

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 79-7 through 79-9 (1979)

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: 5/18/79
Air: 5/21-6/8/79

RONALD REAGAN

RADIO COMMENTARY

Disc 79-7

79-5 A

1.	T.K.E.	2:55
2.	Three Mile Island - Part I	3:05
3.	Three Mile Island - Part II	2:51
4.	Whistle blowers; poverty's causes	2:25
5.	Parable of the talents - updated	2:31
6.	McCarthy	2:58
7.	Miscellaneous	2:43

79-7 B

1.	Grove City College	2:54
2.	I'm Only 17	2:53
3.	Oil	2:45
4.	Fluid Flame Burner	2:49
5.	Disaster Area	2:44
6.	Sex Education	3:12
7.	Graffiti	2:56
8.	Banned Words	2:05

PLEASE NOTE

These programs are provided for airing from May 21st through June 8th, 1979 inclusive. Maintaining this schedule will enable your station to air all newly recorded programs as received.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "T.K.E."

The largest Greek letter college fraternity in the U.S. is Tau Kappa Epsilon, known on the campuses as T.K.E. Its members are referred to as "Tekes".

On March 31st in Boston, Massachusetts, six Tekes from five different colleges-- Missouri Valley College, University of Wisconsin, Newberry College of South Carolina, James Madison University of Virginia, Ashland College of Ohio and Drake University of Des Moines, Iowa--started rolling an empty beer keg. Their destination: Los Angeles, California, 3,300 miles away.

Now if nostalgia grips you and you think it's a return of oldfashioned springtime jinks like panty raids or swallowing goldfish, hear me out. These young men and their fraternity brothers in more than 300 chapters are engaged in one of the largest public service projects ever undertaken by a fraternity.

By the time they reach Los Angeles they will have gone through 16 states. Their arrival in Los Angeles is scheduled for June 12th. All across the country local college chapters are notified when the barrel rolling team is in their vicinity and various celebrations are held.

What would make these young men set out on such a journey? Well, I said it was a public service project. They are crossing the country raising money for St. Jude's Children's Research Hospital. They have the blessing of the Grand Council, the board of directors of TKE and the undying gratitude of one of their own fraternity brothers.

St. Jude Hospital was founded in 1962 by a Teke named Danny Thomas. Yes, that is the Danny Thomas who has brought so much laughter to audiences in theatres, nightclubs, on TV and the screen. Through his efforts over the years, he has also helped bring life and health to uncounted thousands of children. St. Jude's Hospital has been Danny's cause, his hobby and his avocation. It's his way of saying thanks to the Lord for the blessings that he himself has known.

St. Jude's Hospital is the only institution solely dedicated to conducting clinical research in the catastrophic diseases of children. Located in Memphis, Tennessee, one of its most frequent and welcome visitors is Danny Thomas.

If the barrel rollers are on schedule they should be somewhere in New Mexico by now. Their goal is one million dollars. They should be in Arizona the last few days of May, cross into California at Earp on June 7th, and as I said, reach Los Angeles June 12th -- 3,324 miles from Boston.

The other night I saw a TV movie about fraternity life. It was the old stereotype film about snobbish young men and women living selfish lives, looking down on non-members and being pretty useless and obnoxious in general. Maybe that was true in a long dead past, but not anymore. Today, they're too busy doing other things--like helping children.

Would you forgive me if I told you I'm a Teke?

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Three Mile Island--Part I"

I'm sure all of us feel we've had all the news about Three Mile Island and the nuclear accident there that we want to hear. But, my only reason for doing this broadcast on that subject is that I'll be using news that somehow and for some unknown reason didn't get widely reported.

My decision to talk about this was triggered by a New York TIMES CBS poll that found 36 percent of the people think a nuclear power plant can blow up like an atom bomb and another 40 odd percent don't know whether it can or not. The simply inarguable truth is -- no, it cannot. The fuel used in nuclear power plants has been reduced to where it simply cannot explode. I think the news media have been, to quite an extent, irresponsible in sensationalizing Three Mile Island. Now, since I'm part of the media by way of these commentaries, I'll contribute my bit to balancing the news.

The accident is still being called the "worst catastrophe in the history of nuclear power". Some catastrophe! No one was killed, no one was injured and there will probably not be a single additional death from cancer among the 2 million people living with a 50 mile radius of the plant. Don't take my word for it. Senator Edward Kennedy chaired a Senate subcommittee on April 4 which summoned Washington's top authorities in the field of health and environment to report on the accident. Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Joseph Califano, provided the information on the two million people. He further stated that the 25,000 people living within five miles of the plant had received at most, radiation equivalent to two chest x-rays. The maximum safe exposure is more than six times as much as any received by the 25,000 people.

The Surgeon General told the committee there was no significant risk to the public event in the close vicinity of the plant. The head of the Environmental Protection Agency and the head of the Federal Food and Drug Administration, an agency that often errs on the side of being too cautious said there was no increased health risk from the drinking water or the food. The gases that escaped from the plant are a type that disperses rapidly and loses their radioactivity in only a few days. Insignificant traces of iodine were found in the milk of an area amounting to at most one three hundredth of the safe permissible level.

One of the networks interviewed a man on television who owns a few goats. He said he didn't think the goats' milk was safe to drink even though government inspectors had assured him it was. The network didn't say that his wife was a member of an anti-nuclear protest group. She showed up on another program with what she said was a sick sheep and she was sure its illness was due to the accident. Incidentally, the total radioactivity the people and the animals were exposed to in the immediate vicinity of the plant was less than the difference between living in Dallas or living in the higher altitude of Denver, Colorado.

There were, as I said, no injuries, no deaths, and no residual radioactivity-- and it was the worst catastrophe in the history of nuclear power. Oh yes, the supposedly radioactive cooling water released into the Susquehanna River turned out to be the water from the plant lavatories which has always been released in the river -- after an automatic checking process.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Three Mile Island--Part II

On the previous commentary I reported the testimony of government officials such as H.E.W. Secretary Califano, the Surgeon General, the head of Food & Drug and others that the event at the Three Mile Island power plant was more an incident than a catastrophe. Secretary Califano and the others said there would be no additional deaths from cancer among the two million people living within a 50-mile radius of the power plant.

Now Califano has changed his testimony. He says there was more fall-out than he had previously stated, and as a result, there might be one additional case of cancer in the lifetime of those two million people. No one can take this lightly, but the question arises--will we ever know? Can we be so accurate in predicting how many among two million people will develop cancer in the next 30, 40 or even 60 or 70 years that we'll even know if there is one extra?

There was fall-out of a beneficial kind to one small group of Americans -- the cast, crew and investors in the movie "The China Syndrome". The story line of this picture involved a threatened nuclear disaster and the attempted cover-up by the utility bigwigs who, being businessmen, were of course more concerned with finances than human lives. I say "of course", because businessmen are portrayed as villains more often than not in today's movies.

Anyway, the box office receipts for "China Syndrome" boomed with every scare headline about "Three Mile Island". The screenwriter admitted to an interviewer that his script reflected his personal views about nuclear power. He obtained his technical help from engineers aligned with the anti-nuclear forces. He also stated that his first garget was going to be the oil industry but then he switched to nuclear.

Recently the Knight Rider newspapers carried a story by Mike Lavelle that revealed something of the fanaticism indulged in by the anti-nuclear group and how opposed they are to giving the other side a fair hearing.

David Rossin was invited to a preview of "The China Syndrome". Rossin is an engineer with Chicago's Commonwealth Edison Company. Jane Fonda, Jack Lemmon and Michael Douglas had invited about 50 editors of college newspapers to the preview, which Lavelle says was to be followed by a question and answer period.

A young girl led off asking a question critical of the movie. According to the news story, Michael Douglas "asked her sneeringly if she worked for Commonwealth Edison. David Rossin raised his hand. He was asked to leave. Not wanting to make a scene, he did.

One wonders if any of the college editors wrote about the one sidedness of the question and answer session, or did they accept the anti-nuclear brainwashing? One wonders also if the makers of "The China Syndrome" were pleased that the accident at Three Mile Island caused no deaths from radioactive fall-out. I'd like to think so.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Whistle Blowers; Poverty's Causes"

The Chicago TRIBUNE recently reported that an aide hired by Chicago's new mayor, Jane Byrne, was once fired by the WALL STREET JOURNAL, for whom he had worked as a copy editor. It seems that he had, as a copy editor, passed along a top secret WALL STREET JOURNAL memo to someone who was a target of that newspaper's investigative reporters. The JOURNAL immediately asked for his resignation.

Funny, but why is that when someone in government leaks secret material to a newspaper he is called "a whistle blower" and is treated like a hero? Fire a "whistle blower" who may have leaked sensitive material, and you are criticized by the media. But leak a memo from a newspaper to a politician and you are fired immediately...or, as they say, "asked to resign". Why are leaks from newspapers to the outside world so wrong and leaks to a newspaper so right? After all, the public's right to know includes the right to know what's going on inside those giant corporations who allegedly guard the public's right to know.

Speaking of what the public knows and does not know, let's turn to the subject of poverty. After years of wars on poverty, of professional poverty barons who live off government grants and entire libraries of books on the subject, we haven't yet answered the basic question: What causes poverty? Why are some nations rich and some poor?

When I say we haven't answered that question, perhaps I should qualify that statement. I should say that certain economists and other deep thinkers haven't yet applied common sense to the questions. John Kenneth Galbraith has written a book about the subject of mass poverty. According to P.T. Bauer, who reviewed Galbraith's book for -- once again -- the WALL STREET JOURNAL, Galbraith is entertaining, interesting -- and, wrong in his ideas about how poverty hits some nations and not others. Galbraith says that poor nations need more education. But Bauer points out that there was no compulsory education in England before 1870, the high-water mark of English economic supremacy. No, says Bauer, the fact is that it is "very largely"... personal, social and political factors" that determine a nation's income and productivity. In short, if people are willing to work to better themselves, if they live in a social system in which work is rewarded and if they have a political system that allows freedom to risk and thereby possibly gain, income and productivity will rise.

That's common sense. But it is also the most sound and firmly based economic theory.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Parable of the Talents - Updated"

Once upon a time (last year, actually) a Roman Catholic priest in Hartford, Connecticut lent a total of \$20,000 to 50 people with the understanding that in his words "they would multiply the money for Christ". The money was given as part of a plan to generate funds for a massive evangelization plan. The priest's hope was that the 50 people, having been given an opportunity to do something useful--and profitable-- with all that money would be able to pay back the diocese of Hartford with interest.

Unfortunately, it didn't turn out quite that way. Reverend Edmund J. Nadolny reports that he "lost \$18,000. Only five people returned the money...50 percent of the people who received loans gave the wrong address, wrong names, wrong phones and can't be contacted."

In retrospect, Father Edmund Nadolny found that those who did not repay the loan had several characteristics in common: "they were all in a state of financial panic, had no financial reputation and couldn't get loans anywhere. They were financial risks. They had no sense of commitment."

Father Nadolny's little experiment would appear to be a cautionary lesson against unwise expenditure of funds. No matter how much you admire his faith and trust in human nature, you have to admit that there just might have been better use made of those church funds.

It seems to me that there must be some other choice to be made between giving out hard-earned money to deadbeats and not taking any financial risks at all. Throw money away and it will never come back--take no risks at all and you miss chances for growth.

What is true about this particular story is true about our nation today. Nobody wants to see the poor and the needy and the elderly denied the benefits of necessary government aid -- but nobody wants to see tax dollars given away to poverty warriors, special interest groups disguised as "Public Interest" groups and other varieties of street smart con-men. When some congressman decides that his heart is so big that he is bursting to give away your money in the hope it just might do some good, you have a right to ask some questions. Asking questions doesn't mean that you don't have a heart -- it does mean that you still have your wits about you.

I applaud the spirit that motivated the Connecticut priest's experiment. I'd love to see it spread all across America, and especially the cold, marble halls of government.

But, I'd feel a lot better if the spirit was accompanied by some spiritually rewarding accounting methods as well.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "McCarthy"

I've spoken before about the so-called "cold war" era in the 40's and 50's when there was widespread Communist subversion and infiltration of government agencies and selected industries. And I've called attention to the rewriting of history that would have us believe now that the "cold war" was unreal, existing only in the minds of some "reactionaries".

Yet, the cold war, the subversion and attempts at infiltration were real and very much part of an overall Communist plan. In Hollywood in 1947 several Communist-infiltrated unions attacked their fellow workers by way of a jurisdictional strike and there was physical violence and bombings. I was part of that Hollywood and participated in the successful effort to keep the studios open and operating.

Today all of those stormy years are lumped together by the history rewriters and laid on the doorstep of the late Senator Joseph McCarthy. Indeed, the term "McCarthyism" is used to identify that entire era. Actually the Senator didn't make his charges and begin his investigations until several years after the Communist effort in Hollywood had been defeated. But it's true that the Senator used a shotgun when a rifle was needed, injuring the innocent along with the guilty. Nevertheless, his broadsides should not be used today to infer that all who opposed Communist subversion were hysterical zealots, while the Communists were high-minded liberals, free thinkers and not really Communists at all.

Recently while watching the TV show "60 Minutes", I saw a case in point. Let me hasten to say I'm a regular viewer of that program and have the greatest respect for the investigative work of the people involved in "60 Minutes". They have exposed any number of evil situations that needed spotlighting. But, in a recent program in tribute to Edward R. Murrow, they were led down the garden path.

A Murrow "See It Now" broadcast of 25 years ago was replayed on "60 Minutes", showing a portion of a filmed hearing by the "Government Operations Committee", which took place in March, 1954. The witness appearing before the committee had been discharged from a position in the code room of the Pentagon on charges of membership in the Communist party.

Viewers of "60 Minutes" saw only a carefully edited portion of the witnesses' testimony and questioning. Now understand this editing was not done by "60 Minutes", they were replaying film of a program that had been aired 25 years ago. But today's viewer must have come away with an impression that the witness was innocent and was being persecuted by the committee chaired by Senator McCarthy. What the viewer couldn't know is that only a tiny portion of the witnesses' testimony was shown. In fact, only 180 lines scattered throughout the more than 1,000 lines of testimony were in the transcript shown.

The entire transcript does not give the impression of innocence as does the filmed portion. And there was no one to tell us that in 1959, five years after the hearing, new evidence was disclosed that the witness was indeed a Communist and had perjured herself in her appearance before the committee.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Grove City College"

If Paul Revere did his midnight ride today he'd have to gallop through more than every Middlesex town and his warning would be, "The regulators are coming".

Another college has taken up arms to repel the regulators, joining Brigham Young University and Hillsdale College who have already taken the federal Leviathan to court. A small liberal arts college in the hills of western Pennsylvania, Grove City College, has challenged H.E.W. on a matter of principle.

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare has sent or is sending to every college and university in the land, a form to be filled out acknowledging (or perhaps proving is a better word) that they are in compliance with Title Nine of the Education Amendments of 1972. Title Nine bans discrimination against women in hiring.

Now let me hasten to say Grove City College is not practicing discrimination. In fact the first judge hearing this case said, "there was not the slightest hint of any failure to comply with Title Nine save the refusal to submit an executed assurance of compliance. This refusal," he added, "is obviously a matter of conscience and belief." The President of Grove City College has stated his belief in women's rights and that the college supported these rights as a matter of conscience.

You see, Grove City College takes no federal funds whatsoever. It is fiercely independent and feels that signing the H.E.W. form would be an acceptance of H.E.W. jurisdiction over a school that doesn't take a penny of government money.

H.E.W. on the other hand has ruled that even though a college takes no federal funds itself, if even one student is getting federal aid through a loan or the G.I. Bill, for example, the college or university is subject to H.E.W. regulations.

In 1974, Bob Jones University in South Carolina refused to sign a compliance from under Title Six of the Civil Rights Act, the grounds being that the university took no federal funds. There were students there on the G.I. Bill so the government in retaliation stopped payments to those students. The government feels this established a precedent which will help it in the Grove City College case. The college and four of its students on the other hand have filed a complaint against H.E.W. alleging that the government has exceeded its constitutional authority.

Once again a David has taken up his sling against Goliath and all of us should be on the side of David if we value our freedom. Here is a plain case of law being created by a government agency instead of by the Congress. Aid given to a student is a matter between that individual and the agency granting the aid. It should not confer upon the agency power to regulate the school chosen by the student any more than a bank could impose on a college because it had loaned money to a student.

President John D. Phillips of the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities has correctly called this case, "a lightning rod to raise the general question of the limits of federal control."

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Miscellaneous"

Even with the world divided into two camps -- the authoritarians and the free worlders -- we find that government, any government, has certain characteristics common to all.

The U.S. Commerce department claims that one American out of eight is living below the poverty line set up by our government. The percentage figure is 12.3. Professor Morton Paglia of Portland State University, writing in Policy Review, says that isn't true. What the professor really said was "this is nonsense". He sets the figures at one out of 27 or only 3.6 percent. How does he explain this? Very simple. If you count "in kind" benefits such as food stamps, medical care and public housing as income -- which it is -- you come up with the professor's figure. You'd think the Department of Commerce would be able to see that.

On the other side of the world the men in the Kremlin, Amnesty International and the International Labor Organization (from which American labor withdrew because of the I.L.O.'s Communist tinge) are in a bit of a dispute. The Amnesty group charged the Soviet Union with sending organizers of free labor unions off to mental hospitals. The International Labor group ignored the charge. The Soviets argue that since the U.S.S.R. is a workers' paradise only a madman could want free unions. And the psychiatrists at the mental hospital closed the case in favor of the Kremlin by finding that Vladimir Klabanov, a union organizer suffered from "a mania for struggling for justice".

Going even further around the world our newly established friendship for the Red Chinese apparently hasn't caught on with everyone on the mainland. The greatest exodus from China since the famine of 1962 is taking place. More than 30,000 Chinese have managed to swim, or climb the fences to get into Hong Kong.

Now, on around the world we go and wind up back on the shores of the Potomac. Congressman George O'Brien of Illinois says that the 1980 budget reveals that in the battle against bureaucratic gobbledygook -- gobbledygook is winning.

The administration is seeking funds to help communities that are growing rapidly because of energy development projects. Now that's pretty easy to understand. But not when the budget writers translate it. Then it comes out like this -- "Inland, Energy Impact Assistance Funds for the implementation of impact mitigation strategies and for infrastructive improvements". Well, we may have to pay for that, but we sure won't know what it is.

The administration also wants a CHAP, which it turns out is a "Child Health Assistance Program". Then there is an item called OJARS -- that's the Office of Justice Assistance, Research and Statistics. But the administration wants to get rid of something called HTGR. That's a high temperature gas-cooled nuclear reactor.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "I'm Only 17"

Maybe you'll think "Dear Abby" is an unusual source for a commentary, but I hope you'll agree she was well worth quoting.

A 17-year-old high school student wrote Dear Abby asking for permission to reprint in her high school paper a column Abby had written two years ago. The young lady said it had made her do a lot of thinking. Abby gave her permission and here is that two-year-old column -- because it has made me do some thinking.

"The day I died was an ordinary school day. How I wish I had taken the bus! But I was too cool for the bus. I remember how I wheedled the car out of Mom. 'Special favor', I pleaded, 'all the kids drive'. When the 2:50 bell rang, I was free until 8:40 tomorrow morning! I ran to the parking lot, excited at the thought of driving a car and being my own boss. Free!

It doesn't matter how the accident happened. I was goofing off -- going too fast. Taking crazy chances. But I was enjoying my freedom and having fun. The last thing I remember was passing an old lady who seemed to be going awfully slow. I heard the deafening crash and felt a terrific jolt. Glass and steel flew everywhere. My whole body seemed to be turning inside out. I heard myself scream.

"Suddenly I awakened; it was very quiet. A police officer was standing over me. Then I saw a doctor. My body was mangled. I was saturated with blood. Pieces of jagged glass were sticking out all over. Strange that I couldn't feel anything."

"Hey, don't pull that sheet over my head. I can't be dead. I'm only 17. I've got a date tonight. I am supposed to grow up and have a wonderful life. I haven't lived yet. I can't be dead."

"Later I was placed in a drawer. My folks had to identify me. Why did they have to see me like this? Why did I have to look at Mom's eyes when she faced the most terrible ordeal of her life? Dad suddenly looked like an old man. He told the man in charge, 'Yes, he is my son.'

"The funeral was a weird experience. I saw all my relatives and friends walk toward the casket. They passed by, one by one, and looked at me with the saddest eyes I've ever seen. Some of my buddies were crying. A few of the girls touched my hand and sobbed as they walked away.

"Please...somebody...wake me up! Get me out of here. I can't bear to see my Mom and Dad so broken up. My grandparents are so racked with grief they can barely walk. My brother and sisters are like zombies. They move like robots. In a daze, everybody! No one can believe this. And I can't believe it, either.

"Please don't bury me! I'm not dead! I have a lot of living to do! I want to laugh and run again. I want to sing and dance. Please don't put me in the ground. I promise if you give me just one more chance, God, I'll be the most careful driver in the whole world. All I want is one more chance.

"Please, God, I'm only 17!"

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Oil"

A few weeks ago I was flipping the TV dial during the early morning news programs looking for a weather forecast when I came upon a discussion. Discussion! It was an argument.

Forgetting the weather, I watched and listened to a top oil company executive and Senator Metzenbaum of Ohio. They were guests on a talk show and the subject under discussion was the President's energy program.

The Senator was pounding away on the oil company profits, their increase, the increase they'd have with decontrol of oil prices and the only answer to these "obscene profits" was a "windfall" tax. Oh, yes, he also cited the upsurge of oil company stocks on Wall Street.

When the oilman responded with a list of major corporations, all of which had a higher percentage of profits and an even greater increase in the market price of their stocks, Metzenbaum said, "yes, but that's different. The oil industry is a monopoly." The oilman broke out laughing.

I didn't get to see the rest of the show; the clock ran out on me; but I think I know why the gentleman from the oil industry was laughing. How do we determine whether an industry is competitive or monopolistic? Well, there is no mystery about that. How concentrated is it? Is there freedom for newcomers to enter the field? And what is the record or history of profits?

On that first point -- concentration of the industry, for example, the top four automakers account for 91 percent of that business. The top four aluminum companies make and sell 96 percent of the total output of aluminum. By comparison the top four oil companies share only 33 percent of all the oil products sold in America.

As for freedom of entry there has been a 65 percent increase in the number of new oil companies since 1951. Independent oil companies have increased their share of the business about 30 percent over the last 10 years.

We are so used to thinking of the entire industry in terms of its most familiar trademarks. It comes as something of a surprise when we take a census of the industry as a whole. There are 8,000 different oil and gas producers, 130 refiners, 16,000 wholesalers and 186,000 service stations -- mostly run by independent businessmen.

The third point is determining whether a monopoly situation exists has to do with the history of profits. But it's only about half as profitable as television or the major newspaper publishers and it comes in about the middle range of all American industry.

There is an oil monopoly. It is made up of the OPEC nations. We can break that monopoly only by finding and producing more oil in these United States, thereby lessening our dependence on OPEC oil. And if our government will trust in the incentives of the marketplace we'll find and produce that additional oil. Then we'll all be laughing--maybe even Senator Metzenbaum.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Fluid Flame Burner"

Some time ago I did a couple of commentaries about Morbark Industries in the midwest and how they were converting wastewood from our forests into useful energy. I've recently learned of another development in the West which illustrates the ongoing miracle of our free market system.

A company called Energy, Incorporated has gone forward with what can only be termed a new industry born of the fuel shortage. It utilizes as a substitute for oil and gas materials heretofore considered waste. As of now Energy, Incorporated through a subsidiary, Energy Products of Idaho has installed 25 commercial units described as fluidized-bed combustion systems. Most of these are in connection with the forest products industry, but one in California generates steam power from olive pits.

Let me take one of these installations and try to describe it in layman's language. Actually I find the process as fascinating as science fiction, yet it's as practical as the safety pin. Energy Products of Idaho, in connection with the Boise Cascade Corporation's Emmett, Idaho Plywood plant, has installed an energy system that saves probably one million dollars plus annually in natural gas costs. The substitute fuel is the green bark peeled from logs that become plywood.

Reduced to chips about three inches in size, the bark travels through a blow-pipe some 650 feet into a storage silo from which it is fed into a combustion/boiler instation called a fluid bed burner. Here is where it becomes science fiction to me. The burner bed is a 12-inch layer of sand preheated to a temperature of 700 degrees by propane gas. At that temperature the waste bark chips are fed into the burner where they are ignited by the sand which has begun to unlock, boil and mix. It never reaches a liquid state but gives such an appearance. The gas has been turned off when the wood ignites and the operating temperature reaches 1600 degrees. Incidentally, the burner has been shut down for as long as 26 hours and the sand retains enough heat to ignite the back without having to be reheated by propane.

In this plywood plant the heated gas from the burning bark performs two functions: it heats the boiler, creating power to run the plant and it serves to dry the plywood, too. In this latter function this substitute gas actually dries the plywood in a shorter time and with an improved quality over that obtained when natural gas was used.

The bark that is burned is waste. Boise Cascade still processes the better quality bark and sells it as soil conditioner, mulch and horticultural decoration. What is significant in this new system is that the fuel can be moist, in fact the bark has 60 percent moisture content. This indicates that even the waste we cart to the city dump is potential fuel for the fluid burner of Energy Incorporated. As I said, in California a similar plant is burning olive pits. What's next--and where?

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Disaster Area"

When you read in the daily press that some part of our country has been declared a disaster area you assume that fire, flood, earthquake or some other natural calamity has struck. The declaration becomes official notice that victims of the calamity qualify for various kinds of federal aid. Such a calamity is usually a pretty obvious thing as we've all seen numerous times on the TV news. And, of course, the victims are well aware that a disaster has taken place.

Recently, Cloud Lake, Florida received an official notice from the federal government that it had been declared a "major disaster area". The Treasury Department notification came to Town Clerk Dorothy Gravelin. Under a bold type heading "Disaster Notice", she read that her town--population 128--had been declared a major disaster area by the President of the United States.

Now Town Clerk Gravelin hadn't heard of any trouble. She looked out the window and everything appeared to be normal. Picking up the phone she called Tallahassee and several other nearby towns to ask if they were disaster areas too. Evidently they had been spared; only Cloud Lake had suffered.

In the meantime, word had spread through the community, but no one could recall any disaster and none of them could figure out how they'd missed it.

Clerk Gravelin's next call was to Washington. She finally reached the Florida coordinator in the U.S. Office of Revenue, who didn't know what the disaster might be but would check it out.

Finally the answer came. Cloud Lake had suffered a crop freeze in January, 1977. That, of course, should have solved the mystery and ended the suspense. But it didn't. Cloud Lake hadn't suffered any crop damage in 1977 or any other year because the nearest crops are about 20 miles west of Cloud Lake.

But Washington had an answer for that. There probably had been some indirect effect, such as farmers who wouldn't be spending as much money in town. There are seven business establishments in Cloud Lake, all lined up on Southern Boulevard. The busiest happens to be the Cloud Lake Adult Book Store. A check of that establishment found there had been no let up in business -- in fact the proprietor just laughed at the idea.

But Washington doesn't take such things lightly. Cloud Lake has been declared a disaster area and Washington wants Cloud Lake to forget its pride, get off the dime and admit it has had a disaster. The Town Council is supposed to fill out the government form saying "yes, the disaster had an effect on us", sign it and mail it in. Then Washington can do its thing by sending Cloud Lake -- population 128 -- the federal funds it is entitled to because of a freeze that took place somewhere in Florida back in January of 1977.

I'm sorry I don't have word as to whether the Town Council has taken the action or whether the federal check is still lying there in Washington. The check is for \$22.61.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Sex Education"

Recently a Los Angeles newspaper editorialized about "the increasing birthrate among unwed teenager mothers", calling it a "personal disaster for them and their children and a social disaster for the country."

The writer then confirmed his opinion by citing statistics developed in a two-year study by a task force of the House Select Committee on population. The figures are indeed sobering; one million adolescent girls get pregnant each year and a third of them have abortions. Of the 600,000 who gave birth last year almost half, 250,000, were under 17 years of age.

About 70 percent of the pregnant girls do not finish high school and 90 percent of those under age 15 drop out of school. In 1976 about half of the public funds expended for "Aid to families with dependent children", \$4.6 billion, went to mothers who first gave birth as teenagers. Births among unwed teenagers have more than doubled since 1960 and the rate of births to girls under 15 has increased 33 percent in the last 10 years; 50 percent of unwed mothers are in their teens.

The editorial went on to support proposals by a member of Congress to increase funds to extend family planning services to more teenagers and for an extension of sex education in our schools. It was pointed out that these proposals could lead to a saving of money because so many of these teenage mothers became dependent on welfare.

I've never been against saving tax dollars, but I wonder if our first concern shouldn't be for saving these girls from tragedy which could very well affect their entire lives. I'm not sure that more sex education, as it is presently taught, is the answer.

Please note that I said, "as it is presently taught". I'm sure all of us are aware of the importance of young people knowing, as we used to say, "the facts of life". But in our concern lest "sex education" in the schools violate religious beliefs, have we been teaching sex as a purely physiological function, like eating when you are hungry? Can we completely divorce sex education, as I'm afraid we do, from any association with moral behavior without implanting in young minds that it has no more significance than eating a sandwich -- so why not?

A California scholar has written an essay, "Turning Children Into Sex Experts". The author says "The seventh grader in my city is advised to set for himself a purely 'personal standard of sexual behavior.' No religious views, no community moral standards are to deflect him from his overriding purposes of self-discovery, self-assertion and self-gratification." A judge has advocated lowering the age of consent to 13 because youngsters are more sexually active these days.

Before we accept the Congressman's idea that more sex education is an answer to teenage pregnancy, shouldn't we ask if anyone has done a comparison of the situation before there was such education in the schools and after. I've had a report from one district that the venereal disease rate among young people in that district went up 800 percent in the first few years after sex education became a party of the curriculum. Before we do more of what we are doing, why don't we find out if what we are doing is part of the problem.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Graffiti"

One night several months ago, over dinner in New York City, Harvard Professor Nathan Glazer was discussing what he called the "negative energy" so prevalent in that city. By "negative energy" he meant the energy people spend doing things such as littering and scribbling graffiti on subway cars. I asked him how this could be turned into positive energy. He replied that that was a little like asking "What is the meaning of life?", and that he had spent 25 years studying urban problems and didn't profess to have an overall answer. But, he said, he was working on an article about New York subway graffiti and he would send me a copy when it was published. He has, and his article in The Public Interest magazine, offers some keen insights into the outpourings of negative energy.

He describes the elaborate daubings of spray paint that cover so many New York subway cars, inside and out. He says that in almost every case the graffiti are signatures of the people who did them. If not actual names, then nicknames. He points out that "there are not political messages or references to sex--two chief topics of traditional graffiti." Professor Glazer says that there is some sentiment in New York for considering these scribbles as harmless expressions of teenagers, but there is another side to that coin. He says "...the cars in which persons unknown to the passengers have at their leisure marked-up interiors and obscured maps, informational signs and windows, serves as a permanent reminder to the passenger that the authorities are incapable of controlling the doers of mischief." Thus, the fear of crime has cut into the number of people using the subways. And, as the number of passengers declines the remaining passengers become an easier target for subway marauders.

The subway police aren't asleep on the job, Nathan Glazer points out. They have tried arresting the 11-to-16 year olds who make up the graffiti-scribbling crowd. But, judges, faced with much worse juvenile crimes, tend to let them off easy and they go right back to spraying their self-styled "art" on the cars. The idea of making the offenders clean up the cars as punishment was considered, but the cost of supervising them proved to be too much.

The graffiti-sprayers tend to go on to more serious crimes. The police studied the careers of 15-year-old graffiti artists they had caught in 1974. Three years later, 40 percent had been arrested for more serious crimes, such as burglary and robbery.

How about summer jobs for these youngsters? Professor Glazer wonders "whether most jobs available for unskilled youths would match the excitement of painting graffiti onto silent subway cars in deserted yards, watching for the police, stealing the paints, organizing the expeditions."

The police estimate that nearly all the graffiti are made by about 500 teenagers and they know who they are. Maybe some of our great foundations might put some of their funds into a program that combined youth employment along with real art classes and perhaps a chance to spray some graffiti in controlled situations, such as on the walls of empty buildings. At least that might turn some of that teenage negative energy into positive energy.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Banned Words"

It's been about three months since an organization called The Unicorn Hunters proposed banning a list of "overused, misused or pompous" words and phrases, and, guess what? People are still using them.

The Unicorn Hunters, 2,000 members strong, is made up of writers, poets and college professors interested in linguistics. The words to be banned came from nominations submitted by the members.

According to the New York TIMES, W. T. Rabe of Lake Superior State College in Michigan, who distributed the list of words and is secretary of The Unicorn Hunters, did acknowledge "that people are not speaking--or writing--much better than before."

But ,he said, "It's not as bad as last year, when I got in my car, turned on the radio and heard: 'This parade is uniquely original'." As Mr. Rabe points out, "Something is either unique or original, not both."

One of the banished phrases this year is "you know", which is usually pronounced "y'know". The Unicorn Hunters described the phrase as "a terminal condition of the English language." They were so concerned about the phrase "y'know" that they appointed a commission to find a solution. But, alas, in its final report, the commission used the phrase 68 times!

Another phrase banished by The Unicorn Hunters was "social security". They say "It's neither social nor secure". And, they have decreed that the phrase "somewhere down the road" is to be banished, too. They describe it as being like the phrase "light at the end of the tunnel". We don't know how long the tunnel is.

If you want the entire list of banned words and phrases you'll have to send for it. Mr. Rabe is quoted as saying, "Anybody who wants the list has to send me an envelope on which he or she has written his or her address and to which he or she has affixed a stamp. We banned 'self-addressed' some time ago because that implies that the envelope wrote an address on itself."

I have a hunch that Mr. Rabe and The Unicorn Hunters are swimming upstream on this, right? Really. I mean, y'know?

RONALD REAGAN

RADIO COMMENTARY

Disc 79-8

Taped: 5/29/79
Aired: 6/11-6/29/79

79-8 A

1.	California Gas Shortage	2:51
2.	Oil	2:46
3.	Sex Education	2:34
4.	People's Park I	2:45
5.	People's Park II	2:39
6.	Free Trade vs Protectionism	2:25
7.	Political Bestiary	2:43

79-8 B

1.	Marijuana	3:12
2.	The Delaney Amendment	3:06
3.	Miscellaneous I	2:54
4.	Miscellaneous II	2:52
5.	Investment Lag	3:20
6.	Crime	2:49
7.	Vietnam War	2:53
8.	Operation Get Smart	3:31

PLEASE NOTE:

These programs are provided for airing from June 11th, 1979 through June 29th, 1979 inclusive. Maintaining this schedule will enable your station to air all newly recorded programs as received.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "California Gas Shortage"

All the world I guess is aware of the California gasoline shortage. Some think we are careless gas guzzlers and it serves us right. Others laugh it off as proof that Californians are pixilated. But Californians sitting in those long lines are angry and to make it worse, they aren't certain as to who they should be mad at. Is it the fellow running the gas station? How about the big oil companies? Is there really a shortage and if so, who caused it?

One thing we can prove; California drivers aren't to blame as a Washington POST editorial suggested they were. The average use of gasoline per car in California is 59.7 gallons a month. In Virginia, where a lot of Washington POST subscribers live, it is 73 gallons. In Maryland it's 66.7.

California has 65,000 oil wells. About 23,000 of them are closed down. Crude oils aren't all the same. California crude is a heavy oil and requires more expensive equipment to refine it. Once upon a time this was reflected in the price for California oil. Since 1973, however, the Department of Energy has set the price on oil. So when a well in California sands up or a pump breaks down, there is no profit incentive in putting it back in operation. At least 15,000 of those closed down wells could be reopened if the Department of Energy would get out of the way and trust the free market to determine the price.

Then there is Alaskan oil -- but its high sulfur oil and California refineries aren't built to handle that. Japanese refineries are. Well then -- let's sell the Alaskan oil to Japan and buy the right kind of oil elsewhere for the California refineries. The government won't allow it.

How about changing the California refineries so they can handle the high sulfur oil? For the last six years the Department's regulations about how to recover the costs have made that impossible. That's why in the midst of this shortage California refineries have only been operating at 80 percent of capacity.

Just of late the Department has made a move to change these reputations--a tacit admission that it has been a road block for six years. But even this isn't a total answer to the California shortage. There are still price controls on gasoline plus the allocations dictated by the Department of Energy. The Department has done a little squirming of late and even indicated its allocation formula might be the reason the roof fell in on California. It seems our allocation out here was based on 1972 population figures. We happen to be a fast growing state with more people and four million more automobiles than we had in 1972.

The Department is updating the formula to 1978 but a tentative effort to let the market determine price has been overruled by the Administration.

Have you figured out yet who we should be mad at?

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Oil"

During the Arab oil boycott in 1973-74 the lines at the oil stations were long and tempers were short. We've had a rerun of that situation here in California and maybe before the summer is over it will happen in other states as well.

Summer is a time of heavy driving, but it's also a time when refineries are building up a reservoir of heating oil for the winter that follows. At the moment they are behind schedule in that department. If rumors were crude oil, we'd have no problems.

Everyone seems to be looking for someone to blame. But where to begin. Well, there is the federal allocation system. The Arabs and Iran have all reduced the amount of oil they are pumping so our government has reduced each state's allotment to a percentage of what they were getting last year.

In doing that they overlooked something. Some states have fewer people and hence fewer cars than they had last year. And some states, like California for instance, have hundreds of thousands of new citizens and tens of thousands of additional automobiles. That's why business seems normal in other states while motorists spend four hours in line out here waiting to buy gas.

Then there is a refinery shortage due to environmental regulations. There is the case reported by UPI a short time back; Jack Evans applied for permission to build a refinery in Portsmouth, Virginia in 1969. It is now 1979 -- 10 years and seven million dollars later. The money went for environmental impact statements and legal fees. He still doesn't have permission to build the refinery.

Then there is the increasing demand for unleaded gas as more and more cars are equipped with smog control devices -- federally mandated. It takes more oil to produce unleaded gas. And the unleaded gas doesn't give as many miles per gallon. And incidentally, unleaded refinery capacity has not been allowed to grow to meet demand. Ask Jack Evans.

It's easy to look at the big oil companies and blame them, but can we be sure we'd have the right target? I know their profit picture has been improving; still when you buy a gallon of gas the federal government gets 10 times as much from your dollar as does the oil company and the OPEC countries get 17 times as much.

Now the environmental Protection Agency has dreamed up some new regulations. They will take a lot of oil industry money that might better be spent exploring for new oil. Drilling mud, oil production brines and crude oil residue are to be classified by E.P.A. as "hazardous waste". Total cost of that decision would come to about \$6 billion more than our entire bill for imported oil -- somewhere around \$45 billion a year.

One thing does seem very clear -- if we could produce more domestic oil and thus reduce our dependency on Arab oil we might find that Arab oil suddenly had a lower price. We'd also find the lines (of cars) had disappeared from around our gas stations.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Sex Education"

Not too long ago in talking about sex education in our schools I mentioned (if I remember correctly) that someone had recommended lowering the age of consent to 13 years. Let me correct that statement. Someone didn't just suggest it. It's a part of the 212 page criminal code signed into law last August in the state of New Jersey. It has just been discovered by a New Jersey police officer who sounded the alarm.

The new law reads that age of consent for sexual intercourse is lowered to 13 and even lower if there is less than 4 years difference in age between children having sex.

The purpose of the change was to exempt consenting youngsters from statutory rape charges while strengthening protections for actual rape victims according to the two feminist groups who drafted the legislation. Spokespersons for the groups said, "A rape prosecution is too high a price to pay for adolescent sexuality." They also said this brought the law up to date with the sexual habits of teenagers; that "many parents don't know or want to admit it, but the number of sexually active teenagers is increasing rapidly."

In fairness let me say these spokespersons evidently were not representative of many in the feminist groups who were not aware they were sponsoring such a law. Remember it was in a 212 page bill -- Chapter 14 section 2C: 14-2.

In fact it had slipped by many of the legislators who had voted yes and who now have introduced a bill to repeal the provision.

But it was the parents, the clergy, the NAACP and other groups who manned the ramparts. One father said, "I look at my 13 year old and other youngsters and I just can't see that they can handle sex emotionally."

Ironically this slipped through a legislature that is considering raising the drinking age from 18 to 19 or 20.

But in all of the furor and understandable distress of parents one thing should warm the hearts of all of us. God bless the wisdom that often goes with youth.

An 8th grader said, "I'm against the law. A lot of kids who didn't do it before are going to try it now -- it's like giving them permission. And if they get pregnant, who's going to marry a 13 year old?"

A teacher held a discussion of the law in her class when the publicity about it had made it a subject of general conversation. "The kids said they weren't ready for that kind of responsibility," she reported and then added this wonderful line. "And they were surprised there were adults who thought they were."

Well, as someone once said, "some people grow up and some people just grow older."

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of radio program entitled "People's Park I"

A few weeks ago the press reported that about 150 people gathered on the campus of the University of California at Berkeley to observe what was called the 10th anniversary of the "People's Park". Nothing was reported as to the make-up or what was said at the occasion.

At least one of California's largest newspapers, however, printed a piece by the former owner of a Berkeley book store, Fred Cody. Mr. Cody's article was a nostalgic memorial to that day, May 15th, 1969, when the several years of campus rioting in Berkeley achieved a new peak of violence resulting in death for one person and blindness for another.

Cody mentions that. But from there on his memory seems to have been pretty vague because his account of that tragic day is not supported by historical fact.

Describing the property owned by the University as a "kind of no man's land -- a muddy, junk strewn parking lot", he said hundreds of students and others tried to beautify it by planting flowers, trees, and so forth. In quoting a professor as saying this was, "a beautiful example of spontaneous community effort to improve its ecology", he may have been accurate. There were faculty members at the time who looked kindly on any effort to disrupt campus and community life.

But then Mr. Cody tells of the University fencing off the property, the ensuing struggle that resulted in the tragedies I've mentioned, the arrest of thousands and injury to additional hundreds. I don't dispute those figures but there is a subtle switch of good guys and bad guys in the way the events are described. Quote: "Police discharged shotguns loaded with buckshot into the crowd of protestors. Demonstrators on the campus were sprayed with tear gas from a low flying helicopter." And then he adds that, "the precedent had been set for the fatal shootings soon to come at Ohio's Kent State and at Jackson State in Mississippi."

I come in for some personal attention in Mr. Cody's article. Quote: "To many, including an angry Governor, Ronald Reagan, People's Park seemed an act of revolutionary insurrection aimed at subverting property rights. As such it was to be put down savagely, lest the youthful rebels capture Berkeley and make it a 'liberated zone', a citadel of national youth revolution." He goes on to say the national guard occupied Berkeley for several weeks. (They weren't there that long).

There is no question but that the riot over the so-called "People's Park" was an event of national interest. But when Cody refers to it as an almost "romantic memory" and says it "remains--quietly and stubbornly -- still a symbol of the city's legacy of unorthodoxy and dissent", he is asking for a rebuttal. And since I'm out of time today -- the rebuttal will be given on the next commentary.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "People's Park II"

On the last commentary I discussed an article which appeared on the tenth anniversary of the tragic and ugly "People's Park" riot at the University of California, Berkeley. One person died and another was blinded on that terrible May 15th. Hundreds were injured.

Here is the truth about that riot. The university had acquired a piece of property a few blocks from the campus. The intention was to develop it as an outdoor recreational field for the students.

Berkeley had attracted a colony of squatters known as the "Street People". They aligned themselves with the radical dissenters on the campus. Their current cause was that no one had the right to own land just because they'd bought it. The land, according to them, belonged to everyone.

They homesteaded the university property and defied the university to proceed with its plans for development. The Chancellor met with and tried to reason with them and of course got no where. At the same time he was receiving countless complaints from the homeowners neighboring on the Park. Their nights were made miserable by raucous all night parties complete with bonfires and bongo drum serenades. Their lawns were used for romance as well as substitutes for the park's non-existent toilet facilities.

Housewives were afraid to use the sidewalks even in daylight hours and evidence was overwhelming that drug use among the squatters was commonplace.

May 15th was set as the day work would start on the recreational field. A fence was erected in the early morning hours. A noon time rally on the campus ended with the cry, "on to the park!" A mob of 2,000 armed with broken chunks of concrete and footlong pieces of steel reinforcing rod, which were thrown end over end, with horrifying results, swept down on the Berkeley police.

The officers never drew their guns and in a matter of seconds 75 of them were on the pavement over by the mob. Sheriff's deputies had been held in reserve. Armed with shotguns they fired the lightest of birdshot into the mob as they came to the rescue of the downed police more than forty of whom had to be hospitalized.

The mob grew and spread out into the shopping areas near the campus. A reserve policeman's car was overturned and set on fire. He was knocked down by the rock throwing mob and might have lost his life if he hadn't been rescued by citizens who dragged him into the building under a shower of rocks.

It was late afternoon when I received a call from the President of the University who told me was with the Mayor, the Sheriff, and the Police Chief and they were unanimous in their belief they could no longer guarantee the safety of the citizens of Berkeley. They asked that the National Guard be sent in.

The "People's Park" is not, as the author of the news article said it was, "a romantic memory".

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Free Trade vs. Protectionism"

With Congress soon to decide whether the United States will endorse the new multi-national trade agreements worked out in Geneva, the question of trade protectionism versus free trade is a hot topic of discussion.

The Institute for Contemporary Studies has come out with a timely book entitled *Tariffs, Quotas and Trade: The Politics of Protectionism*. In it, Professor Richard Sweeney of Claremont Men's College, makes a strong case for free trade. He says, "The case for free trade is based on the simple truth that voluntary exchange between two people is mutually beneficial -- otherwise they wouldn't do it or continue to do it."

He goes on to point out that while what he calls "trade liberalization" benefits a nation as a whole, it can hurt some industries and groups within the nation. He says that those who gain "come out so far ahead that they could compensate completely those who lose -- and the gainers would still be ahead". The problem lies, of course, in the fact that the losers generally are not compensated for their loss. This leads to cries for trade protection such as we are hearing these days.

Yet protectionism, in the form of higher tariffs, quotas on imports and so forth, almost always leads to retaliation; sometimes even trade war. Back in the early Sixties, we slapped high tariffs on small pickup trucks (a move aimed at the time at Volkswagen) and then found chickens we exported to Europe were being subjected to new, higher duties. It was called The Chicken War.

Whether or not we get into any new "Chicken Wars" will depend on how carefully Congress deals with the complex new trade agreements.

When cries go up for protection, we need to remember that a great many American jobs are dependent on import-export trade. The people who work at our ports; people involved in transportation; those involved in marketing and selling imported products. Also, as Professor Sweeney points out, "it is often forgotten that many U.S. industries depend on imported materials and components".

He makes the point that the root cause of our international trade problem is our own domestic inflation. Until we get a handle on it, we cannot solve the trade deficit problem; we can only attack the symptoms. Meanwhile, special temporary provisions, such as tax benefits, can always be considered for U.S. industries which have been especially hard-hit by imports.

On balance, making trade as free as possible is the best course for any nation, especially one such as ours whose dealings have such a great impact on the world's economy.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Political Bestiary"

Conservative columnist James J. ("Jack") Kilpatrick and one-time liberal Presidential candidate Eugene McCarthy may seem like unlikely collaborators, but it turns out they are good friends. One night a few months ago, sitting by the fire in Jack's home in the Blue Ridge mountains of Virginia, they got to talking and were inspired to write what may be the season's funniest book, A Political Bestiary. As they say in the foreward, "During the course of a pleasant evening, as the flames leaped up and the bourbon went down, the two naturalists spoke of the strange creatures they had seen in the thickets of politics and in the seas of language." Late in the evening they telephoned Jeff MacNelly, the Pulitzer Prize-winning editorial cartoonist and got his agreement to illustrate their book about these strange creatures. A Political Bestiary begins with The Mandate and ends with the Vanishing Milieu and, along the way, you will encounter such beasts as The Viable Alternative, The Mounting Crisis, the Running Gamut, the Leaping Quantum, The Gathering Momentum and many others.

Here is a sampling of their description of The Mandate: "Mandates come in as many varieties as finches, warblers, sparrows and Southern politicians. They are generally divided into Greater Mandates and Lesser Mandates. Among the Greater Mandates are the Impressive Mandate and the Overwhelming Mandate. Greater Mandates usually are discovered almost immediately after elections, gamboling about the White House lawn. They appear like tree frogs in early March or old friends after a victory at the polls." Once you have seen MacNelly's drawings of two Mandates you'll be able to spot one coming forever after.

Here are the two political zoologists on a strange fish called The Bloated Bureaucracy: "The species is almost always accompanied by its adjective...Bloat is no laughing matter; a bloated government has serious digestive problems. The more it eats, the more it wants; the more it wants, the more it eats. The Bloated Bureaucracy has a life span that ranges somewhere between the infinite and the eternal."

Next comes The Untouchable Incumbent, shown clinging to the trunk of a tall tree. About him, the authors say, "Today incumbents feed on the juiciest leaves high on the tree, their diet consisting principally of choice prerogatives, traditional perquisites, special privileges and fringe benefits. On such a rich diet, with their tree-parking places carefully reserved, incumbents tend to build up heavy layers of fat just below their quill-protected skin. This comfortable blubber is called a pension."

That's just a sampling. You'll have to get a copy of A Political Bestiary to enjoy the rest. I have a hunch you'll have as much fun reading it as Messrs. Kilpatrick, McCarthy and MacNelly had putting it together.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Marijuana"

Marijuana smoking has been decriminalized in 11 states and enforcement of anti-marijuana laws in the other 39 is lax or nonexistent. This has probably contributed to the widespread belief among young people that pot, grass or weed, as marijuana is called by its users, is really a harmless, mild intoxicant.

Surveys indicate that one out of nine high school seniors are daily pot smokers. When those seniors entered high school four years ago the rate among seniors was only one out of 20 or so. Of course, the percentage of high school students who smoke marijuana less frequently than every day is far greater.

Now the National Institute of Drug Abuse has sounded a warning which has received far too little attention from the press. The pot smoker who drives a car is a threat to himself or herself and to everyone else on the road. And the Institute says 60 to 80 percent of the marijuana smokers they've questioned admit to driving while high on pot. I myself have had young people tell me they are actually better drivers when they've been smoking marijuana.

They are living in a dream world and that's not just a figure of speech. They think they are driving better but actual research has discovered their vision, memory span, attention, skill and tracking ability are all impaired. They imagine they are holding a steady course in the proper lane when in truth they are weaving from one lane to another.

A professor of psychiatry at the University of British Columbia conducted actual driving tests with 64 individuals, all of whom had experience in smoking marijuana. A third were asked to smoke one joint, a third smoked two joints and the rest smoked a harmless fake. They were all put in cars with dual controls and an observer in each car and asked to drive a closed course. Those who had smoked a single joint showed a one-third decline in driving skills. Those who had smoked twice as much had a 55 percent decline.

Then they drove a 16-mile route through heavy traffic in the downtown area -- again with someone ready on the dual controls. They were rated on the basis of taking the examination for a driver's license. Here the low dose group had a 42 percent decline in skill; the higher dosage group had a 63 percent decline. The observers noted a failure to see signals, stoplights, and so forth, and an unawareness of pedestrians and stationary vehicles.

Significant also was the fact that several hours after smoking pot, when the subjects no longer had a feeling of being high, their driving skills were still impaired and there was a lingering effect as much as 24 hours later.

READER'S DIGEST in the May issue did an article on these tests and others and concluded with the warning that state should enact laws to deal with marijuana intoxicated drivers. At present only two states, Alaska and Minnesota, have such laws. The article also recommended an educational campaign including brochures to be distributed at gas stations, spot ads on radio and so forth, pointing out that it's "dangerous to be stoned". The author of the article, Peggy Mann, tells of a driving instructor who gave a marijuana joint to a student driver to "relax". The California Department of Justice has made a study of Highway Patrol arrests and found a vast increase in the number of traffic violators who are intoxicated by marijuana.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "The Delaney Amendment"

After 32 years in the House of Representatives, Congressman James Delaney of New York retired last year.

The former Congressmen is best known as the man responsible for the Delaney Amendment, which was passed by the Congress in 1958. This clause states that "No additive shall be deemed to be safe if it is found to induce cancer when ingested by man or animal.." That simple statement, added to the law 21 years ago, is today creating a lot of headaches for Congress and the food industry.

In 1977, the Food and Drug Administration proposed that saccharin, the artificial sweetener, be banned from the market because lab tests showed that large doses of the substance caused bladder cancer in male rats. The authority under which the FDA proposed its ban was the Delaney Amendment. But after a nationwide uproar from dieters and diabetics who depend on saccharin to control their intake of sweets, Congress responded to the FDA by passing a two-year moratorium on the proposed ban. The President signed the bill into law and most of the country forgot about saccharin.

But the ban expired on May 22. Unless Congress acts again to postpone the removal of saccharin from the market, the FDA machinery to ban the sweetener will be set into motion. Every indication is that Congress will extend the moratorium for at least another three years.

Meanwhile, the Delaney Amendment is creating problems for another important food additive -- nitrates. Nitrates are added to cured meats. They provide the meats with the color and taste to which we are accustomed. But more importantly, nitrates prevent the formation of botulism.

In a recent series of lab tests, a professor from M.I.T. discovered that the ingestion of nitrates in rats caused an excessive incidence of tumors. Enter the Delaney Amendment. The FDA and the Department of Agriculture got together and informally proposed that nitrates be phased out over a three year period so that the industry could have time to develop an alternative to this important additive.

But the Justice Department said "no". The Attorney General ruled that under the provisions of the Delaney Amendment, a phase-out is not a legal alternative. The substance must be banned outright.

The Delaney Amendment's lack of flexibility in the case of nitrates and the controversy over saccharin have led many to believe that some serious changes in the law are necessary. A study commissioned by Congressman Clarence Brown of Ohio suggests that instead of the black-and-white absolutism of the Delaney Amendment, the following criteria should be established for a potentially cancer-causing additive to be allowed in food. The substance would not be banned if first, it is a unique food additive for which there is no safer alternative. Second, if the substance is essential as a dietary supplement necessary for medical reasons. And finally, if the removal of the substance would create a much greater risk to the public than would its continued use.

The precipitous reactions of the FDA to sketchy scientific evidence about saccharin and nitrates is evidence enough that the power which permits it to exercise this control over our diets should be reviewed. No sensible person supports the continued use of genuinely unsafe products, but serious changes in the Delaney Amendment are necessary.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Miscellaneous I"

With the SALT II treaty coming closer it's interesting to see what the Soviet attitude is. Supposedly we are in the final stages of negotiating the treaty terms and supposedly the Soviets are eager to have the argument ratified by our Senate.

One can't help but suspect that their eagerness might be because they'll get more out of the treaty than we will. Our President is telling us that SALT II holds out the promise of peace and an end to the costly arms race. But what does that do to us if we are the only ones not racing?

Some weeks ago the Soviet Union took off into the wild blue yonder testing a new, intercontinental bomber of super-sonic speed. They already have a bomber called the Backfire which will not be covered by the SALT treaty because the Russians say it's only of medium range. Our Air Force says it can reach American targets which is the measure of a strategic aircraft. Still it isn't included in the treaty.

This new plane strangely enough looks remarkably like the American B-1 bomber the President cancelled.

The next Soviet surprise was the testing of the SS18 intercontinental ballistic missile carrying 14 separate warheads. Apparently SALT II was ready to permit the deployment of a giant missile with 10 warheads. With this agreed to -- why are they testing one with fourteen? Unless they have no more intention of keeping the terms of SALT II than they did of SALT I and those they violated from the first day. Incidentally, our CIA and therefore the administration knew about the fourteen warheads for two months before the Pentagon learned of it.

Here is another item by way of the NATIONAL REVIEW BULLETIN from behind the Iron Curtain on an entirely different subject. One thing we know about Communism is that everyone is equal. There is no aristocracy, no ruling class in the workers paradise. Every citizen starts equal to every other citizen and they stay equal.

Well maybe some are a wee bit more equal than others. Take Rumania, where the Communist party Boss Nicolae Ceaucescu is President and Commander in Chief. His wife is a member of the Party's permanent bureau and also of the political executive committee. Their son is secretary of the Union of Communist Youth. They have another son who is a top physicist at the Maghuele Nuclear Center. Ceaucescu has a brother who is a Major General and a lecturer at the Rumanian military academy. Another brother is minister of agriculture and a third brother is a senior correspondent for the party's daily newspaper. Would you believe there is a fourth and he runs the Rumanian economic agency in Vienna? Don't go away -- the fifth brother is consul-general in Kiev.

Just to round things out there is a sister who is married to the former Prime Minister. He resigned in March because of ill health. But that's alright because another sister is married to the new Prime Minister.

A nephew is minister of foreign trade and another nephew is deputy prime minister. Ceaucescus brother-in-law is state secretary in the ministry of machinery.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Miscellaneous II"

We can be forgiven for saying that Washington's worry about hospital costs sounds a little hypocritical. The Department of H.E.W. has ordered the nations hospitals to adopt a new idea in accounting procedures.

For a number of hospitals the start-up cost alone will amount to \$100,000. For all of them it will require keeping two sets of books -- one for the hospital and one for H.E.W. Even without this, government regulations are adding considerably to the average hospital bill. A recent study in New York state found that regulations alone add \$38.86 daily to the patients bill.

While on the subject of H.E.W. That agency whose budget is third largest in the world (exceeded only by the National budgets of the United States and the Soviet Union) managed to lose an affirmative action plan from the University of Alabama three times. That took some doing since the report was the size of a New York phone book.

When the university finally managed to get their plan to the proper desk at H.E.W. they were informed the regulations had been changed and they would have to submit a new plan.

I know I've commented a number of times about our society's soft on crime attitude and suggested we should have more compassion for the criminals victims.

Well here is an outstanding example of what I've been talking about. Virginia Annables car was stolen a few months ago and driven out on the ice of Long Islands Great South Bay. There it was set on fire. Miss Annable found her burned out car but before she could do anything about getting it back it had sunk through the weakened ice, coming to rest on the bottom of the bay. Well it was an old klunker worth only about \$400,00 - so end of story. Or is it?

The Army Corps of Engineers has informed Miss Annable that her sunken car is a menace to navigation and must be removed from the bay. She will be billed for the removal which the Engineers say will cost \$1,000.00. Now wouldn't you think some nice, sensible judge would rule that the criminal who stole the car is responsible and tell the Corps of Engineers to find him and collect their \$1,000.00.

On a happier note-- and I couldn't be happier than I am over Englands new Prime Minister. It has been my privilege to meet and have two lengthy visits with Margaret Thatcher. I've been rooting for her to become Prime Minister since our first meeting.

If anyone can remind England of the greatness it knew during those dangerous days in World War II when alone and unafraid her people fought the Battle of Britain it will be the Prime Minister the English press has already nicknamed "Maggie".

I think she'll do some moving and shaking of Englands once proud industrial capacity which under the Labor Party has been running down hill for a long time. Productivity levels in some industrial fields are lower than they were forty years ago. Output per man hour in many trades is only a third of what it was in the 1930's. Bricklayers for example laid 1,000 bricks a day in 1937 -- today they lay 300. I think "Maggie" -- bless her soul, will do something about that.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Investment Lag"

The recent victories of Margaret Thatcher in Great Britain and Joe Clark in Canada have encouraged those of us who feel that the governments of the West have gone too far in over-regulating their economies-- Britons and Canadians spoke loud and clear in their recent elections. And they said -- we've had enough of a nameless, faceless bureaucracy ever expanding its authoritative role in our private lives. We've had enough of a government which dreams up schemes to redistribute our income instead of adopting policies which encourage the continued growth of that income.

Many Americans expressed relief at the election results in Great Britain. There was a feeling that this election might have been Britain's last chance to turn away from the policies that produced a stagnate economy and put disproportionate shares of power in the hands of a few trade unions. For many, the final straw came when the Labor government actually permitted the Post Office to stop delivery to a company which was being struck by its workers. Mrs. Thatcher has promised to turn away from the failure's of Britains's brand of socialism and get the country moving again.

But while we are wringing our hands over the economic plight of Britain, we should not neglect the warning signs in our own system which suggest that we may be headed down the same path. High inflation and burdensome government regulations are the obvious points of comparison. But certain long-range economic trends are cause for even greater concern.

According to a study by the American Council for Capital Formation, since 1960, the productivity growth in American manufacturing has been lower than that of the major non-Communist countries -- including Great Britain. Americans save much less than the others too. We save only about five percent of our after-tax income. And as a nation-- we invest a smaller portion of our Gross National Product in new business and industry than Japan, West Germany, Canada, France and once again, even the United Kingdom.

These disturbing trends have prompted a very thoughtful essay on the future of the American economy in Time magazine in April. Marshall Loeb contemplates what the American economy will be like in the 1980's. Will it be a period of unmatched growth and prosperity for all Americans? Or another decade of inflation coupled with a stagnant, no-growth economy?

The key is our lack of investment and savings for the new decade. Mr. Loeb sees some very concrete reasons why American business is discouraged from investment and families are discouraged from saving. He writes "The shortfall is rooted in policies which have led to too much statism and not enough private initiative. Liberal or conservative, Republican or Democrat, almost all the wxperts agree on the causes of America's capital lag. Government policies have discouraged personal savings and thus have retarded capital formation. Federal spending has diverted money away from investment to consumption. And regulation has shifted capital away from productive, job-creating investments." Well, you take those factors and add to them a double-digit rate of inflation, and the cause of our investment lag becomes clear.

But it does not have to be that way in the 1980's. Not wanting to be just another of America's many prophets of doom Mr. Loeb recognizes the latent strength of the American economy. If we can adopt policies to unleash the great potential of our economy, as it has been released for most of our history, he writes, the new decade will bring a period of unmatched prosperity. Government can encourage new investment and capital formation by eliminating unnecessary regulations, reducing the growth of federal spending and by encouraging greater domestic production of energy. If we do this, then the 1980's will be a decade we can all look forward to.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Crime"

I know that I've given reports on these commentaries of studies linking crime directly to the lack of punishment. The studies have been sound. Reverse studies indicating that crime rates fall when punishment is swift and severe confirm the other studies.

Why then can't we act on this research? Columnist Pat Buchanan has collected several recent incidents that make one wonder if anyone weeps for the victims of crime. Plea bargaining which reduces the sentence in order to avoid a costly trial, judges granting probation, mental hospitals releasing the criminally insane -- possibly to free up a bed, all of these things add up to more victims.

Picture this scene as if it were on television. A man holds a knife to a woman's throat while he robs her. Then he throws her off the subway platform on to the tracks below, breaking both her legs. Still she manages to pull herself back on to the platform. He kicks her in the face sending her reeling back on the tracks where she is almost crushed by an onrushing train.

He is arrested and allowed to plead guilty to robbery instead of attempted murder. He can be out on another subway platform in four years. He had done the same thing to a ninety-year old man but was released because of inadequate identification.

In California a man was sentenced in 1975 - 15 years to life for a two hour horror scene in which he raped a young lady twice, pressed a carving knife to her throat and sexually abused her in a depraved and brutal manner.

Last year the State Supreme Court decided he had not inflicted great bodily harm on her - he'll be back on the streets next year. Incidentally, a year before the crime I just described he had pleaded guilty to a sexual assault on an eight year old girl. He was given probation - that's why he was free to commit the crime in 1975.

Another Californian was convicted in 1974 of two separate assaults on children for which he spent sixteen months in a mental hospital. Six months after they let him out he committed a sexual assault and this time went to prison -- for 22 months. He was paroled and now stands accused of twenty counts of kidnaping, rape and assault in connection with two child molestation incidents just last winter.

In Washington, D.C. a man is charged with stabbing and strangling an eighteen year old girl. At the time of his arrest for this crime he was on parole from a federal prison in Florida and also free on his "personal recognizance" from the District of Columbia jail, having been arrested for larceny.

I have just reported the crimes of four individuals. The total number of victims is twelve. Had these four law breakers been in prison for their first convictions eight of the twelve victims would not have been harmed.

It's almost as if we're opening the cages at the zoo and turning the wild animals loose. That isn't fair though -- the animals would probably leave us alone if we didn't bother them.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Vietnam War"

The Oscar was given on Academy Award Night to the motion picture "The Deer Hunter". I'm sure you all know the movie deals with the Vietnam War. If you haven't seen it then possibly you don't know that it is a story of friendship among young men; that it certainly does not glorify war although it is unashamedly patriotic and it doesn't call down punishment on the United States for being in that war.

It is this last point that has caused some to withhold congratulations for its award of the Oscar. Those who in the 1960's and early 1970's saw no virtue in anything America did and only nobility of purpose on the part of North Vietnam cannot of course accept any story about that war which doesn't follow that theme.

Indeed they can't accept the truth let alone a fictional version. I wish someone in the world of television or movies would do a film about the men who endured captivity for six, eight and ten years in the Hanoi Hilton as it was called, or any of the other Communist torture camps.

Capt. John McCain, U.S. Navy, spent six years in the hands of the North Vietnamese. One day he was told he was to meet an "American actress" who was for peace. Recognizing a propaganda trick he refused. He was beaten, starved, finally put in an unventilated box five feet long and two feet wide and kept there for four steaming summer months.

If the producing gentry in Hollywood want to follow up on "The Deer Hunter" success there is plenty of material at hand. Scott Blakey has written a book called "Prisoner At War - The Survival of Commander Richard A. Stratton". It's published by Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Dick Stratton was a prisoner more than six years. His story is one of love as well as war; of a wife who never lost hope. And it's the story of dozens if not hundreds of men who were his fellow prisoners. There are amazing tales revealed for the first time. One such concerns Admiral Jeremiah Denton.

If you remember that long night when we all watched television waiting for the landing at Clark field in the Philipines of that first plane bringing our P.O.W's home, Jeremiah Denton was the first man we saw. He made his way down the ramp, saluted the flag and thanked us for bringing them home.

You might not remember that you had seen him a few years before on television when his captors forced him through torture to be filmed telling us how well they were all being treated. He stood there before the microphone his eyes blinking in the harsh television lights. But now thanks to Scott Blakey's book we know it wasn't the lights that made him blink. He was spelling out in Morse code the word "tortured" over and over again.

When the film was played on network television in America a Naval Intelligence officer recognized and read the message. Naturally this had to be kept a secret while our men were still prisoners.

You'll learn a lot from the book and you'll get a little impatient with those who don't like pictures that don't hate America.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Operation Get Smart"

Back in April, I reported on a very unorthodox program conducted at New Jersey's Rahway State Prison which is designed to literally scare the crime right out of young offenders. The Juvenile Awareness program, as it is called, was founded by Frank Bindhammer, a convicted murderer. A graphic documentary on the program called "Scared Straight" was broadcast throughout the country in March. The film has since won an Oscar as the best documentary of 1978.

The film demonstrates how the program works, and the logic behind it is very simple. Seventeen teenagers, all who have already had serious problems with the law, were locked in a room with a panel of murderers, armed robbers and other criminals with long prison sentences. The young people sat there for three hours as the inmates screamed at them, swore at them and scared them, all in an effort to convince the youngsters to go straight before they, too, ended up in a maximum security prison like Rahway. The results so far have been impressive. The documentary reports that of the 17 young people attending that particular session, only one had committed a crime a year later.

The success of this program and its sheer simplicity prompted the establishment of other programs throughout the nation. But in South Carolina, a similar program, one which is much more extensive, has been steering young people away from crime since 1964. It is called "Operation Get Smart".

The founder and prime mover of this worthy program is Ken Laws. Ken, who is now 42, was convicted of murder and sent to prison in 1964. Soon after his incarceration, Ken decided that he wanted to tell his story to other young people. He wanted to show them how an honor student from a good family like himself could embark on a course which finally resulted in a prison sentence for murder. During that first year, Ken had a total of six speaking engagements. But since then the program has snowballed. This past year Ken (who has since been paroled), along with a team of young inmates, spoke to no less than 850 civic groups, schools, churches and military bases in South Carolina. Their message to the young people in the audience is simple. It is easier than you may think, the inmates tell them, to get involved with the wrong crowd, to get involved with drugs and go off on some reckless adventure which turns into a crime -- and a disaster. As in the Rahway program, the inmates of "Operation Get Smart" tell of the hardships of prison life -- the monotony, the poor conditions and the threat of physical assault.

Ken is careful to point out that his program is different from the Rahway program in many significant ways. The scope of "Operation Get Smart" is much wider. "Scared Straight" is limited to those young people who have already committed serious crimes. Ken and his group have a message for the entire community. They even conduct worship services. Also, Ken tells us that while the fear of prison life is invoked in his presentation, the panel does not browbeat the audience with verbal abuse as in the case of Rahway. "Our purpose is education," Ken tells us. "We don't moralize. We present them with the facts so that they can make intelligent decisions."

Ken served 10 years in prison. He could have pushed the experience out of his mind. But instead, he relives his story hundreds of times a year in the hope that it may prevent others from making the same mistakes he did. He stands before communities throughout South Carolina and tells them "My name is Ken. I was convicted of murder. I lost respect for God."

In 1977, the state of South Carolina recognized the importance of Ken's work and funded "Operation Get Smart" as an integral part of the state's crime prevention and corrections program. Meanwhile Ken Laws expresses the hope that other states will adopt similar programs. I hope so too.

Taped 6/19/79
Air 7/2-7/20/79

RONALD REAGAN
RADIO COMMENTARY
Disc 79-9

79-9 A

1.	John Wayne	2:44
2.	Double Standard	2:46
3.	The Pope in Poland	2:59
4.	Nuclear Power	2:56
5.	Oil Profits	2:54
6.	Miscellaneous	3:00
7.	Money	3:04

79-9 B

1.	A Green Lawn	2:39
2.	Bukovsky	2:58
3.	Molecules	2:40
4.	A Tale of Two Countries	2:51
5.	Joan Baez I	2:39
6.	Joan Baez II	2:43
7.	The Family	3:03
8.	Corruption	2:45

PLEASE NOTE:

These programs are provided for airing from July 2, through July 20th, 1979 inclusive. Maintaining this schedule will enable your station to air all newly recorded programs as received.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Double Standard"

SCENE: a dark, cramped, high-ceilinged office in an old government building in Washington, D.C. It is the Bureau of Double Standards, occupying only two rooms. In the inner room, the chief of the bureau gazes out the window. His assistant, Smithers, rushes in.

SMITHERS: Chief! Chief! Great news. It's the break we've been waiting for; the first really good news since the Human Rights Office people traveled around South America giving those governments lectures on morality.

CHIEF: Calm down, Smithers. We've waited so long a few moments to catch your breath won't hurt.

SMITHERS: Right, chief, but I'm very excited. You see, the president has decided to keep the sanctions on Zimbabwe Rhodesia, despite the fact they elected a new black majority government freely, with nearly two-thirds of the population voting.

CHIEF: Wonderful, but did he use the language we drafted for him?

SMITHERS: Yes, that's the best part. He said the elections weren't "free and fair" enough to justify his lifting the sanctions. He said that keeping them on would be in the best interests of the U.S. and -- get this -- the people of Zimbabwe Rhodesia.

CHIEF: Perfect. Did he go all the way and compare the new government in Salisbury unfavorably with, say, Nigeria or Zambia or Tanzania?

SMITHERS: Not quite, but he implied it and I doubt the point was lost on the public. He made it pretty obvious that if a government in Africa is run by a dictator, is Marxist or socialist or has a self-proclaimed emperor, president-for-life or one-party rule or if it has oil it threatens to withhold, such as Nigeria, we'll accord that government full diplomatic honors. But not Rhodesia.

CHIEF: In other words, he's holding firm -- as we recommended -- for inclusion of the terrorists Nkomo and Mugabe, who have refused to participate in talks with the Salisbury coalition and who turned down every invitation to participate in the elections?

SMITHERS: Right. Andy Young says they've got to be part of the deal, even though they've made it clear they aren't the least bit interested in democracy, only getting control of the country. Still, the various dictatorships in the neighborhood have told Andy that Nkomo and Mugabe have to be in on the deal or they'll be angry with us. And that threat is enough to make Andy light-headed.

CHIEF: Smithers, I'm proud of you. This is a great day in the history of the Bureau of Double Standards. It takes me back to the day the president said we couldn't control events in other countries -- referring to the revolution in Iran -- just as the administration was cutting off credit and arms to Nicaragua in order to topple the government there.

SMITHERS: It's good to be back in the good graces of the White House, Chief. Why, now, maybe they'll restore our budget cuts and give us a couple of extra rooms and even a secretary.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "The Pope in Poland"

When President Carter and Leonid Breshnev met at the summit in Vienna, Breshnev is quoted as saying that God would never forgive them if they failed in their mission. I'm sorry that I can't believe in his sincerity. Indeed I think he was hypocritical and deliberately using the Lord's name to curry favor or soften up the President who does believe in God as Breshnev does not.

Atheism is as much a part of Communism as is the Gulag. Every kind of roadblock is thrown in the way of religion, up to and including imprisonment. Children in Soviet schools are indoctrinated from grade one with the falsehood that there is no God.

The day after the papers carried Breshnev's quote the Los Angeles TIMES carried a front page story of another meeting -- this one in Poland. It was a report on Pope John Paul II's final appearance on his visit to his homeland. This appearance was not seen on TV and until the TIMES story I don't believe there had been any account of it in the press.

It seems the Communist rulers of Poland had barred live TV, press passes were severely limited and at the last minute they agreed upon closed circuit TV had to be cancelled for "technical reasons" just before the meeting began. The meeting was the most significant of the Pope's entire visit, significant because it was with the youth of Poland.

The church officials had given out 30,000 tickets but there were 60,000 there. They were a cross section of the country's young people, high school students, university students and working youth. Those without tickets had climbed over 12-foot walls, helping each other. They had begun arriving while the sun was still high and they sat through the hot hours waiting, passing bottles of water to each other so that no one was left thirsty. They spread flowers on the path by which the Pope would enter. When he finally arrived they threw thousands more flowers; there was a band and symphony orchestra.

Then there was quiet and they waited for him to speak. "May I say something to you?" he asked, "I like you very much." Many times he had to hide his emotion as they came in an hour long procession bringing him gifts. And they sang all the old hymns from memory while other thousands of people watched from house tops and windows from as far as the eye could see.

The Pope put aside his prepared sermon and just talked with the thousands of young people, reminiscing of when he was the arch bishop in that very city. He spoke humorously at times and at others of the need for high ideals. It was 10:30 at night when he finished speaking. The time had come for the blessing of the crosses, a 12-foot one brought by one group and the other smaller ones.

When he invited the presentation there was movement among the young people and then the meaning of this night for them was revealed; they raised the thousands and thousands of crosses they had brought -- many of them home made.

These young people of Poland had been born and raised and spent their entire lives under communist atheism. Try to make a Polish joke out of that.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Nuclear Power"

Several weeks ago the modern day Luddites were out in full force. The Luddites, you'll recall, were people in England who wanted to stop the industrial revolution back in the last century. They took to the streets and tried to smash factory machinery, fearing it would put them out of work.

Today's Luddites are opposed to generating electricity by the use of nuclear generators. I'm sure many of them are sincerely motivated and truly believe there is great danger to mankind in the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

But, I'm also sure many of them aren't aware that the whole anti-nuclear movement is infiltrated by some of the same disruptive elements which sent so many young people into the streets to riot during the Vietnam war. We are naive indeed if we think that day of worldwide anti-nuclear demonstrations several weeks ago just happened by accident. There were disturbances and violence in West Germany, France, Spain and I don't know how many other countries besides the dozen or so demonstrations here in the U.S.

I said the movement was worldwide, but I have to qualify that. There were no such demonstrations behind the Iron Curtain. Consider this: "Nuclear Power not only gives mankind the key to a practically limitless source of energy, but also means the creation of one of the most modern branches of industry which significantly contributes to the development of science and technology".

Now who do you suppose said that? Well, it was Soviet Prime Minister Alexie Kosygin who was in Prague in May to see the first Czechoslovakian nuclear power station go into full operation. Earlier, and by coincidence on the same day as the Three Mile Island accident, the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary signed an agreement to start a huge new nuclear plant in the Ukraine.

Industrial output is directly proportionate to the energy supply a nation has available. Both Czechoslovakia and East Germany hope to be getting 40 percent of their electrical power from nuclear generators by 1990. That's only 10 years and a few months down the road. Restrictions in our country are such that if we started a new plant tomorrow it couldn't be operating by 1990. Incidentally, there were no news stories about Three Mile Island in the controlled Soviet press.

I don't have the figures on how many nuclear generators are operating in the Soviet Union itself, but there are four in East Germany and four more planned; Romania has ordered four from Canada, Bulgaria has two, Hungary is building its first and Czechoslovakia is to build four more.

If the U.S. were producing 40 percent of its electricity from nuclear generators we would be almost independent of the OPEC oil cartel if not totally so. What a dent that would make in our trade imbalance and in inflation.

As I said before I'm sure many of our anti-nuclear protestors are sincere. I just can't help but wonder why they don't start some demonstrations in East Germany or Czechoslovakia, or Russia for that matter.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Oil Profits"

I'm aware that there are hazards in saying a kind word about the oil industry; aware that the major oil companies are seen by many as all powerful institutions responsible for smog, inflation, congestion, urban sprawl, chillblains and dizziness.

In spite of this I don't feel they deserve the abuse they've been getting from political demagogues. One thing is certain we stand a lot better chance of getting the oil and gas we need from them than we do from our \$12 billion Energy Department whose 19,000 employees deal in paper not petroleum.

England's great statesman Disraeli once said "there are lies, blankety blank lies and then there are statistics." So it is with our energy crisis. Recently the White House gave the populist media ammunition for it's assault weapons when it cited accusingly, Texaco for having had an 81 percent jump in profits for the first quarter of 1979.

Now that was not a lie -- it was a statistic. There is no question but that those facing long lines at the gas station saw this as evidence a rip off. An 81 percent increase in profits brings an image to mind of almost doubled prices leaving our pockets and ending up in Texaco's money bag.

Well let's use some additional statistics to put things in focus which the White House could have done but which it neglected doing.

The 81 percent increase for the first quarter of this year was the increase over the rate of profit for the final quarter of last year which was 2.4 percent. That means Texaco got 2.4 cents out of each dollar of sales last year and with the increase was getting in the first quarter of this year 3.7 cents which translates out to 1.6 cents for each gallon of gasoline. If they didn't take any profit at all there wouldn't be much of a drop in the price of gasoline.

Translating even further the meaning of these statistics, we find the dividends to stockholders were a little under 6 cents for each dollar invested. U.S. Treasury notes are paying almost a dime, 9.6 cents on each dollar.

Over the last five years total oil industry profits came to \$61 billion and that's a lot of money. So is the \$130 billion the industry paid to federal and state governments in taxes. And we aren't talking peanuts when we add that the oil industry spent about \$126 billion in exploration and development.

Actually oil industry profits as a whole run pretty close to the average of all industry in America and considerably less than some of the top businesses such as I.B.M.

The Department of Energy estimates that 30 to 35 billion dollars a year must be invested in exploration and development by the oil industry just to keep us even with the amount of oil we are producing now.

It would be nice if we could invest more and produce more because we've sent \$165 billion to foreign producers over the last five years.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Miscellaneous I"

From time to time on these commentaries I've pointed out the shortcomings of CETA (the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act). This is the multi billion dollar program intended to train the unemployed for useful jobs.

The main criticism is that it simply has been used by local governments all too often to put people on the public payroll. But now comes a new twist right there in the nation's capitol, exposed by the seven month effort of Nebraska's Congressman John Cavanaugh.

The District of Columbia paid more than \$200,000 last year in job training funds to 27 convicted felons at Lorton Reformatory. Now I realize it is desirable to rehabilitate prison inmates with the hope that they will turn to honest labor when they are released from prison but the District seems to have gone a little beyond that.

One of the prisoners earned \$9,858 as a plumber but he won't be released from prison until the year 2003. Three others received \$11,066 each as laborer - warehousemen. Others were paid to work as clerks, cartographers, trade helpers, warehousemen and one as a dairy janitor.

The District collects \$2 a day from these working prisoners for room and board. This charge did not increase even though the prisoners received a five and a half percent cost of living pay raise. They also earned paid vacation time.

The City of Washington official figures show 25,000 unemployed actively seeking work in the city. The prisoners were being paid to do prison tasks.

Before I leave the District of Columbia here is a little cost item revealed by North Carolina's Senator Jesse Helms. The Federal Food and Drug Administration's budget is now 21 times as great as it was in 1960. And what do you think we're getting for that increase? Well in 1960 and before, an average of 43 new prescription drugs came into being each year. The average now is 13. It used to cost about a million dollars and about two years to develop a new prescription drug. Now thanks to FDA regulations the figures are \$20 million and eight to ten years. That adds about 50 cents to the cost of every prescription written.

One last item. You'll remember the Alaskan Pipeline was delayed several years and it's cost increased from \$1 billion to more than \$7 billion because of engineering changes to meet the demands of environmentalists mainly concerned about the migrating habits of Caribou.

In a number of places the pipe had to be put under ground to create gates for the Caribou and special measures were taken to keep heat from the pipe melting the perma frost. All of this to keep the Caribou from being unhappy.

Guess what? The Caribou have never been happier. They love the pipeline -- not the specially created gates etcetera. They enjoy it's warmth, sleep under the pipe and jump over it just for exercise.

Do you ever get the feeling that nature is laughing at us?

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Money"

Is the Proposition 13 fever that swept the country last fall and had candidates promising spending cuts beginning to cool down? Or does it just need a reminder from all of us that another election year is coming up and we still have that fever?

At the height of the fever, Senator Nunn of Georgia introduced an amendment-- which was duly passed--calling for a spending limit and tax reductions over the period 1980 to '82. But as spring fever lulled his economy-minded colleagues, they reverted to type. By the middle of May it was clear that the Senator's spending limit would be exceeded by \$42 billion and taxes will go up \$68 billion above his ceiling. Now this doesn't mean his fellow lawmakers will raise taxes by that amount. They won't have to. Government profits by inflation and as cost of living pay raises move workers into higher surtax brackets, the government will get that much undeserved income.

Many years ago, Nicolai Lenin said a government can quietly and unobservably confiscate the wealth of its citizens through inflation. Well, to make it less unobserved, holders of U.S. government bonds lost \$45 billion in the value of those bonds last year because of the nine percent inflation rate.

Harvard Economist Martin Feldstein says our once powerful U.S. economy is slowing down because people are no longer saving money as they once did. It just doesn't pay to save as that loss on savings bonds indicates. When we save either through insurance or bank savings accounts that money is invested in business and industry to earn the dividends and interest we receive. Without such savings to invest our economy can't grow and provide jobs.

Professor Feldstein suggests cutting the tax rates on savings and investment. But as the first item indicates, Congress is not in a tax cutting mood which indicates some in our Congress need to take a course in elementary economics.

Two economists with Chicago's Harris bank, Robert Genetski and Young Chiu, have studied the economic growth rate of our 50 states. Those states that cut taxes had an above average economic growth. A number of states that sharply increased their taxes -- among them New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Vermont, New Jersey and Massachusetts -- suffered an economic decline. States that neither raised or lowered tax rates went along with lower than average economic growth.

One last item on money. Citicorp, a giant New York based bank, recently put out a pictorial document on the history of inflation in the U.S. over the last 100 years. They did it by picturing stacks of pennies representing the purchasing power of the dollar at various times.

They took the year 1900 as the base, with 100 pennies to the dollar and went backward and forward from there. For example, in 1894 the dollar was worth 96 pennies. In the war year of 1918 inflation had reduced it to about 55 and one half cents. Its highest point since then was in 1934 when there were 62 pennies in the stack. A dollar was worth 48 cents in 1942, 27 and one half cents in 1962 and only 12.8 cents in 1978. It has lost some of that so far in 1979.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "A Green Lawn"

Today I won't mention inflation, bureaucracy, SALT II or any of the other things in the headlines these days. Instead, now that Mothers Day and Fathers Day are behind us, I'd like to read you a newsletter authored by a lady named Erma Bombeck. Maybe it will awaken a nostalgic memory or two. The author called it "Yard of Life".

"When Mike was three, he wanted a sandbox and his father said, "There goes the yard. We'll have kids over here day and night and they will throw sand into the flower beds and cats will make a mess in it and it'll kill the grass for sure."

And Mike's mother said, "It'll come back."

When Mike was five, he wanted a jungle gym set with swings that would take his breath away and bars to take him to the summit and his father said, "Good grief, I've seen those things in backyards and do you know what they look like? Mud holes in a pasture. Kids digging their gym shoes in the ground. It'll kill the grass."

And Mike's mother said, "It'll come back."

Between breaths when Daddy was blowing up the plastic swimming pool, he warned, "You know what they're going to do to this place? They're going to condemn it and use it for a missile site. I hope you know what you're doing. They'll track water everywhere and you'll have a million water fights and you won't be able to take out the garbage without stepping in mud up to your neck and when we take this down we'll have the only brown lawn on the block."

"It'll come back," smiled Mike's mother.

When Mike was twelve, he volunteered his yard for a campout. As they hoisted the tents and drove in the spikes, his father stood at the window and observed. "Why don't I just put the grass seed out in cereal bowls for the birds and save myself the trouble of spreading it around. You know for a fact that those tents and all those big feet are going to trample down every single blade of grass, don't you? Don't bother to answer," he said. "I know what you're going to say -- 'It'll come back.'"

The basketball hoop on the side of the garage attracted more crowds than the Winter Olympics. And a small patch of lawn that started out with a barren spot the size of a garbage can lid soon grew to encompass the entire side yard. Just when it looked like the new seed might take root, the winter came and the sled runners beat it into ridges and Mike's father shook his head and said, "I never asked for much in this life -- only a patch of grass."

And his wife smiled and said, "It'll come back."

The lawn this fall was beautiful. It was green and alive and rolled out like a sponge carpet along the drive where gym shoes had trod, along the garage where bicycles used to fall and around the flower beds where little boys used to dig with iced tea spoons.

But Mike's father never saw it. He anxiously looked beyond the yard and asked with a catch in his voice, "He will come back, won't he?" --

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Bukovsky"

Vladimir Bukovsky is a 27 year old refugee from the Soviet Union who spent half his adult life in prison camps and infamous Soviet mental hospitals (call them torture chambers) before finding sanctuary in this country. In 1976 he was exiled from Russia in exchange for the Chilean Communist leader Luis Corvalan.

He has written a book, "To Build a Castle -- My life as a Dissenter". In this book he tells of his years in prison and of the attempts to destroy his mind when his persecutors would move him from the Gulag into Russia's so-called mental hospitals.

Far more important however is what his book tells us about the change that is taking place in the Soviet Union. He writes of what was in his mind as the K.G.B. drove him to the airport in Geneva, Switzerland where the official exchange for Corvalan took place. "I couldn't rid myself of a strange sensation -- as if, thanks to a blunder by the K.G.B., I had carried out something very precious, something that should never have been let out of the country." He was referring to his insight into what was happening within the minds and souls of the Soviet people.

All of us in America -- that is all of us who view the Soviet Union as a potential threat to the free world, have some awareness of the Soviet military buildup and the Soviet lust for world power. Bukovsky tells us of a Soviet Union where dissidents are not skulking in alleys and basements trying to create an underground movement. They are speaking out openly, citing their rights under the Soviet Constitution (yes there is such a thing). True, they are sentenced to prison or sent to the mental hospitals as insane but they are also proving that the six decades of unceasing propaganda has not made the people a docile mass of willing slaves.

Jews are insisting on their right to emigrate to Israel; industrial workers are forming genuine Unions; Ukrainians, Tartars and Baltic peoples talk of national independence. "From top to bottom", says Bukovsky, "no one believes in Marxist dogma anymore." He says everyone, including the hierarchy, knows that the idea that they are building a Communist state is a fairy tale.

But here is where his book is important to us. In the 40's when Stalin was burying millions and millions of Soviet citizens in the torture camps of Siberia, there was no word in our press about this. The victims lived in total hopelessness because there seemed to be no awareness of their plight. He makes it plain that it was in the 1960's when the western nations began to realize their future was somehow tied to what was going on in Soviet prisons. The prisoners lived with hope and determination to continue dissenting and resisting. Guards would tell them that Radio Liberty and the BBC had carried stories of their hunger strikes and protests and thus they were encouraged to carry on.

Let our State department take heed--a little less detente with the Politburo and more encouragement to the dissenters might be worth a lot of armored divisions.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Molecules"

On May 1st the news broadcast on WIBC Indianapolis carried a story that more Americans should hear. If you are a listener to that station and by chance missed it, stay tuned. I think you'll be interested.

In all my commenting about the foibles and follies of bureaucracy I don't think I've ever compared bureaucrats to children. I like children. But we all know that idle hands can tempt youngsters into mischief. Could that be the excuse for the government shenanigans reported on that May 1st broadcast?

The Indiana Farm Bureau struck oil in Gibson County about two years back. And as so often happens got natural gas along with the oil. "Citizens Gas" of Indianapolis contracted to buy the gas. Since there was no pipeline, Texas Gas Transmission Co. agreed to use its pipes providing connecting feeder lines were built.

Enter the government. The gas well is in Indiana, the gas was to be shipped in Indiana, sold in Indiana, and used in Indiana. But Texas Gas Transmission is an interstate carrier. The federal government stopped the sale claiming it had the right to regulate it.

The Farm Bureau in Gibson County established that it would put X number of cubic feet of gas into the pipeline each day and take the same number of cubic feet out each day in Indianapolis. Therefore there would be no shipping of this gas across state lines even though the pipeline is used for interstate shipments.

The federal government said it was true that you could accurately measure the amount of input and outtake of gas but there was no way to be sure that the actual molecules of gas taken out were the same molecules that were put in. And horrors of horrors some of the molecules put into the pipe in Gibson County might stray past Indianapolis and thus cross a state line.

Silly as it sounds, the government was demanding that it had regulatory power because there was no way to be sure that the exact same gas would be removed from the pipe in Indianapolis.

The Farm Bureau had no other way to move the gas and no storage facility, so for almost two years it burned off \$10,300 worth of gas a day.

Comes now the end of the story. The government finally gave in. The Farm Bureau prepared to lay a feeder pipe across the bottom of the White river. The Army Corps of Engineers has said no because a professor claims there might be an endangered species of mussel in the 12 foot wide section of river the pipe is supposed to go in. The professor has searched the section seven times without finding one of the endangered mussels but he's going to keep on trying.

So ends this tale of Molecules and Mussels.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "A Tale of Two Countries"

Once, Joseph Stalin is said to have dismissed the Vatican by contemptuously asking, "How many divisions does the Pope Have?"

Well, in recent weeks that question has been answered by Pope John Paul II. It has been a long time since we've seen a leader of such courage and such uncompromising dedication to simple morality; and to the belief that right does make might.

On our TV screens we've seen the reaction to this kind of leadership. Wherever he went in his native land, the people of Poland came forth in huge numbers. There were crowds of 400,000, 500,000, one million and then five million, gathered from miles around even though they don't have the easy means of transportation we have. And they gathered knowing there was every possibility they were risking their livelihood and even their freedom.

For 40 years the Polish people have lived under first, the Nazis and then the Soviets. For 40 years they have been ringed by tanks and guns. The voices behind those tanks and guns have told them there is no God. Now with the eyes of all the world on them they have looked past those menacing weapons and listened to the voice of one man who has told them there is a God and it is their unalienable right to freely worship that God. Will the Kremlin ever be the same again? Will any of us for that matter? Perhaps that one man -- the son of simple farm folk -- has made us aware that the world is crying out for a spiritual revival and for leadership.

Perhaps this should be a tale of two countries. For on that very day when our newspapers reported that the Pope had been greeted by the largest crowd in his entire visit, they also reported that Mrs. Madelyn Murray O'Hare had launched another attack in here against our Judeo-Christian traditions.

Mrs. O'Hare, who successfully obtained through judicial rulings a ban on prayer in our public schools, has now decided she can't bear the pain of carrying coins which carry the inscription: "In God We Trust".

She cites the Constitutional provision which calls for separation of church and state. Most of her fellow citizens believe the authors of the Constitution simply intended freedom to worship the God of our choice in the manner of our choosing; that we would not permit the establishment of a state church.

Mrs. O'Hare invokes the first amendment of the Constitution which gives her the right to express her views and beliefs. It does not, however, give her the right to impose her beliefs on others. And it is that same first amendment that says Congress "shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Our country's motto is "In God We Trust". At the rate we're going, that motto may be the only thing of value on our coins.

No one is trying to force this woman to believe in God, although I'm sure there are many who pray for her soul and even now and then, that she'll mind her own business.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Joan Baez I"

Back in the 1960s when our campuses were in turmoil and a quarter of a million demonstrators disrupted the business of government in the nation's capitol, singer Joan Baez was a prominent figure in the Anti Vietnam war movement.

Today Miss Baez may be making a major contribution to better understanding of that tragic decade. Some of us at the time insisted that while many in the so called peace movement were sincere there were others who were using it to further different and longer range goals.

By her recent actions Miss Baez has proven that she was sincere in her anti-war activism. Disturbed by the stories coming out of Communist Vietnam -- stories of persecution by the North Vietnamese conquerors she once thought of as liberators, Joan Baez is condemning the Hanoi government for its inhumanity. She serves as President of the Humanities/International Human Rights Committee and in that capacity took out full page ads in five major newspapers on May 30th demanding an end to the imprisonment and torture of innocent men, women and children in Vietnam.

Joan did more. She mailed out to reporters and columnists packets of material documenting her charges against the communist regime, including in it a map pinpointing the location of the prisons and torture camps. She has appeared on national television and has been joined by a few -- but only a few of her former associates in the anti war movement.

Miss Baez is probably still a socialist in her political leanings and possibly hasn't changed her mind about our participation in the war but she no longer has any illusions about the communist conquerors of South Vietnam.

By her own admission it took some time for her to accept the reality of what was going on. The first horror stories out of South East Asia found her trying not to believe them but she didn't close her mind. She sought the truth.

Probably the final proof came from Dr. Tran Xuan Nink who later appeared with her on a national press conference. The doctor has spent 27 months in one of the re-education camps where he witnessed the torture and beatings of his fellow prisoners. He bribed his way out of the camp and with his family escaped Vietnam by boat. While only a few hours from safety in the Phillipines his youngest child and only son died in his arms.

Joan Baez took her facts to Vietnam's ambassador to the United Nations and asked him to let a team of neutral observers go to South Vietnam. He refused on the grounds that this would be an interference in Vietnam's internal affairs.

On the next commentary I'd like to tell of some of those in the anti-war movement who apparently had other causes they served and who have refused to help Miss Baez.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Joan Baez II"

On the last commentary I spoke of a singer, and one-time anti-war activist Joan Baez and how she has come to realize that communist North Vietnam is guilty of the utmost in inhumane treatment of the South Vietnamese people.

She published an open letter in which she said the facts, "form a grim mosaic" of torture and terror. "People disappear and never return; people are shipped to re-education centers, fed a starvation diet of stale rice, forced to squat bound wrist to ankle, suffocated in boxes; People are used as human mine detectors, cleaning live mine fields with their hands and feet. For many life is hell and death is prayed for."

Joan has asked help in her present mission of mercy from these who were once allied with her in the anti-war movement. Her two letters to Jane Fonda have gone unanswered.

Nothing has made it more clear that some of the one time anti-war leaders were less sincere than Miss Baez; that indeed they perhaps had a cause that went beyond peace, than the response to her open letter by William Kunstler, well known lawyer and activist in New Left causes.

Kunstler calls her open letter, "a cruel and wanton act." Tens of thousands of Vietnamese, men, women, and children put to sea in boats to escape the cruelty of their communist tormentors even though they know the odds are 50/50 they'll die. Mr. Kunstler excuses this by saying, "the sudden release of long pent-up emotions can easily result in regrettable instances of the denial or subversion of fundamental rights and liberties." And then he says these "violations of human rights are not relevant to this discussion."

What discussion does Mr. Kunstler refer to? Well he says that excoriating Vietnam for this slaughter of the innocents serves "to divide the left over an absolutist mythology at precisely the moment when the near tragedy at Three Mile Island seems to be pulling it together." In other words the new left party line is now "anti-nuclear power" and like the Vietnam war it can be used to deceive sincere people into helping the new left influence American policy once again.

Let me remind you there is no anti-nuclear movement behind the Iron Curtain where any number of nuclear power plants are being constructed.

When Joan Baez called Danniel Ellsberg and asked him to sign her human rights letter, he gave her a pitch about her "future in the anti-nuclear movement."

These people who reveal that the anti-war movement was only a means to an end now have another means to an end -- anti-nuclear power. Is it too much to ask what the end really is? Or is that pretty evident without asking?

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "The Family"

Many people are concerned today about what seems to be an erosion of the family structure. Articles have been written suggesting that the rising incidence of crime, the drug culture and the increase in illegitimate births is evidence of the family's deterioration.

I only mention that by way of introduction to today's topic which has to do with the nomination of the federal judge. The President has submitted the name of Patricia Wald as his appointee to the U.S. Circuit Court for the District of Columbia.

This particular judicial post is considered by many to be the most influential Federal tribunal besides the Supreme Court itself. And since judicial rulings often become what is known as "case law," it is interesting to note some of the expressed views of the nominee to this important bench.

Ms. Wald in a 1974 article on the rights of youth suggested that childhood has been seriously compared to slavery. Now I'll admit to remembering a few hot summer afternoons when my father had reminded me it was my turn to mow the lawn (my brother and I shared that task) that I could have been persuaded I was the victim of enforced bondage. But from my present vantage point that and other chores like carrying out the ashes seem little enough in return for what my parents had to put up with.

Some of Ms. Wald's suggestions for removing the slave chains from our children would do very little to restore the family as a unit in our social fabric. True, she proposes that every young child has the right to be consulted and informed about critical decisions in his or her life. I think many of us as parents will admit to sometimes not involving our children as much as we should in discussions about things affecting them. But I also think most parents know that when we do, after the discussion is over the final executive decision is ours to make.

Ms. Wald however doesn't see it that way. She argues or at least did in 1974 that, "the child's interests deserve representation by an independent advocate before a neutral decision-maker."

That does evoke a warm family picture. Dinner is over, Mom and Pop are in the living room and the door bell rings. Junior says, "that's my advocate about this summer camp business." He lets him in, the parents introduce themselves and then present their case. The advocate listens and proposes (maybe) a compromise solution acceptable to his client -- their little boy.

According to the President's nominee for the judgeship, "A youth ought to be able to seek legal advice or help to redress his grievances against family, school or others who adversely affect him...a child or youth should have access to free or paid legal services on a confidential basis to discuss his personal grievances..."

To top it off it is proposed that adolescents should be able to seek medical or psychiatric care on their own. "This option", she says, "will become economically possible," when we have a nationalized health program. That's good because it will be Mom and Pop who'll need to visit a shrink.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Corruption"

These last few years have made it difficult to urge morality on our sons and daughters. Never has there been less respect for our basic institutions. No little share of the blame for this goes to the numerous cases of and charges of corruption in high places in government particularly among elected officials.

But now comes word of a more direct form of corruption -- outright theft and not at the executive level. Is it perhaps indicative of a general decline in moral standards that millions of dollars worth of property and office equipment is being stolen from government offices on a daily basis?

The General Services Administration says thefts from government offices is general throughout the country but most severe in Washington. Last year in the Washington area theft of both federal property and personal possessions of government employees totaled some 3,000 items valued at more than on-half a million dollars.

Those who pilfer are expected to do better this year based on first quarter figures. From January through March in our nation's capital alone more than 1,250 items valued at \$277,000 were stolen from government offices.

If you are curious about just what is being taken they aren't items you can slip in your lunch box or pocket. The loot includes electric typewriters, calculators -- not just the pocket kind but the expensive desk size ones and automobiles. The personal possessions of employees range from fur coats and radios to handbags.

No department or agency is exempt not even our top law enforcement agency, the United States Justice department. One can wonder about our national security too and protection against theft of defense secrets when the Pentagon has to admit to theft of 79 typewriters, 68 calculators and 44 personal items -- most of them in the month of January alone.

Even the CIA is included, but HEW and the Department of Agriculture top the list. Maybe at HEW they are so used to giving things away it just comes naturally.

Blame for the crime wave has been laid by some on Congress which has stressed an open building policy to make public buildings more accessible. Other officials say the need is for more security personnel. That doesn't hold up very well because the best guarded buildings have the highest rate of theft.

No one pretends this thievery is the result of breaking and entering which leaves us with the ugly thought that federal employees who average about \$4,000 a year more in income than the average worker, are to blame. But let us be careful not to blanket indict. I'm sure the overwhelming majority of public employees are honest -- indeed are victims of some of the crimes themselves.

Surely someone can come up with a system for apprehending a thief walking out of a building with an electric typewriter under his arm.