

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 78-10 through 78-12 (1978)

Box: 14

To see more digitized collections visit:

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

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Inventories, visit:

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

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

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

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

Taped: 7/17/78
Aired: 7/31/78 - 8/15/78

RONALD REAGAN
RADIO COMMENTARY

Disc 78-10

78-10A

Generic Promos

1. Government	2:43
2. Mirages	2:31
3. Lumber	2:43
4. Freedom of Speech in Russia	2:46
5. Stanley Yankus	2:40
6. Charity	2:44
7. School Busing	2:55

78-10B

1. Wedding	2:44
2. South Africa	2:44
3. Cuba	2:42
4. Castro	2:53
5. Walter Knott	2:22
6. Trains	2:43
7. Chiefs of Staff	2:41
8. Proposition 13	3:14

PLEASE NOTE:

These programs are provided for airing from July 31st through August 18th 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 "Government"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Not long ago a friend sent me a clipping from the Pasadena STAR-NEWS. That is the Rose Parade Pasadena in California. It seems that Pasadena couldn't qualify as a distressed area eligible for the President's urban program to help distressed areas.

Now that hardly qualifies as news to make one lift an eyebrow and say "how come?". To be eligible, an area must meet three of four criteria: It must have an unemployment rate above the national average; a five-year growth rate of employment below the national average; a five-year growth rate of population below the national average; and its five-year absolute change in per capita income must be below the national average.

Pasadena is a stable area and what is usually termed a wealthy community so it isn't surprising that it didn't meet the so-called "need" requirements for an Uncle Sam handout. It was the cities that did qualify that raised a few eyebrows in California.

San Marino, La Canada, Flintridge and Bradbury are all on the eligible list. It's true these cities aren't filled with industries and they probably have quite a few people who aren't working at regular jobs. But that's because they are the kind of communities where a lot of people don't need jobs. As a matter of fact, a pretty good percentage of the people in those communities are better off than the federal government if you compare their credit ratings. I doubt they'll be rushing to Washington for a handout.

Meanwhile, business in the nation's capital goes on as usual. Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Joseph Califano, summed up his agency this way: "If you combined the budgets of all 50 states the total would be \$50 billion shy of matching HEW's budget". This one agency of our government has the third largest budget in the world, topped only by the budgets of the U.S. itself and the Soviet Union.

Now that we're all past the income tax date you might be interested to know that the world's most confusing document is the Internal Revenue Service's official manual. It has 38,000 pages in 12 volumes. That's bad enough, but they continue to make changes every month to such an extent that the IRS librarian can't keep pace with the indexing.

One I.R.S. agent who needs the manual in his work (which involves criminal tax investigations) became so fed up he went out and bought a commercial copy. When tax time came and he listed the cost of his purchase as a tax deduction--the manual being an essential tool in his work as an I.R.S. agent--his boss, the I.R.S., refused to allow it.

In closing, the Treasury department proposed making tax regulations more simple. They said, "A regulation which would otherwise be eligible for consideration as a significant regulation, may, nonetheless, with secretarial approval, be determined not to be a significant regulation." Doesn't that make you feel better?

RONALD REAGAN

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

I suppose it's only natural for any of us regardless of our faith to speculate at times as to whether or not there might be a natural explanation for some of the biblical miracles. I'll confess to doing it in idle thought on occasion but always winding up unable to explain away the happening described in either the Old or New Testament as natural phenomena.

But today just as there are revisionists trying to rewrite history so are there scholars--yes and theologians trying to de-spiritualize the Judeo-Christian tradition. Some time ago I commented on this with regard to the Christmas story.

Now a scholar has come up with a scientific explanation of two of the better known miracles. He says they were simply mirages. The first is the parting of the Red Sea which allowed Moses and the Israelites to escape the pursuing Egyptians and the second is Jesus walking on the waters of the sea of Galilee.

Most of us know something about mirages, particularly those of us who live in the Western United States. And I dare say most of us have been driving on a hot day and seen the highway ahead take on the appearance of water shining in the sunlight. We don't put on the brakes because we know it is simply heatwaves rising from the pavement giving the illusion of water. Of course there is much more scientific knowledge about the often elaborate mirages and reflected images seen in desert areas and I'll admit I'm not blessed with that knowledge.

But this scholar has suggested that the Israelites were simply led across desert sands at a time when a mirage gave them the appearance of walking through water.

As I say I'm not an informed scholar on the subject of mirages. But even giving the writer that edge, I'm still left with some questions. The mirage might (and let me emphasize the word might) explain the Israelites crossing the Red Sea but that leaves the story very much unfinished. The Armies of the Pharaoh tried to follow and the waters closed on them crushing chariots and drowning men and horses. A mirage can do that?

Then there is an unanswered question or two about Jesus walking on the water if we assume he was on dry land and part of a mirage. First of all it was night and the Disciples were in a wave-tossed boat. Jesus walked from the shore to join them in the boat. If that was a mirage and he was really on dry land--what was that boat doing there?

I'm afraid our scholar has asked too much of heatwaves and reflections on clouds and desert sand. It will take more than a mirage to do a successful re-write of the world's all-time best seller--the Bible.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "LUMBER"

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

I'm sure I won't surprise you by saying that lumber prices, which are about 15 per cent of all construction, are a major factor in the high cost of building. Some contractors find it almost impossible to give a reasonable estimate on a project because of the uncertainty of lumber prices. Can all of this be laid at the door of the lumber industry--or is there something to be done that is beyond its power?

Columnist John Chamberlain recently gathered together some information having to do with lumber forests which points to an attainable solution. Once again, it is a simple matter of using common sense.

The problem is, of course, the high cost of new homes. Our private forest industry at present plants more trees than it cuts. No longer does the industry denude the forest land and then move on. But that industry only owns 16 per cent of the nation's standing softwood. States own about 12 per cent, but the federal government owns 52 per cent. So, as Chamberlain points out, the U.S. Department of Agriculture could be the key to lower housing costs.

Right now the Forest service (a unit of the Agriculture Department) sells about 12-and-a-half billion board feet of lumber annually to the saw mills. The forest industry, from its much smaller holdings, sells almost 16-and-a-half billion and another 14-and-a-half comes from non-industrial sources. All this indicates that Uncle Sam's 52 per cent offers the best chance of increased supply.

Now I'm sure all of us want conservation of trees in our national forests. No one would suggest wholesale cutting to meet commercial demand. But what John Chamberlain has discovered is that the federal Government is allowing lumber to go to waste each year when it could increase the supply by six billion board feet.

Trees aren't like minerals which stay where they are until someone removes them from the earth. Trees grow up, they may get sick, they grow old and die. This apparently is not recognized by some environmental extremists who confuse conservation with preservation. Dead trees are pure waste and are harmful to the forest.

Take the example of Lassen National forest in California. This preserve allows a cut of 150 million board feet a year. It could raise that to 268 million board feet if the timber cutters were allowed to harvest only the over mature and dying trees. Lassen would be a better national forest and one much safer from the threat of forest fire if the additional cutting were done. As it is, it's choked with rotting wood.

Chamberlain points out that this additional cutting in Lassen National Forest alone would also provide an increase of 1200 jobs in California. And it would lower the price of lumber. So what's the federal government waiting for?

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Freedom Of Speech In Russia"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Recently, National Review magazine presented an article by Lennart Frantzell that revealed how much idealism there is in the world and exposed how much hypocrisy there is behind the Iron Curtain.

The author gives an accounting of young students and others from France, Belgium, Norway, Finland and other countries of Western Europe who journey to Russia as tourists. These particular tourists however aren't interested in sight seeing. They smuggle in books and leaflets which they then openly hand to Russians on the streets. These are books the Russians are forbidden to read such as the writings of Solzhenitsyn. Invariably the book distributing tourists are arrested. One young Belgian girl handing out lists of political prisoners names was seized by KGB agents so quickly she could only throw the leaflets in the air before she was arrested.

Now, the Soviet Constitution guarantees freedom of speech but like the Helsinki pact the Russian government doesn't feel obliged to observe it. Nevertheless Soviet officialdom is taking its lumps and is very uncomfortable in the face of these tourists who argue back with full knowledge of their legal rights and the terms of the Helsinki pact.

Listen to this exchange between a 22-year-old French girl and the two KGB officers who arrested her:

--QUOTE--"Are you a member of a political party?"

"Yes"

"What does your father do?"

"He is a politician."

"Does he have a high position?"

"High enough"

"Does your father know of your trip to the U.S.S.R.?"

"Yes, of course"

"Well, both you and he know that is is forbidden to bring books into the U.S.S.R."

"Really? But Why? To our country, for example, one can bring in any books. In our country people have the right to read anything."

"Well this isn't Belgium but the U.S.S.R."

"How does the U.S.S.R. differ from Belgium?"

"We want our nation to think according to our ideology."

"You are really naive people! Do you really believe that 250 million people will think the way you want them to think?"--UNQUOTE--

The KGB agents didn't have an answer to that one. All they could say was

--QUOTE--"It is forbidden to bring in books! You may get 10 years for it."

--UNQUOTE--. To which she replied--QUOTE--"I know, we already packed some things in case we would have to go to camp."--UNQUOTE--

The smugglers have the help of the Russian emigre' organization and contacts in the Soviet Union who help pass the literature along. Leaflets have appeared in cities and towns far distant from Moscow and books are regularly circulated among dissident intellectuals in Moscow.

A Mr. Sokolov, a member of the section in charge of the confiscated books, was arrested a couple of years ago for selling those books to black market dealers. He hasn't been heard from since. But the smuggling goes on and significantly the Russian people show a great eagerness to get their hands on the forbidden literature.

RONALD REAGAN

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

As a veteran of the mashed potato circuit--my name for the after dinner speaking-- I'm always on the lookout for interesting anecdotes. The other day on a flight to the midwest I was reading the newspaper when a familiar name caught my eye. It wasn't the name of a well-known public figure, but it had been a part of a speech I'd made almost 20 years ago.

Stanley Yankus was a chicken farmer in Michigan back in the late 50's when our government was deeply involved in the control and regulation of American agriculture. Some of you will remember those days of acreage allotments and subsidies for now growing things. It was not the best of times for farmers and coincidentally, there are signs that Washington is anxious to return to those days.

But back to Stanley Yankus His chicken farm was the culmination of a dream. He had worked for years in Chicago as a hog butcher, saving for the day when he could have his own farm. With his dream realized he worked from dawn till long after dark when he and his wife would candle eggs on the back porch. Maybe I'd better explain to a younger generation that candling meant holding each egg up to a light to make sure it wasn't a fertile egg containing an embryo chicken.

Stanley was a good family man and citizen, serving on the local school board and educating his children. He raised wheat on his little farm which he harvested and fed to his chickens. Then in the late 50's the government told him he couldn't do that. The government had a wheat control program in which farmers were given allotments of how much wheat they could raise.

Yankus protested that he wasn't in the wheat business, he was just raising enough to feed to his own chickens. He refused to plow his wheat under as the government ordered him to do. The government attached his small bank account. When he still didn't give in they fined him \$5,000 and threatened him with worse penalties.

I can remember citing his experience and a judge's ruling that said in effect, "the government had usurped the right to tell a citizen what he could raise on his own land for his own use." Stanley Yankus said--QUOTE--"This is the action of a police state--the sort of life we were brought up to detest."--UNQUOTE--

He sold his farm to pay the fine and became the first American I know of to leave the United States in search of freedom. He and his family moved to Australia. There, unfortunately, he learned life was also pretty much regulated by government. Becoming a salesman, he started in to reclaim his dream of once again having a farm.

A few weeks ago, 19 years after he had left America, his dream was near realization. He bought a 10 acre almond farm in his new homeland and was awaiting plans for the house he would build on his own land.

Stanley Yankus was then 59 years old. He died of a heart attack before the house plans arrived.

RONALD REAGAN

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

You've heard me criticize government many times for taking on tasks that properly should be left to the people. To tell you the truth, a very real fear of mine is that government with its many social reforms may rob us of that great sense of generosity and charity which is our American heritage.

Not too long ago I received a letter from a long time friend, Robert Young. To younger listeners, I'm speaking of the Robert Young you probably know as Dr. Welby. In his letter he told me some facts about child abuse--that is the number one killer of children under five years of age--that 60 percent of abuse victims are not yet two years old--that 325,000 cases are on record, but experts say the real total, including the unreported, is probably over a million.

Those, of course, are just statistics--they don't tell about a father plunging a squirming 14-month old son into a tub of scalding water because he cried or a nine year old retarded boy beaten while he knelt on carpet tacks. They don't tell of little Mary Beth.

Investigating officers went to a typical suburban residence where they were greeted by a neatly dressed young mother. There were two boys, ages six and eight, in the room who seemed to be uncommonly quiet. When the officers mentioned that neighbors had reported hearing screams, the young mother said she had disciplined one of her children for misbehaving. As she was talking, the officers heard a soft whimper, like the sound of a hurt animal coming from a room down the hall.

While the two boys cowered in fear and the mother protested, the officers threw open a bedroom door. There was an overpowering stench of urine, vomit and defecation. Then they saw the little girl huddled naked in a corner of the bed--one wrist tied to the bed post with an electric cord. An ugly blue, black swelling had closed one eye, her lip was split and her mouth was swollen.

As her mother followed the officers into the room, little Mary Beth, through her bruised and swollen lips, said: "Mommy, if I die, then will you love me?"

Neighbors said this little battered animal was really a bright, beautiful and charming child. Her punishment had been for wetting the bed.

In his letter, Robert Young told me about "Children's Village", a modern residential facility near Los Angeles on 119 acres, where abused children can be cared for--where they will hear possibly for the first time a kind voice as they are tucked in bed with a teddy bear or a doll.

Children's Village U.S.A.--because some of your fellow citizens wanted to make a battered, hurting child whole again.

RONALD REAGAN

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

The other day when I picked up my local Los Angeles newspaper, I saw a headline referring to the court ordered school busing program scheduled to begin in September. I thought my eyes were playing tricks. The busing scheme, it seems, will involve bus rides of up to 90 minutes each way every day for some of the youngsters. That's three hours a day on a bus for a child, just to satisfy some federal judge's notion of how to achieve equal education. It sounds more like the Mad Hatter's Tea Party.

Federal judges still seem to be stuck on the notion that rigid forced busing schemes which disrupt family and neighborhood life (not to mention wasting thousands of gallons of gasoline and large numbers of tax dollars) are somehow the way to solve the problem. Yet, in case after case, such schemes have proved impractical, counter-productive and divisive. Meanwhile, there have been a variety of innovations designed to improve and equalize educational opportunities--such things as "magnet" schools, academic parks, open enrollment and the flexible voucher system. Increasingly in recent years, public opinion has been running strongly against compulsory busing. Judges, however, are insulated against public opinion. When they legislate, as they are doing in implementing and overseeing forced busing schemes, they can upend people's daily lives without answering to anyone.

There is a remedy that is coming closer to fulfillment. Back in 1975 a freshman Congressman, Representative Ron Mottl, Democrat of Ohio, introduced a Constitutional amendment to abolish forced school busing as a means of achieving racial integration. Representative Don Edwards of California, also a Democrat and chairman of the House Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, refused to hold hearings on the bill. Mottl then tried to get a discharge petition, the only other way he could get his bill to the floor. He needed a majority of signatures--218; he got only 17.

Early last year, Congressman Mottl tried again. His bill has two key provisions: One says "No student shall be compelled to attend public school other than the one nearest his residence". The other says, "The Congress shall have the power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of this article; and to insure equal educational opportunities for all students wherever located".

Edwards again refused to hold hearings and, along with Congressman Peter Rodino, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, he persuaded 10 members to take their names off the Mottl petition. Still, by this summer, a net total of 201 members of the House have signed it, just 17 short of the needed number. The signers are about evenly divided between Democrats and Republicans, though individual names are not made public while a petition is being circulated.

Congressman Mottl believes that if he can get his petition to the floor of the house it will pass and also has a good chance in the Senate. He says, "There is growing sentiment in Congress that compulsory busing just hasn't worked; that it is a case of many minuses and no plusses."

RONALD REAGAN

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

On Sunday, July 16th in Chicago, Linda Frascchalla walked down the aisle and was married to Pete Saraceno. As they led the wedding party from the church, the pace was a little slow because Pete had to use a walker.

Actually the marriage itself was about two years late. Linda and Pete had planned to wed in 1976 right after he was released from the Marines. Then Pete and a buddy crashed an automobile. Pete was critically injured and pronounced dead on arrival at Westlake Hospital. But a doctor felt for a pulse one last time and found a very faint one. Pete was alive, but in a coma.

After 12 days in a respirator and with five other life support machines attached to him, the doctors told his mother to pull the plug. She replied that if God had wanted him, he would have taken him in the accident. He would remain in the coma for 3½ months. At three months he contracted double pneumonia and was given only a few hours to live.

Linda works in the admitting office at St. Luke's Presbyterian Hospital. Every night after work she visited Pete, who never so much as moved an eyelash. Nevertheless Linda was there decorating his room with a lighted tree for Christmas, spending New Year's Eve with him. Sympathetic doctors told her to go out, have fun and try to forget him. She refused.

Then one day Pete opened his eyes and his eyes began following Linda as she moved around the room. Later a finger moved, then an arm and finally he tried to speak. Linda was the only one who could understand him--even when he made no sound she could read his lips.

He spent seven months at Westlake, then to the Chicago Rehabilitation Institute and finally home. Linda quit her job and used her savings to buy a 28-foot back yard swimming pool to help him exercise his legs.

One day his mother took him back to Westlake to meet the nurses who had cared for him during the long months of coma. He stepped off the third floor elevator using a walker and Mrs. Saraceno says there wasn't a dry eye on the floor.

When Pete asked Linda's father for permission to marry her, Mr. Frascchalla said, "When you can walk down that aisle, she's all yours." Linda has returned to her job, but has spent her evenings decorating a garden-type apartment in Melrose Park where they are now at home. Pete had wanted to become a Chicago policeman, but still has trouble with his left arm. Linda says he can do some kind of desk work.

Pete says, "The doctors call me the miracle boy and I guess they are right. I'm lucky to be alive and I'm lucky to have Linda." Yes, he is. When the doctors told Linda that he would never make it, she told them "I love him" and she refused to believe them. She said, "I wanted to help him, so I stayed at his side as much as I could." Pete says, "She sure taught me about love." I think she taught all of us something, Pete. Congratulations. And to you, Linda, a lifetime of love and happiness.

RONALD REAGAN

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

It is the right of every American to have opinions, to express them and when the occasion warrants to urge our public officials to take action based on such opinions. We all can criticize our national policies and suggest changes. We can vote against elected officials who refuse to heed our suggestions. But whether as private citizen or public servant we can't have our own foreign policy and privately establish our own international relations.

The U.S. maintains trade and diplomatic relations with South Africa. South Africans have fought beside Americans in two world wars. It is true, however, that most Americans find South Africa's policy of apartheid repugnant and hope very much that those South Africans who share our repugnance will strive until they succeed in righting what we perceive to be a great wrong.

Some Americans think we should end our friendship with South Africa; refuse to allow American businesses to set up branches there and simply ostracize South Africa until it meets our own standards of racial tolerance. But since we have only recently achieved our present level of tolerance and have a fresh memory of an America where intolerance, bigotry and prejudice were fairly wide spread, isn't it possible that we could be more helpful? A friendly America acting with understanding and compassion based on our own experience could be of more help in resolving apartheid than we could by turning our back.

A black journalist, recently returning from a visit to South Africa, told me of American industries there who were showing the way in hiring practices and even in providing employee housing. He said that black employees of American firms said it would be terribly hurtful to South African blacks if the American firms were forced to close up shop.

The other day I came across an item that shows how ridiculous people can be when motivated by prejudice. It seems that the lady in charge of the American Peace Corps is so bitter about South Africa and its policies that she won't allow any Peace Corps volunteers to serve in that country. It does seem as though she is making a policy determination that is or should be beyond her authority.

But never mind that. Recently two young volunteers serving in Botswana, which borders on South Africa, came down with back ailments. They were not allowed to seek treatment in a nearby South African hospital. Madame director had them flown to Frankfurt, Germany. That is a 14 hour flight one way. As one of the young men said, he flew 14 hours, waited another four-and-a-half hours to spend 20 minutes with a Doctor then flew 14 hours back. And here is the tag line-- Madame director, who wouldn't allow treatment in a South African hospital, sent them to Germany on a plane of South African Airways. Cost \$3,000.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Unless you've boycotted the daily press or refused to listen to the evening news, you are aware that the administration in Washington has had some harsh things to say about Cuba. Castro has been told to remove his mercenary troops from Africa or we'll--or we'll--or we'll what? Come to think of it, the administration has never mentioned what the "what" might be. And you can bet that Mr. Castro is well aware of that.

There are now 50,000 Cubans in Africa propping up a whole cluster of third world nations and training an assorted pack of guerillas in the gentle art of butchery. And not so incidentally threatening to cut off minerals vital to the industrialized western world.

Some of the senior members of Congress on both sides of the aisle have become very much aware of that unanswered "what" in the President's rhetoric. Like prompters coming to the aid of an actor who has forgotten his lines, they are trying to give him the next sentence.

House minority leader John Rhodes of Arizona urged the President to stop wringing his hands and take some specific action, which he then outlined. I bring this up because if you weren't in the House gallery on the day Congressman Rhodes spoke, you probably have never heard or read of his proposal. For some reason this subject seems to be of no interest to the news media.

Then a short time later Democratic Senator Talmadge of Georgia took the Senate floor to charge Cuba with aggression and subversion in Central America and support of Puerto Rican terrorists who have been responsible for numerous bombings in our own country.

The Senator said that outside of a few feeble protests, our only response has been to exchange diplomats with Cuba, lift the ban on travel to Cuba, send athletes, performers, businessmen and Congressional delegations down there. He added: "We seem to be bent upon treating our enemies as friends and our friends as enemies."

Senator Talmadge didn't have any trouble suggesting some practical steps--close the Cuban mission in Washington, ban travel to Cuba, prohibit sending dollars to Cuba and restore the ban in diplomatic and economic relations. But for all the press he received, he might as well have marked his speech "top secret".

Shortly thereafter the Democratic majority leader of the Senate, Robert Byrd of West Virginia, echoed his colleague's words and added that we should cut back sales of advanced technology to the Soviet's who "have not swerved from their commitment to foment chaos wherever they believe it can benefit". He made page 14 of the New York TIMES and was mentioned in the Washington POST in a story hailing the split between "McGovern and Byrd". McGovern got 10½ paragraphs, Byrd, 3½, but his proposals about the action we should take were not mentioned.

The visit of the Cuban ballet to the United States was given more than one full page.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Several weeks ago the President released intelligence summaries which established pretty conclusively that as long ago as 1976 Soviet and Cuban advisors were asking permission of Angola to go raiding across the border into Zaire. The government of Angola is, of course, Marxist and totally sympathetic to Soviet aims. The intelligence reports stated that Cuban and East Germans trained the raiders for the '77 invasion and that Cubans were involved in the recent massacre at Kolweize in Zaire.

Down in Cuba, Fidel Castro brands all of these reports as lies and implied that the President was lying. He told American reporters: "We may be private about some things. We may be discreet. But we have never lied. We never made use of lies as an instrument of politics". So says Castro.

You know, calling the average man a liar is a pretty drastic charge and the average man reacts with vehemence when his veracity is so questioned. But calling a Communist a liar when he is one is pretty frustrating. How do you insult a pig by calling it a pig? Communists are not bound by our morality. They say any crime, including lying, is moral if it advances the cause of socialism. That is Karl Marx as interpreted by Lenin.

Fidel says he and his fellow communists never lied. When he says that, Fidel is a liar and he's been lying on a regular basis since before he seized power in Cuba. In 1958 he said, "we are fighting to do away with dictatorship in Cuba and to establish the foundations of genuine representative government." A year later in his victory speech he pledged to respect and uphold the country's laws. He also said that if the men in his government proved unequal to the task, the people could replace them in free elections.

A month later he promised no violation of human rights, no beating of anyone, indeed no one would even be insulted. His former military commander, Huberto Matos, in prison now for almost 20 years, could attest to the honesty of those promises. And he would have confirmation from the estimated 20,000 political prisoners living under the most inhumane conditions.

But here are two Castro statements that make our case. In May of 1958 he made a public declaration: "I never have been or am I a Communist. If I were, I would have sufficient courage to proclaim it". Now that is a pretty definite statement. But after he had seized power he asked, "Do I believe in Marxism?" Then answered his own question--"I believe absolutely in Marxism. I am a Marxist-Leninist until the last day of my life."

He added that he was a Communist leader back in 1953 when the Moncada barracks were attacked and believed in it in 1959 when he assumed the dictatorship of Cuba. Fidel Castro is a liar.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Back in 1920, when he was a nurseryman and farmer in Orange County in Southern California, Walter Knott probably had no idea that the roadside stand he and his wife opened to sell berries would someday turn into America's third most popular "theme" park, drawing five million visitors a year.

That's just what Knott's Berry Farm has done. Today, it is still family-owned and managed by second and third generation members of the Knott family. Walter Knott's farm is a classic American success story.

Today, Knott's farm is a 150-acre collection of rides, shops, restaurants, food stalls, Wild West relics and historic buildings. There are stagecoaches, trains, models of California's Spanish missions, a Roaring Twenties Airfield, a parachute drop, motorcycle chase, animal farm--well, the list seems almost endless. All this is set in a beautifully landscaped, tree covered park--a far cry from that little berry stand.

In common with other popular "theme" parks throughout the country, Walter Knott's enterprise is designed for family recreation. But, unlike the latter day parks which sprang, full-blown from drawing boards and blueprints, Knott's Berry Farm just grew and grew over the years.

In the early days, Walter Knott developed and promoted his boysenberry. Selling a variety of berries, he and his late wife Cordelia found that the world began beating a path to their roadside stand. Then, Mr. Knott decided to serve chicken dinner in the family's dining room to bring in a little extra money. They were a great hit. Soon, the waiting lines were so long Walter decided to buy an old hotel, dismantle it and rebuild it as a diversion for the dinner customers while they waited their turn. Today, the farm that Walter built has 20 eating places, and Mrs. Knott's Chicken Dinner Restaurant serves more than a million and a half chicken dinners ever year.

Though it has grown to be a \$60 million-a-year enterprise, Knott's Berry Farm has never lost the family touch. And, it still reflects its founder's deep love and patriotism for his country.

Walter Knott is 88 now and he still lives on the farm. Though he's not as active as he once was, he looks on with pride as the members of his family continue to do what he has been doing for so many years--bringing smiles of pleasure to people's faces.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Trains"

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

A good case can be made that the ills of railroading were brought on by excessive government interference in the running of the railroads. Now of course that same government has ridden to the rescue with Amtrak and in the East a combine called Conrail. Both are losing horrendous sums of taxpayers money every day.

I just have to read you a letter to the Department of Transportation from the "Texas South Eastern Railroad" responding to the Department's order that strobe lights be mounted on locomotives to reduce railroad crossing accidents. This letter was inserted in the Congressional record. There are several references to Conrail in the letter, possibly because Conrail has recently been trying to explain to Congress why it is losing millions and millions of dollars at the same time it wants to give a hefty pay raise to those who are managing Conrail.

The letter reads: Gentlemen: The best solution would be to require all motor vehicles to STOP, LOOK, AND LISTEN at all railroad grade crossings....This of course will never be considered because it would probably eliminate 95 per cent of all crossing accidents...It would also place a heavy drain on the legal profession and that alone will keep such action from ever being taken.

Therefore, we have on our own and without any government grant of any kind made an independent survey...We have determined that one strobe light on each locomotive will probably eliminate one per cent of all grade crossing accidents. Based on this assumption, if one hundred strobe lights were placed on each locomotive we could eliminate 100 per cent of all grade crossing accidents. We would also suggest that no trains be operated during daylight hours as daylight will reduce the effectiveness of the strobe lights.

Probably the next best method would be to require that all trains stop at all grade crossings. This, of course, would greatly increase the railroads' operating expenses. We have estimated this figure to be \$697,492,654,552.27 annually...Our figures were arrived at with the help of a cost expert on loan from Conrail.

This same gentleman advises us that this amount is insignificant, and that we could, of course, expect a government grant for this expense. One method would be to add this to Conrail's request for the next six months' Operating Expenses, where it would probably go unnoticed.

One other suggestion would be to require all vehicles to approach all grade crossings at 90 miles-per-hour. This would allow many motorists to beat the trains at a legal speed. Those that did not could be almost certain of not being crippled in the resulting collision.

Respectfully submitted,

George T. Honea

Vice President, General Manager
"Texas Southeastern Railroad"

RONALD REAGAN

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

For more than 200 years our nation has followed a policy of civilian control over the military. The President is the Commander in Chief; he appoints as Secretary of Defense a civilian and then come the uniformed Admirals and Generals.

The system was designed to guard against military dictatorship and it has served us very well. I'm sure no American, including those in uniform, would want to change it. Presidents have the counsel and advice of top military experts in the decisions they have to make with regard to our national safety, but Presidents in the final analysis make the decisions.

Several weeks ago we watched on TV as one Chief of Staff, General Brown, stepped down. In his farewell remarks the General warned us of danger ahead if we did not add to and strengthen our military capability.

A short time later on the TV screen we saw the President (who was not present at the previous ceremony) announce the appointment of a new Chief of Staff. He made this the occasion for remarks about our defense stature that were contrary to the warnings of the outgoing Chief.

It is no secret that this President has over-ridden the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff or ignored their opinion on several occasions. What happens if a President using his command authority appoints as Chiefs of the various services men who will tell him what he wants to hear rather than their best considered military opinion?

We have the case of General Singlaub who was transferred for expressing his opinion against withdrawing American troops from South Korea. Then later when he expressed a contrary view regarding the Newton war head decision he was --QUOTE-- "allowed" --UNQUOTE-- to take early retirement.

In the case of the Korean withdrawal he had been informed that there was "no announced decision" as yet. Indeed the South Koreans had been told they would be consulted before any decision was made. In truth they were not.

Now in retirement and free to express himself the General says we weren't honest with the South Koreans. He also says there was --QUOTE-- "no authentic military input concerning the decision to withdraw" --UNQUOTE-- . North Korea incidentally has a two-to-one advantage over South Korea in artillery, armor and combat aircraft. Their military forces are stronger than the combined American and South Korean forces before we withdraw.

The decision to withhold the Newton weapon was made with no attempt to get military advice. But most telling with regard to the President's unwillingness to take or seek advice was the word to the military regarding the Panama Canal treaties. The Joint Chiefs were told they could feel free to disagree with the treaties--and resign if they did so.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Proposition 13"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Following the passage of Proposition 13 in California and the wave of comment, criticism and just plain cheering that swept the nation, Gallup took a very interesting poll. His first question aimed right at those who pooh pooh cuts in government spending because, they claim, the people still demand services and handouts from government.

Mr. Gallup asked, "Would you favor or oppose a proposal in your state to cut or limit property taxes, even if it means a reduction in certain local services, or an increase in other forms of tax?" Nationwide the response was 57 percent would favor such a proposal, 30 percent said no. I won't bother giving the "don't knows".

Then Mr. Gallup asked how much the respondents believed property taxes could be cut without a serious reduction in local services or an increase in other kinds of taxes. All in all, 71 percent felt there could be a cut ranging from 10 percent to 50 percent or more. It broke down to 29 percent believing a 10 percent cut was possible, 23 percent thought a 20 percent cut, 11 percent a 30 percent cut and four percent each for a 40 or a 50 percent tax cut.

People of a more liberal bent continue to insist that the sales tax is unfair and that average citizens believe in the present graduated income tax. Gallup found this, too, was part of the economic mythology of our times. Only 10 percent thought the property tax was the fairest, 36 percent the income tax, but 43 percent approved the sales tax as most fair.

Continuing on the theme, the fifth question asked respondents to name the tax they most objected to. Income tax--federal, state and local--tied with real estate tax at 31% each. Sales tax was objectionable to only 16%.

The poll indicated the correctness of the Founding Fathers in wanting to keep government as much as possible at the local level. When asked which level of government gave the most value for the tax dollar, 22% said federal, 23% state and 35% local. When the poll asked why local taxes have increased in the past few years, 34% gave as a "very important" reason that people expect too many services from local government. But 57% said money is spent on programs and services that are not really needed, and 70% said too much money is spent on overhead and administration.

One final question inquired as to whether the respondent's community spent too much, too little or just the right amount on each of a list of local services. The replies revealed general satisfaction with those basic government services that bureaucrats all too often treat as luxuries. Fire and police protection, public libraries and sanitation were rated highest with regard to costing about the right amount. They averaged 57%; only eight percent thought they cost too much.

RONALD REAGAN
RADIO COMMENTARY

DISC 78-11

78-11A

Generic promos

1. SALT Talks I	3:03
2. SALT Talks II	2:59
3. Employment	2:35
4. Economics I	2:48
5. Economics II	3:09
6. Paperwork	2:56
7. Religious Freedom	2:38

78-11B

1. Miscellaneous	2:58
2. Rome	2:51
3. South Seas	2:37
4. Prisoner Exchange	2:51
5. Local Government Center	3:00
6. Alternative Energy and Uncle Sam	2:31
7. A Refugee Success Story	2:34
8. Accidents	2:42

PLEASE NOTE:

THERE ARE TWO SETS OF PROGRAMS IN
THIS SHIPMENT.

78-11 programs are provided for airing
from August 21st through September 8th
inclusive. Maintaining this schedule
will enable your station to air all
newly recorded programs 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 "SALT Talks I"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

You might be interested in some time tables as presented by former Secretary of the Air Force Thomas C. Reed. Tom was part of our Sacramento team in the early days and then moved into the Pentagon. By training he is a nuclear physicist. He challenges the concept that "detente" has eliminated the possibility of a nuclear showdown with the Soviet Union.

In a presentation to the American Security Council he reviewed recent history beginning with the Cuban missile crisis 16 years ago. It was October, 1962 when the world for six days hung on the brink of nuclear war. Then the Russians blinked and their missiles were removed from Cuba.

President Kennedy expressed the hope that the governments of the world could--QUOTE--"turn their earnest attention to the compelling necessities for ending the arms race and reducing world tensions."--UNQUOTE--. Unfortunately the Soviet Union turned its "earnest attention" to a massive build-up of military force. A Soviet deputy foreign minister said--QUOTE--"Never will we be caught like this again."--UNQUOTE-- They were caught because we had overwhelming nuclear superiority at the time.

Two years later in 1964 Brezhnev had replaced Khrushchev and began the work of keeping that deputy foreign ministers promise. He began increasing the resources dedicated to military programs. By 1969 the Soviets had passed us in numbers of ICBM--Intercontinental Ballistic Missile silos. By 1970 with a gross national product only half as great as ours they were spending more on arms than we were.

Now follow this time table Tom Reed has put together, remembering that in 1962 we had about an eight-to-one edge over the Soviets. By 1971 they outnumbered us in tactical aircraft. By 1973 their surface navy outnumbered ours. Also in 1973 they flew their multiple independently targeted re-entry vehicles--MIRVs. These are the multiple nuclear warheads carried by one rocket which separate in flight and fly onto different targets. We had them but thought the Russians were years away from catching up. By 1974 they passed us in the number of submarine launching tubes for nuclear missiles. They also added one million men to their armed forces. By 1975 their spending on strategic offensive nuclear forces was double ours and seven times as much in the field of ballistic missiles.

Also in 1975 they began full-scale production and deployment of the backfire supersonic long-range bomber. They called it a medium range aircraft but it is capable of attacking targets in the United States. By 1976 they deployed their Delta-class submarines equipped with a new 4,200 mile missile. We have a comparable submarine system called the Trident. It won't be on line till 1981. In 1977 they demonstrated a non-nuclear weapon capable of knocking our satellites out of space.

And now it is 1978 and the Soviets are preparing to test their fifth generation of ICBM's while they undergo a massive replacement of existing missiles with a fourth generation system. We completed our last Minuteman Silo in 1967.

RONALD REAGAN

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

On the last broadcast I quoted a former Secretary of the Air Force, Tom Reed, regarding the Soviet buildup of military power and the dates by which they had achieved significant military posts. Today I'd like to continue and start with a future date--1985.

Quite a while ago I did a commentary which involved 1985. Our military intelligence had learned that Brezhnev told a secret meeting of Communist leaders that detente was a strategem to allow the Soviets time to build up their military so that by 1985 they could exert their will wherever they wished.

Former Secretary Reed asks--QUOTE--"What is it about 1985 that captures Brezhnevs attention."--UNQUOTE--. Then he points out that both the CIA and an independent study led by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology point to world oil shortages beginning in about 1981. Right now the Soviet Union is supplying oil to its East European satellites who can't afford to buy it from the OPEC nations. Tom suggests that the Soviets will not let those satellites starve for energy in the mid 80's and points to the 1,500 mile border Russia has with oil rich Iran and the conflicting interests of Russia and Norway in the North Sea oil.

To those who think "detente" is working because things seem to be quiet right now Tom says--QUOTE--"it's always quiet when you are feeding the alligator--when you throw him an arm or leg every now and then--when you drop Angola or Somalia over the side without much of a splash, when you ill the B-1 and abort the MX missile. Under those circumstances", he says, "things are bound to be quiet--except for the munching and crunching."--UNQUOTE--. Will places like Iran or Norway be fed to the alligator when the time comes?

If we started right now to resume production of the B-1, it wouldn't be operational until 1985. If we moved ahead on the MX missiles they couldn't be deployed until 1984.

We are negotiating the SALT II treaty from a position of weakness. Very shortly a proposed agreement will be presented to the Senate for ratification and without doubt that agreement will be flawed and not in our best interest. It would be easy to say we should respond with a flat "no". The answer is not that simple. There should be a most thorough and painstaking study of SALT II particularly with regard to our right to verify whether or not Russia could cheat. If the answer is that Russia could and if the treaty is--as it probably will be--balanced in Russia's favor, the Senate should reject it. But, at the same time the Congress should be prepared to go forward with a military build-up of our own.

Tom Reed reminds us of Somerset Maughams admonition:--QUOTE--"If a nation values anything more than freedom, it will lose its freedom and the irony of it is, that if its comfort or money that it values more, it will lose that too."--UNQUOTE--

We can have the strategic superiority we had in 1962 if we have the will. Or as former Air Force Secretary Reed asks,--QUOTE--"Will our national leaders face the 1980's alone, with nothing but a broad smile and good intentions to protect us in our final days."--UNQUOTE--.

RONALD REAGAN

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

In past broadcasts I've talked of the probability that we aren't getting an honest count and haven't for some time with regard to unemployment. For months metropolitan papers in their Sunday editions have carried scores and scores of pages of help wanted ads.

Why then should we continue to be given information that indicates large-scale unemployment with all its heartbreak for those vainly seeking jobs? One answer could be that so many government programs in the social reform field exist only if there is chronic and persistent unemployment.

Curiously enough "we the people" with an almost instinctive wisdom have given indications that we no longer consider unemployment a top priority. When polled as to what are our most important national problems, inflation is number one by an overwhelming majority. Unemployment is down with the also rans. And as is so often the case--the people are right.

Last April the number of unemployed fell below six million for the first time since 1974. Now jobless people numbering six million would indicate that do have a problem but that is not necessarily so. There are many of those who are first time job seekers, even more who are voluntarily unemployed. And it is estimated that possibly two million actually have jobs but are working for cash to avoid taxes. Really significant figures have to do with among other things how long the unemployed remain out of a job. The average for all labor is less than 13 weeks but for skilled workers it is less than a month. Add to this the fact that a greater number of moonlighting--holding down two jobs--and it's easy to understand why many industries are hoarding man power fearing a shortage.

More than 100 million Americans are working--the greatest number in our history. The most astounding figure however, at a time when government is still claiming that unemployment is a problem, has to do with the percentage of adults who are employed, 63 percent of all those over age 16 in America are employed. That too is an all time high figure and establishes the fact that more women must be in the work force than at any time in our history.

It's time to re-order our priorities. The jobs those 100 million Americans hold are vulnerable to an energy shortage. An even greater threat is declining productivity due to aging and obsolescence of our industrial plant brought on by unnecessary government regulation and short sighted tax policies.

Meanwhile back at the ranch--we have double digit inflation and that is the biggest threat of all.

RONALD REAGAN

(Réprint of a radio program entitled "Economics I"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Early in July the leadership of the California AFL-CIO met in convention and made a few decisions that will affect the livelihood of the workers they represent. These leaders of organized labor were more than a little upset about the passage of Proposition 13. Meaning no disrespect, I feel compelled to say the remedies they proposed reveal that they believe too many of the economic fairy tales widespread in our land today.

In the first place they must be out of step with their own rank and file members because those members voted for Proposition 13 in large and enthusiastic numbers.

But where the economic fairy tale shows up is in the conventions decision to battle for re-imposing the property tax Proposition 13 cancelled back on business and industry. They said it was a three-and-one-half billion dollars break for business and therefore by their reasoning bad for the individual citizen. If they have their way that three-and-one-half billion dollars will end up being paid by the very individual citizens they claim they want to help.

Whether it be corporation or corner store, taxes are part of business costs and must be recovered in the price of the product. Meaning that all of us consumers pay those taxes.

Let's take the case of a corner grocer in a nice middle class neighborhood. The store keeper rents the building. Everyone who shops there can understand that he must charge enough to cover the wholesale cost of the things he sells, wages to helpers and his rent plus a fair return for himself so he can make a living. But now supposing he buys the building? There is no more rent but there is interest on the mortgage and property tax instead of rent. Obviously he can't stay in business if those costs can't be recovered in the price of the things he sells. And just like his wage earning customers--many of them union members--he has to make enough gross income to pay his living costs--after he has paid his income tax.

What this all adds up to is that government can't tax things like businesses or corporations, it can only tax people. When it says it's going to "make business pay", it is really saying it is going to make business help it collect taxes.

Into our corner store comes a regular customer to pick up a loaf of bread on his way home. We've already covered the fact that the grocers mark up includes a share of the property tax on the store. But the truth is the wholesale price the store keeper paid to the bakery included its taxes and more than 150 others going all the way back to the farmer who raised the wheat. If he can't get a price for his wheat that will cover the real estate tax on his farm, he can't stay in business either. If the trucker who hauled the wheat can't charge enough to cover his license fee and gasoline tax, he can't stay in business.

Union leaders will serve the men and women they represent a lot better if they'll drop the demagogery and take a simple course in economics.

RONALD REAGAN

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

On my last commentary I criticized the AFL-CIO California convention for adopting some resolutions which were actually hurtful to the men and women they represent. I spoke specifically on the false idea that business can be made to pay a larger share of the tax burden thus relieving individuals. The truth, of course is that business taxes are part of the cost of operation and must be paid by the customer in the increased price of the product.

But the labor leaders in that California convention made other decisions equally harmful to their rank and file members. For example, they raised the old cry--born of demagogery--that income taxes should be more progressive, making those with higher earnings pay a bigger share of the tax.

Well right now at less than \$10,000 a year--and I don't think many union members earn less--you are in the top 50 percent of income earners in the United States and you pay 94 percent of the total income tax. At a little over \$20,000 you are in the top 10 percent and that 10 percent pays half the total tax. And if you are talking of the one half of one percent who earn \$50,000 a year and up--go ahead, raise their tax to 100 percent, take every dollar they earn and it will run the government for less than three days.

The delegates to that California AFL-CIO convention I'm sure were well intentioned but they made it clear they did not want a cut in government spending. They want more tax revenues to pay for that spending and they don't seem to realize the only source of additional revenues is the great working, middle class which includes their own members. And which works almost five months a year to pay for the cost of government.

Finally the other proposal the convention made was to gain more revenue from the capital gains tax. The delegates echoed the President's ill considered charge that a reduced capital gains tax constituted a windfall for millionaires. Frankly speaking the President was a little off base.

It's hard to get great numbers of people excited about the capital gains tax. Very simply it is the tax one pays upon selling for a profit something one owns. It is true it affects mostly those who have savings to invest in stocks, land, or some other object. It is also true that capital investment is what fuels our industry and creates jobs. Our competitors in world trade such as Japan and West Germany--even Socialist England have no tax on long term capital gains.

But it isn't true to say it affects only people of wealth. Half of all those reporting capital gains have adjusted gross incomes below \$15,000. And more than half of the total amount of capital gains is reported by people with incomes below \$25,000.

In 1969 we virtually doubled the Capital gains tax. In 1970 there were 31 million investors putting up the capital to increase productions and create jobs. Today there are fewer than 25 million.

I wish today's labor leaders had the statesmanship of the American Federation of Labor Leaders in 1942 who demanded that the Capital gains tax be reduced if not eliminated because it was preventing the investment of capital needed to create jobs for their members.

RONALD REAGAN

(Réprint of a radio program entitled "Paperwork"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

The Federal government goes to press more often than the New York TIMES. The United States Printing Office spews forth about 600 documents per day. Now I'm not talking about forms or questionnaires. These are truly documents supposedly designed to inform the citizenry and by so doing make our lives richer and fuller. OSHA for example on a given day comes up with a booklet called "Safety with Beef Cattle".

It contains gems such as "Hazards are one of the main causes of accidents." I think I'm correct in saying it is also the manual that informs the farmer he should keep his eyes on the ground when walking about the farm because here and there, there might be a slippery substance which if he stepped in it could cause a nasty fall.

But to get back to the total number of such documents, in 1976 alone there were 150,000 printed. There are several depositories in the country. At one, the main library of the University of Iowa, it takes one full-time employee just to open and sort the 14 boxes that arrive each day. Then nine other employees take over to catalogue and put the documents on the shelves. According to a University of Iowa source, the index is practically useless as a means of finding any particular subject matter.

On this subject of government paper the National Review Bulletin not too long ago posed an interesting problem. "Suppose you're a gasoline service station operator. It's the busy season and you're running from the pumps to the repair rack and back again. And suppose the day's mail brings you a bulky envelope from the Department of Energy. You open the envelope and find a detailed questionnaire, entitled "Retail Motor Fuels Service Station's Survey". And you are informed that "under public law 93-275" you are compelled to fill out the questionnaire.

You wade into it trying to follow instructions like this: "Suppose the full-service pump selling price for leaded regular gasoline is 62.8 cents per gallon on the first day of the month. Suppose on the 10th of the month the price is raised to 64.9 cents per gallon; and on the 25th of the month, it is reduced to 61.9 cents per gallon. In order to provide the required data, you should list the accumulator reading on the full-service leaded regular gasoline pump when the station opens on the first day, the 10th day and the 25th day of the month, and when the station closes on the last day of the month."

About 8,000 of the 15,000 service station operators threw the whole packets away. They had been selected by the new Energy Agency as guinea pigs in a survey but they weren't about to play once they had struggled through the printed material. Now what did the Department of Energy do? Well believe it or not it sent its Fuels Survey questionnaire to the seventh grade class of the Ellicott City Middle School of Maryland--for revision and criticism. With all its 20,000 employees the department thought maybe seventh graders could rewrite the thing and make it understandable.

My own hunch is the kids threw it away to prove they had the same good common sense these service station operators had.

RONALD REAGAN

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

I think sometimes there is a built-in optimism in Americans that makes us want to believe that things are all right in other lands and other places. Perhaps it is this happy outlook that makes us accept the stories of returning travelers from behind the iron or the bamboo curtains.

There is plenty of evidence indicating that visitors to the various "workers paradises" are treated to show case tours, but carefully kept from seeing things as they really are. Of late we've had the make believe exposed by visitors to Cuba, China and elsewhere who, with courage and persistence, risked possible imprisonment to look behind the false front.

One of the more prevalent myths has to do with religious freedom and whether it does or does not exist in those lands where Karl Marx is hailed as the Messiah. The World Council of Churches seems unable to believe that religion might be forbidden fruit in the Communist world. The fact that a few churches in Russia remain open and are attended by an ever shrinking group of senior citizens makes the council ignore the uncompromising Marxian denial of God. He swore that his paradise could only be realized by destroying the church. He had a special hatred for the Hebrews, possibly because the God of Moses is also the God of Christianity.

Not too long ago Austrian journalists got hold of an examination being given school children in Czechoslovakia. They made their findings public and it does seem to answer those who have denied that communism and religious persecution go hand in hand.

There are 15 questions in the examination, but I think three are enough to settle any argument. In giving the test the students are instructed that they are to answer "correctly, truthfully, and honestly". Question one: "If you are religious, are you aware that your religious rating will form a serious obstruction with a view to your future career." If that one isn't discouraging enough, try this one: "Our school is educating you as a skilled worker of the future. Since you will participate in the leadership of the production process, your attitude toward religion must be clear. For this reason the school has the right to influence your religious attitude and your feelings in respect to your future job. Does the school--the teaching staff--do this with conviction? Answer yes or no."

Now if that one isn't enough to put little Ivan's teacher on notice, here is sample number three. "During your term of study at the school, was enough insight and help given in the battle against religion and its pressures and in the formation of a scientific view of the world?"

So much for religious freedom in the world of communism. I doubt that many children behind the curtains treasure gold stars for Sunday School attendance.

RONALD REAGAN

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

I think most of us were surprised at how little uproar we heard from the top most levels of organized labor when their so called "labor reform bill" was killed by a Senate filibuster. It's possible that in labors top most echelons they've been reading the polls.

The measure labor had designated as number one on its hit list and which had White House support would have made it easier for Unions to organize non-union shops, easier for recruiters to operate on business premises, and would have speeded up union representation elections. Pollster Caddell's most recent sounding found that Americans by better than seven to one do not want those very things. Even more telling were other polls taken among union members themselves showing that the hierarchy of organized labor is completely out of step with its rank and file who think the union leaders have too much power now.

This paragraph has to do with Federal regulations. It's a breakdown on their cost; almost five billion dollars for governments cost in running the 41 regulatory agencies, \$96 billion spent by business--but paid by us in the price of things we buy--to comply with regulations, \$32 billion for the paperwork required by Washington and two billion dollars in loss of productivity by employees who have to spend all or part of their time dealing with the regulators. All in all it totals \$134.8 billion. That's too big a figure for anyone to comprehend so look at it this way--it's about \$612 a year for every man, woman, child and baby in the land.

The administration is still determined to normalize relations with the Communist tyrants of Hanoi. World Bank President Robert McNamara isn't waiting however. World Bank funds will provide a huge loan--largely of our money--to Hanoi for repair of irrigation dykes destroyed by our bombers--in raids Robert McNamara authorized when he was defense secretary.

The next little tidbit comes indirectly by way of a "Time" correspondent in the Middle East. A Soviet K.G.B. agent happily confided to him that all the cloak and dagger operations the Soviet Union and the United States have conducted against each other none benefited the K..G.B. as much as the campaign in our country to discredit the C.I.A. The KGB agent said--QUOTE--"In our wildest scenarios, we could never have anticipated such a plus for our side. It's the kind of gift all espinoge men dream about. Today our boys have it a lot easier and we didn't have to lift a finger. You did all our work for us."UNQUOTE--.

Well you can't say we aren't going all out for detente.

By the way there's going to be a B-1 bomber after all. Well almost. The Soviet Union has decided to develop a nuclear bomber according to testimony given the Senate Armed Services Committee by the Defense Intelligence Agency and it looks very much like the B-1 we're not going to make. It will be in operation before 1985.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Back in 1939 an amateur historian, H. J. Haskell, Washington correspondent for the Kansas City Star, wrote a book called "The New Deal in Old Rome". The idea for the book came to him when he and his wife were touring Europe in pre-World War II days.

They drove over a Roman built bridge in Southern France that towered 165 feet in the air. It was also an aqueduct. And almost 2,000 years after its construction that aqueduct was still carrying water.

Haskell wondered how a civilization that could build such wonders could simply disappear into the dust bin of history. And thus a book was born.

Rome, with a population of about one million, received 250 million gallons of water a day through 11 great aqueducts for its several hundred swimming pools, 856 public baths and 13,000 fountains. Even though there was no printing press, books were plentiful and Rome alone numbered 28 public libraries. Roman houses had indoor plumbing, with flush toilets.

We can envy a little the Roman postal system that extended north into Europe and south to Egypt and guaranteed safe delivery. Roman justice made possible such things as commercial contracts, property laws, marriage and divorce, wills, trust, etc.

We've inherited something not necessarily the best of Rome. Quintas, younger brother of Cicero, didn't think his brother was a tough enough politician so he wrote a handbook to guide him. He said that "a flattering manner wrong in other walks of life, was indispensable in seeking public office". And he urged that if possible one should attempt to get a scandal started against an opponent.

But it was in the growth of government intervention that we should find a warning. They set interest rates, devalued the currency, created a wheat subsidy and then dumped wheat on the market. There were extensive public works like our New Deal--WPA; a welfare system and food stamps. Believe it or not, they had a depression and created a Home Loan Corporation, an Agricultural Adjustment Administration which plowed under half the grapes to stop over production of wine and their basic coin, the Denarius, sank lower and lower in purchasing power. They, of course, didn't have printing press money, but they increased the money supply by adding copper to the silver in the Denarius. It went from 94 percent silver to only two-one-hundreds of one percent in Rome's final days.

They even tried wage and price controls with capital punishment for violators, but even then they didn't work as they don't work now. By that time government in Rome had brought commerce and industry to a halt with confiscatory taxation and a network of regulations.

In his closing lines, Haskell did not attempt to draw a parallel as to the safe limits of modern government spending, but did say "it is possible to involve destructive taxation with the dangers of inflation".

RONALD REAGAN

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

Most of us at some time or other have gone Polynesian in our day dreams. The very words "South Sea Island" brings up pictures of white coral sand, blue sky water, balmy breezes and just possibly a ukulele providing background music.

I'm sure there still must be such islands. If there aren't I don't want to know that. But I'm having trouble clinging to my day dream. A married couple from New Mexico set out on a cruise to the South Pacific and I've been reading an account of their trip.

Several days beyond Hawaii they came to one of the Micronesian islands awarded to the United States after World War II. Some of the indestructible charm of the South Pacific is there--after all blue sea is blue sea and sand is sand but it wasn't helped by beer cans and rusting automobile bodies. That dreamy island music is now a juke box.

It seems that back in the early 60's we decided to improve life for our Micronesian wards. Thousands of civil servants journeyed to the islands to supervise education, hygiene and various sociological programs. Financial aid followed of course--about \$1,000 per native. It is estimated that an average of \$162. of each 1,000 is regularly invested in bottle goods. This had led to further advantages of civilization such as alcoholism and crime. One does not go for an evening stroll 'neath the coconut palms unless one wants to get bopped on the noggin and not by a falling coconut.

The natives do not go forth at day break in their canoes to spear fish for a luau. Japanese fishing boats have caught the fish which are canned and sent back to the island for sale. Somehow it's hard to get romantic over a can opener.

Our touring couple asked an elderly man what it was like under the Japanese occupation during the war. He said--QUOTE--"very bad--much work, no money". Then they asked how it was under good old Uncle Sugar and he answered, "No work, plenty money."--UNQUOTE.

A plebiscite who held offering the people a choice between economic development and welfare--welfare won by a country mile. The growth in population is increasing and like feeding deer, we have made the natives on this island so totally dependent on our help, there would be great suffering if we put them back on their own. The rice fields are gone and the mills are idle and deteriorating.

But hold on to your dream. Our touring couple sailed onto another island and while it showed some signs of modern day culture it was still South Pacific as it should be--largely due to the efforts of missionaries who feel their duty is to import religion and the dignity of honest toil.

There's a lesson in here--someplace. Both government and the missionaries have the same motive--they want to help the islanders.

Maybe government should try bringing God instead of Gold.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Anatoly Shcharansky has been sentenced. He will now disappear into the Soviet Union's Gulag Archipelago for 13 years of labor on a starvation diet, plus whatever additional tortures come to his jailers' minds.

Free people all over the world are outraged at this further example of Soviet hypocrisy. From Moscow has come the accusation that Shcharansky is an American spy. Our President has of course denied this. There have been hints that the Soviets might be willing to free Shcharansky in exchange for a couple of known Soviet spies we have in jail.

At first hearing most of us would probably say, "why not"? We caught the spies, they can't do any more damage, send them back. In return a man who had the courage to stand up to Russia's slave masters would be free to tell the world what life is like behind the Iron Curtain, just as Alexander Solzhenitsyn and others have done. Unfortunately, things aren't that simple in the world of international diplomacy.

If we made such an exchange, the Soviets would have a great propaganda victory. They would challenge the President's credibility. Hadn't he been willing to exchange their spies for ours?

Now, however, Alexander Yanov, exiled from Russia four years ago, a distinguished professor of Slavic languages, has suggested a way to get Shcharansky out of Russia and the slave labor camp.

Some weeks ago on one of these commentaries, I told of the great Soviet propaganda campaign concerning a prisoner on "death row" in Alabama. The Soviet press and television have made this man, John Harris, a national hero to the Russians. They have told their people he is being executed for simply expressing his views. The truth is, Harris is a convicted robber, rapist and murderer. He is not a political prisoner. In fact, he committed murder while serving a life sentence for other crimes.

Yanov has made a brilliant suggestion. We say Shcharansky is a political prisoner. The Russians say he is a common criminal. They say Harris is a political prisoner and we say he is a common criminal. Why not trade them -- Harris for Shcharansky?

After all their build up and propaganda about Harris in their own land, they'd look pretty silly if they refused to save him from the electric chair when they could bring him to the Soviet Union for a ticker tape parade. Come to think of it, we'd have to send them the ticker tape too.

Yanov has suggested that Ambassador Andrew Young, in view of his charge that our prisons house hundreds, maybe thousands of political prisoners, is the logical one to propose the Harris-Shcharansky trade. He could follow up and free scores more of those Harris-type political prisoners he says we have by exchanging them for Piatleus, Ginsberg, Yuri Orlov, Kovalev, Slepak and other inhabitants of Gulag.

Yanov has another suggestion, if any of our prisoners refuse to leave their jail cells in America for freedom in Russia -- let Brezhnev explain such a puzzling phenomenon to the world.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Several years ago a couple of bright young men named Mark Frazier and Robert Poole recognized an important unmet need. That was to develop efficient ways for cities to meet their public service responsibilities. Poole, an urban systems analyst for a California think tank, and Frazier, a journalist just out of Harvard, got together and organized the Local Government Center in Santa Barbara, California.

They began to accumulate information on good ideas for making municipal services more cost effective, including especially the use of private contracting for garbage removal, public works and even fire departments. Under the sponsorship of the National Taxpayer's Union, Poole launched a copyrighted monthly newspaper column called "Fiscal Watchdog". The Center published a booklet entitled "Cut Local Taxes", which focused not on cutting out municipal programs so much as putting them on an economically sound, cost effective footing.

Some of the Center's discoveries are astounding. They found that private paramedic services were as much as 70% less in cost than comparable publicly run services. They unearthed a Columbia University study showing that it costs 68% more for a city department to collect garbage than for a private firm to do it. Los Angeles County found a management system that was able to cut the welfare error and fraud rate from 14% to 2.67% in just four years. Scottsdale, Arizona has pioneered in contracting out its entire fire protection program to a private firm.

Contracting out is not the only way a city can conserve scarce tax dollars. The Local Government Center did a survey of user fee systems, and found numerous examples of cities trying to apportion the costs of recreation, tree trimming, library, street sweeping and other programs directly to those who benefit from the programs, instead of imposing the costs on all the taxpayers.

The passage of Proposition 13, the tax limitation amendment, in California has suddenly sent city officials all over the country looking for ways to maintain essential services within much tighter budgets. Fortunately, the Local Government Center has just completed a remarkable multi-volume management study called "More for Less". This is a compendium of proven techniques for cost effective local government along with firsthand commentaries by the people who made the programs work. Included are pieces by Lou Witzeman, the Scottsdale fire chief; Pat Gallagher of the Police Foundation; Dr. Barbara Stevens of the Columbia University solid waste efficiency study and Robert Carleson who was United States Commissioner of Welfare and earlier spearheaded our successful California welfare reform program.

With tax limitation catching on everywhere, the Local Government Center is likely to move a lot of copies of "More for Less". If you're interested, you can get more information from the Local Government Center, 221 W. Carrillo, Santa Barbara, California 93101.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Alternative Energy and Uncle Sam"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

The Arab oil embargo of 1973 produced a lot of effects on America, and one of the beneficial ones was a great upsurge in creative research and development of alternative energy sources. Chief among these have been, of course, solar and wind energy. Naturally, there have been voices raised in Congress for Uncle Sam to spend more and more money on developing these new energy sources. But now some of the most respected voices in the alternative energy field are discrediting the arguments for ever-increasing government subsidies.

Tom Bender is one such person. He was a leader in the creation of the National Center for Appropriate Technology, funded by the Federal Community Services Agency, but he has become a sharp critic of that organization and the federal funding approach in general. Bender says that government funding for alternative technology is probably not necessary, mainly because so much progress is being made without it. There is a growing awareness, he says, "that our problems must largely be resolved by local responsibility and action, and that government money is not free dollars but only our own hard work and taxes, diluted 5 to 1 with bureaucratic red tape and control." We always get the best results with our own money", he adds, "because we're more careful with it. Local money is second best, and federal money the most dangerous."

Another leading figure in solar energy development, Steve Baer, is even more critical. Baer says that President Carter is silly to hand out so much rhetoric about a national energy policy. Baer says there shouldn't be any national energy policy because no one has the wisdom to make one. "We do not need a Department of Energy," he declares. "We do not need laws governing everything from the car you drive to the windows in your house. Foolish people will waste their money on inefficient cars and badly built houses; isn't that their business?"

"Leave people alone with enough wealth after they pay their taxes and they will invent, develop, trade with each other and do a good job of solving their own problems," says Baer. It's a great shame that the so-called energy crisis is being used by politicians to increase taxes and laws - thereby taking away liberties Americans have previously enjoyed. Behind every gentleman working on government research stand the police. I don't think the founders of our country had this relationship in mind." UNQUOTE from solar energy leader Steve Baer.

These solar pioneers are right on target. After we've heard so much romantic rhetoric about alternative energy sources, this kind of realism is refreshing, isn't it?

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "A Refugee Success Story"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Five years ago Nguyen Huy Han held a very important position. He was director of taxation for all of South Vietnam, one of the top administrative posts in his country. But, with the fall of South Vietnam to the Communists, Nguyen Huy Han fled to America, determined to build a new life for himself in a strange land.

He settled in Pontiac, Michigan and opened an unusual restaurant. It's called the West-East Ethnic Restaurant and, in addition to Vietnamese and American dishes, he offers such extras as Mexican enchiladas and Indian curry. His customers like it -- in fact, they like it to much that he now has more than 1,500 of them as regulars. One reason they like it is that Nguyen Huy Han has instituted what may be the only customer profit-sharing plan in the restaurant business.

In 1977 Mr. Han had a good year. He decided that his steady customers should share in his rewards. So, after putting aside reserves for emergencies and giving himself a reasonable return on labor and capital, Han allocated \$10,000 for the people who were responsible for his good fortune -- his customers.

Every time his steady customers pay for a meal, the cashier credits a running account, kept by customer number. At the end of the year customers get a patronage refund amounting to as much as 20% of the amount they've paid for meals.

Mr. Han's customers naturally appreciate the rebate, in addition to the good food, but there is more to it than that. Americans can't help but admire and respect a man forced out of his native land who starts over again and works so hard to become an independent and responsible citizen in a new country.

His customers know that Mr. Han lives with a sister, an 84-year-old mother and three nephews more than a mile from the restaurant. They know he walks back and forth to work every day of the week and spends 15 hours a day making his restaurant a success. They admire that kind of spirit.

Mr. Han may be unusual in Pontiac, Michigan, but his story is typical of many in California, where many Asian refugees have settled. Under the most difficult circumstances, thousands of new Asian-Americans have worked long and diligently to stand on their own feet and build a better life for their families and their communities. They have set to work with a will, and I thank God that the American system is still free enough that their dedication brings deserved rewards to them.

Mr. Han and many others like him are showing all of us a bright example of the virtues of freedom and opportunity. We should be working together to keep that freedom and opportunity alive.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Automobile accidents are no laughing matter, indeed they are serious and too often tragic but someone has found a lighter side, if that is possible.

The way of the Toronto Sun comes a list of quotations from insurance or accident forms. These are the statements all too many of us have had to make when we fill out a form summarizing exactly what happened in an accident. I thought you might enjoy hearing some of the more imaginative ones.

There is, for example, the man who explained: "Coming home, I drove into the wrong house and collided with a tree -- I don't have." Or the fellow who wrote: "I thought my window was down, but found out it was up when I put my hand through it." This one should give you something to think about; "I collided with a stationary truck coming the other way." Another fellow said: "my car was legally parked -- as it backed into the other vehicle." And, "the telephone pole was approaching fast. I was attempting to reverse out of its path when it struck my front end." You'd think Ralph Nader would do something about those reckless telephone poles!

Just suppose you're an insurance claims adjuster, it's Monday morning, you've had a nice weekend at the beach and now you sit down at your desk, faced with a stack of reports such as these.

"A truck backed through my windshield into my wife's face."

"The guy was all over the road; I had to swerve a number of times before I hit him."

"I was on my way to the doctor's with rear-end trouble when my universal joint gave way, causing me to have an accident."

"A pedestrian hit me and went under my car."

"I told the police I wasn't injured, but on removing my hat, I found that I had a skull fracture."

"The pedestrian had no idea which way to go -- so I ran over him." Now, you'll have to admit that shows a certain ability to make quick decisions. Just as this next one reveals a compassionate nature.

"I saw the slow-moving, sad-faced old gentleman as he bounced off the hood of my car."

"The indirect cause of this accident was a little guy in a small car -- with a big mouth."

This next fellow must like to bet on sure things. He reports, "I was sure the old fellow would never make it to the other side of the roadway when I struck him."

Here's another one of those telephone poles, only this time the pole isn't to blame. "In my attempt to kill a fly, I drove into a telephone pole."

Detroit is going to have to do something about cars that fail to communicate. One victim reports: "The other car collided with mine without giving warning of its intentions."

And finally, "I was unable to stop in time and my car crashed into the other vehicle. The driver and passengers then left immediately for a vacation -- with injuries." Well, times up -- I'm leaving immediately -- without injuries I hope.

Taped: Extras
Air: 9/11-9/29/78

RONALD REAGAN
RADIO COMMENTARY

DISC 78-12

78-12A

Generic promos

1. Income Tax	2:49
2. British Health Care	2:48
3. History	3:08
4. Brainwashing I	2:55
5. Brainwashing II	3:00
6. Tax Revolt	3:03
7. Left and Right	2:52

78-12B

1. The Average Man	2:48
2. Polls and Guns	2:48
3. Guantanamo	2:43
4. Government Costs	2:57
5. Pay Raise	3:12
6. Miscellaneous	2:43
7. Two Worlds	3:07
8. Technology	2:41

PLEASE NOTE:

THERE ARE TWO SETS OF PROGRAMS IN
THIS SHIPMENT.

78-12 programs are provided for airing
from September 11th through September
29th inclusive. Maintaining this schedule
will enable your station to air all
newly recorded programs received.

Please be advised that our office does not
fulfill requests from listeners for copies
of Governor Reagan's radio programs. The
enclosed copies are provided to you for
that purpose.

RONALD REAGAN

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

With the fever for tax reduction running high throughout the land, Congress is debating changes in the income tax law. Much of that debate is over how much to reduce the tax - which in itself is something of a monumental breakthrough. Very few voices are raised in opposition to a cut and none suggest an increase.

Of course I'm talking about elected representatives who will submit themselves to the voters in November. Over in the offices and corridors of the Internal Revenue Service no such foolishness as reducing the citizens' tax burden is tolerated. Jerome Kurtz, Internal Revenue Commissioner has suggested that if a taxpayer wants to pay less income tax he should - QUOTE -- "take a lower paying job."

If Congress won't give him new laws increasing the tax, Commissioner Kurtz just might use his authority to pass a few regulations on his own. U. S. News & World Report recently listed some 40 so-called fringe benefits the Internal Revenue Service is assessing as possible income, subject to tax.

Time won't permit listing all 40 but let me read you some to show how phoney is the constant talk of loopholes with its inference that tax deductions benefit only the well-heeled.

For example, "Free parking on employer's premises." "In-kind benefits, such as free or cut-rate telephone and power service for retired employees of phone companies and other utilities." That, of course, aims directly at senior citizens on fixed incomes as does the idea of taxing residents of, "Old age homes provided by companies for their retired employees."

And listen to these "fringe benefits" the Internal Revenue Service would tax: "Christmas gifts worth more than \$25 from employers; vacation facilities maintained by companies for free use by employees; employee cafeterias and executive dining rooms offering subsidized prizes; lunch and dinner money provided for employees in all sorts of situations; company picnics; Christmas lunches; parties; taxi fares for employees coming or going after dark and free transportation to plants or offices in distant locations or unsafe neighborhoods."

All of these are the things we've always thought of as the mark of a good, responsible employer. And speaking of employers, the Internal Revenue Service would like to tax "free receptions and entertainment for wives at trade conventions." That smacks a little of using taxation to separate husband and wife. Another so-called fringe benefit is the provision of bodyguards for corporate executives. With the number of businessmen who have been kidnap and murder victims or terrorists that hardly seems a luxury. On the Internal Revenue Service list there are, of course, all the perquisites of country club memberships, company jets, and so forth. All-in-all, the Internal Revenue Service is putting itself in the management role by using taxation as more than a means of raising revenue.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "British Health Care"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Back in 1948 when Britain's Prime Minister Clement Atlee saw his dream of socialized medicine come true, he believed it heralded the beginning of an England so healthy, doctors would go out of style. Maybe that is extreme, but he was sure that the new system would bring such improvements in the health of the people that medical costs would become less and less.

In its first year, however, the costs were double what had been anticipated and now, after 30 years, the program is the target of bitter criticism by doctors, patients and politicians. For a year now a royal commission has been studying the system to find a way out of what is openly called a health care crisis.

With compulsory national health insurance being pushed by some of our own politicians we'd better learn what that Royal commission has learned. First, they concluded that hospitals are worn out and antiquated, lacking modern equipment. Half were built in the last century.

Next, there is an enormous waiting list for what are called non-urgent operations such as hernia, arthritic joints or varicose veins. They may be called non-urgent, but more than 600,000 people are waiting and will wait for years for operations to correct such painful and disabling problems.

A top-heavy bureaucracy has created an unworkable mass of red tape. There is anger and frustration among doctors and patients over the elaborate decision-making machinery which does everything, it seems, but make decisions.

Top quality doctors are leaving England, or at least the National Health plan, out of sheer frustration. Their places are taken by foreign doctors and nurses, many of whom are not up to the level of training of the personnel they replace.

Morale is so low among hospital personnel that strikes, slowdowns and outright rebellion are becoming commonplace among professionals once hailed for their dedication.

Any figures the British system can point to as evidence of success (such as reducing infant mortality) are either matched or topped by other countries, including our own.

One orthopedic surgeon called the 127 patients he has on a waiting list to tell some of them they may have to wait more than 30 years for their operations at the present rate of scheduling. This doesn't mean he's that busy -- it's the unavailability of operating room time and recovery beds in the ancient hospitals.

Some of the patients he called were elderly people in wheel chairs waiting for replacement of arthritic hip joints so they can walk again. The surgeon was only able to do two such operations in all of 1977 because so little operating room time was available to him.

The Royal commission is supposed to come up with some answers in 1977. Meanwhile I would think we have all the answers we need for Washington.

RONALD REAGAN

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

A few years ago a gentleman named Gary Rekstad wrote a capsulized summary of history under the title, "Once there was a great nation." I've capsulized it even more to fit our time limitation. I thought you'd like to hear it.

Once there was a great nation -- "founded by pilgrims who decided to leave their own country which didn't encourage freedom of religion. They migrated to an uncivilized land inhabited only by savages. The rock where they landed was to become a national shrine.

They drove off the natives, built rude shelters and houses of worship, setting aside a special day to give thanks.

These pilgrims believed in their God and they also believed in work. They established schools that in a way became the first public free education in the world.

Other colonists came and established other communities. And some of the noblest words ever written began to surface. Facades of our modern buildings bear some of them, "liberty," "justice," "freedom of worship."

Then an older nation sent tax agents to exploit the colonists. The colonists sent their greatest men as representatives to a general assembly, choosing a gentleman farmer as their leader. He united them and won the war against the "old world." That farmer is known as the "father of his country." Today a famous U.S. city is named after him.

Ultimately, a civil war divided the fledgling country. It's leader who tried to keep the Republic united was assassinated. His murder has been immortalized by one of the greatest playwrights of all time. After the wounds of the bloody civil war healed, the nation became a world power.

Next, the citizens began to think of security paid for by tax money. Farmers petitioned for price supports. The government bought up crops and stored them in warehouses. Industrialists were next to ask for tax benefits. The middle class declined under the added tax burden. Crime became so commonplace it was dangerous to walk the streets at night.

A crippled man led the nation into a war and foreign entanglements.

A General who had been victimized by government pleaded with the nation to return to the principles of the Founding Fathers. He died bitterly thinking his anguished thoughts.

An honest senator dared to speak out for a halt to foreign aid and foreign subversion. He was branded a reactionary.

The nation fell deeper into debt. It joined a league of the world. Increased taxes to send wheat to its enemies, devalued its currency, substituting base materials for silver in its coins.

That nation's name? Ancient Rome. I skipped a couple of lines to tell you that, lines that are facts of history. Mr. Rekstad had summed up that the nation -- Rome was totally corrupt, its middle class dead. The barbarians moved in and destroyed its civilization.

The parallel to our own history is almost eerie, so much so one wonders if we can avoid those last couple of sentences. The rock where those first Romans landed is called the pilgrim's rock -- Cincinnati; the assassinated leader Julius Caesar; the crippled leader -- Caligula; the General, Marc Antony; and the honest senator, Cicero. Shakespeare, of course, is the playwright who immortalized the death of Caesar.

How will we finish our story - the story of another great nation?

RONALD REAGAN

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

The Soviet Union must really be uptight about the neutron weapon.

Seldom have we seen such a campaign to kill off a weapon before it even goes into production. In our own country, well-intentioned people have joined in the campaign but without (and let me emphasize that "without") any realization that their own concern might possibly be the result of subtle, Soviet "brainwashing".

Recent polling has revealed a strange dichotomy in people's views of this weapon which could be the greatest defense against the Russian tanks massed opposite our NATO forces in Europe. A year ago the American people favored going ahead with production of the weapon 44 percent to 38. Now the poll reads 47-to-35 against.

Strangely, those same Americans while opposing production and development of the weapon believe 46-to-25 that it is the most effective defense we could have against the threat of an attack on the NATO line. By a lesser margin (36-to-34) they still see it as an effective deterrent that would reduce the chances of war. But, (and here is where the possibility of brainwashing comes in) a large majority (74-to-12) fears that use of the neutron weapon might lead to the use of other nuclear weapons, meaning the exchange of the ultimate in destructive weapons, the arsenals of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

The President has indicated from the first his opposition to the weapon, but under pressure from our NATO allies and our own military leaders he has held off a final "no". His position is that he might cancel production of the warhead if the Soviets agree to a new SALT treaty.

Now, while the Soviets normally oppose the idea of any weapon for us (as they proceed with the buildup of the greatest offensive military machine the world has ever seen) they have been unusually excited about the neutron weapon.

Our NATO allies and we have faced the Soviet tank forces massed on the German border with some pretty potent anti-tank weapons. There are small but effective guided missiles that can be carried and fired by one or two men, and heavy caliber infantry missiles such as the American T.O.W. All have the ability to penetrate Russian armor and knock out or disable tanks.

Now we learn the Soviets have developed and field tested a new tank, the T-80, and according to all available information it is immune to our anti-tank missile. They have invented a new type of composite armour. It is a kind of honeycomb of steel, ceramics and aluminum with three times the protective quality of conventional steel plate, yet it weighs virtually the same.

We know how good it is because, by coincidence, the British have come up with virtually the same thing for our tanks. It is impervious to present anti-tank weapons. But (and that explains Russia's anxiety about the neutron warhead) the new armor is no better against the neutron weapon than the present steel plate.

With an order to go ahead on our weapon we could nullify their new T-80 tank.

RONALD REAGAN

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

The Soviet Union's Nicolai Ogarkov has delivered a message to the American people. He says, "You once had military superiority and felt secure. You no longer have that superiority and you will never have it again. And now you will know what it means to feel threatened."

On the last broadcast I called attention to a new invention of the Soviets which could make their tanks invulnerable to present day anti-tank weapons. It would not protect them against our neutron weapon. That is, if we had it.

The June issue of The Officer, the official Reserve officers journal, carried a story based on data and material authenticated by the American Security Council and presented by Major General J. Milnor Roberts.

The article opened with what the General called a "worst case" scenario. Let me read portions of that scenario to you. QUOTE -- "Suddenly and without warning, hundreds of Soviet-bloc divisions spearheaded by 15,000 assault tanks and amphibious armour, spin from Warsaw pact maneuvers and lunge westward. Their target, the English Channel.

"Swarms of Soviet warplanes, armed with missiles, bombs and cannisters of death dealing chemicals, strike NATO bases and stockpiles of U.S. tactical nuclear weapons.

"Outnumbered and out gunned, allied forces retreat before the massive Communist blitzkrieg. At sea, Soviet submarines prepositioned hours before intercept and attack U.S. convoys attempting to rush reinforcements. Behind the lines, Communist saboteurs emerge in Western Europe cities and industrial centers, creating widespread havoc.

"With Western Europe about to be overrun, the President of the United States is faced with a life or death decision; to accept the Soviet conquest of all Europe or to unleash American nuclear counterforce, thereby risking a worldwide holocaust."--UNQUOTE

The General admits this "worst case" scenario may never happen. But he does say the possibility that it might is the constant nightmare of allied leaders. Then he quotes General Haig, our Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, "The greatest single threat to stability and peace continues to reside -- as it has for 29 years -- in the immediate presence of massive Soviet military power. . . the greatest peace time aggregation of military power the world has ever seen." UNQUOTE

The article then goes on to catalog the statistics of Soviet power and the continued retreat by the U.S. over the last couple of decades.

In 1962 (the time of the Cuban missile crisis) our superiority was so great that Kruschchev had no choice but to back down. Eleven years later in the 1973 Arab-Israeli war Soviet power was such that a threat by them to intervene in that war forced the Israelis to halt their drive against Egypt. Our Chief of Naval Operations said, "had there been a confrontation between the United States and Russia in the Eastern Mediterranean, we would have lost."

Production of the neutron weapon could eliminate the nightmare of that "worst case" scenario at best and, at least, buy us some much needed time.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Recently a California newspaper did a survey undoubtedly inspired by Proposition 13 but aimed at learning people's attitude toward government services and government spending. As it turned out 73.6% of the respondents had voted for Proposition 13. The poll sought answers as to the areas where government could be reduced, and how much "fat" those polled thought there was in government.

When they were asked how much fat they thought there was in local government, the biggest percentage (just over half) estimated 25% or more. But almost 94% put it at above 10%. And, 77% said 10% or more of local government employees should be cut from the payroll. Here again the biggest percentage, 22.2% would eliminate 25% or more. Personally, I've always felt the best, and -- yes -- the humane way to reduce the government payroll is by attrition. Put a freeze on hiring replacements for those who retire or leave government service. We made this work in California and there were no layoffs.

Most interesting in the poll, however, was where people thought the cuts should be made. They were given a pretty complete list of city functions and asked, yes or no on whether cuts should be made in each of these services. More than 85% said "no" to reducing police or fire protection. Next highest support -- a fraction over 65% -- was for street maintenance.

But in the "yes" vote -- where they felt cuts should be made -- more than 95% said, "in administration". Around 85% would cut aid to non-profit groups and the size of the city work force. Nearly 80% of those polled would cut downtown redevelopment and planning.

Switching to county functions, almost 82% would not make cuts in the Sheriff's Department. But almost 88% would reduce welfare and public assistance, 80% would cut planning and more than 82% would reduce the size of the work force. But here again, the biggest cut by far wanted was in administrative overhead -- 94.7%.

Finally, the poll took up school spending. In basic education activities 84.2% said "no" to any cuts and more than 63% would not reduce the number of teachers or increase class size. However, almost 94% would cut administration. And 86.3 would cut programs such as bilingual education. Around 65% would close neighborhood schools with low enrollment and child care centers, and 58% would trim spending on extra-curricular activities such as band, art classes and driver education. Almost 80% would reduce the size of the work force.

The final two questions in the poll should be of special interest to elected public servants. More than three-fourths (76.7%) said they would favor a state constitutional amendment that would limit how much money state and local governments could spend. And 77.6% said they did not -- repeat -- not want other taxes increased to help pay for services that may be cut as a result of Proposition 13.

Just maybe some one in government had better be listening.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Left & Right"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Seven years ago Karl Magnuson was a professor on the faculty of a well-known state university. He was secure and well-paid, but unsatisfied. He simply did not want to spend the rest of his life as a comfortable faculty member of a taxpayer supported institution.

So Karl Magnuson dropped out of academia. He went back to the little community of Topaz, Michigan and became a farmer. He learned to live independently, close to the land, and to participate in community life. He had hardly arrived, however, when he learned that his little community in the great pine forests of Michigan's Upper Peninsula was under almost constant assault from various levels of government.

First the regional planning commission, made up of appointees and bureaucrats not accountable to the people, was about to impose a comprehensive plan on his area which would concentrate all future growth and economic development into two selected "growth centers" -- leaving Karl's community in a permanent "no opportunity" zone. Karl and his neighbors fought back, and were promptly attacked as "right wingers" for challenging the sacred cow of regional planning.

Then, while that fight was still going on, another threat appeared. The U.S. Forest Service announced its intention to spray the forests with a chemical defoliant, by helicopter. Karl and his neighbors got an injunction to prevent the spraying of their forests and homes. They were immediately recognized as concerned environmentalists.

Soon the U.S. Navy appeared with a plan to construct a vast communications array in Karl's township. Karl and his neighbors fought back again. This time a prominent state official branded them "Communists." Then the Forest Service returned with a proposal to designate hundreds of thousands of acres in Karl's country as permanent wilderness. Again the same people fought back. Now they found themselves labeled as greedy exploiters of the forests. Remember, these were the same people who had just been called "environmentalists" for opposing the toxic sparying of the same forests!

The former professor wondered how it was that he and his neighbors seemed to alternate continuously between the political Left and Right in the view of the mass media and government officials. Finally, he began to see through it all. "The Left-Right opposition functions as a smokescreen that obscures and diverts people's attention from a real and terrifying process that has developed with frightening rapidity in capitalist and socialist countries alike," he says. "The real threat is the enormous enlargement and the decisive centralization of all the means of power and decision." Now, he adds, the instruments of control reach dangerously far into the lives and activities of ordinary citizens.

For Karl Magnuson of Topaz, Michigan, the real issue can no longer be discussed in terms of Left and Right. The real issue is how to reverse the flow of power and control to ever more remote institutions, and to restore that power to the individual, the family, and the local community. Millions of other Americans, in both the small towns and great cities of this land, are steadily coming to the same conclusion.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "The Average Man"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

I know that I do a lot of criticizing on these commentaries, pointing to things that need correcting, but please believe me I'm an optimist. I truly believe the people of this country will justify the faith the Founding Fathers had when they said that the people, themselves, were the best custodian of freedom and their own security.

An old friend from college days regularly sends me the magazine he publishes. It is called Sunshine - Ultra-sophisticates might think it corny. I find it is just what it's name implies, and it's good for the soul.

There was a short article in the August issue which refurbished my optimism. I thought you might like to hear it -- it's about the Average Man. Sunshine magazine says, "The progress and prosperity of the free world is based upon the basic decency of the average man."

It goes on to say: "This average man is a fellow who respects himself. If he buys something he will pay for it. He expects to work for the money he needs. He wants a home and he is willing to accept the responsibility for the care of his children. He is a temperate person in every sense of the word. He wants to use the good things in life. He doesn't want the headaches that come from abuse. He is a law observer with common sense, enough to know that you have to have law enforcement for a few. He knows that freedom is rooted in self discipline, that rights and responsibilities go hand in hand.

"The free world has its problems, for freedom is not Utopia. It has individuals who are misfits, who do not measure up to the average man. It has the individual who scoffs at law observance, who has to be held in check by law enforcement. It has those who confuse anarchy with freedom, and privileges with rights, who think law and order is oppression. And these people get more than their share of the news media's attention.

"But all the time the good, decent, law abiding average man is going about his job of earning a living, supporting his country, contributing to worthy programs to help the less fortunate, and participating in the religious life of his community. He is the back bone of the free world. He is the one who is doing the plain, everyday, seldom spectacular things that are slowly making this a better world for everyone.

"Sometimes he wonders if those in public office have any interest in his right to use the street in peace and safety. He wonders if they are concerned with his right to be secure from violence in his own home. He wonders if working for what you need, saving for what you want, and living for what you believe is right is out of date.

"But even as he wonders, he keeps on doing his job and keeping faith in what he knows in his heart is best."

That's the average man. Some do-gooders demean him by assigning him to something called "the masses", or even worse "the little people". And sometimes he's called, "the common man". Well, he is very uncommon and he'll probably wind up saving those do-gooders in spite of themselves.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Polls & Guns"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

To paraphrase the great statesman Disraeli "there are lies, expletive deleted lies, and statistics." Now, I'm not going to be that forceful about polls. But we should know more than we do about how the questions are phrased by the pollsters and whether a certain public relations result is the goal of the organization or individual paying for the poll.

A few years ago, in a Washington economic conference, a lady who heads up a large financial house put her finger on the matter of polling. She said "Ask a citizen if he'd like government to provide a certain service for the people and the answer will probably be yes." But then she said, "Give the citizen a \$100 bill and ask him if he'd like the service if it meant giving up the \$100."

What brought all this to mind was the widespread press coverage given to a poll in which apparently 84% of Americans favor stringent handgun control and registration. A third of those polled would even ban the manufacture of such weapons.

Now frankly, I don't support this kind of gun control and I've never before seen evidence that the American people are that up in arms about arms if I may coin a phrase, so I did a little checking.

This particular poll was conducted by a reputable firm so I'm not inferring that pollsters are guilty of falsification. But the sponsor of this poll was the "Center for the Study and Prevention of Handgun Violence" and it was taken on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the tragic assassination of Robert Kennedy.

A little more than a year ago another reputable pollster was commissioned by the Second Amendment Foundation which defends our right under the second amendment to bear arms. Their poll found that 54 percent of Americans believe the answer to violent crime lies in stiffer punishment. Only 10 percent would outlaw hand guns. In fact when the question was asked "Do you think gun controls have helped to reduce crimes committed with guns?", 67 percent said "no".

Possibly we need to augment polling with some more comprehensive research. A University of Washington sociologist in a 1975 study found that "gun control laws have no significant effect on violence beyond what can be attributed to background social conditions." Spoken like a true sociologist. But he also found that gun control laws do not limit access to guns by those who intend doing violence.

Much more recently a survey of 6,000 law enforcement officers found that 80 percent feel gun control laws have no effect on crime and 83 percent believe criminals would benefit more than citizens from the banning of hand guns. In other words, the laws would make it hard for the law-abiding, but not the criminal, to get a gun.

Maybe the only poll that's really reliable is the one taken in liberal Massachusetts in 1976. A referendum to ban ownership of handguns was on the ballot in the November election. The voters of Massachusetts defeated it three-to-one.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Since Spanish-American War days and the freeing of Cuba, the United States has maintained a naval base on the island of Cuba at Guantanamo bay. There is nothing imperialistic about this nor does it infringe on Cuban sovereignty the way some Panamanians thought our canal across Panama did. The Guantanamo base is on Cuban territory leased by us, the lease to run in perpetuity.

I won't get into the strategic importance of this base other than to point out it's location off the entrance to the Panama Canal and the added range it gives us in securing the South Atlantic sea lanes. It was key to the the Monroe Doctrine back when we enforced the Monroe Doctrine.

During the long debate over the Panama Canal treaties, many opponents of those treaties, particularly men with great experience in naval strategy, pointed to the obvious close relationship between Castro and Panama's dictator General Torrijos. Predictions were made that the Canal, if given up, would only be the first of several "dominoes" and the next could very well be the Guantanamo naval base. This, of course, was passed off by the State Department as having no real basis in fact, and we were assured that we were buying the gratitude and friendship of the Panamanians with our magnanimous gesture.

Well, the treaties have been ratified and recently Castro ordered a week long celebration of the revolution by which he seized the reins of government in Cuba. We could also add that he has made Cuba a satellite of the Soviet Union. In his speeches during the celebration he brought up Guantanamo, using all the phrases which were used so often by the advocates of the Canal treaties. The base was an affront to Cuba's sovereignty, it was colonialism, imperialism, and of course, he wasn't going to stand for its continued presence.

Right on cue, those new friends we'd supposedly made in Panama were, "redefining," Panama's foreign policy in a 14 page document. Foreign Minister, Nicolas Gonzalez Revilla (RE-VEE-UH) observed that the centerpiece of Panama's foreign policy had been the canal. Now that agreement has been reached on that, they can lay the ground work for a future foreign policy.

Their groundwork covered quite a bit of ground. For example, the Torrijos government is calling for Israel to yield all occupied Arab lands. Closer to home, they want self determination for Puerto Rico. Never mind that Puerto Rico has that already and more than 90% of its citizens want to stay right where they are -- very close to Uncle Sam. Finally, Panama's new foreign policy called for the United States to give up its naval base on Guantanamo bay.

Now -- will it be a surprising coincidence if some of our State Department types suddenly discover we don't need that naval base and giving it away will win the friendship of Castro?

RONALD REAGAN

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

Is it possible a tax revolt was already on the way and that California's Proposition 13 just set the date for its happening? What city in America has the highest level of per-capita earning? What city has the highest percentage of household income over \$25,000, the highest average household income, the highest percentage of white collar employment, the most banks and Mercedes-Benz automobiles per capita? Well, one city is first in all of these things -- Washington, D.C.

Of course Washington was smart enough, as some one once pointed out, to latch onto the fastest growing industry -- government. Washington has the highest average income and the majority of its earners work for government or in related fields. Maybe it's only coincidence but Sacramento, capitol of the most populous state -- California, is among the top five cities in those same categories.

I remember about 15 or 16 years ago reading an item about a young man, age 19, in Arkansas who was charged by the government with overplanting his five acre cotton allotment by a fraction of one acre. In those days the government would survey land to make sure farmers hadn't exceeded their acreage allotments. The government sued the young man to collect penalties of \$52.38. They spent \$61.10 on travel expenses for deputies to serve the papers. In the meantime, bad weather and boll weevils had ruined the crop. No cotton was picked and the young man had joined the navy. I thought at the time it was quite a comedy of errors and much ado about nothing. I certainly didn't realize then it was just standard operating procedure. Today it's "ho-hum", when you discover that CETA (the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act) is putting up \$31,000 to build a 30 foot high concrete monolith in Salem, Oregon. It's for rock and mountain climbers to practice on.

In Fall River, Massachusetts, the State Department of Public Welfare spent \$450 a day on room and board for a 15-year-old-boy. No, the young man hadn't been charged with any crime. He was classified as a child needing services. So while officialdom was trying to decide what to do with him, he was put up in a motel with two \$8.00-an-hour guards. For more than a week he swam in the motel pool, fished in a nearby cove and lived high on the hog. At one breakfast he put away a dozen pancakes and half a dozen eggs.

Then there is the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit system known as BART. So far it has cost double the planned amount, \$1.6 billion. It has only attracted half the passengers it expected and serves only 2% of the trips in the district. It was supposed to reduce auto traffic but less than one-third of its riders came from automobiles. About half switched over from buses. Now the BART ride costs twice as much as the bus and half again as much as the private car. The transit system could buy a fleet of new buses capable of handling all of BART's passengers until 1980 for less than half of what BART is losing each year.

I know you can match me with hundreds of equally silly examples and that's why there is a tax revolt.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Wouldn't you think a married man with two children to support earning \$4,800 a year -- \$400 a month -- would like to up that to \$600 or even \$800 a month? The answer, of course, is "yes" -- under ordinary circumstances. But in our wonder world of welfare the more he earns the less he actually has. In fact, if he really scored and went to \$12,000 a year, he'd have less income than when he was making \$4,800.

In the aftermath of Proposition 13 and during some of the debate in Washington over possible tax cuts, there were demagogic charges that tax cutting was aimed at the poor. Senator McGovern was one among others who declared that those who sought tax cuts had no compassion for the needy. The implication, of course, was that all of government's spending is legitimate and the only way to reduce it would be to cut back on benefits to the poor.

This is not only demagogery, it ignores facts with regard to government costs. The General Accounting Office in Washington estimates that the federal government alone loses \$25 billion a year in fraud. It is true, however, that many people believe welfare itself is a sinkhole where a lot of tax dollars disappear without doing any real good. They believe that welfare has become a fixed institution where the effort is not directed toward putting the needy back on their feet, making them self supporting.

Well, now two economists at U.S.C., Arthur Laffer and Chris Petruzzelli, have put together some figures which indicate that the people are right to be suspicious. We aren't salvaging people; we are making them permanent clients of a professional group of welfarists whose careers depend on the preservation of poverty.

Let's go back to that man I mentioned earlier, the fellow with wife and two children and a \$400 a month pay check. He is a deserving member of the working poor, eligible for substantial tax free welfare payments, food stamps, low income housing and all the other perquisites that go with welfare. His net income wages plus government benefits isn't \$400 -- it's actually \$810.49. If he didn't have any \$400 salary at all, his income would be \$718, so he's actually working each month for \$92.49.

Now, suppose he gets a 50% raise and finds himself earning \$600 a month -- taxable, of course (including tax and social security). His net monthly income drops from \$810.49 to \$784.76. Well, maybe he should work harder and double his original salary -- earn \$800 a month. He does and his net family income drops to \$773.82. Both of those raises, 50% and 100% cost him \$1.05 for every additional dollar he earned.

Can you take more? He really goes to work and starts earning \$1000 a month. Finally, his monthly income goes up, all the way to \$795.94 -- only, \$14.55 less than he had when he was earning \$400 a month. Do you suppose this explains some of our unemployment? If he doesn't work at all he gets \$718 a month. If he earns \$12,000 a year, he gets \$795.94 a month.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Signs continue that the prairie fire touched off by Proposition 13 is still burning even though it hasn't reached every corner of the land as yet.

Among the hot spots, however, is the State of Colorado. The legislature of that state has recently voted to index the state income tax to the Federal inflation rate. This, of course, means that a cost-of-living pay raise will not push a taxpayer into a higher tax bracket. It is estimated this measure alone will save Colorado taxpayers \$100-million a year. Can you imagine what the savings would be if the Federal government would be that honest with regard to the federal income tax?

From time to time on these commentaries I've called attention to the savings in local government costs that can be achieved by contracting out to private entrepreneurs some of the chores performed by government agencies.

In November, voters of Los Angeles County will have a chance to vote on changing the county charter which now prohibits such private contracting. It is a change much to be desired. The state of California would do well to review its own constitution which prevents private contracting for state work.

Just recently the New York State Court of Appeals upheld the right of Westchester County to contract with a private protection agency for security guards. A line up of municipalities were eagerly awaiting that decision to go forward with plans of their own.

One community immediately replaced its public sanitation force with a private one. The Deputy Mayor said the savings was a full 25% with absolutely no reduction in the quality of service.

So much for the good news. As I said at the beginning, the Proposition 13 prairie fire hasn't reached every corner of the land. The United States Senate has passed a bill reorganizing the White House. There will be a 50% increase in the number of presidential aides classed as Executive level 2. Executive level 2 means they get \$57,500 a year. There will now be 25 of those. There will also be 25 at Executive level 3; their pay level is \$52,500.

Then comes five G.S. 18's -- that means Government Service 18 and I think I'm correct in saying that's the highest rank in the government's G.S. ratings. Those five come in at \$47,500. There will be an unlimited number of G.S. 16's who receive \$42,423.

The Senate also refused to put any limit on the President's entertainment budget. Now, I have no quarrel with that. Obviously we can't have our President unable to hold a state reception or dinner for a visiting head of state because he's used up the authorized budget. And no one can deny that such functions are a necessary part of international diplomacy. It might be nice, though, if the President would quite acting as if business entertainment in the private sector were somehow evil skullduggery.

RONALD REAGAN

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

I was going through a bundle of quotations I've collected over the years looking for something appropriate for an upcoming speech. I keep them on cards and they aren't indexed or catalogued so I literally have to shuffle through the whole stack.

While doing that a thought came to me apropos of the present world situation where we continue to believe we can maintain a detente with the Soviet Union and that their leaders, way deep down, must be pretty much like us. I was shuffling through statements of great Americans and mixed in with them were quotes by the past and present leaders of the Soviet Union.

There was that poetry from whence comes the inscription on our statue of Liberty: her name -- Mother of Exiles. From her beacon hand glows worldwide welcome; her mild eyes command the air bridged harbor that twin cities frame. Keep your ancient lands, your storied pomp, cries she with silent lips. "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these, the homeless, tempest tossed to me. I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

How that contrasts with these words of the Soviet Union's founding father -- Nicoloi Lenin: "It would not matter if three-fourths of the human race perished; the important thing is that the remaining one-fourth be communist." And his invitation; "The Communist Party enters into bourgeois institutions not to do constructive work, but in order to direct the masses to destroy from within the whole bourgeois state machine and the parliament itself."

John Winthrop on the deck of the tiny Arbella in 1630 off the coast of Massachusetts said to the little band of pilgrims: "We shall be as a city upon a hill. The eyes of all people are upon us, so that if we shall deal falsely with our God in this work we have undertaken and so cause him to withdraw his present help from us, we shall be made a story and a by-word throughout the world."

The oath of the Communist Party U.S.A., written in 1930, says nothing of a city upon a hill. "I pledge myself to rally the masses to defend the Soviet Union, the land of victorious socialism. I pledge myself to remain at all times a vigilant and firm defender of the Leninist line of the party, the only line that insures the triumph of Soviet power in the United States."

Thomas Jefferson said, "The policy of the American Government is to leave their citizens free, neither restraining nor aiding them in their pursuits." And he added, "The God who gave us life gave us liberty -- can the liberties of a nation be secure when we have removed a conviction that these liberties are the gift of God."

Pravda responds with these inspiring words: "The worldwide nature of our communist program is not mere talk but all embracing and all blood soaked reality." There were dozens more and from our Founding Fathers to the present day leaders the plea was for social justice, decency and adherence to the highest standards man had evolved in his climb from the swamp to the stars. From the Soviet leaders came calls for treachery, deceit, destruction and bloodshed. Detente--isn't that what a farmer has with his turkey--until Thanksgiving day?

RONALD REAGAN

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

Back in the Depression years the factory smokestack belching black cloud of coal smoke skyward was a symbol of reassurance that the good life was still possible. Today it is an evil thing to be deplored and eliminated, symbol of everything that is wrong.

Now I'm not lobbying for air pollution, water pollution or destruction of the environment in the name of progress. But have we been so busy lately deploring the unattractive by-products of technology that we've overlooked all that it can do for us?

It goes without saying that technology has made life easier and more pleasant in a million ways from pre-packaged meals to home entertainment by electronics, instant worldwide telephone communication and travel in comfort over thousands of miles in but a few hours time.

The list could go on and on. Yes, I'm aware of the problems accompanying the benefits, but do we throw away the benefits to get rid of the problems or do we have faith that the technology that gave us the benefits might first possibly rid us of the problems?

Right now American industry is stepping up research, particularly in the field of potential shortages in fuel and raw materials. The direction of the research is toward finding catalysts. That isn't a word that means very much to most of us, but catalysts are substances, usually metals that speed up chemical reactions without being altered themselves.

As an example of what they can mean to you and me, catalysts hold the secret of how to obtain gasoline from coal. The oil industry would be in sad shape without catalysts. An official of one oil company says catalysts called "zeolites" more than double the gasoline that can be extracted from a barrel of crude oil.

They make possible reduced prices and use of less expensive raw materials. Monsanto Chemical Company has developed one that allows acetic acid -- a building block for other chemicals -- to be made from methanol, a cheaper material, thus cutting costs by 20%.

Polyethylene, the most widely used plastic, can now be made by Union Carbide with savings of 50% on capital cost and 75% on energy because of a newly discovered family of catalysts. This will translate into billions of dollars of savings for consumers in everything from plastic bottles to trash bags within the next few years.

Catalyst technology also will help the environmental fight. One, used in making gasoline, will reduce the amount of carbon monoxide in the flue gas at refineries from 80,000 parts per million to less than 500.

The word from industry is that recent breakthroughs have taken place and more can be expected. One spokesman says (believe it or not) that possibly we may produce gasoline one day without oil. In other words, the technological genius that gave us our standard of living may very well preserve and enhance it at a lower price.