

# Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

---

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

---

**Collection:** Reagan, Ronald: 1980 Campaign Papers,  
1965-1980

**Series:** XV: Speech Files (Robert Garrick and Bill Gavin)

**Subseries:** A: Bob Garrick File

**Folder Title:** January 1977-June 1977  
(1 of 3)

**Box:** 431

---

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Inventories, visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

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

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

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

Having been in political life for a few years now, I have a skeptical attitude toward polls of public opinion. Either they tell you things you already know or else they give you important information but don't tell you what to do with it. But I came across a poll recently, which I think can serve as a jumping-off place for a look at where we are today in the United States and where we're going.

It was taken by Potomac Associates in Washington. Respondents were asked if they had a "great deal" of confidence, a "fair amount", "not very much" or "none at all" in 18 private and public American institutions.

The four institutions or groups the respondents showed most confidence in were, in this order:

- The American people, military leadership, young people and the American system.

That does not include government. The federal government's handling of international affairs ranked 15th out of the 18 and in domestic affairs it was one rung lower on the scale.

That is a remarkable finding. After years of persistent and vicious criticism of the American system, the American people still have faith in it. After a decade of abuse and slander, unparalleled in American history, the American military leadership remains next to the top in the confidence rating. And the kids, who only a few years ago were said by the media to be on the other side of an unbridgeable generation gap, still have the confidence of their parents. Most importantly, we the people trust ourselves. This poll came a little bit late for the bicentennial celebration, but it's a nice birthday present.

Still, there is that other side to the poll. Decline in confidence in the federal government so marked that one newspaper stated: "The public perception of the federal government...is nearly uniformly unfavorable." This is not some sudden change, a quick anger by the people at their government.

I do not claim the gift of prophecy nor do I seek some satisfaction by way of saying "I told you so" but, more than two decades ago, speaking on the growing power of government -- the encroaching control over our lives by a swelling bureaucracy in Washington -- I said, "When government stops respecting the people, the people lose respect for government."

The temptation to say "I told you so" is overwhelming. But what good would it do? It does no good to any American to see that his fellow countrymen have come to such a state that they look upon their government as "the other guys". A drastic change in public attitude like that can't be ignored. How did it come about and what can be done about it?

I leave it to the writers of history to give a definitive summary of how, in the last half of the twentieth century, the American people came to distrust their own government. What I will do, however, is steal a little device from the business, I used to be in. In the movies, it's called a "montage": a succession of images flashed quickly on the screen to bridge a passage of time or set a mood. I'm going to do a verbal montage, reading a few clippings not in any particular order. I'll comment on them when the montage is over.

-- Headline: "RETIRING HEW CHIEF SAYS: 'CUT REDTAPE.'" Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare David Mathews said that \$2 billion is spent by colleges and universities each year just filling out forms for the

more--more--more

federal government. Five federal programs alone take 60,000 faculty hours a year completing required paper work.

- NEWS REPORT: The people who put out the Federal Register have scheduled three 3-hour meetings for newcomers to Washington. Subject? "How to Use the Federal Register". That's having a directory for a directory.
- MAGAZINE ARTICLE: A county government in Ohio wanted to know exactly how much government money was spent in the county in the year 1973 and where every dollar came from. The study took nearly four years and cost more than a third of a million dollars. It took so long to find out what they were spending then that the results have no meaning today. Of course, the people could have told them in five minutes where those dollars were coming from.
- ITEM: In 1966 the federal government attempted to catalogue federal domestic spending. Result; a 53 volume report called "Federal Outlays: A Report of the Federal Government Impact by State, County and Large City."
- HEADLINE: "BIG GOVERNMENT'S NEEDLESS INTERVENTIONS." Columnist James Jackson Kilpatrick says it might be supposed that the burial of a local person by a local mortuary in a local graveyard is a local matter. The Federal Trade Commission says funerals affect interstate commerce. They took almost two years and \$449,000 of your money to come up with 20 pages of regulations; one of which makes it a federal offense for a funeral director to suggest that your choice of one casket over another might show disrespect for dear old Uncle Ned.
- NEWS STORY: After a decade of shoving federally funded,

more--more--more

expensive innovative advances down the throats of local schools, the federal government spends another almost two million dollars testing the results on 60,000 elementary school pupils. Result; they've found Johnny doesn't learn any better, read any better or add and subtract any better, but we still have the programs.

-- ITEM: A recent study of the federal bureaucracy made by professors at the University of Pittsburg shows that the overwhelming majority of career civil servants in the highest levels of government favor current levels of federal spending. 83% of social service employees believe that some groups somewhere, somehow, are still "inadequately represented" which translates, "give me some more tax dollars, and I'll set up my own little empire for those who are not yet getting enough federal loot".

Well, that ends my verbal montage. If it were on film, there would be a series of rapid pictures of bureaucrats, red tape, unending paperwork, miles of regulations leading to chaos, more bureaucrats, more regulations, more red tape and, here and there, a businessman taking a tranquilizer.

The American people have seen the future as the big planners, big spenders and ideological commandoes and taxpayer-subsidized goody-dispensers would have it, and -- they don't like it!

For too many years now we have been told a little inflation is good for us. After all, it helped to pay for all those wonderful programs we all needed even though we didn't know we needed them. Milton Friedman, Nobel-Prize winning economist, says inflation isn't hard to stop; the problem is that the favorable effects of inflation come first. Like the first few drinks that feel just fine. Then comes the hangover.

The politicians who got us all drunk in the first place are now

more--more--more

telling us more of the same bad liquor will sober us up.

Perhaps what we are dealing with is not a political, but a medical, problem. Congress seems to be suffering from two illnesses at the same time: Total deafness when it comes to hearing the pleas of the taxpayers for less spending and over-developed arm muscles from shovelling out those tax dollars. As the Frenchman, Bastiat, said, "Public funds seemingly belong to no one and the tendency to bestow them on someone is irresistible." We want Congress to be responsive to real problems. But sometimes these big spenders of our money remind me of a letter sent by a member of Parliament to his constituents some 200 years ago. It was in response to a letter from them complaining about the excise tax. He wrote:

"Gentlemen: I have received your letter about the excise tax, and am surprised at your insolence in writing it at all. You know, and I know, that I bought this constituency. You know, and I know, that I am now determined to sell it -- and you know what you think I don't know, that you are looking for another buyer. But I know what you certainly don't know, that I have found another constituency to buy. May God's curse light upon you all . . . "

It's kind of fun to picture George Meany getting a letter like that from any one of a number of Congressmen he lays claim to.

I'm willing to grant that Congress has good intentions but I also know of a well-known road that is paved with good intentions and where that road goes. A generation or more of meddling and spending and interfering and an unwillingness to face the consequences -- for other people -- of what Congress has been doing to savings and earnings of families throughout America has reached its inevitable conclusion: the people are fed up with the federal government.

more--more--more

Perhaps Despotism is too strong a word for the abuse we've seen of the public trust? But what the great G.K. Chesterton said about despotism certainly fits what politicians have been doing for too many years.

"Despotism...(is) a kind of disease of the public spirit.

(It represents) the drunkenness of responsibility. It is when men begin to grow desperate in their love for the people...that they fall back upon a wild desire to manage everything themselves. This belief that all would go right if we could only get the strings into our own hands is a fallacy almost without exception...The sin and the sorrow of despotism is not that it does not love men, but that it loves them too much and trusts them too little."

We've had too many who love humanity but just hate people. They don't trust individuals and families? The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States do not say that those who govern must love the people. It is hoped that they will, but you can't enforce love by law. Both of those documents rest on an unassailable fact and that is democratic government is impossible without trust in the judgment of the people. Jefferson said if the people have all the facts they will make no mistakes. But when you inflate their currency, bus their children, invade their privacy with so-called "health and safety" inspections; when you create a bureaucratic state in which no man is free of the hungry gaze of the bureaucrat, you have told the people, in action they understand only too well: we don't trust you. Trust begets trust. The American people want to trust as well as be trusted. But oh how often they have been deceived.

So we get polls showing us that that American people don't trust their own government.

Well, that's the bad news -- now the good news. Remember that

more--more--more

poll placed "young people" high up among those in whom the people place great confidence. In fact, just ahead of faith in the system itself. Now, hear the results of another poll taken by Who's Who Among American High School Students. Almost 24,000 "high achievers" across the country were polled. Seventy-five percent of them favor the same or an increased defense budget for the United States. In 1973, just four years ago, 59% favored cutting the defense budget. Forty percent would advocate US aid to any Third World country fighting communist aggression; almost another 40% were even in favor of sending military advisors to such a conflict. Sixty-four percent are against legalization of marijuana; the same percentage said they attend weekly religious services. That doesn't sound like a bad bunch of kids.

Then there's the survey taken by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. It was conducted in 1975 among 25,000 undergraduates, 25,000 graduate students and 25,000 faculty members in colleges across the country. The director of the survey said:

"...the apparent radicalization of college campuses in the late 1960s was a short-term phenomenon, stimulated by the Vietnam war and exaggerated by the press.

"The events on...campuses in the late 1960s were serious and important...but to a very considerable degree they were media events; their effects and larger significance were almost certainly exaggerated...colleges and universities have been marked more by stability in basic attitudes and values of their students and teachers than they have been by any...great changes."

Isn't it time for us right now to start doing something so that when our sons and daughters and the generation they represent start running the country, the institutions they inherit will be strong and

more--more--more



revered and trusted once again?

Since you are involved in the business world, there is one other finding of that teenage survey and one other finding of the Potomac Associates poll you should know about.

Seventy-three percent of the youngsters said corporate power is too great and 66 percent think the economic power of business is "too influential". The Potomac Associates poll (the one that rated the people's confidence or lack of it in 18 different institutions and groups) placed "business and industry" thirteenth -- that's almost as low as their opinion of the federal establishment. Labor unions finished dead last, but when you're only a few spots above that, you can't afford to gloat.

Well, I want you to prepare yourself for a little shock. I am not -- repeat, not -- going to tell you to hire some good PR men to improve your image.

I'm not going to tell you to sponsor some Public Broadcasting Show concerning Greek pottery to show people how public-spirited you are.

You've heard all that. And, quite frankly, I don't think it works very well and I don't think you think it does.

True, business doesn't get the kind of understanding it deserves. But then who does? This is a tough world as you all know. It's tough to make a buck and tougher these days to keep it. It's even more difficult to make a reputation and keep it. Business seldom gets good press. But you can't buy it. You could never spend enough money to make Ralph Nader and the congressmen he has in his pocket like you.

In my opinion, business should concentrate on doing what it does best: bring the very best products at the lowest prices to the most people. Pay the best wages possible. Give workers a real sense of belonging to your company by making them a part of it. Keep high ethical standards not in the hope of pleasing the New York Times -- you can't --

more--more--more

but because it's right. And remember the sound advice of a great labor statesman, Samuel Gompers, Founder of the A.F.L. -- "The company that doesn't make a profit is the enemy of the working man."

I realize that my recommendations are exactly what the overwhelming majority of you in business and industry consider standard operating procedure. May I add one more that hasn't been? Fight back. Challenge the doom criers, stand up to the arrogance of officialdom and remind the media they can only have freedom of the press if you have freedom in the marketplace.

Here and there are encouraging signs that some of you have thought of this too. Henry Ford has resigned as a trustee of the Foundation that bears his family name. His last message to the well-paid staffers of the Ford Foundation was a gentle reminder that the "dividends of competitive enterprise" make foundations possible. The Foundation is "a creature of capitalism", he said, and it would be nice if the Foundation remembered this and if it, in turn, reminded its beneficiaries in the world of the university that this is so.

It was a long overdue reminder but you would have thought he had committed a sacrilege. The New York Times editorially scolded him for such bad taste as to remind foundations shock troops of where the money comes from. Surely the Times is aware they are too old to believe in the Easter Bunny or the Tooth Fairy. One of the practicing elite condescendingly suggested that helping free enterprise be better understood was Ford's business not, heaven forbid, the Foundation's.

How dare a businessman remind those who live off his imagination, his risk-taking and off the labor of working people -- that their activities are undermining the very system that provides the goodies? Well, now they've been reminded and maybe when they quit rending their garments and yelling foul they'll manage a grudging thank you for a

system they've really never understood.

Maybe they could even be tempted in the interest of scientific research and the pursuit of knowledge to get acquainted with people like those respondents to the Potomac Associates Poll. Those people who love this system, not blindly nor without skepticism but who can still recognize it as the best ever devised by mankind.

Sometimes you wonder what would happen if those in the think-tanks who see us all as statistics, groups to be moved and controlled could be brought into a giant stadium filled with the decent, working people of America. It's a fantasy I know but picture our "think-tankers" seeing, in the flesh, the millions of people they've only seen in a computer read-out. the people whose middle class values they so often scorn.

Perhaps a fitting introduction of these typical Americans to their distinguished guests might be -- "Meet the people who, since World War II have given \$219 billion in grants and aid to other nations; who have contributed another seven billion to the U.N. (almost half the total budget of that exotic debating society).

They have voluntarily donated two billion dollars to CARE; sent nearly a half-a-billion dollars to Africa with no strings attached.

They are taxed each year for hundreds of billions of dollars to support several hundred welfare programs and then they voluntarily contribute 30 billion dollars more a year to charitable causes.

They have clothed the naked and fed the hungry.

They have sent their sons to die that others might be free and they themselves have paid a higher price for freedom and done more to advance the dignity of man than any people who ever lived."

Then perhaps it wouldn't be too presumptuous to add a postscript to Henry Ford's farewell message and tell those who work in the foundations

more--more--more

that foundation grants are made possible by the earning and the spending of free men and women in the free enterprise system which many in the foundations, whether intentionally or not, have been undermining for too long a time.

Nothing attests to the virility of our system more than the fact that it has managed to survive the harassment of do-gooders, the over-regulation and repressive taxation by government for some four decades. But its strength is not unlimited. Today, 70 million Americans work and earn in private employment to support themselves and their dependents. Then there are taxes to provide for 81 million Americans who derive their living totally from tax dollars.

Fight back. And you don't have to be a Henry Ford. A plumbing and electrical subcontractor in Pocatello, Idaho has found that out. His is a family owned business with 35 employees. Not too long ago, it was his turn to be visited by inspectors from OSHA. The visitors demanded entry to ferret out any possible violations of their 3400 regulations.

They were asked to show a warrant. They said that under paragraph 8A of the Occupational Safety and Health Act, they didn't need one. He said, "You do to come in here." When they came back, they had a court order, not a warrant. He still refused and was cited for contempt. He petitioned the federal district court, charging that paragraph 8A violated his constitutional rights under the 4th Amendment. A three-judge panel ruled that paragraph 8A is, indeed, unconstitutional. Now OSHA is appealing to the U.S. Supreme Court and, pending the appeal, has halted all inspections in Idaho.

Congressman George Hanson of Idaho says that isn't good enough. He has introduced a resolution in Congress that inspection in all the states be halted until the Supreme Court rules. Like the farmers at Concord Bridge, that sub-contractor in Pocatello has struck a blow for freedom.

It is time for Corporate America to realize that a little boat-rocking won't make anyone but the bureaucrats seasick. Time for them to find out they have allies in millions of independent businessmen and women who are the very heart and soul of capitalism. And both have allies in the farmer who has had enough of rules being changed in the middle of the game. All have a stake in seeing that the doctor doesn't become socialized because if he does, the patients are next.

Freedom for all of us will be safer if business moves up from the near bottom of that poll. Businessmen will regain prestige among young people when you make them see that you aren't a powerful influence seeking selfish favors. You intend to engage openly in the battle of ideas and politics to preserve this system but it is not business that lays claim to ownership of a majority in our Congress.

The next time, let it be business that honors a man like Alexander Solzhenitsyn when he comes to our country. Let's stop being cowed by every sociology professor who can say alienation in three languages. Public relations didn't build America -- courage did. And, courage, not public relations, will save this economic system. Periodic breast beating only gives you a sore chest. We all know the importance of the "bottom line" but if that's all we believe in, then we don't really believe in freedom. We just want the rewards.

We won't win every fight. And, yes, Ralph Nader will probably be very angry. But John Stewart Mill said, "A state which dwarfs its men in order that they may be more docile instruments in its hands -- even for beneficial purposes -- will find that with small men no great thing can really be accomplished."

It has been said that there are three forms of government and each has a special relationship to its people. When that relationship changes that form of government is doomed. A dictatorship can not

more--more--more

survive if the people lose their fear. A Monarchy is doomed when the people lose affection and respect for the crown. For representative government to endure, there must be virtue among the people.

There is virtue in preserving a system which lets each one of us maintain his dignity and his right to individuality and a guarantee that our children will inherit that same system.

# # # #

OFFICE OF RONALD REAGAN  
10960 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles, California 90024  
For information call:  
Peter D. Hannaford, (213) 477-8231  
(through 1/14/77  
(on 1/15/77 (415) 547-1556

EMBARGOED: Release 6:00 P.M.  
Saturday, January 15, 1977

Excerpts of remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,  
former Governor of California,  
before the Intercollegiate Studies Institute Banquet,  
Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.  
Saturday, January 15, 1977

As Adam said to Eve when they were being expelled from the garden of Eden, "you know, my dear, we live in an age of transition".

I guess this is a recurring theme throughout history. Each age sees itself, in one way or another, as a time of change. And in the United States today it can truly be said that the election of 1976 marks and end of an era in American politics. We currently are in the midst of a reordering of the political realities that have shaped our time. We are now in the beginning of post-Watergate America. The election of 1976 served as a clear dividing line between the all-too-familiar agony of the recent past and the unknown future.

I'd like to talk to you about the problems and possibilities of this time of transition.

I am particularly gratified to have the opportunity to discuss this important subject before this audience. The principles and values that lie at the heart of conservatism are shared by the majority of the American people. Despite what our good friends in the press may say, we who are proud to call ourselves "conservative" are not a minority of a minority party; we are part of the great majority of Americans of both major parties and of most of the independents as well.

A Harris poll released September 7, 1975 showed eighteen per cent identifying themselves as liberal and thirty-one per cent as conservative, with forty-one per cent as middle of the road. A few months later, on January 5, 1976, by a 43-19 plurality those polled by Harris said they would "prefer to see the country move in a more conservative direction than liberal one".

Last October 24th, the Gallup organization released the result of a poll taken right in the midst of the presidential campaign.



Respondents were asked to state where they would place themselves on a scale ranging from "right-of-center" (which was defined as "conservative") to left-of-center (which was defined as "liberal").

- -thirty seven per cent viewed themselves as left of center or liberal.
- -twelve per cent placed themselves in the middle.
- -fifty one per cent said they were right of center, that is, conservative.

What I find interesting about this particular poll is that it offered those polled a range of choices on a left-right continuum. This seems to me to be a more realistic approach than dividing the world into strict left and rights. Most of us, I guess, like to think of ourselves as avoiding both extremes, and the fact that a majority of Americans chose one or the other position on the right end of the spectrum is really impressive.

These polls confirm that most Americans are basically conservative in their outlook; But once we have said this, we conservatives have not solved our problems, we have merely stated them clearly. Yes, conservatism is the majority view. But the fact is that conservatism can and does mean different things to those who call themselves conservatives.

You know, as I do, that most experts and commentators make a distinction between what they call "social" conservatism and "economic" conservatism. The so-called social issues -- law and order, abortion, busing, quota systems -- are usually associated with blue-collar, ethnic and religious groups themselves traditionally associated with the Democratic Party. The economic issues -- inflation, deficit spending and big government -- are usually associated with Republican Party members and independents who concentrate their attention on

economic matters.

Now I am willing to accept this view of two major kinds of conservatism -- or, better still, two different conservative constituencies. But at the same time let me say that the old lines that once clearly divided these two kinds of conservatism are disappearing.

It was only a few years ago that the word "inflation" was something found only in the vocabulary of economists, Republican spokesmen and some editorial writers. But go into any supermarket in America today, stop a man or woman pushing a cart filled with groceries, and mention the word "inflation." You'll get a quick rundown on what inflation really means to working people. It hurts. It hurts everyone. And it is an issue on which all conservatives agree.

Inflation has become what the political pros call a "gut" issue. It's no longer the exclusive worry of hard-line conservative economists or spokesmen for free enterprise. It hits home because it hurts the working man and woman. When economic and social conservatives meet today, they share one major concern and that is what a big-spending, irresponsible Congress has done to the earning power of American workers. A good first step might be to set up a meeting on the problem of inflation to which spokesmen of the economic and social conservative views could attend and exchange ideas.

Let us at least see if it is possible to present a program of action based on political principle that can attract those interested in the so-called "social" issues and those interested in "economic" issues. In short, is it possible to combine the two major segments of contemporary American conservatism into one politically effective whole?

I believe these are the most important questions in American politics today. And my answer to all of them is: Yes, it is possible

to create a political entity that will reflect the views of the great, hitherto, unorganized conservative majority. We went a long way toward doing it in California. We can do it in America. This is not a dream -- a wistful hope. It is and has been a reality. I have seen the conservative future and it works!

What I envision is not simply a melding together of the two branches of American conservatism into a temporary uneasy alliance, but the creation of a new, lasting majority.

This will mean compromise. But not a compromise of basic principle. What will emerge will be something new, something open and vital and dynamic, something the great conservative majority will recognize as its own, because at the heart of this undertaking is principled politics.

I have always been puzzled by the inability of some political and media types to understand exactly what is meant by adherence to political principle. All too often in the press and the television evening news it is treated as a call for "ideological purity". Whatever ideology may mean -- and it seems to mean a variety of things, depending upon who is using it -- it always conjurs<sup>s</sup> up in my mind a picture of a rigid, irrational clinging to abstract theory in the face of reality. We have to recognize that in this country "ideology" is a scare-word. And, for good reason. Marxist-Leninism is, to give but one example, an ideology. All the facts of the real world have to be fitted to the Procrustean bed of Marx and Lenin. If the facts don't happen to fit the ideology, the facts are chopped off and discarded.

I consider this to be the complete opposite to principled conservatism. If there is any political viewpoint in this world which is free of slavish adherence to abstraction it is American conservatism.

When a conservative states that the free market is the best mechanism ever devised by the mind of man to meet material needs, he is merely stating what a careful examination of the real world has told him, is the truth.

When a conservative says that totalitarian Communism is an absolute enemy of human freedom, he is not theorizing -- he is reporting the ugly reality captured so unforgettably in the writings of Alexander Solzhenitsyn.

When a conservative says it is bad for the government to spend more than it takes in, he is simply showing the common sense that also tells him to come in out of the rain.

When a conservative says that busing does not work, he is not appealing to some theory of education -- he is merely reporting what he has seen down at the local school.

When a conservative quotes Jefferson that government that is closest to the people is best, it is because he knows that Jefferson risked his life, his fortune and his sacred honor to make certain that what he and his fellow patriots learned from experience was not crushed by an ideology of empire.

Conservatism is the antithesis of the kind of ideological fanaticism that has brought so much horror and destruction to the world. The common sense and the common decency of ordinary men and women, working out their own lives in their own way -- this is the heart of American conservatism today. Conservative wisdom and principles are derived from willingness to learn -- not just from what is going on now, but from what has happened before.

The principles of conservatism are sound because they are based on what men and women have discovered through experience in not just

one generation or a dozen, but in all the combined experience of mankind. When we conservatives say that we know something about political affairs, and that what we know can be stated as principles, we are saying that the principles we hold dear are those that have been found, through experience, to be ultimately beneficial for individuals, for families, for communities and for nations -- found through the often bitter testing of pain, of sacrifice and sorrow.

↓ One thing that must be made clear in post-Watergate is this: the American new conservative majority we represent is not based on abstract theorizing of the kind that turns off the American people, but on common sense, intelligence, reason, hard work, faith in God, and the guts to say, yes, there are things we do strongly believe in, that we are willing to live for, and yes, if necessary, to die for. That is not "ideological purity". It is simply what built this country and kept it great.

Let us lay to rest, once and for all, the myth of a small group of ideological purists trying to capture a majority. Replace it with the reality of a majority trying to assert its rights against the tyranny of powerful academics, fashionable left-revolutionaries, some economic illiterates who happen to hold elective office and the social engineers who dominate the dialogue and set the format in political and social affairs. If there is any ideological fanaticism in American political life it is to be found among the enemies of freedom on the left and the right -- those who would sacrifice principle to theory, those who worship only the god of political, social and economic abstractions ignoring the realities of everyday life. They are not conservatives.

Our first job is to get this message across to those who share most of our principles. If we allow ourselves to be portrayed as ideological shock troops without correcting this error we are doing ourselves and our cause a disservice. Wherever and whenever we can, we should gently but firmly correct our political and media friends who have been perpetuating the myth of conservatism as a narrow ideology. Whatever the word may have meant in the past, today conservatism means principles evolving from experience and a belief in change when necessary, but not just for the sake of change.

Once we have established this, the next question is: what will be the political vehicle by which the majority can assert its rights?

I have to say I cannot agree with some of my friends -- perhaps including some of you here tonight -- who have answered that question by saying this nation needs a new political party.

I respect that view and I know that those who have reached it have done so after long hours of study. But I believe that political success of the principles we believe in can best be achieved in the Republican Party. I believe the Republican Party, for a variety of reasons, can and should, provide the political mechanism through which the goals of the majority of Americans can be achieved. For one thing, the biggest single grouping of conservatives is to be found in that party. It makes more sense to build on that grouping than to break it up and start over. Rather than a third party, we can have a new first party made up of people who share our principles. I have previously said that if a change in name is thought desirable, then so be it. But tonight, for purpose of discussion, I'm going to refer to it by the title of the New Republican Party.

And let me say so there can be no mistake as to what I mean:

-- The New Republican Party I envision will not, and cannot,

be one limited to the country club - big business image that, for reasons, both fair and unfair, it is burdened with today. The New Republican Party I am speaking about is going to have room for the man and woman in the factories, for the farmer, for the cop on the beat and the millions of Americans who may never have thought of joining our party before -- but whose interests coincide with those represented by principled Republicanism. And let one thing be made clear: if we are to attract more working men and women of this country, we will do so not simply by "making room" for them, but by making certain they have a say in what goes on in the party. The Democratic party turned its back on the majority of social conservatives during the nineteen sixties. The New Republican Party of the late seventies and eighties must welcome them, seek them out, enlist them, not only as rank-and-file members but; as leaders and as candidates.

↓ The New Republican Party I envision is still going to be the party of Lincoln and that means we are going to have to come to grips with what I consider to be a major failing of the party: its failure to attract the majority of black voters. I know there are historical and economic reasons for the top-heavy majority black Americans give to Democratic candidates. But the time has come for Republicans to say to black voters: Look, we offer principles that black Americans can, and do, support. We believe in jobs, real jobs; we believe in education that is really education; we believe in treating all Americans as individuals and not as stereotypes -- and we believe that the long-range interest of black America lies in looking at what each major party has to offer. And then deciding on the merits. The Democratic Party takes the black vote for granted. Well, it's time

9--9--9

black America and the New Republican Party move toward each other and create a situation in which no black vote can be taken for granted.

The New Republican Party I envision is one that will energetically seek out the best candidates for every elective office, candidates who not only agree with, but understand, and are willing to fight for a sound, honest economy, for the interests of American families and neighborhoods and communities and a strong national defense. And these candidates must be able to communicate those principles to the American people in language they understand. Not the economic jargon and cliches that too often sound like long passages from poorly written textbooks. Inflation isn't a text book problem. Unemployment isn't a text book problem. They should be discussed in human terms.

Our candidates must be willing to communicate with every level of society, every group and sub-group because the principles we espouse are universal and cut across traditional lines. In every Congressional district there should be a search made for young men and women who share these principles and they should be brought into positions of leadership in the local Republican Party groups. We can find attractive, articulate candidates if we look, and when we find them, we will begin to change the sorry state of affairs that has led to a Democratic-controlled Congress for more than forty years. I need not remind you that you can have the soundest principles in the world, but if you don't have candidates who can communicate those principles, candidates who are articulate as well as principled, you are going to lose election after election. I refuse to believe that the good Lord divided this world into Republicans



who defend basic values, and Democrats who win elections. We have to find the tough, bright young men and women who are sick and tired of the cliches and the pomposity and the mind-numbing economic idiocy of the liberals in Washington.

It is at this point, however, that we come across a question that is really the essential one: what will be the basis of this New Republican Party? To what set of values and principles can our candidates appeal? Where can Americans who want to know where we stand look for guidance?

Fortunately, we have an answer to that question. That answer was provided last summer by the men and women of the Republican Party -- not just the leadership, but the ones who have built the party on local levels all across the country.

The answer was provided in the 1976 Platform of the Republican Party.

This was not a document handed down from on high. It was hammered out in free and open debate among all those who care about our party and the principles it stands for.

The Republican Platform is unique in that unlike any other party platform I have ever seen, it answers not only programmatic questions for the immediate future of the party, but also provides a clear outline of the underlying principles upon which those programs are based.

I am convinced that the New Republican Party can and should use the Republican Platform of 1976 as the major source from which a Declaration of principles can be created and offered to the American people.

Tonight I want to offer to you my own version of what such a

declaration might look like. I make no claim to originality. This declaration I propose is relatively short, taken, for the most part, word for word from the Republican Platform. It concerns itself with basic principles, not with specific solutions.

We, the members of the New Republican Party believe that the preservation and enhancement of the values that strengthen and protect individual freedom, family life, communities and neighborhoods and the liberty of our beloved nation, should be at the heart of any legislative or political program presented to the American people. Toward that end, we, therefore, commit ourselves to the following propositions and offer them to each American believing that the New Republican Party, based on such principles, will serve the interest of all the American people.

We believe that liberty can be measured by how much freedom Americans have to make their own decisions -- even their own mistakes. Government must step in when one's liberties impinge on one's neighbor's. Government must protect constitutional rights, deal with other governments, protect citizens from aggressors, assure equal opportunity, and be compassionate in caring for those citizens who are unable to care for themselves.

Our federal system of local-state-national government is designed to sort out on what level these actions should be taken. Those concerns of a national character -- such as air and water pollution that do not respect state boundaries, or the national transportation system, or efforts to safeguard your civil liberties -- must, of course, be handled on the national level.

As a general rule, however, we believe that government action

should be taken first by the government that resides as close to you as possible.

We also believe that Americans, often acting through voluntary organizations, should have the opportunity to solve many of the social problems of their communities. This spirit of freely helping others is uniquely American and should be encouraged in every way by government.

Families must continue to be the foundation of our nation.

Families -- not government programs -- are the best way to make sure our children are properly nurtured, our elderly are cared for, our cultural and spiritual heritages are perpetuated, our laws are observed and our values are preserved.

Thus it is imperative that our government's programs, actions, officials and social welfare institutions never be allowed to jeopardize the family. We fear the government may be powerful enough to destroy our families; we know that it is not powerful enough to replace them. The New Republican Party is committed to working always in the interest of the American family.

Every dollar spent by government is a dollar earned by individuals. Government must always ask: Are your dollars being wisely spent? Can we afford it? Is it not better for the country to leave your dollars in your pocket?

Elected officials, their appointees, and government workers are expected to perform their public acts with honesty, openness, diligence, and special integrity.

Government must work for the goal of justice and the elimination of unfair practices, but no government has yet designed a

more productive economic system or one which benefits as many people than the American market system.

The beauty of our land is our legacy to our children. It must be protected by us so that they can pass it on intact to their children.

The United States must always stand for peace and liberty in the world and the rights of the individual. We must form sturdy partnerships with our allies for the preservation of freedom. We must be ever willing to negotiate differences, but equally mindful that there are American ideals that cannot be compromised. Given that there are other nations with potentially hostile design, we recognize that we can reach our goals only while maintaining a superior national defense, second to none.

With these basic principles as foundation, the New Republican Party pledges to work for freedom, justice and prosperity for the individual, the family and the nation.

There it is. I want to emphasize that what I have just read to you is not meant to be engraved in stone. It is rather an attempt to present what might be called first draft of a New Republican Party's Declaration of Principles.

My friends, the time has come to start acting to bring about the great conservative majority party we know is waiting to be created.

And just to set the record straight, let me say this about our friends who are now Republicans but who do not identify themselves as conservatives:

I want the record to show that I do not view the new revitalized Republican Party as one based on a principle of exclusion.

After all, you do not get to be a majority party by searching for groups you won't associate or work with. If we truly believe in our principles, we should sit down and talk. Talk with anyone, anywhere, at any time if it means talking about the principles of the Republican Party. Conservatism is not a narrow ideology nor is it the exclusive property of conservative activists.

The success of liberalism in the United States is due, in no small part, to the success of its adherents in the media and the universities in making liberalism attractive to young Americans and in serving as sources of ideas to liberal politicians. Conservatives in political life should make it a habit to keep in touch with, and hire as aides, conservative thinkers and academicians. We have great ideas. We have too often failed to put them in practice. I guess what I'm trying to say is that we've succeeded better than we know. Little more than a decade ago more than two-thirds of Americans believed the Federal government could solve all our problems with it's multitude of bureaus, agencies and programs, and do so without restricting our freedom or bankrupting the Nation.

We warned of things to come; of the danger inherent in unwarranted government involvement in things not it's proper province. What we warned against has come to pass. And today more than two-thirds of our citizens are telling us, and each other, that social engineering by the Federal government has failed. The Great Society is great only in power, in size and in cost. And so are the problems it set out to solve. Freedom has been diminished and we stand on the brink of economic ruin.

↓ Our task now is not to sell a philosophy, but to make the

majority of Americans, who already share that philosophy, see that modern conservatism offers them a political home. We are not a cult, we are members of a majority. Let's act and talk like it. We must not allow a healthy distrust of big government to be portrayed as total anti-government absolutism. Condemning the excesses of liberals in power and the irresponsibility of the present Democratic Congress is not a challenge to the idea and existence of government itself.

When we are maligned as having little thought or compassion for people, let us denounce the slander for what it is. Concern for the people is at the very heart of conservatism. Concern for the dignity of all men; that those in need shall be helped to become independent -- not life time recipients of a dole; concern that those who labor and produce will not be robbed of the fruit of their toil or their liberty. Concern that we shall not forfeit the dream that gave birth to this Nation -- the dream that we can be as a shining city upon a hill -- an "alabaster city undimmed by human tears."

Believing in that dream, I became a Republican and because of that dream I am a conservative.

OFFICE OF RONALD REAGAN  
10960 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles, California 90024  
For information call:  
Peter D. Hannaford, (213) 477-8231  
(through 1/14/77  
(on 1/15/77 (415) 547-1556

EMBARGOED: Release 6:00 P.M.  
Saturday, January 15, 1977

Excerpts of remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,  
former Governor of California,  
before the Intercollegiate Studies Institute Banquet,  
Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.  
Saturday, January 15, 1977

Crossfiled Under:

*Conservatives 1-7*  
*Republicans 7-13*

OFFICE OF RONALD REAGAN  
10960 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles, California 90024  
For information call:  
Peter D. Hannaford, (202) 659-5750

EMBARGOED: Release 6:00 PM (E

Saturday, February 5, 1977

Excerpts of remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,  
former Governor of California  
Fourth Conservative Political Action Conference  
American Conservative Union Banquet  
Hyatt Regency, Washington, D.C.  
Saturday, February 6, 1977



I'm happy to be back with you in this annual event after missing last year's meeting. I had some business in New Hampshire that wouldn't wait.

Three weeks ago here in our Nation's capitol I told a group of conservative scholars that we are currently in the midst of a reordering of the political realities that have shaped our time. We know today that the principles and values that lie at the heart of conservatism are shared by the majority.

Despite what some in the press may say, we who are proud to call ourselves "conservative" are not a minority of a minority party; we are part of the great majority of Americans of both major parties and of most of the Independents as well.

A Harris poll released September 7, 1975 showed eighteen per cent identifying themselves as liberal and thirty-one per cent as conservative, with forty-one per cent as middle of the road. A few months later, on January 5, 1976, by a 43-19 plurality those polled by Harris said they would "prefer to see the country move in a more conservative direction than liberal one".

Last October 24th, the Gallup organization released the result of a poll taken right in the midst of the presidential campaign.

Respondents were asked to state where they would place themselves on a scale ranging from "right-of-center" (which was defined as "conservative") to left-of-center (which was defined as "liberal").

- thirty-seven per cent viewed themselves as left of center or liberal.

- twelve per cent placed themselves in the middle.

- fifty-one percent said they were right of center, that is, conservative.

2--2--2

What I find interesting about this particular poll is that it offered those polled a range of choices on a left-right continuum. This seems to me to be a more realistic approach than dividing the world into strict left and rights. Most of us, I guess, like to think of ourselves as avoiding both extremes, and the fact that a majority of Americans chose one or the other position on the right end of the spectrum is really impressive.

These polls confirm that most Americans are basically conservative in their outlook. But once we have said this, we conservatives have not solved our problems, we have merely stated them clearly. Yes, conservatism is the majority view. But the fact is that conservatism can and does mean different things to those who call themselves conservatives.

You know, as I do, that most commentators make a distinction between what they call "social" conservatism and "economic" conservatism. The so-called social issues -- law and order, abortion, busing, quota systems -- are usually associated with blue-collar, ethnic and religious groups themselves traditionally associated with the Democratic Party. The economic issues -- inflation, deficit spending and big government -- are usually associated with Republican Party members and independents who concentrate their attention on economic matters.

Now I am willing to accept this view of two major kinds of conservatism -- or, better still, two different conservative constituencies. But at the same time let me say that the old lines that once clearly divided these two kinds of conservatism are disappearing.

In fact, the time has come to see if it is possible to present a program of action based on political principle that can attract those interested in the so-called "social" issues and those interested in "economic" issues. In short, isn't it possible to combine the two major segments of contemporary American conservatism into one politically effective whole?

I believe the answer is: Yes, it is possible to create a political entity that will reflect the views of the great, hitherto, conservative majority. We went a long way toward doing it in California. We can do it in America. This is not a dream -- a wistful hope. It is and has been a reality. I have seen the conservative future and it works!

Let me say again what I said to our conservative friends from the academic world: What I envision is not simply a melding together of the two branches of American conservatism into a temporary uneasy alliance, but the creation of a new, lasting majority.

This will mean compromise. But not a compromise of basis principle. What will emerge will be something new; something open and vital and dynamic, something the great conservative majority will recognize as its own, because at the heart of this undertaking is principled politics.

I have always been puzzled by the inability of some political and media types to understand exactly what is meant by adherence to political principle. All too often in the press and the television evening news it is treated as a call for "ideological purity". Whatever ideology may mean -- and it seems to mean a variety of things, depending upon who is using it -- it always conjurs up in my mind a picture of a rigid, irrational clinging to abstract theory in the face of reality. We have to recognize that in this country "ideology"

is a scare-word. And, for good reason. Marxist-Leninism is, to give but one example, an ideology. All the facts of the real world have to be fitted to the Procrustean bed of Marx and Lenin. If the facts don't happen to fit the ideology, the facts are chopped off and discarded.

I consider this to be the complete opposite to principled conservatism. If there is any political viewpoint in this world which is free of slavish adherence to abstraction, it is American conservatism.

When a conservative states that the free market is the best mechanism ever devised by the mind of man to meet material needs, he is merely stating what a careful examination of the real world has told him, is the truth.

When a conservative says that totalitarian Communism is an absolute enemy of human freedom he is not theorizing -- he is reporting the ugly reality captured so unforgettably in the writings of Alexander Solzhenitsyn.

When a conservative says it is bad for the government to spend more than it takes in, he is simply showing the same common sense that tells him to come in out of the rain.

When a conservative says that busing does not work, he is not appealing to some theory of education -- he is merely reporting what he has seen down at the local school.

When a conservative quotes Jefferson that government that is closest to the people is best, it is because he knows that Jefferson risked his life, his fortune and his sacred honor to make certain that what he and his fellow patriots learned from experience was not crushed by an ideology of empire.

Conservatism is the antithesis of the kind of ideological fanaticism that has brought so much horror and destruction to the

world. The common sense and common decency of ordinary men and women, working out their own lives in their own way -- this is the heart of American conservatism today. Conservative wisdom and principles are derived from willingness to learn -- not just from what is going on now, but from what has happened before.

The principles of conservatism are sound because they are based on what men and women have discovered through experience in not just one generation or a dozen, but in all the combined experience of mankind. When we conservatives say that we know something about political affairs, and that what we know can be stated as principles, we are saying that the principles we hold dear are those that have been found, through experience, to be ultimately beneficial for individuals, for families, for communities and for nations -- found through the often bitter testing of pain, or sacrifice and sorrow.

One thing that must be made clear in post-Watergate is this: the American new conservative majority we represent is not based on abstract theorizing of the kind that turns off the American people, but on common sense, intelligence, reason, hard work, faith in God, and the guts to say, yes, there are things we do strongly believe in, that we are willing to live for, and yes, if necessary, to die for. That is not "ideological purity". It is simply what built this country and kept it great.

Let us lay to rest, once and for all, the myth of a small group of ideological purists trying to capture a majority. Replace it with the reality of a majority trying to assert its rights against the tyranny of powerful academics, fashionable left-revolutionaries, some economic illiterates who happen to hold elective office and the social engineers who dominate the dialogue and set the format in political and social affairs. If there is any ideological fanaticism

in American political life, it is to be found among the enemies of freedom on the left and right -- those who would sacrifice principle to theory, those who worship only the god of political, social and economic abstractions ignoring the realities of everyday life. They are not conservatives.

Our first job is to get this message across to those who share most of our principles. If we allow ourselves to be portrayed as ideological shock troops without correcting this error we are doing ourselves and our cause a disservice. Wherever and whenever we can, we should gently but firmly correct our political and media friends who have been perpetuating the myth of conservatism as a narrow ideology. Whatever the word may have meant in the past, today conservatism means principles evolving from experience and a belief in change when necessary, but not just for the sake of change.

Once we have established this, the next question is: what will be the political vehicle by which the majority can assert its rights?

I have to say I cannot agree with some of my friends -- perhaps including some of you here tonight -- who have answered that question by saying this nation needs a new political party.

I respect that view and I know that those who have reached it have done so after long hours of study. But I believe that political success of the principles we believe in can best be achieved in the Republican Party. I believe the Republican Party can and should provide the political mechanism through which the goals of the majority of Americans can be achieved. For one thing, the biggest single grouping of conservatives is to be found in that party. It makes more sense to build on that grouping than to break it up and start over.

7--7--7

Rather than a third party, we can have a new first party made up of people who share our principles. I have said before that if a formal change in name proves desirable, then so be it. But tonight, for purpose of discussion, I'm going to refer to it simply as the New Republican Party.

And let me say so there can be no mistake as to what I mean: -- the New Republican Party I envision will not, and cannot, be one limited to the country club -- big business image that, for reasons, both fair and unfair, it is burdened with today. The New Republican Party I am speaking about is going to have room for the man and woman in the factories, for the farmer, for the cop on the beat and the millions of Americans who may never have thought of joining our party before -- but whose interests coincide with those represented by principled Republicanism. If we are to attract more working men and women of this country, we will do so not simply by "making room" for them, but by making certain they have a say in what goes on in the party. The Democratic party turned its back on the majority of social conservatives during the Nineteen Sixties. The New Republican Party of the late Seventies and Eighties must welcome them, seek them out, enlist them, not only as rank-and-file members but, as leaders and as candidates.

The time has come for Republicans to say to black voters: look, we offer principles that black Americans can, and do, support. We believe in jobs, real jobs; we believe in education that is really education; we believe in treating all Americans as individuals and not as stereotypes or voting blocks -- and we believe that the long-range interest of black America lies in looking at what each major party has to offer. And then deciding on the merits. The Democratic Party takes the black vote for granted. Well, it's time

black America and the New Republican Party move toward each other and create a situation in which no black vote can be taken for granted.

The New Republican Party I envision is one that will energetically seek out the best candidates for every elective office, candidates who not only agree with, but understand, and are willing to fight for a sound, honest economy, for the interests of American families and neighborhoods and communities and a strong national defense. And these candidates must be able to communicate those principles to the American people in language they understand. Inflation isn't a text book problem. Unemployment isn't a text book problem. They should be discussed in human terms.

Our candidates must be willing to communicate with every level of society, because the principles we espouse are universal and cut across traditional lines. In every Congressional district there should be a search made for young men and women who share these principles and they should be brought into positions of leadership in the local Republican Party groups. We can find attractive, articulate candidates if we look, and when we find them, we will begin to change the sorry state of affairs that has led to a Democratic-controlled Congress for more than forty years. I need not remind you that you can have the soundest principles in the world, but if you don't have candidates who can communicate those principles, candidates who are articulate as well as principled, you are going to lose election after election. I refuse to believe that the good Lord divided this world into Republicans who defend basic values, and Democrats who win elections. We have to find the tough, bright young men and women who are sick and tired of the cliches and the



pomposity and the mind-numbing economic idiocy of the liberals in Washington.

It is at this point, however, that we come across a question that is really the essential one: what will be the basis of this New Republican Party? To what set of values and principles can our candidates appeal? Where can Americans who want to know where we stand look for guidance?

Fortunately, we have an answer to that question. That answer was provided last summer by the men and women of the Republican Party -- not just the leadership, but the ones who have built the party on local levels all across the country.

The answer was provided in the 1976 Platform of the Republican Party.

This was not a document handed down from on high. It was hammered out in free and open debate among all those who care about our party and the principles it stands for.

The Republican Platform is unique. Unlike any other party platform I have ever seen, it answers not only programmatic questions for the immediate future of the party, but also provides a clear outline of the underlying principles upon which those programs are based.

The New Republican Party can and should use the Republican Platform of 1976 as the major source from which a Declaration of Principles can be created and offered to the American people.

Tonight I want to offer to you my own version of what such a Declaration might look like. I make no claim to originality. This Declaration I propose is relatively short, taken, for the most part, word for word from the Republican Platform. It concerns itself with basic principles, not with specific solutions.

10--10--10

We, the members of the New Republican Party believe that the preservation and enhancement of the values that strengthen and protect individual freedom, family life, communities and neighborhoods and the liberty of our beloved nation, should be at the heart of any legislative or political program presented to the American people. Toward that end, we, therefore, commit ourselves to the following propositions and offer them to each American believing that the New Republican Party, based on such principles, will serve the interest of all the American people.

We believe that liberty can be measured by how much freedom Americans have to make their own decisions -- even their own mistakes. Government must step in when one's liberties impinge on one's neighbor's. Government must protect constitutional rights, deal with other governments, protect citizens from aggressors, assure equal opportunity, and be compassionate in caring for those citizens who are unable to care for themselves.

Our federal system of local-state-national government is designed to sort out on what level these actions should be taken. Those concerns of a national character -- such as air and water pollution that do not respect state boundaries, or the national transportation system, or efforts to safeguard your civil liberties -- must, of course, be handled on the national level.

As a general rule, however, we believe that government action should be taken first by the government that resides as close to you as possible.

We also believe that Americans, often acting through voluntary organizations, should have the opportunity to solve many of the social problems of their communities. This spirit of freely helping others is uniquely American and should be encouraged in every way by government.

Families must continue to be the foundation of our nation.

Families -- not government programs -- are the best way to make sure our children are properly nurtured, our elderly are cared for, our cultural and spiritual heritages are perpetuated, our laws are observed and our values are preserved.

Thus it is imperative that our government's programs, actions, officials and social welfare institutions never be allowed to jeopardize the family. We fear the government may be powerful enough to destroy our families; we know that it is not powerful enough to replace them. The New Republican Party must be committed to working always in the interest of the American family.

Every dollar spent by government is a dollar earned by individuals. Government must always ask: Are your dollars being wisely spent? Can we afford it? Is it not better for the country to leave your dollars in your pocket?

Elected officials, their appointees, and government workers are expected to perform their public acts with honesty, openness, diligence, and special integrity.

Government must work for the goal of justice and the elimination of unfair practices, but no government has yet designed a more productive economic system or one which benefits as many people than the American market system.

The beauty of our land is our legacy to our children. It must be protected by us so that they can pass it on intact to their children.

The United States must always stand for peace and liberty in the world and the rights of the individual. We must form sturdy partnerships with our allies for the preservation of freedom. We must be ever willing to negotiate differences, but equally mindful that

there are American ideals that cannot be compromised. Given that there are other nations with potentially hostile design, we recognize that we can reach our goals only while maintaining a superior national defense, second to none.

In his inaugural speech President Carter said that he saw the world "dominated by a new spirit..". He then said, and I quote: "The passion for freedom is on the rise...".

Well, I don't know how he knows this, but if it is true, then it is the most unrequited passion in human history. The world is being dominated by a new spirit, all right, but it isn't the spirit of freedom.

It isn't very often you see a familiar object that shocks and frightens you. But the other day I came across a map of the world created by Freedom House, an organization monitoring the state of freedom in the world for the past 35 years. It is an ordinary map, with one exception: it shows the world nations in white for free, shaded for partly free and black for not free.

Almost all of the great Eurasian land mass is completely colored black, from the western border of East Germany, through middle and eastern Europe, through the awesome spaces of the Soviet Union, on to the Bering Strait in the north, down past the immensity of China, still further, down to Vietnam and the South China Sea -- in all that huge, sprawling, inconceivably-immense area not a single political or personal or religious freedom exists. The entire continent of Africa, from the Mediterranean to the Cape of Good Hope, from the Atlantic to the Indian Ocean, all that vastness is almost totally unfree. In the tiny nation of Tanzania alone, according to a report in the New York Times, there are 3,000 people in detention for political crimes -- that is more than the total being held in

South Africa! The Mid-East has only one free state: Israel. If a visitor from another planet were to approach earth, and if this planet showed free nations in light and unfree nations in darkness, the pitifully small beacons of light would make him wonder what was hidden in that terrifying, enormous blackness.

We know what is hidden: Gulag. Torture. Families -- and human beings -- broken apart. No free press, no freedom of religion. The ancient forms of tyranny revived and made even more hideous and strong through what Winston Churchill once called "a perverted science". Men rotting for years in solitary confinement because they have different political and economic beliefs, solitary confinement that drives the fortunate ones insane and makes the survivors wish for death.

Only now and then do we in the West hear a voice, from out of that darkness. Then there is silence -- the silence of human slavery. There is no more terrifying sound in human experience; with one possible exception. Look at that map again. The very heart of the darkness is the Soviet Union and from that heart comes a different sound. It is the whirring sound of machinery and the whisper of the computer technology we ourselves have sold them. It is the sound of building; building of the strongest military machine ever devised by man. Our military strategy is designed to hopefully prevent a war. Theirs is designed to win one. A group of eminent scientists, scholars and intelligence experts offer a survey showing that the Soviet Union is driving for military superiority and are derided as hysterically making -- QUOTE -- "a worst case" -- UNQUOTE concerning Soviet intentions and capabilities.

But is it not precisely the duty of the national government to be prepared for the worst case? Two Senators, after studying the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, have reported to the Armed Forces committee that Soviet forces in Eastern Europe have the capability to launch, with little warning, a "potentially devastating" attack in Central Europe from what is termed a "standing start".

Reading their report one can almost see the enormous weight of the parts of the earth that are under tyranny shifting in an irresistible tilt toward that tiny portion of land in freedom's light. Even now in Western Europe we have Communists in the government of Italy. France appeasing terrorists, and England -- for centuries the model or the sword of freedom in Western Europe -- weak, dispirited, turning inward.

A "worst case"? How could you make a good case out of the facts as they are known? The Soviet Union, poised on the edge of free Europe, capable of striking from a standing start, has modern tanks in far greater numbers than the outmoded vehicles of NATO. We have taken comfort from NATO's superiority in the air, but now the Soviet Union has made a dramatic swing away from its historic defensive air posture to one capable of supporting offensive action. NATO's southern flank is described in the Senate report with a single word -- "shambles".

The report is simple reality as it was, with different names and faces, in Europe in the late Nineteen Thirties when so many refused to believe and thought if we don't look the threat will go away.

We don't want hysteria. We don't want distortion of Soviet power. We want truth. And above all we want peace. And to have

that the United States has to immediately reexamine its entire view of the world and develop a strategy of freedom. We cannot be the second best super-power for the simple reason that he who is second is last. In this deadly game, there are no silver medals for second.

President Carter, as a candidate, said he would cut five to seven billion dollars from the defense budget. We must let him know that while we agree there must be no fat in our armed forces those armed forces must be capable of coping with the new reality presented to us by the Russians, and cutting seven billion dollars out of our defense budget is not the way to accomplish this. Some years ago, a young President said we will make any sacrifice, bear any burden and we will to preserve our freedom.

Our relationship with mainland China is clouded. The so-called "gang of four" are up one day and down the next and we are seeing the pitfalls of making deals with charismatic personalities and living legends. The charisma fades as the living legends die, and those who take their place are interested not in our best wishes but in power. The key word for China today is turmoil. We should watch and observe and analyze as closely and rationally as we can.

But in our relationships with the mainland of China we should always remember that the conditions and possibilities for and the realities of freedom exist to an infinitely greater degree with our Chinese friends in Taiwan. We can never go wrong if we do what is morally right, and the moral way -- the honorable way -- is to keep our commitment, our solemn promise to the people of Taiwan. Our liberal friends have made much of the lack of freedom in some Latin American countries. Senator Edward Kennedy and his colleagues here in Washington let no opportunity pass to let us know about horrors in Chile.

Well, I think when the United States of America is considering a deal with a country that hasn't had an election in almost eight years, where the press is under the thumb of a dictatorship, where ordinary citizens are abducted in the night by secret police, where military domination of the country is known to be harsh on dissenters and when these things are documented, we should reject overtures from those who rule such a country.

But the country I'm describing is not Chile -- it is Panama.

We are negotiating with a dictatorship that comes within the portion of that map colored black for no freedom. No civil rights. One man rule. No free press.

Candidate Carter said he would never, relinquish "actual control" of the Panama Canal. President Carter is negotiating with a dictator whose record on civil and human rights is as I have just described and the negotiations concern the rights guaranteed to us by treaty which we will give up under a threat of violence. In only a few weeks we will mark the second anniversary of the death of freedom for the Vietnamese. An estimated 300,000 of them are being "reeducated" in concentration camps to forget about freedom.

There is only one major question on the agenda of national priorities and that is the state of our national security. I refer, of course, to the state of our armed forces -- but also to our state of mind, to the way we perceive the world. We cannot maintain the strength we need to survive, no matter how many missiles we have, no matter how many tanks we build, unless we are willing to reverse:

-- the trend of deteriorating faith in and continuing abuse of our national intelligence agencies. Let's stop the sniping and the propaganda and the historical



revisionism and let the CIA and the other intelligence agencies do their job!

-- Let us reverse the trend of public indifference to problems of national security. In every Congressional district citizens should join together, enlist and educate neighbors and make certain that Congressmen know we care. The front pages of major newspapers on the East coast recently headlined and told in great detail of a takeover, the takeover of a magazine published in New York -- not a nation losing its freedom. You would think, from the attention it received in the media, that it was a matter of blazing national interest whether the magazine lived or died. The tendency of much of the media to ignore the state of our national security is too well documented for me to go on.

My friends, the time has come to start acting to bring about the great conservative majority party we know is waiting to be created.

And just to set the record straight, let me say this about our friends who are now Republicans but who do not identify themselves as conservatives:

I want the record to show that I do not view the new revitalized Republican Party as one based on a principle of exclusion. After all, you do not get to be a majority party by searching for groups you won't associate or work with. If we truly believe in our principles, we should sit down and talk. Talk with anyone, anywhere, at any time if it means talking about the principles of the Republican Party. Conservatism is not a narrow ideology nor is it the exclusive property of conservative activists.

10 10 10  
We've succeeded better than we know. Little more than a decade ago more than two-thirds of Americans believed the Federal government could solve all our problems with it's multitude of bureaus, agencies and programs, and do so without restricting our freedom or bankrupting the Nation.

We warned of things to come; of the danger inherent in unwarranted government involvement in things not it's proper province. What we warned against has come to pass. And today more than two-thirds of our citizens are telling us, and each other, that social engineering by the Federal government has failed. The Great Society is great only in power, in size and in cost. And so are the problems it set out to solve. Freedom has been diminished and we stand on the brink of economic ruin.

Our task now is not to sell a philosophy, but to make the majority of Americans, who already share that philosophy, see that modern conservatism offers them a political home. We are not a cult, we are members of a majority. Let's act and talk like it.

The job is ours and the job must be done. If not by us, who? if not now, when?

Our party must be the party of the individual. It must not sell out the individual to cater to the group. No greater challenge faces our society today than insuring that each one of us can maintain his dignity and his identity in an increasinly complex, centralized society.

Extreme taxation, excessive controls, oppressive government competition with business, galloping inflation, frustrated minorities and forgotten Americans are not the products of free enterprise. They are the residue of centralized bureauracy; of government by a self-anointed elite.

Our party must be based on the kind of leadership that grows and takes its strength from the people. Any organization is in actuality only the lengthened shadow of its members. A political party is a mechanical structure created to further a cause. The cause, not the mechanism, brings and holds the members together. And our cause must be to rediscover, reassert and reapply America's spiritual heritage to our national affairs.

Then with God's help we shall indeed be as a city upon a hill with the eyes of all people upon us.

# # # # #