

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 78-16 through 78-17 (1978-1979)

Box: 14

To see more digitized collections visit:

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

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Inventories, visit:

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

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

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

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

RONALD REAGAN
RADIO COMMENTARY

DISC 78-16

TAPED 11/21/78
AIRED 12/4 - 12/22

78-16A

Generic Promos

1. Private Schools	2:53
2. Toys	2:41
3. Hope for the Cities	2:21
4. Basketball	2:50
5. Horse & Rider I	2:38
6. Horse & Rider II	2:39
7. China	2:39

78-16B

1. Salt II	2:50
2. Jokes	2:15
3. An Accurate Thermometer	2:23
4. Miscellaneous	2:55
5. Wood I	2:43
6. Wood II	2:56
7. Bilingualism	2:20
8. Taxation	2:58

PLEASE NOTE

These programs are provided for airing from December 4, 1978 through December 22, 1978 inclusive. Maintaining this schedule will enable your station to air all newly recorded programs as received.

Please note the details of our no-charge reprint service described in the attached memo.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Our nation is blessed with a pluralistic school system reflecting the great diversity of our people. We developed at the local school district level probably the best public school system in the world. Or it was until the federal government added federal interference to federal financial aid and eroded educational quality in the process.

We have had, however, an answer to dissatisfaction with this public system; a network of so-called private schools of every description. Some are truly private in the sense that total costs are recouped in the tuition paid by those attending. Obviously such schools depend on people of means. There are, however, parochial schools charging tuition but depending in the main on church support.

These schools were born of a desire on the part of parents to have their children educated within the religious atmosphere of their choice. Of late there have come to be hundreds of privately endowed schools dependent on private citizens' contributions offering recognition of God in a non-denominational way. These are a reaction to the ban on prayer in our public schools.

All these independent or private schools, if you will, have been granted a tax free status, plus tax deductibility for those who contribute to their support. Without this it is doubtful any of them could continue to operate.

Right now hearings are being held which could result in cancelling this tax free and tax deductible feature. This is a pocketbook issue threatening every taxpayer because virtually all these independent schools are educating students at a far lower per-student cost than the public schools and usually doing a better job of it.

How can this be happening? Well, it's another example of bureaucracy making its own law by adopting regulations. Internal Revenue Service Commissioner Jerome Kurtz, whose job in the Treasury Department is the collection of income taxes, has decided to take upon himself additional duties and powers.

With Congress not in session, he has decided to issue an edict which will deny the tax exempt, tax deductible status to private schools that fail to meet an arbitrary quota of minority enrollment and hiring. Private and church supported schools will have to institute minority recruitment, minority hiring programs and provide minority scholarships to increase minority enrollment.

Let me interject that virtually all such schools are presently desegregated and many, many of them do offer scholarships to offset their high tuition rates.

The Commissioner tried to implement his regulation without the present hearings but a number of Congressmen--significantly of both conservative and liberal philosophy--descended on him in angry force. Even so he is holding the hearings while Congress is in recess. His obvious intent is to face Congress in January with his edict already established and being enforced.

Chief Justice John Marshall once declared "The power to tax involves the power to destroy." The I.R.S. threatens the destruction of religious freedom itself with this action. The Commissioner and your Congressman should be hearing from you right now.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Toys"

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

For a great many years, certainly all that I have lived, parents have waited for their children's letters to Santa Claus to get some idea of what to put beneath the Christmas tree. As growing up changed that, a more direct form of communication took place. After all, raising a family presents enough problems without having to guess about what will bring joy to your children on Christmas morning.

Now where do children get the ideas they incorporate in those letters to Santa or in later years that they carefully hint to us parents in elaborately casual conversation? In my childhood it was very often a Sears Roebuck catalog that fired up desire for an electric train or an erector set. Then and now it can be the walk through the toy department to see Santa in person. But whatever, a child's imagination isn't up to inventing the toys he or she wants to find under the tree on Christmas morning.

In short, they see something some childhood friend has--they see window displays, catalogs, and now in living color, TV commercials and from any or all of these choose those toys they'd like to have. There is, of course, the element of parental judgment which often modifies the expressed desire, sometimes for economical reasons, sometimes because of unsuitability. I remember wanting a mechanical boat I'd seen in a catalog at a time when there wasn't a body of water of any size within miles of where we lived. A couple of years later we moved to a river town and there on the first Christmas was my boat.

This system of communication between parent and child has worked very well for a long time. Now government wants to get in the act. The Federal Trade Commission is considering a ban on TV advertising of toys to children. I'm not sure whether they intend applying the ban to other forms of advertising. But with regard to TV they say children must be protected since they are too young to see the distinction between program and commercial. I think they underestimate our children.

Isn't this really an interference in the parent-child relationship. The F.T.C.'s concern should extend no further than insuring that the advertising is not deceptive or misleading and that the toy meets legal requirements as to safety, etc. From then on it is the parent's responsibility to decide whether a toy is or is not suitable for their child.

Right now the industry itself regulates all toy advertising. Every commercial is submitted for approval by the National Association of Broadcasters, the networks and the Council of Better Business Bureau.

What children watch on TV and for that matter how much they watch is a parent's responsibility. The fact that some parents don't exercise that responsibility as they should is hardly the province of the Federal Trade Commission.

As for me, I'm still trying to find out what Nancy wants for Christmas. Our children have long since given us the word.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Hope For The Cities"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

There's an old saying that most of us don't want to change the world--only our small corner of it.

There are signs that the wisdom in that statement is once again playing a part in revitalizing America.

The other day, for example, I read an article in the Christian Science Monitor. It was written by Osborn Elliot, former editor of Newsweek magazine, former deputy mayor of New York City and currently chairman of the Citizen's Committee for New York City.

Mr. Elliot had this to say about the comeback New York City is in the process of making:

"Seven million New Yorkers live in neighborhoods: exciting and dull; large and small; bustling and quiet; famous and unknown. The outside world is generally unaware of the vibrant life in our crazy quilt of neighborhoods.

"The growth of the block association and the neighborhood movement has had an enormously important impact on the economic vitality of the city, as well. You begin with a block and its people and their involvement in this city and their concern for the community, and you have an environment that is also healthy for the development of commerce and industry."

Strong neighborhoods make strong cities--not the other way around. That sounds like common sense. But for almost twenty years the federal government has disregarded this common sense. Billions of dollars, thousands of studies, hundreds of experts--this is the formidable array of weapons the federal bureaucrats brought to the struggle to revitalize the cities.

And what did it all lead to? Failure. Failure so great, so costly, so devastating in its destruction of neighborhoods--all in the name of "urban renewal"--that it is all but unbelievable.

But now we are seeing that the people of the neighborhoods, given a chance to exercise their own ingenuity and talents can preserve a neighborhood's unique characteristics and save a city as they do it.

You don't need billions of taxpayers' dollars to save a city. You need a sense of purpose, some pride, some hope, and a capacity for work on the part of the people who want nothing more than to change--for the better--their little corner of the world.

Come to think of it--isn't that the way this country was built in the first place?

RONALD REAGAN

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

Just a few years after James Naismith invented basketball, high school girls in Dubuque, Iowa were playing the game. The year was 1898. Today, Iowa ranks second in the nation in the number of girls participating in inter-scholastic basketball. The box office draw is greater for the girls' state high school tournament than for the one which decides the boys' state championship. And because the game is taken so seriously, Iowa is a prime recruiting area for colleges and universities. Or didn't you know that athletic scholarships are given to girl basketball players?

There are several other states where girls' basketball is very big. Even though it isn't nationwide as is the boys' game, it's popular in such diverse states as Tennessee, Oklahoma and New York.

If you haven't seen the "coed" game let me tell you now it differs from boys' basketball. There are six players, not five, on each team; three guards and three forwards and only the forwards are allowed to shoot. And there you have the reason for this dissertation on girls' basketball. The Department of Health, Education & Welfare (H.E.W.) is troubled that perhaps in some way there is a sex discrimination issue in the matter of guards in the girls' game not being allowed to shoot.

A girl in Tennessee found a federal judge who was willing to hand down a decision declaring the six player game violated the equal protection clause of the Constitution. Which only proves we should do a better job in appointing federal judges. His decision, I'm happy to say, was over turned. H.E.W. should give careful thought to just butting out. The next thing you know we may have a government regulation that baseball players get to take turns pitching, or football linemen must have equal opportunity to carry the ball.

Some Iowa girls who play basketball summed it up best in a letter to the Secretary of H.E.W. They asked, "Is it true that you are pushing five girl basketball?" And they added, "If so, why?" Then they informed him the girls' game was faster, had better team work and if he'd ever seen a girls' game he'd know that.

There is no question but that the better athletes play forward but then that makes it possible for girls of lesser ability to participate and more girls get a chance with six instead of five on a team.

One lady who is active in wanting H.E.W. to intervene and outlaw the six girl team proclaims with great assurance that the girls of Iowa and their parents will ultimately realize the change was for their own good. That is the "government knows best" kind of arrogance, that has a lot of Americans really frustrated.

Surely we can find some violations of human rights in the world where we won't have to convince the victims they are being badly treated.

Very soon now the Iowa Girls State Basketball Tournament will take place and everyone will have a lot of fun—including the three guards on each team who don't shoot baskets and aren't complaining.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Horse & Rider I"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Anne Keegan, writing in the Chicago TRIBUNE on November 3rd, is the source of today's commentary. She wrote of a husky young man (age 27) who worked on an Illinois river barge until one day a two-inch metal cable broke. As it snapped back it whipped around his body like a boa constrictor, crushing his lower spine. Jim Hendricks became a paraplegic. That was four years ago.

After a period of feeling sorry for himself--which I'm sure we can all understand--he made up his mind that he wouldn't settle for growing old in a wheel chair doing nothing.

Jim had been raised around horses all his life and his first love had been riding. He decided he was going to ride again. You know, there is an old cavalry saying that nothing is so good for the inside of a man as the outside of a horse. I don't know whether Jim was familiar with that saying, but he knew riding would make him, as he put it, feel human again.

First, of course, he needed a horse--a big boned, stocky, quiet horse with common sense and intelligence. He found his mount, standing in a pasture, unbroken as yet. But that was all right because he would have to be trained in a special way.

Borrowing money from the bank to buy the horse, a truck to haul him and some left over to pay for training, he put up his mobile home as collateral. Then he went hunting for a trainer. A special kind of trainer who could teach a horse to lie down so Jim could get aboard and then get up carrying his rider.

He found his man--an old trick rider, now blind. Bud Jones was more than a little doubtful about the project but when he saw how determined Jim was he gave it a try. It was a good try and Calvin--that's what Jim named his horse--learned in three months what they had thought would take a year.

Jim and Calvin became close friends and Calvin seemed to sense the need to take care of his friend. He learned a number of tricks. Jim made himself a leg brace and with crutches, could stand and move around just a little. But he rode without any straps or safety devices.

Then one day Bud suggested that Jim and Calvin should do the horse show circuit and perhaps some county fairs. Jim said no at first, but when Bud pointed out it might be helpful and inspiring to others with handicaps he went on the road billed as "Hopalong, the World's Only Paraplegic Trick Rider and His Horse Calvin". They did rodeos, fairs and just about anything that would take them. When people would marvel at Jim's ability to ride, he'd give the credit to Calvin.

It would be nice if the story of Jim Hendricks, paraplegic, blind Bud Jones and Calvin ended right here, but unfortunately there is more. I'll tell you about it in the next broadcast.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Horse & Rider II"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

On the last broadcast I told of how Jim Hendricks, a paraplegic as the result of an accident, decided to take up horseback riding. He mortgaged his mobile home to buy an unbroken horse and truck to haul his horse. He found an ex-trick rider, now blind, who taught his unbroken horse to lie down so he could be mounted and to do a number of tricks.

Then Jim and his horse Calvin went out on the circuit playing rodeos, horse shows and fairs. They received a fee but actually only broke even with feed bills and the hiring of an assistant at each stop. In fact, Jim never took a motel or hotel room, but slept in the stable with Calvin. But they were having fun and life had a purpose. His support was from Social Security disability out of which he paid the installments on his mortgage.

Then last August Jim and Calvin came in off the road and found his disability had been cut off because he had missed a medical re-examination. He was told he'd have to appeal the decision and that would take three or four months. But then they added that even if he won the appeal and was declared medically eligible he still wouldn't get any checks because he'd become a performer. They turned a deaf ear when he explained he didn't actually make any money--that he was doing it to encourage other handicapped people.

Finally the bank notified him that unless he could resume payments on his loan they'd have to take his mobile home, his truck and Calvin. Trainer Bud Jones says that would probably mean the slaughter house for Calvin because he won't let anyone but Jim ride him. Others have tried and been thrown. Calvin seems to be more understanding than the people at Social Security. He has a sixth sense about his handicapped owner and takes care of him.

Jim has begged the bank to take his trailer and his truck, but not Calvin. He says, "I'd lay down my life for that horse. He's everything to me. He's my pleasure and my protector. He's given me a purpose in life since my accident." Jim feels his back is to the wall. If his disability isn't restored there is no way that he and Calvin can go on. As he puts it, "I'm the type I don't worry if it's just a can of beans on the table for supper. So they can come and take everything to my name. But I don't know how I'll get along if they come and take my best friend away."

Anyone who rides knows how Jim Hendricks of Pleasantview, Illinois feels. Social Security computers can't know nor apparently can any of those desk jockeys who live by the book. I wonder how many discouraged and depressed people with handicaps have been encouraged to find a purpose in life after seeing Jim Hendricks as "Hopalong, the World's only Paraplegic Cowboy and His Horse Calvin"?

RONALD REAGAN

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

A long time friend, former General in the United States Marine Corps V.H. Krulak, recently made the acquaintance of a young man named Chou Shui-liang. General Krulak was so impressed with his story that he made it the subject of a syndicated column he writes.

Chou Shui-liang is an entertainer, a juggler by profession. He was a member of a troupe sent to the Sudan by the Communist rulers of mainland China. I suppose it was in the nature of a cultural exchange.

One night after a performance in Khartoum, Chou decided to leave the troupe. What he really had in mind was parting company with his homeland, the People's Republic of China. He reached the American Embassy in Khartoum late that night where he announced he wanted out.

I'm sorry to say our embassy decided he was diplomatically a little too hot to handle what with Washington getting ready to cozy up to the rulers in Peking. So Chou was passed on to the Sudanese government where according to General Krulak no one could speak Chinese. This was no problem for Chou. He walked over to a map, ball point pen in hand, drew a big X across Peking and pointing to himself made a circle around Taiwan.

The Sudanese got the idea immediately and did what I wish our embassy had done; they bought Chou a ticket to Taiwan--right to the capital city Taipei.

General Krulak had a personal meeting and interview with the now free Chou Shiu-liang. He asked, "Weren't you scared? Here you were brought up under the communists, no real experience anywhere else. You didn't have the slightest inkling of what you were getting into." Chou had an answer to that. He said, "That's right. I didn't know what I was getting into, but I sure knew what I was getting out of." Then he added, "and there are millions more just like me."

He went on to say that he was a child before the communists came into power in 1949. "I remember", he said, "we didn't have much, but we were never hungry. We could go to church or travel or criticize the government and nobody cared. But now there is a ration coupon for everything; you can't move across the road without permission and there's always some commissar around trying to tell you what to think."

Chou sounds like a very forthright young man and one who has his values pretty straight. He makes us wonder whether we can go forward, as the administration apparently intends to, with a program calling for a relationship with Red China based on betrayal of the Free Chinese on Taiwan.

One thing is certain; we can't do that and pretend we are concerned about human rights.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "SALT II"

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Most of us by now are familiar with the names of weapons systems being discussed in the SALT II talks, ICBM's, submarine launched missiles, cruise missiles, etc. Here is one that has a new sound--"D.T.'s". No I'm not talking about that "pink elephant on the wall", result of too much imbibing of strong drinks--"Delarium Tremens".

The D.T.'s the Russians are talking about are "depressed trajectory missiles". Is that a new one for you? It is for me. Well, these are missiles which fly lower than standard ballistic missiles thereby reaching the target in about half the time of the normal high trajectory weapons.

Such a missile launched from a submarine--say 100 miles off-shore--would reach its target in four minutes. That doesn't give much warning time even if it is picked up by radar.

The question that has been raised is whether the Soviets will demand a concession from us if they agree to a mutual abandonment of such a weapon system. It is reported that President Carter leans toward such a mutual abandonment because it would lower the risk of surprise attack and thus make the world a safer place.

The answer to the question is that the Soviet Union will not ask for any new concession from us in return for giving up the D.T. missile. Surprised? Well don't be. You see, we are way ahead of them in this particular technology and a mutual abandonment would mean we were already making a concession by giving up something we have and the Russians don't. This seems to be a habit with us. We repeatedly sacrifice the product of our advanced technology--the B-1 bomber, the neutron warhead and now possibly this low flying missile with its potential for surprise.

The question that should be asked is, what will the Soviets give up if we agree to sacrifice our technological lead? If the object of the SALT II talks is to reduce the possibility of war, what better way is there than to stay so far ahead in weaponry that Russia's imperialistic desires will be inhibited? Inhibited because of their inability to embark on aggression without suffering unacceptable damage.

An Air Force study of fighter aircraft performance in the Korean War provides a convincing answer with regard to the importance of technology. The Russian Mig-15 could perform every maneuver better than our F-86. But the F-86 almost always won in combat against the Soviet plane. At first we just assumed our pilots were better. Then an Air Force study discovered that while the Mig could out-perform us on every single maneuver it could not make the transition from one maneuver to another as fast as the F-86.

Giving up our unquestioned lead in our D.T.'s is enough to give a fellow a case of the D.T.'s--the out of a bottle kind.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Growing sensitivity on the part of ethnic and religious groups have made all of us take a second look at jokes that are insulting to a given group.

I was reminded of this when I came across an item in the newspaper. It seems the head of a federal agency started off a speech with a joke that suggested that Polish people are stupid. To make matters worse, the joke contained a reference to the new Pope, who, of course, is Polish.

What would possess anyone holding a high government job to make such a joke is beyond me. It can be argued that Americans of Polish ancestry should not take these jokes so seriously, that it is all done in good fun. But the very people who make such an argument might very well be up in arms if the joke told were demeaning women or blacks or some other group.

Does all this mean we are losing our sense of humor? I don't think so. Humor goes through changes in fashion and many of those fashions are dictated by social changes. At the turn of the century, it was common to have comedians in vaudeville telling jokes about Jews. Many of these jokes were based on stereotypes. The cruel history of the 20th century has made such jokes no longer tolerable.

Now let me say that, as one of Irish descent, I have been known to tell some jokes in what I consider to be a rather good imitation of an Irish brogue. Whether others of Irish ancestry find the brogue convincing or the joke funny I won't go into now. But whether we like it or not rising ethnic and racial and religious pride has made the dialect joke and the joke based on some supposed ethnic characteristic a thing of the past.

I'm inclined to think that this is a good thing. But it has to be applied across the board. We can't say it is insensitive to tell jokes about one ethnic or sexual or national group and then turn around and tell our favorite joke about what we consider to be a "legitimate" target. No, if we are going to show sensitivity in joke-telling it had better be toward every group and not just to those favored by the media or who have large pressure groups.

There are enough funny subjects around without having to resort to jokes about ethnics. If you don't believe me, have you read the Congressional Record recently?

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "An Accurate Thermometer"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Suppose you haven't been feeling up to par recently and you go to see your family doctor. He places a thermometer under your tongue and when he pulls it out he looks shocked. "You have a fever of 108.6!" he shouts. "It's the hospital for you."

You want to protest that you don't really feel that bad, but the doctor knows best. So you go to the hospital, run up a big bill and eventually come home.

You go to see the doctor for a check-up and you happen to look at his thermometer. You notice it is completely different from the one you have in the medicine chest at home. The doctor's thermometer begins with the figure "101" and goes up from there.

"Hey Doc" you say, "this thermometer isn't measuring my temperature in the same way my old thermometer does. What's up?"

"Well" says your doctor, "we're using a different system of measurement these days because the hospital unions tell us we have to get more and more people in the hospital. So if your real temperature is 98.6 the new thermometer says it's ten points higher."

Now this sort of thing doesn't happen when you go to the doctor's office. He is interested in your real problems, not in what others may want you to feel.

But when it comes time to measure unemployment in this country, we seem to be using one of those hyped-up thermometers.

The eminent scholar Peter Drucker recently said as much in a brilliant article in the Wall Street Journal.

The traditional unemployment index, the one the government puts out, the one that can make or break an administration, is--says Drucker--"meaningless and misleading."

All it really measures is--and I'm quoting Drucker--"the number of people in the labor force of this country who, if the pay were right and the hours were right, might be available for at least a little work once in a while."

Originally, back in the nineteen thirties, this index was used to measure one thing: the number of unemployed male adult heads of households.

But the current index takes into account not only adult heads of households, but those who hold second jobs, officially retired people and a good many young adults not yet burdened with family responsibilities.

I think it's time we concentrate on the heads of households, make sure they have work and then turn attention to others. Our erroneous assumption that current unemployment figures always mean that heads of households are involved has led us to some dangerous and futile government policies, including the Humphrey-Hawkins fiasco.

Let's start using a good unemployment thermometer!

RONALD REAGAN

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

I've spoken before about my opposition to giving the District of Columbia two U.S. Senators, making that one city in all our land equal in representation to each of the 50 sovereign states.

Those who've been crying loudest about the pitiful plight of federal workers not being able to have their own Senators, would have us believe the inhabitants of Foggy Bottom on the Potomac are desperate to the point of rebellion. Just recently the District held its primary election to choose candidates for Mayor. The voters' enthusiasm was a little less than luke warm.

Apparently, 46 percent of the District's registered voters turned out for the election. Now at first glance you'd say, "What's so bad about that?" Well, 46 percent of the registered voters is only 17 percent of the people in Washington, D.C. who are eligible to vote. There are 535,000 eligible voters in a city which has the highest average earnings in America but only 92,000 of them bothered to vote. It doesn't really make you feel they are panting to have a voice in the government, which by the way, employs most of them.

Item number two also comes under the head of irony. The American Political Science Association recently voted four to one to cancel its contract with a hotel in Chicago and not hold its 1979 convention in that city. Reason! Illinois has not ratified the Equal Rights Amendment.

All right, grant them their strong conviction about human rights. How then do we explain their vote in the same meeting to participate in the international Political Science Association's 1979 meeting in Moscow?

Some of the members had introduced a resolution against participation because of the increase in violations of human rights in the Soviet Union. The majority, however, just couldn't see the connection. So the Association that wouldn't meet in Chicago in the name of human rights will meet in Moscow.

Item number three touches on the same general subject. Not too long ago the United States Congress voted, after lengthy and heated debates, to extend the seven years (now almost expired) that had been given for the securing of the Equal Rights Amendment's ratification by the states. The extension will be for about three years.

The hottest debate centered on a proposed amendment. There were Senators who were willing to grant the extended time if states which had already voted were allowed to change their vote. This was turned down even though several states have already changed their position from yes to no.

Now comes Senator Jake Garn of Utah who reminds his colleagues that in 1971 the 92nd Congress passed the Constitutional Convention Procedures Act. Section 13 of that act provided that a state having ratified an amendment might rescind so long as it did so by the same processes by which it had ratified and before a full three-fourths of the states had validly ratified. Senator Garn has rightfully called attention to a pretty glaring inconsistency.

RONALD REAGAN

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

When we have an opportunity to go to the ranch, which is not as often as we'd like, we're off and running. And once there, we never have to ask, 'What will we do'? There is an ongoing perpetual chore we can always turn to after a horseback ride or before, for that matter.

Our house is heated only by fire places so the chainsaws are always gassed up and waiting. But they are used for more than building up the woodpile. Much of the ranch is covered by a beautiful forest of California Live Oak and Madrone trees. It's beautiful to look at but not easy to walk or ride through. You really can't see the forest for the trees.

Nancy and I and our friend Barney have taken to clearing pathways and even entire groves with two chainsaws, a pruning saw, jeep and trailer. Our beautiful forest is a jungle of underbrush, windfalls, dead trees and dead limbs on live trees. The sun can't get through to the forest floor so new young trees die aborning.

We've concentrated on one grove near the house. It is an arduous, back breaking and slow job but the reward is great. The dead limbs and the prunings are piled high in the trailer and then hauled out to a clearing and stacked for burning when our California rainy season comes. The heavier limbs and fallen trees are cut to fire place length and used to heat the house. Gradually this one grove has become park like. The good trees can be seen and the sun dapples the earth beneath as we walk or ride horseback through that particular grove. Already we've seen an increase in wildlife as deer browse on the new growth. Unfortunately there is no way we can ever complete the job on the entire forest and having it done would cost hundreds of dollars an acre.

Now, what I've described is true of just about all the forest land in America. Whether we're talking commercial lumber land, privately owned timber or national forest, if there isn't a trail you can't go very far into the woods. But what if I told you that forest land, which covers half the country--not counting groves of non-commercial lumber like ours, can not only become beautiful and park like with increased wildlife but it can do a lot to solve our energy problem?

No--I'm not suggesting we cut down our forests. Quite to the contrary. Even the most ardent environmentalists approve the idea of clearing forests of dead wood and fallen limbs which make forest fires more probable and also more uncontrollable.

For some time now a gentleman named Norval Morey has been pleading the cause of harvesting junk wood as an energy source. He is President of Morbark Industries, Inc. in Winn, Michigan. He explains that junk wood consists of trees in our forests that are dead, dying, diseased, over crowded and over mature. He not only pleads the cause, he's doing something practical about it. Don't miss our exciting next installment with its amazing figures on a perpetual energy source and how easily it can be ours.

RONALD REAGAN

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

On the last commentary I referred to the President of Morbark Industries, Inc. in Winn, Michigan, Norval Morey, who has been trying to make Washington aware of a self-perpetuating energy source close at hand and greater than our entire import of oil from the OPEC nations.

In the United States (not including Alaska) we harvest about one percent of our wood per year for lumber and paper. Our forest lands produce each year six to seven billion tons of new fiber. This means about five billion tons of fiber is wasted each year as trees die or become old and cease to increase in size. Limbs fall, disease and rot set in. Young trees are stunted, unable to grow because they are smothered by windfalls or are unable to get needed sunlight. This five billion tons of waste wood is the equivalent of eight-and-one-half billion barrels of oil. We only import three-and-one-half billion barrels a year.

What Mr. Morey is pointing out is that less than half of the waste or junk wood in our forests--which makes for a giant forest fire danger--can be used instead to produce steam or electricity equal to what we produce with all the oil we import. And the forests will be healthier and more attractive.

Anticipating a question as to how we harvest this tangle of underbrush, dead trees, stunted trees and old trees, the answer is Morbark Industries is doing this everyday. We all have some idea of regular harvesting practices, the chain saws, bulldozers, cable skidders and the debris left behind; tops, limbs, etc. This conventional method produces some three to ten tons of wood per man day of uniform size wood chips ready for the pulp mill.

An hydraulic shear reaches out and cuts the diseased or over age tree like you snip a cutting from a rose bush with a pair of clippers. A grapple pulls the tree and feeds it, limbs, top and all into a chipharvestor. The chipharvestor is a machine that chews up the tree and spits it into a waiting truck in the form of wood chips and the truck heads for the power plant, factory or paper mill. Morbark is already delivering to paper mills two grades of chips: One, the top grade, is used to make the paper and the lower grade fuels the boilers.

There has been a recent addition to this mechanical chain--a gasifier which turns the waste wood into a natural gas increasing its heat energy. One fellow put it this way--"It even burns up the smoke." Incidentally, whether burned as chips or gas, wood fiber is free of the pollutants found in other fuels. And when the machines pull out they leave a park like forest behind with new shoots sprouting from the root systems providing food and shelter for wildlife.

The term used to describe the process is environmental thinning and we have in the United States 736 million acres designated as commercial grade forest. We don't know how many millions of acres of groves and timber in addition, but in that commercial forest land there is an estimated 100 billion tons of trees of which 40 percent is junk or waste wood and the supply renews itself on a permanent basis.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Bilingualism"

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

A little while ago I spoke to you about some ill-conceived government ideas about bilingual voting ballots. At that time I said--and still believe--that one of the worst things we can do is to allow the government to officially split our nation into separate ethnic conclaves. When we vote, we vote as Americans who share one political language, English--although we may have different national backgrounds with other languages for social matters.

Now I want to emphasize the word "officially". The government should not be in the business of imposing linguistic theories or anthropological theories on our political system. But that does not mean that those of us whose ethnic or national background involves a language other than English should forget or neglect that language as part of their cultural heritage.

I mention this to point out an important fact of our time: more and more Americans are coming to see that being American doesn't mean turning your back on your cultural heritage. More and more Americans are now proudly proclaiming their ancestral language and customs, not as a way of turning away from America but as a way of embracing it.

I thought of this as I saw pictures of Americans of Polish ancestry when they learned of the new Pope. Pope John Paul II is, of course, Polish, and when you see the look of joy on the faces of fellow Americans who are of Polish ancestry you realize that pride in one's particular heritage strengthens our love of this country.

There are many ways of being American and each one can teach us something about America.

But there is all the difference in the world between private, voluntary efforts to promote and proclaim our ethnic differences and a government effort to impose such differences through voting laws or quotas.

In the days of the swing bands there was a song titled: "It Ain't What You Do, It's The Way That You Do It". That message goes for the current ethnic and cultural revival: if the people do it, it's O.K.; if the government tries to impose regulations and laws based on ethnic differences we all suffer. Erin Go Braigh!

RONALD REAGAN

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

We are told by voices from out Mt. Olympus--Washington, D.C. that is--that our taxes have been cut, but don't count on having any extra money to spend. Oh, there are one or two parts of the bill that offer some benefit to the economy with changes in the business and capital gains tax, but an across the board tax cut, it is not.

The Kemp-Roth bill is "supposedly dead, a victim of assassination" by those who believe in higher progressivity in the income tax and that taxation is a method of redistributing the earnings from the most productive to the least productive. Kemp-Roth is not dead--ideas do not die, it is simply waiting for the wisdom of the people to be accepted by the majority in Congress.

Andrew Mellon, who was Secretary of the Treasury under Presidents Harding, Coolidge and Hoover, in his book "Taxation: The People's Business" explains why the progressive tax idea is really a rip-off, not of the rich but of the worker. He says, "The History of taxation shows that taxes which are inherently excessive are not paid." And then he explains away the foolish demagogery of those who want even higher surtaxes and label every effort by individuals to minimize their tax burden as a shameful use of loop holes. Let me read a paragraph from his book.

"The high tax rates inevitably put pressure upon the taxpayer to withdraw his capital from productive business and invest it in tax-exempt securities or find other lawful methods of avoiding the realization of taxable income. The result is that the sources of taxation are drying up; wealth is failing to carry its share of the tax burden, and capital is being diverted into channels which yield neither revenue to the government nor profit to the people.... What rates will bring in the largest revenue to the government, experience has not yet developed, but it is estimated that by cutting the surtaxes in half, the government, when the full effect of the reduction is felt, will receive more revenue at the lower rates of tax than it would have received at the higher rates."

Acting on the philosophy expressed in that paragraph, Mellon succeeded in getting Congress to cut the highest bracket from the WWI higher of 66 percent to 25 percent. There were no screams of protest about benefiting the rich and very soon there was such an expansion of the economy and such prosperity for all the people that we actually made a huge dent in the war debt.

When John F. Kennedy cut taxes across the board in the 60's, the top marginal rate was 91 percent and the base 10 percent. He cut these to 70 percent and 14 percent. The result was the longest, sustained, economic expansion in the history of our country. Kemp-Roth would further lower the rates to a 50 percent top and an eight percent base. And our noted economists predict another economic expansion. It is time for Washington to hear from the people.

RONALD REAGAN
RADIO COMMENTARY

DISC 78-17

TAPED 12/8/78
AIRED 12/85-1/12/79

78-17A

Generic Promos

1.	Christmas Day	2:19
2.	SALT II	2:52
3.	Panama Canal	2:49
4.	Gambling on the Dollar	2:49
5.	The Checkoff Ripoff	2:13
6.	Gas	2:36
7.	Taxes	2:59

78-17B

1.	Keep of the Grass	3:01
2.	Helsinki Pact	2:44
3.	Bread	2:35
4.	Business Tax	3:05
5.	E.R.A.	2:36
6.	Miscellaneous I	2:28
7.	Miscellaneous II	2:57
8.	Textbooks	2:40

PLEASE NOTE

These programs are provided for airing from December 25, 1978 thru January 12, 1979 inclusive. Maintaining this schedule will enable your station to air all newly recorded programs as received.

Please note the details of our no-charge reprint service described in the attached memo.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Let's all take a few moments out of our rushed and frenzied lives and think about Christmas in our time.

To Christians fortunate enough to live in a free nation, Christmas means a lot of things. It means going to church to pay our respects to the new-born King, it means family gatherings; it means Christmas trees and presents and seeing friends and neighbors.

Now perhaps we do not pay enough attention to the religious meaning of Christmas. Perhaps we forget just whose birthday it is and what this stupendous event means to the world. But at least we have a choice. We bring to Christmas what we have in our hearts.

But this Christmas, all over the world, there will be tens of millions of Christians who will spend a different kind of Christmas. Because of the governments which rule them, these followers of the one who was born two thousand years ago, will spend Christmas day in silence or in very private celebration. In the countries in which they live, the state forbids religious education and forbids acknowledged followers of the Prince of Peace to play any part in public life. From the cradle to the grave, these people are told by state-controlled media that Christian belief is wrong, that it must be eradicated, that it is an enemy of the state. These people raise their children as best they can against tremendous odds. Christmas is different for them.

Yet, despite all they have been through, the spirit of that first Christmas continues to live in their hearts. The rulers have thrown Christians into slave labor camps; they have killed their priests and ministers, they have humiliated their children in state-run schools; but in that grim and terror-filled existence, the light of Christian love has refused to be buried. Out of the unfathomable horrors of the atheistic Gulag Archipelago came the unyielding Christian voice of Alexander Solzinytsh. And we know that wherever one or two are gathered in the name of the Prince of Peace, even the forces of totalitarian Hell cannot prevail against them.

What has sustained them through all these years? A babe born in a manger, surrounded by shepherds at his birth, on a night almost two thousand years ago. That event transformed history. Let's take time so it can also transform our hearts.

RONALD REAGAN

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

In view of what I'm about to say let me preface my remarks with a statement. I'm sure all of us would like nothing better than to see the two great superpowers, the U.S. and the Soviet Union agree to a real and effective reduction of armaments; a reduction that would not be one sided, one that would increase, not decrease our hope for lasting peace.

But as the time nears for submission of a so-called SALT II treaty to the Senate for ratification there is a growing fear among knowledgeable and responsible people that the treaty may be dangerously unbalanced. Granted no one has seen the treaty, nevertheless leaks have led to a widespread suspicion that restrictions on Russia's ability to win a war will be far less than the restraints the treaty will impose on us.

Last June the State Department issued a pamphlet called "The SALT Process." It was designed to sell the people on strategic arms control. Again I say, all of us are agreed on the worth of real strategic arms limitation, but the State Department was trying to sell a treaty which had not even been negotiated.

Now while we await at least a preview of what the negotiators have accomplished we see a sales campaign being put together in our Capital. Preparations are underway to convince the people that this treaty, which has not yet been formulated, will be good for us.

A California Senator, Alan Cranston, is holding weekly study sessions to educate Senate staffers on strategic issues. Key aides to Senator Gary Hart of Colorado are participating. One can't help but wonder why if these two Senators know enough about the treaty to do this they don't just tell their colleagues what they know. Maybe they have told one. Senator Kennedy has authored several articles praising the treaty. But why then has a long time Senator, experienced in military affairs, Senator Jackson of their own party, come out so strongly against the treaty?

Meanwhile the State Department has organized a training program for potential speakers, a series of presentations for community groups. Special briefings have been given organizations such as the National Council of Churches and there are more planned. Key business leaders and others will be invited to the White House for a special sprinkling of SALT.

But it is the Senators who must ratify or not ratify the treaty and their decision must be based on one thing alone--is it good for the United States. Why are they apparently going to be the last to learn what the treaty contains?

Even the normal, courtesy information pipe line from the Pentagon to retired high ranking officers has been shut down. Is it possible the scenario is a repeat of the Panama treaty? Will we be told the treaty is ready? Then will it be initialed in a public ceremony while Congress is in recess? The Senate will, of course, be pressured to simply stamp it approved rather than embarrass any of the principle characters involved.

Perhaps the Senate should speak first and tell the administration what it will and will not accept in a treaty.

RONALD REAGAN

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

I've just recently been shown a copy of a letter from a special assistant to the Commissioner of United States Customs addressed to the head of our Panama Canal Company. The letter reads: "Due to the cost items incorporated in the Panama Canal Treaties, tolls at the Canal will be increased approximately 40 to 100 percent. Shipping industry officials based in New Orleans are highly concerned that large toll increases at the Panama Canal will drive cargo away from the Port of New Orleans, the Gulf and East Coast to West Coast ports; approximately 20 percent of the cargo passing through the Port of New Orleans transits the canal." I wonder if some Senators who voted for the treaties knew what they might be doing to the economy of their states? The letter concludes: "I would appreciate your comments and forecasts as to the impact this will have on the shipment of goods bound for the gulf and East Coast ports and the effect it will have on the Canal usage. This information would assist us in future allocations of Custom resources at the ports of entry along the United States coastline."

And we were just getting used to not hearing about the Panama Canal anymore. Well, we'll be hearing when Congress returns in January. For obvious reasons the administration did not send the Congress proposals for legislation to carry out the provisions of the treaty before the election. But in January they'll all have to face up to a deadline. The treaty requires us to hand over to Panama certain buildings and facilities no later than next October 1.

Panama will take over the headquarters of the 193rd Infantry Brigade, the 210th Aviation Battalion, military intelligence for the entire Southern Command and the Mount Hope Cemetery on the Atlantic side. Some 1,200 military and civilian graves will have to be moved to the Pacific side.

All of this involves some \$38 million in new construction by us. The new treaty prohibits the new canal commission from operating such things as bowling alleys and theatres so these will have to be taken over by the military.

Very simply the problem is this. The date for turnover is October 1st, the rainy season starts in April. Construction is virtually impossible. Once the rains start, the place becomes one big puddle and Congress won't be back till January.

The Senate ratified the treaties but all of the legislation implementing this construction, the transfers and the appropriations must be passed by both the House and the Senate. The treaties themselves can stand or die in this coming legislative session.

One thing sure--we'll be reminded that all these millions of dollars worth of new construction to house our men (because we're giving Panama the present facilities) will also be given to Panama in the year 2000.

Yes, we'll be hearing a lot about the canal--at least until the rains start in April.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Gambling on the Dollar"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

President Carter's program to rescue the dollar on world money markets, contains one item that got little attention. Yet that one item represents a tremendous gamble that inflation can be stopped. And they're gambling with your tax dollars.

The problem that President Carter faced on November 1st was the shocking decline of the value of the dollar against other free world currencies. Simply put, foreign investors were dumping dollars in favor of Swiss francs, Deutschmarks, and Japanese yen. The reason for it was the apparent inability of the Carter Administration to take any really serious steps to cut back government spending, to stop printing new money, and to bring inflation under control. Dollars were getting cheaper by the day, and foreign investors wanted out.

So on November 1st President Carter revealed a bold new plan for government intervention to support the price of the dollar. One part of that plan was to sell up to \$10 billion in bonds denominated in foreign currencies, such as the franc, mark and yen. The idea behind this scheme is that by promising to repay the loans in foreign currencies, the United States, and not foreign lenders, will accept the risk of a continuing decline in the value of the dollar.

When those bonds come due, President Carter hopes that inflation will be under control and the value of the dollar effectively stabilized. Meanwhile, the foreign currencies that the United States obtains from this bond sale will be exchanged now for dollars in world markets, thus strengthening the position of the dollar.

It's a logical theory, but it is also a big gamble. For if, by the time the foreign currency bonds come due, the dollar has not stabilized--if the U.S. has not balanced its budget--if inflation has not been brought under control--then the United States is going to take an awful bath in the market--as they say in Wall Street.

It's happened before. In 1968 the Treasury sold several billion dollars worth of foreign currency bonds as part of President Johnson's plan to fund the Vietnam war without raising taxes in an election year. Foreign currency bonds with a face value of \$1.2 billion are still outstanding, payable in Swiss francs. At the time of issue, the franc was worth about 22¢; today the franc brings around 61¢. To pay off those remaining foreign currency bonds, the Treasury will have to accept a loss on the order of three-quarters-of-a-billion dollars. That loss comes out of the hides of us taxpayers, probably in the form of additional taxes, or in further erosion of the value of the dollar.

Currency speculation is a dangerous business. It's even more dangerous when the U.S. Treasury engages in it. For, if President Carter can't bring himself to make the hard decisions about cutting federal spending to bring inflation under control, Uncle Sam is going to come up a sure loser when foreign investors call in their chips. A big mistake is this, and it's possible the dollar may never recover its former status as the world's foremost currency.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "The Checkoff Ripoff"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Almost everyone is familiar with the idea of the check-off. For example, employers automatically check off--that is deduct--union dues from their employees' paychecks under most collective bargaining agreements. Banks, at the customer's order, will automatically transfer money from the customer's checking account to a savings plan every month. The employee's share of the social security tax is automatically checked off, by law, by the employer, and forwarded directly to the government.

The check-off, when freely agreed to, is a convenience. It saves the customer or employee that much paperwork, and automatically takes care of a transaction that otherwise might be forgotten or postponed. When the check-off is not prescribed by law or freely agreed to by the customer or employee, however, it begins to look like robbery.

The negative or reverse check-off is indeed a form of robbery. And like robbery, it can yield quite a bit of money, until you get caught. Fortunately the Kentucky Education Association just got caught, and as a result the whole scheme has been dealt a blow from which it will hopefully not recover.

Under the negative checkoff, funds are deducted from an employee's paycheck for purposes which the employee may not approve of -- namely to back political candidates. In Kentucky, the system worked like this: When a teacher signed an application to join the Kentucky Education Association (a state affiliate of the National Teachers' Union) that was considered by the association to be an authorization not only to have regular union dues checked off by the school district, but also \$1.00 a month for the union's political action fund. If the teacher objected, he or she could petition for exemption to the union -- which, of course, would then know that that teacher was not in support of the union's political objectives.

Before putting this negative check-off system in effect, 2,854 KEA members voluntarily opted for the checkoff, and the union raised a maximum of \$5,740 in one quarter. But after the negative checkoff went into effect, 21,463 KEA members were, in effect, forced to contribute, and collections rose to as much as \$82,000 in one quarter. Apparently only about 14 percent of those contributions were truly voluntary. The Federal Elections Commission took the KEA to court, charging a violation of the Federal Elections Campaign Act. Federal District Court Judge Oliver Gasch agreed. He said, "The method of solicitation for the fund must be calculated to result in knowing free choice donations, an act intentionally taken, and not the result of inaction when confronted by an obstacle."

That decision, if it's upheld on appeal, will put an end to the negative checkoff as a device for extracting unwilling contributions to finance federal election campaigns. But the practice still exists in other forms, beyond the reach of the Federal Elections Campaign act. The most notorious example is that of Ralph Nader's so-called "Public Interest Research Groups" in numerous states. They work the negative checkoff racket using the fees paid by students to their colleges and universities. Like the Kentucky Education Association, self-styled "consumer advocate" Nader seems to be not very keen about the benefits of free choice. Let's hope the KEA court case opens his eyes.

RONALD REAGAN

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

In World War I on the Western Front, Germany unleashed a new weapon that brought horrible death to thousands of British soldiers who were entirely unprepared to defend themselves against such a weapon. The weapon was poison gas. Since then we've learned that it was used in desperation because Germany was running out of powder to keep up the artillery fire necessary to maintain the stalemate of trench warfare.

At any rate, following the Great War, the Geneva Convention outlawed the use of poison gas in warfare. That has been one of the most honored rules of warfare, unviolated in World War II, Korea, Vietnam and the Middle East.

There have been, however, frequent reports that the Soviet Union is prepared to use chemical warfare including various poison gases and bacteriological weapons. It is also reported their troops are prepared to defend themselves against such weapons if used by others. Now comes a disturbing story out of Vietnam where the Vietnamese Communists, who are supplied and backed by the Soviets, are fighting against irregulars, MEO tribesmen in the mountains of Laos.

This is a little reported war, certainly not getting the attention given the Vietnamese advance into Cambodia. Thanks, however, to the "National Review Bulletin", we learn that about 60,000 tribesmen have been holding out in Laos for three years, refusing to recognize the authority of Vietnam's Communist revolution.

A number of MEO, some Royal Laotian officers fighting for them, other refugees and a French doctor who has been working in the area for two years, have managed to cross the Mekong River and escape into Thailand. They all tell the same story. Unable to flush the tribesmen out of their jungle and mountain hideouts, the Vietnamese have resorted to poison gas. There are too many witnesses and the stories dovetailed too well for this to be doubted.

The French doctor personally observed the first gas attacks in 1977. Aircraft flew over the native villages dropping bombs which, upon explosion, released a green cloud. According to the doctor the effects were similar to hyperita, a gas used in World War I. The victims suffered headaches, dizziness, vomiting blood, and, of course, death.

The professional soldiers estimate about 7,000 people died in these poison gas attacks in the district south of the Phou Bia mountains alone. This year the bombings have continued but with a yellow colored gas which results in a much quicker death.

One has to wonder if this obscure war in the mountains of Laos is being used as a kind of laboratory experiment complete with human guinea pigs. But does that exempt it from the Geneva conventions? And where is the United Nations, or should we ask?

RONALD REAGAN

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

Our progressive income tax structure is founded on the idea that those who earn more should pay more and there can be no arguing with the fairness of that. Indeed it is part of our Judeo-Christian tradition--the idea of tithing. The Lord's share is considered to be one-tenth. And, we are told that if the Lord prospers us ten times as much, we must give back to Him 10 times as much. In other words, if you earn \$10,000, you devote one-tenth, or \$1,000 to good and charitable works. If you prosper 10 times as much and earn \$100,000, you give \$10,000 to those good and charitable causes -- in other words, to the Lord.

It is when we "render unto Caesar" that we find the proportionate tax which satisfies the Lord, is totally unacceptable to government. Under what is called a progressive tax, if you are prospered 10 times as much, you are taxed 50 times as much--sometimes even more. This is the philosophy of "soak the rich", which theoretically lightens the burden for the less affluent--those with lower earnings.

To suggest exchanging the progressive tax for a proportionate system would be political suicide for any office holder. Even the Kemp-Roth bill, which called for an across-the-board tax cut (and which I supported) would have retained the progressive feature. Who today would dare say as a Scottish economist said a century ago, "To tax a man in any way other than proportionate to his earnings is to put to sea without rudder or compass. There is no end to the mischief you can do."

All right, having said that, brace yourself. I would like to see the rich pay more tax. I do not, however, believe that can be accomplished by increasing their tax rates. To the contrary, I believe lowering the steeply progressive rates on the upper income brackets would not only increase their taxes, it would mean more prosperity for all of us.

People in the upper income levels have a certain flexibility in arranging their affairs. When, for example, tax rates become too punitive, the affluent refrain from putting their money in risky investments. The reason is obvious: They can buy school and municipal bonds which are safe and, while the return is low, it is non-taxable. Or they can buy works of art, land or treasury notes.

The truth is, real tax revenue from those who should be making business and commercial investments has been shrinking. Let me give you some figures to prove that government gets more revenue when the punitive tax rates are lowered. In the three years--1961, 1962 and 1963--the top surtax rate was 91 percent. In each of those three years, government's actual tax revenue from people earning \$100,000 and up was a little more than \$2.5 billion. In 1964 President Kennedy backed a measure to reduce the 91 percent rate to 77 percent and tax receipts went up to almost \$3 billion. In the following two years the 77 percent rate dropped to 70 percent and government received about \$4 billion each year. They were better off and so were we.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Keep Off the Grass"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

I've commented once or twice about what appears to be a move by the federal government to tie up more and more of the land area of the United States. Right now something called "Rare II" is going on. Rare stands for Roadless Area Review and Evaluation. It is a program by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service to take about 62 million acres of national forest and national grasslands in 37 states and Puerto Rico and designate them as wilderness areas. This would mean, of course, the closing of all roads. In other words, only those robust enough to go backpacking would have access to those millions of acres of scenic land.

To show what this means to many Americans, let me read you a portion of a letter I received from Mrs. Corey. It reads: "I happen to be what is popularly called a "rockhound", as is my husband. Many areas have been open to us for many, many years, for hunting gem and rock materials (from which we make jewelry we sell to make a little extra money). If these plans--Rare II--go through, some 500 rockhound areas in the Southwest alone will be closed to us."

Mrs. Corey then explained how rockhounds have certain areas posted for their use; how it is traditional with rockhounds that they leave no litter behind and even engage in clean-ups of areas where campers have carelessly left rubbish, etc. She goes on to say, "our hobby happens to be one in which senior citizens participate to a great extent. Many of us are disabled so that we cannot backpack, but we can go on the club trips if we can use the four-wheel drives or the recreation vehicles. The BLM and NFS plans would deny us all this. It is a healthy hobby which gets us outdoors and helps keep us active--good for both the morale and the body. If my husband and I did not have this type of recreation, I'm afraid we might become very inactive and do only sedentary type things, which you know is the worst possible thing for older people." Mr. Corey will be retiring in two years and they both look forward to continuing their hobby.

In a P.S. she added, "We want to be entirely self-supporting by our own hands. I believe you will find most of us feel this way--that is in our particular generation." Amen! She closed by pleading not for just rockhounds but for all who enjoy the great outdoors.

Mrs. Corey is right to be concerned and I think we all should be, lest a handful of extremists plus these government agencies lock up in a preserve, the great scenic areas of our land for the benefit of a privileged few.

The Philips Company News in Montana reports that two special agents of the Department of Interior appeared at the home of a retired rancher, Mr. Oshio, with a search warrant and confiscated the collection of arrowheads he had hanging on his living room wall.

The fact is, the Montana rancher had been collecting such artifacts for years as a hobby--not to sell. The federal agents said he had broken the law by taking them from public land. I find it inconceivable that a hiker coming upon an arrowhead in the desert or national forest is breaking the law if he picks it up. As the song says, "This land is our land". It is not a bureaucratic private preserve.

RONALD REAGAN

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

About two years ago on one of these broadcasts I told of a California couple who have made repeated visits through the Berlin wall to bring aid to East Germans who are being denied basic human rights. They have helped many escape from slavery into the freedom of West Germany.

Through them I learned of the routine violation of the Helsinki pact by the communist rulers of East Germany. In signing the pact, East Germany proclaimed that "the application for an exit visa to reunite families, will not lead to any change in the rights and responsibilities of the applicant or members of his family."

Many East Germans learn every day how false and hollow is that statement and the whole Helsinki pact for that matter. In one town a young girl is barred from school because her mother applied for an exit visa. Neighbors who speak out or befriend such people lose their jobs.

Two years ago I learned the story of Rolf Mainz who had applied for an exit visa. The California couple were trying to help him. Rolf had no record as a dissident. Indeed he was a member of the Communist party, a commissioned officer in the "National Volksarmee". His brother Klaus, a dentist, was a celebrity holding the highjump record and championship in 1953.

Then came the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia and the brothers began to think things through. Both applied for exit visas to join their father in West Germany. Rolf resigned from the party and immediately lost his job. He wrote a satirical article and sent it to a West German paper. It was entitled "Comrades, Why Don't You Come Live With Us", and described life in East Germany. Four days later he was arrested and so was his brother. Both were sentenced to prison. Klaus, the athlete, served his term and his right to leave East Germany with his wife and children was bought. His last nine months were spent in solitary confinement on a daily food ration of eight slices of bread, a tiny amount of butter and margarine and a bowl of soup. He suffers from a protein deficiency but is free and has begun to practice dentistry in West Germany.

Rolf was sentenced to an additional five years. He suffers from a duodenal ulcer and is in constant and excruciating pain. He has lost 44 pounds but refuses surgery. It seems that unpopular prisoners have a way of dying on the operating table in Brandenburg Prison.

The conditions in Brandenburg are beyond description. Almost every day prisoners go on hunger strike in protest of the brutality and inhuman treatment. Their keepers let them go for eight days, then they are tied up and given injections of hypertonic salt solution under the skin. This produces such intense thirst the prisoner can only help himself by eating the bowl of soup set before him.

Rolf is in great danger of losing his life. His diet consists of a saltless watery soup. Many in West Germany and two Californians are trying to help him. Our prayers should go with them.

RONALD REAGAN

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

A few weeks ago we took off for Europe to ask questions about some of the problems confronting the United States and our allies in the Free World. Meetings were scheduled with business and government leaders in England, France and West Germany with London the first stop.

There are several ways to fly to London. You can go to New York, overnight there and take the Concorde for a fast three hours or so the next day or the trip can be made in one day. Of course, the one day trip upsets your life routine a bit. Leaving California during the noon hour, you take the big circle route up toward the pole, over Iceland, Scotland and South to Heathrow airport in London. The upsetting thing is that in those nine-and-a-half hours you fly into night crossing eight time zones and arriving at what is bed time in California but already morning in London. This we did and spent the next few days trying to adjust our sleeping, waking and eating to English time.

But enough about jet lag. I mentioned eating and that has something to do with what I wanted to tell you. England had been undergoing a bakers strike for about three weeks before we got there. The press reported it as "industrial action". Naturally we figured on doing without bread, buns and pastries and had already counted the calories we'd save.

To our surprise we never sat down to a meal that didn't include a variety of breadstuffs and pastries. We assumed this resulted from prestrike hoarding or possibly imports until we read a news item under the headline--"Use your loaf Sam". That translates in American "use your head", and the Sam was Sam Maddox, General Secretary of the striking bakers union.

It seems that in spite of the "industrial action"--the strike called by Sam's union--more than 80 percent of the normal supply was reaching the market every day.

At first Sam claimed it was coming from private sources. Later when that was proven to be untrue, he accused the large bakeries with dumping frozen stock they'd had in storage. That also was untrue.

What the press had to report was something of a miracle of the loaves. About 2,000 bakers in all of England had defied their leaders and returned to work; more than 20,000 remained on strike. Mr. Maddox is faced with trying to explain how fewer than 10 percent of the normal work force is providing 80 percent of England's bread supply--seemingly with little strain or upset.

The paper suggested there was evidently "an alarming degree of overmanning", in the bakeries and said, "it is time the leaders of the bread strike faced up to reality". Ironically the newspaper workers who voiced those thoughts were planning to go on strike themselves, before we left.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Louis Rukeyser recently did a column about a corporation's annual report to the stockholders. The particular corporation was Winn-Dixie Stores, Inc., a major food chain.

It must have been a pleasant report for the shareholders to receive because it announced a 20 percent increase in profits over the previous year and the shareholders dividends was \$3.94 per share.

But that wasn't the reason Mr. Rukeyser did his column on Winn-Dixie's annual report. There was another figure in that report that is not usually included in such a document. Profits were up 20 percent, yes, but taxes were up 22 percent and the shareholders could read for the first time that while their dividend was \$3.94, government's take for each share of stock was \$5.93.

The chairman of the board admitted that some of the stockholders were quite shocked by their first time look at the tax bite. Actually that \$5.93 was not the total amount of taxes paid by Winn-Dixie. It included federal income tax, Social Security taxes, franchise and occupational licenses, state income taxes and personal property taxes. It did not include indirect taxes such as the portion of the considerable rent the corporation pays which, of course, includes property tax on the rental facilities.

Let us hope this is only a beginning and that other businesses will fall in line and publish this figure in their reports. They will help to expose much of the economic mythology prevalent in our land. In the first place we can see more clearly the inequity of the double tax. Each shareholder has paid in effect \$5.93 in tax on the \$3.94 he is allowed as his return. But now he must also pay an income tax on that \$3.94 which the Internal Revenue Service calls unearned income and therefore subject to a tax rate of as much as 70 percent.

Ah! But you say that's for a pretty well heeled person. All right, are you in an employee pension plan? Such plans own one-third of the stock in American business and industry. Dividends from those stocks will determine how much will be in the fund when you retire. Do you have an insurance policy? Premiums you and others pay for 380 million insurance policies are invested in shares of stock in America's industry. Your policy dividends come from the dividends earned by those investments.

The fair answer, of course, would be a single tax. If there were no corporate tax, non-taxable funds such as Union pensions, endowments for schools and hospitals, etc. would get twice as much money for their investments and would pay no tax on it. On the other hand, individuals would receive increased dividends and pay income tax at whatever rate was called for by their income tax bracket. The retired couple with only a few dollars investment would pay no tax. As it is now they've been taxed at more than a 50 percent rate before they get their money. The high salaried individual in a 40 or 50 percent bracket would pay that rate of tax on his dividends.

By the way, Winn-Dixie did not make that healthy profit by gouging the customers. Their gross profit on each dollar of sales was less than two cents.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio program entitled "E.R.A.")

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

For a long time we have confidently assumed that government employees cannot be forced to participate in political activities. Apparently we have been wrong. Under certain circumstances their personal views notwithstanding, they can be ordered to support a cause if not a candidate.

Thanks to a state legislator in Arizona, Representative Donna J. Carlson, we learn of a memo within a federal agency which not only orders support for the ratification of E.R.A. but requires interference by federal employees in the state ratification process.

Now let me hasten to say I am not bringing up the Equal Rights Amendment for a pro or con discussion. The Congress has approved an extension of time for the state legislatures to vote for or against ratification of their constitutional amendment. What I am bringing up is what Representative Donna Carlson calls, "blatant interference into the ratification process by the executive branch."

It seems that Representative Carlson came into possession of a memo from the Lower Colorado Regional Office--Bureau of Reclamation, U.S. Department of the Interior. It reads as follows: "Subject: Elimination of Sexual Discrimination." The body of the message then follows: "In a memorandum to the heads of departments and agencies, the President emphasizes that every resource of the federal government is to be applied in eliminating discrimination and inequality based on sex."

If the memo ended there I'd be in complete agreement and I'm sure Ms. Carlson would be also. But it continues. "He states that ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment will remain a priority with the present administration and further directs the head of each department and agency to (1) make the most of public appearance opportunities to demonstrate the administrations commitment to the Equal Rights Amendment; and (2) include in public speeches, where appropriate, language emphasizing the importance of ERA and assure that similar language is included in the speeches made by officials of their agency or department."

Perhaps that paragraph can be defended by some as within the administrations right. But there can be no justification for the final paragraph of this memo to employees of the Department of Interior.

"Accordingly, I am asking each supervisor and manager in this region to comply with the above directions regardless of personal preferences or political opinions. This is not to be considered a partisan issue, but one which federal employees are now obliged to support."

It was signed by the regional director and sent out on October 23rd. It was made public in the Phoenix Gazette in November.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Let me make one item out of two. Washington announced with considerable fanfare that it was moving aggressively forward with its program to wipe out unnecessary and burdensome regulations. We are to be freed from bureaucratic harrassment and nitpicking is their promise.

Washington did not announce with fanfare that as of July 4th in this year of our Lord 1978, the Federal government had already added 28,963 pages of new regulations.

As for the ones they are trying to eliminate, on June 24th speaking in Beaumont, Texas, President Carter told a cheering crowd that already 1,100 of OSHA'S most picky, picky regulations had been wiped out in one day. A national news magazine dutifully reported that OSHA, one of the most pernicious of the watchdog agencies, had wiped out 1,100 regulations. That, of course, made it a fact (in Washington that is) where they tend to believe their own press releases.

The trouble is, the fact wasn't a fact. It was on December 5th, 1977 that Secretary of Labor Marshall announced at a press conference that 1,100 nitpicking regulations were being cancelled. He spoke of how he had learned that getting rid of regulations was not easy. But he added that "with enough determination it is possible to beat the system."

I'm sure the Secretary thought in saying it he had made it so. But it seems that certain protocol must be followed in deleting a rule. The proposed deletion must be published in the federal register. Then you must wait a certain period to see if the rule has any constituents who want to ride to the rescue of said rule. If a hearing is demanded, it must be held. Remember we are talking about 1,100 separate rules.

Well there are constituencies, hearings have been asked for -- none had been held -- as of a year later and the 1,100 regulations were alive and well. An OSHA spokesman refused to give a target date as to when they might go the way of the Buffalo. In fact he said "We couldn't even give you a guess but our new director of safety standards has it near the top of his priority list."

One thing is certain about government programs--they are the nearest thing to eternal life we'll ever see on this earth. Now within the past few weeks the press announced 895 OSHA regulations have been cancelled. Have they really?

Out of Sidney, Nebraska, the town fathers asked for federal aid in buying a \$25,000 snow plow for their airport. Washington haggled over the amount. They'd go for an \$83,000 plow and a \$103,000 building to house it but they couldn't go \$25,000. Since Sidney had to put up 10 percent, Sidney said no to the \$186,000 deal. But Washington drives a hard bargain. It persuaded Sidney to settle for a \$99,000 plow and building.

Meanwhile a young farm girl raised a steer that won the blue ribbon at the state fair. Her steer went for \$14,000 in an auction. The I.R.S. has already told her she owes \$2,200 in capital gains tax.

The Lords of Washington giveth and they taketh away.

RONALD REAGAN

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

This is going to be one of those clear the desk days.

Vladimir Bukovsky, the Soviet scientist who was released from a Russian concentration camp in exchange for the leader of the Chilean communist party, says the 1980 Olympic games should be taken away from Moscow. He charges they will be used purely as a propaganda weapon for the Soviets.

It seems he knows what he's talking about. It is reported that for the first time in the history of the games, Russia will set quotas on who can come to the games. The limit will be 300,000 tourists and only 10,000 of those can be from the United States. Some 200,000 will be allowed from Communist and third world countries. Western Europe will be allowed 50,000.

Continuing on the international scene--we are told that the U.N. General Assembly UNESCO has readied a resolution on the universal rights of animals. "All animals", it declares, "are born with an equal claim on life and the same rights to existence. Any act involving mass killing of wild animals is genocide." Well, I'm sure none of us approve of needless mass slaughter, but who decides what constitutes mass slaughter and does it apply for example to rats? And what about animals that exist by lunching on other animals?

It is reported that General Motors now has more than 20,000 full-time employees who don't help build automobiles. They just work on federal paper work and regulations.

Well, they may need extra help soon. There is an argument going on over at the Department of Transportation in Washington. They can't agree on a regulation about hood ornaments on our cars. One office wants to eliminate those radiator ornaments as dangerous to people who get hit by a car. I may be wrong but if an automobile lays into me head on I don't think the hood ornament is going to make much difference one way or the other. Besides most of them now are on a spring so they lay back if anything touches them.

The faction that wants them removed says there'd be a cost savings in addition to the safety factor. Come on now! A Rolls Royce would be lower priced without that winged lady on its front end?

Maybe some of those people in Washington should look at the last election results before they go on deciding they know what we want. The Consumer Federation of America targeted one Senator and four Congressmen they were out to defeat--supposedly because they weren't thoughtful enough of consumers. All five won. They named four Senators they were going to help win--obviously friends of consumers--all four lost.

On that happy note I'll call it a day.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Columnist Patrick Buchanan (bless his soul) has written a column reminding us that people write schoolbooks and therefore some schoolbooks will reflect the bias of their authors and students will accept that bias as truth.

If you are troubled now and then by a dinner table discussion in which your teenagers attack your views with pronouncements they deliver as unassailable fact--check their sources. You'll probably find it isn't TV or the newly befriended classmate. It's that textbook you're going to send them to their rooms to read. After all, you're a parent and parents are supposed to see that homework is attended to. But let's add for the umpteenth time--parents should know what is in those textbooks.

Pat Buchanan reports that the Georgetown University Ethnics and Public Policy Center requested a veteran diplomat, Martin F. Herz, to examine six best-selling high school history texts on how they treated 16 cold war topics.

He delivered a sobering 76 page report on everything from the Yalta agreement to the Berlin blockades, the Cuban missile crisis, the Korean war and the tragedy of Vietnam. "With the exception of a single paragraph in a single history book", Pat says Herz reported that, "none of the textbooks can be said to present an overly favorable view of United States foreign policy. On the contrary, there is a tendency of several to give the Soviet Union greater benefit of the doubt than is given to the United States."

Only two of the six texts dealt with Soviet aims at all and one of those two was flattering and sympathetic to Lenin, Stalin and Soviet communism. It described the Truman doctrine as committing the United States to intervene in "Democratic revolutions" wherever the world they occurred.

While the books made no mention of Communist subversion in America they painted quite a picture of the excesses of the McCarthy era. And two of them found Fidel Castro an admirable fellow who saved Cuba from Batista. One falsified completely when it said that Castro took the land away from a few immensely rich families and gave it to the poor farm workers. What he did was confiscate all the land from rich and poor alike and set it up like the state owned collective farms of Russia.

Vietnam, of course, was described as an oppressive, dictatorial regime. That is, South Vietnam was described that way. No mention was made of the rampant totalitarianism in North Vietnam, nor was it mentioned that Ho Chi Minh was a Communist.

Pat Buchanan drew a sobering and yes, frightening conclusion. What if an American President is faced someday with rallying his countrymen to the defense of this nation in an East-West clash. And what if he is faced with an indifferent or even hostile young America made that way by our nation's schools?