hand man to kill Letelier on the very day when such a murder would torpedo the (finance minister's) conference, the key to Chile's hoped-for restoration to the good graces of international finance?" Why, indeed?

RONALD REAGAN

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

Last time we discussed the assassination of Orlando Letelier, former Chilean diplomat in Washington, and the efforts of leftist groups to get our government to pin it on the current government in Chile.

Today, let's look at Letelier's own group, the Institute for Policy Studies, and just what Letelier was up to in Washington. According to Virginia Prewett, the award-winning journalist whose report "The Mysterious Letelier Affair: Another Rush to Judgment?" has just been released by the Council for Inter-American Security, the IPS's Transitional Institute, which Letelier headed, had awarded a grant to Tariq Ali, an advocate of urban terrorism. And, among the IPS's leadership are Peter Weiss, chairman, a leading figure in the National Lawyers Guild which consistently follows a Marxist line, and IPS Fellow Roberta Salper, identified as a member of "the U.S. Zone of the Marxist Puerto Rican Socialist Party". That party, in turn, has extensive connections with Castro's international intelligence network.

Letelier's connections with Marxists and far-left causes became clearer when columnists Jack Anderson and Evans and Novak revealed that among the contents of Letelier's briefcase on the day he was killed were documents showing that he was getting \$1,000 a month from Allende's daughter in Havana "for his work".

According to Miss Prewett, what emerged from "The Briefcase Papers" was a picture of a man who was systematically taking advantage of the human rights impulses of liberal members of Congress in order to get an amendment added to the US. Foreign Assistance Act of 1976 imposing mandatory penalties on nations which allegedly violated human rights. This did become law.

The Prewett report says that "the briefcase documents identify Letelier with an intercontinental network of clandestine political activity, within an apparatus co-directed by Havana Communists and aided by the governments of East Germany and the Soviet Union." She adds, "The 'Briefcase Papers' further revealed that Havana was manufacturing propaganda on (so-called) 'human right violations' in Chile for Letelier to use at the UN and elsewhere."

According to the Prewitt report, Letelier took pains to conceal his links to international Marxist and terrorist groups. In fact, having successfully lobbied for legislation that would have the effect of cutting off military aid to non-leftist governments in Latin America, Letelier would have become a severe liability to the Marxist cause if he were exposed as an unregistered foreign agent. In fact, his exposure might have caused a sharp backlash. All this was about the time Tongsun Park's lobbying activities for South Korea were surfacing. Miss Prewett raises the question of whether Letelier might have been murdered by his own masters. Alive he could be compromised; dead he could become a martyr. And the left didn't lose a minute in making him one. I don't know the answer, but it is a question worth asking, especially since the nation's most influential media have been almost totally lacking in curiosity about the matter.

When then-Joint Chiefs of Staff chairman General George Brown testified on the Panama Canal treaty in 1976, he pointed out that the first objective of Soviet policy in the Western Hemisphere is to destroy U.S. military relations with Latin America. Since the passage of the 1976 foreign aid bill and the emergence of a hard-line human rights campaign, it is military aid and our allegiances with Latin American nations which have suffered most.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Intelligence and the Media"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Last spring the House Select Committee on Intelligence was investigating alleged CIA manipulation of the news media. It was all part of the hysteria over the possibility that intelligence gathering agencies and even law enforcement units were threatening the privacy of citizens and the freedom of the press.

As a member of President Ford's commission to investigate the CIA I know that the CIA sought information from American newsmen and women stationed around the world but this was hardly cloak and dagger stuff. Much intelligence-gathering work is devoted to evaluations of public opinion, economic conditions and characteristics of public officials in various countries. Journalists covering those countries are well informed and able to provide this kind of information--indeed it is the very kind of thing they write for their papers and news services.

One member of the House Select Committee with the common sense for which he is known--Congressman John Ashbrook of Ohio--asked Admiral Turner, director of the CIA, to report on the Soviet Union's manipulation of the media. The Admiral was delighted to respond. Just recently the committee received that report. Somehow it hasn't made the headlines.

According to the report, the primary target for Soviet propaganda worldwide is the United States. To carry out that mission the Soviets have created the largest propaganda network in the world. While they deplore Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, our broadcast efforts aimed at penetrating the Iron Curtain, the Soviets maintain a radio broadcasting schedule in 84 languages, 2,000 hours a week. They also have 13 International Communist fronts, one of the most effective being the world Peace Council. The Soviets do have a gift for coining nice sounding titles for their burrowing units. That World Peace Council has held a couple of meetings in our country this year.

If you were a listener to any of those broadcasts in any one of the 84 languages you heard that our CIA was behind the Aldo Moro kidnap-murder. It wasn't that communist gang at all--they'd never do a thing like that. The President of Zaire--Mobutu--is engaged in a conspiracy with the United States, France and West Germany to produce nuclear cruise missiles in his country. And of course they are still carrying on about the inhumanity of the neutron weapon, the production of which President Carter has stalled. Actually its inhumanity consists of being potentially most effective defense against the 40,000 Soviet tanks lined up on the NATO line.

The only thing lacking in the CIA report that Congressman Ashbrook requested is information about Soviet propaganda in the United States--The CIA is no longer allowed to look into such things and I don't know of any other agency in our government with an assignment to do so.

RONALD REAGAN

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

The Secretary of H.E.W. admitted with apparently no great discomfort that last year seven billion dollars was lost in welfare fraud. A number of big city mayors routinely ask Washington to take over welfare as do some governors and the administration--when it talks welfare at all--advocates federalizing it.

From our experience in reforming welfare in California I am convinced the welfare mess is a Washington mess. It can be straightened out if Washington will close down its welfare shop and turn welfare over completely to the states and local government. This of course must include turning the necessary tax sources over to the states at the same time.

Right now welfare is administered at the local level but under thousands of all-encompassing, ever-changing federal regulations. In spite of this there is evidence that locals can eliminate a lot of the mess even with the federal handicaps. Los Angeles County is a classic example--one which makes you wonder what could be accomplished if Washington would get out of the way.

In comparing local management it is interesting that Washington, D.C. has a 35 percent rate of fraud and errors. New York City won't even reveal its fraud/error figures, but the overall New York State average is 12.1 percent. The national average is 8.5; all of California is 3.6; and Los Angeles County is only 2.67 percent.

These figures indicate the extent of California's accomplishment in the welfare reforms which went into effect in 1971. Additional savings estimated at \$100 million could be made if Washington would make the welfare forms readable for recipients. Simplifying the eligibility rules could lead to at least \$150 million in savings and it's anyone's guess what could be saved by computerizing the welfare management system at the local level.

California's 1971 reforms reduced the caseload by 350,000 persons in three-and-a-half years, reversing what had been a 40,000-a-month increase. Key elements were: tougher enforcement of child support laws, enforcing work requirements and cracking down on fraud and error. Now Los Angeles County is an excellent case study of what computers and good management can do. Its error/fraud rate was 12 percent. By 1976 it was down to 4.4 and now, as I said, it's down to 2.67.

Keith Comrie, the Los Angeles County Department head has streamlined operations to the point of reducing welfare employees from 13,000 to 11,000 in just the last two years. A computer cross check can reveal in three seconds whether a recipient is getting welfare in any of the other 26 district offices. The system automatically cross checks the state disability files, unemployment offices and federal, state and local government employees. When that program started it turned up 2,000 county and city employees on the welfare rolls.

I submit, Mr. Comrie makes the case for state and local management of welfare without federal interference.

RONALD REAGAN

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

It's easy to say that everything that can be said about inflation has been said. But we shouldn't stop talking about it till someone in Washington does something about it. Jawboning labor about holding down wages or management about holding down prices is a pretend game to keep our attention away from the real cause of inflation--which is government.

Economist and journalist Warren T. Brookes has put together some figures I think will interest you. He takes the case of an actual worker in Brockton, Massachusetts who earned just about the national average--\$200 a week--in 1976. His net after state and local taxes plus social security was \$161.69. Although Mr. Brookes didn't say this let me interject--our worker would still be paying additional taxes out of that \$161 when he started spending it because of the hundreds of taxes buried in the price of everything we buy--131 in a loaf of bread, 116 in a suit of clothes, for example.

But let's follow our worker from January 1, 1976 until this past June. Due to cost-of-living pay raises, his gross income of \$200 had become \$246--again about the national average. That was a raise of around 23 percent. But those visible federal, state and local taxes had gone up 43.2 percent due, in large part, to the fact that his raise put him in a higher tax bracket. So his net, after-tax weekly income increased about \$30--or did it? There was inflation over those two and a half years. In actual purchasing power he had only increased that \$161.69 by \$1.38. Maybe this is why the per-manhour productivity in American industry is slowing down. There is no longer any incentive.

Now Mr. Brookes takes the case of an insurance company clerk in Boston. He's drawing \$15,000 and a promotion ups that by \$1500. Taxes will take \$570 of the raise and inflation takes \$1050--he's \$120 poorer than he was.

Third case, a middle management man earning \$18,414 10 years ago and now getting \$27,964--a 50 percent increase. Surely he must have bettered himself even though inflation has reduced his purchasing power by almost \$5000. But let's not forget that tax bite. His taxes went from \$4136--a-year, 10 years ago to \$9554 today. He is more than \$1000 poorer than he was 10 years ago when his after tax net income was only \$14,278.

RONALD REAGAN

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

The other day I mentioned the added cost people will pay for electricity because of the delays in nuclear power plant construction resulting from demonstrators who oppose nuclear power. California voters, by a 70 percent majority, voted for nuclear power plants but the governor and the legislature have overruled them on the basis that safe nuclear waste disposal has not been achieved. And, Wisconsin has imposed a ten-year moratorium on any new nuclear construction.

We were supposed to have 1000 reactors producing power by the end of this century. Utilities were ordering 40 new plants a year. Last year 40 became only four, mainly because obstructionism has stretched out the construction time to 12 years for a single plant and there is no guarantee that, once completed, it will be allowed to operate. We could have as few as 200 plants by the year 2000 but our need for electricity will have doubled.

We're not going to get those needed kilowatts from oil or gas which will be declining in reserves by then. But oil and gas shouldn't be used to heat factory boilers anyway. Those two materials are too valuable as ingredients essential to the production of fertilizer, plastics, chemicals and fuel for cars, trucks and planes. And don't look to the exotics--solar energy, wind power, and so forth. It's estimated that by the year 2000 they can produce at best 20 percent of our power needs.

Yes, we have the bulk of the world's coal reserves but they are not inexhaustible and besides they would be better used in the chemical industry. Used as fuel, coal produces millions of tons of pollutants in our atmosphere and it is costly to mine, both in dollars and in human lives (100 miners a year lose their lives in accidents).

We come down to the bottom line--nuclear power is necessary. Why is there such opposition in the face of this obvious fact? Well, in part it's emotional. We lump nuclear power and bombs together and try to ban both. Indeed some of the anti-Vietnam war crowd, lacking a cause, have decided this is a good one.

There is also the no-growth group who think that somehow we can return to a bucolic yesteryear which those who remember it know was not as simple and pleasant as some would have you believe. No-growth's main drawback, however, is that it sentences the poor and jobless to a perpetuation of their present circumstances.

It is true that many people have a legitimate fear of nuclear power. I'm sure only a few still believe a power plant can erupt into a nuclear explosion, wiping out a city. Most are concerned about a so-called "melt down" in which an over-heated core could rupture and release radioactive gas. There is also a worry that proximity to a plant would result in increased radiation, with all its threat to health.

Nuclear power did a great deal to get this country through the winter storms two years ago and through last winter's coal strike, especially in New England and the Midwest.

On the next broadcast I'd like to give some answers to the problems and the fears I've just described.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Last broadcast I presented some of the major objections voiced by those who are against the construction of nuclear power plants. Today I'd like to give some answers to those objections.

First the idea that solar and wind power are practical alternatives. The simple truth is they cannot provide the increased electrical power we'll need by the year 2000. As for increased use of fossil fuels, they are too valuable as building blocks for plastics, fertilizer, and chemicals to be burned just to heat boilers in our industrial plants.

The big objection to nuclear power is, of course, fear. Fear of accidentally unleashing the dread menace of radiation. And, yet, since the first nuclear power plant went on-line 20 years ago, there has not been a single nuclear injury. The safeguards required by law, including automatic shut-offs and back-up systems, make the odds against a fatal accident 300,000,000-to-1. You have 75,000 times the danger of dying in an auto accident than you have of losing your life in a nuclear mishap.

As for radiation, a coal-fired plant emits more radiation than a nuclear powered plant. You even get more from watching T.V. or having your teeth x-rayed. Living next door to a nuclear plant at sea level or on a prairie gives you less radiation than living in mile-high Denver with no nuclear plant around.

The cost factor of nuclear power is easy to answer. Yes, the plants cost more to build, but from then on, they run more economically than oil, gas or coal-fired plants.

Now comes the sticker--waste disposal. Nuclear plants store most of that in the form of spent fuel rods in water-filled cement pools--on their own property. This was intended as a temporary measure and it's true, most of the pools are pretty well filled. But scientists working on this problem are confident that a permanent solution can be found.

For one thing, if we reprocessed that waste we'd recover additional fuel, but Uncle Sam says "no". Our government is afraid this would lead to the proliferation of nuclear weapons in the world. Frankly that is foolish. Much of the reclaimed fuel could be used in our own power plants. The rest, according to scientists, can be vitrified or embedded in blocks of glass and buried deep in rock or salt formations.

But what really puts this disposal problem in its proper perspective is the amount of waste we're talking about. At times you get the impression that we're faced with something similar to our garbage disposal, which is millions and millions of tons a day. The truth is, all of the nuclear waste now on hand and yet to be accumulated between now and the year 2000, could be stacked on a single football field and the stack would only be six feet high.

Paper, not nuclear waste is our real storage problem. The legal work for the Seabrook plant in New Hampshire alone has generated a five foot shelf of state hearing transcripts; 20 three-inch thick volumes of applications to the federal government, 12,522 pages of transcripts from the federal hearings; another five-foot shelf of papers filed before the NRC licensing board; and an unmeasured mass of briefs, environmental impact statements and exhibits. Anybody got a match?

RONALD REAGAN

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

An off-duty police officer, working as a security guard at a Los Angeles bus depot, recently placed a man under citizen's arrest for loitering in the early morning hours. When Los Angeles police checked the man's identity he turned out to be a suspect they had been seeking since September 28th.

They had already arrested two members of his family as accomplices in the September 28th crime, but he had escaped. The crime was the kidnapping, rape and murder of a University librarian. He was also wanted in connection with three other kidnappings and rapes, one of an 18 year old coed.

It is alleged that the suspect kidnapped the young librarian from a bus stop at gun point. She was taken to his family home where she was-- as the press reported it--sexually molested and then shot at close range. Her body was dumped in an ally a few blocks away.

The suspect, according to the police, was also wanted along with others for kidnapping two women, taking them to the same house where--at gun point-- they were forced to perform unnatural acts with each other and raped by five men. One was pistol whipped, suffering a broken jaw.

The following night, the young coed was kidnapped from in front of a cafe by two men, taken to the same home where she, too, was raped and held for 11 hours. She was released in the morning and subsequently led the police to the house where she had been held and where it is assumed the other crimes had taken place. Now the suspect and his sister have been charged with murder. In all, he is charged with 15 felonies including the murder (in addition to kidnapping, rape, robbery and others).

One can't help but have an overwhelming feeling of compassion for the victims who were forced to endure such nightmares of horror and degradation. And in the case of one--death.

But let me make it clear. I did not subject you to this account of brutal crimes just for the shock of telling a horror story. The shock is-- and this is my reason for telling the story--the man charged with these crimes was sent to state prison for bludgeoning a man to death in 1976. On September 13, 1978--just two years later--he was paroled and put back on the street where, in a matter of days, he allegedly committed the crimes I have described.

Our system of justice calls for punishment only if guilt is proven beyond a reasonable doubt. Is it too much to ask of a parole board that they have confidence in a man's rehabilitation beyond reasonable doubt before they free him?

RONALD REAGAN

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

Today's commentary was inspired by a couple of California state Assemblymen who pointed a finger at one or two examples of government waste. These aren't in the billion dollar range or even in the millions, but they reveal a wasteful attitude on the part of government agencies.

Paul Priolo revealed that the Department of Social Services sent nine page telegrams to each of California's 120 legislators--total cost \$2,752. The wires provided information on changes in food stamp distribution. The Department's office is only five blocks from the State Capitol building.

Assemblyman Robert Cline pointed to some frivolous spending by the California Arts Council, for example, \$700 for something called "Mothers Art". It was an experiment of staging entertainment in laundromats. The performances included dressing in clothespin masks and dancing around the washing machines. Other grants included \$2,000 to a sculptor who was experimenting with sculpture using discarded beer bottles.

Thanks to them I picked up a few other items which involved the federal government, so the price jumped a little. A young lady draws down almost \$25,000 a year as a "monitor advocate" for migrant farm workers. She is supposed to oversee migrant workers to make sure all the regulations are complied with. Now so far there's nothing wrong with that--except that she's supposed to do this in the District of Columbia. Not only are there no migrant farm workers in the District--there aren't any farms.

One that really boggles the mind is a little favor trading that turned into larceny and ended up in a surprising finish. A young lady employed in the education section of H.E.W. had a General Services credit card which was to be used for purchase of office supplies and equipment. She traded the card to a parking lot attendant for a convenient parking place. He then got busy with the card and bought \$80,000 worth of goods which he peddled through a fence.

The young lady received a suspended sentence. Whatever pain that might have caused her was eased by a two-step promotion that substantially upped her salary. The parking lot attendant (who is a District of Columbia employee) has not been prosecuted and, according to the press, the \$80,000 has not been recovered.

This next one isn't strictly government but it can cost you a goodly sum. We're all familiar with the earnest demonstrators who oppose nuclear power plants. The best known of course are members of what is called "The Clamshell Alliance" in New Hampshire. They've delayed the construction of the Seabrook plant. Those delays have added \$419 million to construction costs and lost New Hampshire workers an estimated \$132 million in wages. Those added construction costs will hike the residential consumers' bill about \$1,300 over the life of the plant.

RONALD REAGAN

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

When the defense bill was vetoed the reason given was the provision in that bill for construction of a Nimitz-class aircraft carrier. The veto message stressed the greater cost of a nuclear carrier as compared to the conventional kind. That was a little less than accurate for a number of reasons, one being that the cost of the nuclear carrier included fuel for 13 years. Adding fuel cost to the price of the conventional carrier for those 13 years brings it into the Nimitz-class price range--but not its battle effectiveness.

What makes the veto hard to understand though is a report to Congress ordered by the Carter administration making an unanswerable case in support of the giant carriers.

In fact, there were two studies--submitted early last spring, both of which were thorough analyses of naval force planning. One was the "Sea based Air Platform", a study comparing the cost-effectiveness and "survivability" of small, medium and large aircraft carriers. The second was the "Sea Plan 2000", a study which analyzed the mission and the needs of the U.S. Navy from now till the end of the century.

The administration delivered these studies without deleting or repudiating a single recommendation or finding. Then ignoring the studies completely, it submitted a 1979 Navy budget providing for no carriers at all and a shipbuilding program be reduced by half.

To say that Congress was surprised is an understatement. The first study said that the Nimitz-class carrier is individually the most effective and survivable ship. Its massive armor plate, structural strength and compartmentalization make it capable of absorbing a great many enemy hits and still keep on fighting. This is not true of the smaller ships.

The "Sea Plan 2000" study found that our surface ships and carrier battle groups will become less vulnerable over the next ten or more years. This is laid to the expectation that three U.S. developments will more than match Russia's advances in cruise missiles, attack bombers and submarine threat. They are the F-14/Phoenix fleet air defense system; the introduction of a close-in defense against missiles that get through the fighter barrier, and improvements in our anti-submarine warfare.

Over and above all, the studies demonstrated that a navy of 13 carriers, and 600 ships in all could take on the vastly improved and increased Soviet navy in its own waters and win. We are far short of those numbers right now.

Admiral Holloway, who has just retired as Chief of Naval Operations, had recommended the giant carrier. Secretary of the Navy Clayton said, if Congress would authorize a big carrier he would build it with enthusiasm.

It is hard to understand the complete reversal of the administration, when its own studies and arguments were aimed at convincing Congress the nuclear carrier was needed. Congress was convinced, but the President said, "April Fool", and the Soviets smile happily.

RONALD REAGAN

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

There are several ways by which an American can provide for his non-earning years. First, of course, he can earn an income which permits him to accumulate enough wealth to see him through those years. Second, he can invest his earnings in a retirement insurance plan or annuity. But this in turn also requires a pretty high level of earnings. Third, he or she can be a participant in a union or industry-type pension plan in which the employer ends up retiring the worker on a fixed percentage of earned salary. This would also cover public employees, who long ago opted not to participate in Social Security. And of course the latter-- (Social Security) is the retirement plan for a great many.

Unlike the other plans the Social Security retirement income is not based on the payroll tax paid over the individual's working years by employer and employee. That was the original idea, but the plan has actually become a pay-as-you-go arrangement whereby today's workers pay a tax to support the workers of yesteryear. Today's workers in turn expect to be supported by a payroll tax on tomorrow's workers.

Social Security was predicated on a projection that the number of workers would increase faster than the number of retirees, so the payroll tax would, as time went on, become less of a burden. Unfortunately that was a false projection. Fewer and fewer workers are supporting more and more recipients and the program is trillions of dollars out of actuarial balance.

Public employees' pension funds are, to a large extent, unfunded liabilities even though public employees contribute a percentage of their income to such funds.

The employer--in this case governments--simply count on future tax funds to pay their part of the obligation. Federal unfunded pension liability is estimated at around \$450 billion and growing. States and municipalities are unfunded by almost \$300 billion.

Curiously, the Federal government, which does not regulate the solvency of its own plans, subjects private pension plans to a tough scrutiny by something called "Erisa". The contributions by employees and employers are invested in America's industry. Indeed, they are an important source of capital to fuel our economy.

A survey of the nation's 1600 largest companies reveals they can meet their pension obligations with only three months of pre-tax earnings. Employee pension funds own one-third the equity capital of American industry.

Now Secretary Califano has suggested that maybe the answer to Social Security's problem is for it to take over the private funds. That's like the captain of the Titanic telling the passengers to scuttle the life boats and stay on the ship. He even suggests it is unfair for workers who pay both for their pensions and the Social Security tax to have retirement incomes better than those offered by Social Security.

In other words, scuttle the fully-funded programs in an effort to bail out Social Security. In Washington, things are getting curiouser and curiouser.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Self-Help in the Neighborhood"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Ever since President Lyndon Johnson launched his "War On Proverty" in 1964, Washington has buzzed with schemes to channel federal dollars to inner city organizations. But many of these efforts--notably the OEO community action programs and the HUD Model Cities program--have been disappointments at best, and scandalous failures at worst. After 14 years of often bitter experience, many Members of Congress of both parties have become critical of any new proposals for federal aid to stimulate self-help in the cities.

Thus, when President Carter asked Congress last March to create a new "Neighborhood Self-Help Development Fund" as a key part of his national urban policy, the idea got a chilly reception on Capitol Hill. The Carter proposal called for a modest initial annual budget of \$15 million. The Department of Housing and Urban Development would make grants with the concurrence of city governments to neighborhood organizations with proven track records (and, naturally, with the proper political connections).

While well-intentioned, the Carter proposal is certain to founder on the same shoals that proved fatal to previous federal programs to stimulate self-help. There is the question of the legitimacy and responsibility of groups claiming to be the true representative of the neighborhood's people. There is the problem of holding grantee organizations accountable for funds received, a process which orients the groups more to Washington than to neighborhood people and their needs. And, there is the problem of the selected group selling out to city hall and Washington to keep the funds coming, thus robbing neighborhood people of an effective, independent voice in the urban political process.

Now comes a concerned urban Republican Congressman, Rep. Joel Pritchard of Seattle. Pritchard served 14 years in the Washington legislature and six years in Congress. He has learned well the inherent problems of the direct federal grant approach. He knows that the appetite for federal money will inflate the President's initially modest proposal into a budget-breaking bureaucratic behemoth within a few years. So Congressman Pritchard has offered a radically different alternative. Instead of funneling tax dollars through a host of politicians and bureaucracies, why not simply put the tax dollars back into the hands of neighborhood people and let them decide which neighborhood improvement organizations best serve their needs.

At one stroke the Pritchard proposal slashes through the bedeviling problems of legitimacy, accountability, and sell-out. It makes the people the judge. It lets them vote their own tax dollars to support their own choices. If the three-year test program suggested by Congressman Pritchard is successful, any number of federal grant programs could be converted from bureaucrat-choice to citizen-choice.

Now a lot of city and federal bureaucrats and their friends in the white-collar welfare industry won't like Pritchard's idea, because it will put them out of business. But the people of urban neighborhoods will like it, because it will restore to them their lost power of choice. America is going to hear a lot more about Joel Pritchard's neighborhood improvement plan. It makes a lot of sense.

RONALD REAGAN

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

To countless thousands--perhaps millions--of Chinese, Li-I-Che is a hero. Actually the name "Li-I-Che" is a pseudonym for three former Red Guards who shocked Communist China in 1974. Since there are no newspapers open to the free exchange of the ideas on the mainland of China, Li-I-Che painstakingly created a poster of more than 20,000 Chinese characters. It extended over a hundred yards along a wall on the Peking road in the city of Canton. The poster was so powerful that thousands came to read it, and traffic had to be rerouted along the busy road.

The message of the poster was, in effect, that the Peoples Republic of China had become a monstrous, repressive "social-fascist" monopoly of all economic and political power.

Not surprisingly, the three young authors were dragged off to labor camps for "re-education". Their poster, however, is not forgotten. An intensely active movement, called the 70's Libertarian Front, has sprung up in Hong Kong to carry on the attack against the Peking regime. The main thrust of the 70's Front is the contention that Red China has become a giant monopolistic corporation. Like any giant monopoly, the Chinese state imposes universally low wages, causes shortages of consumer goods, manipulates prices, creates privileged bureaucracies, and practices "labor bossism". The economy is governed by raw political power, rather than by the law of supply and demand. The state corporation has become a religious cult, and criticism of the regime is suppressed.

The new Chinese libertarians are not defenders of Western-style private enterprise, nor do they have kind words for the Republic of China on Taiwan. But they do recognize how much better off the worker is under competitive capitalism. They write, "Labor power can be freely sold and mobile under competitive capitalism, but under monopolistic capitalism within the domain of the State, labor power can be sold only to the State.... Under the rule of the communists, the people do not have the freedom to choose their occupation or employment; they do not have the right to choose their place of residence. They are ruthlessly deprived of the freedoms of speech, of press, and of association, which, though guaranteed by the Chinese Constitution, are never allowed because their exercise would threaten the power of the ruling regime."

Simply put, they add, "We oppose all dictatorships, all governments, all forms of statism, and all authority. We stand for endlessly evolving freedom, for we sense that individual freedom is the prior condition of freedom of all, and that once the individual is robbed of his or her freedom, freedom for all cannot possibly exist. Likewise when the collective good ignores or suppresses individual interest, that spells the end of the collective good."

The appeals of the 70's Libertarian Front may never succeed in toppling the Peking regime, but they are a thorny threat to its stability and security. More important, they are a reminder to the Western world that the regime of Mao Tse-tung's successors is still authoritarian and repressive, a statist monopoly founded on violence and propaganda and destructive of the humane traditions of the Chinese people themselves.

RONALD REAGAN

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

The law known as the Davis-Bacon Act requires that all construction jobs involving any federal funds must pay what is called "prevailing wages" to workers. Almost invariably, those wages are at the highest union scale in the area, and the area may extend from a high-wage central city far into lower wage rural areas. In lower-wage areas, local governments are forced to pay exorbitant wages on construction jobs financed in part from federal funds. That is a needless burden on local taxpayers, but it's not the only problem with the Davis-Bacon Act. Consider what happened to the Interfaith Adopt-A-Building project in Manhattan's Lower East Side. There, a group of young Puerto Rican men decided to rehabilitate an abandoned tenement building. By scrounging materials and doing most of the work themselves (and getting title to the building from the city for a nominal sum) they hoped to become owners of their own co-op apartments.

The plan was a good one. Church groups and a local foundation provided money to get started. The men enrolled as trainees in the CETA program, which gave them enough to stay alive while they were learning construction skills and getting their apartments renovated. Then they ran into the Davis-Bacon Act.

These young workers were prepared to pay union plumbers the full union scale to hook up the plumbing. That wasn't the problem. The problem came when the U.S. Labor Department insisted that for the first young worker learning the ropes on the project, 12 union plumbers had to be employed, and for the second trainee an additional 14 union plumbers were required! This is the so-called work rules requirement under the Davis-Bacon Act.

One or two licensed plumbers were plenty to do the job, yet here was the government threatening to shut down the job unless 12 or more journeyman plumbers were hired for each young man hauling rubble, carrying lumber, and painting walls! The purpose of such a requirement, obviously, is to make clear that unless all union plumbers work, no one else can work at all.

The hierarchy of Big Labor seems determined to resist any attempt to change the Davis-Bacon Act. They are comfortably off so it is of no concern to them that the self-help efforts of a dozen young Puerto Rican men in Manhattan are placed in serious jeopardy. No wonder people are losing faith in government.

RONALD REAGAN

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

A number of little items have stacked up on my desk. I don't know whether you'll enjoy them but they might be interesting.

Have you ever wondered if possibly the tremendous cost of government has come about because the figures are just too big for comprehension? For anything to do with the Federal government we automatically talk billions, but now very stealthily the word "trillion" creeps in. Right now in budget discussions the new budget is being referred to as a half-a-trillion dollars. That is the figure five followed by 11 zeros.

Now we can say the government under that budget will be spending one and one-third billion dollars a day, but even that is hard for any of us to picture. So let's try another way. Suppose you could stay awake and active every minute, 24 hours a day, seven days a week for almost ten years--roughly about nine-and-a-half to be more exact. And suppose you spent \$100,000 a minute, around the clock, everyday in those nine-and-a-half years. You would have spent roughly half-a-trillion dollars, or next year's Federal budget.

Maybe that's better than counting sheep to go to sleep. Tonight just watch the clock tick off the minutes and think, "there goes another \$100,000--spent on what?" Well, Congressional investigators working on the General Services Administration case have already turned up 1000 employees they say are involved in corruption totaling \$66 million in fraud. That accounts for 11 hours of those nine-and-a-half years.

We begin to get into the big money with programs like C.E.T.A--the "Comprehensive Employment and Training Act".

Its annual budget is \$11 billion. At \$100,000 a minute that takes care of another 76 days. But how "comprehensive" is the Comprehensive Employment Training? Well, there is a fellow in Chicago getting \$750 a month for teaching youngsters to slap their bodies as "human drums". In Florida 22 workers are being paid to ring doorbells and ask people if they are aware they might be eligible for food stamps. And in our nation's Capitol, 56 of 126 employees of the city council are getting salaries from C.E.T.A. ranging from \$10,000 to more than \$20,000 a year.

Congressman John Ashbrook of Ohio has called attention to the \$683,861 grant to Cesar Chavez union in California. It will be used mainly to train workers for jobs within the union.

Well, enough of that. Here are two short items and the desk is clear. Government Accounting Office inspectors have discovered that a federal program to insure slum buildings which can't qualify for regular insurance has created an arson-for-profit business. Operators have been buying up slum buildings, putting them on government insurance and burning them down.

Last item: the Federal Reserve System was created in 1913 to prevent depressions. The 1913 dollar is now worth 12 cents.