

# 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 78-4 through 78-6 (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/>

RONALD REAGAN  
RADIO COMMENTARY

Taped: 3/13/78  
Airing: 3/27/78 - 4/14/78

Disc. 78-4

78-4A

TITLE

Generic Promos

1.	Canal	3:00
2.	Treaties	2:44
3.	SALT Talks I	2:35
4.	SALT Talks II	2:40
5.	Cubans & Russian	2:46
6.	SALT II	2:48
7.	Two Worlds	2:46

78-4B

1.	War	2:46
2.	Suicide Lobby	2:57
3.	Budget	3:06
4.	Mineral King	2:49
5.	Local Control I	2:52
6.	Local Control II	2:57
7.	A Gift	2:32
8.	Items	3:03

PLEASE NOTE:

1. These programs are provided for airing from March 27th through April 14th 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 "Canal"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Today it's easy for a citizen to throw up his hands and say what can one person do? Well I'll tell you what one person has done and don't tune me out just because it has to do with the Panama Canal.

A builder, a friend of mine in California, knowledgeable about engineering and construction, went to Panama solely for the purpose of seeing for himself what the situation is. Then he wrote me a letter and sent a copy to every U.S. Senator. He wrote, --QUOTE-- I have heard so many ranking Republicans endorse the Panama Canal treaties that I made a special effort to go to Panama. So that I could have access to the people I went through the canal on a private chartered boat. I made no effort to meet brass, but asked leading questions of the ordinary citizens such as Panamanian agents, contractors, cab drivers, etc. and American ship pilots, harbor masters and young and old Canal employees of every category. I came away with a loss of respect for the type of mentality many of our Washington representatives are showing--Republican or Democrat." --UNQUOTE. My correspondent went on to list the conclusions from his observations --QUOTE--

"1: Torrijos is a complete dictator who owns the country, lives in a shabby little house to fool the people, snows our congressmen on a nearby island resort, is a great friend of the Communists, and stashes cash away in Spain and Switzerland.

"2: Panama is practically bankrupt, and many American bankers probably see no way of repayment of their loans; let alone interest, without a gigantic give away by the American taxpayers.

"3: The Panamanian mentality is not to maintain equipment, but to wait until it breaks down and then think about fixing it someday. I saw new buildings in Panama literally falling apart. I saw crews of Panamanians working in the Canal zone where the pay is three times higher. Example: moving a pile of dirt required one supervisor, two men with picks, two men with shovels, two men on a wheelbarrow. One picked while six waited, then one shoveled into the wheelbarrow, then one wheeled it away. Always six waited. Could these people maintain the canal?" He goes on,--QUOTE--

"4: When the treaty is signed, the older Americans may stay around for their maximum pensions; the trained young men are leaving now and will be long gone soon after the treaty signing.

"5: If the treaty is signed in its present form, the following is predicted. An American exodus; 35 then 20 then 10 then zero ships through the canal. Long complete shutdown periods due to breakdowns in complicated equipment. The taking over and staffing with technicians by the Russians who are patiently waiting and outsmarting our Washington representatives once again. Or, a war and then billions spent in repairs." My correspondent concludes--QUOTE--

"Give Panama more money, but not our canal. It is said we can't defend it. If we can't defend it now, we can't take it back when the Communists control it. Thinking Latins don't want the Russians in there any more than thinking Americans do. Now is the time to show some backbone, not after the fact. --UNQUOTE--  
End quote of a letter from an American who went down on his own to see for himself.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio program entitled "Treaties"

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Lawrence Beilenson, a distinguished California lawyer and scholar, authored a book a few years ago that is unique. Called The Treaty Trap, it is, so far as I know, the only history of treaties and the observance and lack of observance of some--dating all the way back through biblical times. One thing stands out sharply: no nation which puts its faith in treaties but let its military hardware deteriorate stayed around very long.

The very nature of treaties is such that, more often than not, they must be written in two languages. The result is that, regardless of the good will of the signatories, the different meaning of words when translated from one language to another can make for misunderstandings.

Let's take an agreement which while not a formal treaty was still a joint communique that climaxed the visit of an American President to the People's Republic of China a few years ago. In looking at the Shanghai Communique, one is apt to be more confused than enlightened.

The Chinese made a statement with regard to our long time ally the Republic of China on Taiwan. They said their government--QUOTE "opposes the creation of two Chinas, an independent Taiwan or a separate solution"--UNQUOTE--. The United States in turn said --QUOTE--" that it does not challenge this view". --UNQUOTE--. To Americans this was plain English that meant we neither agreed nor disagreed--we simply avoided the issue.

Unfortunately it is not that easy and simple. The Chinese translation of the phrase, "does not challenge" is taken to mean that because we make no objection we agree with China's position. Then there is a sentence to the effect that there should be a peaceful solution to the problem of Taiwan. We would interpret that to mean that Peking won't launch an attack or try to conquer Taiwan by force. Again, Peking denies that this language binds them to seek a peaceful solution.

We have an example in the Panama Canal treaties that came to light early in the Senate debate. Senators were proposing amendments to the treaties which apparently didn't disturb the Panamanians--until the Panamanians realized what we meant by the word "amendment". To us an amendment is a clause as binding as the original treaty--as witness the amendments to our constitution.

To them the word used to translate "amendment" into Spanish is "enmienda" and means just a minor change. In Torrijos's view an "enmienda" would be alright as an addition to an existing clause, but definitely a no-no if added as an additional paragraph. That would make it a "reforma"--major change in the manner of our meaning of the word "amendment" and that would be serious business in Panama--it would require another plebiscite, which Torrijos fears losing.

As we approach the SALT II talks with the Soviets we should keep in mind that Russian is an even more complex language than Spanish. Besides, the Soviets don't keep their word even when they understand the meaning.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio program entitled "Salt Talks I"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Every now and then optimistic reports are given of the progress made in the talks preparatory to the Strategic Arms Limitation negotiations--called "SALT II" for short. Usually, the optimism seems to be based on what further concessions we'll make before actual negotiations begin. We've made such preemptive concessions as cancelling the B-1 Bomber without waiting for the negotiations.

Former members of the highest levels of military command have uttered warnings about the Russians' growing might. Among these are former Defense Intelligence Agency Chief General Graham, Air Force Intelligence Chief General Keegan and Admiral Zumwalt, former chief of navel operations--to name a few.

Now, writing in The Reader's Digest former Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird says'--QUOTE-- "The evidence is incontrovertible that the Soviet Union has repeatedly, flagrantly and indeed contemptuously violated the treaties to which we have adhered." He goes on to say; "This evidence has been withheld from the Congress, the press and the public. I believe there is no longer any excuse for denying the American people their representatives facts whose suppression profits only our enemies." --UNQUOTE--

The former defense secretary gives particulars such as the Soviets deploying an anti-ballistic missile, the upgrading of medium-range missiles to long-range and interference in our monitoring efforts. All are violations of the SALT I treaty. And, he says, these violations are increasing even as we go forward with plans for another SALT treaty in which we will rely on the good faith of the Soviet Union. For example, having given up the B-1 we're prepared to let the Soviets continue producing their Backfire bomber so long as they don't increase the rate of production. The catch is we don't know what their present rate is and they won't tell us.

Laird says there has been a steady stream of intelligence reports about Soviet violations both in the previous administration and this one, but the desire for "detente" is so great these reports are being kept from Congress and the people.

Senator James Allen has said that our SALT negotiators apparently feel we could resolve the Backfire impasse by getting Brezhnev to write a letter promising that the bombers will not be deployed in such a way as to threaten the United States. That leads to a pretty obvious question, why would they build them if they intended to keep such a promise?

But to get back to the SALT violation, Laird says the Russians aren't hearing a single peep of protest from us. They must really be looking forward to the new negotiations--just think they'll have a brand new treaty to violate.

I'll talk more about this on the next broadcast.



RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio program entitled "SALT TALKS II"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

A short time back the Los Angeles Herald Examiner's Washington bureau reported on a meeting of the Senate Armed Services committee. Secretary of Defense Harold Brown and another Brown, General George Brown, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, appeared together before that committee.

General Brown is in his final year as our nation's top military commander. Sitting beside the Secretary he made a statement that can only be construed as contradictory to the policies of the present administration. He said:--QUOTE-- "I worry about the day coming when we are not going to be able to stand up to an aggressor."--UNQUOTE--

In a week of such appearances before congressional committees the general was careful to avoid any hint of disloyalty to his commander-in-chief, but he explained that as his service comes to an end he did not want to be accused later on of acquiescing.

When a senator remarked that his warnings marked a great change from some of his past statements, the general did not hedge in his reply. He said that uppermost in his mind was the fact that this would be the last time he would submit a posture statement to Congress. --QUOTE-- "I feel it would be wrong," he said, "if somebody five years from now asked, 'where was George Brown during all of this?', and looked up the record and I had said, 'Don't worry it's all right'." --UNQUOTE--

Telling the seantors the \$126 billion defense budget was too small, he said it should have contained funds for the B-1 bomber, the MX mobile land-based missile, new infantry combat vehicles and a number of other programs.

Aware of the defense secretary beside him he said, --QUOTE-- "I don't think he is complacent." --UNQUOTE-- He did not ask for approval of the present budget but said the time necessary to repair the current imbalance with the Soviet Union made a "quick fix" impossible. And, he made it clear that the risk to our security--already high--would increase.

He made it clear that Congress had to share in the blame for our precarious position--QUOTE-- "Each year", he said, "I have been a party to this action. We've come to Congress with a reduced program only to have an average of five-and-a-half billion dollars taken out of it every year."--UNQUOTE--

When a general who has been as loyal to his civilian supervisors as General Brown has been speaks so forthrightly of our danger we'd better listen. It doesn't cheer me up one bit to have a defense department spokesman say the differences between the general and the secretary were only "of degree", that they were on good terms. He added,--QUOTE-- "the general is representing the uniformed military and takes a slightly more worried position/" --UNQUOTE-- If he's worried, I'm worried too. Aren't you?

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio program entitled "Cubans & Russians"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

The Senate Foreign Relations committee has had a growing amount of testimony about Cuban and Russian infiltration and influence in Panama. But for some reason, it seems unwilling to launch a thorough investigation of those tips it has received.

A group of Panamanians best described as civic and educational leaders appeared before the Senate committee and told of witnessing the landing and takeoff of Soviet planes at the Rio Hato air strip. This was a United States air base in World War II which later we turned over to Panama. The Soviet planes come in low over the ocean to avoid radar detection.

The same witnesses told of how a group of Panamanian students every six months is sent to Cuba to study. What was it the Soviets said about winning just one generation in a country and having that country forever?

Other interesting testimony was that Panamanian students are sent to the U.S.S.R for five year study periods. Also that Torrijos has requested Cuban advisors to come to Panama and teach his administration how to "set up neighborhood committees to facilitate the government's control of the people on a local level". They told the Senators there were agreements between the Soviet Union and Panama to be implemented after the treaties were ratified; involving construction (by the Russians) of a hydroelectric plant in Panama and establishing diplomatic relations with Moscow among other things.

Lieutenant General Daniel Graham, now retired, but formerly head of the Defense Intelligence Agency writing in The Navy Times said rumors of Cuban operatives in Panama are backed by pretty solid evidence. The general had to be circumspect because of the risk of exposing classified information, but he made it pretty clear there were Cuban guerilla warfare specialists in Panama. Being careful not to put his former colleagues in military intelligence on the spot, his comments nevertheless made it clear that a congressional investigation is warranted.

Word in Washington today is that Americans and Panamanians have met with anti-treaty senators and talked of Cuban infiltration. Still a pro-treaty Senator Frank Church complains that if we don't give General Torrijos the Canal, Panama will move to the left. Actually Panama hasn't much of a move left to make. In 1976 in the United Nations out of 21 votes Panama voted 20 times with the Soviet Union against the United States.

Do you suppose the Congressional committees are going to wait and investigate all these reports after we've given the canal away? Anything is possible. The Soviet planes flying over Cuba violate the 1963 agreement between President Kennedy and Krushchev. Our state department defends the Soviet presence in Cuba on the grounds the planes are there for defense and the agreement referred to offensive weapons.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio program entitled "SALT II"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

A California Congressman, Charles Wilson of California, a Democrat has spoken out publicly of his concern about the SALT II treaty being drawn up in Geneva, Switzerland. This of course puts him at odds with the administration.

The Congressman visited Geneva in December and observed the negotiators in action. Upon his return he bluntly declared that the treaty now being drawn up threatens our national security. He pointed out that the Soviets will be allowed two or three times as many nuclear warheads as the United States and their warheads far exceed ours in power.

Another hard-to-understand clause provides that the Russian's Backfire bomber which can carry cruise missiles is not covered by the treaty. But the United States FB-111 and our B-52's or any other aircraft equipped to carry long-range missiles must be counted against the total delivery systems allowed us under the treaty.

Congressman Wilson said--QUOTE--"SALT II is an arms control agreement in name only. It would guarantee the Soviet Union strategic superiority for the remainder of this century while doing nothing for United States national security." UNQUOTE--. He was equally forthright in declaring that our negotiators seemed more interested in helping Jimmy Carter redeem a campaign promise to come up with a treaty than in protecting American interests.

He described the Soviet team as made up of tough negotiators who've been doing this same job since 1969 when SALT I was created. By contract, our team has only two members with previous experience in any kind of Soviet negotiations. He described our team as wanting a treaty simply for the sake of having a treaty. Our concessions deal with Soviet weapon systems already operative. When the Soviets concede at all it is usually with regard to some weapons system we don't have yet.

Then there is the matter of verification. Yes, our reconnaissance satellites can keep a reasonable count on how many missiles the Soviets have on hand, but there is no way without on-site inspection (which the Russians will never agree to) to verify whether the Soviets are indeed complying with the treaty. Satellites cannot tell us whether the treaty is being violated with regard to new guidance systems, or how many warheads each missile contains.

Summing it up, Congressman Wilson says the SALT II treaty the administration is willing to accept is not in our national interest. --QUOTE--"In view of a withering bomber force which will decline in capability during the period, a highly vulnerable ICBM force, with the Trident and Cruise missile programs in doubt within our own government no treaty would be preferable to an instrument which would guarantee Soviet strategic superiority for the remainder of the century". --UNQUOTE-- So says a Democratic Congressman who has been listening in on the SALT II talks.



RONALD REAGAN

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

Most Americans are aware that they continue to support foreign aid through A.I.D.--the State Department's Agency for International Development. And, while many think it is unnecessarily wasteful, there is a generous side to the American native which keeps him from rising up and saying, "enough already".

But few Americans are aware that A.I.D. is only one hole in a sieve. Our money goes through a dozen agencies of the United Nations and such financial institutions as the World Bank, International Monetary fund, Inter-American Bank and the Asian Development Bank.

Congressman Charles Thone from Nebraska has called attention to the fact that even the liberal Brookings institution--citing the unefficiencies of A.I.D.--has called for its abolition. The administration in Washington, however, has proposed an increase in A.I.D.'s spending and the hiring of more staff all around the world.

But let's take a look at the world inhabited by those who work and earn in those international financial institutions we support with tax dollars. World bank salaries are 30 to 40 per cent higher than those in comparable jobs in the federal government. In addition to which the bank provides lavish fringe benefits: payment for family travel and restaurant tabs (possibly even for three martini lunches). The administration proposes increased funding for the World Bank.

The International Monetary fund has its own country club in Washington, says Congressman Thone, and its average salary (including pay for clubs and janitors) is \$43,000 a year. On top of that employees can borrow from the World Bank at four per cent interest. By contrast, some of the money provided to foreign nations to help the poor is loaned by governments of some of those nations to their own citizens at 17 per cent interest.

Now the "world" those World Bank and International Monetary Fund employees live in is very real to them, I'm sure, but only because they can't see over their own horizon to the world where the providees of their good life dwell.

In that world--the one you and I live in, the federal treasury last year took for its purposes 70 per cent of all funds in the security investments market. The figure goes up if you add local and state borrowing. This virtual monopoly on available capital has left little money for the kind of investment that creates jobs in business and industry.

Interest rates are forced up for individual borrowers and small businesses. Then, individuals with savings accounts in banks and savings and loan associations withdraw this money to get the higher yield available on U.S. Treasury bills. Banks alone reported a one month outflow of \$75 million. Mortgage money will be harder to come by--which could affect the construction industry.

In the meantime the number of federal employees increased by more than 52,000 in the first 10 months of 1977. Which world do you live in?

RONALD REAGAN

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

Several weeks ago on the T.V. debate between Bill Buckley and myself, Admiral Zumwalt (now retired) presented a case for ratifying the proposed Panama Canal treaties. I've been surprised his remarks didn't cause more stir in the press. He said, "we were likelier 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 Russian fleet. Then his point was 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 better achieved by being so strong that a potential enemy is not tempted to go adventuring. No one denies that the Russians have assembled an offensive force of tanks, mobile artillery, support aircraft and armored personnel carriers on the Western front in Europe superior to our NATO forces. Until recently our deterrent was nuclear superiority. If the Soviets attacked Western Europe we could threaten Russia with nuclear destruction. That, of course, is no longer true.

It is at this point that a possible new weapons system is in a sense discovered by us; one which can provide the deterrent we need to any Russian attack. It is the neutron bomb.

Very simply it is the dreamed of death ray weapon of science fiction. It kills enemy soldiers but doesn't blow up the surrounding countryside or destroy villages, towns and cities. It won't even destroy an enemy tank--just kill the tank crew.

Now some express horror at this and charging immortality, portray those who would use such a weapon as placing a higher value on property than human life. This is sheer unadulterated nonsense. It is harsh sounding, but all war weapons back to the club, the sling and the arrow, are designed to kill the soldiers of the enemy. With gunpower and artillery and later bombs and bombers, war could not be confined to the battlefield. And so came total war with non-combatants outnumbering soldiers in casualties.

Here is a deterrent weapon available to us at much lower cost than trying to match the enemy gun for gun, tank for tank, plane for plane. It isn't unreasonable to believe that the Soviets will be more hesitant to send those waves of tanks westward if we have a weapon that can wipe out their crews at virtually no cost to ourselves. Indeed the neutron bomb represents a moral improvement in the horror that is modern war. It just may be that the neutron bomb could be the ideal deterrent weapon--one that wouldn't have to be used.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio program entitled "Suicide Lobby"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Many years ago during the period called the "cold war", when Americans were very conscious of the threat of subversion, a huge Congress of the International Communist movement was held in Moscow. The meeting adopted a plan for fighting anti-communism. One part of the plan was directed toward the United States and called for a subtle campaign to make anti-communism unfashionable. The idea was to use well meaning liberals and others until an anti-communist would be ridiculed as some kind of right wing nut guilty of "witch hunting" and looking for Reds under the bed." And so, today most people in public life are afraid to hint at a communist conspiracy.

Professor Jeffrey Hart of Dartmouth has documented some facts that reveal that a number of ghosts from the riotous, hate-filled 60's are stalking the land. They can be found in a network of organizations once prominent in the protest against the Vietnam war. Today their goal is support of the SALT II treaties and unilateral disarmament by the United States.

There is a Soviet-dominated international organization known as the World Peace council. You'll have to admit that has a nice sound. Who's against world peace? Last Spring, Professor Hart says a Council member visited our shores to set up a new combine of anti-nuclear power plant people and advocates of disarmament. We now have M.F.S.--Mobilization For Survival, based in Philadelphia.

Last October M.F.S. held a conference at Yale and the ghosts appeared--in the flesh. There was Dr. Spock, environmentalists Barry Commoner, Sidney Lens who is hardly on the right side of anything and Daniel Ellsberg who heroically revealed secret documents he was honor bound to protect. It seems the honor wasn't firmly fastened.

Supporting the conference was the War Residters League, American Friends Service Committee, Women Strike for Peace and others. They were joined by a new group, the Coalition for a New Foreign and Military Policy.

The M.F.S. group has six task forces working on Congress to cut military spending, drop all new advanced weapons systems and halt the building of nuclear power plants. Halt them that is in our country. They don't seem bothered that the Soviet Union is going all out on its own nuclear power program.

The M.F.S. works closely with the National Center to Slash Military Spending, which is an American arm of the World Peace council and has in its upper crust a number of veteran members of the United States Communist party. They oppose the cruise missile (for us that is) the B-1 bomber (well that's already scratched) and so, I think is the MX mobile strategic missile. They are against the neutron bomb and anything else new we might come up with. They justify the Russians' huge arsenal on the grounds that the Soviet Union is surrounded by all those hostile nations.

You could call these Americans a suicide lobby, but for heavens sake don't say "conspiracy."

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio program entitled "Budget"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Is it possible that federal spending or, for that matter, all government spending has grown so great that we've become numbed and can't envision the huge figures--billions, trillions even? Let's try to envision the enormity of half a trillion dollars Washington will spend in one year by picturing it this way: if, 2000 years ago, we had started spending \$700,000 a day every day, we'd just now be at the point of having spent what our government will spend in one year.

Maybe it's impossible for us to picture spending \$700,000 a day even once let alone 730,000 consecutive days. Would it shock you to know the federal government spends \$57 million an hour round the clock every day including Sundays and holidays? That's \$1.37 billion a day. Now, try this one: 1929 (prior to the crash) wasn't a bad year as far as government services were concerned. I don't recall anyone complaining because the federal government wasn't telling us how to run our lives. The total federal budget was \$2.6 billion. In the 50 years from then till next years budget we've increased our annual spending by 20,000 per cent while population has only increased 80 per cent. Spending has increased 250 times faster than has population.

And, don't let anyone tell you the men in uniform are to blame. National security is supposed to be the primary responsibility of the federal government. Just 10 years ago almost half the federal budget --43.6 per cent--was for defense now it's only one-fourth. Today a half or more of the budget is for social welfare programs of various kinds.

Today we have more people dependent on government than we have working and earning in private business and industry to support themselves, their families and the government. The Brookings Institution puts the figure of those dependent on tax dollars for their year' round living at 81.3 million people. Government's only source of revenue consists of 70.2 million citizens on private payrolls.

I've thrown a lot of figures at you but I still don't think I've described or made understandable how much \$500 billion is so one last try. It is roughly \$2300 a year for every man, woman and child in America. If you are part of the average family--a family of our, two adults, two children, your share of the Federal budget for the coming year is \$9200 and we haven't even mentioned state and local governments. You've got a right to feel sorry for yourself. Federal employees average \$4000 a year more money than you make.

It took the United States 173 years (until 1962) to hit the first \$100 billion budget. We added the second 100 billion in just nine years. It took four more years to add the third, two years to add the fourth and one year to make it that fifth 100 billion for the, "tight, lean" half-a-trillion dollar budget. Some of you have children who won't even have gotten rid of their braces by the time it's a full trillion dollars.

Isn't it time we borrowed an expression from our fellow citizens of latin descent--"Ya Basta"--we've had it.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio program enetitled "Mineral King"

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Thirteen years ago--in 1965--the United States Forest service under a mandate from Congress and at the direction of President Johnson initiated an action to develop the recreation potential of a California beauty spot known as Mineral King which adjoins Sequoia National park. This decision was not in response to any request or proposal by private interests. The government's position was that development of this portion of the national forest was badly needed in the public interest.

In reply to the recreational development prospectus issued by the Forest service, seven potential developers submitted proposals. Walt Disney productions was chosen from among them and began developing a plan for year round recreational use of the area.

There was nothing new in the government's decision to open public land in this manner. Working partnerships between government and private enterprise have created many of the nation's most popular recreational facilities.

As I said, President Johnson issued the directive for the Mineral King development. It was subsequently approved by the two Presidents who followed him. The Governor of California who preceded me endorsed it and so did I. The California legislature approved it and so did the Board of Supervisors of the county in which the area is located.

In good faith the planners at Disney went forward with a variety of plans for government approval, involving much creative effort and great expense. But suddenly a hue and cry was raised by a small group of ardent preservationists opposed to the developments. Their abuse was directed at Disney productions as if the whole thing had been originated by the company.

This special interest group surely must be aware that there are 50 million acres of public land in California. That is virtually half the entire state. Within a 100-mile radius of Mineral King there are more than two-and-a-half million acres of classified "wilderness" or roadless areas and national parks and monuments.

Mineral King would be a ski and winter sports development. Only 15,000 acres of public land in all of California is designated for this purpose. Mineral King is the only area close to Southern California offering such a suitable site and there are one million skiers in Southern California. Mineral King would retain its natural beauty and, by the way, the project would create 600 permanent new jobs in an area that badly needs them.

In late January, the White H0use asked the Congress to support a bill including Mineral King in the Sequoia National park. This would end the 13 years of planning and cancel the development of high quality year round public winter and summer recreational facility.

A bank that is one of the foremost sources of finance for winter recreational developments has thrown up its hands and announced it will no longer advance money for such projects. It says the probability that the bureaucratic red tape will prevent them from ever becoming reality is too great.

Is public land really for the public or for an elite few who want to keep it for their own use?

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Local Control I"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

The whole principle behind our system of autonomous local governments, sovereign states and finally a federal government with limited powers is the preservation of individual freedom by keeping as much government as possible as close to the people as possible.

With few exceptions, money spent by local government has less waste and administrative overhead than we find at the state level, and less at the state level than we find in the federal behemoth. For one thing people are more aware of local spending, better able to see the result and more likely to hold their local officials responsible. After all, they live in the same community. I'm willing to admit New York City might be an exception.

The United States Statistical Abstract reveals some pretty convincing evidence to support the statements I've just made. For every elected official at the local level there are 19 fulltime government employees. At the state level there are 290 bureaucrats for each elected officer and in the federal government the ration jumps to 5,800 bureaucrats for every elected official. Dividing 19 into 5,800 you can see that we have about 300 times more voter control over the bureaucrats' spending locally than we do at the federal level. And make no mistake about it, actual spending for the most part is done by those permanent employees of government. Our only control over them is by way of holding our elected representatives accountable, and registering our approval or disapproval at the polls on election day.

Let's look at one example--education. About 1950 funding of grade schools and high schools began to shift to the state with healthy increases also in federal grants. Local school districts in 1950 were putting up 66 percent of the money, with state and federal making up the other 34 percent. By 1976--the last year for which we have the figures--local government was not carrying two-thirds of the load--it wasn't even paying half. State and federal governments paid 52 percent of school costs and local government paid 48 per cent.

At first glance you might say that's great for the local community--until you realize we, the same old taxpayers, are putting up the entire 100 per cent--just funneling it through different tax collectors. And, the higher you go in government the greater the overhead. Now what has this change meant to us? Well for one thing our locally elected school boards don't have as much to say about content of textbooks, curriculum and methods of teaching as they once did. If we have any complaints we'll have to track down some faceless bureaucrats at the state or national level.

Then there is the matter of cost. Since 1950, the total cost has gone from six billion dollars to 70 billion dollars. Ah! But you say there has been an increase in the number of students, plus inflation. True. But in constant dollars (adjusted for inflation) the per-student cost is three times what it was before we started getting so much state and federal help.

I'll tell you more about this on the next broadcast.



## RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Local Control II"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Adjusting dollars for inflation, the actual cost of educating public school students since 1950 went from \$504 per pupil to \$1400 in 1976. That is an increase in real dollars of 180 per cent. If you don't adjust for inflation the increase is around 1000 per cent.

Part of the reason for this has been a great growth in the educational bureaucracy. In 1950 there was one full-time school employee for every 19 students. Today it is one for nine. The greatest increase has been in non-teaching personnel, mainly administrative. For teachers alone the ration went from one to every 28 pupils in 1950 to one teacher for 21 pupils in 1976. To sum it up, as we transferred much of educational funding to the state and federal level we tripled the cost per student and doubled the bureaucracy.

Now of course we would have no complaint if educational quality had risen to match the increase in cost and staff. Unfortunately, the reverse is true. We were on a rise in educational performance from back in the '30's until the early '60's. Federal aid actually began about 1962, so did federal control over education and so did the decline in educational quality, as measured by the Scholastic Aptitude Tests.

This was not the only indicator. There are state educational testing programs. In one state the score changed from a 10 year rise of about 13½ per cent in reading and 16 in math to a 10 year drop of 13 per cent in reading and an 18 per cent drop in math. Dozens of other states have recorded similar declines--all coinciding with the creation of the United States Office of Education and the rise of state education bureaucracies.

The state with the lowest spending per student and the lowest percentage of personal income devoted to education--New Hampshire--has the highest average score in scholastic Aptitude tests.

New Hampshire also has the lowest percentage of state aid to local schools (16 per cent) which means the least interference with local control. The national average of state aid to schools is more than double that of New Hampshire--39 per cent. By contract Massachusetts has the highest per-student cost and the highest per cent of personal income devoted to education. In Scholastic Aptitude Tests it ranks below the National average.

The only thing you can say for increased state and federal aid to education is that it will result in higher cost, more educational employees and less supervision by the taxpayers.

The National Education association has long lobbied for a United States Department of Education and massive increases in federal aid. As a candidate, the President told the N.E.A. convention he would strive for a separate Department of Education and a \$20 billion increase in federal spending for education. He said he believed the federal government should provide one third of the cost of education. This would reduce local funding to less than 20 per cent which would virtually eliminate local control of education.

RONALD REAGAN

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

During my own terms in office I was aware of the gifts one couldn't accept no matter how well intentioned the donor. But there were gifts that couldn't be refused without doing a great unkindness: the handmade gift from a class of school children, the knitted afghan from an elderly woman who proudly recreated the state seal. To have returned such gifts would have been too hurtful to good and sincere people who were asking nothing in return.

Today, a 78-year-old man lies in a hospital far from his Oklahoma home. He can no longer speak, so we have no way of knowing the depth of his hurt but it is reported that he is despondent.

The man is Chief Redbird of the Cherokee nation. For more than 60 years he has presented to each President of the United States a ceremonial head dress. In the beginning they were made with the traditional eagle feathers. Later as the need grew to protect these handsome birds, turkey feathers were used. But whichever, they were beautifully made in the ancient manner and we can only partially understand the significance of giving these spectacular head dresses to the "Pale face" chief in Washington.

Chief Redbird's first presentation was to Woodrow Wilson who received it with dignity and appreciation as did other Presidents who followed. They were Warren D Harding, Calvin Coolidge (who was on virtually every front page wearing his), then Herbert Hoover, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and John F. Kennedy who could hardly be forced into a hat. But respecting the dignity of the Chief, he donned the head dress. Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon also received the Chief and his gifts.

Though ill and far from home, Chief Redbird made and sent to President Carter his symbolic gift--his way of invoking the great spirit of his people to watch over the chief in the White House.

The staff returned the symbolic gift to the chief telling him the President did not accept gifts from the public. A spokesman for the chief said--QUOTE--This bonnet is not a gift. It's a symbolic tribute to the nation's chosen leader."--UNQUOTE--

Obviously Chief Redbird wasn't asking anything for himself or his people. Certainly no one would have thought the President was taking advantage of his high position or obligating himself in a way not in keeping with his trust.

A good and gentle man lies ill, his kindness and loyalty rejected and a tradition he started as a youth now broken--possibly forever.

Yes, he is despondent; he must also be somewhat bewildered by the ways of the white man.

RONALD REAGAN

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

We used to believe that if you built a better mouse trap the world would beat a path to your door. Now if you build a better mouse trap the government comes along with a better mouse. But maybe we've gone a step beyond that. The Federal government has drawn up specifications on how to build a mouse trap. It must be some trap. The plans and specifications all (20,000 words of them on 700 pages) weight almost three-and-a-half pounds.

National Review magazine uncovered this next example of why an effort is being made in Washington to make bureaucratic language a little more simple. In the Social Security Handbook we read: "The term Substantial Gainful Activity is used to describe a level of work activity that is substantial and gainful." We'd never have figured that out by ourselves.

A crime note from Indianapolis is a head-scratcher. It seems that a would-be bank robber goofed in his attempted holdup and had to make a hasty and emptyhanded escape. It was reported this way. The would be robber was five feet six, weighed about 130 pounds, was wearing a green felt hat with a yellow braided band, a black shirt with pink embroidered figure, and gold-rimmed, tinted sunglasses. He managed to melt into the crowd and elude the police. Makes you wonder what the crowd was wearing.

On the subject of crime, I've called attention on these broadcasts to the damage that has been done to our crime-fighting capacity by well meaning but misguided people in recent years. In a kind of hysteria about supposed violation of our civil liberties by the F.B.I. and C.I.A., we have caused police intelligence units around the country to destroy millions of files on suspected subversives, terrorists and other criminals. Now, the chief of our Secret Service has told a Senate subcommittee that the Service has had to advise the President not to visit certain U.S. cities. Police intelligence in those cities has been so handcuffed it is impossible to evaluate possible trouble from radicals and terrorists.

Not by coincidence I'm sure the pro-Castro F.A.L.N. (a Puerto Rican terrorist group) recently set off two bombs in New York. That makes the total 63 in that city alone. Police have been unable to track down the bombers. You see, a few years ago a New York mayor ordered the Police department to destroy intelligence files on Puerto Rican extremists.

Are you disturbed by the rising cost of medical care? Let me suggest one way we could start cutting back. There are 164 Regulatory Agencies for hospitals alone. Twenty-five review admittance procedures. Thirty-one regulate patient safety. Thirty-three ride herd on patients' rights. It costs hospitals \$35 per patient just to comply with the paperwork.

An unusual number of Congressmen are retiring this year. Possible reason? A bill was passed allowing this congress only to use this year's salary as the basis for figuring pensions instead of averaging income for that purpose. This year's salary was raised to \$57,500.



RONALD REAGAN  
RADIO COMMENTARY

Disc. 78-5

Taped 4/3/78  
Air Dates: 4/17/78-5/6/78

78-5A

1.	Canal	2:58
2.	Tax Time	2:37
3.	Crime	2:40
4.	China	2:36
5.	Bill Simon	2:40
6.	Missing Person	2:34
7.	Three Martini Lunch	2:34
8.	Government	2:43

78-5B

1.	Spies	2:44
2.	No Pay, No Vote	2:52
3.	B-1 Bomber	2:48
4.	Farm	2:40
5.	Regulators	2:37
6.	Miscellaneous	2:50
7.	General James	2:58
8.	Desk Cleaning	2:25

PLEASE NOTE:

This disc contains 16 programs, which provides the replacement for the duplicate program on 78-4.

These programs are provided for airing from April 17th through May 15th inclusive. Maintaining this schedule will enable your station to air all newly recorded programs as received.

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 "Canal"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan"

Perhaps by the time you hear this the long debate in the Senate will have ended and the decision made regarding the Panama Canal. Regardless, here are some things I jotted down out of sheer frustration while listening to the debates on radio.

In spite of the fact that Panama could never have become a nation without the canal; that we gave a disease-ridden, jungle swamp a lower death rate than our own and provided the only solid economic base Panama can count on, treaty proponents droned on and on about how we'd taken advantage of that country of 1,700,000 people. No mention was made of the fact that over the decades we patiently negotiated changes in the 1904 treaty in response to Panamanian complaints. Always the changes benefitted Panama.

Well whether this is after the fact or not here are some the treaty proponents never acknowledged. In 1935 we handed Panama a housing enclave: 25 two-bedroom homes in a walled area with paved streets and all facilities. Cost \$300,000. Note that all the cash figures I use are not today's inflated dollars but actual construction cost. In 1953 Panama was given a seaside hotel built for \$5. million.

In 1955 there was a treaty readjustment that resulted in the following gifts to Panama; the 300-bed George Washington hospital, fully equipped, with all surgical equipment and a one year supply of hospital supplies. Cost, \$15 million. The railroad stations, yards, yard houses, cargo trains plus track -- \$50,000,000. One half of the town of Amcon including the post office building and commissary, two-and-a-half million dollars. And the railroad annuity which had been almost doubled in 1936 was more than quadrupled in 1955. That alone has amounted to \$33 million over these past 22 years. This was done by us even though the 1955 treaty said there was no obligation to alter the annuity. We also built the Boyd-Roosevelt Highway--\$50 million.

In 1963 the Thatcher Ferry International Bridge across the canal--\$227 million and we've been maintaining and painting it every year since at a cost of \$700,000 a year.

In 1975 our State department without Congressional authorization, gave the use of Old France Field (in the canal zone) to the Free Port Authority of the Panamanian government for 15 years, free of charge with an option for another 15 years at the same price. A value of \$3,000,000 could be put on this.

I don't pretend this is a complete list, these just happen to be the ones I know about. There have also been grants of A.I.D. funds totalling some \$550 million. Adding it all up, the donations I've listed come to almost a billion actually \$966,500,000.

You know giving up the Canal itself might be a better deal if we could throw in the State department.

RONALD REAGAN

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

These lines were addressed to the Democratic platform committee in 1976;--  
QUOTE-- "When a business executive can charge off a \$50 lunch and a truck driver cannot deduct a \$1.50 sandwich we need basic tax reform."--UNQUOTE--(We really need to do something about the price of sandwiches) Then came this line;--QUOTE-- "Carefully contrived loopholes have created a regressive system which lets the total tax burden shift more and more toward the average earner." --UNQUOTE-- And, this line has a familiar ring; --QUOTE-- "The national tax system is a disgrace."--UNQUOTE--

Those were the words of Candidate Carter speaking to his parties platform committee and calling for--QUOTE--"a more progressive system of taxation."--UNQUOTE The ideas he expressed are typical of the widespread mythology abroad in the land today. It sustains our policy of robbing Peter to pay Paul. It's time we woke up to the fact we're all named Peter.

The businessman can't deduct the cost of lunch unless it is a legitimate business lunch. Sure, there's room for fudging, but he'd better be pretty careful. As for those "carefully contrived loopholes", 10% of the income taxpayers pay 50% of the total tax and they only take 5% of the deductions allowed by the regulations (or loopholes if you prefer.)

Yes the tax system is a disgrace but not for the reasons usually given and no we don't need a "more progressive system of taxation". Lets take a look at the two ends of the scale. The lowest earning one-fourth of the population pay less than one-tenth of the total income tax. The top one-fourth pay 70 per cent and you are part of that one-fourth if you earn \$17,000 a year.

At \$10,000 of earnings you move into the top half of earners who pay 94 per cent of the tax. Breaking it down a little further, those between \$10,000 a year and \$30,000 which must describe the middle class, pay 54 per cent of the tax but are 45 percent of all taxpayers.

If you can hold still for more figures they make it plain that our tax system is as progressive as it can get without becoming completely confiscatory. At \$30,000 you enter the top 5 per cent of earners who pay 40 per cent of the tax. Less than one-and-one-half per cent earn \$50,000 or more but they pay 23 per cent of the total tax. If we take \$100,000 a year as the beginning of the fat cat class we are talking about three-tenths of one per cent of taxpayers and they pay ten per cent of the total tax.

Traditionally in Western religions it is accepted that the Lords share of our earnings is a tenth and we have been told that if the Lord prospers us 10 times as much we will give ten times as much. But it all comes out a little different when we "render unto Caesar".



RONALD REAGAN

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

Several weeks ago the press routinely carried a story about a United States Supreme court decision that goes a long way toward explaining why the "bad guys" may be winning in the war on crime.

Out in Rolla Missouri a state patrolman saw an unkempt stranger with no luggage of any kind trying to hitchhike his way west on an Intrastate highway. Patrolman Herbert J. Hoffman went on his way without pausing. But when he saw the same man an hour later, this time three miles away trying to hitch a ride south on a local highway he became suspicious enough to stop and ask for the man's I.D.

While the hitchhiker, Thomas Carl Jones, sat in the patrol car Hoffman made a radio check and learned that Jones was wanted in Pennsylvania for the theft of a revolver. Pennsylvania authorities also wanted him for questioning in the murder of his aunt (he was later charged with that crime) Hoffman had already taken possession of a .38 caliber revolver so, all-in-all, it looked like a good bit of police work had resulted from his alertness.

A Pennsylvania court refused to allow the gun or statements Jones had made to Patrolman Hoffman to be introduced as evidence. The judge said the patrolman didn't have "probable cause" to suspect Jones of criminal activity. He further ruled that even though Jones had only been detained and had talked voluntarily to Hoffman, the patrolmans uniformed presence constituted authority and force. The District Attorney said that the gun and the voluntary and the voluntary statements made by Jones had been the critical evidence he was counting on. The judge's decision was upheld by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court. The U.S. Supreme court refused to review it. According to the District Attorney it is unlikely that Jones will be prosecuted for the murder of his aunt.

This is another one of those "exclusionary rule" cases. An arresting officer is held to be in technical violation of someone's constitutional rights, therefore no evidence found by him can be used in court. It is so contrary to common sense that officers have complained if they stopped a man for running a red light and found a bleeding body in the rear seat they could still only charge the man with a traffic violation.

We tried to get a solution to this "exclusionary rule" in California while I was Governor but the trial lawyers association and a permissive legislature blocked action.

We proposed that in cases of technical violations by a law enforcement officer the citizen be allowed to sue the government body employing the officer at the governments expense but that any evidence found by the officer be admissable in court. Not perfect, but it would give protection to the citizen unjustly hassled by law enforcement at the same time that it kept the courts from turning the someone obviously guilty back out on the streets.

Personally, I think Patrolman Hoffman of Montana did just what he should have done.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "China")

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

In this time of doubt and mistrust when we are curbing the ability of our own intelligence machinery to keep us informed, it is especially interesting to note how effective by contract are the Chinese on Taiwan. Their record of making public top secret material from the Communist Chinese on the mainland is amazing and, I might add, very helpful to us.

For example we now have the complete text of a 42,000 word several hour speech Peking's Foreign Minister Huang Hua delivered last July 30 to top level government and party functionaries. It was a report on the entire world situation and definitely not for public consumption. Repeatedly, Huang cautioned his audience against talking about anything they were hearing.

Now you know of course I'm not going to give you all 42,000 words. But I thought you might be interested in how we look to the Chinese communists who want to "normalize relations" with us--providing we'll forget about our friendship with Taiwan.

Huang referred to the Shanghai Communique jointly signed by our two countries as --QUOTE--"like other treaties and agreements--merely something on paper."--UNQUOTE-- He then went on to say, "The U.S. does not have the strength to determine the resolution of the Chinese people to liberate Taiwan--We will simply regard their treaty with Taiwan 'as a scrap of paper'."--UNQUOTE-- He suggested that it was nothing more than that to us and asked if the American people have the will to share the fate of Taiwan if and when Peking sets out to conquer the Republic of China. Answering his own question he said, --QUOTE-- "Go read American history, we have not seen such an instance in which the United States has had such resolve and courage to sacrifice for others. That is why we dare to conclude that the United States is a paper tiger. It can be said that we have the deepest insight into the United States and, after having dealt with it for such a long time, we can paint not only its skin, but also its bones."--UNQUOTE--

Now, that isn't the picture we have of ourselves and history does not support Huang's image of us. But, we should note the examples from recent history he used to support his view; the firing of MacArthur because he wanted to win the Korean war, and our failure to be decisive in Vietnam. He spoke of, "the frailty of the paper tiger that could not withstand a beating". Huang said China would, in effect, be patient until it had the relationship it wanted with us; then it would liberate Taiwan and we wouldn't lift a finger. If we really want peace we'd better remind the world of that America it seems to have forgotten--the one that stands by its commitments.

RONALD REAGAN

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

I'm plugging a book that I think every American should read. Listen to what two Nobel Laureates have to say about it. Milton Friedman--QUOTE--"This is a brilliant and passionate book by a brilliant and passionate man."--UNQUOTE--. F.A. Hayek says of the author;--QUOTE--"If we learn from him and the few people who think like him, we may still avert the threatening collapse of our political and economic order."--UNQUOTE--

The "him" he is talking about is William Simon, former Secretary of the Treasury and that "brilliant and passionate book" is, "A Time For Truth". Secretary Bill Simon has written a fascinating insight to government as he saw it from a cabinet level viewpoint. He has also diagnosed the sickness of soul of America-- but he's also prescribed a cure.

He appeared before Congressional committees more than 400 times and as he puts it, developed an "allergy" to them. In one of Bill Simon's last such appearances,, the committee chairman read off figures on the national debt and, the upcoming deficits and told the Treasury secretary he was there because the committee was studying the relationship between deficits and inflation, deficits and jobs, housing, and so forth.

Simon had a prepared statement touching as usual on the technical questions the chairman had raised but this time he put his statement aside and spoke from the heart. Let me read you some lines from his book telling of what he said to the committee that day.

--QUOTE-- "Unfortunately all the rhetoric about deficits and balanced budgets obscures the real danger that confronts us--the gradual disintegration of our free society." You know, the years that I've been in Washington are like a bad dream. The kind of dream where they are catching up to you and they overpower you and people just walk past and don't pay any attention. But it's not a dream. It's reality. This country is in desperate danger. The real issue is the governments share of the earnings of every productive citizen of this land.

William Simon goes on to say, "You asked me Mr. Chairman about the consequences of deficits. We all know that neither man nor business nor government can spend more than is taken in for very long. If it continues, the result must be bankruptcy. In the case of the federal government we can print money to pay for our folly for a time. But we will just continue to debase our currency and then we'll have financial collapse. That is the direction in which Humanitarians are leading us. But there is nothing humanitarian about collapse of a great industrial civilization. The issue is not bookkeeping. It is not accounting. The issue is the liberty of the American people. I hear no one discussing this danger. Congress does not discuss it. The press does not discuss it. Look around you the press isn't even here...The battle is being lost and not a shot is being fired."--UNQUOTE--

These are only a few lines from William Simon's book A Time For Truth. I hope, for our country's sake, you'll read it.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Having had intimate contact with some of the most violent of our universities during the days of anti-war and anti-almost-anything demonstrations I find it a joy to be invited to a campus today. The students are courteous, aware of world happenings, and have inquiring (not closed) minds.

The contrast aroused many memories of a decade ago and one experience in particular I'd like to share with you. As Governor, I was automatically a member of the board of regents of the University of California. The board met monthly, rotating the meeting place to each of the nine campuses.

As the governing body of the University the board was a target for dissidents. Some would even travel from their own campus to the meeting place to make sure we would receive a proper reception.

The incident that continues to haunt me occurred in San Diego, I arrived there on one of those grey California mornings. Any place else you'd say it was a cloudy day. In California it is a high fog but it still makes for a dreary day. It wasn't brightened any when I learned a special reception had been planned for my arrival.

It seems the meeting was being held in a building deep in the campus requiring about a 200 yard walk. The demonstrators had decided on a kind of silent vigil. The walk to the entrance of the building was flanked by grass covered sloping embankments on which the students had gathered several deep, leaving only a narrow path through which I would have to march while they stared silently down at me.

The security people had another idea, not knowing whether the vigil would remain silent (and inactive) for the whole 200 yard walk. They said they could drive me to the rear of the building and smuggle me in through the back door.

Frankly, I'd had it by this time with the riots, the pickets and the vandalism and I refused. Their silent vigil wasn't going to keep me from going in the front door. So I started down the narrow path.

It's pretty hard not to appear self-conscious with more than a thousand hostile people -- most of them almost near enough to touch--watching your every step and expression. It was a long 200 yards.

I was almost to the end of the ordeal when a rather small, attractive, blonde girl stepped out of the crowd and stood on the walk facing me. I thought "Oh Dear Lord what have they planned for me now." But she put out her hand and spoke, her voice ringing like a bell in all that deep silence. She said--QUOTE--"I just want to tell you I like everything you are doing."--UNQUOTE--. I took her hand but I couldn't thank her, there was a baseball-size lump in my throat. I've never forgotten that moment and her courage. I could go on into the building but she had to stay out there with her peers. I never found out who she was. How I wish I could. I'd like to tell her what her bravery meant to me. I'd like to say thanks.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Three Martini Lunch"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

The administration in Washington is pretty upset about the tax deductibility of the business lunch. I don't know how much additional revenue the government would get by making such luncheons non-deductible, but I suspect there wouldn't be much, not after you figure the decline in restaurant business and the possible layoff of waiters and bartenders.

But, in touting their case, the tax collectors bleed and weep for the working man who can't deduct his bologna sandwich. This has led to an article in the Wichita Eagle and Beacon and which was mailed to me by a reader of that paper. I thought you'd be interested in what it says.

Identifying himself as a working man himself, the writer says he really hadn't been too worked up about the unfairness of allowing a deduction for the three martini lunch and not the bologna sandwich. It seems he rarely eats a bologna sandwich. He's "partial to pastrami and corned beef with an occasional ham and swiss cheese for a change of pace."

Still he says, "To get a tax deduction out of the government you have to start by getting the camel's nose--in this case the bologna sandwich becomes deductible, it is a cinch that in a few years Congress will amend the law to let working men deduct pastrami, corned beef and probably even grilled cheese."

But then our philosopher becomes realistic and recognizes the government isn't really interested in creating a tax deduction for the working man--it just wants to eliminate the deduction for business lunches whether they go to three martinis or not. He points out that since three martinis have about the same effect as a hit on the head with a hammer the three martini drinker probably couldn't care less whether they are deductible or not.

Then he gets down to the real nitty gritty; tax deductions are created to achieve a desired result. A deduction for interest on mortgages encourages home building, for example. He says tax reform always fails because the reformers always want to do away with deductions and the only deduction the taxpayer wants eliminated is the one his neighbor has but he doesn't. Therefore, he proposes that government increase the number of deductions. We all love them so much we probably wouldn't even notice that the tax rate had increased to make up for the lost revenue. We'd be having too much fun bragging about the deductions we were taking. There could even be a social gain. Secretary of H.E.W. Califano could quit scolding smokers and give a tax deduction instead for quitting the habit.

Suggesting that maybe Congress isn't ready for such advanced thinking, our writer comes back to the bologna sandwich and says we should mobilize the political clout of the workers to make bologna sandwiches deductible.

Today Martinis, tomorrow bologna, then a pastrami and maybe even a day when us hot soup fellas will take a deduction. And it all started with three martinis.

## RONALD REAGAN

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

About two years ago Congress decided not to extend the legislation which had created The Renegotiation board. This meant the board would officially expire in October 1976. Well here it is a year and a half or more later and the Renegotiation board is alive and well in Washington.

The board was established to renegotiate government contracts, when and if it was thought that someone was making an excess profit. Through technically dead it remains active because of a legalism that permits it to wind up its backlog of cases. That backlog involves some \$156 billion in open cases which will keep the board alive for at least 10 years. Well we can understand that--a backlog is a backlog. But the board has a yen for longevity so there has been a change in its own regulations. The change of course was made by the board itself. Under the amended regulation it will take jurisdiction over all defense contracts signed under the Foreign Military Sales Act of 1968. Heretofore these contracts were not audited by the Renegotiation board. Some senators have asked the General Accounting office to look into the legality of the new regulation. If that doesn't work we've got a born again bureaucracy.

If I seem to talk a lot about regulations you'll have to remember there are a lot of regulations to talk about. For example H.E.W. has one that requires foreign born doctors to show they can speak English before they are allowed to practice medicine in our land.

Obviously there can be no quarrel with that one. An examining physician must be able to understand what a patient is telling him with regard to where his aches and pains are located. But, as with so many good ideas that start out in the marble halls of government, the results can sometimes be hard to understand.

There is a little town named Velva (population 1500) in North Dakota. Velva has been trying to hire a doctor named Ian Foster to replace the town's only doctor who wants to retire. But H.E.W. regulation has kept Dr. Foster waiting a year.

The problem has to do with that language test. Dr. Foster passed North Dakota's licensing exams and signed a contract with Velva to begin practicing last October. But he first had to take H.E.W.'s Visa Qualification Exam which is given every September and only then. The English test was an inflexible prerequisite. Well, something delayed the processing of his scores and this, plus the set date for the English exam, made him miss the cutoff date for the 1977 exam. Now he and Velva's retiring doctor and Velva must wait till this next September before the change can take place.

What makes the whole delay pretty ridiculous is that Dr. Foster practices in Canada, is British-born and has spoken English all his life.



RONALD REAGAN

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

In our country today there is almost a feeling that nothing is lower than a spy-catcher. At least it seems that way with the continuing vendetta against the F.B.I., the C.I.A. and even local police intelligence units. But espionage is regularly practiced by most nations in this less-than-peaceful world and we're naive if we don't think there is a constant effort by the Soviet Union to infiltrate the most sensitive agencies in our government.

In 1974 the world learned that Chancellor Willy Brandt of West Germany had an East German spy at his elbow. Unknown to the chancellor of course this enemy agent had worked his way up to being his top political aide.

The West Germans did not fool around. They set out to develop drastic new methods of tracking down spies. They estimated there were at least 6,000 East Germans plus another 1,500 from the Soviet Union and its other satellites. The espionage effort was based on the idea of flooding West Germany with so many agents posing as refugees that the government couldn't possibly catch them all.

To counter this the West Germans began feeding information about refugees into a computer. Previously this information had been scattered among several different agencies. Now, gathered together, it is matched against a computer program made up from the behavior patterns and personal characteristics typical of agents already exposed. Each pattern gives them a set of guidelines which can be made more specific as time goes on.

The new plan went into operation early in 1976. By late May they had bagged a top agent (who was serving as Secretary to several officials in the foreign ministry) along with 15 spies in the Defense ministry. By Autumn of last year another eight had been caught and the year end total was 35 arrested while another 35 had fled the country.

It's interesting that the West Germans made public what they were doing. This saved a lot of time and money because sizable numbers of agents took off for the border without waiting to see if the computer would expose them. One couple sent a cable explaining that their sudden disappearance had been caused by a death in the family. A banker told of an accident in Denmark which would prevent his returning to Germany. There was a dying grandmother, a sick wife--any number of excuses for departure. Some city governments found themselves suddenly without certain employees. Employees were lost to nuclear power plants, a fuel research team and to the rocket division of a firm with NATO contracts.

The personnel chief of the Hamburg Criminal Investigating Division and President of the Union of German Police Officials was picked up with five other spies. An Englishman and his German wife were caught 48 hours before they were to cross the border into East Germany. Documents were found in their home which led to a secretary in the Chancellors office. She had previously passed a security check with flying colors.

Does anyone want to say, "it can't happen here"?

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "No Pay, No Vote"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

It goes without saying that the U.S. has proven its generosity again and again. Other nations owe us tens of billions of dollars but they aren't asked to pay up. We are first on the scene to bring aid when natural disaster strikes and our Marshal plan and subsequent foreign aid programs are unique in history.

We helped allies and erstwhile enemies alike, with need being the only criteria. All of which qualifies us now to make a long overdue move in the United Nations.

A United Nations peacekeeping force in Lebanon is estimated to cost \$68 million in the first six months. The United Nations is already \$166 million in debt for other peacekeeping chores going all the way back to 1948 and including the U.N. emergency force in the Sinai from 1956-67, the Congo operation in 1960-64 and the current observer force activities in the Middle East.

We've paid our share for all these U.N. undertakings. Besides, we pay a fourth or more of the entire United Nation budget. The Soviet Union and its satellite states have refused to pay some \$82 billion in assessments for their share of these U.N. activities. They claim that since they disapprove of the actions they don't have to pay.

Back in 1964 there was quite a fuss when the United States and several Western powers threatened to invoke charter sanctions and deny voting rights to the delinquent nations. Unfortunately, we only threatened.

It therefore should come as no surprise to us that the Soviet Union has made plain that it has no intention of supporting the peace keeping force in Lebanon; that it is opposed to the functions of the force and believes Israel should be made to pay the entire cost. This should bring the Soviet unpaid bill up to \$100 million or more. The Soviets even refuse to consider the creation of a permanent United Nations peacekeeping fund.

A U.N. financial expert has been quoted as saying, "If anything brings down the United Nations, I think the financial tangle will." I'll refrain from expressing an opinion on whether that would be good or bad but one thing does need doing. If a club member or, in many cases a union member, is delinquent in his dues he loses privileges, including the right to vote till he pays up. Since the United States holds the unchallenged record for financial responsibility in the U.N. why shouldn't our ambassador officially move that voting rights be denied the Soviet Union? And this time make it stick. If they threaten to pack up and go home-- what will have been lost? Can anyone remember a single instance in which the Soviet Union has contributed anything of lasting value? The Korean war, we tend to forget was fought under the U.N. flag with the Soviet Union lending comfort and aid to the enemy.

If the United Nations would take such an action it might acquire a soul. If it refuses, then we could take a walk and discover we still have one.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "B-1 Bomber"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

It has been several months since the President announced his decision to halt production of the B-1 bomber. I've found around the country there is an uneasiness about our entire defense posture, and the cancellation of the B-1 is symbolic of that uneasiness. Yet, we've been given very little information about the plane and only the administrations explanation that it was too expensive and we could easily find less costly substitutes.

Perhaps we weren't told more about the B-1 because the arguments supporting its cancellation don't stand up. We are told the B-1 had a price tag of \$100 million and it was vulnerable to the Soviet air defense system. Well, no one can look with pleasure on a \$100 million aircraft being knocked down by anti-aircraft fire. First we should know that \$100 million price tag is figured in 1986 dollars on the basis of continued inflation. The real price tag is about \$65 million--still a tidy sum.

It was pointed out that the air-launched cruise missile could be made for \$1 million and launched by re-fitted B-52's, F-11's or even 747's from outside the Soviet perimeter. Now this is true--as far as it goes. But the 747 modified costs more than the B-1 and (with its size) is very vulnerable. The B-52 can only carry half the payload of the B-1 even though its almost twice as big and the modification required is quite expensive-especially when you consider you need two B-52's to substitute for a single B-1. The B-1 incidentally travels twice as fast as the B-52 and being so much smaller is less vulnerable because of its reduced radar image. It shows up on a radar screen about the size of a fighter plane.

The F-11 would have to be stretched and fitted with the same engines designed for the B-1. It would carry less than the B-52. It would not be as good as the B-1---just cheaper.

The B-1 was in production and already flying, a war plane so far advanced beyond anything we have that the world would be years trying to match it, yet we can't start producing cruise missiles till 1981, if then. There have been four successive failures in the tests so far.

The cruise missiles are limited in range, so many Soviet targets would be out of reach. To extend the range it must be launched from planes flying at great heights which increases vulnerability to Soviet ground-to-air missiles. The B-1 is designed to go in low beneath radar, penetrating the enemy air defense system before launching the cruise missiles.

If the President has learned that the Soviets have a new defense system which makes the B-1 less useful he should tell us. It won't be a surprise to the Soviets. If not, then we know the Soviets will have to spend more than the B-1's cost to develop defense against it and what's wrong with that?

RONALD REAGAN

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

Food being the thing we probably buy most often, many of us think of food prices as a measure of inflation. The family shopper comes home from the super-market and with shock and surprise in her voice says, "do you know how much a roast is now?" Or a head of lettuce, pound of butter or whatever.

Strangely enough, as a percentage of income after taxes food has been steadily going down for years. Last year the nation's food bill was 17% of earnings after taxes. This year it is 14.8%. Of that, only 5.3% goes to the farmers who produce the food. And that's why we're hearing about farmers striking, protesting and driving tractors to Washington.

Only a few years ago under then-Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz the farmers were getting out from under the federal program of direct regulation, control and subsidy and back into the free market. Now there is a crisis caused by increased production costs and higher prices for equipment, machinery and fertilizer. Much of the problem is caused by government restrictions on the free market.

I've been trying to find an answer that wouldn't increase government involvement in the farm market. The other day I heard some views expressed by a Congressman who happens first to be a farmer--Idaho's Steve Symms. He, too, is against more government which leaves him understanding the farmer's request for 100% parity but unable to accept that as the answer. He says, "obtaining government insured farm prices" is not a realistic long term solution to the farmers' problem.

Congressman Symms says most farmers recognize the need to maintain extra inventories of food so there won't be hardship in the event of crop failure. But, he points out that government held grain reserves have been used to hold down prices by dumping them on the market when prices rise.

Fearing a bureaucratic monstrosity if government went into the marketing business, Congressman Symms suggests some alternatives to government-insured farm prices. Decrease production costs by eliminating excessive regulation, he says. Current government regulations, he believes, have reached such ridiculous extremes that they seldom do what they were meant to do. The farmer suffers not just as a producer, but also as a consumer.

He says, open foreign export markets to farmers so they can work out their own trade agreements with foreign buyers, without the government as a middleman. After all, why should the State department be negotiating fixed prices with foreign governments for farm exports?

Symms proposes tightening up food programs involved with foreign aid. We often provide food to a government that then turns around and sells it to its own people at high prices. Those governments make an unholy profit at our farmers' expense. And of course he would prohibit government from dumping food surpluses on the market to hold down prices.

Basically, Steve Symms calls for cutting government costs and taxes. It's funny how many problems could be solved by doing that.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio program entitled "Regulators"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Almost a year ago the Wall Street Journal called attention to a fixation of many who man the federal regulatory agencies. Encouraged by activist, special interest lobbies, the regulators apparently are incapable of trusting the American people to do the right thing.

The Journal gave some examples of this ingrained mistrust. The administrator of the program set up to monitor and regulate pension funds who worried because his investigators couldn't find more evidence of wrong doing was typical. This is the program called "ERISA". Since its passage, thousands of smaller business pension funds have closed down because of the costly administrative overhead required by the act. But that isn't the point of this commentary.

The Director of "ERISA" complains that his investigators are not turning up enough cases of wrong doing by pension plan administrators. Some of us would be encouraged by that and conclude there was more honesty and less cheating than we had anticipated. That however is not bureaucracy's reaction. The director wants more investigators and greater use of computers.

The Comptroller of the Currency provided another example for the Journal. His office wasn't getting enough complaints from consumers about the failure of banks to comply with federal rules regarding disclosure and anti-discrimination. Naturally there can be no doubt the banks are not complying and the customers don't know how to make a proper complaint so the solution is, banks must give their customers brochures explaining to them what to complain about and how to do it. The banks will provide forms for their complaints addressed to the Comptroller.

Mrs. Eleanor Holmes Norton, who heads the Equal Employment Opportunity commission, has a different problem. She gets plenty of complaints from citizens who think they are being mistreated by the boss but when the investigators look into these complaints they find many don't have a case.

That does not give Mrs. Norton joy. The commission now will be more systematic in digging up its own cases. Agents will be better trained in how to make a complaint into a court case. She is sure there will be an increase in class action suits as soon as this can be done.

There is danger in all of this bureaucratic witch hunting. When government loses respect for the people, the people lose respect for government. It has been said that each form of government has a particular characteristic. When that characteristic is lost the government falls.

A dictatorship exists because of fear. Let the people lose their fear and the dictator is ousted. A kingdom can only last so long as the people have affection for the royal family. A constitutional republic can only last as long as the people have virtue. Americans do have virtue. Will we continue to have it if government treats us like criminals?

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Miscellaneous"

Commentary by Ronald Reagan

This is another desk-cleaning day. I thought you might be interested to know the AFL-CIO Executive council thinks the federal budget's too low! Come to think of it I can't recall a time when our top labor leaders ever suggested reducing a federal budget. It does seem to be a strange way to represent the rank and file whose taxes pay for so much government extravagance.

Another item: You'll recall the State department went to great length to assure us that we were returning the Crown of St. Stephen to the people of Hungary not its communist government. The people of Hungary would never have found that out if Radio Free Europe hadn't told them over and over again that the crown had been returned. Finally the embarrassed state-controlled press in Hungary admitted to the people the crown was back.

With all of the debate over the Panama Canal treaties why didn't the Senators take a look at a suggestion made by retired General Wedemeyer? He proposed postponing any definitive action till about the year 2000. He said, "Tell the Panamanians that if conditions in the interim are indisputably favorable for our military and economic security as well as theirs and other interested Latin American countries, we would then and only then look with favor upon sharing responsibilities not only with Panama but with other Latin American countries. That solution", he said, "seems realistic and is not arbitrary, yet guarantees Panama participation if their political, economic and ideological policies are compatible with our own."--UNQUOTE-- It's pretty hard to find fault with that--unless you're a dictator trying to swing a deal with a New York financial house for a long term bond issue based on Canal revenues you hope to get if the treaties are ratified.

Back in May, 1976 writing in the official publication of the "War Resisters League" a fellow named Hendrick Hertzberg summed up the 1975 communist victory in South Vietnam as follows. --QUOTE--"The communists were the good guys in the Vietnamese war. Most people will be far better off than they were under Saigon-- Malevolent repression will give way to a more benevolent totalitarianism. Under Thieu (South Vietnam's President) editors were arrested and newspapers were closed down. Under the Communists there will be no further need for censorship, because the press will merely be a part of the states and party apparatus. The society the Communists construct in Vietnam will not be a free society as I understand the term. But the outcome of the struggle, both there and here in the United States was a victory for something honorable in the human spirit."--UNQUOTE-- Slavery is honorable?

I thought you'd be interested in that, inasmuch as Mr. Hertzberg is now a speech writer on the White House staff.

A Domestic item to close with indicates how unfree we're becoming. In California a surveyor telephoned the state capitol to ask who had drawn the costal zone line for his county. California you know, has a costal commission with so much power it can practically imprison a child for building a sand castle on the beach. The commission lawyer who took the surveyor's call didn't know the answer but he said, "The sooner you people up there realize that you have nothing to say about the property you own the better off you'll be."--UNQUOTE--



RONALD REAGAN

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

Several weeks ago the salutes were fired, the bugles sounded taps and a four star General of the United States Air Force was laid to rest in Arlington cemetery. He lies in that place we've set aside for heroes and it is fitting that he should be there for none has deserved it more.

General Daniel "Chappie" James, Jr. is younger than many of his rank who rest in those Virginia hills; 58 years old when his heart gave out. Columnist Pat Buchanan wrote in a tribute to General James;--QUOTE--"There is the bravery of the soldier in battle, and the man against the mob. There is the moral courage of the individual swimming against the tide of contemporary dogma."--UNQUOTE--

I'm sorry to say I never had an opportunity to meet the General face to face, though we talked on the phone several times. He was in charge of the homecoming arrangements five years ago for those other heroes--our returning P.O.W.'s. It was during that period that, when I was Governor of California, that we talked to each other by phone as those men returned from Vietnam by way of California.

It was in one of those calls that for some reason he felt it was necessary to tell me he was black. I was surprised--not that he was black--I was well aware of that and told him so, trying hard not to add--"so what." My surprise was that he felt he had to interject that in the discussion we were having which was about the flood of requests we were both getting for appearances by the P.O.W.'s.

I wondered if he felt that he had to tell me because he thought it might make a difference to me. Now, thanks to Pat Buchanan, I know better. Chappie James, the 17th child in his family, grew up near Pensacola, Florida in an America that had not awakened to the fact it had a racial problem--a problem he would do something about in his own way.

As a boy military pilots at a nearby base would give him airplane rides in return for chores he did for them. At Tuskegee Institute in Alabama he signed up with the all-black cadet unit that became the famed 99th pursuit squadron in World War II. He became an officer, but stayed a first lieutenant for seven years. It was unfair, but he didn't complain. He flew more than 100 missions in Korea earning almost that many decorations. In Vietnam he was teamed with Colonel Robin Olds. They became famous as "Blackman & Robin"--a take-off on the then-current "Batman" TV show. He came home a general and took on campus radicals and protestors in defense of his nation.

He became a four-star general, joining that exclusive club, though he had known times when he was not even allowed to enter an officers club. He was able to see past that to the real greatness of the land. His photo as a fighter pilot hangs in the Pentagon and on it he has written; "I fought in three wars and three more would not be too many to defend my country. I love America and as she has weaknesses or ills I'll hold her hand."

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Desk-cleaning  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Remember when anti-war protestors and some well known public figures ridiculed the "domino theory"; the idea that if South Vietnam fell to the communists other Southeast Asia nations would follow?

Well South Vietnam fell in 1975 and Laos shortly thereafter. Now Cambodia (already communist) is faced with attack by the North Vietnamese communists. Cambodia is or was mainly backed by Peking and North Vietnam is of course, a Soviet chant state. Cambodia has been adventuring across the border of Thailand even while it is protesting and resisting the aggression by the Vietnamese on its other border.

The Mekong river which flows through Cambodia and southern Vietnam also winds between Laos and Thailand. It makes the delta region the rice bowl that it is, feeding much of Southeast Asia. It follows that control of the Mekong means control of the region and after all the ridicule, it seems the dominos are really falling.

On another front, just about the time the campaign warmed up to normalize relations with Cuba we learned of the Cuban troops in Angola--airlifted there by the Soviets. We blustered and made demands unbacked by action. Now Castro has so many troops in Africa that Soviet air force units are flying the air defense patterns over Cuba. That makes it possible for Cuban flyers to fly offensive missions against Somalia--in Russian planes.

Our State department expresses a hope that Cuba will "reduce" the number of troops in Africa so we can go on "normalizing" our relations with Havana. This hardly has the sound of a bold trumpet so it isn't surprising that Cuba's top diplomat in Washington has announced that the Castro government has no intention of trading its ties with Africa for improved relations with Washington. The State department will probably react to this by saying "pretty please--with sugar on it". (Cuban sugar which we might offer to buy at above the market price) .

One thing must be said about us Americans--it takes a lot to make us angry. We arrested a Vietnamese national several weeks ago on charges of spying. The Vietnam ambassador to the United Nations, you'll recall was sent home for his part in the espionage. Now Congressman Robert Drinan says--QUOTE--"he's a fine person, a man with high ideals and thoroughly honest. His sense of responsibility is beyond reproach." --UNQUOTE--

Well you can't quarrel with that last statement. He certainly had a sense of responsibility to his Hanoi bosses.

RONALD REAGAN  
RADIO COMMENTARY

Taped: March-April  
Air Date: 5/8-5/26/78

Disc. 78-6

78-6A

Generic Promos

1.	Guinea	2:44
2.	Christmas	2:48
3.	Do Right	2:44
4.	Life & Death	2:45
5.	School Days	2:51
6.	Government Security	2:52
7.	Sports	2:38

78-6B

1.	Fighting Cal Graham	2:39
2.	Greenville County Education	2:56
3.	Snails & Signboard	3:12
4.	Nit Picking	2:39
5.	Communications I	2:36
6.	Communications II	2:50
7.	Soviet Consumer	2:54
8.	Air Cargo De-Regulation	2:28

PLEASE NOTE:

1. These programs are provided for airing from May 8th through May 26th 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 "Guinea")

Does the United Nations have a duty to people who are subjected to torture? Perhaps my question really should be, what is our obligation, the obligation of each one of us to our fellow human beings who are being denied even a nominal right to life and certainly no right at all to liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Where the coast line of Africa bulges out into the Atlantic just north of the Equator lies a former colony of Spain, since 1968 an independent nation called Equatorial Guinea. It is about the size of the state of Maryland and is ruled by a former civil servant Macias Biyago. (Ma-sias Bee-ah-go)

Dictator Biyago lives in a walled compound in perpetual fear of assassination. But don't waste any pity on him. In the 10 years since independence, half the population has fled the tiny country and tens of thousands have vanished without a tract. Those who remain live in terror.

Western correspondents are barred from the country so our information comes from the few remaining diplomats, business men, technicians and, of course, the refugees.

Biyago has set up a dictatorship backed by a militia drawn from his own tribe plus some Cubans, Russians and Chinese. Incidentally, all American diplomats have been expelled from the country. Amnesty International and the London based Anti-Slavery society have denounced the regime as the most brutal in all the world.

Death is the penalty for dissent and the method of execution is by beating, administered by the soldiers of the militia. A former government minister now living in exile (after escaping through the jungle while the militia combed the countryside looking for him) gives an account of life--or perhaps I should say--death in Equatorial Guinea.

From 1971 to 1975 he was kept naked in a cell seven feet long and two feet wide--his bed the concrete floor. Those dates are just figures and don't really stimulate our imagination to think of four years, 24 hours a day in a bare enclosure only two feet wide and seven feet long. Oh, there was a little diversion. Every Saturday all prisoners were given 50 strokes with a metal rod.

Minister E-Kong said he kept track of the prisoners who were beaten to death in the prison courtyard. Their screams would stop when their backs were broken. Then he would make a mark on the wall. When he escaped there were 157 marks.

I know we can't give the United Nations the authority to intervene in the internal affairs of nations, but it does seem there should be some supervision over the transition of former colonies to statehood, especially when we were all party to the elimination of colonies as a step toward universal freedom. Come to think of it the Russians and their Cuban stooges say their destiny is to free the downtrodden and they are right there in Guinea at the dictator's elbow. Maybe we could ask them to take on that chore.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Christmas")

In these few months since the holidays I've told a couple of Christmas stories on these broadcasts and as a result received one in return. Or possibly it was because of a broadcast about the Ukraine. Whatever the reason, I'm grateful for it.

When the Ukraine was free and not under Soviet bondage, Christmas was of course the religious event that it is in the Western world. A favorite Ukrainian carol was "Nova Radist'Stala" - (The Joyous News Has Come To Us".) A Ukrainian now teaching at the University of Utah has written an article about the evolution of Christmas under communism--at least as it applies to this carol.

In the good days of freedom the people of the Ukraine sang these verses: "The joyous news has come--which never was before, Over a cave, above a manger, A bright star has lit the world, Where Jesus was born--from a Virgin Maiden, clad in raiment poor, like a peasant baby. The shepherds with a lamb surrounded the child, And on flected knees They him glorified: We beg you, our King, We pray to you Today: Grant happiness and joy To this family."

Now of course this was neither fitting nor permitted under Communism, still the commissars were a little leery about an outright ban. They chose to allow the song after some rewriting. In fact, they provided the Ukrainians with two versions neither of which could be expected to have made the Ukrainian Hit Parade.

Here is the first version: "The joyous news has come--Which never was before, A red star with five tails Has brightly lit the world, (See they only changed one line in that verse--but wait) The Altars have crumbled, And all the Kings have fallen, Glory to the working people, To shepherds and the ploughman! Glory to our host And to his fair hostess! May their friendly household know only happiness. May all their family, especially the children, Grow up to be strong and happy, So's to fight the rich men" (You known our own kids could probably get away with singing that one in the classroom).

The second version is a little meatier even though they got the Christmas story down to two verses instead of four. "The joyous news has come--Which never was before, Long-awaited star of freedom--Lit the skies in October. (If you're wondering what happened to the date, the revolutuion took place in October) "Where formerly lived the Kings--And had the roots their nobles, There today with simple folks--Lenin's glory hovers."

The people of the Ukraine both in and outside the Iron Curtain were so carried away by these verses they added one of their own. They sing it but carefully refrained from putting it in the song books.

It goes: "We beg you our Lord, We pray to you today: Grant us freedom, return glory - To our mother Ukraine!" I guess we all hope their prayer is answered.



RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Do Right")

Every generation thinks the preceding one left the world in a mess for them to straighten out. Each generation challenges the morals and customs of the past. We did it, our parents did it and our children's children will do it. There's nothing wrong with that as long as some generation doesn't discard time-tested, proven values simply because they are old.

Charles Edison, son of the great genius Thomas Edison wrote something I thought you might like to hear. He said that a reporter once asked his father if he had any "advice for youth." Thomas Edison replied:--QUOTE--"Youth never takes advice."--UNQUOTE-- and went about his business. Then Charles writes: --QUOTE--"Like my father, I doubt that my advice will be taken. Youth seems to like to learn the hard way--on the battlefield of their own experience. However, here are some thoughts derived from my travels through seventy-three years of life.

"My advice is double edged: it is presented to youth and, by the same token, to our country. For our country and its youth are synonymous. My generation--and the generation immediately preceding it--will soon be a memory--either pleasant or unpleasant, depending on the effect our lives had on our country. It is you--the young people of America--who will be taking over.

"The basic ingredient of my advice is a resurrection of honor. Honor, an old-fashioned word, but one that encompasses everything--duty, responsibility, knowledge and adherence to one's heritage and traditions, respect for the eternal values. An honorable man can live a life free from fear. He knows his duties to his family, his community and his nation, and will exercise them to the best of his ability. He is aware of his responsibilities--first to himself and then to the world around him. He takes the trouble to learn his background--his family, his nation and his God--and uses this knowledge to enrich his own life and the life of all around him. The honorable man cherishes the heritage made available to him by his family, by the founding fathers of his nation and by the thousands of years of history in which men strove for freedom and decency. He knows and respects the eternal values which have come to him from all these years and from all these peoples. A man's honor is the greatest treasure he owns. It will make him rich beyond all dreams of avarice.

"And so, the essence of my advice is to seek out the meaning of honor and, once this is realized, to exercise honor as the basic force of life." --UNQUOTE--

Then Charles Edison sums it all up in this infallible guideline for individuals and for governments. --QUOTE--"When in doubt--do right." --UNQUOTE--

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Life and Death")

No matter how many times we say that death is a normal part of living, a part of God's plan for all of us, we still tend to be shocked and grieved when it comes to those near or dear to us. Of course we feel grief and sorrow when a loved one leaves us. But that sorrow is as much for ourselves because of the loss in our own lives of a beloved companion who has had to depart this life. We speak of the waste if the deceased is young and has not lived out his or her more-than-three-score-and-ten. And, too often we fail to remember that if our Judeo-Christian tradition means anything, the departed has simply moved on to what we've been assured as a better life.

A few weeks ago a little boy died in Santa Barbara, California. His life spanned a mere seven years before leukemia took him. We feel sorrow for the mother and father whose dreams for him ended so quickly, but surely his brief time here served a purpose every bit as much as if his life had been measured in decades, not years.

At seven years he is described as having an unusual understanding of suffering and of God. A volunteer with a group which works with the dying and their families recorded (at Edouardo's request) his thoughts about dying and even his wishes as to his funeral. In answer to a question as to why he wanted to die--(you see, he had asked the doctors to disconnect the life support systems)--he said, QUOTE--"Because I am so sick. When you are dead and a spirit in heaven you don't have all the aches and pains. And sometimes if you want to, you can visit this life, but you can't come back into your own life. If you don't hang on to your body and let yourself ease away, it is not so painful. Death is like a passage way, a walk into another galaxy."--UNQUOTE--. These are the words--the wise words of a seven-year-old boy. He went on to say,--QUOTE--"Sometimes doctors want to save people very badly. They try everything to cure them. I don't feel good and I am too sick to live on."--UNQUOTE--

His mother tells of the final moment. He said,--QUOTE--"Mother, turn off the oxygen. I don't need it anymore."--UNQUOTE--. She did as he asked and says--QUOTE--"I turned it off then he held my hand and a big smile came to his face and he said, it is time....Then he left."--UNQUOTE--

His mother summed it all up when she said,--QUOTE--"It was a privilege and an honor to go through this with my son. I hope it helps parents talk things over with their children and doctors. If he's done this in his short life, then it will have been worth it."--UNQUOTE--

We can all learn from a very remarkable seven-year-old boy and surely his life had meaning for all of us.



RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "School Days")

Think back for a minute to the lines of that old song--"School days, School days--dear old Golden Rule days. Reading and writing and 'rithmetic, taught to the tune of a hickory stick." To a modern day student that must sound as far out as "Close Encounters of the Third Kind."

Author-educator Solveig Eggerz has written an essay on "What ever happened to Public School and Why?" She makes the point that over the past 10 years or so our schools have been drifting away from the traditional concept of teaching, toward some idea about shaping the students' emotional and cultural attitudes, involvement in social engineering and contemporary fads.

I've been critical of the National Education association before in these broadcasts and here I go again. The N.E.A. has published a document titled, "Curriculum for the Whole Student." It declares --QUOTE--" the curriculum must move away from an emphasis on retention of facts to an emphasis on the processes of inquire, comparison, interpretation and synthesis." --UNQUOTE-- There is more, but that should be enough to give you the idea.

Miss Eggerz points out that a flood of so-called "progressive" innovations--teaching consumer education, environment, minority affairs and others heavily larded with cultural relativism have replaced "reading, writing and 'rithmetic."

It is this that explains how, in our nation's capital, an honor student--straight A's and class valedictorian--was rejected by George Washington university because of unsatisfactory scores in his college board exams. He was pronounced unfit for college level work. The Dean of Admissions said sympathetically--QUOTE--" He thinks he's a real scholar. His parents think he's a real scholar. He's been deluded into thinking he's gotten an education."--UNQUOTE--

Remember how often we've been told that classes are too big, schools need more money, and so forth. Well, over the last 14 years spending has increased from around \$400 per student to \$1400. Teachers' salaries have almost tripled and in just five years public school enrollment dropped by more than 50,000 in that Washington school district alone. Total national spending for primary and secondary education is four times what it was in 1960.

In roughly the same 14 years student scores in the Scholastic Aptitude tests--the college entrance exams called SAT's--have dropped every year, ranging from totals of 50 points in verbal skills to 30 in math. The sponsors of the tests said--QUOTE--" the schools are demanding less and less from students and getting it." --UNQUOTE-- Yet, they are handing out higher and higher grades. Homework has been reduced (heaven forbid education should interfere with watching T.V.). Playing hookey (now called absenteeism) is ignored and text books simplified.

We'd better start singing "School Days" again--this time to the educators.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio program entitled "Government Security"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

It was just before mid-February that a Senate Subcommittee heard testimony by two representatives of the Civil Service commission. Alan Campbell, chairman of the commission, and Robert J. Drummond Jr., director of Personnel Investigations, told the committee what some had suspected was indeed true; known members of terrorist organizations and even Communist party members can not only become civil servants in government but can rise to the most sensitive of government positions. Their subversive connections and associations are deliberately left out of the Commissions files.

Mr. Campbell said that membership in any kind of organization is protected by the Privacy Act. The Civil Service Commission does about 25,000 full field investigations every year and, he added, it is increasingly difficult to obtain pertinent information about potential government employees. You see, investigators are instructed to inform each source of information that the information and the identity of the informant will be given to the person being investigated upon request. This does not exactly inspire an informant to tell all.

It seems ridiculous, but it is even difficult to get reports of criminal records of prospective employees. Local law enforcement agencies balk at revealing conviction and arrest records. This is true of large states such as California, New York and Illinois and at least 90 cities in other states. In their words, there is a near collapse of the Federal government's personnel security program.

It boggles the mind when you consider that this lack of ability to investigate involves prospective employees in the Pentagon, Foreign service officers and many who are being hired for other sensitive positions.

The Senate committee well remembers the "cold war" days in the decade following World War II when communists in a great many critical agencies created a massive subversion problem in our government.

Senator Strom Thurmond asked Mr. Campbell: --QUOTE--"You have to have some kind of criteria that enables you to make determinations as to what kind of activity constitutes proper cause for believing the applicant in question may not be loyal to the United States. Would you agree to that?" --UNQUOTE--. Campbell replied there should be such criteria but when he was asked, "Do you have such criteria today?" He answered "No sir, we do not". Then he was asked if it weren't true that the commission itself had ruled that applicants for Federal employment could not be asked whether they were committed to the violent overthrow of our government or whether their sympathies lay with another government. The answer was that legal counsel had advised the commission such questions would violate the Privacy Act.

Senators pressed for answers on specific terrorist groups and whether membership in them would bar an individual from government service. The answer was always no, in addition to which the Director admitted the Commission intended to destroy its files on 2200 questionable organizations.

It makes you wonder if the inmates aren't running the asylum.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio program entitled "Sports"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

In a federal court in Ohio recently a judge ruled that state and federal guidelines providing for separate male and female sports are unconstitutional, and that girls must be permitted to take part in contact sports such as football. I would have missed this entirely if it hadn't come to my attention in a column by M. Stanton Evans.

He says the judge even went so far as to say--QUOTE--"There may be a girl lurking out there somewhere who will become the greatest quarterback in history"--UNQUOTE--. The judge was verbose on the subject. He went on to say--QUOTE--"It has always been traditional that boys play football and girls are cheerleaders. Why so? Where is it written that girls may not, if suitably qualified, play football?" --UNQUOTE--. Stan Evans answered that one in his column. --QUOTE--"The answer is written in the book of nature and the rules of common sense."--UNQUOTE--.

He went on to point out the physical differences between women and men. They are real and they are inescapable facts of nature. Men are constructed differently, with a higher ratio of muscle to body weight. He pointed out that girls, compared to boys, have narrower shoulders, less cardiovascular capacity, lower center of gravity and that running and throwing are not as natural to the typical feminine body.

But enough of that. The judges decision opened up a two-way street that brings all kinds of possibilities to mind. Suppose there is an amazon-type hero out there who can throw a football 60 yards and even scramble to escape a blitz by some charging front four. She makes the grade and is in line for the Heisman trophy. Seriously I don't deny this is possible.

But lets turn around and look in another direction. As I said the Judge opened the street both ways. We presently have girls basketball, softball, soccer and a number of other sports. So here comes "Joe Muscles", six feet four 225 pounds who didn't quite make the varsity. He still wants to play basketball and so he plays--on what used to be the all-girls' team.

Since the not-quite-good enough Joes' undoubtedly outnumber the occasional amazons who win a place on the varsity, a lot of girls happily playing on the girls teams could find themselves permanently on the bench. You buy a ticket to see the championship girls basketball team do its stuff and five hairy chested males "rejects" from the varsity take the floor.

If you think this is far fetched--brace yourself. In Connecticut Little League they made the game-gender free and in 1976 a team of mostly boys won the "Girls" softball championship. A player on the losing all-girl team disappointedly said, "They're so much bigger physical-y."

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio program entitled "Fighting Cal Graham"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

In 1942 America was at war with Germany and Japan, and a patriotic Texas lad joined the Navy to do his part. He completed basic training. He was made a gunner on that gallant old battle wagon the USS South Dakota. At Guadalcanal and Santa Cruz, Cal Graham bravely fed 40 milimeter shells to his anti-aircraft gun as enemy planes raked his ship with a deadly hail of bullets. He was severely injured in the mouth by a shipboard accident, and he was awarded three ribbons and medals for his dedicated service.

But then the Navy Department received a copy of a document from a citizen. And when the Navy digested the message of that document, it snatched Cal Graham from his gun and flew him home to the States. Cal was locked in the brig for three months, then dismissed from the Navy without an honorable discharge.

You see, the document received by the Navy was Cal Graham's birth certificate. It came from Cal's mother. And it proved that fighting Cal Graham was only twelve years old when he enlisted, and 13 when he faced the blazing guns of enemy planes in the South Pacific.

So, for Cal Graham, aged 13 World War II was over. When the Korean War broke out, Cal Graham--by then 21--enlisted in the Marine Corps to once again fight for his country. While in the Marines he suffered another serious accident--a broken back. For this injury he was given an honorable medical discharge and eligibility for Veteran's medical care benefits.

But for his mouth injury from World War II, Cal can't get any help at all. He has appealed time and time again, but his appeals are invariably denied. The Navy argues that since Cal Graham, age 12, forged documents in order to enlist, he was technically never in the Navy and therefore cannot be discharged.

At last, however, fighting Cal Graham has found some friends. Senators Lloyd Bentsen and John Tower of Texas are sponsoring a Senate bill to give Cal Graham an honorable discharge from the Navy. That will sweep away the bureaucratic roadblocks and make Cal eligible for the medical and dental care he has long deserved but never been eligible to receive.

Passing the Bentsen-Tower bill is about the least Congress can do to right the wrong for Cal Graham. In recent years, since the end of the Vietnam War, thousands of former servicemen have had their discharges upgraded to "honorable" under the Ford and Carter amnesty programs. No doubt a great many of these beneficiaries of amnesty were originally denied an honorable discharge simply because they did not want to fight.

Cal Graham wanted to fight for his country. And, given the chance, (even at age 13), he fought side-by-side with men. Congress now owes Cal Graham at least as good a deal as it gave to thousands of others who tried every trick to avoid having to fight for their country.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Greensville County Education"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Most of us have little or no reason to know anything about little Greensville County, Virginia. It has only 17,000 inhabitants and none of them is famous, except maybe Sam Owen. Sam is the county superintendent of schools. His fame comes from the fact that he is one of the first superintendent of schools in the country to put an end to social promotions.

Ever since the one-room, upgraded country school gave way to the graded school concept, the idea of the social promotion has been flourishing. According to that concept, each year every child moves on to the next grade unless he or she is hopelessly behind his or her classmates. The older idea of promotion as a reward for achievement is no longer in fashion. Promotion today, in most schools, means the child has completed another year of attendance without being conspicuously retarded compared to the rest of the class.

Five years ago Sam Owen began to balk at this practice. Sam recognized that in his county schools--and in schools all over the country--merit had disappeared as a justification for promotion. The children were moving steadily up and out, alright, but hardly anyone was stopping to ask just what it was those children had learned to do year by year.

So, Sam Owen took a drastic step. He ordered an end to social promotions. He installed an achievement testing program to help him, the teachers, parents and students, to find out whether eighth graders were really doing eighth grade work. And, at the end of the school year 1300 of Greensville County's 3750 pupils learned that they would not be promoted to the next grade.

There was an uproar. Parents and students screamed for Sam's head. But he held his ground. In fact, he went on the offensive. When the noise level had subsided to a clamor, Sam Owen told the people of Greensville County that the social promotion system was a vicious system. It was a system which deluded school-children into believing they were acquiring real skills, when many of them simply were not. It was a system that encouraged teachers to believe they were doing their job, even as many students were falling further behind. Sam Owen told the people of his county that as long as he was to be their superintendent of schools, he would demand of their children the best that was in each of them. And he led the way for a complete redesign of the county school system to focus on achievement and excellence. It is now in its fifth year, and here's what Sam Owen says about the results:

QUOTE--"Students now manifest an increased interest in learning. Parents have become more concerned about their children's skills, and the cooperation of many parents has had a helpful effect on our program. Their involvement has made our task easier. Teachers are experiencing a renewed pride and sense of professional accomplishment in seeing outstanding achievement gains by their students." UNQUOTE

And in the five years of the county's Minimal Competency program, achievement scores have climbed steadily, and pupil retentions have declined sharply.

Sam Owen and the people of Greensville County believe their program may be the trend of tomorrow in public education. I hope they're right.

## RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio program entitled "Snails & Signboard"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Early in my last year as Governor of California the work load began to build up more heavily than usual as we sought to complete as much unfinished business as possible. So, when I got a letter from a young lady in the 3rd grade at Holbrook School, in Concord (near San Francisco bay) inviting me to "Get out of the rat race and go at a snail's pace", I was intrigued. It was an invitation to judge their annual Great Snail Race, in which the various grades entered brightly painted snails in a brief but spirited race. I couldn't resist, just that once, taking a couple of hours off to judge the snail race, so, off we went to Concord.

The whole school was out in the yard. The band was playing Parents, teachers and civic leaders were crowded around and the decibel level of the children's cheering was enough to make you want to put on earmuffs. The race itself was all over in just 56 seconds, won by a speedy gastropod named Tony. I had brought along what turned out to be the first Great Snail Race Perpetual Trophy, a jar of jelly beans (the race itself was then four years old.)

Well, the other day, I got a letter from seven-year-old Daniel Schwartz of Concord, California inviting me to come to this year's snail race on April 28. This year it's at the Ayers Elementary School and Daniel was good enough to send along the official Snail Race rules. Let me share them with you: The first snail to crawl from the center of the ring (where they all start) to the edge of the nine-inch-round track is the winner. Oh, and no pushing snails, no blowing on snails, no calling snails bad names, no tipping the race track, no teasing snails and definitely no squashing snails if they lose.

The boys and girls take their snail racing seriously and each room will hold runoffs to determine the finalists. There are prizes for the winners of the final. First prize, 11 pieces of sugarless gum; Second prize 7 pieces; Third prize 4 pieces. I wish I could go to the Great Snail Race again. I can't this year, but my hat's off to the kids at Ayers Elementary School.

Signboards are a long way from snail racing, but anyone who lives in Southern California has a certain fondness for that giant sign in the Hollywood hills that spells "Hollywood". If you've visited, you've no doubt seen it. When it first went up in the 1920's it spelled "Hollywoodland" to promote a real estate subdivision. The "L-A-N-D" was taken down in the '40's. In recent years the old landmark has fallen into disrepair and vandals have tried to set fire to some of the nearly 45-foot-high letters. Various civic groups have tried, without much success, to raise funds to repair it and to get some sort of official blessing to take over the sign. Two young men decided not to wait any longer. Stuart Levine, 17, and Cory Slater, 20, began in January to spend their spare time patching up the sign. Both work at night and in the daytime they don hardhats and carry nails and lumber (which have been donated) down the mountainside to repair the sign. Before the heavy winter storms hit they had managed to batten down some loose panels and shore up the legs of one "L". The sign suffered more damage during the rainstorms, but apparently that hasn't stopped Stuart and Cory.

Who says volunteerism isn't alive and well in America?

RONALD REAGAN

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

The President must have been pretty good at that old kid trick of trying to rub his head with one hand while patting his tummy with the other. He still says he's going to reorganize the bureaucracy and streamline government but he's issued an executive order that no one is to be fired or demoted.

He should have a talk with his assistant Secretary of H.E.W. Eileen Shanahan who has only been in government one year. A liberal and former reporter with the New York Times, Ms. Shanahan has been disillusioned somewhat. She says--QUOTE--"While there are many highly competent, dedicated civil servants, the percentage of civil servants who are not earning what the taxpayers are paying them is almost as high as any figure you ever heard from any right winger. There is a very substantial number of people on the civil service rolls who are literally billing the taxpayers."--UNQUOTE--

Thank you Ms. Shanahan. Who knows, maybe her second year of public service will bring an awareness of why the nation's capital is as expensive a city as any in the world - probably because of its proximity to a-1 that federal loot.

The Comprehensive Employment Training Act known as C.E.T.A. which supposedly spends billions of dollars helping the unemployed manages to spill a little on the pot-holed streets of Washington, D.C.

The Washington Star has printed the result of some investigative reporting and we learn that nearly half of the staff of the city council are paid out of CETA funds. This means of course that taxpayers nationwide are helping support the city government of Washington. That's not all. The CETA Funds are providing some juicy plums of nepotism. A councilwoman's son is on salary as a staffer at \$17,000. The Star also notes that the wife of a dentist who is the major supporter of the council chairman has an \$11,000-a-year job. Washingtons per capita cost for providing municipal services is the highest in the land, higher even than New York City's.

Now that Ms. Shanahan has learned about life in government maybe she'll look into some of the foolishness H.E.W. commits under Title IX of the Education amendments of 1972.

The Oak Ridge Tennessee Schools have, for example, been ordered to see that varsity cheerleaders cheer equally for boys and girls teams. Boston State College is on the carpet because the busy guideline writers at H.E.W. have discovered that the corridors where trophies and pictures of athletic heroes and title winning teams are displayed does not give equal space and publicity to womens athletics.

Columnist George Will summed all this up with this warning. --QUOTE--"Government cannot make a fool of itself day after day wallowing in trivialities, in community after community without diminishing its ability to deal with matters that are not trivial."--UNQUOTE--



## RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio program entitled "Communication I"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Recently a meeting took place that revealed how much Americans have been divided by labels and the images. Congressman Phil Crane of Illinois, a Republican and also chairman of the American Conservative Union, decided to try to establish communications with rank-and-file union workers. Obviously he can have contact every day with the hierarchy of organized labor in Washington. Indeed a labor lobbyist stands in the entrance to the House Chamber regularly giving a thumbs-up or thumbs-down signal to Congressmen to indicate how they should vote on legislation when they respond to a roll call. That signal reflects the view of organized labor's leadership in Washington.

Phil Crane and a colleague, a young Congressman from Oklahoma, Mickey Edwards, journeyed to Youngstown, Ohio to meet with local labor leaders. Why Youngstown? Because they wanted to hear the view of those local leaders on the closing of the Youngstown Sheet and Tube plant which wiped out the jobs of nearly 5,000 steel industry workers.

The locals were edgy about meeting with Congressmen they thought of as "the opposition". They insisted on secrecy and no publicity, and they were suspicious that Crane and Edwards might be using them in some way.

The meeting was held on their terms. Congressman Crane asked for their analysis of why the plant closed, and their views about economic problems in general.

These men and women who work on the line, not at a desk in labor headquarters in Washington, told of injury to the investment climate caused by laws passed in Washington.

One angrily asked if the Congressmen knew how much it cost to put in a new blast furnace. This, remember, was a worker--not a voice for management.

They spoke of the inability of management to absorb mounting production costs imposed by government regulations. They were eloquent about the lack of a coherent energy policy designed to provide abundant fuel sources to keep industry going. And they told the two conservative Congressmen of how inflation was caused by uncontrollable deficit spending by the federal government. They criticized unfair trade practices by some foreign competitors and the harm done by environmental extremists who cared more for fish than people.

You've heard me on these broadcasts express the same views. They are often described as "conservative". But, when Phil Crane asked the union workers if they thought of themselves as "liberal" or "conservative", they unanimously declared themselves liberal.

Their definition of conservative was the typical stereotype, "spokesmen for big business and bankers, country club set, anti-working people, and so forth."

Next broadcast I'd like to tell you about the follow up to that meeting.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio program entitled "Communication II"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Congressmen Phil Crane of Illinois and Mickey Edwards of Oklahoma met with local labor people in Youngstown, Ohio recently. On the last broadcast I told how those rank and file union members analyzed the reasons for the closing of a Youngstown steel plant with the subsequent loss of 4600 jobs. Surprisingly, they laid the blame on government regulations; on deficit spending and tax policies that denied industry capital it needed for expansion and new equipment.

They recited what can only be called the conservative creed, but they still labeled themselves "liberal" and described conservatives as the voice of big business, banking and the country club set.

Congressmen Crane and Edwards pointed out to them that the very things they were blaming for today's problems were the result of legislation passed by the liberals in Washington; that they (Crane and Edwards) had a record of voting against everything these workers complained about.

It is the liberal, they said, who would create a paradise for wildlife at the expense of jobs; who would follow a no-growth policy, cheating workers and particularly minorities out of their share in the American dream. Liberals in Congress would put more and more workers on the government payroll and inflict on all of us their belief in government-by-elitists instead of letting us run our own lives.

Well, I'm not going to tell you they made instant converts, but they opened a door. There was another meeting and this time the two Congressmen presented concrete proof that what those workers want, and believe in is exactly what so-called conservatives stand for. Congressman Crane and Edwards brought to the meeting a legislative package they are backing (and which will undoubtedly be opposed by their liberal colleagues). The package will include the Urban Growth Act of 1978, the Truth in Regulation Act and the Anti-Dumping Enforcement Act.

The first is designed to increase employment and job stability by reducing the corporate tax rate, increasing the surtax exemption, making permanent the investment tax credit at 10 per cent and offering an additional 10 per cent credit for investments in high unemployment areas. Time doesn't permit listing all the features, but there are automatic cost of living adjustments and indexing of depreciation rates and capital gains as well as tax credit for keeping employees on during high unemployment periods. There is also elimination of double taxation on dividends.

The second bill would require environmental impact statements to include how many jobs the proposal would cost. Both houses of Congress would have to pass on regulations dreamed up by the bureaucrats.

Third would be a comprehensive program including a labor-industry task force to oversee the program designed to eliminate dumping of anti-competitive imports on our markets.

The Congressmen will ask the union members to urge liberal congressmen to support the package.

It could be those union workers are going to find out that liberals aren't so liberal.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio program entitled "Soviet Consumers"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

For years the leaders of the Soviet Union have boasted that in their state-run economy there can be no inflation. The rising prices in the western world, say the Soviets, are caused by greedy capitalists extorting the last pound of flesh from helpless consumers.

On March 1, however, a funny thing happened on the workers' way to paradise. Gasoline prices doubled. Drivers arrived at gas pumps to find yesterday's 43¢ a gallon gas increased to 83¢ a gallon. Premium grade doubled to \$1.10 a gallon. The State Committee on Prices, however, had a ready explanation.

According to the chairman of that august body of price controllers, Nikolai Glushkov, the price increases came as a result of a popular demand for higher prices! Thousands of Soviet drivers, he reported, had complained that Soviet gasoline prices were too low compared to gas prices elsewhere in the world!

It was observed, however, that popular outpourings of support for Mr. Glushkov's action were---to put it mildly--subdued. And under questioning from foreign newsmen, Mr. Glushkov reluctantly admitted that the costs of finding, drilling and piping Siberian oil had gone up, and also that prices of imports had climbed steadily.

It is little wonder that Soviet motorists are outraged at the price doubling for motor fuel. It is hard enough becoming a car owner in the first place. The average Soviet worker earns \$221 a month, essentially free of deductions. The only car he can buy is a Zhiguli (ZHUH-GOLI)--which is a Fiat manufactured in Russia. This Russian Fiat is priced at \$10,000. Even so, the waiting is more than a year long. And once he gets his \$10,000 Fiat, he must face the possibility of gas prices doubling overnight through another sort of Fiat--a Fiat of the economic czars in Moscow.

By contrast, the average American manufacturing worker with a family of four has about \$700 a month to spend after social security and income tax withholding. He can walk into a showroom and buy a Fiat or any number of other cars for less than \$4,000. He has his choice of Pintos, Gremlins, Dashers, Rabbits, Chevettes, Horizons and many more. Any of these cars can be purchased--no waiting--for not more than six months take-home pay by the average American industrial worker. His Russian counterpart must give 45 months pay to buy as good a car. He has his choice of one brand.

Nor do Russian workers have the opportunity to sit down over a cup of coffee to bemoan their plight. Coffee was unavailable to Russian consumers for several months last year. Now it's back--for only \$12.73 a pound. Soviet Instant Coffee sells for \$39.00 a pound, compared with our country, where at \$8.40 a pound is considered high.

When you hear people telling about the wonders of the workers' paradise with its centrally-planned economy and government price fixing--just remember what price the average Russian really pays for a cup of coffee and a set of wheels.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio program entitled "Air Cargo De-Regulation"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

In the years since World War II the air cargo business has experienced steady growth. It has, however, been constantly and carefully regulated by the Civil Aeronautics Board, which also regulates the passenger airline industry. Actually, regulating is not quite the right term. What the C.A.B. has done since 1938 is maintain a cartel.

Until recently anyone wishing to start an air cargo service to meet consumer demand faced some serious obstacles. The most serious was obtaining the permission of the Civil Aeronautics board merely to exist as a carrier. The Board has never been eager to certify new entrants and new routes. Instead it has seen its role as holding an umbrella of protection over those air cargo companies lucky enough to have gotten in on the ground floor.

But even when the CAB was persuaded to certify a new carrier, it did not leave future results to the workings of the marketplace. Far from it. The CAB insisted on specifying just what rates the carrier could charge, just what routes it could fly, and even what size planes it could operate.

The air cargo business--unlike most of the passenger airlines--fought against the CAB's restrictions. The cargo carriers asked no subsidy from Uncle Sam. They asked for no government cartel to protect them against competition. All they asked was the chance to meet the needs of the economy by doing what they do best--moving valuable freight quickly and efficiently. And last November they won their battle.

Congress passed and President Carter signed into law a bill that, in effect, gets government's hands off the air cargo business. By this November at the latest, anyone fit, willing and able to provide air cargo service will be free to go into the business. Any carrier will be able to decide which cities it wants to serve without first obtaining government permission. Companies will set their own rates, and for the first time can operate any size aircraft.

Now, only a few months after the air cargo deregulation act, we are beginning to see what can happen. Federal Express has placed new orders for six Boeing 727 cargo jets and plans to add many new cities to its routes. Flying Tiger Line will double the number of U. S. cities it serves as soon as it can get more planes. Seaboard World Airways will add domestic service to New York along with its trans-Atlantic cargo flights. The whole field is humming with new activity; activity which will benefit shippers and, ultimately, every consumer who buys their products.

This time, Congress seems to have discovered the value of competition.