

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Reagan, Ronald: Gubernatorial Papers,
1966-74: Press Unit

Folder Title: Speeches – Governor Ronald Reagan, 1968
[05/21/1968-07/31/1968]

Box: P17

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

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

5/21

EXCERPTS OF SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
REPUBLICAN STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE LUNCHEON
Hilton Plaza Hotel, Miami, Florida
May 21, 1968

You people of Florida have your own special evidence for judging how feebly, how irresolutely American power has been applied by the administrations which have been in charge of American security these past seven years. For one of the sorriest benchmarks in the annals of American military operations abroad was the fiasco of the Bay of Pigs. To rescue the survivors of Castro's prisons, those in Washington who had let them down were driven to stoop to ransom. This morally bankrupt device, so out of keeping with all our tradition, has been tentatively suggested in connection with the young men of the Pueblo. One can hardly challenge the soundness of Jefferson's observation that "an insult unanswered is the parent of many others." Only eighteen months after the Cuban ransom, thinking that he had taken the measure of a young and inexperienced president, Khrushchev began to slip into Cuba the nuclear rockets that were calculated to bring two-thirds of the United States within range.

Even in the face of the gathering intelligence that this sinister enterprise was afoot, the men in command were loath to face up to the implications. Not too long ago, Life Magazine printed a remarkable article by the French intelligence officer Philippe de Vosjoli. Here we have been told that during the summer of 1962, well before the final election-eve crisis, and in advance of any U-2 photographic reconnaissance of Cuba, there came into American hands powerful evidence that the Russians were putting the rockets ashore. Only the other day, the former Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara and the junior senator from New York exchanged compliments about how wisely, how courageously, the other conducted himself when finally the chips were down. It is well known, however, that after the CIA had been advised of the Soviet rockets by de Vosjoli, and even after the presence of the rockets on the firing sites had been verified by the U-2's, both McNamara and Bobby Kennedy opposed taking summary action of any sort.

Luckily for the United States, the older brother was a braver man than Khrushchev: had judged him to be. Yet, even so, when the

books were finally closed on the episode, it became clear that the Russians suffered no material loss from their crude gamble. On the contrary, for taking their rockets home to Russia, they were paid off with a parallel withdrawal of U. S. rockets from Europe and a private promise that the United States would not again try to bring Castro down by invasion. And while Khrushchev personally lost prestige, having been caught in the act, it must also be reckoned, according to the further account of the French witness de Vosjoli, that President de Gaulle presently came to doubt that the confrontation was really as serious as the Kennedy men had made it out to be, inasmuch as they had permitted Khrushchev to remove unchallenged from the scene, all the evidence of his crime. All of this, so obviously timed, not for our national security but for impact on the "62" election, was hard for us to believe. Now, of course, the credibility gap is so much a part of our national life we wonder what other unpleasant realities await our discovery.

The moral in all this is that a national policy which is timid about facing up to a deliberate and naked/aggression, lest somebody get hurt is a policy that invites aggression. The slogans, "He kept us out of war," "We won't send American boys to foreign soil," "We won't send our boys 9 or 10,000 miles away," and "Korea is outside our defense perimeter" were uttered by leaders of the party now in power.

Such statements have / constituted a regular and predictable prelude to our being backed into a corner, followed by the inevitable armed conflict. And the record of our foreign policy over the past seven years shows that this was precisely the response the policy has gotten again. The Bay of Pigs in April, 1961 was followed that June by the meeting in Vienna at which Khrushchev flaunted the Soviet menace; by the Soviet breach of the nuclear moratorium with the detonation in September of their fantastic 100 megaton warhead; and by the shifting threats in the winter of 1961 and through 1962 again at Berlin, against the tiny elephant-and-parasol kingdom of Laos, and against a South Vietnam barely beginning to rise from the ruins of the long war with the French. Never before in our history have U.S. positions and interests abroad come under such sustained, deliberate assault and provocation. Never before was an American government less sure of itself.

It became the fashionable thing among the technipols of the

New Frontier to explain that none of these challenges lent themselves to easy, simple answers. The day was past, they argued, when policy-making could be reduced to straight-forward either-or alternatives or black-and-white choices. Instead, decision making had become a kind of spiraling ascent through options revolving in apparent contradiction to each other; or, as one of President Kennedy's senior foreign policy lieutenants put it afterwards: U.S. foreign policy was composed at one and the same moment of "resistance to tyranny and relentless pursuit of accommodation; reinforcement of defense and new leadership for disarmament; counter-insurgency and the Peace Corps; opening to the left but no closed doors to the reasonable right," and so on.

Put that way, it was all very reasonable. The trouble was that the doors and openings pointing toward / ^{accommodation} always looked more inviting to the new breed of policymakers than did the other doors marked "resolution," more and more their protestations against the supposed oversimplifications of those who argued for action carried the sound of excuses covering an incapacity for hard choices. I ran for public office in California on the basis that common sense, not complexity, is needed at the top of any administration. In the area of foreign policy, I am equally unimpressed with all this talk about our problems being too complex, too intricate, to allow timely decision and action.

The fetish of complexity, the trick of making hard decisions harder to make; the art, finally, of rationalizing the non-decision, have made a ruin of American foreign policy.

Barely two years after the prevailing body of Democrat movers and shakers took over the conduct of strategy, the great North Atlantic Alliance--NATO--started to come apart. Secretary McNamara's offhanded cancellation of the Skybolt missile wrecked Britain's plan for modernizing her strategic bomber force. Then the ^{even} more hare-brained Nassau scheme to redeem the blunder by rushing Polaris missiles to Britain under what was blatantly advertised as a joint Anglo-American contribution to NATO had what should have been the predictable effect of infuriating de Gaulle. He had not even been told what was up and, though a NATO partner, he was frozen out of the nuclear sharing. It is not surprising that he has gone his own way.

Five and a half years later, the NATO Alliance has become a haunted house. Indispensable French geography has been lost to the

strategy. Technological improvement within the once allied forces has come to a standstill; and our own and once magnificent Seventh Army, which supplied the stiffening element in the celebrated Forward Strategy developed under Eisenhower, has been gutted to meet the demand for manpower in Southeast Asia.

The decline and fall of NATO simply as a military containing force might not be a worrisome event for us, if the Cold War were indeed beginning to draw to an end. But while the beginnings of another thaw may finally be sensed in Europe--the one proclaimed in the mid-1950's proved to be a false spring--there is certainly little evidence on the part of international Communism for a reasonable accommodation in Southeast Asia. There the aggression invited by timidity and by petty improvisings and half-measures blandly put forward in the foolish expectation that the aggressor would be conciliate if nobody got hurt--the reverse, if you wish, of ^{brinksmanship}. These failures in spirit and purpose have brought our efforts and sacrifices to humiliation and confusion.

We Americans are generating more wealth than ever. But our situation in the world has grown lonelier and more difficult and even more dangerous in our comparative isolation. For some years now it has been the practice of the intellectuals of the Democratic left to blame John Foster Dulles for the American failure to come to peaceful terms with the Communist centers of power in Europe and Asia. They have certainly not done any better in their turn. In fact, valuable ground is being yielded to Communism, and worse still, the relations among the free nations, so promising in the years of earlier danger, have come to a dead end. It may be useful, as some suggest, for us to try to build bridges toward the Communists. But bridges have two ends and so far, there is no evidence that our own are being met by comparable efforts from the Russian side of the river. For example, if Russia needs our wheat to satisfy the hunger of her people, it might be well to point out that wheat could be delivered easier if there were no Berlin Wall between us. And while we are at it, if I had my way, I would make sure that the construction contracts were extended to provide new and wider bridges reaching to our free nation friends.

This era has seen a temporary lapse in our centuries-old friendship with France. From Lafayette to Eisenhower, we have been allies, and the temporary aberration of a particular leader should not be reflected in a permanent change in our policies or attitudes.

To refer once again to Mr. de Vosjoli's report, General de Gaulle's current mistrust of the U. S., his raids on the dollar, and his other carryings-on are as much due to Soviet KGB penetration of his administration as any basic alienation between our people.

We Americans were, until an unreasonable panic fear seized us, the world's leading power. In the midst of riot, we retain unequalled resources of wealth and ingenuity, and we should have, unless we have changed in a generation, sufficient reserves of courage to draw upon. Let us rid ourselves of this strange paranoic mood of feeling that we have been let down. Let us remember what Americans in the ✓ Wilsonian vision of the Twentieth Century were meant to do: "...to set a responsible example to all the world of what free government is and can do."

#

(NOTE: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be additions to, or changes in, the above. However, Governor Reagan will stand by the above quotes.)

PB

5/21

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
RSCC Dinner - Hilton Hotel
Chicago, Illinois
May 21, 1968

Here in the heartland in my home state where memories include college and one of the better jobs I had washing dishes in the girls' dormitory another kind of memory is being built by another generation. The great universities are being terrorized by a rash of outrageous threats, violence and disorders on campus.

At one fine private institution that has led the way in opportunities for the underprivileged, a tiny minority of the student body has seized the administrative offices and compelled the administration to capitulate to all its demands, and guarantee complete amnesty.

At another, the president has wisely decided not to grant full faculty membership to one of our more notorious Viet Cong sympathizers. This has resulted in chaos, scores of arrests and scores more suspended.

And in still another, the militants have bombed the agricultural building while urging that others take over the president's office and burn down his home.

No need to tell you these problems aren't confined to Illinois or any one state and certainly we have had our own share in California.

One wonders if we are deliberately being conditioned to "take to the streets" for every inflamed grievance. Whether that is so or not, what happens when "peaceful demonstrations" become regular occurrences across the land--and then suddenly cease to be peaceful? One thing we do know---the usual student grievances have been augmented by issues we can challenge as being beyond their proper sphere of interest and bluntly are none of their business.

For example, the Institute for Defense Analysis, a \$14 million per year non-profit defense think tank--advises the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense on problems vital to the future of U.S. security. Its board of Trustees includes the presidents of twelve universities, including Columbia, Stanford and the University of California.

Eliminating this legitimate participation by the academic community in our national security has been one of the demands of the more militant rebels more than one campus.

Let me make it plain I am aware I'm speaking of a small minority of faculty and students. I have every confidence in the majority of teachers and students. But it is time that majority spoke out. On our campuses today are several presidents.....

#

(note: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be additions to, or changes in, the above. However, the Governor will stand by the above quotes.)

5/22

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
Sacramento, California
Contact: Paul Beck
445-4571 5.22.68

RELEASE: THURSDAY A.M.'S

EXCERPTS OF SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
REPUBLICAN STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE FINANCE DINNER
Sheraton-Cleveland Hotel, Cleveland, Ohio
May 22, 1968

The New Frontier and the Great Society have both made a big point of their supposed freshness of outlook, their zest for innovation, their gifts of invention. They keep telling us the times call for new ideas, new words and slogans, new solutions--much the same notion, I might add, that was advanced more than 150 years ago by Thomas Jefferson in an earlier time of trouble.

But any traveller today, tempted to retrace the twisting, wandering road leading from the New Frontier to the Great Society, would find himself flung around hairpin turns, bedevilled by unmarked dead ends, and passing through a landscape decked out with garish billboards bearing half-remembered but unkept promises--a kind of huckster's wasteland. The truth is the New Frontier brought forth little that was new and the Great Society even less that is great.

Specifically, let us speak of the condition and competence of our armed forces, and the vitality of American military technology.

Eight years ago, when the New Frontiersmen took to the field to run against the record of the Eisenhower administration, one of the principal targets of their assault was an alleged "missile gap." They charged the U. S. had fallen dangerously behind the Soviet Union in the development and deployment of strategic missile and space weapons systems. Those shattering accusations echoed throughout the country and there is no question but that they had some considerable influence on the election, not because they were true, but because those who spoke them were articulate, persuasive and cynically unconcerned with facts.

The accusations were false, but this wasn't learned until after the votes were counted.

Then we learned that under Eisenhower, the Defense Department, in close partnership with industry and the sciences, had taken American military technologies through sequences of revolutionary invention of

a scope and intensity without precedent in history. Practically all of the truly commanding weapons systems now in the American inventory--the ballistic rockets in their numerous variations; the miniaturized thermonuclear warhead; the reconnaissance satellites; over-the-horizon radar; the entire Polaris concept; and the supersonic jet strike force--were all developed or brought forward during the eight Eisenhower years.

The record of the defense establishment under the recently departed Robert McNamara cannot begin to match that record of true creativity. McNamara, if anything other than an inspired accountant, was a genius of non-invention. One of the vaunted claims of the political scientists around him was that our forces were being transformed from massive, nuclear forces of a doomsday character into relatively light, highly flexible, quick reaction forces for mastering local, or tactical situations--limited war forces, that is, for non-nuclear, essentially infantry warfare.

However, a few months ago, when the North Korean Communists stole the Pueblo and kidnapped our young men, a strange and disquieting fact emerged. It turned out that the American forces in the western Pacific, vast as they have become, were unable to respond in time to the captain's call for help because the only fighter-bombers in striking distance were equipped only for a nuclear response. The one practical proposal for recovering the unfortunate crew has been a suggestion by one of the Democratic candidates that the treasury offer ransom money. This of course is not a new idea. Ransom was the way out chosen by another of the current crop of Democratic candidates to rescue from Castro's prison the Cuban survivors of the Bay of Pigs expedition.

The Vietnam War certainly fits the definition of a limited non-nuclear war and the Great Society strategists have had no more success than the New Frontier strategists who made the original commitment and remade the forces to fight this and other wars like it. We find ourselves involved in the largest, costliest war in our history. It engages the energies and purposes of more than 600,000 Americans, counting the forces in support at sea and in Thailand; and our government is no longer able to muster the resolution to press its cause through to a respectable conclusion against a miserable water-buffalo economy.

The total GNP of North Vietnam over a whole year () hardly equal to the value of the goods and services produced here in the Cleveland area in a single week.

The economic consequences of the Kennedy-Johnson-McNamara strategy do not stop with the squandering of treasure--\$70 to 80 billion so far diverted from urgent and indispensable social investment at home. A far greater loss is our loss of face, our inability to prevail in a war where it is critically important that we do prevail, if we are to have place and meaning in Asia and the western Pacific.

The reason for the failures are not hard to find. A floundering of purpose has all too often been marked with a loss of nerve. The collapse at the Bay of Pigs invited Khrushchev's contemptuous raising of the wall around Berlin; invited Ho Chi Minh's hard thrusts in 1962 against Laos, and encouraged the flow of Soviet naval power into the Mediterranean, the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean, and encouraged the Soviet support of the war against us in Vietnam.

A few years back, things were rather different. It was just 10 years ago that a violent threat by Mao Tse-tung against Quemoy and Matsu had the usual voices urging us to back down and give in or World War III would start. The lyrics were the same against the background music of "Better Red Than Dead." Then a voice spoke in our Nation's Capitol-- with a tone we haven't heard for too long a time. Dwight D. Eisenhower said: "They'll have to climb on the 7th fleet to do it." And to make sure he was fully understood, he gave the Sidewinder air-to-air missile to the Nationalist forces at the testing moment in the air battle. The effect on the Red Air Force was sizeable. World War III did not start. A Soviet thrust toward Syria and Lebanon was swiftly blunted and disarmed by putting American power ashore in Lebanon and Turkey. And twice during the eight years when Eisenhower directed the strategy, menacing Soviet movements against Berlin were disposed of, without the call-up of a single reinforcement, simply by a show of calm, unwavering resolution. Eisenhower understood the authority as well as the limitations of force in international politics; he was not afraid to make it count in a world where force still settles the fate of nations. Of course this is not to say that McNamara couldn't be steadfast. He was steadfast to the point of being stubborn--about the TFX.

At this stage of (as sorry seven-and-a-half-) ar stewardship of our security, the Kennedy-Johnson-Humphrey administration has increased defense spending to a rate of \$75 billion a year and all it has to show for it is the longest and first wholly inconclusive war in the history of the United States and a political airplane that won't fly.

One last word about the missile gap which didn't exist then but now has become a reality. General Schreiver who led the way during the missile crisis headed a special committee to report on defense preparedness to the House Armed Services Committee. Their 103-page report concludes that "the Soviet Union is succeeding in its massive drive toward strategic military superiority" while the United States has been "slowing down its side of the arms race."

This is the rising situation that bothers me. It worries my friends and advisors in the aerospace industries. They understand invention. Here, they say, we Americans had better start giving some serious fresh thought to the new--the real new--the thing itself, not a mere slogan, because there is a long dangerous wait between the idea and the transforming of that idea into a practical, useful weapon capable of defending freedom.

Man has slept uneasily for almost a quarter of a century now with the threat of the bomb. Who among us will sleep when that threat is backed by Soviet power greater than ours?

Those who delight in calling us hawkish and trigger happy would have us awaken each morning testing the warmth of the enemy's smile to see whether we were to know another day of freedom. I believe Americans would rather awaken knowing each day promised peace and freedom because we had the strength to say we intended living in that kind of world.

° ° ° °

(NOTE: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be additions to, or changes in, the above. However, Governor Reagan will stand by the above quotes.)

5/27

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
U. S. Chamber Conference for Businessmen
Fairmont Hotel, San Francisco
May 27, 1968

We all long for peace. That is especially true of Californians. The armed troops pass through here on their way to the fighting. The survivors, the wounded, the dead first touch down here on their way back. The carriers and destroyer fleets sail in and out through the Golden Gate. California leads the nation in casualties suffered in Vietnam.

This, of course, is the real reason behind our prayers for peace. At the same time, however, in California we are forced to consider the economic consequences of peace in Vietnam. The cost of this war is now listed at \$28 billion a year. This does not include the depletion of inventories all over the world. Even so, it is the largest single element in our \$77 billion defense budget this year.

If peace, or even a half-baked armistice, should come to pass, the prevailing assumption in Washington is that a Peace Dividend--that is the actual term which has lately entered the federal vocabulary--could be rapidly generated.

According to some estimates, that Peace Dividend could amount to \$10-\$20 billion a year now. By 1970, this non-existent saving could grow to \$40 billion. As usual, this immense melon is already being sliced and distributed while still on the vine. The politicians have promised that the nation's troubles in the cities can be dissolved once the Vietnam war is out of the way.

While everyone agrees that this war must end, opinions soon differ as to how it can be brought about. Some wish to feed our Vietnamese allies to the Communist alligator, hoping he will eat us last. Only a few weeks ago, Walter Lippman argued that for the United States to back out of Southeast Asia would not really be a great national defeat. Mr. Lippman cautioned the critics of the war to be careful about using the word defeat since it has poisonous connotations for the average citizen. The preferred term is setback--a rose by any other name.

We elected to fight a limited war with an enemy having secure sanctuaries. This naive theory of limited war condemns this high-technology nation to fight an infantry action on the continent of Asia--the thing our wisest military leaders warned us never to do. And now the cost of that war has fired up inflation, aggravated the international payments deficit, raised labor costs, stolen from needful social programs, split public opinion and left people with the feeling that they have been had.

It appears impossible for the present strategy to force a satisfactory outcome even though the Communist forces have been regularly whipped on the battlefield. They are permitted to regroup and reinforce and resupply in Cambodia and Laos, and restock with the weapons they need by sea in North Vietnam and in Cambodia. So long as they are permitted to lick their wounds without interference and to move back into South Vietnam as they are doing right now, we are placing an unwarranted handicap on our own young men at the same time we are admitting they can't be brought home and the U. S. military establishment there cannot be reduced.

Unless of course we choose the only other way out, the path of the quitter: to say out loud, after all the dead and the agony and the wasted treasure, that Americans have little stomach for the toil, the tears, the blood and sweat of world leadership. We are clearing out or buying our way out. As Mr. Lippman has blandly remarked, the American frontiers still would be inviolate; only our prestige, our meaning might be a trifle tarnished. I hope I never see it all end that way.

At any rate, that Peace Dividend melon must remain on the vine.

But this war has also devoured funds that also should have gone into basic military research. Once American forces were seriously committed to battle, the cry from Vietnam has been for more riflemen, more guns and ammunition, more radios, more light bombers, more helicopters---all the conventional goods and weapons, including trucks, jeeps, patrol boats and the like. To satisfy this hunger, the expected capital outlays for research and development in the more advanced systems--orbital vehicles, more efficient strike forces for land, sea and air operations--had to be skimped and even in some cases put aside.

Practically all of the truly commanding weapons systems now in the American inventory--the ballistic rockets in their numerous variations; the miniaturized thermonuclear warhead; the reconnaissance satellites; over-the-horizon radar; the entire Polaris concept; and the supersonic jet strike force--were all developed or brought forward during the eight Eisenhower years.

The record of the defense establishment under the recently departed

In spite of claims to the contrary, the Pentagon, under the present administration, never really prepared for a limited war strategy.

We have been left with an inability to fight limited wars. We have overdrawn our inventory accounts to hide the cost of this failure. And we have ignored the technological future at great risk.

Quite a few reliable and well-informed scientists are beginning to suspect that our seemingly invincible margin of superiority in the ICBM weapons may be in serious danger.

All this suggests that even if the fighting should stop there probably would be no precipitate collapse in military spending. The stocks must be replenished, and we cannot afford to ignore technological innovation any longer. But the real danger lies in lead times. New weapons are now so complex, so expensive, that they require at least four or five years to mature.

The United States has a tradition of ignoring this fact until the very last minute. The frantic efforts of a few and the massive expenditures of many have usually been called upon to save us. It is a nerve-wracking way to live.

The technical feasibility of an H-bomb was apparent right after World War II. In October, 1949, the general advisory committee of the Atomic Energy Commission specifically recommended against building it. Three months later came the confession of notorious atomic spy, Klaus Fuchs. Within four days, President Truman directed the commission to proceed with development of an H-bomb. The panic was on. The U.S. succeeded in firing a thermonuclear device in November, 1952 and nine months later, the Soviet Union did the same thing. What would have been our position if we had listened to the nay-sayers?

The technical feasibility of ballistic rockets was amply apparent to the citizens of London in 1944. At the end of World War II, many of the German scientists responsible for those ballistic rockets were brought to the U.S. where very little was done and finally the project was cancelled. Then in 1953 a secret Turkish radar, operated by the new Eisenhower administration, sighted Soviet ballistic rockets appearing over the horizon. In February, 1957, the first Atlas flew--just eight months before the Sputnik crisis rattled the confidence of the free world. And in 1958, the first Atlas squadrons became operational; there was no missile gap. But what if there had been no Turkish radar? What if we had done nothing until Soviet rockets were splashing into the sea just outside San Francisco on "test flights"?

We Californians are, of course, proud of the fact that both of these rabbits were pulled out of the hat by California institutions. Thermonuclears were initially conceived and developed at the University of California laboratories at Los Alamos and Livermore. Systems management of the ballistic missile effort was carried forward in Los Angeles. Engines for the Atlas were built in Los Angeles. The Atlas air frame itself was assembled in San Diego.

Because of this technical sophistication, California's position in the Vietnam situation is not what most people might expect. California has been a casualty rather than a beneficiary of the Vietnam buildup. Between the Korean and Vietnam wars, California industry usually captured between 18 and 20 percent of the annual procurement awards of the Department of Defense. But cannon, rifles, ammunition, tanks and jeeps have never been the particular forte of California's new industries. We took on only 11 percent of the procurement demand related to the Vietnam buildup, or about half the volume one might have expected---in dollar terms, about \$1.6 billion to 113,000 new jobs. In the meantime, the cutbacks in funds for missile and space systems have left our higher technology industries with a postponed demand. This is certain to open up more jobs.

California ordinarily takes on about 40 percent of all the NASA contracts, and about the same percentage of Department of Defense contracts for R & D; our current share is running only about 33 percent. In the event of peace, I imagine this state would recover its old 40-20 ratios, and our aerospace corporations foresee no drastic fall-off in defense business--at the worst, something on the order of between 10 and 15 percent. Offsetting this will be the new and quite massive private spending created by the success of the Lockheed and McDonnell Douglas air bus programs, by the eventual commitment of the Supersonic Transport to production, and by a variety of other non-defense business.

A saving factor in the character of the California defense and aerospace complex is that a very high percentage of our defense work, by reason of its deep research content, is of a semi-permanent character. Our prime industries tend to be technological rather than military in aim and function. This is true even though a major or even the largest fraction of their billings are with the government. Here is the inherent strength of California industry. Its wide-based technological capability is the true measurement of its industrial

strength, not along its unique position as a vendor to the military.

And here is what I would hope 1968 will mean to this segment of California industry---a change of administration to one concerned about our long-range security.

America's technological resources are in disarray. The president's advisers talk of a scientific plateau. There is no such thing. Our technology on one hand, and law on the other, are the only things that stand between us and the jungle. We look forward to an administration that will put California's special skills back to work.

#

(NOTE: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be additions to, or changes in, the above. However, the governor will stand by the above quotes.)

5/
27

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
Sacramento, California
Contact: Paul Beck
445-4571 5.27.68

RELEASE: Monday P.M.'s

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
National Association of Extradition Officials
Jack London Inn, Oakland
May 27, 1968

I am happy to join in welcoming you to the fourth annual conference of the National Association of Extradition Officials.

California is privileged to serve as the host state for this meeting.

But I must admit it is a far cry from Death Valley Days. In most of those scripts I never worried about state lines. I just went out and got my man. Things are a little more complex today.

We have more laws to violate but at the same time we have taken steps to make them harder to enforce.

In fact, in our efforts to protect the rights of the individual, it seems sometimes that we have forgotten the purpose of the law is to protect society from the criminal and not the other way around.

But nevertheless, your presence here is renewed proof that ours is a society of laws and that the purpose of government is to enforce the laws.

It is an indication that the lawbreaker cannot escape the consequences of his actions merely by crossing man-made boundaries.

Recognizing that most of you serve as the direct representatives of your governors in extradition matters, I can tell you on their behalf that all of us appreciate and recognize the value of your work. We have nearly 2,000 extradition cases each year in California. While most of them are uncontested, and can be processed on a routine basis, I can attest to the volume by the number of times every week that I have to approve and sign my name to the legal documents which are necessary for the interstate handling of fugitives.

Then, too, we do have the difficult cases, which require lengthy hearings, detailed legal analysis, and more complex reviews before decisions can be reached. Since each governor not only has great discretion but also has great responsibility to the spirit and the letter of the extradition laws, high quality assistance is essential to the successful administration of this criminal justice process.

The importance and complexity of decision making in extradition cases becomes very real when we are confronted by the unusual cases. For example, an off-shoot of the New Orleans investigation of District Attorney James Garrison into the assassination of President Kennedy has resulted in an extradition case now in the process of review by our office.

But complex legal decisions--and also difficult human decisions--are not limited to the cases that make the front pages or which gain all the television and radio coverage. The case of a man sought here as a fugitive because he has failed to support his family in some other state, probably defies practical, human, and legally acceptable solutions as much as any other.

Often such a person has started a new life in our state--and with this new life he has acquired a new wife and a new family. Often he has been able to get a job and is earning a modest living.

Shall we simply return him to the demanding state, with the inevitable result that he loses his job; his family here goes on the welfare rolls; and he has lost any possibility of contributing to the support of his previous children as well? In such a situation nobody seems to win, and the taxpayers of two states--who support the welfare program--are the losers.

Or can some solution be worked out whereby he is able to keep his job here, continues supporting his family, and also begins to fulfill his child support obligation in the other state?

And can we be assured that he will continue to live up to his legal responsibilities, if such a solution is offered?

I have dwelled on this particular example, because it illustrates the type of case where a realistic and legal solution can be achieved only through the cooperation and close working relationship between the extradition officials of the states involved.

And it is this spirit of mutual cooperation and close personal relationship which is developed through conferences and face to face communication, such as you will experience this week. As you exchange ideas, work toward uniform procedures among the various states, and generally seek to improve the extradition process, you are making a valuable contribution to the administration of criminal justice in the United States.

The need for such interstate cooperation is growing each year as the field of criminal justice becomes increasingly complex and as the spectre of crime becomes more threatening to the peace and safety of our nation.

We are living in an age where crime is increasing more than eight times faster than our expanding population.

Consider these symptoms of illness in our modern society where too often law-abiding citizens must hide behind locked doors while criminals roam the streets with impunity:

--Crimes of violence in the United States have increased 72 percent since 1960. In the same period, crimes against property have increased 90 percent.

--Assaults on police officers have doubled annually in the last few years.

--Juvenile crime is at an all-time high. Half of all serious crimes are now committed by those under 18 years of age.

--The material cost of crime runs more than \$30 billion a year. Spent constructively, this money could transform America. The cost in wasted human lives and wasted human potential cannot be measured.

--Mob violence and the threat of riots are daily menaces for many of our larger cities. Public officials increasingly have been required to resort to military force to preserve law and order within the boundaries of our nation.

--Violent factions seek to turn our college and university campuses into staging areas for insurrection, and to pervert our educational institutions into centers for criminal conspiracies.

These few examples show why crime is our most important domestic problem, and why we must turn the tide in favor of the responsible, law-abiding citizen.

In your own field, the increase in fugitive cases, which results in more extraditions, illustrates the mobility of the modern criminal. He takes advantage of our advanced technological developments to commit his crimes, to escape apprehension and to avoid the consequences of his acts.

With the developments in air travel, a representative of organized crime can leave the east coast in the morning, carry out his illicit activities any place in the country during the day, and return to his base of operations by night.

Using the latest communications equipment, a criminal syndicate can operate throughout the country and maintain instantaneous contact among its operatives.

Some more enterprising representatives of the underworld have even adapted computer technology to their criminal enterprises.

Faced by this challenge of increasing crime, highly mobile criminals and organized lawlessness, our states must cooperate and unite their resources in a common effort to maintain law and order.

I have great confidence in the ability of state and local government to combat the menace of criminal activity.

The states traditionally have had the primary responsibility for the enactment, the enforcement, and the judicial application of criminal law.

It is significant that our basic laws--which prohibit major crimes such as murder, robbery and theft--are historically the products of state legislatures. Local police, sheriffs and district attorneys bear the primary responsibility for preserving the peace and maintaining law and order. This is as it should be, for it is through strong state and local governments that the individual citizen can know what is going on, can participate in the determination of public policy, and can hold public officials accountable.

Yet if the states are to hold this position as the principal elements for the administration of criminal justice, they must achieve the highest level of efficiency, effectiveness and mutual cooperation. I am satisfied that this can be done, and that the people will be better served, than if we simply surrender our responsibilities to an all-powerful, centralized federal government. There are those who would allow the national government to usurp the authority and the responsibility of our various states on some vague grounds--as yet unproven--of greater efficiency, or more extensive resources, or some other ill-defined reason.

Yet I think that we can demonstrate that when it comes to solving the problems of people--including the crime problem--state and local government have a vitality, an effectiveness, and an ability which can never be matched by a centralized bureaucracy.

What we need in state government, however, is not only that authority and responsibility which we now possess, but also the resources and the revenue capacity which will support increased effort at the state and local level. I don't believe in the federal government imposing massive taxes upon other people in our states--to the point where their ability to provide the revenue for state and local government is seriously diminished--and then turn around and give funds back to the states for specific purposes, with strings attached, and with a large amount taken off the top in the course of administering such grants. Our citizens would receive better results if such resources were left at home in the first place where they could be put to effective use by those levels of government which are closest to the people.

There is no question that certain problems fall within the responsibility of the federal government and require action on a nation-wide basis. Criminal enterprises that cross state lines and interstate flight to avoid prosecution require the attention of federal agencies. But the most effective of these agencies--the FBI--has always operated on a basis of assisting and reinforcing state and local law enforcement agencies, not attempting to supersede or replace these vital units of our criminal justice system.

The relationship between the states and the federal government must be one of clearly defined roles, developed on a partnership basis. The authority and responsibility of each state in serving the public safety must be recognized and respected.

Your Association can provide an outstanding example of the way in which state governments can work together to improve the administration of justice by mutual cooperation and creative innovation. The development of close working relationships, initiated by the representatives of state governments themselves, offers a constructive alternative to increased federalism. Through your efforts you can achieve the highest standards of efficiency and effectiveness, while still maintaining institutions of government that are responsible and responsive to the guidance of its citizens.

I extend my best wishes to you for a most successful Conference, and have an enjoyable stay in California.

* * * * *

(Note: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be additions to, or changes in, the above. However, the Governor will stand by the above quotes.)

Sacramento, California
Contact: Paul Beck
445-4571 6.3.68

EXCERPTS OF SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
REPUBLICAN RALLY
OAKLAND COLISEUM ARENA, OAKLAND
June 3, 1968

In his State of the Union Message, the president remarked on an atmosphere of unease pervading our land--for obvious reasons he did not suggest that government might have contributed to this unease, that as the New Deal and the Fair Deal became the New Frontier and the Great Society, they took us down a strange and unwanted road leading to a land of discontent.

There is little that was new in the New Frontier and nothing that was great in the Great Society except the cost, the extravagance, and the inability to solve the pressing problems of our time. They have carelessly tinkered with the intricate machinery of government that was our guarantee that government's only power would be that provided by us, until without quite knowing how it happened, the government has discovered a source of power beyond our control.

Our gold is gone, paper money can be exchanged any time for more paper, and our coins rattle with the flat sound of copper. We are no longer in control of our currency, and Europeans have made it plain they are willing to exercise that control to protect their own interests.

The Palace Guard fight among themselves for a crown tossed to them like a bride's bouquet by a leader who promised more than he could deliver. And, regardless of what they say or promise along the campaign trail, no one of them can deny the part he has played in amassing the sorry record of failure that marks the Administration in Washington.

They all must take some measure of the blame for urging the belief on us that the road to the promised land lay over the shards of burned and looted cities. That our national duty in Vietnam could be laid aside or at least given lesser priority than slum clearance and free lunches; that our youth need not honor the draft and that some could choose the laws they would obey. Pie in the sky! If we would only get the country moving again. Moving where? There is no simple prescription for anarchy. This is a grand design for the apocalypse.

It is time to top escalating the promise and start enforcing the law before this great country is torn to pieces. It is time for all of us to recognize what is at stake in this election year. Is a government successful because it outranks all others in spending? At some point doesn't someone have to ask if such a government is first in performance?

How should we judge welfare in America, and are we successful because we are spending ten times as much in this supposed era of prosperity as we were in the dark depths of the Depression? Last year when unemployment reached a new low for the period since World War II, we added 700,000 more to the welfare rolls. Wouldn't it make more sense to restate the purpose of welfare and examine our progress toward accomplishing that purpose? Was welfare intended to be a permanent handout or was it supposed to be a hand up to independence and self respect? Federal aid to the poor has increased 290 percent in the last eight years, but at the same time government insists the number of poor has doubled.

Over the last year some of you have heard me report on the condition of this state when we took office. I did not know for a while whether I had been elected governor or appointed receiver. You know of some of the steps we began taking almost immediately after the Inaugural in an effort to restore fiscal stability. You were painfully aware on April 15 of one of the steps we took.

I am sure, however, there must be some confusion in the minds of many of you about budgetary matters and the conflicting figures you are hearing right now. But first, because there seems to be an effort on the part of some to portray this administration as only budget and economy minded, let me bring you up to date on some other facets of the Creative Society you have not heard so much about.

In one area particularly, there has been so much controversy and so many emotional charges, a few facts may be in order. With the exception of one or two small population states, California is spending more per patient in mental health than any other state. California is also first in the percentage of mentally ill patients returned to society able to live useful, normal lives. We are number one among all the major states in the effective treatment of the mentally ill.

our so-called heartless regime with its alleged callous disregard of human values nearly doubled the number of handicapped in 1967 over the previous year who were rehabilitated and made self-supporting. In 1966, California ranked 12th among the states in total rehabilitation. We are now second. This meant a reduction of \$2,750,000 in welfare payments and total earnings for those rehabilitated of \$4,500,000. The return to the state economy for every dollar invested in rehabilitation is \$35.

We rank first in the rehabilitation of disabled persons who have been receiving Social Security disability payments. We are first among the states in the number of blind-operated vending stand locations and net income to the operations. In the 14 months between January, 1967, and March, 1968, more than 10,000 disabled were put into employment and the Department is currently serving more than 50,000.

We are bound in by a great many federal regulations in welfare limiting us as to what can be accomplished to make welfare more effective and at the same time more within our financial capacity.

We are allowed to experiment, however. So with federal permission we are launching a pilot welfare program in one city--Fresno. All of the multitude of welfare programs are being put into one single coordinated program under one director.

Welfare's task is to make people independent of welfare. We are going to break the welfare dependency cycle. We are confident this idea will work and that in a year and a half or two years, we will have evidence to show that Washington should give us permission to do this on a statewide basis. We already have the cooperation of private business for the job part of this program.

Today thousands of employers in California are mobilized in a program to provide jobs in 16 urban centers. In the Long Beach, Los Angeles area where it has been underway the longest, you might be interested to know that the ratio of Negro unemployment to white unemployment is now less than 1½ to one, as contrasted to 2½ to one in the rest of the nation.

San Diego has just announced their first thousand placements in private enterprise jobs there. The story is the same in San Francisco, and San Jose, Fresno, Pomona, and other cities throughout California. It is no coincidence that unemployment in California, always higher than the rest of the nation, has reached the lowest point since the war.

We have not neglected rehabilitation in our prisons. In one institution apartments, complete with cooking facilities, a homelike atmosphere, have been made available for family visits so that prisoners with good records who are facing return to the outside world can reestablish a normal family relationship with their wives and children.

We have a commission for transportation, including the foremost experts we could find representing every facet of transportation: rail, highway, sea and air. Similarly, we have a commission on pollution, not just of air, but of air, water and waste disposal to treat with what in reality is one problem.

We have the first commission, I believe, in the United States combining government representatives, scientists, and members of all the industries having to do with the sea exploring all the ways by which we can fully utilize our 700 miles of coastland and ocean, including desalinization, recreation, mining the sea bottom and using the sea as a source of food.

We have put together one commission with representatives of every facet of law enforcement. We intend that government will accept its responsibility to protect society from the law breaker and not the other way around. There will be those who say when a Republican makes such a statement, it is further evidence that we are appealing to the white backlash. This is, of course, untrue. I am speaking of crime that victimizes all our citizens. Crime that makes us unsafe in our homes, in our city streets, and that menaces our children with dope and pornography and violence.

The criminal is no racist. A ten-month old Negro child burned to death a few weeks ago in his crib because of an arsonist in one city, and in another city a white child suffered the same fate, and the mothers of both knew the same heartbreak. Perhaps someone will die on the highways in California because a judge ruled that a woman arrested for

drunken driving who(license had been suspended should have that license restored, because at the time of arrest she was too drunk to know her constitutional rights. We have indulged ourselves in permissiveness, blaming everyone but the criminal for his wrongdoings.

Well, the time has come, indeed, is long since past, to declare the individual is responsible for his misdeeds and that justice must be swift and certain. All men, regardless of race, religion, or station in life, must stand equal before the law.

We have been busy with the nuts and bolts part of government, too. We have sought and will go on seeking new ways to make government more efficient and less costly. For a number of years past, 40 days was the time required to process a driver's license. We set out last January to reorganize the entire process with the intention of reducing the 40 days to 10 by July 1. We have reached that goal 45 ahead of schedule.

We have worked with our sister states to make our borders meeting places rather than dividing lines. With Nevada we are cooperating to preserve Lake Tahoe.

On June 12, California and Arizona representatives will meet in Yuma where steps will be taken to combine our agricultural inspection stations into one joint operation at the border to eliminate the necessity of produce trucks having to stop twice---once in Arizona and again in California for inspection.

But many of you are confused by the sound and fury coming out of Sacramento in this election year. Over the past several months, and reaching a crescendo in these last few weeks, you have heard conflicting statements regarding state revenues and state expenditures. You have been witness to charges that this administration has, through inexperience or deliberate falsehood, given false estimates regarding our fiscal situation. Those making the charges are playing a dangerous, irresponsible game of cheap politics at the expense of the people.

According to their claims, Medi-Cal was a paragon of financial virtue, never guilty of the overspending we claimed and blessed at year's end with a surplus. The facts are very simple. In the budget we inherited last year, Medi-Cal was allocated \$151 million. One month before we took office they upped it to \$179 million. By spring the program was in need of a supplemental appropriation because the estimate was \$202 million. It finished the year last June 30 costing \$263 million, and the budget deficit would have exceeded \$60 million if we had^{not} had \$23 million saved in other departments by our economies which, with unused funds returned by the Department of Education, gave us a balanced budget.

While this was going on, our legislature was considering the budget we had submitted for this current year. The screams of our opponents in the majority party would have curdled your blood. Not because we suggested spending too much, but because we had reduced the requests for spending by \$127 million and we made it plain that was a conservative estimate of the economies we hoped to make as the year went on. Nothing revealed the difference in philosophy between our two parties so much as their approach to the fiscal crisis that required that gigantic tax increase.

Even as they were admitting to its necessity, they were introducing spending measures which, if passed, would have added almost \$700 million to the cost of government. As it was, I was forced to veto \$80 million

worth and blue pencil \$43.5 million they added to the budget.

Senator George Miller from over in Contra Costa County took to the luncheon circuit a few months ago with a speech he launched across the bay at the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco. The senator has played a kind of gruff watchdog of finances for a number of years. I don't know what he was watching in the eight years before we came along, or maybe he just had a touch of distemper, because someone did to state finances what the Indians did to Custer.

At any rate, in his speech he charged that we were asking almost double the taxes necessary to square things and two minutes later, said: "As a climax, I predict the governor faces a \$200 million deficit."

Just a few weeks ago when the estimate on tax revenues came in, he claimed we would have a \$300 million surplus. The next time the senator and I play golf---I'll keep the score.

That tax estimate was the one indicating we would have some \$42 million more from personal income and corporate taxes than had been expected. To hear some of our friends from across the aisle, you would think this was evidence of some crime we had committed. Let me take a minute to explain the origin of those revenue estimates.

For more than 20 years, California has benefited from the knowledge and skill of leading economists on our campuses and in our business and financial community. Each year they make a considered and studied projection of what our tax revenues will be more than a year ahead, and government plans accordingly. Then as we get into the year, and there is additional evidence and information, they check and correct their estimates. For 20 years, their record has been phenomenal, never missing by more than one or two percentage points. This year, sales, horse racing and alcoholic beverage taxes were under their estimate, but the other taxes were higher, and the net result was an error of less than $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 percent.

Of course, the speaker of the assembly, who resents being referred to as either sizable or paternal, sees in this modest windfall a chance to take himself off the hook for his education bill which was a miracle of bad arithmetic. Jesse authored a bill to parcel out an authorized \$145 million in local school aid. The Department of Education has informed me he overshot the mark by \$70 million this year and a possible \$82 million next year. I can only go by their figures and no

provision was made in either year for these amounts. I asked him to do something about it and he claimed he couldn't afford to offend what he called the education lobby in an election year.

He denies making a legislative goof---and he^{is} right. This was no error. There are no secrets in Sacramento. Mr. Unruh deliberately overspent in an attempt to create a budget deficit to the embarrassment of this administration and at the expense of the California taxpayers

Well, thanks to the increased revenue and more than \$50 million we have saved by streamlining and efficiencies in welfare and Medi-Cal, we can cover the \$70 million. As for next year's \$82 million (and there is now some question as to whether it is that much) I'll do what any businessman would---assume it is the greater amount and budget accordingly. If I am to be surprised next year, I'd prefer a happy surprise.

Sometimes the capitol is a little like handling sled dogs in Alaska. You can harness them, feed them and pat them on the head---but don't fall down, they will tear you to pieces.

I wish I could tell you all our financial problems have been solved, but they haven't been. In the areas of welfare and education, costs are still going up faster than our revenues increase. Hugh Flournoy heads up a group that has taken the findings of our tax task force and is working to bring forth a comprehensive tax reform package that will include property tax relief. In the meantime, we have asked the legislature to return \$35 million in income tax relief to a certain middle income group who were hit unjustly and harder than had been figured in last year's tax increase.

This does not mean we are doing this because we can afford to reduce taxes, and certainly it is^{not,} as our opponents charge, a rich man's tax cut at the expense of the poor. An injustice has been done to one particular group of citizens---that injustice should be corrected

Some of our democratic friends act as if a store keeper who has shortchanged a customer shouldn't give the money back to the one entitled to it but should give it to someone else he decides might have greater need for it.

We are implementing as fast as possible the 1500 task force reports from the nearly 300 citizens who gave so much in time and effort to help us bring common sense to government. We have already put 379

recommendations into operation for an estimated potential savings of \$105.5 million a year, and a one-time savings of \$16 million. Another potential \$65 million worth are scheduled between now and January, and there is another \$66 million in potential savings in measures that will require legislative approval.

That/^{is} why this election is important. We are frustrated in many things we promised to do by a four vote margin in the Assembly and by the Senate situation that still permits our legislation to be buried in committee.

Money is important and you have provided that tonight, but you are important. Call your Republican headquarters, ask how you can be of help in the coming campaign. Give us a majority in Sacramento and give the Creative Society a chance to really function.

#

(NOTE: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be additions to, or changes in, the above. However, the Governor will stand by the above quotes.)

6/5

TRANSCRIPT OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN'S REMARKS
JOEY BISHOP SHOW
June 5, 1968

Joey - Governor Reagan, are you there?

Governor - Yes, Joey.

Joey - Hi

Governor - How do you do?

Joey - I'm all right sir. I know that this is an imposition, I know that you, as a matter of fact, cut short the staff meeting so that you could afford us the opportunity of speaking to you as the governor of the state of California in which a great tragedy has occurred. I just wanted to get some of your viewpoints on how we abolish what is happening, how do we prevent it, what do we do about it?

Governor - Well, Joey, never mind anything that I might have cut short. I am very grateful for the opportunity to speak to all of you and to speak to some of our fellow Californians and our fellow citizens in other states about this--a great tragedy that has occurred here. A young man has been struck down in a senseless and savage act. I am sure that all of us are praying not only for him but for his family and for those others who were so senselessly struck down also in the fusillade of bullets that came from the would-be assassin's gun. There is a pall over our state; all of us feel it. At the same time, though, I would like to say that I am in great disagreement with those among us who are counseling that we should all feel a collective sense of guilt. Two hundred million Americans did not do this. One young man did it, and not even for an American reason. It develops now that this young man believed that because the senator from New York advocated our nation's support of Israel in their conflict with the Arab nations, that he had to perform this vile act in some way for his country, and that was not this country--that was Jordan. I have to say to those people who would suggest that we are all guilty whenever a terrible thing of this kind happens that there can be no such collective guilt. I am sure that all of the people in your studio, all of the people there with you, all of the people here in this studio, everyone that I have met so far, feels this great sense of tragedy, this loss, and is deeply concerned not only about our nation, but about this particular family and the tragedy that has struck. As I say, all of us are praying and, I believe we should go on praying, to the best of our ability, to ask for God's mercy in what has happened to us.

The American people have seen lawlessness and violence come to our nation over the past decade, and I do not believe this is something advocated by the majority of people or that Americans want it. On the contrary, I think most Americans are deeply disturbed, deeply disturbed by what seems to be a loss of principle and standard, a loss of all our moral beliefs.

Now, we have known times in the past, in almost any period of history, when people have broken the social code, broken the rules, broken the laws. But always they knew they were breaking the law. They knew what they were doing was against the moral and ethical code. The disturbing thing in America is that we have had too many people, people in high places, people in and out of our government, who have been suggesting not that we are breaking the rules, but that the rules no longer apply; that the moral standards by which we have lived all these many years, no longer apply; that there has been a change; that we are throwing out the code and saying that people should do what they choose to do. And some of this began with some leaders who, with the best of intentions, suggested that in order to right certain wrongs, in order to correct certain things, it was alright for some of us to choose the laws we would obey.

This can lead only to a law that exists on the basis of who can carry the biggest club. We must return to a belief that no matter how much we disagree with the law, we must follow the usual channels, if we believe they are proper, in getting the law changed. But until it is changed, we abide by and believe in, the law. We must return

to the principle that the individual is responsible for his misdeeds and must pay the price. We must do away with this permissiveness, this idea that society is to blame for all the wrongdoing, for all the misdeeds that take place in our country. Now, I had my political differences, of course, with Senator Kennedy, and yet, the funny thing was to find out how much we all have in common in this country. In recent days here in California, Senator Kennedy has been expressing the desire that this nation should do exactly what we have been trying to do, what some of us have been saying here. The government must become closer to the people; that we must do away with such things as a meaningless welfare that simply perpetuates people in poverty and keeps them on a dole. We must seek a way to give them a hand-up instead of a hand-out; that we must lift them up to where they can be self-sustaining. As a matter of fact, a great Jewish philosopher of the 11th Century, Maimonides, suggested a number of ways in which you can help those who need help. The poorest, he said, is simply to give a man a hand-out. The best is to teach him to help himself. The Talmud tells us that for a father not to teach his son how to make a living is to teach him literally how to steal, because that might be the inevitable result.

Joey - Well, Governor Reagan, I don't mean to interrupt you, but we have Father Kaiser here. Would you like to give the New Testament some equal time?

Governor - Yes, the man from Galilee had a great deal to say about individual responsibility, and that each man must find his own salvation in his own soul. But, about this particular tragedy, as I say, I think it began with those of us who did decide or who admitted or agreed that it was alright for civil disobedience, for the breaking of laws with which we were in disagreement. And, I say that this is what has led us to this particular point. America is not to blame as a society. I think the people of America are deeply concerned by the course our country has been taking.

The enemy sits in Moscow. I call him an enemy because I believe he has proven this, by deed, in the Middle East. The actions of the enemy led to and precipitated the tragedy of last night. Tonight, we find that this same Soviet power has impressed upon the world its belief that the end justifies the means, that there is no morality except ^{that} which furthers the cause we are trying to put over.

Yet, we must make up our minds as to where we stand, with regard to our belief in morality, in law, and in individual responsibility. I say again that all of us have a prayer in our hearts with regard to this tragedy, I say again that the challenge to America is not to castigate ourselves over something for which we were not responsible. Rather, we must say that as of this moment, there will be an end to Americans putting up with, or tolerating, those who advocate the taking of the law into their own hands; that we are, once again, going to become a land in which we are not necessarily our brothers' keepers but our brothers' brothers; that we are going to become a land that abides by the law, that believes in the sanctity of the law that believes in morality.

Joey - We are speaking largely now about the majority, but I think the president himself issued a statement that all presidential candidates are now, I notice, put under the tight security ring, around most of the presidential candidates. Is that true, sir?

Governor - Yes, as a matter of fact, I learned today that the declared candidates have had secret service assigned to them.

Joey - Have you, governor?

Governor - No, I am not a declared candidate. But, Joey, I do not think there is anyone serving in public office today who does not realize that he is in a climate which is endangered by a very dangerous faction in our country--that he is a potential target. He recognizes that certain hazards go with his profession--the same as a soldier.

Joey - Did this same climate hold true in 1864, and at the time when Mayor Cermac of Chicago was shot when they were trying to assassinate President Roosevelt? Was this, or is there, a certain era that this country goes through which produces a kind of violence and immorality over a period of years? Do we find ourselves almost repeating it? Is that so? Does that happen?

Governor - No, Joe, I think we have always had the political assassin. I think a certain segment of our society has always believed in taking the law into its own hands. That is why we have prisons, courts, our entire judicial system. But I think what is coming upon us today is a sort of permissiveness by society which says the criminal is no longer a criminal--that he is some sort of psychological misfit, and all of us are to blame for what happened to him, what made him this way.

The great tendency of some of our recent judicial decisions has been to overweigh the balance on the part of the accused, forgetting that government's principal responsibility is to protect society from the lawbreaker, and not the other way around. All I'm saying is that the difference between those days and today is the difference between the people who knew they were breaking the rules and people today who are trying to foist off on us the philosophy that rules no longer apply, that each one of us is sole judge, jury and decider of what the rules are.

Joey - Governor Reagan, as governor of the state of California, do you intend to pass some sort of legislation regarding how easy it is to obtain a gun?

Governor - Joey, I think that the flurry over the gun law treats the symptom, and not the cause.

Joey - I have some statistics I looked up today.

Governor - Alright, o.k.

Joey - And in this country, 56 hundred people were victims of gunshots. In England, because there was a law against it, there was 30. And I think it was France, there were only 12. But we were 56 hundred as opposed to 30 in one country and 12 in another. Does that seem to have some bearing on the bearing of guns and the carrying of guns?

Governor - Well Joey, how many other murders were committed by other means? For example, this type of assassin last night showed a complete disregard for his own safety. He wasn't hiding someplace to take a shot. He walked right in, knowing that he had to be apprehended, and yet he was willing to take the chance. Isn't this similar to the assassination of the emperor of the Austria-Hungarian empire that began World War I, who did it with a bomb? He walked up and tossed a bomb into a carriage. Wouldn't this man, without a gun, have gone with a knife instead? Isn't it true that this kind of man would find a gun, would obtain a gun in some way, normally through theft? The criminal has no trouble getting one. I don't see the point of just registering firearms so we know who has them. I'm quite sure that this young man was not a psychopath; I'm quite sure that he would have had no trouble, under whatever law, in legitimately obtaining or buying a gun.

No, I think what we've got to treat now ^{are} the causes. We have to get down to "what is this atmosphere?" What is this atmosphere, for example, that begins on a campus, that says that young hoodlums can come in and, under the name of some cause they believe in, interfere with the activities of thousands and thousands of students who are legitimately bent on getting an education, who can vandalize the property of the university or college, who can sit there in the office and interrupt orderly processes. And we're denied, supposedly, the right to exact any punishment or even expel them from school. I believe that there is a principal, an inherited law that says that crime must be followed by swift and certain justice, not necessarily punishment. I think we have to review our permissive attitude.

I read a little piece the other day by a psychology professor who told of an incident in New York in which a young lady was being attacked in an apartment building. A group of men holding a meeting on the second floor came out on the landing. They saw what was going on but never interfered. Then they went back into their meeting. What makes this particularly newsworthy is the purpose of the meeting: to pass some resolutions on how they as committee members could be of more help to unfortunate people. Their help did not include going down one flight of stairs to help a young lady who was the victim of a terrible crime of violence.

Joey - Governor Reagan, I hate to interrupt, sir, but having done a show of your own, some time back, I'm sure that you know that you have to break away once in a while for a commercial, and I must say

sir, in all fairness to myself, that when you did Death Valley Days, I stayed with you through the commercial and after. I hope you'll do the same for me.

Governor - Well, I don't know that I've said all that needs to be said.

Joey - I did want to ask you one more very important question. After we come back from this, I'll hook you somehow.

Governor - I'll be here.

Joey - I do want to find out from you how all this looks to the rest of the world, if you'll just extend me the courtesy of doing this when we come back, and then I will let you go. I will pardon you, governor.

(Commercial)

Joey - If you can, in a few words, or whatever amount of time it takes, tell us how we look in the eyes of the rest of the world....with all the violence that's taking place here.

Governor - Well, you know, Joey, that doesn't bother me too much because I think there's a great deal of anti-Americanism in the world --perhaps we have brought some of it on ourselves. I'm sure that there are going to be writers sharpening their pencils right now all over the world who are going to gleefully point at this, in spite of its tragic nature, as another example of the supposed decadence of America. Most of them wouldn't even be free to write what they wanted to write if this country, ever since World War II, hadn't been standing between them and the barbarians, if we hadn't been pouring out our treasure and guaranteeing our strength, that they had the right to autonomy and freedom. They would have been overwhelmed in five minutes without us. So they don't bother me too much at all.

I think what we should be concerned about, and I have said this before, is that it is time that this country assumes some leadership from its governmental level, and say to the rest of the world: "We're not going to buy your affection anymore, or try to. We're going to demand your respect." We do this best when our government recognizes that the prime function of government is to protect the rights of the individual, to guarantee that he is secure in his person and his property, and that he is safe in his home and his place of business. I'll tell you this. As far as it can be done from a state level, we're going to do that in California, so help me God.

Joey - Governor Reagan, I should like to take this opportunity of thanking you for two occasions--once, for carrying on my opening show, and once again for appearing tonight, and I do hope that next time we meet, it will be under much happier circumstances. Thank you, Governor Reagan.

Governor - Thank you.

#

6/13

EXCERPTS OF SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
Indiana State Fairgrounds, Indianapolis, Indiana
June 13, 1968

Normally on an evening such as this, it would be appropriate to air some political jokes designed to bring discomfort to our opponents while at the same time we sought to inspire ourselves to greater efforts in the campaign ahead. Indeed, I had just such a speech prepared. But I cannot find it within myself to deliver those remarks and it is doubtful you are in the mood to hear them.

Our minds are still on the senseless ^(Kennedy) tragedy of a week ago, asking the why of such things. We have been given some answers already, but I for one find it unacceptable and worse than no answer at all to be told that all of us collectively are to blame and that ours is a sick society. Perhaps we are sick, but not in the way they mean it. We are sick with grief, sick with anger and sick of what has been allowed to go on in this nation for too long a time.

Not even among those of us who were politically opposed can any be found who condone or even feel indifferent to the act of senseless savagery. And it was just that--utterly senseless and bearing no relationship to the causes articulated by the senator. It was the violence of war in the Middle East imported by an alien.

The senator had been speaking of unity among our people, of healing our wounds with respect for law and order, instead of the kind of violence that has beset us. Let us continue that talk. In this week of tragedy six policemen in Chicago have been ^{assaulted} ~~killed~~ in line of duty. Two young Marine officers were murdered in cold blood in our nation's capital because of the uniforms they wore. It is time for an accounting of the stewardship that has left us a nation where this can happen--- a nation whose president cannot reveal his travel plans among his own people because of fear for his personal safety. We talk bravely of sending a man across space to the moon, but we cannot guarantee a citizen's safety on a walk across the park.

In the name of academic freedom and even free speech some, claiming privilege because of intellectual attainment, encourage students in their charge to deny cabinet members and even the vice president the

right to speak on the campus. At the same time, they arrogantly demand that it be offered as a forum for Communist speakers and domestic radicals. If permission is denied, they threaten to burn down the school. They advocate increased welfare not by pleading that we become more charitable, but because the fruit of our toil is not ours to control. We should be forced to meet our less fortunate fellow citizen across a bargaining table where they will tell us what they consider their fair share of our earnings.

The taking over and vandalizing of public buildings interfering with normal services is all defined as the proper use of force. Resistance to such illegal acts by the police is described as violence and police brutality. It is a new and novel way of saying "the end justifies the means."

There have been revolutions against tyranny all through man's history, beneficent revolutions such as the one that gave birth to this nation. The revolution we are seeing today is the very reverse, a revolution in favor of tyranny. A tiny minority of radical malcontents with a hodgepodge variety of causes is actually rebelling against the people's freedom. They demand that we be made subject to a government which will have the power to redistribute our earnings and possessions while it denies us the right of even self-protection. In pursuit of this goal, legislators are subjected to coercion by endless marches, demonstrations and acts of mass civil disobedience.

The great complexity of modern problems is their justification for moving all decision making to the level of government, preferably the federal government. They scorn common sense answers as oversimplification. Better to muddy up the water and avoid not the simple but the hard decision requiring courage.

Right now, for example, our minds are on the breakdown in law and order, the erosion of old and valued standards and the violence that stalks our land and we turn to those who are supposed to be our leaders. The only answers we get are classics of oversimplification. Make it more difficult for the legitimate citizen to obtain a gun and assassinations will no longer take place, legislate prejudice out of all men's hearts, confess that we are filled with hatred for our fellow men.

But there already was a law against the assassin having a gun and most of us do not feel prejudice or hatred. It is time to review our heritage, time to seek the truth and face the facts. It is time to get angry.

Five years ago a president was murdered (one who renounced his American citizenship to embrace the Godless philosophy of Communism and it was Communist violence he brought to our land.

The shattering sound of his shots were still ringing in our ears when a policy decision was made to play down his Communist attachment lest we provoke the Soviet Union. It is that same kind of fuzzy thinking that counsels disregard for laws we find personally offensive.

Some of those so willing to find society sick have a quick and easy--you might almost say simple--cure--provide more education, end poverty, pour more money into social programs. But there has never been so much free schooling and trade training.

Illiteracy is at an all-time low and affluence at an all-time high. Aid to the poor has increased 290 percent over the period of the last eight years. Still, your chances of being murdered, maimed or robbed this year are one out of 70. By comparison, your chance of dying from any and all causes is only one out of 100. One out of five families will be the victim of a criminal this year. One boy in six will get in trouble before he is 18. Crime is increasing six times as fast as the increase in population.

The District of Columbia Grand Jury met five days a week for eight weeks and as a result of what they learned released a letter expressing their shock and dismay. They protested the limitations placed on the police in their fight against crime. They said, "If you happen to murder someone in the near future, feel free to confess to one or a hundred people. Unless you are informed of your rights in the most precise terminology, the odds are that the judiciary branch will see to your freedom."

The letter represented the unanimous thinking of the 23-member panel. The U.S. Attorney's Office officially protested their action in writing and releasing such a letter to their fellow citizens.

And of course it is the custom in this political season to portray any discussion of crime as having an underlying racial motive--an appeal to white backlash. Well, that Grand Jury was predominantly Negro and they expressed themselves as amazed and shocked at the considerate treatment given those who prowl the streets of our nation's capital, "indulging themselves in outrageous acts."

To any member of the white community who with or without prejudice tends to look for statistics indicating the minorities commit a disproportionate amount of crime, let us make one thing very plain; the minority communities are victims of crime out of all proportion to their numbers. Criminals are not bigoted and they are color blind; they rob, maim or murder without reference to race or religion.

In our humanitarian society we have safeguarded the rights of the accused. Nothing horrifies us so much as the possibility of punishing the non-guilty. But now we have carried this to an excessive concern for the guilty. We do not call the criminal a criminal; he is a patient made ill by the failure of society. And since society cannot be tried for its crime, why should he take the blame?

Permissiveness from cradle to crime is our philosophy and what were once considered privileges are now recognized as rights, and first and foremost is the right to adjust any grievance by the nearest means at hand, be it rock, club or fire bomb.

Our Constitution has been eroded by court decisions pretending to extend freedom to all when in reality they gave license to a few. Guilt or innocence is of less importance than the legal niceties. The confessed killer of wife and four children walks free because of his confession, not in spite of it. His lawyer was not present to hear it. Another confessed murderer walks our streets a free man because the police held him too long--a matter of hours--before formally charging him with the crime he had voluntarily confessed.

My friend, Governor Jack Williams of Arizona, in a recent address, asked a poignant question--who weeps for the innocent?

He said, "In 1948 in Texas a 12-year-old girl lost her life. She had a right to live. Just at the entrance to her teens, where (as the poet wrote) 'the brook and river meet,' she was killed.

"Her assailant was an itinerant piano player. Twelve years after that he was out of prison and upon his release, as sure as the sun rose that morning, other lives were threatened somewhere in the years ahead.

"One of them, a Tempe rancher, had lived not quite his three score and ten, but he did not deserve to die when death came upon him at the hand of that same itinerant piano player. He had a right to live.

"Marguerita Bejarano, age 8, is another whose life and death were inextricably entwined in this macabre web. She had not reached the age of adolescence. Her innocence was that of childhood, yet within her was the promise of all girlhood, and behind she left her dolls and her mud pies and her bedside prayers and her grieving family.

"Three lives sacrificed to some strange fixation our nation has developed that the criminal needs protection against the innocent.

"'Who speaks for the dead?' Who speaks for the almost-teenager

"How many lives down the years ahead have already been unwittingly and remorselessly doomed through this system?

"What kind of world is this that cares not for the Marguerita Bejaranos, but dissolves in maudlin tears for those who take life?

"How many more must die before we again come to the realization that the good man obeys the law because he fears God, and the bad man because he fears the consequences if he gets caught?"

Yes, and how many more will die because now the guilty have so little reason to fear getting caught?

It is possible that someone will die on a highway in California because of our obsessive concern for legal technicalities. The judge ruled that a drunken driver must have his driver's license returned to him, because at the time of arrest he was too drunk to know his constitutional rights.

A sports writer in Los Angeles, Jim Murray, turned from the arena long enough last week to comment on "a country that shrinks from punishing its criminals, disciplining its children and locking up its mad." He likened it to a lamb defending the lion's right to eat it and said, "the Consitution was never conceived as a shield for degeneracy. You start out burning the flag and you end up burning Detroit. A young, vigorous country is immobilized by bumper stickers, slogans, neurotic students with their feet on desks they couldn't make, pulling down universities they wouldn't know how to rebuild."

Out of 17,800 students at Columbia University, there are 200 who belong to S.D.S. (Students for a Democratic Society). Those initials should stand for Students to Destroy Society.. Only 200, but they held a dean hostage, occupied buildings for six days, hoisted the red flag and forced the undergraduate division to cancel a full month of classes. One of the leaders of this rag-tag mob has since admitted that if the university had acted decisively and called in the police in the first hour, the rebels would have folded like a house of cards. But in our permissive society, aggression is met with appeasement.

I do not mean to pick on Columbia; the story could be told about a hundred different schools. And the story will go on until parents, alumnae, trustees and that large silent majority of students and faculty and taxpayers say loud and clear, "obey the rules or get out."

Are we a callous people indifferent to human suffering. or is our failure to eradicate proverty and human misery the result of the

same soft permissiveness? The record speaks for itself. We have shared our wealth more widely among our people than any society here-to-fore known to man.

But the Zeitgeist--the wind of the times--is against us. The new social philosophy places no premium on the old virtues of thrift and self-reliance. The hand up has been replaced by the hand out.

Employment reached an all-time high this year and so did welfare both in the number of people receiving it and the number of programs doling it out. Last year's 739,000 additions to the rolls made the total almost 8,000,000. Most of whom would rather be out on their own with jobs instead of caught up in the more than 450 programs.

Eight cabinet departments and 12 so-called independent agencies administer to their health. There are 35 separate housing programs, community assistance facilities are provided by 62 agencies, 33 federal agencies meddle in nearly 300 consumer protection agencies, and in just one medium-sized city 140 separate urban projects have been found administered by seven federal departments. Thirty-six million Americans share in assorted government food programs and 6,000,000 more get surplus food packages or help through the food stamp plan. Still we are told there are 10,000,000 undernourished who must be helped immediately--and that means still more bureaucracy.

In the meantime, we hear of payroll padding, kickbacks and high administrative overhead as poverty funds are filtered through the political machinery of some of our cities. A convicted felon gets \$300,000 intended for disadvantaged youths who remain disadvantaged as he cashes phony paychecks made out to ghost employers.

A \$53,000,000 program is divided \$13 million for the poor and \$40 million for administrative overhead. In Detroit a legislative investigating committee called the unkept promises of the poverty program fraud, explaining that promises were not kept because more than half the funds went to cure the poverty problems of the administrators. And the morality gap extends beyond our borders.

A current national magazine carries a story, apparently well documented, by a reputable journalist telling of the corruption in Vietnam. A Chinese Communist firm was paid more than half a million dollars to deliver rice to the hungry people of that war torn country, but some of the not so hungry skimmed off \$92,000 in pocket money. Perhaps we can shrug off buying \$24,000 worth of medicine for the

peasants that turned out to be bottled sea water. But what should anger us deep down inside is to learn that while our young men are fighting and dying, American-made guns and rockets, intended for their use, are finding their way through the black market and into enemy houses.

It is a multi-billion dollar traffic, according to the author, which our officials claim cannot be stopped because we are guests in the country. They make it sound like an invitation to a beach cottage and bring your own towels.

It is time to tell friend and foe alike, we are in Vietnam because it is in our national interest to be there and whether it offends friend or foe, we are going to do what has to be done beginning now.

We can go on pinning our faith in a government that has shown no faith in the people or we can rediscover our own great ability to govern ourselves.

We opened the West without a redevelopment agency, and won our wars with citizen soldiers and dollar a year men. We have survived foreign intrigue, civil war, cataclysmic depressions and at the same time we have maintained an orderly, compassionate society with more freedom for the individual than man has ever known.

We have no reason to be fearful and we should dismiss those in high places who have sounded the uncertain note.

We have had enough of dividing our people into voter levels, setting class against class, race against race for partisan political advantage. It is time to stop being our brother's keeper and try being our brother's brother.

There is an American out there who has been a forgotten man, perhaps because he asked little of government except freedom. He holds the whole bureaucratic structure of government on his tired back and he works two and a half hours of each day just to pay its cost. He and his wife are first in line to share food, clothing and shelter when catastrophe strikes a neighbor--even a neighbor who lives half a world away and speaks a different tongue.

This forgotten American is black, he is white, he is all the shades in between, and sometimes he wasn't even born here but he built this country and he can do it again.

He deserves better representation than he has had of late. But his vote is not for sale. He wants leadership that will restore his faith in government and perhaps in himself. He believes that all men should stand equal before the law, and the law should be enforced to protect him in his person, his property and his business. He does not want his government beholden to corrupt political machines or run by political hacks and cronies. If his country is in trouble, he wants government to level with him and tell him what he can do to help.

He loves peace, but not at any price. Through his government he will extend the hand of friendship to every nation, but not out of fear. He is tired of trying to buy the world's affection and he would like to demand its respect. If his son is called upon to fight he wants his government to say it will be for a cause worth winning and he will be allowed to win. He wants to be told that wherever he walks in the world his country's flag will defend his God-given right to life and liberty.

He would like to hear his government say: "Stealing the Pueblo and kidnapping our young men is a humiliation this nation will not endure."

Little minds and timid men do not build great societies; only a great people can do that and we are a great people.

A young American not many years ago said something about what our country stood for---something about Americans wanting the rest of the world to know that we were willing to pay any price, bear any burden to make what we stand for endure and prevail.

There was no uncertain sound to the trumpet in John Kennedy's inaugural speech. The pity is that those who inherited the power and responsibility from him, including many of his own lieutenants, no longer hear that trumpet or recognize its grand notes.

In the days just ahead, whether we like it or not, you and I are going to write a page in history. It can describe the rise and fall of the United States of America or it can be a recital of our finest hour. Men will live a thousand years in the shadow of our decision.

#

(NOTE: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be additions to, or changes in, the above. However, the governor will stand by the above quotes.)

6/18

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
Sacramento, California
Contact: Paul Beck
445-4571 6.18.68

RELEASE: Tuesday P.M.'s

EXCERPTS OF SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
PHARMACEUTICAL MANUFACTURERS LUNCHEON
Mark Hopkins Hotel, San Francisco
June 18, 1968

It is always a pleasure to appear before a group such as this. We have many things in common. But, unfortunately, we also have one major difference. You have a prescription for almost everything and I just wish I did.

We have come a long way in this nation from the days of the corner drugstore and the soda fountain. Those were the good old days when Hubert Humphrey was still a pharmacist and we all thought that ADA stood for the American Druggists Association.

But the pharmacists have done much to save this nation. We have made the world nearly impossible to live in, but you have given us tranquilizers so that we don't really care.

Unfortunately, there are some afflictions that are even beyond the magic of Dr. Pierce's Golden Medical Discovery to cure--afflictions that take not drugs, but new outlooks and new leadership.

One of these is the affliction of permissiveness that has beset our nation and that must be held accountable for many of our nation's problems.

Our minds are still on the senseless tragedy of two weeks ago, asking the why of such things. We have been given some answers already, but I for one find it unacceptable and worse than no answer at all to be told that all of us collectively are to blame and that ours is a sick society. Perhaps we are sick, but not in the way they mean it. We are sick with grief, sick with anger and sick of what has been allowed to go on in this nation for too long a time.

Not even among those of us who were politically opposed can any be found who condone or even feel indifferent to the act of senseless savagery. And it was just that--utterly senseless and bearing no relationship to the causes advocated by the senator. It was the violence of war in the Middle East imported by an alien.

The senator had been speaking of unity among our people, of healing our wounds with respect for law and order, instead of the kind of violence that has beset us. Let us continue that talk. In that week of tragedy six policemen were assaulted in line of duty. Two young Marine officers were murdered in cold blood in our nation's capital because of the uniforms they wore. It is time for an accounting of the stewardship that has left us a nation where this can happen--a nation whose president cannot reveal his travel plans among his own people because of fear for his personal safety. We talk bravely of sending a man across space to the moon, but we cannot guarantee a citizen's safety on a walk across the park.

In the name of academic freedom and even free speech some, claiming privilege because of intellectual attainment, encourage students in their charge to deny cabinet members and even the vice president the

right to speak on the campus. At the same time they arrogantly demand that it be offered as a forum for Communist speakers and domestic radicals. If permission is denied, they threaten to burn down the school. They advocate increased welfare not by pleading that we become more charitable, but because the fruit of our toil is not ours to control. We should be forced to meet our less fortunate fellow citizen across a bargaining table where they will tell us what they consider their fair share of our earnings.

The taking over and vandalizing of public buildings interfering with normal services is all defined as the proper use of force. Resistance to such illegal acts by the police is described as violence and police brutality. It is a new and novel way of saying "the end justifies the means."

There have been revolutions against tyranny all through man's history, beneficent revolutions such as the one that gave birth to this nation. The revolution we are seeing today is the very reverse, a revolution in favor of tyranny. A tiny minority of radical malcontents with a hodgepodge variety of causes is actually rebelling against the people's freedom. They demand that we be made subject to a government which will have the power to redistribute our earnings and possessions while it denies us the right of even self-protection. In pursuit of this goal, legislators are subjected to coercion by endless marches, demonstrations and acts of mass civil disobedience.

The great complexity of modern problems is their justification for moving all decision making to the level of government, preferably the federal government. They scorn common sense answers as oversimplification. Better to muddy up the water and avoid not the simple, but the hard decision requiring courage.

Right now, for example, our minds are on the breakdown in law and order, the erosion of old and valued standards and the violence that stalks our land and we turn to those who are supposed to be our leaders. The only answers we get are classics of oversimplification. Make it more difficult for the legitimate citizen to obtain a gun and assassinations will no longer take place, legislate prejudice out of all men's hearts, confess that we are filled with hatred for our fellow men.

But there already was a law against the assassin having a gun and most of us do not feel prejudice or hatred. It is time to review our heritage, time to seek the truth and face the facts. It is time to get angry.

Five years ago, a president was murdered by one who renounced his American citizenship to embrace the Godless philosophy of Communism and it was Communist violence he brought to our land.

The shattering sound of his shots were still ringing in our ears when a policy decision was made to play down his Communist attachment lest we provoke the Soviet Union. It is that same kind of fuzzy thinking that counsels disregard for laws we find personally offensive.

Some of those so willing to find society sick have a quick and easy--you might almost say simple--cure---provide more education, end poverty, pour more money into social programs. But there has never been so much free schooling and trade training.

Illiteracy is at an all-time low and affluence at an all-time high. Aid to the poor has increased 290 percent over the period of the last eight years. Still, your chances of being murdered, maimed or robbed this year are one out of 70. By comparison, your chance of dying from any and all causes is only one out of 100. One out of five families will be the victim of a criminal this year. One boy in six will get in trouble before he is 18. Crime is increasing six times as fast as the increase in population.

The District of Columbia Grand Jury met five days a week for eight weeks and as a result of what they learned released a letter expressing their shock and dismay. They protested the limitations placed on the police in their fight against crime. They said, "If you happen to murder someone in the near future, feel free to confess to one or a hundred people. Unless you are informed of your rights in the most precise terminology, the odds are that the judiciary branch will see to your freedom."

The letter represented the unanimous thinking of the 23-member panel. The U.S. Attorney's Office officially protested their action in writing and releasing such a letter to their fellow citizens.

And of course it is the custom in this political season to portray any discussion of crime as having an underlying racial motive--an appeal to white backlash. Well, that Grand Jury was predominantly Negro and they expressed themselves as amazed and shocked at the considerate treatment given those who prowl the streets of our nation's capital, "indulging themselves in outrageous acts."

To any member of the white community who with or without prejudice tends to look for statistics indicating the minorities commit a disproportionate amount of crime, let us make one thing very plain; the minority communities are victims of crime out of all proportion to their numbers. Criminals are not bigoted and they are color blind; they rob, maim or murder without reference to race or religion.

I have just received a letter from a Harlem woman who identifies herself as a Negro, a secretary and a mother. Listen to what she tells me;

"Unless we put an end to lawlessness we can obtain absolutely nothing in this state or the entire country. There are so many Negroes who live decently and want to live in a quite respectable manner. The hoodlum has taken over the streets, parks and all places of enjoyment in New York City. I have a daughter (12 years) and I cannot let her go to the corner store and feel at ease. There was a time when we could walk down 7th Avenue on a hot summer evening and it was quite pleasant. I am only 31 years of age and it hasn't really been long ago.

"There is no respect for elders or the law. My mother was stabbed in New York last May. My mother stepped off the bus and a child (around 12 years) hit her in her side because she was in his way. She didn't realize she was stabbed until she reached home because she bled internally. Thank God she recovered. The assailant was never caught. When the detectives visited our home, my brother wanted to know what could be done to this child if he were caught. The detective's answer was, 'If you caught him yourself and gave him a good whipping, you would be doing more than what we can accomplish.'"

In our humanitarian society we have safeguarded the rights of the accused. Nothing horrifies us so much as the possibility of punishing the non-guilty. But now we have carried this to an excessive concern for the guilty. We do not call the criminal a criminal; he is a patient made ill by the failure of society. And since society cannot be tried for its crime, why should he take the blame?

Permissiveness from cradle to crime is our philosophy and what were once considered privileges are now recognized as rights, and first and foremost is the right to adjust any grievance by the nearest means at hand, be it rock, club or fire bomb.

Our Constitution has been eroded by court decisions pretending to extend freedom to all when in reality they gave license to a few. Guilt or innocence is of less importance than the legal niceties. The confessed killer of wife and four children walks free because of his confession, not in spite of it. His lawyer was not present to hear it. Another confessed murderer walks our streets a free man because the police held him too long--a matter of hours--before formally charging him with the crime he had voluntarily confessed.

My friend, Governor Jack Williams of Arizona, in a recent address, asked a poignant question--who weeps for the innocent?

He said, "In 1948 in Texas a 12-year-old girl lost her life. She had a right to live. Just at the entrance to her teens, where (as the poet wrote) the brook and river meet, she was killed.

"Her assailant was an itinerant piano player. Twelve years after that he was out of prison and upon his release, as sure as the sun rose that morning, other lives were threatened somewhere in the years ahead.

"One of them, a Tempe rancher, had lived not quite his three score and ten, but he did not deserve to die when death came upon him at the hand of that same itinerant piano player. He had a right to live.

"Marguerita Bejarano, age 8, is another whose life and death were inextricably entwined in this macabre web. She had not reached the age of adolescence. Her innocence was that of childhood, yet within her was the promise of all girlhood, and behind she left her dolls and her mud pies and her bedside prayers and her grieving family.

"Three lives sacrificed to some strange fixation our nation has developed that the criminal needs protection against the innocent.

"Who speaks for the dead?' Who speaks for the almost-teenager of Texas, the Tempe rancher, little Marguerita Bejarano?

"How many lives down the years ahead have already been unwittingly and remorselessly doomed through this system?

"What kind of world is this that cares not for the Marguerita Bejaranos, but dissolves in maudlin tears for those who take life?

"How many more must die before we again come to the realization that the good man obeys the law because he fears God, and the bad man because he fears the consequences if he gets caught?"

Yes, and how many more will die because now the guilty have so little reason to fear getting caught?

It is possible that someone will die on a highway in California because of our obsessive concern for legal technicalities. ^{California} A/ judge ruled that a drunken driver must have his driver's license returned to him, because at the time of arrest he was too drunk to know his constitutional rights.

A sports writer in Los Angeles, Jim Murray, turned from the arena long enough to comment on "a country that shrinks from punishing its criminals, disciplining its children and locking up its mad." He likened it to a lamb defending the lion's right to eat it and said, "the Consitution was never conceived as a shield for degeneracy. You start out burning the flag and you end up burning Detroit. A young, vigorous country is immobilized by bumper stickers, slogans, neurotic students with their feet on desks they couldn't make, pulling down universities they wouldn't know how to rebuild."

Out of 17,800 students at Columbia University, there are 200 who belong to S.D.S. (Students for a Democratic Society). Those initials should stand for Students to Destroy Society. Only 200. but they held a dean hostage, occupied buildings for six days, hoisted the red flag and forced the undergraduate division to cancel a full month of classes. One of the leaders of this rag-tag mob has since admitted that if the university had acted decisively and called in the police in the first hour, the rebels would have folded like a house of cards. But in our permissive society, aggression is met with appeasement.

I do not mean to pick on Columbia; the story could be told about a hundred different schools. And the story will go on until parents, alumnae, trustees and that large silent majority of students and faculty and taxpayers say loud and clear, "obey the rules or get out."

Are we a callous people indifferent to human suffering. or is our failure to eradicate proverty and human misery the result of the

same soft permissiveness? The record speaks for itself. We have shared our wealth more widely among our people than any society heretofore known to man.

But the Zeitgeist--the wind of the times--is against us. The new social philosophy places no premium on the old virtues of thrift and self-reliance. The hand up has been replaced by the hand out, and too often the power of Congress to legislate has been usurped by the power of departments and agencies to regulate with regulations that have the status and authority of law.

And today, in countless ways never intended or authorized by Congress, they are employing that power to intrude into areas of freedom.

As for the intent of Congress, the regulatory agencies disregard it, override it, shift its direction, or misunderstand it. But the process is stealthy and insidious. And it never makes a headline.

There are tricks to every trade--even the bureaucratic trade--and all of them are employed. There is the informal consultation, for instance, during which the agency spokesmen bring policy to bear without being formally accountable for it.

It is simply a matter of obtaining a series of seemingly unimportant compromises with the businessmen or citizens involved: compromises easy enough to win if larger issues are at stake.

Those compromises then become working policy, or agency precedent. But what it boils down to is an extension of the regulatory power.

To appeal these bureaucratic interpretations is easier said than done, because the businessman must first exhaust his administrative remedies before he can bring the matter to court; and the procedure is invariably costly and time-consuming.

And so the bureaucratic victims bend the knee, losing authority over their affairs bit by bit rather than having it stripped away in one arrogant flourish.

As you know, a good case in point is supplied by the Food and Drug Administration. That agency is so determined to control the drug industry, it pays no attention to whether or not the policies it lays down are in conflict with those of other federal agencies.

Now, for instance, it is on the march against vitamin pills.

It wants to force the industry to put a notice on every bottle of vitamins that "you don't need vitamins if you get enough food."

But the Department of Agriculture recently declared that "half the families in America have diets that are deficient in the required amounts of vitamins and minerals."

And the American Medical Association says that a 2100-calorie-a-day diet can keep a man going but is terribly deficient for a pregnant woman.

In her case, iron alone must be supplemented by half again as much as she gets in a normal meal. And the answer is, "eat liver."

If she eats three-quarters of a pound a day she will just make the required amount.

If I feel better taking a little Vitamin C to ward off a cold, government can keep its sticky labels off of my pill bottle.

But there appears to be no end of this regulatory nightmare in sight.

The fact is that the regulatory agencies now furnish the means of making laws without going through Congress or to the people. And it become a way of life in Washington today.

The FDA is now, I am told, also out to control drug industry advertising: limit its distribution, increase its cost, dictate its content, decide who should be urged to buy what.

Once more you face the threat of legislation.

But whether or not it materializes, you will continue to face the threat of regulation.

Do not take the regulatory threat lightly. For whether freedom is chipped away bit by bit, or slashed away in one bold legislative stroke, the end effect is the same.

It not only diminishes the freedom of your own industry but also the freedom of every individual American.

In the meantime, other branches of the federal government keep right on expanding and interfering, too.

Employment reached an all-time high this year and so did welfare, both in the number of people receiving it and the number of programs doling it out. Last year's 739,000 additions to the rolls made the total almost 8,000,000, most of whom would rather be out on their own with jobs instead of caught up in the more than 450 programs.

Eight cabinet departments and 12 so-called independent agencies administer to their health. There are 35 separate housing programs, community assistance facilities are provided by 62 agencies, 33 federal agencies meddle in nearly 300 consumer protection agencies, and in just one medium-sized city, 140 separate urban projects have been found administered by seven federal departments. Thirty-six million Americans share in assorted government food programs and 6,000,000 more get surplus food packages or help through the Food Stamp Plan. Still we are told there are 10,000,000 undernourished who must be helped immediately --and that means still more bureaucracy.

In the meantime, we hear of payroll padding, kickbacks and high administrative overhead as poverty funds are filtered through the political machinery of some of our cities. A convicted felon gets \$300,000 intended for disadvantaged youths who remain disadvantaged as he cashes phony paychecks made out to ghost employers.

A \$53,000,000 program is divided \$13 million for the poor and \$40 million for administrative overhead. In Detroit a legislative investigating committee called the unkept promises of the poverty program fraud, explaining that promises were not kept because more than half the funds went to cure the poverty problems of the administrators. And the morality gap extends beyond our borders.

A current national magazine carries a story, apparently well-documented, by a reputable journalist telling of the corruption in Vietnam. A Chinese Communist firm was paid more than half a million dollars to deliver rice to the hungry people of that war-torn country, but some of the not-so-hungry skimmed off \$92,000 in pocket money. Perhaps we can shrug off buying \$24,000 worth of medicine for the

peasants that turned it to be bottled sea water(but what should anger us deep down inside is to learn that while our young men are fighting and dying, American-made guns and rockets, intended for their use, are finding their way through the black market and into enemy houses.

It is a multi-billion dollar traffic, according to the author, which our officials claim cannot be stopped because we are guests in the country. They make it sound like an invitation to a beach cottage and bring your own towels.

It is time to tell friend and foe alike, we are in Vietnam because it is in our national interest to be there and whether it offends friend or foe, we are going to do what has to be done beginning now.

We can go on pinning our faith in a government that has shown no faith in the people or we can rediscover our own great ability to govern ourselves.

We opened the West without a redevelopment agency, and won our wars with citizen soldiers and dollar a year men. We have survived foreign intrigue, civil war, cataclysmic depressions and at the same time we have maintained an orderly, compassionate society with more freedom for the individual than man has ever known.

We have no reason to be fearful and we should dismiss those in high places who have sounded the uncertain note.

We have had enough of dividing our people into voter levels, setting class against class, race against race for partisan political advantage. It is time to stop being our brother's keeper and try being our brother's brother.

There is an American out there who has been a forgotten man, perhaps because he asked little of government except freedom. He holds the whole bureaucratic structure of government on his tired back and he works two and a half hours of each day just to pay its cost. He and his wife are first in line to share food, clothing and shelter when catastrophe strikes a neighbor--even a neighbor who lives half a world away and speaks a different tongue.

This forgotten American is black, he is white, he is all the shades in between, and sometimes he wasn't even born here but he built this country and he can do it again.

He deserves better representation than he has had of late. But his vote is not for sale. He wants leadership that will restore his faith in government and perhaps in himself. He believes that all men should stand equal before the law, and the law should be enforced to protect him in his person, his property and his business. He does not want his government beholden to corrupt political machines or run by political hacks and cronies. If his country is in trouble, he wants government to level with him and tell him what he can do to help.

He loves peace, but not at any price. Through his government he will extend the hand of friendship to every nation, but not out of fear. He is tired of trying to buy the world's affection and he would like to demand its respect. If his son is called upon to fight he wants his government to say it will be for a cause worth winning and he will be allowed to win. He wants to be told that wherever he walks in the world his country's flag will defend his God-given right to life and liberty.

He would like to hear his government say: "Stealing the Pueblo and kidnapping our young men is a humiliation this nation will not endure."

Little minds and timid men do not build great societies; only a great people can do that and we are a great people.

A young American not many years ago said something about what our country stood for---something about Americans wanting the rest of the world to know that we were willing to pay any price, bear any burden to make what we stand for endure and prevail.

There was no uncertain sound to the trumpet in John Kennedy's inaugural speech. The pity is that those who inherited the power and responsibility from him, including many of his own lieutenants, no longer hear that trumpet or recognize its grand notes.

In the days just ahead, whether we like it or not, you and I are going to write a page in history. It can describe the rise and fall of the United States of America or it can be a recital of our finest hour. Men will live a thousand years in the shadow of our decision.

#

(NOTE: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be additions to, or changes in, the above. However, the governor will stand by the above quotes.)

6/23

SPEECH BY
GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

Republican Congressional Candidates
Campaign School
Washington, D.C. - June 23, 1968

I know that in this election year there are many things you are going to learn, particularly those of you who are trying for the first time. I know one of the things I learned is how much this whole business is like training and driving a Husky dog team in Alaska. You can pat them on the head, you can feed them, you can pet them. But don't fall down or they'll tear you to pieces.

We know that our opponents are doing the same thing. As a matter of fact, I got a look at one of their indoctrination books and it had one item I thought was very interesting. It had to do with campaign finances; and it said they must be very careful not to spend more than they take in. I wish they had one of those books for their incumbents.

Hubert Horatio Humphrey has gotten into the campaign late. All the issues have been picked over, so he's going to stand on the record. That's to keep us from getting a look at him.

I know there's a temptation, of course, to pick on the man in the White House during a campaign, but I think we should be very careful. I don't think we should blame this mess in the nation's capital entirely on the President. A mess like that takes team work. ✓

We're the only people in the world whose money can go to Europe and we can't. But if you listen to their campaign promises you'll make up your mind that the citizens don't have to worry about being able to go to Europe--they'll send for it. One of the most recent attempts--they're going to weather-strip Alaska. I like their crime program, though; they're going to make the money so cheap it isn't worth stealing.

I want to tell you something else though, I was warned when I was elected that I could expect several months of a political honeymoon. If I was on a honeymoon, I was sleeping alone. And if you've seen the California legislature, that isn't the worst thing that ever happened to me.

Well, I know this, we have one common cause; and that's our belief that we cannot continue along the present course without disastrous consequences to this nation.

Recently in California, we received our catalogue. Seven hundred fifty pages describing the different ways the government has of redistributing the earnings of the most productive people on earth.

You will recall in a State of the Union Address that the President remarked on the atmosphere of unease pervading our land. For obvious reasons, he did not suggest that government might have contributed to this unease. And this unease is something you should be aware of in the coming campaign. This is the basis for much of what is going to take place in this coming political season.

The people of this country are becoming aware that those who operate the Great Society have taken us down strange and uncharted paths, leading to a land of discontent. They have discovered that there was little was new in the New Frontier and even less that is great in the Great Society. It is great in cost, extravagance and the inability to solve the pressing problems of our times.

I think the people of our country have become aware that there has been some careless tinkering with the intricate machinery, that for some 200 years guaranteed that Government's only power would be that power derived from the people. And now they've discovered that Government has found a source of power all its own. Particularly in the permanent structure of Government. Not in those that were elected to office, but that permanent structure that has more and more become arrogant as it realized it didn't care which way an election went--it was really running the show.

We see the members of the palace guard fighting among themselves on the other side now for the crown that's been passed to them like the bride's bouquet; simply because the man in charge has realized he's promised more than he could deliver.

Regardless of what they say, or what they promise along the campaign trail, many of the candidates on the other side, indeed most of them, cannot deny the part they have played in amassing the record of failure. They all have to take some measure of blame for urging a belief on us that the road to the promised land lay over the shards of burned and looted cities; that our national duty in Viet Nam could be laid aside or given lesser priority than slum clearance and free lunches. That our youth need not honor the draft, and that some could choose the laws they would obey.

Pie in the sky--if we could only get the country moving again, but moving where? This isn't any simple prescription for anarchy, this is a grand design for the apocalypse.

I think the time has come to stop escalating the promises and start enforcing the law, before this great country of ours is torn to pieces.

In short, what you're here for and what we're all here for is to recognize what is at stake in this election. Is the Government successful because it outranks all others in spending? If so, isn't it about time you start asking "but where do you stand with regard to your effectiveness in providing service for spending more than anyone else"? How, for example, should we judge welfare? On what it costs? Or on what it accomplishes?

Incidentally, during my own campaign, I was warned about talking about welfare. No one votes against Santa Claus, therefore, lay off of that as an issue. I just want to tell you a personal experience. Having been in the business I was in, the opposition very early started pointing out that if I did make a speech that was effective, everyone should ask himself, isn't he an actor used to reading lines, never mind him--who wrote the speech?

It just so happens that I was responsible for--or guilty of--writing my own, and the problem was how could you get this idea over without suddenly just standing up and saying to the people, "I write my own speeches"? So we figured out a device whereby in gatherings of all kinds, I would stand up and say, when I'd finished my remarks, "Fire away. I'm brand new in this business. You have a right to ask me anything you want to know." We figured that eventually the audience would realize that no one could write the script for the answers. So this is what we did. But the sideline benefit, we discovered, was the audience by their questions told us over a period of weeks what were the issues.

And I discovered in the shirt-sleeve crowds, that welfare was one of the biggest issues today. The very people that I was warned against were the ones who were concerned. The first question on the floor would be, "what are we going to do about this particular thing?" And then I discovered why. The shirt-sleeve fella, as he packs his lunch bucket in the morning and starts out to work, he's the fella that lives next door to the man on welfare. He walks past the person sitting on the porch doing nothing. Every day it is brought to him. He is paying for it, he is not the beneficiary of this, and this is why it is an issue.

Last year unemployment reached an all-time low in the modern history of our country, other than the war years, and at the same time we added 739,000 people to the welfare rolls.

Well now, welfare is an issue. Not because we're not compassionate. Not because we don't want to provide for those who must be provided for, those who through no fault of their own cannot provide for themselves. But welfare is an issue because of the way it has been conducted for the last three decades.

It is a colossal and complete failure.

Welfare should be judged not on the basis that it is growing larger every year. If welfare were successful it would be working itself out of business. It would be salvaging human beings, making them independent of the need for welfare, and this is where the Republican Party should stand. We are guilty of letting the other party take this great humanitarian cause personally as theirs. And we are labeled the selfish and unfeeling who have no part in it. They are the ones who have introduced into modern political dialogue the talk of masses, calling American citizens the masses, approaching this on a mass basis.

These people out there on welfare are individuals; each one unique as we are unique. They're asking what each one of us asks: to be treated as individuals, to be recognized as having an inner human dignity, the right to self-respect. And I would say today that the overwhelming majority of people receiving welfare want nothing more than a chance at a job where they can go out and be on their own, and be independent.

They don't like standing in front of a desk. They don't like being called upon by case workers. They don't like being a card in an index file. And this is what the Republican Party can do. We can change this because we stand for individuals. We believe in treating them as individuals.

We've got a column in a newspaper in California, one of those columns called "Answer Line." This is where people can write whatever question they may have and the answers appear in the column. Not too many days ago there was a question in there. A person wrote in and said, "I am thinking of going to Washington, D.C. to Resurrection City. I'm on state welfare. I was wondering if the state welfare department would send my relief check to that address as my car payment comes due each month. I missed the bus and I'll have to drive my own car to Washington."

And as you can imagine, the answer below it was, "Yes, they will send the check if you will leave an address." They go on to say to contact your social welfare worker and tell her your plans and if there are children, whether they will be going with you, and when you are going to return. I suppose that was so they could arrange for somebody to come in and change the water for the goldfish, and tend the kids if they were also present.

What is our answer? You know one of the faults is, and let me make a suggestion. In your dialogue, never open with a negative. Never do what I have done, and attack the program first. First state that, yes, we believe in our humanitarian obligation to these people. Yes, we believe that something should be done for them. Yes, we intend to salvage these human beings. No, it doesn't mean we're that worried about the cost. We'll spend whatever is necessary to salvage these human beings. We're simply worried about pouring the money down a rathole and not accomplishing anything with it. Then go on and tell what's wrong with the program, that we want a program that is aimed at finding each individual, screening him, finding out what are the reasons for his unemployment. Is it a lack of basic education? Is it this that he needs? Is it a lack of job training or skills? Is it some physical handicap? Is it some criminal record about which you need to learn enough to be able to go to an employer personally for this man and say, "In spite of his past record, we suggest taking this person, whatever it might be"? That is our approach to welfare, to making human beings independent and self-respecting.

We turn to, I think, the greatest issue that is in the minds of the people today--crime. It is increasing six times as fast as the increase in population. Here in the District of Columbia just recently a Grand Jury met five days a week for eight weeks, and then they were so horrified by what they learned in that period of time that they issued publicly a letter to their fellow citizens.

They protested the limitations placed on police in their fight against crime. They said if you happen to murder someone in the near future, feel free to confess to one or a hundred people. Unless you're informed of your rights in the most precise terminology, the odds are that the judiciary branch will see to your freedom. The letter represented the unanimous thinking of the 23-member panel. But the United States Attorney and the District of Columbia rushed to them immediately to officially protest their writing such a letter

Of course, it's the custom in this political season, as you well know, that any time you start talking about crime, we as Republicans will be portrayed as simply appealing to an underlying racial motive, appealing to the white backlash. Well, that Grand Jury here in the District of Columbia was predominantly Negro. And they expressed themselves as amazed and shocked at the considerate treatment given those who prowl the streets of our nation's capital indulging themselves in outrageous acts.

Now, What is our response to the white backlash thing? Well, to any white person, any member of the white community who tends to look for unusual statistics indicating that the minority community commits a disproportionate amount of crime, it is very easy to make something plain. The minority communities are victims of crime out of all proportion to their numbers. Criminals are not bigoted, and they are color blind. They rob, maim, or murder without reference to race or religion.

So you and I have to remember that this is how we present this case once again. We're talking about all our citizens and we're not suggesting anything racial in this. What we're simply suggesting is government has a sacred obligation to all its citizens, to make sure that no citizen of this country stands above the law because of his race or because of his particular station in life, or where he stands in the community; that all men stand equal before the law, and government's sacred obligation is to protect society from the law-breaker and not the other way around.

I'm a believer in parables. I think you can do a lot more when you talk to people if you give an illustration. I've found people are very hard put to discover or understand billions. You can talk about the \$300 billion national debt--it's now \$350 billion, since this administration has been in--but I found once a few years ago that the best example I'd ever given was to simply say to an audience that if they wanted to understand how big the debt was, that if you had a four-inch stack of thousand dollar bills in your hand, that little handful of bills made you a millionaire. Four inches of thousand dollar bills and you've got a million dollars. But if you had the national debt piled up in front of us here, the stack of thousand dollar bills would be more than 20 miles high.

You can save a lot of pages trying to explain how much a billion dollars is. Government for example, plays by its own rules. It's grown so complex, so big with all its agencies it's hard to understand.

Another example: In 1920 you could make a long distance telephone call from New York to San Francisco for \$20.60 and for that same amount of money you could send 1,030 letters. Now you can make the telephone call for \$2.85 and for that amount you can only send 47 letters. So the government's investigating the Bell System.

You remember those jokes about the systems of government? Socialism, if you've got two cows, the government takes one and gives it to your neighbor. Communism, the government takes both cows and gives you some of the milk. Well, under our government lately, the the government takes both cows, shoots one, milks the other, throws the milk away and buys butter from Holland.

You know, for a time I didn't know if I'd been elected governor or appointed receiver of California. Eight years, we'd had little brother to big brother in Washington. When the sneeze took place in Washington, the gesundheit was heard in Sacramento.

I've tried to tell people some of the things we've done out there, but again on this subject of billions, I've discovered that I can talk about the fact that we employed task forces, citizen task forces and had over 300 of our most successful people going all through our government departments for six months, full time, day in and day out, coming back and telling us what we could do to improve government, what we could do to make it more businesslike. So far we have implemented 379 of their recommendations for an annual saving of \$105 million. And this doesn't get as big a reaction from an audience in California as when I tell them that we sent the notice for their automobile license renewal out a month early this last year, and the reason we sent it out early was that we discovered we could save \$110,000 by sending them out before the increase in postage rates. This they can understand.

Now of course, you're interested in voting blocs, and I know there is a great deal of discussion of how do we appeal to some of the blocs that have been supporting our opponents. Well, perhaps we can't appeal to some of them, because we can't join the Democrats in going out and making promises. We can't top them. They can out-promise us any day in the week.

But I think there is a voting bloc, and it's been coming into being in this last few years, and this is what we should be going after in this election. I think there is a bloc that crosses party lines, that crosses racial lines, it crosses religious lines, ethnic lines, even economic brackets.

It is made up of the forgotten American. And I think we should remember that we are not talking only to Republicans in our meanings, but that we are talking to Democrats who are just as patriotic, just as honest, just as disturbed as anyone else about what is going on.

This forgotten American is forgotten except when the government needs money. He holds the whole bureaucratic structure on his tired back, and he works for 2½ hours each day just to pay for the cost of government. This man here that we are talking to finds that though his income increases it can't keep up with inflation; that he buys less even though the income is greater. And added to that are taxes. He saves a few dollars hoping to educate his children, and then he sees the college or the university of his choice, the one he had in mind, torn apart by a little dissident, dishonest group of pseudo-intellectual instructors and a minority of students who are tearing things down under slogans such as "Freedom", "Freedom of Speech", and "Equality". The only equality they really understand is that the dissident faculty and students are equal to each other in bad manners, indecency, and a simple lack of morality.

Americanism

This forgotten American sees his own son volunteer for military service or accept the draft, not because he's warlike or hostile toward his fellow men, but because he believes there is a responsibility that goes with freedom. He's proud of his country. This forgotten American and his wife are the first ones in line to support any community undertaking, to share whatever they have with a neighbor when a catastrophe strikes, even when that neighbor lives half-way around the world and speaks a different language.

As I said before, this forgotten man is black, he's white, he's all the shades in between. But he built this country and he can build it again if he has to. And now he's being taxed out of existence to support forces which would deny him the freedom for which he is willing to die.

He's tired of promises. He knows this country is in trouble, but he would like the government to come and tell him the extent of the trouble and what he as a citizen can do to help. He doesn't want a government to be a big brother, or keep him wrapped in cotton batting. He wants his government to offer him leadership, to offer him leadership above all else, a leadership that will restore his pride in his country, in government and in himself.

He's heard a lot about slum clearance; well, he'd like to see some clearing of the political slum in which he has been living for too many years under this administration. He believes in peace, but not at any price; not waking up each morning to measure the degree of warmth of the smile on the men in the Kremlin. He would like to know we can have peace because we have said to the world, "we are going to do whatever is necessary to maintain our strength; to keep the peace."

He's tired of trying to see his government try to buy the world's affection and he would like to start demanding the world's respect.

Somehow down in people's hearts I think this is also an issue. We do not know the exact specifics because we do not know the options that are available to our government. But I think the average American would like to hear his government say in a voice that is heard round the world, "stealing the Pueblo and the kidnapping of our young men is a humiliation this nation will not endure."

Now so far this American has had only minority representation in Washington for a number of years, and you are aspiring to change this. He deserves and it is high time he had representation by the majority in Washington, that is why you are trying to come to Washington as Congressmen from your districts.

Now I recognize there must have been a certain amount of curiosity by your inviting me to partake or participate in this affair. After all, it is not every day that someone who has been riding off into the sunset for 30 years with "The End" superimposed on his back, turns up in this particular capacity, so it occurred to me, with my own campaign fresh in mind, that you might have some questions. So that for the limited time left, why don't you just sing out with the question, and I'll do my best to answer it.

Q: Are you a candidate for the President of the United States?

A: Well, let me tell you this---this has been a weekly thing in the weekly press conference out there. Let me make it plain again, I could not, and I think you could understand there would be some violation of all the rules of chemistry if I should solicit this job and announce myself as seeking that position. At the Convention, I will be placed in nomination by my delegation from California. At that time, if it is an open convention, and a multiple ballot convention, as I'm inclined to believe it will be, and many people think it will be, then yes, at the moment I am a candidate if the delegates of the Convention want to consider me so, and they can take whatever action they please.

Q: What do you believe should have been done about the Pueblo?

A: Well, right now as I said before, one of the difficult things is in a government that is identified by a credibility gap that has been created out of a government's unwillingness to take the people into its confidence. It's very difficult for anyone to know what options were or are available to us. There must have been such options, whether it involved what shipping they had on the high seas that we could intercept, a kind of give it back or else. Whatever we could have done in this regard, no one could say specifically, unless they were privy to the inner councils of the executive branch of the Federal Government.

But I do know this: there had to be such options, and I know that once again it is time to remind the people that loyalty is a two-way street. If you really analyze the very basis of government, government really only exists because we as individuals have banded together collectively and have said that wherever in the world, that if even one of us has his God-given, inalienable rights imposed upon, whether by another individual or by another group, it is the obligation and responsibility that, if each one of us wants to be safe himself, we say that 200 million of us collectively will take action to insure the safety and the rights of any individual. But the time has gone by, we have passed that magic first hour, that first 24 hours. I say that in that first 24 hours this government should have said to the enemy, "We will take any action that is necessary unless you return the men."

Q: Governor, I would like to introduce myself as the Congressional candidate from Watts. As you indicated in your speech that we have a Democratic state in California that is 2 to 1, I told them I was from Watts, and it's 8 to 1, some of them want to know how you are going to do it, because they have several situations. Can you help me out here?

A: Well, yes, if I were the candidate from Watts, and I know what a battle you've got, because you know you are very definitely in a minority in the black community because you know that they have for years past been voting probably 90% the other way. I would first of all seek out Chad McClellan in Los Angeles, who would be very happy to see you. Mr. C. H. McClellan, who immediately after the disturbances in Watts a few years ago enlisted the aid of fellow industrialists and went into that area with a program of putting private enterprise to work to provide jobs. And he put, in 16 months, 17,800 of the unemployed into private enterprise jobs, he and his associates. The day after I was elected, I asked Mr. McClellan if he would do this on a statewide basis, and he said yes, immediately.

banded together. This program has gone into six of our urban areas, particularly the minority communities. In San Diego, a few weeks ago, they celebrated the placing of the thousandth person in one of these jobs.

Five-sixths of the people that were first put to work in that 16 months in Watts are either in the jobs they obtained or were promoted to better jobs. Only one-sixth have fallen by the wayside. In the Los Angeles-Long Beach area, where it has been working the longest, the ratio of minority unemployed to the majority unemployed, has dropped to $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 1, whereas in the rest of the nation it is roughly $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 1.

Now all of this has been done under a Republican administration, believing that jobs in the last analysis must come from the private community. These are the jobs with the future. This is what has been done. I would cite to them that in the Watts area where a freeway has been destined to go through for the first time in the United States in highway building, we are embarking on a program--because we must displace an entire neighborhood--that instead of simply giving the people the cash value of their property and their homes and turning them out on their own to try and find someplace to live, we are going to use highway funds to recreate a neighborhood and give the people the choice of either taking the money for their home or moving into this new, nearby neighborhood, where they will still be in proximity of their churches and friends and so forth, and be given comparable housing that will be created by the State.

And then, last, if I were you, I'd start asking them some questions. All of the problems, all of the great disturbances, all of the riots and the protests and so forth, have taken place with very few exceptions in cities that have been dominated by Democratic machines for years and years and years, and isn't it about time that they ask themselves if the Democratic party deserves their vote. What has the Democratic party done for them?

Q: Governor, in the event that Richard Nixon is nominated in Miami, would you accept the Vice-Presidential nomination?

A: That's the second familiar one. No. No. Let me explain why. I've never believed very much in the importance, campaign-wise, of that position. I've always believed that a governor of a state the size of California can do some effective campaigning, probably as effective as if he were on the ticket, maybe even more in that he would be talking about others instead of selfishly about himself. But also, I believe in the things we have started in California. I believe they fit the Republican philosophy and we have gotten it started and off the ground. I believe that if we can continue in California and make this work, as an example for the rest of the nation and the other states, that this is a greater service than would be possible in that second position. And besides, nobody's asked me.

Q: Governor, you said something about evaluating our weapons, to bring this about. I've got sort of a thorn about these battleships and cruisers in mothballs; I can carry a big stick, you can carry a big stick. What is your opinion on this? I feel they should be re-evaluated at this time.

A: Well, we have taken one out, the New Jersey, as you know, but I'd have to say here to all of you as candidates, that we shouldn't get trapped, any of us, into giving evaluations of what should be military decisions by military experts. I'm in no position to know whether these battleships could aid in this particular conflict or not, so you get back to the general principle of, and I think it is a principle, the general principle is that once the fighting starts, once you're asking young men to fight and die, then there is a moral obligation imposed upon this entire nation to make this a number one priority to get in and get this thing over with as quickly as possible.

Q: I'm from Alabama, and we have a small problem down there named George. Could you come down there and help us with it?

A: That's quite a fight they're waging. Both parties trying to figure out which party is going to be hurt the most by him. I'm a believer in the two party system, and I think everyone ought to be told over and over again, that we have proven through history, that if you vote for a third party in this election you are throwing your vote away.

Q: Governor, many of these people are out for the first time, and I think it would be very helpful to them if you enunciated the issues on which you campaigned, because in a larger sense they are applicable to the major issues of this country, and I think through the campaign techniques you used, your position on the description of those issues would be a tremendous help to all of these men.

A: Well, Bill; yes, these were some of the things that I talked about. I don't think there is any question that morality is an issue. You could call it the crime issue, but it's actually bigger than that, it's a morality issue. The people of this country are not only disturbed about the crime on the streets and the violence; they're also disturbed by what seems to be a lack of moral values. They're disturbed about our tendency to laugh off wrong doing in high places in government, and say, "Well, that's just politics." Well, it isn't just politics, it's just some politicians. They're disturbed because of the revolution today. It isn't that there are more people breaking the rules, it's that today the revolution seems to be against the rules themselves, that there should be no rules. I don't think the bulk of the American people believe that. There should be guidelines.

The end of permissiveness, this is the big issue. It ties into the very welfare thing we were talking about. In California, out of those questions came the issue of Berkeley, because then Berkeley was the target. Today you can just pick any school in your own neighborhood and make it an issue on the same basis: what needs to be done? To those of you who have not served before in office and are not incumbents, I can, of course, say this: the issue is going to be raised about you in particular in the lack of experience. Well, I campaigned on the belief in common sense in government, that we put to work the common sense thinking of the people, the man in the street, the way he approaches his own problems. In other words, an end to government by mystery. You see, there is an easy thing for some of these people. Particularly in this permanent structure of government. To say that everything is so complex, that the simple answers won't do any more--too complicated. Just go on common sense. It's our government, it's government of and by the people and you're going to return it more to of and by the people and employ these common sense answers.

For example, we had a \$16½ million phone bill with the government of California. Nobody had ever thought of the common sense device of going to the phone company which has a service they'll provide free, of coming in and telling even a householder or a business what is the phone system they need, what will fit their requirements, and we called in the phone company, said look it over and tell us, "is it right?" Well, they found people sitting at adjoining desks with inter-communicating systems.

They had phones on their desks, two extra dollars a month per phone, with lights on them, so they could look at the light and tell if the fella beside them was using the phone. Well, we've told them they can turn their heads. We've reduced our phone bill by \$2 million a year just by doing this and it didn't cost us anything. So when they get at you with that experience thing, just remind them if they want experience we've got an administration that's got more years of experience in public life, in office than anyone in the world, and that's what's wrong with the country. You know, there were two school teachers who applied for jobs; and one of them had worked 25 years and the other only one. And they hired the one with the one year experience and the one with 25 protested and said, "With all my experience, how could you do this?" And the man who had made the decision answered and said, "No, you haven't had 25 years' experience, you've had one year's experience repeated 25 times."

Q: In the overall struggle and the larger struggle in the world between Communism and Capitalism, how do you see the struggle at this point in history?

A: Well, eight years ago we heard that there was a missile gap. And then there was a kind of apology after the election when the winners discovered there wasn't a missile gap, that the Eisenhower administration had actually, and you can look it up by record, the Eisenhower administration had conducted this country into more areas of development of new weapons and technology for defense, than any other administration in the history of our nation and made more progress. Indeed, today there isn't a weapon system in full use in our arsenal that did not have its beginnings in the Eisenhower administration, and

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
Sacramento, California
Contact: Paul Beck
445-4571 6.29.68

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

STATEMENT BY GOVERNOR REAGAN
UPON SIGNING OF 1968-1969 BUDGET, JUNE 29, 1968

Good evening ladies and gentlemen. As you know, we are here to sign this administration's second budget. It is a good budget, one that reflects the needs of the people of California.

The Legislature sent me a budget totaling \$5,710,315,991. That was more than I had asked for and so we have spent long hours giving careful consideration to every item in this budget. We have found some programs that we believe are unnecessary and some programs that call for spending more than is required. As a result, I have blue-pencilled out of the budget, as submitted by the Legislature, a total of \$16,188,991.

I wish it could be more because the cost of government in California is still too high. Unfortunately, until the Legislature, which is still controlled by the other party, recognizes this and approves the cost reduction programs I have submitted, the cost of government will continue to rise.

This is not to say that we cannot and will not make economies. I do not believe that money must be spent just because it's there for the spending. And therefore I want to assure the taxpayers of California that the expenditures of every department and agency in state government will continue to be doubly-scrutinized and that none of their money will be spent unless it is absolutely essential.

Some have said this budget misplaces priorities. But they overlook the inclusion of some of the most forward-looking programs in the nation. I refer particularly to the area of mental health, where funds have been appropriated to assure the best possible services available for the rehabilitation and treatment of the mentally ill and the mentally retarded.

Funds are also contained in this budget which will permit the state--working with the private sector--to make meaningful progress toward providing jobs and training for those who have for too long been forced to remain on the dole because of misdirected programs.

I have approved money for the creation of a Multi-Purpose Service Center in Fresno to provide training and assistance for the unskilled and disadvantaged, and appropriations are included for three top priority general hospitals and a mental health center in Watts.

In the area of education, we have included an additional \$1.5 million for the state-wide pre-school education program. The budget also provides for substantial salary increases for teachers at the State Colleges and University--although the increases have been cut back to the level we originally proposed--and for state employees.

As you are probably aware, the budget is up from last year! . And there will be some who will say it has gone up too much. I agree, but it is necessary to point out why.

As I noted earlier, about two-thirds of the budget is outside of my control, and the Legislature has so far declined to give the executive branch the cost-cutting authority we need. We will continue to press for that authority.

Now that a balanced budget has been signed, and because the Legislature extended the sales tax for 90 days, there will be those who will seek to increase the costs of government by proposing new and expanded spending programs.

But I want to caution right now that no measure to increase spending will be considered unless it can be proved it is vital to our citizens.

It is time for a new approach and I intend to pursue this approach with all the vigor this administration can muster. It is time to begin giving the taxpayers' money back to them. It is time to stop spending money just because it has been collected.

Therefore, we will continue to press for meaningful property tax relief and for our other proposals to adjust income tax rates that have unfairly taken too much of the taxpayers' hard-earned money out of their pockets and into the state treasury.

0 0 0 0

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
Sacramento, California
Contact: Paul Beck
445-4571 7.1.68

RELEASE: Immediate

C-O-R-R-E-C-T-I-O-N

Correction on Remarks by Governor Reagan before
California Exposition Dedication; second paragraph
should read: Former Governor Pat Brown, etc.

#

PB

REMARKS BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
CALIFORNIA EXPOSITION DEDICATION
Sacramento, July 1, 1968

I am pleased to be here today to dedicate something unique among the states--the California Exposition. I am only sorry the man largely responsible for this concept cannot be here to share the dedication with all of us.

Former Governor Pat^{Brown} must take much of the credit for giving California this new exposition. And I urged him personally last Friday to try to be here on this special occasion.

Unfortunately, he was unable to accept our invitation, but that certainly does not detract from his dream or the fact that the initial work and planning on this project began in his administration.

It has been up to this administration to make that dream and those plans come true.

Less than 14 months ago, this land was barren.

I know because I walked through the layer of dust that covered it. It was on May 22 of last year that I joined a group of fellow Californians here to dedicate this site.

Look around you now. There has been a major change in the last 14 months.

Since the first California State Fair was organized in 1854, Californians have teamed together to create the nation's richest, most populous and most productive state.

They have done so much so well that a revolutionary new concept in state expositions and fairs--a concept like the California Exposition--was a natural development.

The California Exposition is the answer to many dreams. It is the result of much planning and much hard labor.

It will allow the industries and businesses and professions of this state of 20 million people to display their wealth of wares.

And if you have any question as to whether California ought to have such a showcase, consider that California is larger in area than 92 countries.

It contains more people than 111 countries.

Its import trade exceeds that of 118 countries; its export trade surpasses that of 121 countries.

The California Exposition belongs to all Californians, just as our Capitol building and legislative chambers belong to all Californians.

We all have a special stake in its success.

And it has a special commitment to all of us...a commitment to educate and entertain...a commitment to acquaint us more intimately with the California we enjoy today, as well as the California we are building for tomorrow...a commitment to increase the nation's and the world's interest in us, to bring additional revenues to our state through increased tourism and increased investment.

In a few moments, when we open its gates, the California Exposition will begin living that multiple commitment.

As you pass through those gates, remember that what you see today is the beginning of a dream turning into reality.

The exposition is designed to expand in stages. Its buildings are constructed to allow for the constant change that has become our way of life. The exposition is planned so that it will become self-supporting.

As California grows, the exposition will grow, too.

As California changes, the exposition will change.

With your support, the California Exposition will become an exciting, living record of our great state, a monument to the men and women who have worked and are working so hard to help it achieve its greatness.

Thank you.

#

(NOTE: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be additions to, or changes in, the above. However, the Governor will stand by the above quotes.)

4/4

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
Sacramento, California
Contact: Paul Beck
445-4571 7.3.68

RELEASE: THURSDAY, July 4, 1968
P.M.'S

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
Fourth of July Celebration
Columbia, California
July 4, 1968

It is wonderful to be here in this state capital for a day--
Columbia, the gem of the Mother Lode country.

I am pleased that the legislature saw fit to act on the
bi-partisan request of Senator Stephen Teale and Assemblyman Gene
Chappie to bestow this honor on Columbia.

Columbia is one of the prides of our state park system and all
Californians benefit by this successful effort to keep our Gold Rush
history fresh in our memories.

Of course, there are those who will say having me here as
speaker is a perfect job of type-casting. You are staging a celebra-
tion in the style and atmosphere of the last century. Some people
would go even farther where I'm concerned and suggest I belong to
the Ice Age.

Nevertheless, it is appropriate that a town named Columbia should
take the date of our independence to its heart, and give meaning to
that date and to the cause it celebrates--the cause of liberty.

Since this is a birthday party--the 192nd--it is fitting that we
look back in memory, as well as forward in anticipation.

Call it mysticism if you will, I have always believed there was
some divine plan that placed this nation between the oceans to be
sought out and found by those with a special kind of courage and an
overabundant love of freedom.

Thomas Jefferson tells that on that day of our nation's birth in
the little hall in Philadelphia, debate had raged for hours. The men
gathered there were honorable men hard pressed by a king who had
flouted the very laws they were willing to obey. Even so, to sign a
Declaration of Independence was such an irretrievable act that the
walls resounded with the words "treason, the gallows, the headsman's
axe," and the issue remained in doubt.

Then a man rose and spoke. Jefferson described him as not a young
man, but one who had to summon all his energy for an impassioned plea.
He cited the grievances that had brought them to this moment and
finally, his voice failing, he said, "They may turn every tree into

a gallows, every hole into a grave, and yet the words of that parchment can never die. To the mechanic in the workshop, they will speak hope; to the slave in the mines, freedom. Sign that parchment. Sign if the next moment the noose is around your neck, for that parchment will be the textbook of freedom, the Bible of the rights of man forever."

He fell back exhausted. The fifty-six delegates, swept up by his eloquence, rushed forward and signed that document destined to be as immortal as a work of man can be. When they turned to thank him for his timely oratory, he was not to be found, nor could any be found who knew who he was or how he had come in or gone out through the locked and guarded doors.

Fifty-six men, a little band so unique, we have never seen their like since, had pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. Sixteen gave their lives in the war that followed, most gave their fortunes, and all preserved their sacred honor.

What manner of men were they? Twenty-four were lawyers and jurists, eleven were merchants and tradesmen, and nine were farmers. They were soft-spoken men of means and education, they were not an unwashed rabble. They had achieved security but valued freedom more. Their stories have not been told nearly enough.

John Hart was driven from the side of his desperately ill wife. For more than a year, he lived in the forest and in caves before he returned to find his wife dead, his children vanished, his property destroyed. He died of exhaustion and a broken heart.

Carter Braxton of Virginia lost all his ships, sold his home to pay his debts, and died in rags. And so it was with Ellery, Clymer, Hall, Walton, Gwinnett, Rutledge, Norris, Livingston and Middleton.

Nelson personally urged Washington to fire on his home and destroy it when it became the headquarters for General Cornwallis. Nelson died bankrupt.

But, they sired a nation that grew from sea to shining sea.

Five million farms, quiet villages, cities that never sleep, three-square miles of forest, field, mountain and desert, two hundred million million/people with a pedigree which includes the blood lines of all the world.

That first war that gave us birth was the longest war in our nation's lifetime until this war we are fighting now. And as our blood came from every corner of the world, so has it been spilled in almost every corner, bled into a field called Flanders, the sands of

Corregidor, on the bleak slopes of Pork Chop Hill and now the rice paddies and jungles of Viet Nam.

With the wisdom gained by hindsight, there have been those able to explain how each war (once it was safely past) had been a fraud perpetrated on the people by greedy interests for selfish ends. And so saying, they would add the burden of doubt to the grief of those who mourn the fallen. But one thing they cannot do is tarnish or stain the motives of the men who did the fighting. Men did die to make the world safe for democracy, and they died to push back the evil darkness of the Nazi world without God, where man's morality was measured by the size of the club he could carry. And young men die today because an equally evil force threatens the freedom and dignity of man in every land.

Thirteen years later, those remarkable men we call the Founding Fathers, had formalized their concept of government with a constitution. All of us know the principles of individual freedom, of government by the consent of the governed, and those other far-seeing guarantees that exist to this day. But probably the most unique bargain between man and government incorporated in this document is one that has been less appreciated and less talked about than many others. This is the overall concept that government exists solely for the benefit of the people--that government's only excuse for being, is to guarantee that each individual will be protected by the collective might of his fellow citizens. If, at any time, his God-given inherent rights are imposed upon, either by another individual or a group or an outside force.

It is strange to think it took man six thousand years to achieve this common sense two-way street of loyalty.

In less than a score of years, the new nation went to war in observance of this principle because American sailors were being kidnapped by a foreign power. Thirty more years went by, and the new little nation was still not accepted by the great powers of Europe as something permanent on the world's map. They waited for the day when they would cut up the rich prize and return it once again to the status of colonies.

A foreign-born refugee was to be the means for testing government's responsibility to the individual. A young Hungarian named Koscia had fled after the abortive uprising against the emperor of Austria-Hungary, taking out his first citizenship papers in this

country. He became an importer. He was in a Mediterranean port on business when he was recognized and taken aboard an Austrian flagship in the harbor for return to the empire to be tried as a traitor. His frantic manservant recognized a flag he had heard his master describe as now his flag--the Stars and Stripes. It was carried by a small American war sloop. He told the story of his master's fate to the captain of this small vessel.

Captain Ingram went ashore and repeated the story to the American consul. Then, without waiting for the slow, diplomatic wheels to turn, he went aboard the Austrian flagship and demanded to see the American citizen they held. The Austrian admiral must have been somewhat amused when the prisoner was brought on deck in chains and the upstart American captain said he could hear the prisoner better without those chains. The chains were removed.

Then, Captain Ingram asked Koscia one question: "Do you ask the protection of the American flag?" And the answer was yes. He said, "you shall have it."

Going ashore once again, he told the consul of his action. By this time it had been learned that Koscia had only taken out his first application for citizenship. The consul's reaction was that we should wash our hands of the affair. Captain Ingram disagreed.

As the day went on, two more Austrian warships sailed into the harbor and it began to look as if all three ships were preparing to depart. Captain Ingram sent a messenger to the Austrian admiral. He said, "Any effort to leave this port with our citizen will be resisted with appropriate force. I will expect a satisfactory answer by 4 o'clock this afternoon."

As the hour approached, the little war sloop stood ringed by the three giant warships. Captain Ingram ordered the guns rolled to the open ports. Then he ordered the tapers lighted with which the cannons were to be fired. At that moment, a lookout called down from the mast and said they're lowering a boat. Koscia was delivered to Captain Ingram, who then went below and wrote his letter of resignation to the United States Navy.

He said if he had embarrassed his country, this was all he could do, but the action he had taken, he believed, was in keeping with his oath as an officer. His resignation was turned down by the United States Senate with these words, "This battle that was never fought may turn out to be the most important battle in our nation's

Today, there is another Koscia languishing in chains, a refugee from Castor's Cuba. He was taken from a hijacked airliner and is to be tried as a deserter. There is little doubt that he will be found guilty, and his sentence will undoubtedly be death, at the hands of a firing squad. So far, there has been no Captain Ingram to come to his rescue.

If this citizen dies, can any of us feel safe again?

In the lifetime of most of us here, it has been possible for our citizens to walk anywhere in the world with relative safety because of our flag and because of the world's knowledge that we would protect the individual with the full power of our collective might. In wartorn lands, in countries torn by revolutions, it was only necessary to establish identity as an American to be guaranteed safety.

Is it living in the past to look back seeking where our path changed? Where we took a different course?

A birthday is not an inappropriate time for taking inventory. We were born in revolution, but today there are those in our midst striving to engage our society in another revolution...even as we fight wars abroad and guard the freedom of the world. But, their cause is not freedom. It is anarchy. And their aim is not to build a nation of laws, but to create a condition of tyranny. Tyranny of the mob, where might makes right and no man is safe in his own home.

Not for them a nation under God. They have decided, "God is dead." And if that is true, they had better check their own pulse. He is not dead, we just cannot pray to him in a schoolroom.

The Founding Fathers were not destroyers. They built a nation. But today's domestic revolutionaries are like kids taking apart an old alarm clock. Success to them is finding a way to stop the ticking, but they haven't the vaguest idea how to put the clock back together again. They can rebuild none of what they would so carelessly tear down.

Cicero said, "A nation can survive its fools and even its ambitious, but it cannot survive treason from within, for the traitor appears no traitor. He speaks in an accent familiar to the victims and he wears their face and their garments." He rots the soul of the nation. He works secretly and unknown in the night to undermine the pillars of the city. He infects the body politic so that it can no longer resist. The murderer is less to be feared."

Now, perhaps it will be said of using this quote of Cicero's that the inference is too harsh, that treason is not abroad in the land and no reference should be made to traitors. And yet, a convention was held at one of the nation's large universities just several weeks ago. The ^{delegates} were from some 250 chapters of Students for a Democratic Society. One of the more moving moments occurred when two young women marched down the aisle and placed flags on either side of the stage--one, the red flag of Communism, and the other, the black flag of anarchy--and eight hundred delegates cheered lustily.

Then, they turned to the business of the convention. You did not read much about it because they made each member of the press present identify himself and only those who represented Communist or leftist papers were allowed to remain.

They passed two interesting resolutions, somewhat contradictory: One--they would continue to encourage young men to resist the draft; the other--they would encourage their own members to get into the military service in order to subvert the men in uniform. And before the convention ended, they made it plain their aim is to overthrow the present system in the United States. This hardly qualifies as youthful hijinks, and some new version of the panty raid.

A University of California professor is hailed as the foremost literary symbol of the New Left by the New York Times. In his book he proposes left wing dictatorship. He says people are confused about politics and they really do not know how to use freedom of speech correctly. It should be withdrawn from those who oppose the extension of public services.

Are you worried about gun control? Last May a leaflet was distributed on college campuses inviting students to Chicago this August at convention time and instructing them how to make fire bombs before they arrive. "Fill one soda or whiskey bottle with one-fifth sulfuric acid" and so forth and so on, in exact detail, concluding with this warning: "This is a highly volatile mixture, so be careful." Yes, be careful. We would not want anything to happen to these young intellectual irresponsibles.

And if traitor does seem too harsh a word, perhaps that is the word we are looking for--irresponsible. There is a responsibility gap in our nation, a lack of responsibility in government where leadership has been abdicated, a lack of responsibility on the part of those who use disagreement with government decisions as an excuse to

the courts, who seem to think their responsibility is to protect the rights of the accused to the point they fail to protect society against the guilty. A civil rights leader lacks responsibility when he forgets his responsibility to his people and uses them instead to further his own causes and beliefs. We talk of sending a man to the moon? We cannot even guarantee a citizen's safety in a walk across the park.

The other day, testimony was given before a congressional committee echoing the hysteria regarding gun control laws that has followed the tragedy of a few weeks ago. This testimony was sighting the fact that sales of hand guns in one state are eight times what they were just a short time ago.

Can we honestly believe that criminals in such numbers are rushing into gun stores and buying guns with which to commit acts of violence. Isn't it time we pointed out to someone that increased numbers of citizens--legitimate, God fearing, law abiding citizens--are buying those guns because they have lost faith in government's ability to protect them in their person and their property. Let government fulfill its responsibility to protect society from the lawbreakers, instead of the other way around, and perhaps we would see a decline in the purchase of weapons. We are divided at home and despised abroad.

Jim Murray, a Los Angeles sports writer, turned from the sports arena long enough recently to call us "a country that shrinks from punishing its criminals, disciplining its children, and locking up its mad." He said "The Constitution was never conceived as a shield for degeneracy. You start out burning the flag and you end up burning Detroit. A young vigorous country is immobilized by bumper stickers, slogans, neurotic students with their feet on desks they couldn't make, pulling down universities they wouldn't know how to rebuild."

In our California Parks Department, we have given our employees special law enforcement training because of what is going on in our land. It has been necessary because they too have to contend with the irresponsibles, the malcontents and the rabble rousers who would make our parks untenable for decent people. Strident voices tell us we are a callous people, indifferent to human suffering because we have failed to completely eradicate poverty and human misery. The truth is, we have shared our wealth more widely among our people than any society heretofore known to man.

There is another American we can look at even today, and this is a good place to start. From here in the hills we can see more clearly the choice of paths we can take.

The men who first settled here 118 years ago were a pretty colorful lot. Dr. Thaddeus Hildreth and his brother came all the way from Maine. While headed to Woods Crossing, they found some "color" in the stream, stayed to pan for gold, and named their hill after the old landmarks in Maine.

They came west without an OEO grant.

They camped and lived without benefit of the Area Redevelopment Agency making room, or the Rural Electrification Administration supplying the comforts. They and their new neighbors did not wait for Aid to Dependent Children. They set up E Clampus Vitus to look after their own. Their children built great cities, an incredible railway, and a series of magnificent valley farms. They played a small part in the greatest war on poverty this nation has ever seen.

And so it has been with all of America. We won our wars with citizen soldiers and dollar-a-year men. We have survived foreign intrigue, civil war, cataclysmic depressions, and at the same time, we have maintained an orderly, compassionate society with more freedom for the individual than man has ever known.

We have no reason to be fearful, and we should dismiss those in high places who have sounded the uncertain note.

We have had enough of dividing our people into voter levels, setting class against class, race against race for partisan political advantage. It is time to stop being our brother's keeper and try being our brother's brother.

There is an American out there who has been a forgotten man, perhaps because he asked little of government except freedom. He holds the whole bureaucratic structure of government on his tired back and he works two and a half hours of each day just to pay its cost. He and his wife are first in line to share food, clothing and shelter when catastrophe strikes a neighbor--even a neighbor who lives half a world away and speaks a different tongue.

This forgotten American is black, he is white, he is all the shades in between, and sometimes he wasn't even born here, but he built this country and he can do it again.

But the Zeitgeist--the wind of the times--is against us. The new social philosophy places no premium on the old virtues of thrift

and self-reliance. The hand up has been replaced by the hand out.

Employment reached an all-time high this year and so did welfare, both in the number of people receiving it and the number of programs doling it out. Last year's 739,000 additions to the rolls made the total almost 8,000,000, most of whom would rather be out on their own with jobs instead of caught up in the more than 450 welfare programs.

Eight cabinet departments and 12 so-called independent agencies administer to their health. There are 35 separate housing programs, community assistance facilities are provided by 62 agencies, 33 federal agencies meddle in nearly 300 consumer protection agencies, and in just one medium-sized city, 140 separate urban projects have been found administered by seven federal departments. Thirty-six million Americans share in assorted government food programs and 6,000,000 more get surplus food packages or help through the food stamp plan. Still we are told there are 10,000,000 undernourished who must be helped immediately--and that means still more bureaucracy.

In the meantime, we hear of payroll padding, kickbacks and high administrative overhead as poverty funds are filtered through the political machinery of some of our cities. A convicted felon gets \$300,000 intended for disadvantaged youths who remain disadvantaged as he cashes phony paychecks made out to ghost employers.

A \$53,000,000 program is divided \$13 million for the poor and \$40 million for administrative overhead. In Detroit, a legislative investigating committee called the unkept promises of the poverty program fraud, explaining that promises were not kept because more than half the funds went to cure the poverty problems of the administrators. And the morality gap extends beyond our borders.

A current national magazine carries a story, apparently well documented, by a reputable journalist, telling of the corruption in Vietnam. A Chinese Communist firm was paid more than half a million dollars to deliver rice to the hungry people of that war torn country, but some of the not so hungry skimmed off \$92,000 in pocket money. Perhaps we can shrug off buying \$24,000 worth of medicine for the peasants that turned out to be bottled sea water. But what should anger us deep down inside is to learn that while our young men are fighting and dying, American-made guns and rockets, intended for their use, are finding their way through the black market and into enemy houses.

It is a multi(illion dollar traffic, according to the author, which our officials claim cannot be stopped because we are guests in the country. They make it sound like an invitation to a beach cottage and bring your own towels.

It is time to tell friend and foe alike, we are in Vietnam because it is in our national interest to be there, and whether it offends friend or foe, we are going to do what has to be done beginning now.

We can go on pinning our faith in a government that has shown no faith in the people or we can rediscover our own great ability to govern ourselves.

We would like to hear our government say: "Stealing the Pueblo and kidnapping our young men is a humiliation this nation will not endure."

Little minds and timid men do not build great societies; only a great people can do that, and we are a great people.

A young American not many years ago said something about what our country stood for--something about Americans wanting the rest of the world to know that we were willing to pay any price, bear any burden to make what we stand for endure and prevail.

There was no uncertain sound to the trumpet in John Kennedy's inaugural speech. The pity is that those who inherited the power and responsibility from him, including many of his own lieutenants, no longer hear that trumpet or recognize its grand notes.

In the days just ahead, whether we like it or not, you and I are going to write a page in history. It can describe the rise and fall of the United States of America or it can be a recital of our finest hour. Men will live a thousand years in the shadow of our decision.

#

(NOTE: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be additions to, or changes in, the above. However, the governor will stand by the above quotes.)

7/19

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
Sacramento, California
Contact: Paul Beck
445-4571 7.19.68

~~RELEASE:~~ (immediate

Hold for release:
6p.m. - PDT

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
Price for Congress Rally
Amarillo, Texas
July 19, 1968

California and Texas have long been active competitors in the field of military procurement. We have also competed in the tragic statistics of Vietnam casualties. Thus we both can view with some horror the incompetence of the Great Society in the matter of our nation's defenses.

The Great Society has made a big point of its supposed freshness of outlook, its zest for innovation, its gift of invention. The truth is that the Great Society has brought forth little that is great and nothing that is new.

Practically all the truly commanding weapons systems now in the American inventory were developed or brought forward during the Eisenhower years:

The ballistic rockets in their numerous variations, a development driven to completion by a brilliant, young missile-man of the New Breed, General Bernard Schriever;

The miniaturized thermonuclear warhead, made possible by the inventive genius of Dr. Edward Teller;

The supersonic jet strike force, conceived and made operable by General Curtis LeMay, father of SAC, and one of the greatest air generals of all time;

The entire polaris concept, coupling missile and weapon technology with the nuclear submarine, born of Admiral Hyman Rickover's persistence.

But where are these men of drive and determination now? Having pulled America's chestnuts out of the fire in the 50's, what do they have to say about American technology of this decade?

Given command of all Air Force research and development activity, General Schriever--since retired from the service during the reign of that efficient disaster, Robert McNamara--was asked to prepare a study for the House Armed Services Committee on the current state of U.S. defenses. His conclusion: "The Soviet Union is succeeding in its

massive drive toward strategic military superiority," while the U.S. has been "slowing down its side of the arms race."

And where is Dr. Teller? Well, he is still a most esteemed member of the faculty at our University of California. This week in particular he is testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, pointing out the need for the "development of effective defensive systems," else "international stability and the prospect of peace may be jeopardized."

Curtis LeMay, whose Strategic Air Command held a nuclear umbrella over the Free World for two decades, confirms there has been no new military technology since the end of the Eisenhower era. He has written a book entitled "America is in Danger." In it he points out the folly of fighting a ground war in Asia, on the enemy's terms, and in letting that war so bankrupt us that we have abandoned the development of our military technology.

And what has happened to that brazen Admiral Rickover? Well, he is still in the service, attempting to upgrade the quality of the new nuclear Navy. In testimony before the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee earlier this month, he accused civilian analysts in the Pentagon of "studying things to death."

Retired generals and admirals usually view with alarm the ideas of the next generation. Today a civilian bureaucracy is planning to fight the next war with the last war's weapons. When the inventive genius, the driving force behind every important weapons system in our inventory has, in one way or another, said, "America is abandoning its defenses;" when the brightest of our bright young men, when the grand old general of the air war, when one of the most creative physicists of our time, when an admiral who has repeatedly demonstrated incredible foresight all agree that nothing is being done to protect this country's future, it is time to be concerned.

Who does this administration listen to--evidently not its own appointed chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Earl Wheeler. On July 7 he told the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, "The most dangerous threat to the United States is posed by the growing Soviet strategic nuclear forces." When asked by Senator Stuart Symington "Are you not beginning to become apprehensive about the survival capability of the United States?" the answer was simply, "Yes."

Some years ago when the Red Chinese poured across the Indian

border, Nehru, who had placed his faith in promises and pacifism, was so shocked he went into hiding. Reuters News Service, with all its connections, was two days finding him and asking his reaction. He said, "We have been out of touch with reality."

Our leaders propose the odd notion that if we allow the Soviet Union to achieve military superiority they will no longer be suspicious of us, that we can live on the technological achievements of the past, ignoring the lead time necessary to maintain our strength. They have been out of touch with reality. They have failed miserably. It is time to turn them out.

* * * * *

(NOTE: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be additions to, or changes in, the above. However, Governor Reagan will stand by the above quotes.)

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
Sacramento, California
Contact: Paul Beck
7.20.68

RELEASE: A.M.'s

EXCERPTS FROM A SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
Charlottesville, Virginia
Saturday, July 20, 1968

It is wonderful to be here in Virginia, the cradle of liberty and the mother of Presidents.

This year Virginia has no candidate for President, but the way Virginia votes this fall and the way 49 other states vote will guide the course of this nation and all the world for the next four years.

And if the vote is for the same party of hacks and cronies and gaps that range from credibility through to morality, the same old party of blunder and plunder, we may never have another chance.

But the people are yearning for a change. They know the job can be done better; they know, in fact, that the job hasn't been done but that it can be done.

They want new ideas and new approaches.

They have watched the programs of the 30's fail in the climate of the 60's. They know that the old isolationism of the '30's won't work in the shrunken world of the '60's.

They have watched as the new economics has led to the old tragedy of inflation that wipes out savings and dreams alike.

They have seen a welfare change from a public obligation to a private right and watched as the federal government set out to prove that there is such a thing as free lunch for a privileged few.

They have watched as those who govern have become those who rule, as decisions and the fate of the nation have been decided, not by the people, but in place of the people.

I say to you here tonight America can no longer afford politics or politicians as usual in this fateful year of 1968. It is time to turn the old guard out to let the people in.

In California we have developed a philosophy of government we call the "creative society".

The creative society turns to the people for a solution to the people's problems. It rejects the idea that an elite few in any far distant capitol can possibly know what is better for the people than the people themselves.

(more)

It recognizes that a complex, highly technical, highly mechanized, highly diversified society must also be a decentralized society, with states and local governments and the people themselves accepting the responsibilities for handling their own affairs.

It is not just a theory. It is in effect and becoming a California way of life based on the great capacity and genius of the people.

But a creative society means a responsible people, means an answer to the spirit of permissiveness abroad in our land. The permissiveness that says rights are what you choose them to be and laws were made to be broken if conscience or whim so dictates.

The Creative Society has answers to those who do not want and refuse to accept responsibility. It repudiates such statements as the one by ^a student body president quoted in the Wall Street Journal: "What I mean by revolution is overthrowing the American government and American imperialism and installing some sort of decentralized power."

"Decentralized power, yes." He and I are using the same words. But he is talking about anarchy and mob rule where the only law is the club and the only outcome is total dictatorship.

One should remind those youthful revolutionaries who mistake anarchy for idealism that while you can have law and order without freedom, no society and no man can have real freedom without law and order.

(end)

7/20

EXERPTS OF SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
Little Rock, Arkansas
July 20, 1968

Today there are those in our midst who are striving to engage our society in a revolution at home, even as we fight wars abroad and guard freedom around the world. But their cause is not freedom. It is anarchy.

And their aim is not to build a nation of laws, but to create a condition of tyranny. The tyranny of the mob where might makes right and no man is safe in his own home.

Not for them a nation under God. They have decided "God is dead." But if that's true, they'd better check their own pulse. God isn't dead; we just can't pray for him in the schoolroom.

The Founding Fathers were not destroyers. They built a nation. But today's domestic revolutionaries are like kids taking apart an old alarm clock. Success to them is finding a way to stop the ticking. But they haven't the vaguest idea of how to put the clock back together again.

As one writer put it: "They put their feet on desks they couldn't make, tearing down universities they wouldn't know how to rebuild."

A convention was held at one of the nation's large universities several weeks ago. Delegates were there from 250 chapters of "Students for a Democratic Society". One of the more r moving moments occurred ~~xxx~~ when two young women marched down the aisle and placed flags on either side of the stage. One was the red flag of Communism and the other the black flag of anarchy. And 800 delegates cheered lustily.

Then they turned to the business of the convention. But you didn't read much about it, because they made each member of the press present identify himself and only those who represented Communist or leftist papers were allowed to remain.

They passed two interesting resolutions, somewhat contradictory.

One, they would continue to encourage young men to resist the draft.

The other, they would encourage their own members to get into military service in order to subvert our men in uniform.

(more)

Before the convention ended they made it plain that their aim was to overthrow the present system of government in the United States. This hardly qualifies as youthful high jinks or some new version of a panty raid.

There is a responsibility gap in our nation, where the leadership has been abdicated. There is a lack of responsibility on the part of those who use disagreement with government decisions as an excuse to shirk their obligations to serve in the nation's military service..

The civil rights leader lacks responsibility when he forgets his responsibility to his people and uses them to further his own causes and beliefs. There is a lack of responsibility on the part of those courts that seem to think it is their responsibility to protect the rights of the accused to the point of failing to protect society against the guilty.

There is talk of sending a man across space to the moon, but we can't even guard a citizen's safety in a walk across a park.

There has been a great hysteria over gun control legislation in the wake of the tragedy of a few weeks ago. Registration of all citizen weapons is urged in spite of the lack of evidence that this would in any way limit the accessibility of guns to criminals.

As a matter of fact, according to the Supreme Court the very reverse is true. On January 29th, the U. S. Supreme Court handed down a decision in the case of Haynes v. the U. S., reversing Haynes' conviction on charges of having illegal possession of an unregistered, sawed-off shotgun, a violation of present federal gun laws.

The Court ruled that since the law obviously is aimed at criminals, it is a violation of the constitutional right against self-incrimination.

If we can't require criminals to register guns, does this mean that only the law-abiding must be so restricted.

According to testimony given recently before a Congressional committee, sales of hand guns in one state are eight times what they were just a short time ago. Can we honestly believe that criminals in such numbers are rushing to buy guns with which to commit acts of violence? Isn't it time we point out to someone that increased numbers of citizens -- God-fearing, law-abiding citizens, are buying those guns because they've lost faith in government's ability to protect them in their person and their property.

(more)

I realize that when a Republican talks "law and order" there are those who say he is using a code word appealing to the white backlash. The implication is that we cannot be for law and order and at the same time be for improving the lot of our minorities.

This is nonsense.

Those who demand law and order are not racists and those who want to help the underprivileged should recognize that they can accomplish their goals better within a framework of law and order.

No man must be above the law and no man beneath it. All men must stand equal before the law, regardless of race, religion or station in life.

The criminal is no bigot and he is color blind. Members of minority communities are victims out of all proportion to their numbers. They are the principle victims of riots in terms of suffering, death and economic losses..

In California we have made it clear that we will not tolerate lawlessness or rule of the mob, whether it be on the campus, in front of a draft board or in the streets. At the same time we are taking steps to improve the economic opportunities for those who haven't shared the bounty this land has to offer.

In recent months I have met with leaders of minority neighborhoods up and down California listening to their problems and frustrations, their complaints in regard to the broken promises from those in high places.

I haven't heard them ask for more welfare. They've asked for a chance at jobs. I didn't hear them ask to have their children bussed from one school to another, but I did hear mothers and fathers ask for a better education in the schools they were attending.

They told me their children were sometimes being passed from grade to grade simply because they had come to the end of the year and not because they'd learned what they should have learned in that class. And they wanted them to get the education and to be held in that class until they had learned what they should learn.

We have a program in our state headed up by an industrialist, H. C. KNA (Chad) McClellan that has mobilized more than 20,000 employers who are going into 16 urban areas to put the unemployed through job training into private enterprise jobs.

And I can tell you that in our largest industrial area the ratio of minority unemployment to white unemployment has dropped to less than $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 1 where in the rest of the nation it's $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 1.

We in short are going to see that anyone who wants work will not be denied that work because of the color of his skin.. We're going to see that they have an equal opportunity at the starting line but at the same time we are going to make it plain that we cannot have freedom and guarantee at the same time all citizens an equal finish at the finish line. Just that equality of opportunity to start.

end

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
Sacramento, California
Contact: Paul Beck
445-4571 7.30.68

RELEASE: 7:30 P.M., (EDT)
July 30, 1968

EXCERPTS OF SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
FUND-RAISING RALLY, WINSTON-SALEM, NORTH CAROLINA
July 30. 1968

Under the "New Economics" we were to know ever-increasing prosperity. Of course, to bring this about there was a little matter of inflation, but we were assured it was so slight and so gradual we would never really notice...and for a while this was true. After all, if this year's dollar only brings 99 cents worth next year and the shop windows are full of glittering things to buy, there can't be any real harm. But that was five years ago and someplace along the line there was a slight acceleration. The 99 cents began dropping not one but two cents a year. Now it is dropping four cents a year. Maybe we would afford even a four cent drop if every year we started fresh with a new dollar, but we don't. Inflation, like radioactivity or arsenic poisoning, is cumulative.

What would you say if the boss told you you would be taking a slight annual pay cut that would in five years reduce your income ten percent. Well, that is what inflation has done in the last five years of this administration. Now the government adds a ten percent surtax, which it says is necessary to slow inflation, and its own economists predict this tax will add another 800,000 to the rolls of the unemployed; at the same time, they admit it will probably take four more years to bring the annual four cent drop in the dollar back to only a one cent drop. So, when election year rolls around, four years hence, your dollar will have lost another 16 cents in value. Add that to the dime you have already lost and your salary cut is 26 percent. And you still haven't stopped inflation--that 74 cent dollar will still be losing a penny a year.

The voluntary curbs on foreign investment became orders from on high; how soon will the suggestion that business and labor observe caution in price, and wage increases become price and wage controls? Perhaps it is time for government to realize there are things government should quit trying to do, and one of them is assuming government can grind out an answer for everything and everybody.

In the third act of Henry IV, Shakespeare has Glendower claiming "I can call spirits from the vastly deep." Hotspur answers, "So can

I--so can any man; but will they come when you do call for them?"

With the \$10 billion surtax, there goes also a \$6 billion cut in spending. We know we can bet on the tax increase; for government that is easy. But would you really risk a bet that government will reduce spending? Part of the ^{economy} was to be in the post office, and we have witnessed a classic example of bureaucratic blackmail. Ten thousand post offices would be closed, delivery cut to four days, among other things. Congress had to back down. It has been done before and it will be done again as the attempt is made to apply the \$6 billion cut to various government agencies. Simply cut the service to the point the public puts pressure on Congress and the funds have to be restored. But what if the postmaster general had been appointed by a Republican president who had said to him, "I want that cut in spending and if you can't accomplish it, I'll get someone who will."

Only a few years ago you could mail a letter for two cents, and we had twice-a-day delivery. Now it is six cents and once-a-day delivery to the wrong address. Remember when we used to charge government was in business and government would answer, "Who'd want to sell the post office?" Well, now we can ask, "Who'd want to buy it?"

#####

(NOTE: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be additions to or changes in the above text. However, the Governor will stand by the above quotes.)

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
Sacramento, California
Contact: Paul Beck
445-4571 7.30.68

RELEASE: WEDNESDAY P.M.'S

EXCERPTS OF SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
Republican National Convention
Platform Committee Meeting
Miami, Florida
July 31, 1968

Mr. Chairman, members of the Platform Committee.

You have honored me greatly with your invitation. Because you are eminently well-qualified to draft a platform setting forth our Republican philosophy, let me confine my remarks to the broader area of what the president referred to as "the unease pervading our land."

You here this week and those of us who will join you next week have an awesome responsibility not simply to draft a platform or nominate the men who will champion our cause, but to rescue this nation from the predicament it is in; to put our national house in order; to bring our people back together; and to restore reason and honor and common sense to our land and its highest office.

I know custom decrees that each election year be labeled as a time of great decision, but even our opponents have revealed they know this is one of those unique, once-in-a-century moments when history's course will be determined for generations yet to come.

This is not a time when we can solicit the citizens' support by offering gift-wrapped promises with the hope that our ribbons and wrappings have more glitter than our opponents'. An unease does pervade our land and Americans of every political persuasion want to be told the truth about our troubles and what they can do to help. This does not mean the tasks which must be undertaken for the rebuilding of this republic will be immediately popular nor will they be easy. But we cannot shrink from controversy. The gray safety zones which seek to accommodate the demands of reality to the pressures of expediency offer no real solutions and little hope of leadership.

Our overriding concern in this convention must be to see that this party which is the repository of the hopes of an anxious nation commits itself to those decisions, those positions and those actions which are demanded if we are to reconstruct this republic.

And after eight years of the present administration, what is left unimpaired in this republic?

Our nation is agitated by suspicion, hesitant out of fear and aimless from lack of leadership.

We have seen license allowed to the wicked and abuse heaped upon the decent and the innocent.

We have been deceived by the cunning and enticed by the wily.

Our young men bleed and die in a war our leaders are reluctant to call a war and the bleeding and dying increase as the enemy pretends to talk peace across a Paris table, when in truth his purpose is propaganda. Our planes are restricted to prove our desire for peace while the enemy fires rockets into the cities of our allies. The Pueblo is abandoned and 82 men still count the endless days in an enemy prison.

At home, federal programs are piled on top of programs, and surtaxes on top of taxes, and the rights and resources and revenues of the several states are stripped away and carted off by federal spoilers. Our treasure is squandered--sometimes to aid the enemy, but most often to subsidize programs which debilitate the genius and initiative of our people's enterprise.

Order has broken down in our streets.

Organized rebellion has broken out on our campuses.

The courts approve and often underwrite the very things our individual integrity rejects.

The immorality of it all confounds the mind and exhausts the spirit.....and, worst of all, it disenchants our young.

Eight years ago there was no doubt about our missile superiority. Today, there is.

Eight years ago our national security was not in danger. Today, it is.

Eight years ago our land was not torn by riots and insurrection. Today, it is.

Eight years ago terror did not stalk our streets and parks and schoolyards. Today, it does.

Eight years ago the dollar was not questioned in foreign markets. Today, it is.

These are not the hallmarks of a great society; but, they are the heritage of the Democrat years.

It is our task and our responsibility to repair this damage, to renew the spirit and restore the purpose and the pride of America.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

In foreign affairs and in matters of defense we must be guided at all times by a clear understanding of our national best interest.

To say this is not to take a narrow or a selfish view.

The peace and security of the world depends on the fiscal and economic stability and the defense potential of the United States.

To jeopardize America is to jeopardize our friends and allies around the globe.

About one issue there should be no confusion.....prevent the expansion of Communist power. It is time to tell friend and foe alike: we are in Vietnam because it is in our national interest to be there.

Abandonment of our allies in Vietnam would open the way to greater aggression. It would weaken the credibility of American commitments everywhere. It would intoxicate the passion and whet the appetite of our enemies in every area of the world. Yet one wing of the Democratic Party apparently favors just such a disastrous course. It is a course which has already prolonged the war, confused our allies, delighted our enemies and cost us thousands of lives and billions of dollars.

Only when we increase the effectiveness of our allied forces in Vietnam, only when political and economic pressures are brought to bear in the world arena, can we have productive peace talks. Our goal must never be less than an honorable peace--one which refuses to hand over South Vietnam--and Southeast Asia--to the Communists.

The Vietnam War should not mean the neglect of other important areas throughout the world; but, when we look we see that our policies are in disarray in those areas as well.

Stability in the eastern Mediterranean is a vital American interest. We must strive for a settlement of the Arab-Israeli dispute, a settlement which will take into account the just claims of both sides.

National security--and not groundless optimism or wishful thinking--must prevail in defense planning. No consideration should take precedence over our ability to stop aggression, prevent war and protect the American people against any military threat. Yet, there is abundant, and disturbing, evidence that our strategic capabilities have been and are being sadly neglected. In this there is no second best, precisely because there is no second chance; we cannot risk a nuclear Pearl Harbor.

A responsible defense policy need not preclude treaties on weapons limitations, particularly as effective devices and methods for inspection become available. But, here too the criterion must be national security. In these dangerous years, while we work for peace among men of good will, we must rebuild and maintain our strength; building peace will take time, and strength is the currency which can buy that time.

LAW AND ORDER

Here at home we must recover the will necessary to make our streets safe, our cities free from violence and our campuses centers for learning rather than for outrage and insurrection. We must reject the permissive attitude which pervades too many homes, too many schools, too many courts.

It is too simple to trace all crime to poverty or color. There is a crime problem in the suburbs as well as in the slums; and, the minority communities are victims of crime out of all proportion to their numbers. Criminals are not bigoted and they are color blind; they roam and rob and maim and murder without reference to race, religion or neighborhood boundaries.

We must reject the idea that every time a law is broken, society is guilty rather than the lawbreaker. It is time to restore the American precept that each individual is accountable for his actions.

URBAN AFFAIRS

There is no quick and easy solution to the problems which beset our cities. Yet we think that necessary services are best performed by that level of government which is closest to the people. Statutes at the federal and state level should be redesigned to expand local responsibilities. In all crucial areas--education, housing regulation, consumer protection, health care, employment--local institutions are more flexible and more responsive to the needs of the people than bureaucracies thousands of miles and many years away.

Local governments must be permitted to develop fiscal programs and to possess the ability to finance local services without having their taxing capacity pre-empted by excessive federal and state taxation.

There is an educational problem in our core cities; but, the busing of children to distant schools, far removed from home, is not the answer to the problem. And, certainly federal pre-emption and dictation

are not an answer but an aggravation.

If state and local governments are to assume their proper role in the solution of urban problems--as we Republicans believe they should--then these levels of government must have an adequate, flexible revenue base. The federal government has pre-empted virtually all sources of new revenue. There must be, immediately, a redistribution of revenues and responsibilities between these levels of government. We should explore the feasibility of block grants, awarded with as few strings as possible. We should consider the possibility of revenue-sharing and tax credits. Without measures of this sort, our states and cities cannot hope to deal with their most pressing problems.

WELFARE ✓

We know that our welfare programs at both the state and federal level are unsatisfactory. They are hang-overs from a bygone day, a misconceived approach; they do not offer a hand up, they engage mostly in handouts; they demean, dehumanize and enervate our people. They are heavy with bureaucratic overhead; they are not relevant to the needs and aspirations of the day.

Let me quote from a statement published by CORE--the Congress of Racial Equality:

"Handouts are demeaning. They do violence to a man, strip him of dignity, and breed in him a hatred of the total system.

"For, poor men want the same as the rest of us. Poor men want to be independent. Poor men want jobs, ownership, control over their own destiny.

"Welfare is no answer, but there is an answer.

"We seek to harness the creative energy of private enterprise to achieve a solution to America's crisis.

"We look to American independence of spirit to recognize opportunity and to take advantage of it.

"We look to the vitality of American initiative to transform the underdeveloped parts of this nation.

"It has happened in the past; it can happen again."

Yes, it can happen again--if we will recognize that the answer to poverty is jobs--not welfare, not handouts, but jobs. The walls of the ghettos are economic.

Why have we let our opponents seemingly pre-empt this humanitarian field with their talk of the masses--a term that has a strange sound to American ears. They answer our criticism of their failure to solve

this human problem with charges that we lack compassion. Well, let us answer once and for all that we will do whatever is required to salvage human beings, but we are going to stop destroying them.

We are dealing with individuals--each one unique as we are unique, each one crying out to be recognized as an individual. Who better than Republicans committed to the dynamism of the free competitive enterprise system--who better to work with our people, with the private sector, to provide the job training, the job opportunities and the jobs that offer a man income, dignity, purpose and pride?

Our entire welfare structure must be re-designed. We must work to break the chain of dependency and help our people become productive members of society.

The failure of the present administration's urban renewal program is a disgrace. What is needed is not so much urban renewal as human renewal. And, urban renewal should not mean Negro removal as it has been in the past; the disruption caused by ill-conceived programs has been a major cause of disorder.

EDUCATION

Our colleges and universities are a great national resource, indispensable to the well-being and defense of the nation. It is abundantly evident that small bands of revolutionaries--egged on by subversive agitators--plan to take over, or cripple, our institutions of higher learning. This is intolerable. We must make it clear that we will protect the safety and the rights of the majority of students and faculty; that we will defend these institutions from their assailants. It is time to move against these destructive dissidents; it is time to say: "Obey the rules or get out."

Fellow Republicans, it is our responsibility to help our citizens once again place government in its proper role:

Government should lead; the people must act.

We will not solve our nation's problems, we will not provide the needed leadership, if we merely imitate our political opponents and plunder private incomes for public programs. We cannot help the poor by bankrupting the nation.

The valid test of good government is not how much taxpayers' money is siphoned off for public indulgence. The true test is whether govern-

ment unleashes the power of its people--allows the genius of a free people to devise the best solutions to the problems; some solutions will involve government participation, many will not.

I have intentionally today talked in some generalities because I believe our party should be bound by principles, not just details.

You have an opportunity to make it unmistakably clear that we do not come before the American people offering the same old things. Our people are sick and tired of disorder at home and lack of purpose abroad. They look for a new commitment.

What is needed at this time, in this land, and from this party, is a statement of purpose and resolve which will stir America's soul...

...a declaration by men and women who are not afraid to call for dignity in office, common sense in government, and compassion by those who govern.

This Republican affirmation, this Republican commitment, is what America wants...for our people are eager to participate if only we will spell out the challenge and give them the proper leadership.

Americans will respond to a leadership which countenances neither bigotry nor anarchy...a leadership which demands that every citizen is fully protected in his person, his property and his opportunity... a leadership which refuses to barter propriety for indulgence or integrity for political gain.

And, yes, a leadership which asserts that if we must fight for freedom, we will fight to win...that if we ask our young men to bear arms, the power and the might and the resolve of this nation will stand with them, and behind them...that we will never again abandon them; no, not even one of them.

If we are not willing to say these things--and if we are not willing to proclaim them proudly and act accordingly--we deny our heritage, our cause and our country.

And the day will surely come when those who are now young will ask of us:

"Where were you when America called for leadership?"

"What in God's name were you doing that was more important than the survival of our nation--and the fate of the world?"

* * * * *

(NOTE: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be additions to, or changes in, the above. However, Governor Reagan will stand by the above quotes.)