

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

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

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

SERIES: I: HANNAFORD / CALIFORNIA
HEADQUARTERS

Subseries: A: Ronald Reagan Files

Folder Title: Radio Commentaries / Broadcasts:
Disc 78-1 through 78-3 (1978)

Box: 14

To see more digitized collections visit:

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

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Inventories, visit:

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

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

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

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

Taped 1/9/78
Aired 1/23 - 2/10/78

RONALD REAGAN
RADIO COMMENTARY

. Disc 78-1

78-1A

	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>TIME</u>
1.	Salt II	3:00
2.	Christmas	2:54
* 3.	American Farm School I	2:47
* 4.	American Farm School II	3:03
* 5.	Human Rights I	2:56
* 6.	Human Rights II	2:52
* 7.	Human Rights III	2:39

78-1B

1.	Taxes	2:35
2.	Our Country	2:46
3.	Crime	2:34
4.	Miscellaneous	2:44
5.	Welfare	2:44
6.	Healthy Competition	3:00
7.	Pot	2:46
8.	Social Security	2:58

We suggest the programs marked (*) be aired in sequence.

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



RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Salt II"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

When it comes to the current Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (they're called SALT II for short), the Soviet Union seems to be resorting to a technique they've used with us before: bluster. Right now, they seem so pleased with some tentative concessions they got from our government last fall that they've launched a major propaganda campaign to lock them in place.

American critics of the current negotiations are worried that our cruise missile will be bargained away. It's a new weapon system that could provide security for Western Europe. In fact, its deployment in Western Europe was one of the Russians' greatest worries till their Foreign Minister met with President Carter in September. Now they aren't talking about it anymore.

To review, Secretary of State Vance went to Moscow last spring, made some proposals and was turned down cold by the Soviets. After that, Moscow turned its propaganda machine to "high" in denouncing the U.S. This, too, stopped after the Gromyko-Carter meeting and after the SALT talks themselves seemed to turn more to the Soviets' liking.

Bear in mind the Soviet objectives. They want maximum flexibility for their mobile-launched missiles; they want to downplay the importance of their inter-continental Backfire bomber and, of course, they are firmly against on-site inspections.

Now, since fall, there has been a barrage of Pravda stories and Radio Moscow panel programs to stress the urgency of signing a formal agreement quickly -- "on the basis of agreements reached in principle as result of recent talks."

Meanwhile, attacks on U.S. skeptics of the SALT talks sharpened, especially against Senator Henry Jackson of Washington, former Defense Secretary Melvin Laird, Senator Barry Goldwater and former Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Nitze. Pravda and Ivestia have unleashed some of their highest voltage criticism on these men because they have expressed sharp doubts about the turn the negotiations have taken.

Moscow has also asked the help of its friends on the left in the United States to try to build pressure for a favorable SALT II agreement signed. Prompted by the Soviet-controlled World Peace council, an ad hoc group met twice in October to work out a link-up between advocates of U.S. disarmament and the more hysterical elements of the anti-nuclear movement. Among groups supporting the Mobilization for Survival, the new ad hoc operation, are some old familiars on the left: the War Resisters League, Women Strike for Peace and the American Friends Service committee.

The plan of this coalition is to fight every new American weapons development tooth-and-nail (along with nuclear power), on the grounds that if we take the first disarmament steps unilaterally, the Russians are sure to follow. Heard that one before? It's been around at least two decades. One of the things that caused so much controversy over Paul Warnke's appointment by President Carter as disarmament chief last year was Warnke's apparent belief in this theory.

You needn't ask whether there are any Moscow chapters of this anti-nuclear, pro-disarmament lobby. There aren't. And the Kremlin is going ahead with nuclear power and weapons development full-tilt, without so much as a peep of protest from the American left.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Christmas"

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

All the traditions associated with Christmas were observed as usual in the past holiday season, including the chorus of complaints that "commercialization" is robbing the day of its true meaning. I'll have to confess I can't join that chorus. Somehow the ads offering helpful gift suggestions when we are all filled with the spirit of giving; the decorations on the streets, in the stores; the familiar carols--all add to the Christmas spirit for me and don't really strike me as crass. I am disturbed, however, about something I read over the holidays which could really rob Christmas of its meaning for millions of us who see it as more than just the birthday of a great and good teacher. I realize there are those who, by religious belief, consider Jesus a very human prophet whose teachings about love for one another, treating others as we would like to be treated ourselves are sound patterns for living; that he is to be respected by not worshipped.

But for many of us he is much more. He is the promised Messiah, the Son of God come to earth to offer salvation for all mankind. It was disturbing therefore to read that in many Christian seminaries there is an increasing tendency to minimize his divinity, to reject the miracle of his birth and regard him as merely human.

Meaning no disrespect to the religious convictions of others, I still can't help wondering how we can explain away what to me is the greatest miracle of all and which is recorded in history. No one denies there was such a man, that he lived and that he was put to death by crucifixion.

Where then, you may ask, is the miracle I spoke of? Well consider this and let your imagination translate the story into our own time--possibly to your own home town. A young man whose father is a carpenter grows up working in his father's shop. One day he puts down his tools and walks out of his father's shop. He starts preaching on street corners and in the nearby country side, walking from place to place preaching all the while, even though he is not an ordained minister. He never gets farther than an area perhaps 100 miles wide at the most.

He does this for three years. Then he is arrested, tried and convicted. There is no court of appeal so he is executed at age 33 along with two common thieves. Those in charge of his execution roll dice to see who gets his clothing--the only possessions he has. His family cannot afford a burial place so he is interred in a borrowed tomb.

End of story? No, this uneducated, propertyless young man who preached on street corners for only three years and who left no written word has, for 2000 years, had a greater effect on the world than all the rulers, Kings and emperors; all the conquerors, generals and admirals; all the scholars, scientists and philosophers who ever lived--all of them put together.

How do we explain that--unless he really was what he said he was.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "American Farm School I"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

"Give a hungry man a fish and he'll be hungry tomorrow. Teach him how to fish and he'll never be hungry again." Unfortunately that ancient maxim has not always guided us in our efforts to help others through foreign aid. But today I'd like to tell you about a program that does meet that test.

A few months ago friends of mine in San Francisco told me of their interest in helping something called the American Farm School. Thanks to them, Nancy and I were visited by a young lady who works out of an office at 380 Madison Avenue, New York City. The sign on that big city office door must seem a little strange to native New Yorkers--"American Farm School."

If they'd drop in and ask a few questions they'd learn as we did from our charming visitor that the American Farm School is about 20 minutes from downtown Thessaloniki in northern Greece. It is an agricultural and technical training center on 400 acres, with a girls' school featuring home economics and crafts and a boys' school with specialties in Farm Machinery, Animal Husbandry, and Horticulture. It was founded in 1904 and owes its existence to one man who had a dream he made come true.

John Henry House, a Congregational minister, was a missionary in the Balkans for 30 years. During that time he became increasingly aware of a sociological trend. Village boys had learned to despise village life and made their way to the cities. Reverend House believed a change in education could result in a new or perhaps a revived belief that it was not degrading for educated people to work with their hands.

Rev. House had that rare combination of the practical and the visionary. He dreamed of founding an educational institution that would develop "the whole man, the head, the heart and the hand." He believed that a school patterned after Hampton Institute in Virginia, Tuskegee in Alabama and the Penn School for girls in South Carolina could train young people to be leaders, modern farmers and make them content to stay down on the farm--down on the farm in Macedonia.

Rev. House was 60 years old in 1902 when he and two missionary friends bought 53 acres of parched, waterless land in a bandit - infested part of northern Greece. If they were to convince their students to-be, they had to start with land as poor as that of the poorest farmer. House had raised the money for the project himself. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions did not share his vision and considered it outside the scope of the missionary endeavor for which he'd been sent to the Balkans.

Rev. House was not a man to give up on a dream. He took his wife to see the land he had chosen for his venture. Standing on the 53 windswept barren acres she asked, "Whoever will you get to live in this place?" He answered, "You, my dear." And live there she did. Thus was started the Thessaloniki Agricultural and Industrial Institute which was to become the American Farm School. I'll continue this in my next broadcast and I'm sure you'll be a little more proud of America the Beautiful.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "American Farm School II")

Comment by Ronald Reagan)

The Rev. John Henry House and his wife Susan started scratching at 53 barren acres in northern Greece in 1902. Their harvest? A beautifully landscaped campus and 400 acres of productive farm land with several hundred Greek boys and girls learning and working.

They dry-farmed, dug wells, prayed to God and built a tiny school room. Their first students were a handful of orphans, refugees from the massacre of Macedonian peasants by the Turks.

From that beginning the Thessaloniki Institute became the American Farm School and is one of the oldest educational landmarks in Macedonia. It has survived wars, pestilence, drought and malaria. Today it is a middle level technical school open to those who've had nine years of schooling.

Rev. House never lived to see one part of his dream come true--the creation of a girls' school on the campus. It was his belief that, "when you educate a man you educate an individual. When you educate a woman, you educate a whole family."

In 1917 his son Charles, a Princeton engineering graduate, returned to Greece where he had been brought up. His father was aging and Charles pitched in to help what had now become the American Farm School. When John House died in 1929 Charles took over. He understood and loved the Greek farmer. The school is not an American outpost on Greek soil. Of its graduates six out of 10 today farm in their native villages, others have gone on to get additional training and some have returned to teach and carry on the tradition of John and Susan House.

In 1945 when a rural electrification program began in Greece, the Farm school graduates were the first to harness electricity for farm use.

Charles died in 1961 but the school carries on, led by Bruce Lansdale, who is as dedicated to the founders' dream as was the founder himself. With the exception of years in college in America he has lived in Greece since 1925 and has known the American Farm School since childhood.

The students get a total education -- an academic program plus homemaking skills and crafts for the girls and modern farming for the boys. They pay \$350 a year which is one-half of the cost-per-student. All the work is done by the students, the housekeeping chores and the farming. They have a shop where the girls' handiwork is sold. This, and the produce raised by the boys, provides almost one-half of the school budget. A small percentage of help now comes from the Greek government which pays to send adult farmers to the school for special courses. Our own foreign aid program, A.I.D., helps with some construction needs which leaves 37 percent to be raised by private donations, both in Greece and the U.S.

Talk about dropping a pebble in the water and watching the rings spread across the surface--the school now has a student exchange program with other countries and there are special summer courses in the ancient arts and crafts of Greece which makes for an interesting summer vacation for even a touring American.

Time won't permit a listing of all the programs offered by the school, but you can get complete information or if you just want to keep a truly successful bit of American neighborliness going, write the American Farm School, 380 Madison Avenue, New York. Up around Thessaloniki no one says "Yankee go home."

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Human Rights I")

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

If human rights are denied to a people over a long enough period of time do they become ineligible for such rights? The answer to that as we listen to the voices raised in Washington would seem to be, "yes they do lose those rights."

U.S. government representatives have been meeting in Paris with representatives of North Vietnam. The announced reason for the meeting is to open the door to friendship and to enter into an era of normal relations. The only two sticking points seem to be our demand for an answer as to the whereabouts or the fate of some 2,500 of our men listed as missing in action. And, on the North Vietnamese side, their demand for about \$3 billion they say we promised in the Paris Peace accords to repair all the battle damage to both North and South Vietnam.

Now those Paris Peace accords were signed by us, the South Vietnamese government and the Communist regime of North Vietnam. And it's true we agreed to put up the money. But the accords also called for North Vietnam to quit trying to conquer South Vietnam and to immediately give us an accounting of our men.

Haven't our negotiators overlooked what should be the first issue to be settled before there is any talk about friendship or rebuilding any part of Vietnam? There were two Vietnams, north and south. They had been separate nations for 1000 years. Both became colonial possessions of France in what was known as French Indo-China and both were freed a few years after World War II as one after another of the European colonial empires were liquidated. Vietnam returned to its pre-colonial status as separate nations. The great powers in Geneva set down a plan, first, to allow the people of both countries to move to which ever of the two they chose without interference and, second, for an internationally supervised election by the people as to whether they wanted to unite or continue as separate nations.

The Communist dictator of North Vietnam, Ho Chi Minh, refused to hold the election and when a million of his people started moving south away from Communism (under the terms of the agreement) his troops barricaded the frontier and halted the migration.

The Vietnamese war was a plain and simple effort by North Vietnam to conquer South Vietnam. We tried to prevent this in a long, bloody war which our government refused to win. But now how do we negotiate with North Vietnam unless we begin with Step One--the release of half-a-million South Vietnamese now in concentration camps and the North Vietnamese withdrawal from South Vietnam, leaving it once again a free and independent nation.

For that matter how did we agree to North Vietnam's entry into the United Nations which specifically demands that its member nations do not take up arms against their neighbor? Until South Vietnam is freed, North Vietnam is still an outlaw among nations.

Time's up, but next air time I'll continue with some other nonexistent human rights we've forgotten lately.

RONALD REAGAN

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

An American ex-G.I. and his German-born wife have made the perilous journey through the Berlin Wall almost a dozen times in the last few years to help people who have no human rights. This couple will have to remain anonymous for obvious reasons. You see, they'll be making more trips to East Germany.

The wife in our story was a little girl when American bombers were flattening the city in which she lived. Her father was a prisoner in an American prison camp. The war ended, he returned to his family and they watched the Russian tanks roll in. Six years later they escaped to West Germany where the girl grew up and married an American soldier.

Our Mrs. X knew great anguish as she learned of what her country under Hitler had done. She even turned away from God for letting her be born there, but that was only for a little while. She says, "Then I realized He knew what He was doing when He gave me the life He did." And she explains that her experience fitted her for the missions of mercy she has undertaken since coming to America.

She and her husband began by making contact with those Germans who had courageously defied Hitler. They learned all the tricks one must know to visit relatives or strangers in East Germany without bringing the wrath of the Communists down on their heads. She says that outside the Soviet Union there is no tighter and more repressive Communist government than that in East Berlin. And she adds, "If I remain quiet about what I know I become implicated in the crime in East Germany just like those who knew what went on under Hitler but preferred to shed the responsibility".

Right now she is trying to help a man named Rolf Mainz and his family. Mr. Mainz held an executive position with a publishing company. Then one day he dropped his membership in the Communist party. Several days later he was fired but no one would say why. He can list his credentials in seeking employment, but when his name is learned it seems the vacancy has just been filled.

So, after six months he wrote a letter to the editor of a West German paper-- a sarcastic letter under the heading "Comrades why don't you come live with us?" His letter telling of his effort to get a job was printed on page one. One week later the paper reported he had been arrested four days after his letter appeared. He is now serving a 54-month sentence in the worst, most brutal East German prison. His wife has lost her job and his children are abused at school. Both he and his wife suffer from ill health. Friends and neighbors are afraid to even speak to the family, let alone offer neighborly help.

Mr. and Mrs. X have helped with money and necessities and have contacted the West German government and Amnesty International about Rolf Mainz. They say the greatest need now is for our representatives in Washington to know about this blatant violation of the Helsinki pact so that pressure might be put on the East German government to free Mainz and let him and his family leave East Germany. I hope this helps a little.

RONALD REAGAN

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

In signing the Helsinki pact we gave the Russians something they've wanted for 35 years. In effect, we recognized the Soviet Union's right to hold captive the Eastern and Central European nations they have ruled since World War II. We signed the pact apparently because of one clause which had to do with human rights. Those making the decision to sign claimed the Soviet Union by its signature had agreed to let people have some (if not all) of the rights the rest of us take for granted. They are (for example) supposed to be able to leave the Soviet Union and the captive nations if they choose. But the Russians make promises; they don't keep them.

For more than three decades now we've referred to the Iron Curtain countries as the captive nations. Each year we have proclaimed a Captive Nations week to remind the world and ourselves that the Soviet Union holds millions of people in bondage.

This year as Captive Nations week drew near, there was no proclamation from the White House--only silence.

Then Americans of Central and Eastern origin brought pressure to bear and a weak, meaningless Presidential message was released. It pleased no one but the Russians.

The U.N. Human Rights commission in Geneva faced an American motion calling on the U.N. to question the Soviet Union about implementation of the human rights clause of the U.N. Charter. But then our chief delegate withdrew the motion before it could be brought to a vote.

Now comes an act of symbolism which has shocked every American of Captive Nation descent and those of Hungarian descent particularly. I'm talking about the Crown of St. Stephen. It was first used in the coronation of Hungary's King Stephen (now Saint Stephen) by the Pope nearly a thousand years ago. It has come to have an aura of mysticism about it with both religious and nationalistic significance to the people of Hungary. Most significant, it is symbolic of the legitimacy of Hungarian government.

At the end of World War II we liberated Hungary from the Nazi's but under the deal made at Teheran turned it over to the Russians.

Our departing forces were asked to take the Crown of St. Stephen to keep the Russians from getting it and hold it in trust until Hungary was once again free. For more than 34 years it has been kept in the vaults at Ft. Knox.

Now the White House has declared this crown which confers legitimacy and the blessings of Heaven upon Hungarian government to be the rightful property of the Godless, Communist rulers of that captive land.

At Teheran we sold a freedom not ours to sell. Now we give legitimacy not ours to give to an illegitimate government. Are we really serious about human rights?

RONALD REAGAN

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

In California a court decision has outlawed the traditional financing of public schools by local property tax on the grounds that some school districts are poorer than others in real estate values. Naturally this has caused an automatic turn to the state as the only source of funding some 1100 districts on an equal base.

California doesn't face this problem alone. More than 20 states -- perhaps your own -- have switched from local property tax funding since 1971. That was the year a high-powered movement began to centralize school funding at the state level. Those pushing the move were very well aware that control of funding would also mean control of education and that was really their goal.

Up in Maine, a statewide property tax was adopted in 1973 with the enthusiastic support of the Maine Teachers association -- an affiliate of the National Education association. Prior to 1973 the citizens of each Maine community met at annual town meetings and voted on the budget for specific local programs including education. Since their decisions had a direct effect on local property tax rates, economy dictated those decisions.

Under the new system, the state set the uniform property tax rate and then returned to each community an amount based on the number of children enrolled in school. This meant of course, that some towns found themselves supporting their own schools as well as schools in other towns. At first those "other towns" -- the ones benefiting from the new system -- were happy as clams.

Of course, the towns that had to share their revenues had a legitimate beef and they weren't long in starting to complain. But they weren't alone in their misery for long. School budgets began to move skyward as the public school establishment lobbied for and got from the state legislature all the things it had always wanted. And, of course, the statewide property tax climbed right along with those skyrocketing school budgets.

The people of Maine did more than just complain. On December 5th they went to the polls in a statewide referendum and voted three to two for repeal of the statewide tax. Their campaign went up against the school establishment and the National Conference of State Legislatures, which has been plumping for a statewide system all over the country. The move to repeal was, for the most part, a grass roots affair and the issue was local budget control.

If this action by the people of Maine is the forerunner of a national move toward more authority and autonomy at the local level and a return of such by the federal government to the states, government will cost less and we might look around some day and find inflation "went that-a-way".

RONALD REAGAN

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

I have disagreed with those in government on many of these broadcasts. I'm sure I will continue to do so. But just to keep the record straight, let me make plain my criticism is not directed against this system of ours which is unique in all the world. I criticize those I believe are turning away from and repudiating the very principles which brought us greatness. They are instead, eroding individual freedom, robbing us of independence and the right to control -ur own destiny.

I thought of this the other day when I read an account of a meeting to launch an Australian visitor here on a three-month tour of campus appearances. The visitor, Wilfred Burchett, is hardly a typical representative of the land down under. He has been identified as a collaborator with our enemies in two wars -- Korean and North Vietnam. A Russian K.G.B. defector testified he has been a Soviet K.G.B. agent. He is telling our college students what is wrong with America and his message is not just a complaint about bureaucratic ineptness. According to him, our system is the enemy of mankind, and those who believe in it are the dragons who must be slain before we devour all that is good and noble in the world.

Well, I offer in rebuttal the words spoken a few years ago (when we were still involved in the Vietnam war) by a widely known and respected Canadian commentator who became angry at the rest of the world for, as he put it, kicking us when we were down.

God bless him, Gordon Sinclair went on the radio and said, "It is time to speak up for the Americans as the most generous and possibly the least appreciated people in all the earth". He said, "As long as 60 years ago, when I first started to read newspapers, I read of floods on the yellow river and the Yangtze. Who rushed in with men and money to help? The Americans did. Germany, Japan and even to a lesser extent Britain and Italy were literally lifted out of the debris of war by the Americans who poured in billions of dollars in aid and forgave other billions in debts. When the franc looked to be in danger of collapsing in 1956, it was the Americans again who propped it up.

"When distant cities are hit by earthquakes it is the United States that hurries in to help. Managua, Nicaragua is one of the most recent examples.

"The Marshall paln, the Truman policy, all pumped billions upon billions of dollars into discouraged countries. Now newspapers in those countries are writing about the decadent war-mongering Americans.

"I can name you 5,000 times when the Americans raced to the help of other people in trouble. Can you name me even one time when someone else raced to help when the Americans were in trouble." - UNQUOTE. Mr. Sinclair said he wouldn't blame us if we thumbed our nose at the rest of the world. I'm grateful to him, but I hope there'll be no nose thumbing. I hope we'll keep right on being the first to arrive when help is needed.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Crime"

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

We talk of human rights and civil rights but is there any greater right -- human or civil -- than the right of an honest man to his life, the right of a child to walk on the street without fear or a housewife to feel secure in her own kitchen?

I have just received a letter from the father of a young man who was brutally murdered on New Year's Eve five years ago. His letter was a cry of protest because one of his son's two murderers has been free on parole after only two years in prison and now has been discharged from parole and is totally free.

The judge who sentenced the man to second degree murder and the prosecuting attorney are both outraged. They had spent 16 days in court, one presenting and the other listening to the shocking evidence of the brutal crime. The judge says of the parole, "It is a miscarriage of justice. Two years for a brutal murder like that?" The prosecutor expressed disgust with what he called "another failure of the system". And he asks, "What is a human life really worth when compared to the degree of punishment?"

The victim of the crime was a young man 24 years of age with a wife and a young child. The murderers -- one 21 and the other a year younger -- were both on parole for previous offenses. Having beaten the victim and abused him in other ways, they decided he'd have to die so their paroles wouldn't be revoked.

The testimony at the trial showed that in the hours before his death the victim had been beaten, sexually abused and then bound hand and foot and stuffed in the trunk of a car. He was taken to a remote country road where he was shot in the back of the head and twice in the back.

At the trial, the two killers tried to blame each other. On May 9, 1974 they were found guilty; one on murder in the first degree for which he was sentenced to life imprisonment. Under California law he'll be eligible for parole three-and-a-half years from now. The other was given a five-year to life sentence for murder in the second degree. He is the one who was paroled after two years in prison and now a year-and-a-half later has been released from further parole.

A spokesman from the parole board, which in our state is now called the "Community Release Board", said there was nothing wrong in the decision to release him because the board didn't have the full details of his involvement in the crime. Is it asking too much to suggest that a board having the power to send a convicted murderer back into society should take the time to get the details?

As Cicero said, "The safety of the people shall be the highest law".

But, in California, a father writes, "After two years the murderer of my son goes free, but my son is dead."

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Miscellaneous"

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

I'm going to touch on several subjects today, no one of which would cover a full broadcast. For example, a couple of tributes to bureaucracy's ability to find new ways to spend our money.

The Senate Energy and Natural Resources committee has unanimously approved legislation which first confesses that in 1893 the U.S. minister to the Kingdom of Hawaii did "unlawfully conspire" to overthrow the government of Queen Liliuokalani. It then goes on to set up an Aboriginal Hawaiian Claims Settlement Study commission. This commission will seek out descendants of the aboriginal Hawaiians and bestow on them a billion dollars.

On the subject of money it is interesting but not surprising to find that the State department has a streak of generosity. The Prime Minister of Jamaica who is taking that lovely island nation into totalitarian socialism, is discovering the price of such foolishness. The once solid tourist trade and flourishing economy of Jamaica are virtually non-existent now. But over the hill to the rescue comes the cavalry. The State Department is bailing him out with a little over \$63 million of our money. It is reported the announcement of this was held up till after Fidel Castro's visit with the Prime Minister.

Now this next one is a verbatim quote from a farm bill passed by the House. Perhaps it will help you understand the ways of government a little better. "Upon a finding by the Secretary", (of agriculture I presume) "that the peanuts marketed from any crop for domestic edible use by a handler are larger in quantity or higher in grade or quality than the peanuts that could reasonably be produced from the quantity of peanuts having the grade, kernel content and quality of the quota peanuts acquired by such handler from such crop for such marketing; such handler shall be subject to a penalty equal to 120 per centum of the loan level for quota peanuts on the peanuts which the Secretary determines are in excess of the quantity, grade or quality of the peanuts that could reasonably have been produced from the peanuts so acquired." You wouldn't like to have me run over that again, would you?

Turning to the world of sports; the Soviet Union has given a hint of what to expect at the 1980 Olympics. African diplomats visiting Moscow have been informed that Rhodesia and South Africa will be banned from the games. Why oh why won't some nation (preferably our own) say if they don't go we won't go?

Well let's close on a cheerful note. You can, as I've said before, "fight city hall". More businesses have taken to fighting the Occupational Safety and Health Agency's habit of inspecting work places without a warrant. OSHA has a no-win streak in 18 consecutive contests, they've lost six times in Federal courts and 12 times in state courts.

Now, we're waiting for the final round -- a ruling by the Supreme Court as to whether paragraph 8A of the OSHA act is unconstitutional.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Welfare"

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

For some time now we've been told the Carter administration will present a plan for welfare reform this year. While there have been trial balloons sent up as to the direction such reform would take, we've had little in the way of a comprehensive summary.

Now thanks to Rep. Charles Thone of Nebraska we have some factual information. I doubt that it will rouse your enthusiasm for the proposed reforms.

To begin with I'm convinced, in view of our own experience with welfare reform in California, that a primary goal of reform should be to reduce the welfare rolls. Our caseload was increasing by 40,000 people a month. We reversed that and achieved an 8000 a month reduction in the rolls for more than three years. This doesn't mean we callously threw needy people into the streets nor is this what I'm suggesting at the national level. We found that there were some of what I call "paper people"-- names on the welfare lists of nonexistent people which meant some people were collecting more than one welfare check.

Our reforms tightened eligibility procedures but mainly we directed our effort to salvaging human beings and making them self-supporting. The proposals for welfare reform in Washington will do just the opposite -- they will put additional people on the dole, says Congressman Thone.

The California reforms save overall welfare cost in this one state alone of some \$2 billion. The Washington proposals will increase the annual cost by almost \$15 billion -- about \$12 billion more than the Carter Administration said it would cost. That estimate is based on the present value of the dollar, but the reform wouldn't go into operation until 1981. With inflation that \$15 billion estimate will have to be increased considerably.

Even that doesn't tell the whole story. The program is designed to provide government jobs for all who can't find private employment. The ratio now for public employees is one for ever four-and-a-half in private enterprise. Or try this one on for size--there are approximately 73 million people in the country working and earning in private enterprise. They are the only source government has for tax revenue. Their taxes are supporting 81 million other Americans who are totally dependent on tax dollars for their year 'round income. That should be a convincing argument against making government the employer of last resort.

The administration has projected that this program will put 1.4 million people to work by 1981. Private business and industry created more jobs than that in just two months and it didn't take a single tax dollar to do it.

Welfare can be reformed by using common sense. The objective should be to care for those who can't help themselves, give temporary aid to those who can while you get them back into the private industry job market. But it looks as if the White House has given up on this objective before it begins.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Healthy Competition"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

In my years of public life I have been privileged to know many fine men and women. But there have been a few who lived in memory because of their great dedication to important principles. Ed Wimmer was such a man.

From the first year of the New Deal until his death last fall at 76, Ed Wimmer had an unrelenting, high-minded devotion to the great cause of his life--the preservation of the spirit of independent enterprise in a free republic.

Ed knew that the liberty and prosperity of the American people depended critically upon the preservation of economic freedom. Ed's hero was the bold, daring, independent man or woman who cleared and planted, dug and drilled, built and invented, invested and produced. Without that enterprising spirit, America could scarcely have become the most productive--and spiritually strong--nation on earth.

Over the four decades of his public life, Ed Wimmer was a one man army for independent business. In the Thirties he fought successfully for legislation to break up the overgrown utility holding company empires. He fought to curb predatory marketing practices, where monopolies underpriced its products purely to drive competitors out of business. Wherever monopoly raised its ugly head to threaten independent business, Ed Wimmer sprang into the breach like Horatio at the bridge.

Now that gallant man is gone, to whatever special corner of heavn is reserved for those who devote their lives to preserving the liberty of a free people. But Mike and Hope Wimmer, his son and daughter, are pumping new vitality into their father's organization, Forward America. It's working today, from its national headquarters in Covington, Kentucky, to develop and promote responsible and economically sound public policies to preserve and give full scope to the vital spirit of enterprise. It is exploring the ground rules for the economy--notably the federal tax code and regulatory policies--to identify the points where the balance is tilted toward "giantism". And, at those crucial points, Forward America is proposing to reverse that tilt to favor increased opportunity for the dynamic small and medium-sized company and the enterprising individual.

Forward American is not waging war on bigness as such. In our modern economy a large scale is often necessary for efficiency in production. Forward America's target is bigness unjustified by any claim to efficiency--bigness for sake of exercising monopoly power--bigness to extract special privilege from government--bigness working to destroy genuine competitive free enterprise.

Concentrated power has always been the enemy of liberty. Power widely diffused among the people means freedom. Thus Forward America's program aims at encouraging a widespread distribution of capital and property ownership, and discouraging the concentration of economic and political power in the hands of Big Business, Big Labor and Big government alike.

Ed Wimmer, like his hero Thomas Jefferson before him, devoted his life to defending this principle. In Forward America's new program, Ed's soul goes marching on.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Pot"

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

On last November 21st I read an article by a mother about her teenage son and his experience with marijuana. She told of her first awareness of a change taking place--a change in the personality of her son and of his admission he was smoking pot. One phrase she used in describing this change was that she watched his "eyes growing dimmer."

Her story had a happy ending. He stood before her one day, his eyes no longer dim and told her he had quit because he finally realized what the weed was doing to him. Her story ended with the statement that she looked at her son and, "knew he had become a man".

On December 3rd, the Los Angeles TIMES printed a page of letters it had received in response to this story. I couldn't believe the viciousness and outrage of the writers. One accused the mother of practicing "parental fascism". Most of them carried on about one generation forcing its standards on another and made it plain that in their view she was some kind of monster for disapproving of marijuana.

Then, on December 17, in the same editorial section there appeared a response to the letters by a local teacher named Patrick Kennedy. He wrote, "I could not in good conscience sit back and not reply to those opinions about marijuana use and teenagers." He told of the experience--sometimes exhilarating, sometimes heart breaking--of being close to 200 teenagers, seeing their struggles with the problems of growing up. Speaking of them as a generation "needing and unconsciously seeking moral guidance and structure," he asked, "if parents are not responsible to provide a moral atmosphere, stressing the values they find important, who is responsible?" Answering his own question he said, "this is not parental fascism--it is parental commitment to the most sacred of all tasks: to see that the young get a good start with healthy roots and a straight growth in the proper directions". He called it a responsibility that is being avoided by too many of us and that our society is paying the price.

He asked the letter writers if they had ever been closely involved with bright young teenagers: "Have they seen those bright eyes slowly become dimmer, the once-quick minds less attentive? Have they experienced the slow growth of paranoia in the eyes of these students; the inability to look you in the eye any longer with that innocent look of trust and friendship?"

Telling of the heartbreak in seeing that happen he said of pot. "It poisons the mind in the sense that when a problem arises in the life of a teenage pot smoker he or she doesn't solve the problem. It's too easy to avoid it by getting high. So they reach adulthood without ever facing or overcoming adversity."

Any parents who find their sons and daughters in the classes of Patrick Kennedy should be very happy.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Social Security")

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

A couple of months after this year's elections the social security tax will start climbing again, till, by 1987, it will be three times what it is now for employer and employee. A rate of more than seven percent will be applied on all earnings up to \$42,600.

One nice touch I must admit was putting off the actual increase until after the election. After all, you know they must have done that for our benefit. With our interest centered on the candidates we wouldn't want to be bothered by trivialities such as tax increase. This could even explain why the cut in benefits from 44 percent of earnings down to 41 percent won't take place until 1984.

The bill-signing ceremony in Washington was well covered by television so we saw all the congratulations, the back-slapping and hand-shaking. Sure they were happy--they don't pay any social security tax.

This \$250 billion, 10-year tax increase will do nothing but stave off for a few years the collapse of the social security system. By its own admission, the program is 17 trillion (yes, trillion) dollars out of balance. What happens when those few years are up? Another tax increase? At what point do we face up to reforming the system and making it actuarially sound?

I have a copy of the official announcement of the beginning of social security November 24, 1936. It is addressed to us the citizens and explains how the program will function, "if you work in some factory, shop, mine, mill, store, office or almost any other kind of business or industry you will be earning benefits that will come to you later on."

The tax started at one percent of earnings up to \$3,000. And, it was explained how the rate of tax would increase by half a cent every three years until it reached its ultimate ceiling of three percent, but only on \$3,000 of earnings.

Then came this promise. "That is the most you will ever pay". We were also promised that our dollars would go into a fund where we were guaranteed at least three percent interest, therefore we would always get back more than we paid in and more than we could get by putting our money into any kind of private investment.

I'm sure they meant those promises, but they never kept them. Right now more than half the people paying into social security will get less than they pay in--possibly as little as half. For more than half the work force the social security tax is bigger than the income tax and, remember, it is not deductible for income tax purposes--you pay a tax on a tax.

Truth is if we could invest you and your employer's share of the social security tax in savings or insurance we could make a much better return than that promised by social security.

It was never going to cost more than three percent on \$3,000. Now it's going to cost more than seven percent on \$42,600 and it is, in effect, bankrupt.

Tapes 1/27/78
Air Dates 2/13-3/3

RONALD REAGAN
RADIO COMMENTARY

Disc 78-2

78-2A

<u>TITLE</u>	<u>TIME</u>
1. Big Mo (<u>MUST</u> air before 2/17/78)	2:32
2. Panama	2:54
3. St. Stephan's Crown	3:02
4. Korea	2:46
5. Oil	2:59
6. "Independents" vs. IRS	2:57
7. Regulation	2:45

78-2B

1. Welfare Reform	2:50
2. Miscellaneous (Customs; Women's/Men's Year Commission; and Christmas in Schools)	2:47
3. Looking Out a Window	2:24
4. Jobs	2:46
5. Miscellaneous (Over-regulation; Ms. Ludtke; and trade between Israel and South Africa)	2:42
6. Pity the Middle Class	2:27
7. Miscellaneous (Jobs; O.S.H.A.; IRS; Dept. of Agriculture; and Rumania coal mining strike)	2:48
8. Father & Son	2:29

PLEASE NOTE:

1. These programs are provided for airing from February 13th through March 3rd inclusive. Maintaining this schedule will enable your station to air all newly recorded programs as received.
2. Please be advised that our office does not fulfill requests from listeners for copies of Governor Reagan's radio commentaries.



RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Big Mo"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Quite a long time back on one of these broadcasts I talked about a great pro-basketball star named Maurie Stokes. To all the N.B.A. fans he was known as Big Mo.

At the very height of his career he was struck down by a rare--almost unheard of--disease. One of his teammates, Jack Twiman, accompanied him to the hospital because, as he later said to his wife, "It didn't seem right to let him go by himself." That was the start of one of the truly great stories of friendship between two strong men.

That story caught the attention of a fine Hollywood screenwriter, Doug Morrow, who had also written the story of Monte Stratton, the baseball pitcher who lost his leg in a hunting accident and fought his way back to be a starting pitcher in the big leagues. Jimmy Stewart, you may remember, played Stratton in what was one of Hollywood's finer movies.

It was only natural that Doug Morrow would see the epic quality and the drama in the real life stories of Big Mo and Jack Twiman. With Big Mo gone Jack Twiman set the rule that the story would have to be the truth, the whole truth and, so help me, no artificial "tinsel town" gimmicks added. Those conditions didn't bother Morrow--that's the way he wanted to do it. He wrote the story and co-produced the picture with Frank Ross, producer of the epic, "The Robe".

They made this motion picture the way pictures used to be made. More important it was a picture that everyone should see; a picture about the indomitable human spirit that has raised us above the primeval swamp. Against the competitive background of big time pro basketball "Big Mo" is a story with heart, humor, excitement and suspense. And you can have a family night with a picture the kids should see and you won't have to pretend you didn't hear certain words.

In today's world here is a story about man's humanity to man. One of our biggest army training centers has made this picture a part of recruit indoctrination and credits it with unifying our young men and binding them together in a common cause. The first time I saw it I called it a picture all America should see. You'll see courage and compassion, brotherly love without mawkishness and a story that will hold your attention. And every minute of it is a true life story that really happened.

I know I sound like a commercial, but I mean every word of it. If you liked the story of Brian Piccolo, you'll love "Big Mo" on C.B.S. Friday Night.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Panama")

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

On a recent visit to Panama two U.S. Senators, Paul Laxalt and Bob Dole, met with the Panama Canal Zone Civic council. The council is made up of representatives of the towns in the zone.

One of the council members who spoke to the senators was a fireman. He was born in the zone to parents from the West Indies, he is by law, a Panamanian. Yet, in his heart he is American and in his heart he is against the treaties which would give the canal to Panama.

He spoke with a heavy West Indian accent. He's a man in his 40's, black and concerned (as are most of the canal employees) that he will face retribution if the treaties are ratified because of his loyalty to the United States.

He was quite emotional as he spoke:

--QUOTE-- "The employees that you see here working, the ones that come from the United States and the ones that are employed locally, we are a breed of people--a breed of second, some third generation, whose fathers come here and built this place.

"They're probably turnin' over in their graves wanting to find out what's wrong with the United States government. What's this business about givin' away the Panama Canal? To Who? Are we working for what? We sacrifice all the time. We give of ourselves.....freely. Yes, we came here and worked for 10 cents an hour. We are going to defend it. Regardless of what anybody wants to say, we stood here in 1964 and we defended it." --UNQUOTE-- (He was speaking of the riots)
Quote--And we dare anybody to come over and take it away from us. That's the kind of feelin's that I have. I am tell you that.

"You are never making me an American citizen which I know that I'm entitled to be because I was born and grow up in the Canal Zone under the American Flag. And trained western style. I don't know anything about Communism or whatever. I read, write english. That's the language I know. The money in my pocket --"In God we trust"-- thats what it writes on there. It's American money. And it's the only kind of money I care to spend.

"So what you think I'm going to do? Sit here and let some tinhorn terrorist come over here and tell us what we should do. Uh? This is our country. We built it. This Panama Canal was built by this people and it was paid in blood, sweat and tears. Are you going to tell me the United States government just--just give it away like that?--UNQUOTE. At this point he was interrupted by another member of the Council who said, QUOTE--"This man is very dramatic but he is 100 percent right."

The fireman continued QUOTE--"I know that I'm right. That's the reason why my kids at home--three girls and a boy--they're going to be in the United States Navy and Army. They're not to go through this what I'm going through. Never happen. I'm going to see to it. And any day that this treaty comes into effect I'm going to tell you this: you'll have an exodus to the United States. Employees--black and white--will be going out of here." UNQUOTE--

I hope he knows how many Americans feel the same way.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "St. Stephan's Crown"
commentary by Ronald Reagan)

I've spoken before about the Crown of St. Stephan which has been a symbol of freedom to the Hungarian people for a thousand years, but I can't resist having one more go at it.

The Washington paper Human Events has published a conversation between Reed Irvine of Accuracy-in-Media and a spokesman for the State department regarding the President's statement that we were returning the crown -- QUOTE-- "To the people of Hungary." --UNQUOTE-- Here's the way it went. I'll play both parts.

Q: Could you tell us whether this statement that they are returning the crown to the people of Hungary indicated that the State department and the United States government believe that the government of Janos Kadar, which has been supported by Soviet occupation forces in Hungary, and installed with their support, represents the people of Hungary?

A: We are not returning it so much to the government, Reed...we are returning it to the Hungarian people.

Q: You obviously are not turning it over to the man in the street, you are turning it over to government officials.

A: There has to be somebody--

Q: Do you think that the government officials represent the people of Hungary?

A: I don't think the question arises in this particular case, Reed.

Q: It obviously does, from your statement. You say you are returning it to the people--and you are returning it to the Hungarian government.

A: We have a disagreement which we can discuss if you want. I am saying that--

Q: Do you think that the government of Hungary is representative of the people?

A: I won't answer the question. It's not what we are saying here.

Q: Well, could you tell us when the last free election was held in Hungary?

A: I would have to go back and look at the history books. I don't really know.

Q: Has Janos Kadar ever submitted himself to a free election?

A: I think what you ought to do is ask the Hungarians.

Q: Well you know that. You know he hasn't.

A: Well, then, why do you ask the question?

Q: Well, I wanted to get the State department's view of why they feel that this government is representative of the people.

A: My answer, Reed, as I have said, is that from this podium we are not in the habit of making judgments on other people's governments.

Q: You don't have opinions about representative governments?

A: I did not say that.

Q: In Rhodesia, South Africa?

A: No, I am not saying that at all.

Q: I'm at a complete loss to understand the State department's position.

A: Maybe I am at a complete loss to know why you don't inform yourself of what this forum is about, and what these briefings are really intended for.

Q: I take it, it's to try to find out what the United States government policy is, isn't it? What is our policy?

A: I don't think you are asking me what our policy is.

Q: I am asking you. What is our policy?

A: Our policy to what?

Q: Toward governments that don't represent people. You say you are returning the crown to the Hungarian people. You are returning it to Janos Kadar, who obviously doesn't represent the people, because he has never submitted himself to an election.

A: And?

Q: Therefore, you are saying, it seems to me, incorrectly, that the government of Hungary represents the people and by this action you are indicating to everyone in the world that this government represents the people.

A: No, I would contest that strongly, Reed. I don't think I am making that kind of statement at all.

But he never explained what kind of statement he was making.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Last spring Major General John Singlaub, a most capable soldier with a distinguished military record was abruptly and publicly removed from his job in South Korea by the Commander-in-Chief himself. The General had expressed his views in what he thought was a private conversation, that the President's plan to withdraw our 2nd infantry division from Korea could tempt the Communists in the North to have another go at conquering the Republic of Korea.

Arriving in this country, the General was summoned to appear before the House Armed Services Committee. He told the Congressmen that our intelligence reports reveal that the North Koreans have done what the Soviet Union has done--engaged in a massive buildup of military power. And being the honest man he is, he said that removing troops from Korea would seriously weaken South Korea's ability to defend itself.

Now, many months later, our State department (which from the first has supported the President's decision to withdraw the 2nd division) comes forth with a 12-page report to Congress on Korea. And, guess what? The report stresses the fact that North Korea has rejected all efforts to peacefully settle the political issues which divide the two Koreas.

The report points out the "sizable military advantage" the North has over the South and the fact that North Korea's military force is obviously offensive and not defensive in nature. In tanks, armored personnel carriers, rocket launchers, artillery, and so forth, the South is outnumbered more than two-to-one. North Korea's advantage includes jet fighter planes, naval vessels and Russian missiles for use against ships. South Korea has no submarines, but Korea builds its own.

Most significantly, the report--after stressing the proximity of Seoul to the North Korean border--makes it plain that South Korea could survive an attack with our help. They will have to have air, naval and logistic support. The report goes farther and says steps must be taken to "replace the combat capability of the U.S. ground forces we are going to withdraw." We must build up South Korea's stores of ammunition and equipment, send more and better tanks and anti-tank weapons; there must be an increase in South Korea's capability to utilize sophisticated weaponry and still -- with all that -- they would need our active participation if war should come.

The report doesn't come right out and say it, but it strongly implies we'd be better off if the U.S. 2nd infantry division stayed right where it is. In other words, General Singlaub knew what he was saying! The presence of our troops in South Korea could very well mean the difference between peace and war.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Not too long ago I told of the editor of an oil industry trade paper who had figured out that at 45¢ a cup (which he had paid) coffee was \$600 a barrel compared to \$14 for Arab oil. Then he wondered why there were no Congressmen clamoring about the high price of coffee, with the usual charges of monopoly, withheld reserves and obscene profits.

I'm afraid most of us look at the familiar signs and billboards of the major oil companies and find it easy to believe at least some of the tirade against the oil merchants. With that in mind I decided to do some boning up. I was surprised at what I found, and maybe you'll be too.

Try this one for starters. Since 1958 the cost of mailing a letter has gone up 333%. The price of gasoline has only gone up 88%. Makes you wonder about that new \$10½ billion Energy department in Washington, doesn't it?

Senator Henry Jackson of Washington has found a few things in the oil industry to criticize. But, if the price of gasoline had gone up as much in his home state as those tasty apples they raise there, Washingtonians would be paying \$1.46 a gallon. Senator Muskie of Maine has had some unkind things to say about the petroleum peddlers, but if gasoline had gone up in price to match Maine lobsters it would sell for \$2.85 a gallon. While we're at it let's take the dollar itself (we won't be taking much). Over the last 40 years the dollar has shrunk a little. It's worth a fraction under 26¢. But you can still buy a gallon of gas for less than one of those 26¢ dollars.

High on the list of things the oil industry is accused of is that it enjoys being a monopoly. Congress debates divestiture a bill to break up the major oil companies. Now monopoly means domination of the industry by a few companies, reduced competition and limited entry into the business by others.

Well that was my next surprise. There are more than 10,000 companies competing with each other in oil and gas exploration and production; 133 companies operate 264 refineries and more than 100 pipeline companies transport crude oil, liquefied natural gas and refined products.

In the wholesale side of the industry there are 15,000 companies selling petroleum products to over 300,000 retailers (90 percent of whom are independents). Would it surprise you as it did me to learn there are more than 1500 different brands of gasoline for us to buy? That's not much of a monopoly.

There is a direct ratio between increased production in America and energy. Four million jobs are created for every billion barrels of oil found in this country. I hope the new Department of Energy knows that because we'll need 19 million new jobs by 1985. That's five billion barrels of oil.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Independents vs. IRS"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Reginald Dwyer is one of a rare breed, an independent Vermont logger. Even in subzero weather you can find Reg Dwyer out in the woods, bringing out pulpwood to feed the nation's huge appetite for paper products. And, after a hard day in the woods, you may find him at the school board meeting in his little town of Sheffield. Reg is one of those dependable, community-minded small businessmen who have done so much, over two centuries, to create the image of Vermont in the national mind.

But Reg Dwyer is in trouble - \$18,500 worth of trouble - with the Internal Revenue Service. It's not about paying his taxes - he's always done that. It's about paying other people's taxes. To understand why the IRS is hounding him and dozens of other small logging contractors in New England and the deep South, it's necessary to know how an independent logging operation works.

Most of the pulpwood produced by independent loggers in the northeast is produced on what is called the contract system. The prime contractor - a man like Reg Dwyer - secures stumpage or cutting rights. Then four operations follow in sequence: felling and limbing the trees, skidding the logs to a collection yard, cutting the logs to pulpwood size, and loading and trucking the wood to the paper mill. Sometimes, in large operations, one company will hire employees to perform these various operations. But, in independent logging, each operation may be performed by a specialist who works on contract with the prime contractor. Fellers and cutters provide their own chain saws, fuel, safety equipment, and transportation to the job. The skidder may own his own bulldozer or skidder to haul the logs out of the woods. The trucker will own his own truck with an expensive clamshell loader.

Now, all these subcontractors are in business for themselves. They may work for many different logging contractors over the year. But the IRS has traditionally been hostile to this independent business system because it makes it more difficult for it to track down and tax every dollar of income. Self-employed persons pay less than employees to social security. And they may deduct up to five times as much in self-employed retirement plans as employees.

So the IRS informed the Dwyers - by announcing it to them before their neighbors in the lobby of the Sheffield post office - that they owe Uncle Sam \$18,500 in social security, withholding, unemployment insurance taxes, penalties and interest for all the independent subcontractors they have contracted with over the past five years--whether or not those subcontractors have already paid the required taxes! And if the Dwyers have to pay, it will darn near put them out of business.

New England's independent loggers are not the only victims of this IRS attack. Independent contractors of all kinds -- artisans, truckers, taxicab operators, repairmen, and fishermen are under the same gun (although Congress exempted certain lobstermen by statute in 1976). It's time that Congress told the IRS, loud and clear, that the independent small contractor is a vital part of America. They cannot survive if, in addition to the risks of the economy, they are harassed into insolvency by an IRS determined to make them pay the taxes of others with whom they contract, as well as their own.

RONALD REAGAN

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

We have a long way to go in making government responsive and less intrusive if, as a recent poll says, less than a third of our citizens believe there is no over-regulation of business and industry in America. Perhaps our problem is that most people, on hearing the term "business and industry", automatically think of great corporations with legal departments of their own, auditing staffs and banks of computers.

But, this ignores reality. Take the letter a relatively small law firm sent to its Congressman recently. This firm has instituted a retirement plan involving profit and ownership sharing for its few employees. One line in the letter informed the Congressman that the ERISA act of 1974, having to do with pensions, had resulted in making the cost of administering the law firm's retirement plan greater than the plan's benefits.

Then came these lines, -- "There should be some provision for reducing the complexities and paper work for small business. We only have eight employees. A sole proprietor with only a couple of employees can hardly justify the administration costs if he complies with all of the present requirements." Now, remember, this is a law firm which obviously is better equipped than most to handle technical matters.

The letter gave an example of bureaucratic bungling when it said that last November 17, the firm had received from the Department of Labor a request for a nine-page summary of its plan to be filed on November 17. Incidentally, the Internal Revenue Service already had the information the Department of Labor was demanding.

Now comes evidence that the concern expressed in the letter for smaller (non-lawyer) employers is well founded. In Annapolis, Maryland a man who repairs sewing machines decided to hire one employee--his first. It seems this takes more than just running an ad and offering someone a salary. He had to write for an employer's state and federal tax forms.

From the state he received a stack of forms including two notices he was required to put on the wall of his shop telling employees how to complain about unsafe or unsanitary working conditions and how to apply for unemployment compensation. The federal government sent him a packet containing 44 forms ranging from one to 30 pages each. He said, "I wouldn't have time to do my sewing machine work if I had to send all this."

But that isn't the real price we're paying for the blizzard of paper that government demands. The proprietor explained that he had thought he could help the unemployment situation a little by teaching some boy or girl a trade. He added, "But they don't make it easy for you at all."

The I.R.S. concedes his complaint is a familiar one among small businessmen, but it ho-hummed that most of them eventually get used to it. Maybe, but just maybe a lot of them such as the sewing machine man change their minds about hiring anyone.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Back in 1971 when California started its highly successful welfare reforms the weeping and wailing was enough to make your blood run cold. But most of it came from those who had no need for welfare themselves. They delight in bleeding for others. And a goodly share came from the professionals and organizers who thought their carrers were being threatened in what we were trying to do.

One such was the head of an organization dedicated to protecting the rights of those on welfare. Testifying before a Congressional committee she said, QUOTE--"Everyone in this country has a right to share the wealth. The money has gone to the middle class and if we don't get our share we're going to disrupt this country and this Capitol."UNQUOTE.

We found in California that tens of thousands of able bodied welfare recipients wanted nothing better than to become self supporting. We found also that the welfare system doesn't encourage this. Many of these people fall into a pattern which, after awhile, renders them virtually incapable of entering the competitive job market. Treating only the material needs of man will not endow him with nobility of spirit, creativity and the unselfish desire to become productive.

One day after our reforms had been in effect for awhile, I received a letter that began "Dear Sir - I am one of those people who left California and its welfare rolls when you started your reform program." Right there I wanted to stop reading. I thought the letter would accuse me of being heartless and cruel and that I had brought hunger and unhappiness to the writer. I was wrong. The letter went on to say, "I'd like to thank you. My life is much brighter now. I lived for years in public housing with my two sons, drawing a welfare check because it was so easy. And the longer I did it the easier it got and the lazier I became. I wouldn't even get married and lose the security of that check. When you started cleaning up the welfare mess the government was creating I figured it was only a matter of time before I was told to find a job. So I decided to do something. I had \$520 I'd saved out of that poverty I was supposed to be living in. I came to Alaska where my family lived. I found working was fun and a lot better than day time T.V. I've got a lot more self respect and pride now." and then she thanked me again.

Welfare is really not the complex problem government pretends it is. All we have to do is think of it as a temporary helping hand until we can assist someone to become self supporting. And that means we recognize it for what it is--charity, and "charity" is a noble word. We should judge our success by how much we decrease the need for welfare. The failure of the present programs is indicated by the vast increase in the number of recipients. Welfare is a dangerous drug destroying the spirit of people once proudly independent. Our mission should be to help people kick that particular durg habit.

RONALD REAGAN

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

How can a \$2.28 ash tray become a problem in international relations? Sounds impossible and a little bit ridiculous doesn't it? But, never underestimate bureaucracy.

There is a fellow in Philadelphia who has a cousin in Salisbury, Rhodesia. The Philadelphia cousin has a birthday and the Salisbury cousin sends a present--a \$2.28 ashtray. The package arrives in Philadelphia and immediately the postal and customs authorities go into action. The U.S. is, after all, a party to United Nations sanctions against Rhodesia.

The Philadelphia cousin is notified that the package addressed to him is an "unlicensed" import. Now, you and I would think a sample answer to this bit of bureaucratic nonsense would be to return the package to the sender, namely the Salisbury cousin. But, you and I don't realize the seriousness of the situation. The Philadelphia cousin is told he will have to apply for a re-exportation license to return the package to his Salisbury cousin. He appeals to his Congressman who is unable to shake the Treasury department (there will be no exceptions to the sanctions on Rhodesia). It's too bad the Salisbury cousin didn't live in Moscow or Leningrad. If he had, the ashtray would have been delivered right to Philadelphia cousin's door.

On another front, here's an item you could say had to happen after the government put up \$5 million for the recent International Women's Year Commission. A man in Florida has brought suit on behalf of all American males, demanding \$5 million to be put up by the Federal government to fund a Men's Year Commission.

And, I suppose this next item is also something we should have known was bound to happen. With voluntary prayer banned from our public schools, Christmas has been tolerated so long as there was no reference to its religious significance. So there has been no singing of "Silent Night" or "Hark, the Herald Angels Sing". They were replaced by "Jingle Bells" and "Rudolph, The Red-Nosed Reindeer". The star in the east and a babe in a manger were out, but children were permitted a decorated tree and, of course, jolly old Santa Claus. But maybe his days are numbered.

The Rhode Island branch of the American Civil Liberties union has decided even the present method of recognizing Christmas threatens the Constitution. A spokesman explains that Santa comes on Christmas Eve so he has acquired a religious significance and must be expelled from the classroom. That goes for the decorated tree and, naturally, singing about red-nosed Rudolph would remind you of Santa, so it must join "Silent Night" and the other outlawed songs.

But when these zealous busybodies have had their way and every traditional symbol of the day--the reindeers and sleigh, Santa and the lighted tree and of course the nativity scene--have been banned in our schools, won't they come to the name of the day itself? And what will they do about that?

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Looking Out a Window"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

I'm afraid you are in for a little bit of philosophizing if you don't mind. Some of these broadcasts I must draft while I'm out on the road traveling on what I call "the mashed potato circuit." A little while after I write them, for example, I'll be speaking to a group of good people in a banquet hall.

Right now, however, I'm looking down on a busy city at rush hour. The streets below are twin ribbons of sparkling red and white. Tail lights on the cars moving away from my vantage point provide the red and the headlights of those coming toward me the white. It's logical to assume all or most are homeward bound at the end of a days work.

I wonder why some social engineer hasn't tried to get them to trade homes. The traffic is equally heavy in both directions, so, if they all lived in the end of town where they worked it would save a lot of travel time. But, better forget I said that and don't even think it or some bureaucrat will try to do it!

I wonder, though, about the people in those cars--who they are, what they do, what they are thinking about as they head to the warmth of home and family. Come to think of it I've met them--oh--maybe not those particular individuals, but still I feel I know them. Some social planners refer to them as "the masses", which only proves they don't know them. I've been privileged to meet people all over this land in the special kind of way you meet them when you are campaigning. They are not "the masses", or as the elitists would have it--"the common man." They are very uncommon. Individuals, each with his or her own hopes and dreams, plans and problems and the kind of quiet courage that makes this whole country run better than just about any other place on earth.

By now, thinking of their homecoming I'm counting how many more hotel room windows I'll be looking out of before I'm in the rush hour traffic heading home. And yes, I'm feeling a little envious of the people in those cars down below. It seems I've said a thousand goodbyes, each one harder than the one before.

Someone very wise once wrote that if we were all told one day that the end was coming; that we were living our last day, every road, every street and all the telephone lines would be jammed with people trying to reach someone to whom we wanted simply to say, "I love you."

But why wait for such a final day and take the chance of not getting there in time? Speaking of time, I'll have to stop now. Hello, operator, I'd like to make a long distance call.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Job"

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Back in 1971 Congress -- spurred by the recession of 1970 -- passed a measure called the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. It was to be a temporary program, cost \$1 billion. The money was to be doled out to state and local governments which would, in turn hire the hardcore unemployed in fields such as law enforcement, health, education and so forth.

The "temporary" program is still with us, but now it costs \$6 billion a year. It has also been proposed as a part of the much talked about welfare reform going to \$9 billion. Well, with one out of five workers in the United States already on the public payroll, more government jobs doesn't seem to be a practical answer to unemployment.

But more importantly, the record of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act -- called CETA for short -- is a story of boondoggles and scandal. Here and there special interest groups have managed to get grants which helped pay for their own staffs and could hardly be called legitimate public service jobs.

One county in my own state of California came up with a program that won a Golden Fleece award from Senator William Proxmire. The Senator gives his award each month for the biggest and/or the most ridiculous example of wasteful government spending. In this California case, \$400,000 of CETA money is being used to hire some 85 people who will do a door-to-door survey. They are counting all the dogs, cats and horses living in or near the 160,000 homes and apartments in the county.

The awarding of the "Fleece" brought the project to the attention of the citizenry of that particular county and they felt just about the same as Senator Proxmire did. But the counting goes on and will continue through the spring.

Defending the program, CETA's local director said the Department of Labor doesn't "weigh the project's merits". He then went on to say that an idea would have to be "illegal or extremely ridiculous" before the department would cancel the funds. And while he admitted that counting animals might sound ridiculous it really isn't.

County officials defended the nose count on the grounds that they might pick up revenues by turning up unlicensed animals (\$400,000 worth?) Then there was the matter of animals not vaccinated for rabies. Well, no one can question the seriousness of a rabies epidemic, but there hasn't been a single case of rabies among dogs and cats in that particular county for more than ten years. So, the program seems well deserving of the Senator's monthly award.

It does bear out what the French economist Bastiat said more than a century ago, "Public funds seemingly belong to no one and the temptation to bestow them on someone is irresistible".

RONALD REAGAN

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

I'm sure it won't come as a surprise to you that I've found another example of over-regulation by government. This time, however, the federal colossus gets a breather. Today's incident is of local doing.

Just suppose you lived in a modern up-to-date city such as Chicago. You survive the rush hour traffic, pull into your garage and find it has become the lodging place for one of our little wild friends--the furry kind, black with a white stripe down its back.

Well, this happened to a fellow named Bill Stanton who figured the arrangement involved a certain amount of incompatibility. He called the police, but it seems this was out of their regular line of work. For some reason the animal welfare department couldn't help him nor could the local zoo. The department of conservation it seems, stops short of conserving skunks and the dog catcher wasn't having any either.

Left to his own resources Bill, in good old pioneer style bought a trap and caught the skunk. He also caught the attention (finally) of the police, the local zoo, the animal welfare department and the department of conservation. I think the dog catcher continued to mind his own business.

But the others charged him with illegally bringing a trap into Chicago, with illegal use of a trap in Chicago and with illegal use of a trap without a license in Chicago. Collectively, they have informed him that it is illegal to keep a skunk in captivity, illegal to let it go (it might have rabies) and it's illegal to kill it. Still, none of the agencies bringing the charges will take it off his hands. Bill Stanton feels a little put upon. It's also hard for him to put the problem out of his mind (skunks have a way of reminding you they are still around).

Well, here is another item, and I'm indebted to National Review for it. It's one of those things you just knew had to happen in today's climate. A Ms. Ludtke, reporter for Sports Illustrated is suing the New York Yankees, the American League, the baseball commissioner and the City of New York (as if the Big Apple didn't have enough troubles). It seems she's been barred from the New York Yankees dressing room which means she doesn't have the same sports reporting rights the male reporters have. And, of course, she is barred simply because of her sex. Or maybe it's because of the ball player's sex.

I have one suggestion. Why don't they grant her permission, then tell the ball players' wives what they've done and see if she could make it as far as the locker room door?

Footnote on another subject; The U.N. has censured Israel for trading with South Africa -- \$50 million worth. Thirteen of the African nations that joined in voting for censure do \$1½ billion trade with South Africa.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Pity the Middle Class"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

The greatest fear in a man's life is to be poor. It is about the worst thing that could happen. But gradually that's changing. Nowadays, you can get subsidized housing, health and dental care, university scholarships and other welfare benefits, provided you're poor enough. All you need to enjoy many of the advantages of life is proof that you are disadvantaged. Nobody can complain about that. It's human and kind. However, society has now created another problem group. That's the middle class.

Nobody wants to be middle class anymore because the middle class has an awkward amount of money--too much to be eligible to live as well as the poor, too little to live as well as rich.

Instead of living downtown (like the rich and the poor) the middle class guy has to buy a lot 35 miles from town because that's all he can afford. Then he spends the rest of his life trying to pay his bills, educate the kids and meet the mortgage because nobody will help him out. If poverty gets any more attractive, the following conversation may soon be commonplace at the office:

"Mr. Goodie, I wonder if I could speak to you a minute?"

"What is it, Smedley, I'm busy."

"It's about my salary, Mr. Goodie. I wonder if you could give me a decrease?"

"You had a decrease less than a year ago, Smedley."

"I know, sir, I wouldn't ask if it wasn't important, but I sure could use less money."

"What size decrease did you have in mind?"

"I was hoping for a \$25 cut in salary."

"Twenty-five dollars! That's a big slide, Smedley. What have you done to merit it?"

"I've worked for the company 23 years, Mr. Goodie. And I've never let you down. My work has always been up to standard."

"I realize that, Smedley. But \$25. Wouldn't you be satisfied with a \$15 cut?"

"We have a budget right now. We're already below last year's salary figures."

"Mr. Goodie, a \$15 cutback is better than none, but my wife and I had our hearts set on a \$25 decrease."

"How about \$20?"

"If I made \$25 less, we'd be eligible for an apartment in the city's new development, the one downtown with a pool, sauna and tennis court. Besides, my son would qualify for a government scholarship and we would get his teeth fixed at government expense."

"You drive a hard bargain, Smedley. OK, you get a \$25 decrease on this condition. If your work slips, you'll get a \$10 raise, no questions asked."

"Bless you, Mr. Goodie."

"And Smedley, will you invite me over for tennis and a swim some night when you get into your new place?"

"Certainly, sir. I believe the poor should share with the less fortunate."

RONALD REAGAN

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

Today I have several items from the marble halls of government.

Here's one for starters. In the last two years business and industry in the U.S. have actually created seven million new jobs. The Federal Government is still talking about an \$8.8 Billion job program to put one million four hundred thousand people to work in jobs the government will create. That pro-rates out to about 6300 tax dollars per job. Yet, the seven million I first mentioned didn't cost the tax payers anything.

It's nice to hear the Administration talking about a tax cut. That is, after they've raised the Social Security tax and added on the new energy taxes. It's hard to envision government costing less when the Equal Employment Opportunity commission, which started out in 1965 with a budget of Two-and-a-half million dollars now has one of \$66,850,000.

The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (O.S.H.A.) has only been around seven years. It's budget has gone up 758%--from a little over \$15 million to more than 130 million. The Enviromental Protection agency is a bureaucratic piker by comparison. It only increased its budget 114% in seven years. Of course it raised the price of things we purchase by tens of billions of dollars with it's sometimes nonsensical rulings.

Here are a couple of quotes that may explain why there have been some meetings in Washington lately about simplifying burocratic language. The Internal Revenue service is still trying to explain how to fill out our income tax returns. Somehow I don't think the following quote from the Tax Code will help - "For purposes of paragraph 3, an organization described in paragraph 2 shall be deemed to include an organization described in Section 501 (C) - 4,5, or 6 - which should be described in paragrah 2 if it were an organization described in Section 501 (C) 3." And all this time you thought a tax return was complicated.

But if you are a farmer you might have trouble with this little number from the Department of Agricultur, -QUOTE-"The failure of the private market to internalize all the externalities in production and consumption associated with an urban economy established the observed distribution of city sizes as an upper bound on the range of socially optimism city sizes." UNQUOTE- And that, I submit, cannot possibly have any meaning at all--even for the fellow who wrote it.

Here's one thought to make you feel good. Last summer, it seems, there was a big and lengthy coal mining strike in Rumania. The government suppressed all news of this strike. But, thanks to one correspondent, the trugh came out recently, including the reason for the news blackout. The miners told the top leader in Rumania they wanted to go back to capitalism.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Father & Son"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Not too long ago on one of these broadcasts I quoted an anonymous source to the effect that if all of us knew on a certain day the world was ending, the roads, streets and telephone lines would be jammed with people trying to reach someone to say "I love you". Since then some of you have written to express agreement with that unknown author. And some have begun a sentence with the words, "If only I had" (or "hadn't" as the case might be).

Back in World War II a father wrote a letter to his soldier son in the form of a poem:

Dear Son:

I wish I had the power to write
The thoughts wedged in my heart tonight
As I sit watching that small star
And wondering where and how you are.
You know, Son, it's a funny thing
How close a war can really bring
A Father, who for years with pride,
Has kept emotions deep inside.
I'm sorry, Son, when you were small
I let reserve build up that wall;
I told you real men never cried,
And it was Mom who always dried
Your tears and smoothed your hurts away
So that you soon went back to play.
But, Son, deep down within my heart
I longed to have some little part
In drying that small tear-stained face,
But we were men--men don't embrace.
And suddenly I found my Son
A full grown man, with childhood done.
Tonight you're far across the sea,
Fighting a war for men like me.
Well, somehow pride and what is right
Have changed places here tonight
I find my eyes won't stay quite dry
And that men sometimes really cry.
And if we stood here, face to face
I'm sure, my Son, we would embrace.
Son, Dads are quite a funny lot,
And if I've failed you on some spot
It's not because I loved you less
But just this cussed manliness.
And if I had the power to write
The thoughts wedged in my heart tonight,
The words would ring out loud and true
I'm proud, my Son, yes proud of you."

He signed it "Dad" and walked down to the corner and dropped it in the mail box. As he returned home and reached his own door step he was handed a War department telegram; the kind that began with the fateful words "We regret to inform you..."

I'm glad I can believe his son knew he had written that letter.

RONALD REAGAN
RADIO COMMENTARY

Disc 78-3

Taped: 2/20/78
Air: 3/6-3/24/78

78-3A

TITLE

Generic Promos

1.	Panama Canal debate	2:49
2.	Spaceships	2:57
3.	Redwoods	2:44
4.	Swordfish	2:48
5.	Farm Day	3:04
6.	Tax Limitation 1978 style	2:42
7.	Steel	2:48

78-3B

1.	Labor	2:34
2.	Economy	2:44
3.	Neighborhoods	2:31
4.	Cuba	2:45
5.	Treaties	2:40
6.	Neutron bomb	2:42
7.	Bakke	3:03
8.	Blind on the left	2:45

PLEASE NOTE:

1. These programs are provided for airing from March 6th through March 24th inclusive. Maintaining this schedule will enable your station to air all newly recorded programs as received.
2. Please be advised that our office DOES NOT fulfill requests from listeners for copies of Governor Reagan's radio commentaries. The enclosed copies are provided to you for this purpose.



RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Panama Canal debate")

If you've followed the Senate debate over the Panama Canal treaties you know that the senators have examined some aspects of the issue with a fine-tooth comb. Still, worries won't go away over the possible cost to the American taxpayers, over the Panamanian government's ability to manage the Canal and, most of all, over the possible consequences of these treaties to our security.

Many Panamanians have worries over the treaties, too. An American who lived in Panama for many years and visits there often, wrote to me the other day to say that what a large number of Panamanians want--especially the young people--is democratic government. He quoted one young Panamanian professional, a recent graduate of the university there, as voicing the views of many when he told my correspondent--QUOTE--"The Canal is not a solution right now. It is a problem. Panama's greatest need at the moment is the gradual creation of an honest, efficient, responsible government deriving its power from the people under law". --UNQUOTE--

The Torrijos regime seems a lot less interested in principles such as this young man expresses than it does in making money. For example, word comes from New York that an underwriting firm is in discussion with the Torrijos regime to issue between 50 and 100 million dollars worth of long-term bonds, payable out of canal tolls after the treaties are ratified. Torrijos has already run up Panama's indebtedness to more than one-and-a-half billion dollars since he came to power nine years ago. The country's debt at that time was only \$167 million.

Worries that the American taxpayer will end up footing a hefty bill for the Canal turn-over won't go away. Recently, the Carter administration, after insisting for weeks that the treaty payments to Panama would be covered by tolls, finally admitted that there would be a cost to the taxpayers of \$600 million. Outside estimates go much higher than that.

On the security issue, an important item comes from the respected English publication, The Intelligence Digest. It says,--QUOTE--"Plans are being formulated at Patrice Lumumba university in Moscow for the establishment of a subversive network in the United States using illegal immigrants from Mexico. This is linked to developments throughout the Central American area. The U.S. border with Mexico is left open effectively for political purposes and plans are being made in Moscow and Havana to train Mexican activists who will, at the right time, stimulate nationalist claims to those parts of the United States "stolen from Mexico." But, first the Panama Canal has to be eased from United States control."--UNQUOTE--

This is a time for Congress to take its time and let the legislative wheels grind slowly and exceedingly fine on every aspect of the Panama Canal treaties.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Spaceships")

When an earth-orbiting Soviet satellite reentered the earth's atmosphere, disintegrating and scattering wreckage across the frozen northland of Canada, the White House expressed concern when it developed that the wreckage was giving off radioactive rays, but relief that the orbital path was over sparsely populated country. Others speculated about future accidents in which the debris would land in a crowded city, and a few protested that we should stop cluttering up space with our man-made hardware.

Without writing off the legitimacy of worrying about radioactivity from whatever source, may I suggest we have a far greater worry? After all, what was the purpose of the space vehicle that crashed to earth? In what way was it serving its masters in the Kremlin?

The answers to those questions give us far more to worry about than radioactivity from a repeat failure. The New York Times carried the answers in a recent story. Cosmos 954 was a naval reconnaissance satellite carrying a powerful radar able to scan the world oceans to locate naval vessels of the United States and our allies. Information about location and number of ships could be radioed to Soviet ground controllers.

We've been pretty snug about our apparently superior sophistication in space technology, but this piece of hardware shows a very high level of sophistication on the part of the Russians. In fact, our own experts didn't believe such a space-borne radar was possible because of the tremendous power needed to beam radar signals. The Soviets developed a nuclear reactor small enough to be put on a spacecraft--hence the radioactivity in the snows of Canada.

I've said before--that while we are trying to avoid a war the Soviets are preparing to win one should it occur. It has only been a short time since we learned they have been developing "hunter-killer" satellites. The former head of air force intelligence (until his retirement), Major Lieutenant George Keegan has described our strategists as "startled" two years ago when the Soviets launched a new version of their killer which could "home in" and destroy a target in space during a single earth orbit. The Russians are also believed to be developing orbital bombardment vehicles and laser weapons.

Our military leaders fear that destruction of our communications satellites could leave the Pentagon unable to communicate with ships, planes, submarines, missile silos--even ground forces. Over the past 10 years the Soviets have launched at least 33 satellites as either "killers" or targets for the "killers".

We have embarked on a catch-up program which will have us armed with very sophisticated space weaponry sometime in the early 80's. Let's keep our fingers crossed.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Redwoods")

No one can quarrel with the idea of preserving the Cathedral like groves of Coast redwood trees which are found only in California. And, likewise, it's hard to be against a national park when one thinks of the exceptional beauty spots preserved now in parks such as Yellowstone and Yosemite. Why then do I think the idea of a National Redwood park doesn't make sense? I think I have an answer.

The Los Angeles Times, in an editorial, recently referred to the long struggle that --QUOTE--" led first to the creation of the original 58,000-acre park to the preserve." --UNQUOTE-- I believe the people of the United States who are being asked--make that told-- to put up millions and millions of dollars for the added acreage plus \$40 million or more on a job training program for the lumber jacks and others who will be thrown out of work should know there isn't a 58,000-acre National Redwood park.

Back in 1968 when diehard preservationists were going all out for a national park the federal government learned that virtually all of the superlative redwoods, the cathedral-like groves were already preserved in a number of state parks totaling 282 square miles. That is more than 180,000 acres. The only way there could even be a pretense of a national park would be to include one of our existing California state parks. The Federal government bought 28,000 acres (not 58,000) and 16,000 of those acres were either non-timber or cut-over land. Only 320 acres consisted of the superlative trees, plus 10,000 acres of old growth redwoods similar to the kind used for lumber.

When I left the California Governor's office in early 1975 nothing had been done to incorporate the state park into the national holding. The promise of more than one and a half million visitors a year as a boost to the local community turned out to be about 35,000. Nor had the Bureau of Land management opened the 40,000 acres of commercial-type forest to timber cutting which had been promised to avoid hardship in the lumber industry.

The state park that was supposed to make the National purchase look like a park has almost six times as many acres of superlative trees and twice as many old growth forest. It only has one-fourth the open or cut-over land as the federals bought. I'm sure this is known to Senator Cranston and Congressman Phil Burton of California who honchoed this measure through Congress. But, I wonder if it is to all those others who voted "aye"?

The 48,000 acres approved for purchase are not the ancient giant trees that we have already preserved in those state parks. This purchase is for a so called buffer zone and is a run of the mill mix of redwoods and fir trees. I have no doubt the push will continue to acquire more thousands of acres of timber land to act as a buffer zone for the buffer zone.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Swordfish")

Remember swordfish, that tasty, relatively inexpensive fish that used to be so abundant? Nowadays, of course, even if you can find swordfish on an occasional restaurant menu, the price is right up there among the most expensive delicacies. You can thank the bureaucrats of the Federal Food and Drug administration for that.

The story begins almost 10 years ago, in 1969. Acting on scares of mercury poisoning from swordfish in Japan and Iraq, the F.D.A. virtually banned swordfish in the United States. The swordfish, you see, absorbs a certain amount of mercury normally found in the ocean. After the ban, the F.D.A. began hearings to decide just what was a permissible level of mercury in swordfish, but it never completed the hearings and no final rule was issued.

In 1974, the F.D.A. did publish a proposed "guideline" to establish a level of Point Five (.5) parts-per-million for mercury in fish and shellfish. At that time, many experts submitted comments on the proposed guideline, questioning the scientific and legal basis for such a low permissible level of mercury. Some argued that this level frequently exists naturally in fish and shellfish in their normal environment.

Though the F.D.A. never issued its "guideline" in final form, it enforced it energetically. Using so-called "emergency" procedures it began clamping down on the fishing companies one at a time. The swordfishing business in the United States is composed of rather small companies and most don't have the resources to fight back against the bureaucrats. The result has been disaster for them. Since 1969, the swordfishing business has lost approximately 90 percent of its employment and production capacity. At the same time, swordfish has been virtually forced off the market and the consumer price of seafood protein has shot up.

Those consequences didn't seem to bother the enforcers at the F.D.A. who have continued their actions, primarily in Boston and Florida, where the remaining swordfishermen sail from. Recently, they went after Anderson Seafoods, A Floridy firm. This time, the fishermen decided to fight back. They banded together assessed themselves to build a legal defense fund and Anderson Seafoods filed a class action suit in federal court asking that the F.D.A. be restrained from enforcing its mercury "guideline" because "it has never been promulgated in final form; it has no basis in law or scientific fact; and it is otherwise arbitrary, capricious, and an abuse of discretion." Now that's a mouthful, but it was the beginning of a successful action for the swordfishermen. They asked a public interest law firm, the Pacific Legal Foundation, to enter the case and Pacific Legal filed a friend-of-the-court brief supporting the fishermen.

Result? The federal district court ruled in favor of the fishermen and against the Federal Drug administration. Who know, maybe the bureaucrats will think twice before they go after the little guys.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Farm Day")

March 20th is Agriculture day or Farm day, whichever you choose. It's an annual event staged by the entire Agriculture-business combine to make us better informed about the American Farmer and what he means to all of us.

In these decades of continued inflation we've heard the complaint, "Food prices are too high." We should ask, "compared to what?" Food the thing we buy most often has become an easy target for gripes about inflation. And of course the villain is the producer of food--the farmer. But is he? If he really is the villain then why is he parading those tractors in protest? Well maybe he is caught in the cost price squeeze, even more than everyone else.

Let's take just one crop. In 1976, wheat was selling for \$3.33 a bushel. In 1933 it was selling for only 72¢. But today \$3.33 will only buy what 55¢ would buy then and now the price of wheat has dropped \$2.30 and that's less than it costs to grow it.

The wheat farmer gets 2½¢ out of the loaf of bread you buy. The wrapper on the loaf costs almost 3¢. If the farmer contributed the wheat free of charge there wouldn't be much of a drop in the price of bread. But of greater significance (and consumer advocates please note) if the price of wheat doubled, the price of bread would only go up 2½¢.

Wheat is just one example. In France a worker has to put in almost two hours, in Russia 2¼ hours and in Japan 4½ hours to buy one pound of sirloin steak. In America he works 24 minutes.

Twenty five years ago one out of seven Americans farmed and each farmer raised food for 16 people. Today only one out of 22 is a farmer and each one produces enough food for himself and 55 others. In the last 25 years the farmer's per-man-hour rate of production has increased 5.3 percent a year, more than double the rate of productivity for all other industries. If non-farm production had matched the farmers increase there would be no inflation.

During these 25 years the cost of food as a percentage of our after tax income has fallen more than 30 percent. It now only takes 14.8 percent of our income after taxes to put food on the table. And only a little over a third of that 14.8% goes to the farmer. We eat better for less money than any other people on earth. And yet a congressman about a year or so ago asked, "When are we going to see dollar a pound steak again?" The man he had questioned replied Mr. Congressman, 20 years ago your salary was \$12,500 a year, now it's \$42,500 and on its way to \$50,000 or more. We'll see dollar a pound steak again when we see \$12,500 a year Congressmen again.

The farmer is receiving fewer dollars then he did a year ago and the dollars buy less but he's paying more for everything he buys. On Agriculture day, March 20, say a prayer for the American Farmer...and a thank you.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Tax Limitation 1978 style)

If you live in California you know by now that the sky is scheduled to fall on June 6. If you live in Massachusetts, the date hasn't been set, but the sky is definitely loose and expected to fall between now and 1980.

Who do we have to thank for these timely warnings? None other than the good folks who brought you record-breaking public budgets, burgeoning bureaucracies and ever-higher taxes.

And what is going to cause the sky to fall? In California, it is called the Jarvis-Gann property tax limitation initiative--Proposition 13 on the primary election ballot. In Massachusetts it is the Tax Limitation ammendment and it is wending its way through the Bay state's complex initiative process on its way to the ballot.

The Massachusetts ammendment would limit state spending to a fixed percentage of the public gross income. Some 56,000 signatures were required to petition the legislature in Boston to take up the matter. Proponents got 87,000. One-quarter of two consecutive state legislatures must vote to put it on the ballot (some 70 votes). Donald Feder, who heads Citizens for Limited Taxation, says they have about 40 votes now. Their timetable is to get on the ballot by 1980.

Officials in Massachusetts are squirming, just as they are in California. Governor Michael Dukakis has said the measure would put the state --QUOTE-- "in a fiscal straitjacket"--UNQUOTE--to which angry taxpayers are probably crying, "Right on!".

In California, Howard Jarvis, a 75-year old veteran battler of high taxes, stunned the spenders in Sacramento when his petition drive netted more than 1.2 million signatures--an all-time record. The measure, if passed, will limit property taxes to one percent of assessed valuation. To prevent a tax "shift" from local to state government, it would require a two-thirds vote of the legislature to enact any change in state taxes.

Jarvis contends that local essential services need not be cut back; that intelligent pruning combined with distribution of the state's hugh treasure surplus (nearly \$3 billion) back to the local level will solve the problem.

Meanwhile, some of the spenders in the legislature--scared stiff that they will no longer be able to buy votes with other peoples money--are sounding like a Greek chorus. They are crying "tax shift" and warning that state income and sales taxes will have to go up to make up for local budget cuts.

Their assumption is that government costs can only go up, never down. Jarvis is getting ready to cut them off at the pass by collecting signatures for yet another initiative. It would limit even further the legislature's ability to raise sales and income taxes. If both measures pass, the legislators will finally have to do what they fear most--make choices and set spending priorities.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Steel")

There are charges of dumping of steel on the United States marketed by Japan. Dumping is the term used to describe selling at below cost with the Japanese government making up the loss to the Japanese steel companies. Appeals were made to our government to take retaliatory action.

Possibly there was some dumping--I don't know, but the problem of the United States steel industry is a little more complicated than that. For example in 1976 our labor costs averaged \$12.22 an hour compared to Japan's \$6.31. Since then, steel in our country agreed to a wage contract that will raise the hourly pay 30% over the next three years. In 1977, steelworkers' pay averaged \$12.75 an hour compared to the workers in all manufacturing getting \$7.79.

But, before we jump all over labor as the sole villain, let's look at some other factors in steel's dismal decline which has been almost directly proportional to the decline in capital investment in American industry, which reduces need for steel. Profits in steel went from 4.6¢ on each dollar of sales in 1975 to 1.4¢ in the first half of 1977.

The truth is, Japan and some of our other competitors in the world market have modernized plants and equipment and have thus increased their rate of production per-man-hour. Not only have low profit rates kept us from needed modernizing, so has government emphasis on a lot of non-productive regulations which eat up capital without increasing productivity. OSHA descended on the industry with 67 different rules, ranging from ladder design to noise prevention. The Environmental Protection agency has added costs that over the next few years will be three times as much as the industry's normal profit margin. A host of other agencies, up to and including the White House, have added to the harmstringing.

In all these harrassments the steel union has been silent, but maybe that will change. A former president of the Steelworkers has publicly stated --QUOTE--"Does stepping up the efficiency of each worker mean work speedups, job eliminations? Hardly. It does mean cutting down on excessive absenteeism, tardiness, turnover and overtime. Let's put our brainpower to work to create more efficient manufacturing processes, and better equipment. But then lets use them. Labor has always sought more wages and benefits. But labor also knows that to obtain more, we must produce more." --UNQUOTE--

If this could signal an alliance between labor and management in opposition to unnecessary government regulation and in favor of more realistic tax policies plus a real effort to increase per man hour productivity American steel could take care of itself in the world market.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Labor")

On January 25th the Senate Human Resources Committee reported out and sent to the floor of the Senate the so-called labor Reform bill which is a high priority item on organized labor's agenda. The President has pledged to George Meany and Company his support of this bill.

While it is called a labor reform bill it is, in fact, a measure wherein government will give labor special advantages in its effort to recruit members and to organize workers in nonunion plants. Management will be given no comparable rights.

The AFL-CIO has been declining in membership in recent years and has 500,000 fewer members than it had last year. It's ironic that the heirarchy of labor seeks this government recruiting help because just possibly their partnership with government may be the cause of their shrinking membership.

Back at the time of the AFL-CIO merger, the late Walter Reuther, the CIO leader, influenced the leadership of the newly formed alliance to get things from government which, heretofore, labor had tried to win from management at the bargaining table. Maybe their success has made them less necessary to workers now. Opinion polls suggest that rank-and-file members find the leadership too powerful and too involved in politics. Whatever the reason, there is a growing desire on the part of many workers, both in and out of unions, to have freedom to choose.

Faced with a loss of power, the union chieftans have come up with Senate bill 1883 and House resolution 8410 which they call mere technical amendments, but which in reality would make significant changes in the National Labor Relations Act. An enlarged National Labor Relations Board would, undoubtedly, have more power and a definite pro-labor, anti-management bias.

Today, only one of every five workers is in a union and unions have been losing more than half the elections conducted under government supervision even though 80 percent of them aren't contested by management.

Perhaps today's union bosses should go back and read again the words of the great labor statesman who created the American Federation of Labor. Samuel Gompers, in his last speech to a labor convention, said, "There may be, here and there, a worker who does not join a union of labor. That is his right no matter how wrong we think he may be. It is his legal right and no one can dare question his legal exercise of that right." Gompers said, over and over again, there could be no real strength in a union unless the members had freely chosen to join out of personal conviction.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Economy")

The federal budget for the fiscal year beginning next October first will top half-a-trillion dollars. That's some 60 billion dollars more than expected revenues. That isn't the entire story. There have come to be, in recent years, a number of programs outside the budget and they, too, have deficits. To put it briefly government spending continues to accelerate, eating up scarce capital resources and fueling inflation, plus recession. It is impossible not to believe that ahead lies a big economic bellyache.

Writing of this one economist, Hans F. Sennholz, says--QUOTE-- "our economic situation is very precarious. World trade and commerce which are important pillars of the working and living conditions of all peoples are held together by a thin dollar wrapper that may tear at any time. If it should burst because it is getting thinner with every turn of the United States printing presses, the world may fall into an abyss of a depression, deeper and longer than the Great Depression."--UNQUOTE--

I know it's hard for many of us who knew the dollar when it could be turned in for gold or silver to think of that familiar green bill as so ailing and anemic. But since 1933 when the government took our gold from us and replaced it with paper unredeemable in gold we've had printing press money and history records no nation as ever making imitation money work over a long period of time. The temptation to speed up the presses without considering the consequences is too much for most politicians to resist.

Sennholz says that the present administration has, in its first year, planted the seeds for a serious recession. He cites the new minimum wage; the new social security tax increase and the tight controls on the energy industry, plus the acceleration of government spending. "Many economists," he says "are convinced that the international paper-dollar standard is destined to lead to worldwide hyper-inflation and economic disintegration." And he adds, "The coming year may bring us one year closer to the catastrophe."

He also says this does not have to be. He means we still can be the masters of our own destiny, if you and I will insist that we live as a nation within our means. The integrity of the dollar can be restored if we'll cut through the Washington doubletalk and demand that the budget be balanced. Stop and think for a minute--the proposed budget is more than 500 billion and the deficit about 60 billion dollars. Can anyone honestly believe that we can't find 12 percent fat in that Federal budget? The government spenders usually counterattack by saying, "which program would you eliminate?" What if we reply, don't eliminate any (although there are plenty we can do without) just make every department, every bureau, agency and program reduce its expenditures by 12 percent.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Neighborhoods")

Last December, President Carter named the 16 persons who, along with four members of Congress, serve on the new National Commission on Neighborhoods. Now, it is no secret that Presidential commissions have, as often as not, been devices for either generating support for a President's existing policies or for sweeping unpleasant issues under the rug for awhile. But, this new commission just may turn out to be different.

We all know the importance of preserving strong urban neighborhoods. For millions of city residents their neighborhood is far more than just the location of a home or apartment. The neighborhood scale is a human scale--a place where the real spirit of a community can develop. Many neighborhoods are rich in tradition and memories. And, in many, there is a mixture of generations and functions, so that activity is continuous. This, in turn, works to keep crime down when, as one urban planning critic described it, there are "eyes on the street"; eyes of grandparents and shopkeepers who watch the passing parade.

Neighborhoods can provide a sense of roots. It is the home of the fraternal lodge, the church, the deli, the corner pub, the street festival, the Fourth of July celebration.

The legislation that created the Neighborhoods commission recognized all this and more. It recognized that foolish government policies over the past several decades have often worked to undermine, even destroy established neighborhoods, building codes, zoning laws, highway construction, urban renewal, federal mortgage insurance, the so-called model cities program, forced school busing--these and other factors have often combined to depress the value of neighborhoods and undercut the fullness of their life.

Wisconsin Senator William Proxmire, a member of the new commission, commented on this at a Senate hearing when he said to a witness, "You would probably have better neighborhoods today if there had been no federal programs at all!" Amen to that!

Congress has given the new Presidential commission the responsibility for assessing the impact of all this governmental activity on urban neighborhoods and to make recommendations for sweeping away the obstacles that face people who try to keep up their neighborhoods.

Quite a few of the commission's members seem committed to that point of view, including its chairman, Massachusetts State Senator Joseph Timilty.

A particular target of commission disapproval is likely to be H.U.D.--the federal Housing and Urban Affairs department.

What America's neighborhoods need, of course, is not a massive "delivery of services" from government, but a massive rebirth of opportunity. That could begin with the new national Commission on Neighborhoods. Let's hope so.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Cuba")

From time to time on these broadcasts I've tried to bring to your attention reports that refute the more euphoric accounts of life in places such as communist Red China, for instance. The latest "discovery" has been Cuba, now that our tourists have been allowed to visit that island. We've heard the returnees tell of meeting workers and students eager to recite the joys of life in Castro's Cuba. And the news media, I must say, dutifully report such tributes in detail.

But, finally, comes a report of another Cuba; the Cuba the tourists never see. The story written by Barbra Zuanich for the Los Angeles Herald Examiner tells of eight Americans (led by independent television producer Ed Shaw) who went to Cuba in good faith, believing that they would have official cooperation in making a T.V. documentary on the colorful cultural elements of the island.

The team departed Los Angeles, approved by the Cuban government via the Czechoslovakian embassy in Washington. Normally eight is not a full television crew so everyone was doubling in brass.

Arriving in Cuba, they called officials they were supposed to count on for cooperation. Their calls were not returned, their baggage was searched when they left their rooms and actually they found they were more or less just members of a tour.

They had anticipated dividing up their small force in order to get maximum coverage of the real Cuba. But, they were not allowed to go anywhere unless they all went, and they were watched every second. Just the same, they got their documentary in candid camera style, hiding cameras under their coats, single members sneaking out late at night, and so forth.

In Miss Zuanich's story she quotes our touring film producer Ed Shaw. He said --QUOTE-- "We got a picture of loneliness. The entire island was like a giant ghost town. There were school yards with no children, restaurants with no patrons, few people on the street." --UNQUOTE--

They did interviews with individuals who had to wear disguises. If they were caught they would be shot for treason (the minimum sentence would be prison for 20 years). They told of rations of eight ounces of meat every 12 days, two pairs of underwear a year for men, water rationing and what they called --QUOTE-- "The Incredible Russian influence." --UNQUOTE-- And these Cubans begged for help to escape.

The crew has on videotape, footage of filth, paint peeling from every building, toilets without seats even in hotel washrooms (and with such a stench the crew couldn't get within 20 feet of them). They used James Bond tactics to get their tape out of Cuba and, now back in the United States, they can't rid themselves of fear of retribution or even kidnap with their videotape the ransom.

Now, what you and I must ask is whether we'll be allowed to see the film. Will a network put it on the air? Will a sponsor come forward to help make that possible.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Treaties")

"A man's home is his castle." That is a time worn truism, but it was born of a right we all have and take for granted with little thought of how it came to be.

When our Founding Fathers--(that little band of men whose like the world has seldom seen)--gathered to draw up the Constitution, the right of an individual to own property was very much on their minds. In most of the world prior to that time the rulers, be they king, emperor or tribal chieftan, could award someone title to property and could also cancel the title. The framers of our Constitution had seen colonists' homes seized on the whim of George III. They had decided this must no longer happen. So the Fifth amendment to our Constitution reads,--QUOTE--"No person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation. --UNQUOTE--

The American worker with his house and lot, the farmer plowing his own ground, the shopkeeper--we have all accepted this as part of the very basis of our freedom. But, I'm afraid we've forgotten it was not always this way. Now of course we've become aware that under a different banner rulers in large parts of the world have returned to the age old policy that land belongs only to the government. The banner is called Marxism.

For many years the United Nations has had before it two covenants, the Covenant on Civil and Political rights and the United Nations Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights. Both specifically omit the right to own property or to be protected from arbitrary seizure without compensation. Ownership of property is not--according to the covenants--a basic human right.

Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon and Ford steadfastly refused to sign these covenants because of this omission which is so contrary to American tradition. In 1966 there was an effort made to amend the covenants to include property ownership as a human right. It was voted down. Obviously the Socialist and Communist countries could not accept such an affront to their totalitarianism. Right now one of the biggest obstacles to normalizing relations with Castro's Cuba is his seizure of American-owned property without compensation.

What is apparently little known by the American people is that President Carter has signed both of these United Nation covenants which, in effect, nullify the inalienable right of an individual to own property--If they are ratified by the United States Senate, United Nations treaties become the law of the land superseding all other laws.

We'd all better be ready to write our Senators when these treaties are submitted for ratification.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Neutron bomb")

Several weeks ago, during the television debate between Bill Buckley and myself, Admiral Zumwalt (now retired) presented a case for ratifying the Carter-Torrijos Panama Canal treaties. I've been surprised that some of his remarks didn't cause more of a stir in the press. He said that we were likelier (than ever) to lose a nuclear war with Russia; we were likelier to lose a conventional ground war in Europe; and we were likelier to lose a naval war in view of the increased size of the Soviet fleet. He then made the point that we'd have a better chance of using the Canal if Panama were friendly toward us.

Now, I'm not bringing this up to argue his final point. I want to talk about the frank pessimism he expressed with regard to our strength vis-a-vis the Russians.

We want to avoid a war and that is best achieved by being so strong that a potential enemy is not tempted to go adventuring. When it comes to the Soviet Union, no one denies they have assembled an offensive force of tanks, mobile artillery, support aircraft and armored personnel carriers on the Western front in Europe that are superior to our forces and those of our NATO allies. Though correcting that imbalance is important, we could at least say, till recently, that we had the deterrent of nuclear superiority. That, if the Soviets attacked Western Europe they would do so at the risk of nuclear destruction. That deterrent ability is fading rapidly and there are indications that the SALT II Negotiations may leave us even worse off.

There is a new weapons system that we have been the first to develop that could restore the deterrent capability. It is the neutron bomb.

Now, some news stories make it sound like the Buck Rogers ray gun; that it would kill enemy troops without so much as cracking the plaster in a building. That's not quite the case. It would destroy things in the area of impact, but the area of destruction would be limited, while it would kill enemy troops at a much greater distance. Outside the immediate impact area, for example, it could kill a tank crew without damaging the tank.

Now, some who have reacted in horror to such a weapon--saying it puts a higher value on property than on human life--are missing the point. The fact is all war weapons back to the club, the sling and the arrow have been designed to kill the troops of the enemy. With gunpowder, artillery and, later, aerial bombs, war could not be confined to the battlefield. It was then that non-combatants began to outnumber soldiers as casualties.

The point of the neutron bomb is that it is available to us at much lower cost than trying to match the Soviets gun-for-gun, tank-for-tank and plane-for-plane. And, because of its effectiveness, it has the greatest advantage of all. For us, it could become the ideal deterrent weapon--the one that wouldn't have to be used.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Bakke")

There is a case now on appeal before the Supreme Court known as the "Bakke Case". You have heard of it, I'm sure, and probably know something of what it's about. It has caused controversy and even resulted in demonstrations on some college campuses. Not the violent hassles we had so many of back in the 60's, but demonstrations nonetheless.

Because the issue is one which arouses anger in some mention of the name "Bakke" (as if he is somehow a bigot working against the effort to redress ancient wrongs), I thought I'd provide some information that isn't generally known.

There was a time when various professional schools were virtually out of bounds for the economically disadvantaged and this of course included many minorities. It was not necessarily a reflection of prejudice, it was just that entrance standards were so high a great many young people from poor backgrounds couldn't meet those requirements. In view of this there have been efforts to see that each entering class includes a certain percentage of those who were heretofore excluded.

At the University of California Medical school in Davis this effort resulted in what can only be called a "quota" system even though quota is a very unpopular term. At any rate, 16 entrants were permitted each year in the school of medicine whose scores were below the normal requirement.

Allan Bakke is a Vietnam veteran who first applied at Davis in 1973. He is now suing the University of California on the grounds that his constitutional rights were violated. This is the case that is now on appeal before the United States Supreme Court.

The whole story however makes it pretty evident that Mr. Bakke is not an impulsive troublemaker or sorehead. Aspiring medical students take four preliminary tests estimating their verbal skills, quantitative skills, scientific skills, and general knowledge.

In 1973 the average grades in those four tests for the regularly accepted applicants were 81, 76, 83, and 69 respectively. The special entrants scored 46, 24, 35, and 33. Bakke scored 96, 94, 97, and 72. He waited a year without complaint and tried again in 1974. The average this time was 69, 67, 82, and 72. For the quota students the average was 34, 30, 37, and 18. Bakke scored 96, 94, 97, and 72, the very same high marks he had made in 1973. But again he was passed by.

The cumulative total for the regular entrants was 309 and the special group 138 in 1973. Bakke's total was 359. In 1974 the accepted groups scored respectively, 290 and 119. Again Bakke scored 359. It was then--after two attempts--that he filed the suit now pending before the court.

I believe it is right that we have a program to ensure equal opportunity for those aspiring to a profession. But surely we can come up with something that doesn't result in the kind of injustice done to Alan Bakke.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Blind on the left")

A number of years ago when a concerted, organized effort was made to subvert the motion picture industry to a communist propaganda tool I asked a question which is still unanswered. The question was, why is it that the many defectors from communism, domestic or International make so little impression on those who had no trouble seeing the menace of Nazism or Fascism? Now--for the record--I take second to no one in my detestation of Adolph Hitler and everything he represented. As a matter of fact I'm still mad at the Kaiser. But there are others in the world today as evil as Hitler and guilty of the same brutal, inhuman deeds. When a defector--sometimes one who held a fairly high rank in the Soviet social order or even a domestic communist party member now disillusioned wants to tell us the reason for his defection or disillusionment, he is dismissed by many liberals as no longer a credible source. Yet very often those same liberals will accept as gospel the complaints of an American who disavows patriotism and proclaims from podium and printed page--"What's wrong with America."

I was reminded of all this not long ago when a remarkable woman died in Washington, D.C. just a few days short of her 80th birthday. It would be impossible to count the lives she touched in England where she was born, in China, Japan, the Soviet Union and here in her adopted home, the United States.

She once described herself as a "Premature anti-communist. I told the truth about Communism long before the world was prepared to hear it." And Freda Uteley knew the truth about communism because as an idealistic young woman in the 1920's she accepted communism. In fact she married a Russian and went to live in Moscow. After he was taken away by Stalin's secret police she came out of Russia and wrote a book The Dream We lost in which she said--QUOTE-- "The just and the unjust enter through the same revolving door and the stream passing in with great expectations is matched or exceeded by the crowd of the disillusioned getting out." --UNQUOTE--

But many of the intellectuals didn't want to hear what she had to say. She had impressive academic credentials when she came to the U.S., but publishers and the academy closed doors against her. She understood all too well. She had tried communism and learned its falseness. She said only those --QUOTE-- "who have never fully committed themselves to the Communist Cause"--UNQUOTE-- can continue to believe in it. Her book The China Story which told of how the Reds were taking over became a best seller--after China was lost.

It is bone chilling now to read that Soviet defector Oleg Glagolev (Glogo-Leff) former consultant to the Kremlin on strategic arms is telling our government that Russia has the cruise missile already displayed in submarines off our coasts. Is anyone really listening?