

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

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

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

SERIES: I: HANNAFORD / CALIFORNIA
HEADQUARTERS

Subseries: A: Ronald Reagan Files

Folder Title: Radio Commentaries / Broadcasts:
Disc 76-11 through 76-13 (1977)

Box: 14

To see more digitized collections visit:

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

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Inventories, visit:

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

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

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

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

Taped 3/23/77

RONALD REAGAN
Disc 76-11

76-11A
Programs:

<u>TITLES</u>	<u>TIME</u>
1. Economic Plan	3:17
2. Equal Rights Amendment	3:02
3. Taxes	3:00
4. Intelligence	3:13
5. Saccharin	3:09
6. National Review	3:22
7. Chile I	3:06

76-11B
Programs:

<u>TITLES</u>	<u>TIME</u>
1. Chile II	3:15
2. Chile III	3:11
3. Labor	2:51
4. Murphy's Law	3:17
5. Day Care Centers	3:30
6. Charity	2:59
7. Argo Merchant	3:07
8. Government By The People	3:06

Please retain your program reprints.
Reprints may be xeroxed to meet your
listener requests for copies of
program scripts. Please do not forward
these requests to us.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Economic Plan" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

The President has submitted an economic plan to Congress calling for a rebate of fifty dollars to part of the people and a government plan for putting some of the unemployed on the public payroll. There is also a tiny break for business taxwise, which it is claimed will stimulate business and industry to expand, thus providing more jobs. Unfortunately, it is too tiny to do any good. It is not a good plan but still it is better than the amended version turned out by the House Ways and Means Committee. Their version is a concession to the anti-business bias which characterizes them philosophically.

Congressman Al Ullman, Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, was so determined to do things his way that we now have an economic monstrosity which will solve nothing and mess up much. Mr. Ullman titles his plan the "jobs tax credit program." It has a supposed stimulant to encourage companies to hire new workers. But the A.F.L. - C.I.O. Director of Research calls it, -- QUOTE -- "an administrative nightmare". -- UNQUOTE. The chief economist for the United States Chamber of Commerce is equally vehement in his denunciations -- and those two aren't usually on the same side. An economist for the liberal Brookings Institution says that it, -- QUOTE -- "encourages employers to substitute part-time workers for full-time workers, and low income workers for moderate income workers". -- UNQUOTE. Actually, the plan only reaches the unskilled and low paid, least productive sector. The Assistant Secretary of the Treasury says it ignores 66 percent of the work force.

Maybe by the time you hear this, it will be all over, and we'll be trying, once again, the snake oil cures that have failed so many times in the past. A bipartisan group in Congress, which believe the free market can handle inflation and unemployment if government will first get out of the way, has come up with something better, but no one seems to be listening. For four years a young New York Congressman, Jack Kemp, has been urging on his colleagues a tax plan based on common sense, and backed by a record of success. The pattern for his plan comes from the early 1960's and the late President John F. Kennedy. It calls for an across-the-board tax cut to provide incentives for long term economic growth. The Carter plan the the Ullman distortion of that plan will both add to the deficit and therefore to inflation. Kemp's plan calls for each income tax bracket to be lowered about 22 percent. Ullman and his cohorts scream that this would give a break to those with higher earnings. Yes -- the same break given to those with lower earnings. The top tax brackets will be just as much higher than the lower, as they are right now.

In 1962-63, Kennedy chose this way to get "the country moving again". He cut the 91 percent bracket down to 70 percent and the 20 percent bottom rate to 14 percent. His Keynesian advisers swore the government would suffer a great loss of revenue. Indeed, they predicted that between 1963 and 1968 tax revenues would decline 2.4 percent in 1963 up to a drop of 24.4 percent in 1968. Or, a six year loss of 89 percent. Instead the stimulus to the economy was so immediate that actual tax revenues totaled a 54 percent increase over the six years. The doom-criers were off in their projections by 143! If we look back in history to the Eisenhower years and earlier, we find this is always the result of reducing taxes across-the-board. Congressman Ullman has chosen failure over a record of certain success.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Equal Rights Amendment" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

The Equal Rights Amendment is beginning to look like an idea whose time may never come. The framers of our Constitution expected the amendment process to be used when there was broad public support for change. Right now, support for the Equal Rights Amendment seems to be going the other way. It is shrinking rather than growing and must tell us something about the merits of the document itself.

In its first year, 1972, the Amendment had been ratified by 22 states. Eight more ratified the next year and three more in 1974. But now, three years later, it looks as if 1977 will pass into history with the Equal Rights Amendment still two or three states short of the 38 needed for ratification. If it hasn't gotten them by 1979, the whole issue lapses into the history books. I think it should. The other day I looked back over some of my radio commentaries from year-before-last, including one expressing my reservations about the Equal Rights Amendment. I find that those reservations haven't changed. I noted then that there is nothing in the Constitution that says that women are unequal. Congress and the states can, and do, legislate to correct specific inequities in jobs, housing and so forth. The Equal Rights Amendment would lock into the Constitution matters which should be left to legislative bodies to determine.

There are plenty of questions about what the Amendment would and wouldn't do if it were to become law. Would it involve wholesale conscription of women in time of war? Would it require women to serve alongside men in combat? Would it wipe out laws that were passed especially to make sure that women were not put upon by men? Divorce laws; child support laws; laws protecting women from being forced to work long hours at hard physical labor? We can't say for sure, and that is one of the major flaws of the Equal Rights Amendment. It is just vague enough that it will almost certainly end up in the courts.

The judges will then become legislators, designing its impact by their ruling from the bench. Bureaucrats will do the rest. Isn't it time we had a little less distortion of our federal system from the courts and the bureaucrats rather than inviting more by ratifying this well-meaning but poorly thought out Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution?

You can usually tell when an issue is failing by the shrillness of its supporters. The tougher the sledding for the Amendment, the more desperate its more militant supporters have become. Recently, the Washington STAR ran a column by one of its writers that was nothing more than an ad with instructions on where to write and who to call to push for support of the Equal Rights Amendment. President Carter, the First Lady and assorted aides warmed up the telephone lines trying to arm-twist a number of state legislators into voting for ratification -- with little success. A documentary on ABC television described opponents as "ultra-conservatives", "far rightists" and "Communists". If you don't have a good argument, you can always call the other guy names.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Taxes" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

A short while ago the morning paper gave a few paragraphs to a news release from the Treasury Department. The headline read, -- QUOTE -- "182 Pay No Income Tax Despite Making \$200,000 or More". -- UNQUOTE -- The story itself has become an annual report, it seems ever since an outgoing Under-Secretary of the Treasury -- three days before the inaugural in 1969 -- told a Congressional Committee we faced a possible tax revolt by the middle class because there were, -- QUOTE -- "Many high income Americans who paid little or no Federal Income Tax". -- UNQUOTE -- This it turned out, was a serious distortion of fact.

Congress acted like Congress, and in no time at all we had the tax "reform" of 1969 -- probably the worst tax legislation in the memory of any of us. Ever since, those inclined to sensationalism and demagogery come riding forth at tax harvest time to inflame people's passions, charging there is skullduggery abroad in the land.

Despite inflation, the earning level chosen for the stories remains that \$200,000 figure. And, as in this most recent news item, the indicated individuals are always referred to as "rich". Now I'll agree that \$200,000 is a healthy income but it isn't automatically accompanied by great wealth. Those could be one-time earnings for a golf pro having a hot season on the tournament circuit. Earnings at that level are not uncommon to athletic stars in a variety of sports who will only have a few years of such earnings -- and no allowance is made by the Internal Revenue Service for the shortness of the earning period.

In 1969, Congress was provided with an explanation for each one of the cases in the departing Under-Secretary's bombshell. Some had lost law suits that took more than their entire year's income; some had business losses that wiped out earnings -- catastrophic losses such as fire or flood; and a few had earned and paid their taxes in a foreign land. One stuck in my mind. He had reported gambling winnings of \$200,000 but he could also prove he lost \$440,000 doing the same thing. The head of Internal Revenue Service said the only way they could get at him was to charge an amusement tax!

Let's look at this latest news story again. There were 41,361 persons who had incomes of \$200,000 or more. Less than one half of one percent -- 182 persons -- paid no tax. Are we to believe that the other 41,179 were smart enough to earn \$200,00 or better, but not smart enough to find those illicit loopholes found by the 182? That is, if we assume such loopholes do exist?

Why not a story about the fact that a few years ago only three percent of all income taxpayers were up in the surtax brackets and now, due to inflation, more than 30 percent are; not because they are better off financially, but mainly because cost-of-living pay raises put them up in higher tax brackets even though their purchasing power hadn't increased by one dollar? That story might make us mad, but we'd be mad at the right people -- members of Congress.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Intelligence" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

In mid-March the Soviet Union warned us that detente would be endangered if American officials continued to criticize violations of human rights behind the Iron Curtain. I don't know about you, but I didn't exactly tear my hair and go into a panic at the possibility.

On February 11, the BOSTON GLOBE carried a news story that should have been front page in every major paper in the land. So far the only publication I'm aware of that saw fit to reprint the item was Bill Buckley's magazine NATIONAL REVIEW.

According to the GLOBE article, British Intelligence in early 1973 obtained a speech given by Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev at a secret meeting of East European communist rulers in Prague. In their evaluation, the British rated this speech as comparable in importance to Kruschchev's 1956 denunciation of Stalin. The British informed the United States government of Brezhnev's speech, but apparently it didn't lessen our government's thirst for detente.

Mr. Brezhnev told his fellow communist leaders, -- QUOTE -- "We are achieving with detente what our predecessors have been unable to achieve using the mailed fist. We have been able to accomplish more in a short time with detente than was done for years pursuing a confrontation policy with NATO. Trust us Comrades, for by 1985, as a consequence of what we are now achieving with detente, we will have achieved most of our objectives in Western Europe. We will have consolidated our position. We will have improved our economy". -- UNQUOTE. And then he added the bottom line which certainly should have guided our own policy for these intervening years. He said, -- QUOTE -- "a decisive shift in the correlation of forces will be such that come 1985, we will be able to extend our will wherever we need to". -- UNQUOTE.

There was more to his speech. He was optimistic about the future of Marxism in France and Italy. Now, four years later, we know his optimism was justified. He said Finland was already in the Soviet pocket, trends in Norway were in the right direction and Denmark was no longer a viable part of Western strength.

Washington evidently received the British intelligence report with less than a wave of excitement. According to the GLOBE, then Secretary of State Kissinger minimized its importance -- to say the least. The only official reference to it came three years later (1976) in the NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE ESTIMATE.

Maybe in 1973 there was some excuse, such as interpreting Brezhnev's remarks as a form of campaign rhetoric for in-house consumption. But now we can look back over the four years since the speech was made and see how consistent with his words Soviet policy has been.

Soviet forces on the NATO front have been increased by 54 divisions; a 40 percent increase in tanks to three times NATO's armored strength. They have developed six new strategic nuclear systems and apparently are engaged in a crash program to develop an effective anti-ballistic missile system. You'll remember, we bargained away our right to have such a weapon for the protection of our cities. That was one of our contributions to detente. Question -- Why did we keep this information secret for three years? And why have the news media ignored it now that the secret is out?

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Saccharin" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Nearly 20 years ago, Congress enacted the Delaney Clause which required that foods which caused cancer in animals had to be banned from human consumption. That sounds sensible enough on the face of it, but the intent of Congress was to prevent people from taking as part of their daily diet foods that might involve pretty clear risks.

Leave it to the bureaucrats to stretch that original intent to a far-fetched conclusion. Take the proposed ban on saccharin as a case in point. It all started in Canada where laboratory researchers were feeding 100 rats a diet of five percent pure saccharin for their entire lives. Some second-generation rats developed bladder tumors. In fact, 14 of them did, while only two rats not on the saccharin diet did. Viola, the scientists concluded, saccharin must cause cancer! The Canadian government immediately ordered a ban on the sugar substitute which has been in use worldwide with no known ill effects on humans for more than 80 years.

Not to be outdone, the zealous bureaucrats at the Federal Drug Administration in Washington called for a similar ban in this country. Now, the earliest date the United States ban could go into effect is July. The FDA is in the middle of a 60-day period of soliciting comments from what it calls "interested parties" before it writes up its final ruling.

Let's see what caused all the fuss. Saccharin, widely used by persons with diabetes as a needed sugar substitute, is also the only substitute sweetener currently allowed in this country. Americans use more than five million pounds of it a year, most of it in dietetic foods and soft drinks and in commercially sold sweeteners for use in coffee and tea. A little is used in mouthwashes and cosmetics.

While it's estimated that users of these products consume only a very small amount of saccharin in a year, they would have to swallow more than 800 12-ounce diet sodas every day for life in order to equal the dosage those poor rats ingested.

Remember cyclamates? The FDA banned them in 1969 with much fanfare and accusatory fingers pointed at those using them. That ban, it turned out, also rested on the theoretical 800-can-a-day soft drink diet.

Having swallowed the FDA's line once and found it not quite all it was supposed to be, people reacted skeptically to the saccharin ban. And, the skepticism is bipartisan. Republican Congressman Jim Martin of North Carolina immediately introduced a bill to set aside the saccharin ban. Democrat Andrew Jacobs, Jr. of Indiana, with tongue-in-cheek, introduced a bill to allow continued use of saccharin but with this wording on the label. "Warning! The Canadians have determined that saccharin is dangerous to your rat's health." Congressman Andrews calls his bill the "Un-Crazying of Federal Regulations Act of 1977". I'd say "amen" to that, but first, I remind you that there's still time to make your voice heard. If you think the government's gone too far this time, sit down and write your Representative and your Senator and the President.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "NATIONAL REVIEW" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

In my latest weekend reading, NATIONAL REVIEW told of some of the comments made by that Soviet pilot who defected and landed his MIG in Japan. He's now in the United States for debriefing. He described the enlisted men's life at the Northern Frontier Post where he was stationed. They are behind barbed wire, for all the world like prisoners, in barracks housing 50 or 60 men to a room. They go months without seeing their families. The suicide rate is high and the desertion rate higher. Penalty for desertion is not a pardon -- you are shot.

The Lieutenant is astonished by the amount and quality of food served on American bases and by the fraternizing between officers and enlisted men. He watched crews handling takeoffs and landings and expressed his astonishment as they did it, -- QUOTE -- "without ever being given an order and without anyone shouting at them" -- UNQUOTE. He said, -- QUOTE -- "If my regiment could see five minutes of what I saw today -- there would be a revolution". -- UNQUOTE.

In NATIONAL REVIEW I also learned of a new Russian hero. Well, he actually isn't Russian and you can make up your own mind as to whether you think he is a hero. But he has been awarded the Soviet Union Gold Star which is roughly equivalent to Britain's Victoria Cross, the French Croix de Guerre, and our own Congressional Medal of Honor.

You don't get that Gold Star for just being at work on time or not missing a cell meeting. Well, the new hero is a Spaniard by birth and when you start totting up his score he sounds like a pretty ordinary, run-of-the-mill Communist.

He wound up in Moscow in 1968 and from there until now has made a living doing some translating, a little editing and lecturing. Nothing there to merit the Soviet Union's highest honor.

Before 1968 he was in Prague, Czechoslovakia with a group of Spanish exiles and did nothing that would distinguish him from any of his comrades. We lose him for a few years between 1960 and his arrival in Prague, for he dropped out of sight in Cuba. Prior to that, and for 20 years, he was in a jail in Mexico -- 1940 to 1960. Surely he didn't get the Gold Star for good behavior in a Mexican jail. No, but what did he do to get the 20 years? Now we're getting warm. On August 21, 1940 -- on orders from Joseph Stalin -- he took an alpenstock (that's an ice axe used by mountain climbers) and buried it in the skull of Stalin's great enemy, Leon Trotsky, who was then a refugee in Mexico. Thirty-seven years later he is awarded the Gold Star of the Soviet Union.

I remember reading an Air Force General Order during World War II conferring our highest honor on a bomber pilot in the Eighth Air Force. His B-17 had been badly shot up by anti-aircraft fire. The ball turret beneath the belly of the plane had taken a hit. The gunner was wounded but with the turret jammed he couldn't be removed. Limping home across France and out over the channel, the plane was losing altitude at such a rate the Captain had to order the crew to bail out. The kid in the jammed turret realizing he would be left to go down with the plane, cried out in terror. The last man to leave saw the Captain sit down on the floor of the plane. Taking the boy's hand he said, -- QUOTE -- "Never mind, son, we'll ride it down together." -- UNQUOTE. Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously awarded. We give our medals on a different basis. I hope we always will.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Chile I" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

A few weeks ago, in March, our delegate to the United Nations, Brady Tyson said, --QUOTE -- "We could be less than candid and untrue to ourselves and our people if we did not express our profound regrets for the role some government officials, agencies and private groups played in the subversion of the previous democratically elected Chilean Government" -- UNQUOTE. He was speaking, of course, of the election of the late President Salvador Allende. Thank heaven our government, by way of State Department and White House immediately disavowed Tyson's apology and made it plain he was speaking only for himself. Yet, in spite of that disavowal our government does maintain a discriminatory policy against the present Chilean regime.

In Congress, particularly, the attitude is first that Allende was truly elected by the people in democratic style, and second that he was deposed in September of 1973 by a military coup covertly aided and/or directed by the CIA and U.S. military. Let's take a closer look at these assumptions.

In September 1970, Allende won 36.2 percent of the vote in a three-way race. Thus, he was not the choice of 63.8 percent of the voters. Under the Chilean constitution the Congress is empowered to ratify a winner. The Congress did ratify Allende as President, but only after he signed a constitutional amendment reaffirming freedom of the press, education, the electoral process and the non-involvement of the military in political matters. Following his election by the Congress, Allende told a French journalist, Regis De Bray, -- QUOTE -- "I signed the amendment as a simple tactical necessity to gain power." -- UNQUOTE.

There is little or no evidence to support Mr. Tyson's statement that the United States, through either the military or the CIA rigged, ran or even participated in the subsequent overthrow of Allende. We apparently did give some small campaign assistance to one or the other of his opponents in the election, but the Soviet Union was giving the Allende campaign 20 million dollars.

After he assumed office, no foreign government, including our own, played any significant part in the failure of Allende's Marxist experiment. We withheld relatively minor amounts of aid or credit, but this had to be expected in the face of his seizure of private assets owned by Americans. All the facts, few of which have been made available to Americans, make it plain that Allende's 1,000 days as President were a disaster for the people of Chile. One witness on the scene for all those 1,000 days has said, -- QUOTE -- "if Allende was the creator of the Chilean Marxist experiment he also was without doubt its executioner. The record speaks for itself for those who are willing to listen." -- UNQUOTE.

I hope you are willing to listen, because on the next broadcast I'm going to give that record. With the Soviet Union spreading its influence in Latin America as energetically as it is, I think we, the American people, should have the facts about a Latin American neighbor with a long record of democratic traditions similar to our own.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Chile II" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

On September 11, 1973, President Salvador Allende of Chile was overthrown in a military coup that probably received more worldwide media coverage than any similar event in history. At 1:45 on the afternoon of the 11th -- fifteen minutes after his supporters had surrendered -- he committed suicide with a gun which bore a gold plate in its stock inscribed with the words, "To my good friend Salvador Allende. Fidel Castro".

A barrage of propaganda, aided and abetted by the world Communist press, tried to portray this as a democratically conceived government reflecting the will of the people overthrown by politically ambitious military leaders.

Allende's downfall was the direct result of shameful economic mismanagement, deliberate violation of his nation's constitution and laws and terrorist tactics imposed on his people. The chief foreign correspondent of the TIMES, Dave Holden, said -- QUOTE "Unfortunately nobody with even a nodding acquaintance with economics could have classified the management of the Allende government as anything but disastrous". -- UNQUOTE.

When Allende took office the government had 343 million dollars in reserves. Three years later Chile's deficit was more than 300 million dollars. The admitted inflation rate was 508 percent, but economists charged that the figures were rigged to hide a real inflation rate of 700 percent. Either figure was a world record for inflation.

The government had increased the amount of paper money 670 percent in two years. The consumer price index had gone up 842 percent. Agricultural production was down 22 percent and copper, which makes up 80 percent of Chile's foreign export, was down 25 percent.

Allende had assumed control of all the banks, and therefore, of all loans, savings and credit essential to business. Using printing press money, massive spending programs were instituted mainly to benefit the roughly one third of the people who were Allende's constituency. By June of 1973, the government had confiscated 282 large industries which produced more than one half of the country's output. Almost 6000 farms -- 40 percent of the agricultural land -- was seized (much of it at gunpoint) and redistributed, again, to Allende's followers. In the summer of 1973, there were great food shortages and those who couldn't afford to deal in the black market lined up for hours to buy rationed necessities. In May of 1973, Chile's Supreme Court unanimously denounced the Allende Regime for "disruption of the legality of the nation." One month later a second Supreme Court resolution charged the President with illegal and unconstitutional interference in legal affairs that fall within the exclusive competence of the Judicial power. A few weeks later, the leaders of the two houses of Congress appealed to Allende to reestablish legality, "before it is too late". They cited the danger inherent in his, "creation of a parallel army in which numerous foreigners are collaborating". These foreigners were primarily Cuban and they were featherbedded on the pay rolls of the confiscated businesses and industries.

By August, the Congress charged the President with widespread violation of human rights and the Bar Association issued a report concluding that only Congress was competent to legislate and determine the extent of Presidential power. Tomorrow I'll try to cover the final days and the specific events leading up to the overthrow.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Chile III" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Salvador Allende, the late President of Chile, has been described as a gentle man-of-the people. Maybe so, but he declared in 1970 that if the Congress didn't make him President, "Santiago would be painted red with blood." And, when he was questioned as to how he could keep a campaign promise to provide a quart of milk everyday for every Chilean child, he replied -- QUOTE -- "when we run out of four legged beasts, we'll milk the two legged kind." -- UNQUOTE.

By 1973, his presidential retreat in the Andean foothills was the training center for a 15,000 man private army equipped with Russian weapons. The commander of his personal body guard was a Cuban assassin nicknamed "Easy Trigger". The military instructors were Cuban and so was most of the 15,000-man force.

In that final summer, on June 27th, his handpicked chief of the regular army, General Gonzalez, was involved in a street incident that reveals the political climate. A woman driver passing the General's car stuck out her tongue at him. Despite the heavy midday traffic he gave chase, firing two shots at her car. Overtaking her he put his pistol to her head, called her an unrepeatable name and demanded an apology. This was too much for several hundred bystanders who went to the woman's rescue. The General barely escaped with his life.

On June 19th a single armored regiment -- in an almost comic-opera move -- launched an attack on the Presidential Palace. The tanks went through Santiago stopping at all the traffic signals and running out of gas in front of the Palace. Let it be noted, the regular army put down the abortive attack.

But Allende seized the opportunity to go on the air and urge his followers to take over all industries and enterprises. The workers, who responded and took over 244 factories, were surprisingly prompt and well armed.

In July the transportation workers walked off the job joined by most other Union and Professional Associations. Food virtually disappeared. Medical care was available only for emergencies. Municipal services ceased, electric and telephone service was a sometime thing and there was no gas at the gas station. On August seventh, a radical Communist organization known as M.I.R. -- supported by Allende's leaders in Congress -- was revealed as having infiltrated the Navy with a plot for mutiny and murder. On the 22nd of August, 300 Army wives appeared before General Gonzalez' home demanding his resignation. The General had fire hoses turned on them.

The Admiral commanding the Navy resigned; and, still hopeful of avoiding civil strife, top Naval officers begged Allende to appoint as his successor Admiral Jose Merina. The President agreed and on September seventh Merina went to the Palace to be sworn in. But Allende reneged on his promise and the embarrassed Admiral returned to his ship.

All day and night on September eighth, shocked senior Naval officers met and conferred. By now they had learned of "Plan Zeta" -- an M.I.R. plot to murder, on September 18th, six hundred key military figures and civilian leaders. Sunday, September ninth, the Naval officers sent a simple message to the Army and Air Force commanders, -- QUOTE -- "D-day is Tuesday. The hour 0600." -- UNQUOTE. The two Generals gave a one word answer, -- QUOTE -- "CONFORME" -- UNQUOTE -- meaning concur. On September 11th -- regardless of what the propagandists say about it-- the Chilean military freed the people of Chile.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Labor" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

I'm going to preface my remarks by saying that I have the utmost confidence in the rank-and-file membership of organized labor. I believe in their patriotism and their fairness. They are part of that great body of Americans who pay the freight charge for government, support good causes and provide the manpower when the nation is threatened with war. I say this so the distinction will be very clear when I criticize-- as I intend to -- the top leadership of organized labor. Too many of those top leaders believe they know what is best for the rank-and-file members better than do the members themselves.

Victor Riesel, the columnist -- perhaps the best informed commentator on the doings of organized labor -- has recently revealed how the leadership is planning to raise additional funds to influence elections and get a Congress even more subservient to its will.

Already the election laws are so rigged as to allow the Committee on Political Education of the A.F.L. - C.I.O. opportunities not available to the rest of us for support of candidates. COPE's headman, Al Barkan, has come through with a new strategy for raising tens of millions of dollars. According to Riesel, the plan was unveiled with all the secrecy of a military campaign at a meeting of top labor officials in Bal Harbour, Florida. It calls for having management pay a modest, per-employee contribution to union-controlled political funds. This will be a collective bargaining demand and it means that in the future the employers will finance labor's political activities.

It was pointed out that these contributions could be camouflaged in many fashions. And, during the closed sessions, the 250 political specialists were urged to keep the project quiet so employers couldn't mobilize and plan against it.

Some of the political activists said a check-off as low as a nickel could result in tens of millions of dollars. Those present made it plain they want the plan in operation in time for the 1978 elections. Incidentally, confirming what I said about the leadership not reflecting the desires of the members, the reason for the new plan is found in the carefully guarded financial records of COPE. Right now the fourteen-and-a-half million members of A.F.L. - C.I.O. are not contributing voluntarily in any significant way. Most of COPE's money is coming from the Union's central treasuries. This is only legal if the money goes for registration drives and for contacting the members themselves. It can't be used to propagandize the public.

As Riesel says, -- QUOTE -- "the smell of money and powerful political machinery being geared up for the next congressional and presidential campaigns permeated the jam-packed room." -- UNQUOTE. Money means precinct power. Among those on hand urging backing for this, according to Riesel, was California's Senator Cranston.

If management gives in to this demand, it will deserve whatever happens to it, for it will be supporting the most powerful special interest group in America.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Murphy's Law" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

During the mid-Thirties on a New Year's Eve, a song would sweep the country. And, for a few hours preceding midnight it seemed to be the only song anyone wanted to hear. It was silly -- but easy -- to sing. "Catchy" is the word. It literally played itself out on New Year's Eve. Oh, you'd hear it occasionally after that, but its peak was reached between sunset and midnight on that one holiday.

It was something like a comet: not here for long, but it put on quite a show while it was. Last year's Swine flu scare and the vaccination program were a little like that, too. They caused quite a flurry in the news, and a lot of confusion among the people, but they seemed to disappear without a trace not long after. I have a hunch the vaccination program was done in by Murphy's Law. You know how it goes, "Whatever can go wrong will go wrong". That's exactly what happened to the Swine flu vaccination program.

On March 24th last year, the President announced that the government would provide "every man, woman and child" with Swine flu immunization. Trouble started within 24 hours. Dissent came from such diverse sources as the New York TIMES, health research groups, and even the inventor of oral polio vaccine, Dr. Albert Sabin. He, however, by June, had changed his mind.

Congress passed a \$135 million dollar bill, including \$110 million dollars to buy the vaccine and \$25 million to subsidize state health departments. State officials screamed because that only pro-rated out to 13 cents a shot, but the cost would be one dollar and 10 cents! On June 2nd, HEW officials announced a slight technical problem. One of the four vaccine manufacturers had produced two million doses of the wrong vaccine! The Federal Drug Administration's Bureau of Biologics had given them the wrong culture strain. Then, officials of the National Institute for Allergy and Infectious diseases reported problems in determining the proper dosage for children. It seems that enough to stop the flu would cause too many side effects.

In July, two firms said they wouldn't participate unless they were given liability protection. Finally, Congress -- after great debate -- offered such protections not only to the manufacturers but also to the doctors involved in the free public-immunization clinics. By August 1st, all signals were go and the drug firms accounted a-hundred-and-one-million doses on hand. They would be ready by the September 15th starting date. But someone must have miscounted. On August 27th the firms said they couldn't make shipment before October 1st and only one-fourth of the hundred-and-one million doses were on hand. Then they told the shell-shocked planners of mass immunization that only 65 million doses would be ready for shipment by the end of November!

Finally the program got off the ground. Then the press began reporting deaths of elderly people in connection with the vaccinations. Local health departments began closing down the program. Then, a case of Swine flu was reported in Missouri. But the confirmation on that case was withdrawn when it turned out the chap didn't have Swine flu after all. Then came the charge that a certain paralysis resulted from some vaccinations. That debate still goes on. There were 12 deaths in cases where there had been no shots given. And it seems no one knows what does cause that particular paralysis. The argument will go on, I'm sure for years, about whether the program was right or wrong. But one thing is certain, Murphy's Law was upheld.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Day Care Centers" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Day care for children of welfare mothers so they can get jobs and stop being a burden on the taxpayers sounds like an unassailable idea. After all, how much can taking care of a little child cost? If a little subsidy will get mama off the welfare roles and on to the taxpayers roles with the rest of us, it's a good investment. Or it would be if Government didn't insist on acting like government.

Last Fall, the State of New York (through its welfare administration) told the insolvent City of New York it should reduce its average day care cost from \$75.00 to \$65.00 a week. Now \$65.00 is about \$3,250.00 a year per child. That's a little high just to get someone a job, particularly, if there is more than one child in the family. Incidentally, the swank, uppercrust nursery schools caring for the children of even the very rich only charge \$75.00 a week.

In New York state outside the big town, day care runs \$40.00 a week. That's \$2,000.00 per child per year. There really is no way to estimate a national average on this, because the truth is, dozens of government agencies, in several government departments all have a piece of the action under a variety of titles -- child care, child development, and so forth.

We start out with what seems like a practical idea. If a mother of small children can't get a job because she has to take care of her children, then find a way to care for the kids while she's at work. A lot of women who aren't on welfare and never were, are working. How do they handle the problem? Well, some of them do pay private nursery schools or day care centers. In those swank \$75.00-a-week establishments the staffing level is one teacher for every 10 children. When government gets into providing the day care, however, the staffing standards are little different. For children up to six weeks of age, it's one employee per child. From six weeks to three years, one-to-four employees, and for four to five year olds, one-to-five employees. But five is kindergarten age and there are usually about 20 kids for each kindergarten teacher. I know that federal staffing standards are for the benefit of the child, but one gets an uneasy feeling they might be for the benefit of the staff.

To get back to those mothers who've solved the problem themselves, most of them don't use the \$75.00 nursery schools at all. There is grandma, or a housewife sister with kids of her own, or a neighbor who happily watches after the children for a few dollars. Still the professional day care idea has a powerful lobby, far better organized than the great majority of mothers who think mothers are supposed to take care of their children if they can. The lobby has professionals who say they, the professionals, can develop the child better than an amateur who just happens to be a mother. Then there are those in the feminist movement who say the state should raise the kids so they won't interfere with mama's seeking a career. One question is avoided by the day care lobbyists. If there is such a crying need and such a demand for institutionalized child care, how come the private sector hasn't moved into the field to supply the needed service for a profit? Meanwhile, Stanford Research, the Urban Institute and even the liberal Brookings Institution have found that most women who need day care can find it and that private care is as good as public, and at a lower cost. Still on Capitol Hill, people such as Vice President Mondale say child development is too important to be left to chance; meaning, to the parents in the home.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Charity" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

A hundred and thirty or forty years ago a French philosopher came to America to see, at first hand, what he called, -- QUOTE -- "This great experiment." -- UNQUOTE. He's probably been quoted more by after dinner speakers in these modern days than any other individual.

Going back to France he wrote a book about Democracy in America. He said he had sought for the greatness of America in her commodious harbors and her ample rivers and it was not there. Nor did he find it in our rich mines and vast world commerce. He wrote, -- QUOTE -- "not until I went to the churches of America and heard her pulpits aflame with righteousness did I understand the secret of her genius and her power. America is great because she is good and if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great". -- UNQUOTE.

In his book he told his countrymen how in America a citizen would see a problem that needed solving and he would cross the street and talk to a neighbor. They would talk to others and soon a committee would be formed, the problem solved and as Alexis deTocqueville said, -- QUOTE -- "You won't believe this, but no government bureau will be involved at all". -- UNQUOTE.

Our French visitor of more than a century ago would have been reassured if he had been in Santa Barbara, California not long ago. A young girl, in her teens, faced certain death from a form of Leukemia. Her chance for life depended on the relatively new and unusual procedure of bone marrow transplant. The operation and accompanying treatment, available in a medical center in Minnesota, cost tens of thousands of dollars; money her family didn't have.

Then the word got around. The local news media broke the story. Someone proposed forming a committee. I can't recount all the efforts that were put forth, but a symphony concert contributed its proceeds. McDonalds contributed food for a benefit dinner. School children went door-to-door, soliciting contributions and as deTocqueville, more than a century earlier said, -- QUOTE -- "Before you knew it, the problem was solved." -- UNQUOTE.

Tens of thousands of dollars were raised and the young lady, thanks to neighbors and friends she didn't know she had, went to the hospital in Minnesota where her younger brother was the donor in the transplant operation. How I wish I could say this was the happy finish. But, sadly I can't.

An infection, apparently unrelated to her dread disease, took her life and ended the story. Or did it? Was all the goodness, the affectionate outpouring by so many people wasted? Not if we believe that God has a purpose for each one of us -- a purpose that gives meaning to our lives without regard to the length of time we spend here. This teenage girl has left many who sorrow and grieve, but she has also left a heritage to her community. Even before she embarked on her journey to the hospital the people of Santa Barbara had made a decision. More money had been contributed than was needed. It was decided to use the surplus as the beginning of a permanent fund for future needs of this kind. Down through the years how many will be helped because a 17 year-old girl inspired an entire community?

Her schoolmates, and youngsters who didn't even know her, will become adults remembering the generosity of today's grownups. They'll remember, too, how they themselves learned the job there is in serving others. They'll remember to "cross the street and talk to a neighbor".

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Argo Merchant" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Last December a Liberian tanker the "Argo Merchant" ran aground on the Nantucket shoals. Pounded by the heavy seas, it began to come apart like a wet cigar, spilling it's cargo of Number Six fuel oil into the Atlantic. The dread cry went up, "oil spill" and every ecological Chicken Little in the land took off to warn that the sky was falling.

The director of the Environmental Protection Agency called it the "biggest oil spill disaster on an American coast in our history". The Senate held hearings and the networks gave it more coverage than they did the elections -- well, almost. One network, having supposedly consulted with experts, announced that the oil would sink to the bottom, spreading across the ocean floor like a carpet of black ooze smothering lobsters, crabs, scallops and flounder. Fishermen filed a 60 million dollar suit, charging that the spill had permanently robbed them of their livelihood. All in all, it was about as widely covered a disaster as never happened.

The oil never reached the Georges Banks fishing grounds, and the lobsters, crabs, scallops and flounders are still doing whatever it is that lobsters, crabs, scallops and flounders do. The Coast Guard was a voice of sanity through the whole mess, but no one listened. Everyone was too busy waiting for the sky to fall -- or looking for scapegoats. The Coast Guard pointed out that Number Six fuel oil is lighter than water so it could not possibly become a black carpet of ooze on the bottom. If it reached the bottom at all, it would be as scattered tar balls, with hard outer shells, non-toxic and as harmless as so many rocks thrown into the sea.

The oil did exactly what the Coast Guard said it would do -- floated around on the surface until it was broken up by the waves and blown out to sea. Before that happened, a few birds were recovered and cleaned of oil and two washed ashore dead. One of them was immediately immortalized on the front page of the New York TIMES. The only real tragedy is that none of the Chicken Littles ever bothered to admit that the sky didn't fall. There has been no explanation that the carpet of ooze never came to be, and many Americans who listened and read still assume that it did. Opponents of offshore drilling -- including members of Congress -- keep up the disaster talk to convince us there should be no offshore drilling for oil. There is no connection, of course, between an off-course tanker going on the rocks and a well drilled in the ocean floor, but if they can they'll keep the people from knowing that.

That fact is Georges Bank is not only a rich fishing ground, it is also a potential oil field capable of meeting the fuel needs of an energy-hungry New England. And we don't have to choose between sea life and oil. We've learned in the Gulf of Mexico that fishing can actually be improved, with the hundreds of drilling rigs affording shelter to all manner of aquatic life. Riding into battle armed with the disaster of the "Argo Merchant" (which turned out to be a disaster only for the ship itself), opponents of offshore drilling have raised the spectacle of hundreds of "Argo Merchants" bringing oil into harbors from the offshore wells, with a good share of them cracking up like the "Argo Merchant", spilling oil from Maine to Manhattan. But what is the difference between tankers bringing the oil ashore from nearby wells or tankers bringing it thousands of miles from Araby? The number of ships will be the same and so will the number of barrels of oil they carry and they'll enter the same harbors. The "Argo Merchant" disaster didn't happen. The coldest Eastern winter in 100 years did.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Government by the People" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Every one of us knows that the very basis of our system of government is that government exists only by the will of the people; that government has no other powers except those granted to it by the people. Well, either we, the people, aren't working at government-by-the-people or someone in government isn't listening.

United States Senator William Scott sent a letter to his 400,000 constituents in Virginia seeking their opinion on a number of major issues. The replies were reported in the Congressional record last month and it would seem that Washington and the people of at least one state are on very different courses.

The Humphrey-Hawkins bill, which I have criticized in these broadcasts as a relic of Mussolini's fascism and which could give government unprecedented control over business and industry, is the number one priority in the Congress. But how do the people feel about it? Well, Senator Scott's replies were divided, 89 percent against Humphrey-Hawkins; only 11 percent in favor.

Another high priority item on the agenda of the new Congress is some kind of national health insurance -- a socializing of the practice of medicine. Apparently the only thing delaying its passage by the present Congress -- egged on by the hierarchy of organized labor -- is the 70 or 80 billion dollars in additional government spending that it calls for. But the patients don't seem to want it at all. The poll shows 54 percent of the people favoring some kind of nationalized insurance for catastrophic illnesses only, 38 percent want the Federal government to stay out of the medical field altogether, and only eight percent favor a comprehensive program. It makes you wonder how socialized medicine manages to stay alive so long in the halls of Congress.

On the matter of defense spending, Senator Scott's respondents are very definite about what they want their public servants to do. 80 percent do not want any cuts in the defense budget. Only 20 percent do.

Senator Scott's constituents were also asked if the United States should negotiate a new treaty with Panama, limiting American rights. Only 12 percent said yes. 80 percent said they were against such a treaty. High on the list of promises made by the new administration and/or the majority in Congress are a Consumer Advocacy Agency, postcard or no registration for voting, a break up of the large oil companies and an abolition of state right-to-work laws. This latter would be accomplished by cancelling Section 14 (B) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Those are the aims of many elected representatives. Do they reflect the will of the people? Well, in reply to Senator Scott's questionnaire, 85 percent rejected the Consumer Agency, 93 percent opposed postcard registration (believing it would lead to widespread voter fraud). Almost three quarters -- 74 percent -- of those questioned disagreed with the legislature to break up the oil companies. As for 14 (B) of Taft-Hartley, the right of states to have right-to-work laws (and nearly half do), 95 percent said they did not approve of Washington denying this right. If those Virginia poll results are anywhere near close to people's views in other states, Congress must be marching to the wrong drummer.

Taped - April 13, 1977

RONALD REAGAN
Disc 76 - 412

76 - 12A

PROGRAMS:

<u>TITLES</u>	<u>TIME</u>
1. Redwoods	3:07
2. Capital Punishment	3:02
3. Electoral College	2:55
4. Panama	3:06
5. Brezhnev	3:07
6. Gasohol	2:43
7. Coal Car	3:00

76 - 12B

PROGRAMS:

<u>TITLES</u>	
1. Human Rights	3:12
2. Jamaica	2:57
3. Recycled Theater	2:35
4. Environment	3:02
5. Education & Religion	3:02
6. Miranda	2:55
7. Student Letter	3:02
8. Arson	3:07

Please retain your program reprints. Reprints may be Xeroxed to meet your listener requests for copies of program scripts. Please do not forward these requests to our office.



RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Redwoods" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Congressman Phil Burton of California has introduced a bill to add 50 or 75,000 acres of Redwood forest land to California's National Redwood Park. He plays on a misconception that somehow the great Redwood trees are in danger of being lost forever and only the enlarging of the present National Park can save them. That isn't true.

Still, I'm sure that lacking the truth many Americans are ready to march forth under the Burton banner. The big redwood trees of California are unique in all the world and must be considered a national treasure. Standing in one of the cathedral-like groves of trees is a moving experience and one can feel very close to God and very humble.

Why then am I critical of the Congressman? The answer is, we don't need his bill or a National Park to preserve the redwoods. Thanks to an organization called Save-The-Redwoods League, virtually all the superlative trees, the cathedral-like groves, have been incorporated into state parks already. The League for decades has been raising money to buy these groves and give them to the park service. And, for the most part, the lumber companies have been cooperative in not cutting the great trees till the League could make the purchase. Somewhere near 200,000 acres have been preserved, with only about 4,000 scattered acres of superlative trees still in private hands.

The redwood forests are a major part of the economy in northern California, providing thousands of jobs in the lumber industry and an extremely fine wood for home building and furniture. Closely regulated by the state, the industry has achieved or is close to a sustained yield basis -- cutting no faster than replacement growth. Still it has been subjected to constant harassment by some who apparently want every redwood tree left standing.

This is unrealistic. The vast redwood forests are not made up of the great 1000-year-old trees one sees on the picture post cards. Redwoods are fast growing, reaching harvest size in about 40 years. Our great grandchildren will see as many redwoods as we see today.

For years, there has been a demand for a National Redwood Park. Finally, Congress gave in, but with no real enthusiasm and little understanding of the extent of the magnificent California state parks. As Governor at the time, I had to tell the chairman of the Congressional committee that a park was unnecessary from the standpoint of saving the trees. They had already been saved, but possibly a national park would calm the waters and bring stability to the industry.

So we have a national park which would have little attraction if it were not between two of California's most beautiful state parks. Roughly half of the 55,000 acre national park consists of what was already state park land. To illustrate what I said about the lack of need for a national park, the federal government bought roughly 27,000 acres of which almost 16,000 were cut-over or open land without trees. By contrast, the state park portion is 28,000 acres of which about 20,000 are superlative and old growth big trees with only about 4,000 acres in cutover and non-timber land. The excuse for enlarging the national park is that a buffer zone of redwoods must be provided to protect the present park boundaries. But if a buffer zone is added to the park, won't that call for another buffer zone to protect the buffer zone and that can go on until you run out of trees.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Capital Punishment" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

A short while ago a former Attorney General of the United States -- one-time anti-war activist and defeated candidate for the U.S. Senate, Ramsey Clark, visited Sacramento, California. Appearing before a State Senate Committee he called for limiting all prison sentences to five years maximum even for first-degree murder. He said punishment in itself was a crime. He then expounded on the standard bleeding-heart line that prisons weren't the answer; that we must do away with poverty, lack of education, and broken homes. Do all that and crime will cease to be.

A few months ago on one of these broadcasts I reported on a study by two eminent scholars debunking this whole society-is-the-cause-of-crime approach. The study had shown by fact and figure that crime was reduced in proportion to the increased severity and certainty of punishment and vice versa.

But Mr. Clark touched a nerve with me when he reminded the Senators that California had carried out an execution in 1967 and then asked, -- QUOTE -- "Did that reduce the murder rate?" -- UNQUOTE. Having been Governor at the time of that execution, I feel called on to reply. No, I don't think one execution reduced the murder rate by any measurable degree. But, one Californian has reason to believe that that execution prevented at least one murder -- his own.

During the week of that execution, an elderly storekeeper in San Francisco was the victim of a robbery. The robber had him on the floor and tried to stab him. Struggling to avoid the descending blade, the storekeeper desperately cried out -- QUOTE -- "You'll get the gas chamber if you do". -- UNQUOTE. The knife paused for a moment in its descent, then the robber ran out of the store. The intended victim wrote me that he was convinced that great attention given the execution at the time by the press had saved his life. Not statistical evidence -- just one man's opinion.

But there are statistics which tend to refute the foolishness of Ramsey Clark. In the years from 1930 until the mid 50's, murder was actually decreasing in the United States. It fell from more than 10,500 in 1935 to less than 7,500 in 1955. During those years, capital punishment was consistently enforced in most of our states with executions numbering in the hundreds each year. Then in the early 60's the crusade against capital punishment began to roll. By 1964, there were only 15 executions and four years later they stopped altogether. Murderers weren't being put to death, but murderers were putting others to death; 12,500 in 1968, 18,500 in 1972 and more than 20,500 in 1975. A 200 percent increase in 20 years.

Professor Isaac Ehrlich of the University of Chicago offers an explanation of the relationship between crime and punishment. He says most human acts, including crime are based on costs and benefits. If the cost for doing murder is death and a criminal is aware of this he may decide not to commit the murder.

Professor Ehrlich also said that during the years we began saving the lives of murderers we traded the lives of eight victims for every murderer we didn't execute. That kind of inflation we can't afford.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Electoral College" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

The move is on to revise the election laws. Again! High on the list of changes which Vice President Mondale has proposed is elimination of the Electoral College. Now, I doubt if very many of us could find an excuse for continuing the ceremony after each Presidential election in which appointed electors in each state (one for each Senator and Congressman) go to the state capitol and reelect the already elected President. And, maybe some of you think that's all they are talking about doing.

Unfortunately, there is more to it than that. The very basis for our freedom is that we are a federation of sovereign states. Our Constitution recognizes that certain rights belong to the state and cannot be infringed upon by the national government. This is the guaranty that small states, or rural, sparsely populated areas will have a proportionate voice in national affairs.

Those who want to do away with the Electoral College really mean they want the president elected in a national referendum with no reference as to how each state votes. Thus, a half dozen rural states could show a majority for one candidate and be outvoted by one big industrial state opting for his opponent. Presidential candidates would be tempted to aim their campaigns and their promises at a cluster of metropolitan areas in a few states, and the smaller states would be without a voice. If the would-be executioners of the Electoral College are sincere, let them eliminate the College but continue to tote up the vote by states. Based on majority rule within each state, that state's electoral votes, one for each Congressman and Senator would be given to the winner of the majority vote. The possibility of an appointed electoral college member voting on his own would be eliminated, but everything else would remain the same. Yes, it is possible under this system to have a President elected with a smaller total vote than his opponent, but it has only happened three times in 200 years. Is that worse than having a president who only carried a dozen out of our 50 states and got all his votes from big urban areas? Would his programs in agriculture be fair to farmers or would they be aimed at helping only consumers in big city markets?

The other proposed election law changes are equally flawed. The Hatch Act would be liberalized so as to allow increased participation in campaigns by federal employees. There are roughly 15 million government employees. Grant that they each influence one additional vote and you have a voting block of 30 million with a vested interest in high taxes, big government and more government programs. A Congressman or Senator would think twice before launching a crusade to reduce bureaucracy or government revenues.

Then, there is a part of the reform calling for easy voter registration. Let the voters walk into the polls on election day, sign up and vote. The idea being the low voter turnouts are due to the present registration rules. Somehow they skip over the fact that millions of already registered voters don't vote. What's their excuse? And, of course, they pooh - pooh the idea that voter fraud might be encouraged. Yet, in one state right now, the count in the last election in one congressional race has been challenged. So far they've found a half dozen oil stations, several warehouses and empty lots, a cemetery and two public parks that voted for the winner.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Panama" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

In the next few months, we're going to be treated to a sophisticated public relation's campaign designed to convince us we really want to give away the Panama Canal. The government of Panama has hired an American public relations firm, headquartered in Washington, to do a nationwide sales job on the American people. The fee is some where between 150,000 and 200,00 dollars for a six month's campaign, which should buy a fair-sized snow job.

It is interesting to note that the firm selected by the Panamanian government is one experienced in matters political. The owner is reported to be former Democratic National Chairman Strauss, but the political spectrum is pretty well covered. Former Goldwater campaigner and participant on the Republican side in the last campaign, F. Clifton White, will be among those running the operation.

No one, of course, can know in advance what the advertising theme will be. Could be the Canal is obsolete and unimportant; or it is a last vestige of colonialism. Then of course, there is the ever-present threat the enraged Panamanians will rise up and do violence to us and the Canal. Any, or all, of these could be the basis for the sales campaign. And all of them are as phony as some of the old-time Hollywood publicity used to glorify not-so-epic screen epics. We can be a little more sure of what they won't tell us. There will be no mention of the fact that General Torrijos, Panama's dictator, was not chosen by the people. He was part of a junta that siezed power at the point of a gun nine years ago. No reference will be made to the amount of shipping going through the canal each day, and how much prices would go up if those ships had to go 'round the "horn". Or, how much prices would go up if someone like the General, instead of non-profit Uncle Sam, were setting the toll fees.

We've already been conditioned to accept that Panamanians are at a boiling point over this issue, so I'm sure the public relations campaign will make no mention of the stories Ronald Yates of the Chicago TRIBUNE has been filing from Panama City. Yates has found that Torrijos is not an object of affection in Panama, and the poor and unemployed want desperately for us to stay in control of the Canal. A number of our congressmen and senators have heard the same thing from businessmen and Panamanian leaders, but they only express themselves in whispers. Mr. Yates found that those with little to lose (except their lives) were bolder. Singly, in groups, and freely giving their names they are quoted as saying, -- QUOTE -- "All of us would fight for America to keep the Canal. We would never fight against the United States." -- UNQUOTE. The one who said that also said, -- QUOTE -- "The only people in Panama who have ever given the United States trouble are communists, rich University students, and parasitic intellectuals who live off the blood and sweat of people like us." -- UNQUOTE. Another said, -- QUOTE -- "Running the Canal is a complex thing. As soon as the Panamanian government gets its hands on the controls, forget about the Canal as a means of getting ships between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans." -- UNQUOTE. His friends tried to persuade him not to talk because he would be taken away by the police. He shrugged them off and said, -- QUOTE -- "The Americans are the only friends we've got. Poor people don't have nobody else." -- UNQUOTE. An old woman summed it up when she told the TRIBUNE reporter, -- QUOTE -- "You ask the General how he got so rich in eight years." -- UNQUOTE.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Brezhnev" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

On March 21st Soviet Communist Party Chief Leonid Brezhnev made a speech warning the President of the United States to lower his voice on the subject of human rights. He, of course, received worldwide coverage. Indeed, we could all be excused if we thought that's all he talked about. It wasn't. He had things to say about the Middle East and frankly, if a man biting a dog is more newsworthy than a dog biting a man, then the world press missed the real news in his speech.

In introducing the subject of the Middle East, Brezhnev sounded as if a reconvening of the Geneva Conference on the Arab-Israeli stalemate might be in order. Then, speaking for the Soviet Union (which cochairs the Geneva Conference) he outlined what his country considers essential to a peaceful settlement between Arabs and Israelis. He said, -- QUOTE -- "We hold, in particular, that the final documents should be based on the principle of" -- now hear this -- "the impermissibility of acquisition of territory by war." -- UNQUOTE. He then went on to say that Israel should withdraw her military forces from all the territory she took in the Six-Day War back in 1967. And, of course, return that territory to the Arabs.

This to be sure, is one of the bones of contention in the present stalemate and could raise among us Americans a question of, "why not"? After all, we fought two world wars, were victorious in both and never asked for, or took, so much as a square-inch of anyone else's territory. But we'd be pretty naive if we applied that yardstick to Israel in the present situation. The real issue in the Middle East had to do with the Arab refusal to recognize that Israel has a right to exist as a nation. To give up the buffer zones Israel took in the Six-Day War, could be to put cannon on her front walk aimed at her front door by those who have said she must be destroyed.

But let's take a look at those other words of Mr. Brezhnev. He is telling us the Soviet Union does not believe any nation has the right to hold territory seized by force of arms? Let's play, "what if?". What if the United States said to Israel, you give back that territory to your Arab neighbors, and we'll enter into a treaty with you -- a mutual aid pact -- that says, if you are attacked we come to your aid? Don't go away! There is more to come if we are playing "what if?". Then we say to the Soviet Union by way of Mr. Brezhnev, -- QUOTE -- "You, of course, must get out of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia which you seized by force of arms". -- UNQUOTE. And, come to think of it, that means turning loose Finland, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, East Germany and Rumania. As a matter of fact, there are some islands north of Japan and some territory in Mongolia you occupy only because you joined the fight against Japan 20 minutes before the end of the war. (I don't think they heard a single shot fired in anger). And, up till then, Korea was one nation. It only became a North and a South Korea because the Soviets came in like a squatter and homesteaded the north half. Unfortunately, that was during a time when we were in that good-old Uncle-Joe mood, thinking Stalin was going to turn out to be the gruff old codger with a heart of gold.

How about that? One sentence by Brezhnev in a speech on March 21, 1977, and if everybody (especially him) did what he said, peace would come to the world.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Gasohol" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

I'm no engineer. Let's have that understood in view of what I'm going to talk about. Beyond changing a tire, my knowledge about making a go-less car go consists of calling the Automobile Club. But, ever since the Arab Oil embargo, I've wondered if we shouldn't be thinking about an energy source we could somehow plant and harvest as we do food and fiber.

This isn't new or original with me. Racing cars run on alcohol. Ethyl alcohol can be made from corn or other grains. Then there is wood alcohol and methanol which can be made from a number of things; sewage, garbage, waste wood, etcetera. I'm not suggesting we cap all the oil wells. I'm just asking why more hasn't been done with a mix called gasohol, already tried and proven workable. Here we are, importing more oil than we were four years ago, and producing less here at home than we were then. They've upped the price and we can't do anything about it because if they slap another embargo on us, we'll all be walking.

Two years ago in the midwest, thousands of gallons of a ten percent alcohol/ninety percent gasoline mix were sold to customers who apparently were happy with the result. One state ran tests on its state vehicles with this 90/10 mix and found in almost three-quarters of a million miles that results, ranging from pollution to engine wear, were no different than with plain gasoline.

Arithmetic on this "gasohol" indicates that general use could save us about 700,000 barrels of oil a day. That's between two and three billion dollars of savings on our import bill. Instead, those billions of dollars would be spent here at home growing and making the alcohol. That does not count the initial outlay for building the producing plants we don't have.

Washington, which seems so bent on involving itself in everything, has been strangely silent on this possible answer to the energy shortage. Except, of course, for proposals that we drive less. And, to make that attractive, they talk of a hike in the gas tax -- which is pretty consistent with most government proposals.

Well, gasohol would cost about five percent more than gasoline, but you get about five percent more miles per gallon, so that's a standoff. With some engine modification and improved technology, the mix could be more alcohol and less gasoline -- or so I'm told. And that sounds reasonable if racing cars can run on alcohol alone.

As I said at the beginning, I'm no engineer. Maybe there are hang-ups and pitfalls we haven't heard about. But, it is fascinating to think of a day when much of our transportation fuel could possibly be a farm product, planted, harvested and processed with only the vagaries of weather to threaten the supply. There would be a whole market for agriculture and a new industry offering jobs to our people. Well, as I said, I'm no engineer -- but -- why not?

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Coal Car" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Last time, I talked about "gasohol", that mixture of ten percent alcohol and ninety percent gasoline which has been catching on in Nebraska. That's one approach that shows promise. There's another one that seems further off, but worth a lot of serious talk and study. It's methanol gas, which might actually be made from coal without taking the coal out of the ground. Word about progress on methanol as a motor vehicle fuel comes from Dr. Peter Beckmann, the good humored, highly literate and staunchly pro-science University of Colorado professor who publishes Access to Energy, a fascinating monthly newsletter.

Dr. Beckmann visited with me a little over a year ago and told me about the possibilities for methanol. Now he updates the situation in his current issue. He approaches this, and any other new, alternative fuel source, with a sensitive man's hope and a scientist's skepticism. So, his report on methanol doesn't engage in any tub-thumping; it just gives the facts as they now stand.

He reports on tests conducted by General Motors' research laboratories in actual driving conditions, using a fleet of 14 autos from model years 1966 through 1974. All but two were converted from gasoline to a blend of gasoline and methanol. The two had fuel injection, thus pure methanol.

One of the drawbacks of methanol is that it has half the heating value of gasoline so it requires a tank twice as large for the same operating range (there goes your trunk space). It has a higher octane number, though, so it can give better performance. But, it's less volatile than gasoline meaning colder starts and slower warmup. But, again on the plus side, its lower combustion temperature sharply reduces nitrous oxide pollution. It is, however, both more toxic and corrosive than gasoline.

Currently, methanol is made from natural gas, but it could be made from coal, wood -- even garbage! In fact, according to Access to Energy, it could, in principle, be made from coal that never leaves the ground, via underground explosions that produce methane, from which methanol would be made.

How about the GM test? "Less than a howling success" for the mixed methanol-and gasoline cars, Dr. Beckmann says. "To run on pure methanol, a car needs a number of modifications beyond a doubled fuel tank." all materials in contact with methanol must be made corrosion resistant; an additive is needed to improve starts; carburation must be changed; and the spark plugs and distributor re-set. The two fuel-injected methanol-only cars fared better, though still requiring several adjustments. Dr. Beckmann concludes, "Methanol remains, technically, a serious contender as a gasoline substitute." He adds, "...these are merely the technical details. The crucial point about methanol is the cost, and the coal-to-methanol technique is kept artificially uncompetitive by congressional price-fixing of natural gas and by the uncertain climate for investments. Methanol remains blocked -- by the people who think automobile engines need not be designed, because they can be legislated." -- UNQUOTE.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Human Rights" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

With talk of human rights, the latest subject along the Washington cocktail circuit; an old threat to our own independence, has risen to haunt us. The President, in his address to the United Nations, promised to "work closely with our Congress" to achieve ratification of the Genocide Convention.

Reduced to the simplicity of that title it would seem that no one could be opposed to our participation in such a pact. Genocide -- the wiping out of a people -- for whatever reason is, of course, abhorrent to any civilized being. Our 200 year history makes it plain that the United States has never shown even the slightest indication that such a thing would be thinkable.

Unfortunately, the Genocide Convention is not as simple as its title indicates. I'll speak to that in a moment, but first a little history. When the United States agreed to abide by the World Court in the late '40's, our government established -- through the Connally Reservation -- that the United States reserved the right to decide for itself what cases affecting us would be taken to the World Court. Off and on in these 30 years, efforts have been made to scrap the Connally Amendment. They have been resisted, because without it the World Court would involve itself in our purely internal affairs.

Now comes the latest effort. The Genocide Convention which in its Article Nine states, -- QUOTE -- "Disputes between the contracting parties relating to the interpretation, application, or fulfillment of the present Convention (including those related to the responsibility of a state for genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in article three) shall be submitted to the International Court of Justice at the request of any of the parties to the dispute." -- UNQUOTE.

Now, let your imagination go for a minute. Picture some of our mischief-makers, charging any kind of discrimination or unfairness, taking their case to an international court which includes jurists from the Soviet Union and other communist and pro-communist nations. Remember, once ratified by us, this treaty subjects the United States to the unreserved jurisdiction of that International Court. It supersedes all state laws and nullifies all Acts of Congress inconsistent with the terms of the Convention.

One of the great watchdogs over the years, who stood between us and ratification of this treaty, was former U. S. Senator Sam Ervin (Democrat of North Carolina.) He is recognized as a great authority on our Constitution. He is now retired, but during the many battles over this issue, he said things we should be remembering now that we are being threatened again.

He said the World Court, -- QUOTE -- "could require the United States to go to war to prevent one nation from killing the nationals of another nation." -- UNQUOTE. American soldiers could be tried by this international tribunal for killing, or wounding, the military forces of a warring enemy and the Convention could authorize calling the United Nations to take action against the United States.

Former Senator Ervin says our own public officials and individual American citizens could be prosecuted and punished for causing mental harm (and who defines that?) to members of a national, ethnic, social, or cultural group. In short, it appears that the President in his speech on human rights promised to help Congress eliminate the guaranty of our human rights embodied in our own Constitution. Surely, that can't be what he intends.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Jamaica" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

In a series of these broadcasts a few weeks ago, I told of how President Allende of Chile had taken his country to the very brink of a communist takeover before he was stopped by the Chilean military. History does repeat itself. It's almost like a rerun of T.V. If you missed Allende's destruction of Chile's economy, his buildup of a private army -- aided and abetted by Cuba -- and his elimination of civil liberties, tune in on Jamaica.

That island nation setting astride the sea lanes leading to the Panama Canal, seems to be well on its way to becoming a marxist state, indeed, a Soviet satellite. This should worry us because of its geographical position and because it is a source of bauxite, thus aluminum.

Somehow, with so much media attention fixed on Africa, very few of our nation's guardians in Washington seem aware that Prime Minister Michael Manley is following the blueprint drawn by Allende. He openly expresses his intention to model Jamaica after his communist neighbor to the north, Cuba. And, like Chile under Allende, there are thousands of Cubans, many of them part of Cuba's secret police, training communist cadres in Jamaica.

Several hundred Soviet agents are also enjoying the climate and handing out advice. A student exchange program is a three-way deal between Cuba, the Soviet Union and Jamaica. Manley has made all the proper statements; he admires the Soviet Union, supports the national liberation efforts of the African people and wants to sell things to Eastern Europe. He has also adopted all the standard communist procedures. Jamaicans who complain about the spreading Marxism receive a certain official attention. Under an emergency act they can be "detained". Several hundred are already in jail, including the leaders of the opposition political party. There is increasing violence and the usual efforts to curb the press.

Like Allende, Manley is organizing a "people's" militia that already outnumbered the army and police force put together. But, he hasn't stopped there. Cuban experts are selling communism to the police and military. Expropriation of American owned aluminum companies hasn't exactly taken place yet. They've just had to give fifty-one percent control to the Jamaican government, which more-and-more is becoming Prime Minister Manley himself. Banks are being nationalized as well as private businesses. Getting away from Jamaica isn't easy for Jamaicans. They can leave but they can only take fifty dollars when they go. Taxes on a \$12,500 income are sixty percent, private land is being confiscated, there are price controls and a growing number of regulations and restrictions on industry.

And, as with Chile under Allende, economic problems are growing. Foreign investors are not coming to Jamaica and Jamaican doctors, lawyers and businessmen are leaving regardless of the fifty dollar limit. Tourists, once a major source of income for the Island, have been scared off by the violence and vandalism. Tourist trade is down to about one-fourth of normal. But guess who is to blame for all these troubles according to Prime Minister Manley -- the C.I.A.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Recycled Theater" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

When they screened the last picture show at the Crown Theater in Pasadena, California a couple of years ago, it looked like "curtains" for the ornate old movie place -- a fate that has befallen a lot of downtown theaters in recent years. But that was before Bruce Barkis came along. When he did, nothing -- not dollar costs, grime or downtown blight -- would keep him from making a boyhood dream of owning a theater come true. Today, he's putting the finishing touches on a complete stagedoor-to-front door renovation of the 55-year-old theater and will open it this spring, not to show the latest trendy sex-and-violence films, but a mixture of family films and stage shows.

Mr. Barkis says he searched up and down California for the theater of his dreams. He had plenty of boarded up theaters to look through, but the Crown was just right. It holds up to 2,700 people, has a big stage and plenty of dressing rooms and a fine theater-size organ which delights Barkis, who is a professional theater organist.

The new owner's enthusiasm for his restoration project has been infectious. A scientist at Pasadena's Jet Propulsion Laboratory developed a computer "language" that can be used to feed any kind of music through an offstage computer into the theater's sound system. A good example of ornate theater decoration in a style called Greek and Roman Revival, the Crown is being brightened up to give modern theater-goers a taste of those old days. It boasts a hand painted curtain featuring a 1920's automobile cruising through a pastoral landscape. And, it comes complete with Burgundy Red seats and plush carpets.

What does he think about swimming upstream against a film trend that glorifies anti-heroes, violence, and sex? "We are going to show films that families can enjoy," Mr. Barkis says simply. And, he wants to put on stage everything from local variety shows to Las Vegas-league entertainers. Illustrating the caliber of entertainers and movies he hopes to attract, he mentions Victor Borge, Frank Sinatra, "Oklahoma" and "the Sound of Music".

A tall order, but Mr. Barkis is determined to succeed. "Most important," he says, "I would like to bring back that nice warm spirit we had in theaters."

Now, several months after he started, and with about a half-million dollars invested in restoring the theater, he is about to find out. Recycling of old movie theaters has worked elsewhere. For example, St. Louis, Missouri and Oakland, California have recycled old cinema palaces as symphony and concert halls with success. If you like entertainment that entertains, I'm sure you'll join me in wishing Mr. Barkis good luck.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Environment" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Virtually every one of us is an environmentalist at heart. Therefore, we're all pre-conditioned to accept the idea that men in search of profit have torn up the hills, scraped the earth bare, destroyed the forest and dumped their waste in the nation's streams and lakes. The motive, of course, pure greed.

Certainly there is evidence that in the past when our country seemed limitless in its expanse and capable of healing the wounds inflicted by puny humans, there was too little regard for nature. And, it was government that first sounded the alarm. President Teddy Roosevelt, an outdoorsman himself, led the charge. Of course, there were also farsighted individuals who had been crying out against such things as hydraulic mining for gold, a method that ripped into hillsides and choked rivers and streams with gravel. They raised a cry against the early lumber barons who cut down the trees and moved on with no thought of replanting.

But today so much progress has been made. The lumber industry is virtually on a sustained-yield basis, planting as many trees as are harvested. Strip miners replace the top soil and stringent controls limit air and water pollution by industry. Now it seems that we, the people, are the despoilers through our own government agencies.

The biggest polluter of San Francisco Bay is the city sewer system. In New York City it is the dumping of garbage in the Atlantic Ocean that threatens the coast with a tidal wave of toxic sludge. And, for a time, the nearest stream or body of water was automatically the city sewer system. But we are doing something about it. The present day doomcriers notwithstanding, we can all feel pretty good about what has been accomplished here in the United States at both the private and government level. In fact, we may be troubled now and then by protective overkill. For example, only a few years ago the governor of a state fronting on one of the Great Lakes announced he was going to halt any industrial thermal pollution that changed the lake's temperature by more than one degree. By that, he meant no plant could turn clean -- but hot -- water into the lake. This would have meant millions of dollars in cooling towers and equipment. Yet, that particular lake undergoes a temperature change of about 40 degrees every year between winter and summer. But to make us a little proud and optimistic, hear the story of a Soviet trawler Captain who defected three years ago and sailed his ship into a Swedish port. He has described the fishing operation of those Russian trawlers that seem to be off every port in every ocean. They use such fine mesh nets, he says, that they catch half-grown fish of every kind, the result being that much of the catch rots on board. If the refrigerator vessels can't take what they have, the surplus is thrown overboard, polluting the spawning grounds with rotten fish. If they sail into port with their catch and the port facilities can't handle their haul, it is dumped on shore to decay and taken inland later to be burned. The refugee Captain estimated no more than one-third of the catch ever reaches the consumer as food. That ties in with other information about Soviet agriculture. Their need for food imports is not alone the result of drought, crop failure, or just plain inefficiency in farming. Like the fish, much of their agricultural output rots in the field or spoils in storage. I just thought you'd like to know that, now that Spring is here.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Education and Religion" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Determined to avoid the domination of government by a religious order or a situation where religious belief could be dictated by the government, the framers of our Constitution made sure that our new nation would enjoy a separation of church and state. They intended that individuals be free to worship as each chose; that government could not favor or discriminate against particular religions or denominations, nor could any denomination assume a role in government.

I challenge anyone to prove that a clear and present danger to that Constitutional protection has ever existed, for even one moment, in all the years since the Constitution was ratified. And yet a few years ago, a suit brought by an avowed atheist, led to a Supreme Court ban on voluntary prayer in our schools. Have we, as a result, let some among us make atheism a religion and impose it on those of us who believe in our Judeo-Christian traditions?

There is a fundamental difference between separation of church and state and denying the spiritual heritage of this country. Inscribed on the Jefferson Memorial in Washington, D.C. are Jefferson's words, -- QUOTE -- "The God who gave us life gave us liberty -- can the liberties of a nation be secure when we have removed a conviction that these liberties are the gift of God"? -- UNQUOTE.

Our coins bear the words, -- QUOTE -- "In God We Trust" -- UNQUOTE. We take the oath of office asking God's help in keeping that oath. And, we proclaim that we are a Nation under God when we pledge allegiance to the flag. But we can't mention God's name in a public school or even sing religious hymns that are non-denominational. Christmas can be celebrated in the schoolroom with pine trees, tinsel, and reindeers but there must be no mention of the man whose birthday is being celebrated. One wonders how a teacher would answer if a student asked why it was called Christmas.

We have gone so far that it almost seems a rule, originally designed to guard against violation of the Constitution, has become an aggressive campaign against religion itself. And isn't that the very thing we set out to guard against -- domination of religion by the state? In this case by public school officials?

A case in point: In an elementary school in St. Petersburg, Florida, two teachers came to class wearing lapel buttons which read, "I Found It". Such buttons, bumper stickers and even billboards are widespread around the whole country. There have even been spot-ads on television with people declaring, "I Found It".

At any rate, the school principal inquired what the buttons meant and was shocked to learn the wearers were simply acknowledging they had found God. You would think this was a personal thing with each of the two teachers, but the principal didn't see it that way. She said, -- QUOTE -- "I feel if the buttons are worn in the school building and a child asks what they mean, it would be bringing religion into the schools". -- UNQUOTE.

Well it would seem that not only is religion lacking in the schools -- so is common sense. I wonder what a teacher is supposed to say if a kid asks about those four small words on a dime -- "In God We Trust?" -- Or could it be that's why they aren't being taught how to read these days?

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Miranda" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Some years ago the United States Supreme Court ruled that a man named Miranda could not be convicted on his voluntary confession of rape and murder because his lawyer wasn't with him at the time, and he hadn't been advised by the police that he didn't have to say anything. He went free for a very brief time and then was back for committing the same kind of crime. Of course, no one could bring back the victims.

Since that time, as we've seen in countless crime shows on television, the police must read an arrested individual his rights. QUOTE -- "You have the right to remain silent, etcetera," -- UNQUOTE. That's one line a lot of actors don't have to learn anymore, they've said it so often.

In real life the "Miranda Decision" has resulted in some great miscarriages of justice, as suspects -- due to technical error -- have gone free even though there was overwhelming evidence of their guilt. Then the Supreme Court, under Chief Justice Burger, modified the ruling and a measure of common sense returned to the courtrooms of the land.

Let me make it plain, we must preserve the rights of the accused. Indeed, that was one of the principles we fought a revolution to secure. But we must not forget government's obligation to protect the law-abiding. The "Miranda Decision" came back into the Supreme Court by way of Iowa a few weeks ago. Five Justices used it to grant a new trial to an escaped mental patient who had been convicted of rape and murder of a 10-year old girl on Christmas Eve in 1968. Chief Justice Burger and three of the Associate Justices vehemently dissented from their five colleagues but to no avail. So once again a confessed killer has, on a legal technicality, a chance to go free.

Briefly here is the story. Little Pamela Powers, 10 years old, disappeared on Christmas Eve, 1968. Robert Williams was arrested in Davenport, Iowa and driven to Des Moines by the police. He was informed of his rights at least four different times, and had a lawyer present in Davenport where he said he would tell the whole story in Des Moines.

On the auto trip, a detective who knew that Williams, in spite of his record of sex offenses also had a kind of religious quirk, mentioned the importance of giving the little girl a, "Christian burial". Actually, no one knew whether the missing girl was dead or alive. But the detective, who was guessing, mentioned the weather forecast of impending snow and how that would make finding her body difficult. Williams led the police to her body. It is true the police had promised he wouldn't be questioned during the ride. But was he questioned? A very intelligent detective made a couple of observations, one having to do with the weather. He should get a medal. But the Court's ruling was that Williams' lawyer should have been present.

Now it remains to be seen if nine years later he can be convicted again. Or is there another victim fated to suffer as Pamela Powers did? We want, "one nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all" -- including little girls who have a right to grow up and live happily -- if not forever, at least until they have become whatever God intended them to be.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Student Letter" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Economists (at least the good old-fashioned kind) have written countless books and essays trying to explain that a free market economy is superior to the collectivism of Karl Marx. There really shouldn't be much of an argument with all the examples we have for comparison. Everywhere there is a socialist nation, there is a failure to meet the needs of the people of that nation except by calling on capitalist neighbors for help. Still, it is the socialist world that is expanding while ours grows smaller.

Well, how would you like to feel a little better about the whole thing? I received a letter a couple of weeks ago that brightened my whole day. Paul A. Leonard, a sophomore at Mayo High School in Rochester, Minnesota, wrote to tell me that he had listened to some of these radio broadcasts. Then he wrote, -- QUOTE -- "In view of your support of free enterprise I thought that you might be interested in an experiment that I recently conducted in my history class. Fifteen volunteers were selected with an eye to an approximate balance of athletes, non-athletes, boys and girls. The volunteers were not informed of the purpose of the experiment.

The first day a socialist-like system was set up. The subjects were informed that they had 'volunteered' to do pushups, in return for which they would be given candy." -- UNQUOTE. Now, pushups and candy! What do they have to do with socialism? Well, Paul Leonard explained to the 15 volunteers that they would do pushups, with a limit of 30 on how many anyone would have to do or be allowed to do. For every five pushups they would each get a piece of candy. And here is where the political science comes in. The total number of pushups accomplished by the volunteers would be divided by 15 (the number of volunteers) and each would receive a piece of candy for every five pushups. Those who could do 30 and those who couldn't get off the floor once would share equally in the candy.

Four managed to do the maximum and the overall average was 16.2 pushups, so everyone received three pieces of candy. That was half the experiment -- the "socialist" half. The next day was capitalism's turn. The volunteers found they were going to do pushups again -- same limit, no more than 30 -- the same reward, one piece of candy for each five pushups. Just one difference -- they were capitalists this time -- no averaging. They would each get one piece of candy for every five pushups that each one was able to do. In other words, there was an incentive for each one to do his or her very best.

The average of 16.2 on the socialist day went up to 21.2, nearly a one-third increase in productivity. And, this time, almost half of the volunteers -- seven, not four -- did the maximum of 20.

I gathered from Paul Leonard's letter that he really wasn't too surprised about that. If I could deliver a personal message to Paul, sophomore at Mayo High, it would be this: Congratulations, Paul, you've demonstrated you understand the differences between the magic of the free market system and the idiocy of Karl Marx. There are some pretty eminent Ph. D.'s in economics who can't figure that out. End of message.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Arson" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

We know that our ancestors way back in dim antiquity discovered fire could be a useful tool. We don't know when they discovered it could also be used maliciously for spite or revenge; to murder, maim and, more lately, provide illicit profit.

About 25 years ago, the handful of men in California who were engaged in fire/arson investigation formed an organization now known as "The California Conference of Arson Investigators". They recognized the need for training and education in their field, They were also convinced that many fires of so-called "undertermined causes" were, in fact, fires deliberately started for one reason or another.

In these 25 years, their investigative work has become a science, not only in the determination of arson, but in identifying other fire problems. We are now aware of structural design faults, whereby stairwells, elevator shafts and air ducts become natural chimneys, resulting in the rapid spread of fire. Their work has led to improved building materials with fire-retardant qualities and better appliance design to eliminate fire-causing malfunctions.

One would think this knowledge indicated the situation was well in hand and we were on our way to happier and less dangerous times. We might think that but we'd be wrong. Back in 1970, when I was Governor we had a task force called the "Arson Information Study Group". They brought me a report that in the years 1967 to 1970, the total numbers of fires in California increased by 19 percent. The cases of detected arson increased 87 percnet. This report led to the forming of the first arson detail within the State Fire Marshall's office.

The report, taking data from other states, indicated that arson was a crime costing the nation 800 million dollars a year -- more than four times the cost of the next most costly crime, auto theft.

Just recently, I received a letter from one of the men who served in that study group and the arson investigating team in California, James Timmons, now doing the same work for a California city. Reminding me of what had been done in our state he said, -- QUOTE -- "National Fire Protection Association data indicates arson fires have been increasing at a steady rate of 10 percent a year since 1968" -- UNQUOTE. Those are just the cases were arson is proven. They estimate half of the fires of "undertermined cause" are, in fact, arson.

Then Mr. Timmons asked some pertinent questions maybe we all should be asking. Why are less than one-half of one percent of fire and police personnel assigned to arson investigation? Why do so many cities and towns have no trained personnel in this field? They report they have no arson -- just an awful lot of fires of "undertermined cause". Why does the F.B.I. not classify the nation's most costly crime as a Class One Crime? Indeed, the F.B.I. crime reporting system does not recognize the existence of arson. And, finally, why did the International Association of Police Chiefs recently recommend against having the F.B.I. classify arson as a Class One Crime?

I have the greatest respect for law enforcement agencies and for those who fight our fires. If there are answers to these questions, I'd like to hear them and I think you would too.

Taped 5/4/77

RONALD REAGAN
Disc 76-13

76-13A

<u>TITLES</u>	<u>TIME</u>
1. F.B.I.	3:30
2. A Renewable Source	3:12
3. Rhodesia	3:10
4. Lawnmowers	3:00
5. Cuba And Africa	3:17
6. Kidco	2:58
7. Keng Piao	3:18

76-13B

1. Punishment	3:08
2. Drugs And The F.D.A.	3:20
3. Lord Chalfont	3:10
4. Recycled Streamliner	2:42
* 5. Strategy I	3:20
** 6. Strategy II	3:05
7. Bill Niehouse	3:12
8. Postcard Registration	3:10

**To be aired the day following the
preceding program (Strategy I)

Please retain your program reprints.
You may reproduce them to meet your
listener requests for copies of
program scripts. Please do not for-
ward these requests to our office.



RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "F.B.I." -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Legislation is now before the Congress which would end all -- QUOTE -- "political surveillance" and shut down the intelligence-gathering functions of the F.B.I. and the C.I.A. This legislation will prevent all covert gathering of foreign intelligence in peace time and keep the F.B.I. from collecting information on any person unless there is evidence that person has already committed a crime, or is about to commit one.

If such a law had existed in the years preceding World War II, the F.B.I. would have been prevented from infiltrating the German-American Bund. The record will show that the F.B.I. deserves most of the credit for the fact that not one major act of sabotage interrupted our war effort during the years from Pearl Harbor to V.J. Day.

As for the second point, how do we propose to halt the increasing wave of terrorist activities if we have to wait until the crime is committed? Or, how will we know someone is about to commit the crime? Our police intelligence forces - the F.B.I. and the C.I.A. - have for 40 years used tactics of surveillance, phone taps and, yes, mail openings when they had reason to believe there was a threat to the safety of our country and our people.

Using these techniques, an F.B.I. agent infiltrated the Ku Klux Klan, and found the murderers of three young civil rights workers a few years ago. I know of no government agency that can match the Federal Bureau of Investigation for its record of more than 40 years of dedication, effectiveness and freedom from scandal.

Now the Attorney General of the United States, evidently carrying out Department of Justice policy, will try to convict a 25 year veteran of the Bureau -- former agent and supervisor John Kearney, who retired in 1972. He will be charged with illegal phone taps and opening mail several years ago when these were normal operating procedures. The Attorney General admits that even if he is found Not Guilty, he will be ruined because the cost of defending himself will wipe out his life savings.

And, who was the object of Agent Kearney's attention when he did these things? The "Weathermen", one of the groups that surfaced in the anti-war demonstrations several years ago. Members of the Weathermen traveled to communist countries, boasted of bombings they were responsible for and 26 of them were, at one time, on law enforcement's "most wanted" list.

There is no other way to protect against terrorism than to try to learn in advance what the terrorists are planning. I wish we could have known beforehand about the bomb that would arrive in a California college office, packaged as mail. A young bride of three weeks was blinded and had her hands mangled as she opened that package. A janitor, on another campus, was blown to eternity when he tried to remove a bomb in the faculty dining room.

I'm glad for the intelligence report, and I, frankly, don't care how it was obtained, that warned me -- when I was Governor of California -- of a plot to kidnap my wife and kill her if I wouldn't agree to free some imprisoned members of a terrorist group.

John Kearney is being prosecuted and persecuted for protecting his fellow citizens; for doing what the Congress, several Presidents and Attorney Generals had approved over a period of several decades.

Continued...

RONALD REAGAN

Subject: "F.B.I."

Page 2

If the Department of Justice, yielding to the hysteria of the moment, carries through with its announced plan, I hope there will be a fund we can contribute to for John Kearney's defense.

This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

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

"A Renewable Source" -

Nuclear energy continues to be shunted aside in the proposals being made by government as to how we're going to meet our energy needs in the years to come.

We are told that industry and power generating plants must switch from natural gas and oil to coal. We're also told the clean air regulations will not be compromised to allow for the additional pollution burning coal will bring. And, there will be stricter regulations imposed on the mining of coal. We are not told that it will cost about 50 billion dollars to convert American industry back from oil and gas to coal.

A C.I.A. report is quoted to prove we only have a few years supply of oil and gas left in all the world. A United Nations report saying we have enough oil for 100 years (in which time we surely can come up with alternate sources) is not quoted. Nor is a report that with more freedom to make the price of natural gas compatible with costs, we have a 1,000 year's supply by conservative estimate.

The cleanest, most economical and efficient energy source -- nuclear power is nearly dismissed out of hand. The issue of possible proliferation of nuclear bombs is raised if we increase the number of nuclear power plants in the world. But, we can't stop other countries from having them, so, if there is such a danger we can't prevent it by ourselves. The Naderites raise environmental objections citing radioactive pollution, risk of nuclear disaster and, finally, that uranium to fuel the plants is in as short supply as oil.

That last point brings us to the underlying fact in all of the energy debate; we are talking about finite fuels. Coal, oil, gas, uranium are all energy sources which conceivably will be used up.

Right at hand, however, still in an experimental stage, but far enough along for us to know it is practical in the immediate future if we continue our developmental effort, is a renewable fuel that is, literally, perpetual motion realized. It is the breeder reactor which generates nuclear power and produces plutonium at the same time which, in turn, produces more nuclear power.

The President has ordered a halt to further development, citing environmental and other danger as the reason. But Washington is sitting on an environmental report prepared for the Energy Research and Development Administration that says just the opposite. This E.R.D.A. document, 500 pages, known as 1554-D was prepared by the Savannah River Laboratory and has been in the administration's hands since February. In short, the report says, -- QUOTE -- "there is no safeguard related reason to delay the development of fuel cycle facilities to demonstrate reprocessing, including plutonium conversion -- and storage." - UNQUOTE.

Capitol Hill researchers were led a merry chase in trying to track down this document. Finally, invoking the Freedom of Information Act, a copy was obtained. It is an extensive, obviously costly and thorough report. Not only does it make plain there are no insuperable safety problems with plutonium, it states that recycling plutonium is safer than not recycling it.

Why are we not supposed to know that a practical source of energy is at hand which regenerates its own fuel, meaning the supply is inexhaustible?

This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Rhodesia" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Other governments, friendly and unfriendly, maintain information offices in Washington, D.C. to try to see that news advantageous to them will be disseminated through our news outlets. One of these is the Rhodesian Information Office. It is duly registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1935 administered by the Department of Justice.

Such an office allows us a viewing window on this faraway country, which otherwise would remain pretty unknown to us. Its size doesn't warrant the maintaining of American news bureaus there.

Under that 1935 act, these foreign information offices are subject to a periodic audit -- a checkup to see that the information it hands out meets certain requirements as to reliability, and so forth. Usually these audits are pretty routine and carried out in a friendly, courteous manner. After all, aren't we the world's leading exponent of free speech?

But, several weeks ago three United States agents walked into the Rhodesian Information center unannounced, and began a minute inspection which was headlined by one paper as a full-fledged investigation of the "Rhodesian Lobby."

By coincidence, this surprise visit followed right on the heels of a discussion in the United Nations Security Council (chaired by our Ambassador, Andrew Young) of a British resolution to close down the Rhodesian office. It seems that under an informal arrangement, we have (for some years now) made American dollars available in return for Rhodesian money which American missionaries and business men need for doing business in Rhodesia.

The United Nations resolution is aimed at halting that exchange which would leave the Rhodesian office out on a limb, indeed out of business. The only objection has come from, of all people, the Russians, but only because they want a tougher resolution which would include cutting telephone and cable communication with Rhodesia. Come to think of it, that figures with what they probably have in mind -- a curtain of silence to screen a bloody takeover by Russian-supplied guerillas.

But forget the Rhodesians for a moment and think of what this resolution, when passed, would mean to all of us. The United Nations -- that tower of Babel stained with hypocrisy would be making law for the United States without any action by our own Congress. That is a surrender of sovereignty we should never permit.

Then, of course, we should ask ourselves if we are ready to also abandon our principle of freedom of information; our right to have access to news from Rhodesia or, any and all other countries of the world. One wonders why we haven't heard from the American Civil Liberties Union about that.

But to get back to the Rhodesians themselves -- we've already imposed trade restrictions on them and the question is why? It's true, they do not grant majority rule, but it's also true they are proceeding to do so in exact conformity with the plan proposed by our former Secretary of State. That plan called for a two year transition period leading to a peaceful transfer of authority as voted by the people themselves. The Rhodesian government agreed to do this.

Continued...

RONALD REAGAN

Subject: "Rhodesia"

Page 2

The United States, Britain and the black nationalist leaders of several factions also agreed. Then the pro-Marxist nationalist leaders reneged and demanded an immediate take-over without regard to the wishes of the majority. The position of Great Britain and our own government, in the face of this, has been somewhat less than noble as is the United Nation's resolution.

This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Lawnmowers" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

My friend, columnist James J. Kilpatrick, has thrown a journalistic spotlight on another longtime American institution that is about to be improved out of existence by the multitudinous humanitarians who dwell on the banks of the Potomac.

Some of us still have memories of an earlier day when our fathers would rise from the breakfast table and say, "The lawn needs mowing." Or, if there was more than one male offspring in the family he might be more subtle, by asking, "Whose turn is it to mow the lawn today?" Of course, in later life if you were lucky, a loving wife stood between you and your golf clubs and said, "The neighbors are going to complain if we don't do something about the lawn pretty soon."

In this latter-day adult experience, modern technology has lessened the labor and even put a little fun in the job. We have power mowers and there is no way to describe the pleasurable adventure of gassing up the machine and then engineering it around flower beds and sidewalks. Innocently we took for granted that only the tulip bed or possibly the garden hose, left carelessly on the lawn, were in any danger. That, however, was B.C. -- B.C.P.S.C. -- before the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Now we find that it is we who are in danger. How could we have gone so long enjoying our weekend toy, pulling the starter cord, scaring the dog with the satisfying roar of the one-and-a-half horsepower motor, without realizing that we were in deadly peril?

But over the hill to the rescue has ridden the Consumer Product Safety Commission. We may have to wait a bit for their proposed standards to be implemented, but at least we've been made aware.

Their principal recommendation is for a "dead man's" control -- that would give you an idea of the risk you've been running. This is for the walk-behind mower and the kind you ride. If you should fall in a faint, or carelessly take your hand off the handlebar to mop your forehead, the deadly blades of the mower will stop in three seconds.

Jack Kilpatrick has suggested the possibility that the Commission staff responsible for this proposal has had little, or no, experience in mowing a lawn. He points out that "real world" lawn mowing is a series of interruptions; moving a tricycle, garden furniture, a toy or whatever. In real life, under their proposal, every interruption will find you pulling that rope to re-start the motor.

But this kill-the-engine gadget is only one of the -- QUOTE -- "improvements" -- UNQUOTE -- contained in the 200-page proposal. An easier starter is demanded to ease the pain of all that rope pulling. The bottom line is a sizable increase in the cost of power mowers and a major re-tooling by manufacturers in an almost two billion dollar industry. There are 40 million in use and about 33 million a year sold. Economic analysis by the Commission itself indicates that smaller manufacturers will be put out of business with a loss of between one and two thousand jobs. They estimate a 20 per cent drop in retail sales and they acknowledge that customers who do pay the added price will, undoubtedly, go to the nearest mechanic and have the control disconnected.

Mr. Kilpatrick quotes a staff member of the Commission who summed it up in these words, -- QUOTE -- "We will be mandating a product that most customers do not want at a price they cannot afford to pay." -- UNQUOTE.

This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Cuba And Africa" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

The United State Senators from South Dakota, George McGovern and James Abourezk, should be congratulated on their ability to hide their disappointment while the University of South Dakota basketball team was losing two games in a row to a Cuban All-Star team. As a matter of fact, they managed to look practically ecstatic.

The game was evidently the result of a meeting between Senator McGovern and Fidel Castro, in which the Senator found the Cuban dictator to be a charming, friendly, well informed fellow. It sort of reminds you of how we discovered that Joseph Stalin was good-old-Uncle Joe, shortly before he stole, among other things, our nuclear secrets.

Then the other day, one of our leading metropolitan papers editorialized about how wrong it has been for the United States to be unfriendly to this island neighbor 90 miles off the Florida coast. And how right it is that we should be restoring trade relations. Oh sure, Castro has some 15,000 troops stirring up trouble in Africa and he did visit Africa himself, but the fact that his visit coincided with that of Soviet President Podgorny -- well it's a small world.

The month was March, and Fidel Castro boarded a Russian supersonic plane and flew off, first to Algeria and then on a tour of Libya, South Yemen, Ethiopia, Somalia, Tanzania and, of course, Angola. It was also March when military forces armed with Russian-made weapons, and trained in their use by Cuban soldiers, advanced across the border into Zaire. The invasion was into the Shaba province which is literally a treasure house of copper, uranium and cobalt.

On March 22, Soviet President Podgorny, with a staff of 120, arrived in Tanzania also by way of a Russian supersonic transport. He spent several days in mainland Tanzania and Zanzibar. He then flew to Zambia and Mozambique. It is unrealistic for us to fail to recognize the Soviet Union has opened a new stage in its campaign to achieve strategic dominance over Africa with all its mineral riches.

Mozambique, a home base for the terrorists who slaughter innocent villagers in Rhodesia, has declared itself dedicated to the goal of becoming a Marxist-Leninist state. Angola's conquerors, the M.P.L.A., are following suit, bolstered by Castro's thousands of mercenaries.

President Podgorny stood on the bank of the Zambesi River looking toward Rhodesia and proclaimed that, -- QUOTE -- "Together with the Republic of Zambia and other progressive African states, the Soviet Union stands on the same side as the peoples of Rhodesia, South West Africa and South Africa." -- UNQUOTE. Of course, in those latter three countries, he didn't explain that the people he stands with -- the revolutionaries and terrorists -- are not the majority.

In Lusaka he met for several hours with the leaders of the groups carrying on terrorist, guerilla attacks and pledged that the Soviet Union, -- QUOTE -- "will permanently support the first struggle of the fighters of Southern Africa." -- UNQUOTE.

Castro got back in time for the basketball games, and now we're talking about sending a baseball team to Cuba. That's only part of our response to this Soviet-Cuban assault on Africa. We've removed all obstacles to American travel to Cuba and we are negotiating, or at least discussing, re-opening of trade and political relations with the Cuban government. And, oh yes! We've ordered a halt

Continued...

RONALD REAGAN

Subject: "Cuba And Africa"

Page 2

to buying chrome from Rhodesia. It looks like we're going to lose more than a basketball game before the foolishness ends.

This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Kidco" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Kidco Incorporated, of Ramona California, has had -- among other commercial pursuits -- a contract with an equestrian center to clean the sawdust, wood shavings and manure out of the stalls. Kidco does this in return for getting the use of the material it removes from the stable. The corporation profit comes from composting this material and then selling it as fertilizer to nurseries and a country club.

Recently, the California Board of Equalization declared that this constituted sale of a tangible product, therefore a seller's permit was required and sales tax due, retroactive to the date the arrangement began. The president of Kidco Incorporated was ordered to appear before the Board with the books and records of the Corporation.

Richard Cessna, Jr., the President, said that since Kidco had been incorporated outside of California he was not aware of the need for a seller's permit. As for the sales tax, he had a pretty good argument and one that sounded reasonable. Sales tax had been paid already on the wood shavings and other material when it was in the form of feed purchased by the equestrian center and he didn't think it was due again.

At any rate, President Cessna appeared before the Board of Equalization. The meeting was amiable with no such bureaucratic procedures as fines or punishment. Kidco will get a seller's permit and begin to pay sales tax.

Now, if this seems to be a rather routine and minor bit of corporate government disagreement hardly worth becoming a radio event, let me add a few details. Richard Cessna, Jr., President of Kidco Incorporated, is 12 years old. Vice President of Kidco is his nine-year old sister, Ne-Ne. Sister Bette, age 11, is secretary of the corporation and their half sister, June, 14, is treasurer. The owner of the equestrian center, from whence comes Kidco's stock-in-trade, is their father. I'm sure the California State Board of Equalization found the situation a little unusual. Make no mistake about it, Kidco is a real corporation, legally registered.

The kids do all the work themselves, plus some other money-making activities such as street and driveway clean-up in the community. I don't know what the overall annual income of the corporation is, but the hearing did bring out that in one recent month the gross receipts were three thousand dollars.

Maybe this incident is an indication of our changing world. Once upon a time we taught our children the fundamentals of free enterprise and thrift with jobs such as paper routes, mowing lawns and, of course, the traditional summer lemonade stand at the front curb.

But it's a different world now; one in which the alphabet is more than A. B. C. If you are going to be in business it's F.T.C., B.L.S., I.R.S., N.L.R.B. and all the multitude of alphabetical agencies, federal, state and local that are now involved whenever, and wherever, buying and selling takes place.

I take my hat off to Mr. Cessna, Senior and hope, with all my heart, the officers of Kidco Corporation have not been discouraged or made cynical by their first experience with the intrusive and benevolent hand of officialdom. Just the same, I'm a little nostalgic for the good old days.

This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Keng Piao" -
Commentary by Ronald Reason.)

Last January the Chinese Information Service in New York released a report about a commencement address in Peking that should have had our ears burning. I'll be right back.

With our own counter-intelligence capability somewhat hamstrung as it has been recently, it's good to have friends. Intelligence sources in Taipei (the free Republic of China) have made available excerpts of a speech made by Keng Piao (Kung Pyow), director of the Department for Foreign Liaison, to the graduating class of the "College of Foreign Affairs" in Red China.

The college is the training institute for diplomats. Keng's speech, like the Brezhnev speech I reported on a few weeks ago, was not for public dissemination -- which is a polite way of saying it was supposed to be secret. His topic was, "A Turning Point in Sino-American Relations". It might be well to note that while the name Keng Piao is not exactly a household word in America, he is very much a part of the policymaking process in the Chinese Communist Party.

In his address he was bluntly outspoken about the two superpowers, Russia and the United States. He said both were bent on aggression and therefore the spearhead of Red China's struggle should be aimed at both. The fact that, for the moment, we are not being referred to as "United States imperialists", doesn't mean that Peking has forsaken, or even softened, on Marxist-Leninist principles, says Keng.

According to Keng, the Peoples Republic of China is temporarily caught in a narrow crack between two imperialist camps -- yes, he calls the Soviet Union "imperialist" as well as "aggressor". According to Kung, it would be unthinkable for his country to try to deal with the two imperialists at the same time. So, the strategy is to "temporarily" -- and we should permanently keep that word in mind -- put their dispute with us aside so as to have one less enemy.

He complained to the graduates that there were some revolutionary hotheads in their people's paradise who don't realize the United States, for all its vaunted power, has a soft, weak side which they (the communists) can use to their advantage. Ah! To see ourselves as others see us.

Keng explained that Peking, while recognizing our imperialism, could at the same time promote -- for its own purposes -- a friendly relationship with the United States. In perfect Mao Tse-tung language he called this a "policy of duality". Under this policy they can denounce us for stationing troops in some lands (Taiwan, for instance) and at the same time, with no self-consciousness, endorse our maintaining troops in Western Europe and the Phillipines. This he called "tactical flexibility".

He admitted there was no hurry about taking back Taiwan, they simply accept that it belongs to them and they don't mind our taking care of it for them -- for awhile. But, he made it plain that normal relations between the United States and Red China will not come about unless we withdraw our Ambassador from Taiwan. On that point he said we haven't lived up to their expectation, but then went on to tell the students, -- QUOTE -- "Just wait for the opportune day, then we'll tell Uncle Sam to pack up and leave." -- UNQUOTE.

Before closing he reaffirmed that the Soviet Union is the primary threat and "detente" is disturbing to Peking. More American leaders he said, -- political, military and

RONALD REAGAN

Subject: "Keng Piao" (cont'd.)

Page 2

social -- would be invited to mainland China to keep us quiet and friendly until they can handle, -- QUOTE -- "Soviet revisionist social imperialism." -- UNQUOTE. Then it will be our turn.

That's something for us to keep in mind while our touring officials are mastering chopsticks.

This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Punishment" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

I've been as critical as anyone about lenient judges who are reluctant to impose severe sentences, or who send the guilty back to the street on probation. Sometimes, however, the judge has no choice under state statutes and those can be changed if enough of us will make our wants known to our legislators.

A few weeks ago, a judge of the California Superior Court, Harry V. Peetris, sent me a copy of his remarks made in open court as he sentenced a convicted murderer. He explained that it was the obligation of the court to deter the convicted man from committing crimes in the future, to deter others, and to protect society.

The Judge told me he was frustrated in achieving these goals by California's new Sentencing Act of 1976. The man before him had served two prison terms for armed robbery and burglary, and an extra term for parole violation. Now, after a four month trial, he had been found guilty of four cold-blooded, deliberate murders -- one of them for hire. His victims were a man, a 15 year old boy and two women.

In describing the crimes, Judge Peetris said a woman and her son were seated in their living room. The murderer placed a gun deep in the woman's ear and fired. The boy begged for his life but was killed in the same manner, because, in the words of the killer, he couldn't leave an eyewitness to the first murder.

His third victim was his cocaine supplier who also begged for his life. This time the weapon was a sawed-off rifle and the victim was stuffed into a plastic garbage bag and buried in the forest.

He was hired to kill victim Number Four, a woman. Using a handgun, he shot her in the head four times. Miraculously, she lived but was partially paralyzed. Two months later, for an additional fee, he returned and finished the job, saying, --QUOTE -- "This time she's really dead." -- UNQUOTE.

In passing sentence, Judge Peetris said the only appropriate punishment would be death in the gas chamber. But the people of California, who voted - better than two to one - to reinstitute capital punishment several years ago, are still waiting for the legislature to pass the implementing legislation. The next proper sentence would be life imprisonment without parole, but under California law such a penalty doesn't apply to first-degree murder. And, the New Sentencing Act of 1976 forbids the judge from passing sentence for each of the four murders and having them run consecutively.

All the Judge could do is sentence this cold-blooded, professional killer of four people to prison with the knowledge that he will be eligible for parole in five years and 10 months.

Judge Peetris said, -- QUOTE -- "The sentence that the law allows me to render also fails to provide protection for the witnesses who in this case came forward under threats of death from the defendant." -- UNQUOTE. There were four women who couldn't hide their stark fear while they were on the witness stand. They will live with the knowledge that, in less than six years, the man they helped to convict might possibly be free to carry out his threat on their lives.

The law properly provides for a judge to be lenient when the case calls for leniency. It does not provide for his being severe when that is called for in order to protect society. Only the people can make their legislators change the law.

This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Drugs and the F.D.A."
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

A bill to curb some of the bureaucratic fumbling in the Federal Drug Administration, defeated in the 94th Congress, has another chance in the 95th. I'll be right back.

Congressman Steve Symms of Idaho has 87 co-sponsors in the House of Representatives on a bill, -- QUOTE -- "to expand the medical freedom of choice of consumers by amending the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act to provide that drugs will be regulated under that act solely to assure their safety." -- UNQUOTE.

Now, how many of us thought that safety was the only concern of the Federal Drug Administration -- the F.D.A.? We have so many laws, and we add so many more each year, it's understandable if we failed to note (or to remember) that in 1962 the Federal Drug Act was amended to say that drugs and medicines should not only be safe, they must also be effective.

The late Senator Estes Kefauver chaired the Antitrust and Monopoly subcommittee which was investigating prices of new drugs. About that time the tragic Thalidomide disaster hit West Germany. It had not been licensed in America. It could not have been licensed under our laws as they were then, but tragedy was used to push through, in emergency fashion, a bill granting additional power to the F.D.A.

The result of that hasty, panic-inspired amendment has hardly benefited the American people. In the first place, deciding a medicine is safe to take is one thing, but trying to establish its effectiveness is something else again. Doctors, over the years, have displayed a great ability to sort out medicines which aren't very effective. If aspirin hadn't been approved prior to the 1962 amendment, mightn't be on the market today.

Prior to the amendment, United States drug companies added an average of 43 new medicines each year. Now we're down to 13. It used to take one or two years to get a medicine licensed and at a cost of about one million dollars. Now it takes eight to 10 years at a cost sometimes as high as 20 million dollars. The average is about 12 million.

With all of government's concern about eliminating monopoly, the 1962 amendment encouraged monopoly. Only the very biggest drug firms can afford to develop new medicine now. Our government almost automatically accepts foreign studies showing that a drug is not good. It does not, however, accept such studies if they find the drug is good. Many American discoveries are denied to the American people, but are licensed and used effectively in the rest of the world. Three-fourths of new drugs developed in the United States are barred to us but sold overseas.

Take the case of an American arthritis discovery; it has been given extensive tests in 15 countries, is sold in more than 40, and there have been about 120 million "patient hours" of use. It is not available in the United States. What price have we paid in suffering and death because of the arrogance of officialdom? One F.D.A. official boasted that he had held up for nine and one-half years any drug for angina pectoris and hypertension because, in his opinion, these are symptoms and not diseases.

RONALD REASON

Subject: "Drugs and the F.D.A." (cont'd.)

Page 2

The doctor who prescribes the medication is best able to judge its effectiveness. Congressman Steve Symms says, -- QUOTE -- "the health of Americans should never be subjected to the whims of Congress. The only long term solution is to take away from F.D.A. the power to make the terribly subjective determinations about drug effectiveness." -- UNQUOTE.

Steve Symms has offered a pro-consumer, anti-monopoly bill. It is known as H.R. 54. He could use our help.

This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Lord Chalfont" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

On these broadcasts I have, on occasion, called attention to the massive build-up of the Soviet military forces and the fact that those forces are, by every criterion, designed for offensive action.

Also, on at least one or two occasions, I've passed on the observations of a member of the British Parliament, Lord Chalfont. His Lordship seems to have an ability to observe and point out with amazing clarity, obvious things that make us wonder why we have failed to notice them ourselves.

The latest such has to do with the Berlin Wall. Certainly this ugly affront to all that is humane and decent has been talked about, written about and photographed ad infinitum. It is hard to think that anyone, anywhere in the world where news is available, is not aware that this structure is a barrier to freedom, designed to keep the beneficiaries of enlightened socialism from straying across the border into the affluence and comfort of miserable, imperialistic capitalism.

The East German police who man the Wall are not guards on watch to keep someone in the West from scaling the wall to gain entry to their workers' paradise. They are there for one reason and one only -- we are told -- to keep people within the communist world. Barbed wire, trained dogs, land mines, electric current through the wire and, of course, automatic rifles are the guard's tools. So far they've killed quite a number of men, women and young people who yearned to breathe free.

Now Lord Chalfont points out an interesting fact, he says, -- QUOTE -- "If one examines a little more closely the East German frontier guards who patrol the Wall, it becomes clear that they constitute something substantially more than a prison service. They are equipped with tanks, artillery, heavy machine guns, and other modern mobile weapons." -- UNQUOTE. His Lordship adds, -- QUOTE -- "Rather more, one would think that they need to deal with the occasional dissident citizen making a terrified dash for the West. It may be, of course, that they are also there for purposes of military defense. Someone in the Kremlin may really believe that one day the Allied soldiers in West Berlin are going to burst irresistably out of their barracks and annihilate the 100,000 Russian and East German troops who surround the city." -- UNQUOTE.

Then Lord Chalfont calls to our attention something which, as far as I know, has never been openly discussed or even mentioned. He asks, -- QUOTE -- "If that is really the case, there is something else which needs to be explained. What is the reason for that strange concentration of East German troops at Glienicke, (Glee-ni-kuh) a point on the Berlin Wall opposite one of the principal Allied airfields? If they are defensive in purpose, why do they need the latest bridging equipment? The only water obstacle is in front of them in West Berlin. Why do they need chemical warfare vehicles? And, perhaps most significant of all, why is the sector of the East-West border immediately in front of them the only sector along which no concrete wall has been built?" -- UNQUOTE.

Thank you, Lord Chalfont. I'm sure if we try we can think of a possible answer to those questions.

This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Recycled Streamliner" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Forty-one years ago the sleek stainless steel streamliner, the Burlington Zephyr, rolled out of Chicago for its first run to Minneapolis. Three decades and tens of thousands of rail miles later the 100 mile an hour streamliner was retired.

Many railroad buffs figured that this famous train, which set the style for luxurious rail travel in the late Thirties and the Forties (and was nicknamed "The Train of the Gods"), would end up on the scrap heap at worst, or in a railroad museum at best.

It did gather dust for 10 years but this year it has been reborn, several thousand miles around the globe, in the deserts of Saudi Arabia.

Now it speeds across the desert from Dammam (DA-MOM), a Persian Gulf port, 350 miles to Riyadh (REE-AHD), Saudi Arabia's capital. The trip takes about seven hours (including several intermediate stops) and a ticket costs about \$4.50. Despite the Zephyr's ability to go 100 miles an hour, the temperature extremes in the desert can cause the rails to bend, so the train is run at 60 miles an hour instead. Sandstorms are another hazard -- a far cry from the Zephyr's old haunts through the northern woods of the Middle West.

American know-how put the Zephyr back in working condition. The rolling stock was modernized in Kansas City. The cars have up-to-date interiors and airline-style seating. Microwave ovens have replaced the ranges in the kitchen car.

Altogether there are 21 Zephyr cars and they are made up into three trains, shuttling back and forth. They include coaches, sleepers, a baggage car which includes a generator to keep the lights and air conditioning going, and the elegant dinner-observation car -- the same ones that made their debut by the Great Lakes in December, 1936 -- at the tail end of the train.

The reborn Burlington Zephyr is powered by American-built 1500-horsepower diesel-electric units specially adapted for desert travel. The crew's cab is air conditioned and sand filters keep the power units clean.

Arabians are proud of their new streamlined railroad -- the only one in the vast desert kingdom. (Lawrence of Arabia blew up the last one in his desert guerilla war against the Turks back in World War I.)

The railway itself was built for the late King Saud by Aramco -- the Arabian American Oil Company -- and now carries some 170,000 passengers a year.

So, it seems, a proud old train "found a need and filled it" long after most people had thought of it as only a memory of a type of travel long gone.

This is Ronald Reagan. Thanks for listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Strategy I" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Some months ago American Cause, a bipartisan, tax-exempt, political education organization directed by former Senator George Murphy, sent out a warning authored by a former editor with FORTUNE magazine, C.J.V. Murphy, and James Angelton, former chief of counterintelligence for the C.I.A.

Their warning is even more timely today and we should be grateful to American Cause for making it available. They asked these questions: QUOTE -- "Do Soviet bloc aims and use of power imperil American security and, if so, what is the nature of the threat? If the danger is real, what should our defense posture be? Can we accept military inferiority? Shall we settle for parity or superiority? Are alliances essential? Are we prepared to demonstrate that the American leadership can be counted upon in a crisis? If the danger is real and must be met with allies, what new direction and stimulus should be imparted to our strategic policies to restore our deterrence to aggression?"-- UNQUOTE.

These questions aren't new. They were first faced by President Harry Truman in 1950. In August of 1949, our monopoly on nuclear weapons had ended. The Soviet Union had the bomb. In April of 1950, the President was handed a very timely National Security Council paper to be called NSC 68. Only five years had passed since World War II and Stalin had gathered in Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania and implanted dictatorships over the countries of Eastern Europe. In two months, he would send the North Koreans against Americans and South Korea and launch a new and bloody war.

NSC 68 said, -- QUOTE -- "The Soviet Union, animated by a new, fanatic faith antithetical to our own, seeks to impose its authority over the rest of the world. It calls for the complete subversion or forcible destruction of the machinery of government and the structure of society of non-communist nations by means, both violent and non-violent, and by infiltration and intimidation." -- UNQUOTE.

Declaring that even then the Soviet Union had armed forces far in excess of those needed for defense, the paper called for the United States to have overwhelming atomic capability and conventional forces sufficient to make us not altogether dependent on nuclear weapons. NSC 68 said, QUOTE -- "No moral restraints, only calculations of practicality, would govern the Kremlin's decision whether to resort to a surprise attack -- including nuclear." -- UNQUOTE.

Then these points were made, -- QUOTE -- "The Kremlin recognizes us as the only threat to its aims of world domination. We must realize the cold war (which rewriters of history today would have us believe was only imaginary) is a real war and the survival of the free world is at stake. With sacrifice and discipline we and our allies would have to achieve a rapid, sustained build up of economic policy and military strength. Without superior strength, a policy of containment is no more than a bluff." -- UNQUOTE. And finally, this statement, -- QUOTE-- "We stand in greater danger of defeat from lack of will than from any mistakes likely to flow from a show of purpose. No nation ever saved its freedom by disarming in the hopes of placating an enemy." -- UNQUOTE. Those were the findings and recommendations given to Harry Truman 27 years ago. I'll carry on with this tomorrow.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Strategy II" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

On my last broadcast, I recited the questions faced by President Truman 27 years ago, when our monopoly on nuclear weapons ended and we knew the Soviet Union also had the bomb. I listed the points given to him in a National Security Council paper called NSC 68 which, until recently, had remained secret.

To briefly recap, it stated flatly that Russia is determined to impose its authority over the world; that we are the principal obstacle they would have to overcome, and if their expansionism wasn't checked, or contained soon, no possible combination of the remaining free nations could assemble sufficient strength to stop them short of their goal. And that was said 27 years ago. Then were listed the things America must do, including military buildup, leadership role among our free world allies, recognition that the cold war was real, and that -- QUOTE -- "No nation ever saved its freedom by disarming itself in the hope of placating an enemy." -- UNQUOTE.

What are the answers to the question of today? Questions that are even harder. Alexander Solzhenitsyn says the Soviet Union has already won the political side of its war for Europe, the Middle East and the emerging nations of Africa. He says the Kremlin strategists have been, -- QUOTE -- "Breaking off piece after piece, country after country." UNQUOTE. He adds, -- QUOTE -- "You can simply be taken with bare hands." -- UNQUOTE. Willy Brandt, a socialist himself, warns that "Eurocommunism" in France and Italy is as deadly as the Moscow brand.

But, here in our own country we have a warning we dare not ignore. A group of dozens of well-known men and women of both parties; former Secretary of State Dean Rusk, ex-Deputy Secretary of Defense, Paul Nitze on the Democratic side; David Packard former Deputy Secretary of Defense, Clare Booth Luce and Gordon Gray, members of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board on the Republican side, and the General Secretary of the AFL/CIO, Lane Kirkland; this group with unquestionable credentials, has sounded an alert.

They say, -- QUOTE -- "Our country is in danger and the danger is increasing. The principal threat is the Soviet drive for dominance based upon an unprecedented military buildup. The scope and sophistication of the Soviet campaign and its tempo has quickened. Encouraging divisiveness among nations new and old, it has been acquiring a network of positions, including naval and air bases, which supports its drive for dominance in the Middle East, the Indian Ocean, Africa and the South Atlantic. Soviet expansion and worldwide deployment of military power threaten political independence of our allies and access for them and us, to raw materials and the freedom of the seas." -- UNQUOTE. Then they called for a policy of collective defense just as NSC 68 did 27 years ago. Their summation was that if the present drift continues, the United States could find itself isolated in a hostile world with a succession of bitter choices between war and surrender.

Only by mustering a superiority, beginning with a superiority of the spirit, can we stop the thunder of hobnailed boots on their march to world empire.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Bill Niehouse" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

On February 27, 1976, William Niehouse was abducted from his home in Caracas, Venezuela by "leftist guerillas." He was an employee of an American firm doing business in Venezuela -- Owens-Illinois Company. He was not engaged in any kind of James Bond adventures. He worked for Owens-Illinois and lived in Caracas with his family. He is the victim of a crime.

The ransom demands came. First, there must be the publication of a leftist manifesto in the New York TIMES, London TIMES, Paris LE MONDE and Venezuelan EL NACIONAL. Owens-Illinois complied with the demand and the manifesto appeared in all but the Venezuelan paper. The government of Venezuela refused to allow it to be printed in that country.

The next demand called for \$114.00 to be paid to each employee of Owens-Illinois in Venezuela. Owens-Illinois complied. At that point the Venezuelan government announced the company had broken the laws of the country and for so doing, must sell its possessions to the government. While not totally expropriating the American company, it was about as close as you could get. As of two months ago, the business negotiations were at a standstill.

Demand Number Three arrived. It called for an outright payment of ransom. The Venezuelan government refused to permit any such payment, but also refused to allow anyone to say it wasn't permitted. Mrs. Niehouse had naturally become of interest to the news media in Caracas. But, with this third demand, her interviews were cut if any reference to ransom was made or asked about. One television station was closed by the government, and a newspaper taken over.

Donna Niehouse stayed in Venezuela for six months. She was under constant surveillance. Her house was bugged and her phone tapped. Two policemen lived in the house as part of the surveillance -- not as a measure of protection for her. During the period when the messages were coming from the kidnappers, letters came from her husband assuring her he was alive and well. Then in July, an attempt to make a token payment to the kidnappers was aborted by the Venezuelan police. Nothing has been heard from the kidnappers or the police since that time. The police continue to make arrests and the government has announced that everyone involved has been arrested, and the case is solved. But where is Bill Niehouse?

There is only this post script -- Donna Niehouse was recently called to Venezuela to see if she could identify any of the persons under arrest. She positively identified one suspect and apparently his fingerprints prove he was present at the kidnapping. But they have been unable to get any information from him -- possibly because he is held as a political prisoner, and in Venezuela, political prisoners usually walk away free.

Mrs. Niehouse, and literally hundreds of friends, have written to the State Department and the White House. Each has received a form letter reply, -- QUOTE -- "We are doing everything we can. We must allow the Venezuelan government to handle it." --UNQUOTE. I still say a government has no reason to exist unless it is willing to pledge its total resources to help even one citizen, wherever he may be in the world, if that citizen's Constitutional right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is being unjustly denied.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Postcard Registration" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Before you get too enthusiastic about schemes such as postcard registration which are intended to increase voter participation, let me tell you about the experience of a fellow I know. In fact, he's a research associate of mine and he takes his voting seriously. So seriously, that he goes to the polls even when there is nothing more than an obscure city charter revision to vote about.

Well, several weeks ago, he moved to a city just east of Los Angeles. That city had already had the first round of its municipal elections. The final round would come up in mid-April. State law requires that you be in residence and registered thirty days prior to election day. He had moved in with six days to spare. So, he called a local fire station which he figured was about as close as any to his new address. They said, yes, they would be happy to register him any time of day or night.

He has about a 30-minute commute from office to home, but it was longer that evening for that was one of the very few days this last winter when drought-afflicted Southern California had a first class rainstorm. He plowed through the rain and wound around the foothills till he finally found the fire station.

The two firefighters on duty had two stacks of voter forms and debated over which ones to use. They resolved the matter by selecting the State's new postcard registration forms and filled out my friend's answers to their questions. He asked them if they would be turning in the form the next day and explained his concern about the deadline. One of the firemen, said, -- QUOTE -- "You bet, first thing in the morning. Even if we forgot, the elections people at the county clerk's office wouldn't let us overlook that deadline." -- UNQUOTE.

With that, he tore off the bottom half of the voter card form and handed it to the newly registered voter as his receipt. The form said that if he didn't hear anything in thirty days to call a certain telephone number. Since nothing had come in the mail, he did call in thirty days. A Thursday. It was the county clerk's office he was calling. They had no record of his registration, but said they would keep looking and to call back Monday. Tuesday was election day. Meanwhile, he called the city clerk to learn where his polling place would be.

Monday, he called the county clerk again. Despite the friendliness of the lady on the other end of the line, she could be of little help. She had searched and still no record of his name. She suggested calling the city clerk who could look it up in the actual voter lists that would be posted at the polling place. He did. Again, another helpful voice and much searching, but his name was nowhere to be found. By now it was late Monday afternoon. The city clerk suggested as a last chance that he call the county registrar of voters who keeps all of Los Angeles County's nearly two million voters recorded on microfilm. He called. Another friendly voice. The woman said it would take a few minutes, but she would be happy to call him back. She did, in about ten minutes. She was very sorry, but his name simply wasn't on the county's microfilm records. She said, -- QUOTE -- "If you could just give me the serial number of your receipt, I might be able to look further." -- UNQUOTE. But he didn't have a receipt. You see, the so-called receipt from the streamlined easy-to-use new postcard registration form he got at the fire station isn't like the old fashioned forms which have serial numbers on every page for easy tracing. No, the new, easy-registration form has none at all. Scratch one voter on that election day.