

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 79-1 through 79-3 (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/>

TAPED - 1/3/79
Aired - 1/15 - 2/2

RONALD REAGAN
RADIO COMMENTARY

DISC 79-1

79-1 A

1. Taiwan	2:57
2. Taiwan I	2:17
3. Taiwan II	2:32
4. Taiwan III	2:32
5. Jim Hendricks	2:30
6. Patent Medicine I	2:44
7. Patent Medicine II	2:49

79-1 B

1. Human Rights	2:13
2. Health Insurance	2:47
3. Telescope I	2:37
4. Telescope II	2:21
5. Miscellaneous I	2:57
6. Miscellaneous II	2:36
7. Miscellaneous III	2:41
8. South Africa	2:32

PLEASE NOTE

These programs are provided for airing from
January 15th through February 2nd, 1979 inclusive.
Maintaining this schedule will enable your station
to air all newly recorded programs as received.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Taiwan"

If one word could describe the mood of the Carter administration, most American news media and a lot of American businessmen, on the opening of formal diplomatic relations with Peking on New Year's day, I'd say the word is "euphoria".

Officials of the administration have been patting themselves on the back in interviews; a lot of reporters and commentators have taken the Administration's words at face value; and many a businessman has gushed about the nearly one billion customers he expects to find on the mainland of China.

Mr. Carter's sudden move may not provide all the benefits we've been hearing so much about. In fact, it may produce some unhappy results in the long run, including the ultimate loss of freedom for Taiwan's 17 million people.

The question hasn't been whether we should be friendly toward the Chinese people on the mainland. No, the question brought into sharp focus by Mr. Carter's move is the freedom and security of the people of Taiwan. America has formally cast an ally adrift with only vague promises about future relations and sales of defense equipment -- mostly based upon the hope that Peking will keep its hands off.

We can't undo the President's switching of formal relations -- that's within his constitutional power. But does our mutual defense treaty with Taiwan need to be scrapped? Dr. Hungdah Chiu, a professor of international law at the University of Maryland, says no. In an article in the Christian Science Monitor which appeared the day before Mr. Carter's surprise announcement, Dr. Chiu describes as a "misconception" the idea that recognition of Peking automatically should result in termination of our mutual defense treaty with the Republic of China on Taiwan.

He says, "The Theory...is that this treaty was concluded with the R.O.C. as the government of the state of China. Once the U.S. recognizes the (Peking) government as the government of China, it would necessarily derecognize the R.O.C. and deny that it has any international legal personality, including the capacity to maintain existing treaties."

But, he adds, "This theory would make sense only if the U.S. government has in fact and in law treated the R.O.C. government as the only legal government in China since 1949. But this is not the case. Article VI of the...defense treaty clearly provides that 'the terms 'territorial' and 'territories' shall mean in respect of the Republic of China, Taiwan and the Pescadores,' thus limiting U.S. recognition of the R.O.C. government to the area under the latter's effective control.

Dr. Chiu says, "since 1958 I have not seen a single U.S. foreign policy document which asserts that the R.O.C. is the only legal government in China."

That's an article I hope every member of the Senate reads. One of the dangers of sudden action in foreign affairs is that not all aspects of the situation can be thought out. Taiwan's security is in this category, but Dr. Chiu may have pointed a way for us to save the treaty which undergirds Taiwan's security -- and thus its prosperity and freedom -- despite the new relationship with Peking. Since we have never before broken a treaty without cause, this would save us some of our honor, too.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Taiwan I"

Someone once said every form of government has a single characteristic which forms the basis for its power; if that is lost, the government falls. Monarchy, for example, is based on the affection and respect of the people for the royal family. When the respect and affection disappear, the monarchy falls. Dictatorship is based on fear. It is successful only so long as the people fear the dictator. In a democracy the underlying principle is virtue. When that is lost, the democracy fails.

There came a moment in World War II when the Japanese offered Chiang Kai-shek a separate peace on the most generous terms. He of course knew that the Chinese Communists in Northern China had an army ready and waiting to seize power - as they subsequently did. The Japanese offer must have been tempting to the Generalissimo. He could have turned his full attention to the Red army and guaranteed the continuation of his regime.

The Japanese of course would have been able to throw their entire army fighting on the mainland of China against our forces in the South Pacific.

Chiang Kai-shek told our General Wedemeyer of the Japanese offer and of his refusal to make a separate peace. He said that he could not betray his friend and ally, the United States: that he would fight to the end by our side.

In spite of all the platitudes, the reiteration of arguments that the declaration by the President, December 15th, was simply "recognizing reality." One fact remains clear: The United States for the first time in its history, broke a treaty without cause. We callously betrayed a long time friend and ally which had refused to betray us. And we did so with brutal rudeness.

During the two years of the Carter administration, there has been a deliberate snubbing of the government of Taiwan. An Asian journey by our Vice President took in most of the Western Pacific except Taiwan. We sent no representative to the inauguration of the President of the Republic of China, the son of Chiang Kai-shek. And, in December there was no consultation with him, warning him of Mr. Carter's decision to accept the terms laid down by the Communists in Peking. What our government did was entirely lacking in virtue.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Taiwan II"

In Mr. Carter's announcement December 15th that we were establishing diplomatic relations with the Peoples Republic of China on the mainland, the implication was given that this was somehow a breakthrough, the result of successful negotiations. This is a little less than accurate. It didn't require any negotiations to do what the administration has done, nor was this any victory as the announcement also implied.

The legitimate government of China some three decades ago was overthrown by a military coup led by Mao Tse tung. That government fled to Taiwan and set itself up as the government in exile of China. Mao set up a Communist government in Peking. Both claimed to represent all of China. The United States continued its recognition and diplomatic relations with the exiled government on Taiwan.

In 1972 President Nixon made his historic visit to Peking and opened the door to a relationship with the mainland Chinese. In the discussions and negotiations that followed, trade and cultural relations were established. But the Red Chinese made three demands which they said would have to be met before there could be full diplomatic relations. Those demands were, the breaking of our defense treaty with Taiwan, cancellation of diplomatic relations and the removal of all American military advisors from Taiwan.

For almost seven years this has been the impasse between the United States and the Peking Regime. Neither President Nixon nor President Ford would accede to these demands. We must remember also that Red China was the supplicant. The rulers in Peking wanted full diplomatic recognition, mainly because of their hostile relations with the Soviets. They had everything to gain by recognition, we gained virtually nothing we didn't already have. The "breakthrough" the President announced on December 15th was, as I said earlier, not a breakthrough at all. We simply gave in to Peking's demands. This could have been done anytime in the last six or seven years -- whenever we were willing to throw a loyal ally overboard. During those years, poll after poll showed that while three-fourths of the American people wanted better relations with the mainland, three-fourths of them did not want to do this by dumping Taiwan.

Now, I believe there are things the Congress can do to lessen the damage that has been done, and I'll talk about this on the next broadcast. But one thing cannot be changed. The nations of the world have seen us cold bloodedly betray a friend for political expediency. That memory will not go away.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Taiwan III"

In the first days following the December 15th announcement by Mr. Carter that we are abrogating our treaty with Taiwan, spokesmen for the administration and some pundits of the press declared we were simply recognizing a reality. After all, there are some 900 million Chinese on the mainland and only 17 million on Taiwan, so -- they said, it was foolish to pretend the government on Taiwan was the government of China. But isn't it just as foolish to pretend that the regime in Peking is the actual government of Taiwan?

If we're going to put this on the basis of looking at reality, there are a few things we shouldn't overlook. The Peking regime -- once allied with the Soviet Union -- now sees the Russians as not being true to the principles of Karl Marx. Soldiers of the two great communist powers face each other across a long border and China proclaims Russia is an enemy and a threat to peace.

But, in their speeches to their own comrades, Peking's leaders have repeatedly said we are an imperialist enemy which must eventually be destroyed. To their own people the Communist leaders explain that we aren't an immediate threat as is the Soviet Union, so first things first.

And if they should ever decide we're Enemy Number One, not Number Two, they can do so with a clear conscience. They'll only be doing to us what we've done to Taiwan.

With Congress back in session, there are thing we can do to lessen the damage that has been done. We don't have just one treaty or agreement with Taiwan. We have more than fifty. And Taiwan and we do nearly eight billion dollars'worth of business a year together.

The President can say that all this will continue on a non-governmental basis, but that's impossible. Granted, he has the power to close our Taipei embassy and open one in Peking, but government representation by us in Taiwan and by the Republic of China here is essential. The same daily functions performed now by embassies and consulates must still be performed if we are to maintain trade and cultural relations. If the Chinese Communists could handle embassy functions in Washington by calling it a "liaison office" before January 1, why can't the Republic of China's embassy -- handling much more work -- be called a "liaison office" after January 1?

Congress can make sure that those treaties and agreements remain in force and also that we really do provide the people of Taiwan with the arms they need to defend themselves. Your congressman needs to hear from you right now with regard to this.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Jim Hendricks"

Some time ago on one of these broadcasts, I told the story of a young man in Bridgetown, Illinois -- Jim Hendricks and his horse Calvin. Since then I've had a number of letters from neighborly people who want to give a hand to Jim and Calvin. Before this commentary ends, I'll give Jim's address in case you want to be ready to take it down.

Jim Hendricks, a young man in his middle or late 20's was working on a river barge when a two-inch cable snapped and crushed his spine. He is a paraplegic living in a trailer home and was living on disability payments from Social Security. Those payments were suspended a while back as the result of a bureaucratic "snafu". It's curious how quickly the payments could be cancelled, yet now that the "snafu" is cleared away, Social Security tells him it will still be several months before his payments can be reinstated.

Meanwhile, Jim is being pressed by a bank because he mortgaged his trailer and everything he owns including his horse Calvin. Of course with no income, he is unable to keep up the mortgage payments and could possibly lose his home and Calvin.

Now Calvin is the thing that makes this story pretty special. Jim Hendricks resolved that he would not spend his life sitting in a wheelchair watching the world go by. He had grown up on a farm riding horses as a boy. He decided that he wanted to ride again even though he was paralyzed from the waist down.

He set out to find the right horse. Having done this, he looked for and found a trainee; a blind man who had trained trick horses for the circus. In three months they had a horse that would lie down so Jim could get aboard and could be ridden by him with no braces or straps. Strangely enough, Calvin seems to understand and is protective of his rider, but won't allow anyone else to ride him.

If the mortgage is foreclosed, Jim will lose Calvin. Well, this is the story I told a while back. I've received letters from disabled people telling me what Jim and Calvin have done to inspire them. Others have written wanting his address so they can help.

So here it is -- Jim Hendricks, P.O. Box 229, Bridgetown, Illinois 62618. I'll repeat -- Box 229 Bridgetown, Illinois 62618. And thank you all -- sincerely.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Patent Medicine I"

Not too many people are around who remember the flamboyant painted wagon that used to roll into town with an entertainer (dancer, banjo player or Indian tom-tom thumper) and a huckster peddling a medicine guaranteed to cure any and all ailments.

The routine was always the same: the side of the wagon would open, providing a small stage. The entertainer would attract a crowd and then the medicine salesman would make his pitch.

I was reminded of this old-time medicine show a few weeks ago when a subcommittee of the U.S. Senate showed up in the Los Angeles area, supposedly to hold hearings on compulsory national health insurance. Now, a hearing by a legislative committee is supposed to gather facts and opinions that will help the committee determine policy on a given matter. The subcommittee that went to California after appearing in Washington, D.C., West Virginia, Detroit, Chicago, Denver, wasn't gathering information. It was beating the drums in support of legislation. The chairman of the subcommittee, Senator Edward Kennedy, is already for the legislation, his own nationalized health insurance bill.

I think it is fair to question whether taxpayers' money should be used to drum up support for a legislative proposal. The senator went to California and, as he did in those other cities, had a road show troupe of several Canadians and U.S. citizens all of whom had suffered catastrophic illnesses. In California there was an audience of more than a thousand to hear, first, the Canadians tell how the great cost of their illnesses was paid by the government. Then the Americans would tell their story of wiped-out savings and lost homes as they tried to pay for their catastrophic ills. Now let me say, I'm not belittling those witnesses who suffered long and costly illnesses. Catastrophic injury or disease can strike any of us and the tremendous costs can go on for years. But this is a particular problem to be solved and it should not be used to justify compulsory government medicine for everyone.

At each stop Senator Kennedy's road show attracts opposition witnesses who have difficulty getting on the agenda. In Chicago, the President of the Illinois Medical society surprised the senator by turning his time over to a doctor from Canada. Senator Kennedy was not pleased. He curtly addressed this Canadian saying. "Well get on with it. Where are you from?"

Dr. Robillard, a neurosurgeon, trained at Harvard, now President of the Federation of Medical Specialists of Quebec, said "I have no axe to grind, but let me say one thing loud and clear. America has the best medical care in the world. In your haste to copy our Canadian system, do not bring American medicine down to the Canadian level. For now we look up to you." The senator tried to rebut the doctor in an emotional outburst, and the hearing ended. No such surprises were allowed in the California show.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Patent Medicine II"

On the last broadcast I told of the Senate subcommittee that is roadshowing the country under the pretense of holding hearings when in truth it is campaigning to socialize medicine; and the taxpayers are footing the bill for this sales trip.

Part of the sales pitch is based on how much medical costs are increasing and how much they'll be in a few years if we don't adopt a program of compulsory government medical care. Nothing is said, however, about the cost now and in the future if we do adopt such a scheme.

Health care now costs us about \$150 billion a year. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare -- even though it wants government medicine -- has estimated that the Kennedy proposal would add \$80 billion to that the first year. Supporting this is the evidence in all -- and let me emphasize all -- the nations in the world which already have nationalized (that is socialized) health care. This includes among others Canada, Britain, Sweden. In these latter two, some kinds of care are being denied to people because of cost. This denial takes the form of setting an age limit above which things such as transplants won't be given. Patients are denied care if a disease is too far advanced, reducing the odds of saving the patient. Several thousand kidney patients in one of those countries die each year because the cost of keeping them alive is too great. In other words, the medical bureaucrats play God.

But we have evidence close at hand of the role government intervention in health care can play in raising the cost of such care. The Hospital Association of New York State reveals that 24 percent of the costs of hospital care in that state result from government regulations aimed at cost and quality control. This report was based on a study of 148 hospitals. It was found that administrative personnel spend from 50 to 70% of their time complying with regulation. Even nurses spend more than one-quarter of their time on such matters instead of in the care of patients.

In that one state alone, New York, the number of employees engaged full time in paper work, year-round, is equivalent to what it would take to fully staff 75 hospitals with 250 beds each. Or put it another way, they could provide full hospital services to 600,000 people.

Possibly New York is above the average in this regulatory extravagance, but it indicates a problem that must be serious in all of the country. In New York, regulatory costs add almost \$40 a day to each patient's bill.

Can any of us believe that total takeover by government would not vastly increase the paper work, the regulations and the cost of health care? We have provisions now for the elderly and the destitute and more than 130 million Americans have some kind of health insurance. If the government really wants to help, let it give citizens income tax reductions or credits for health insurance premiums.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Human Rights"

A few weeks ago on one of these broadcasts, I told the story of an entertainer, a juggler in a show troop who made a sudden decision to change countries. He was a citizen of the Peoples Republic of China and the troop he was with was performing in the Sudan. After an evening performance he made his way to a Sudanese government office and asked to be sent to Taiwan. They bought him an airline ticket and he became a free man.

We know of course that literally tens of thousands of mainland Chinese every year make their way to the British outpost, Hong Kong. Some of these swim through miles of shark-infested waters, so determined are they to escape their homeland.

Some also make their way to Taiwan where there is freedom and one of the highest standards of living in all of Asia.

I mention this and the juggler's story because it connects with the administration's unexpected move to establish diplomatic relations with Red China. Not too long ago President Carter said "human rights" was the "soul" of his foreign policy. There are few countries in the world where human rights are more non-existent than in the Peoples Republic of China.

One wonders if the President will address the rulers in Peking through his new ambassador on this matter of "human rights". Will he, for instance, bring up the backing by Peking of the inhumane regime in Cambodia which is practicing genocide on its own citizens? The horror stories from that once-happy land tops anything in the world for sheer inhumanity.

But within the Communist China itself the violation of human rights is confirmed by literally thousands of stories told by escapees. Visitors to China of course do not see this because they are shown only the showcase China. When former United States Senator Hiram Fong -- himself of Chinese origin -- was on an official visit to Peking, and asked to be allowed to visit the village where his parents had lived, he was bluntly refused.

I've talked of our betrayal of the 17 million Chinese on Taiwan -- haven't we also betrayed millions and millions of Chinese on the mainland who lived with a dream of one day regaining freedom? We have legitimized the denial of their human rights.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Health Insurance"

I've spoken a number of times about the need to study government medicine in those countries that have chosen socialized medicine and to compare their health care with what we have. In very instance their costs are greater, their ratio of doctors to patients is less, and quality of care is way below ours. This is true even in Canada, no matter how much Senator Kennedy tries to peddle the Canadian medical program to the American people. But we should also study government medicine as we already have it in the United States. Medicaid, our program of care for those on welfare and those who work but receive an income too low to afford medical care, is far more costly than medicine as practiced in our traditional fee-for-service system.

In California, for example, the proposed Medicaid budget for next year is \$3.8 billion. There are fewer than three million people in California eligible for Medicaid. But, for the sake of discussion, take the figure for eligibles at a full three million and divide that into 3.8 billion. We find the annual health bill per man, woman and child pro-rates out to \$1,266 each. It's hard to believe that every one of those three million people will need \$1,266 worth of health care next year. We can only assume two things; there is a great deal of over utilization of the program and there must be a tremendous amount of administrative overhead. There's no question that medical treatment has gone up in this inflation-plagued era, but is the only answer a compulsory system, not just for the 10 percent or so who presently don't already have coverage, but for the other 90 percent as well?

The government itself admits that Medicaid fraud alone amounts to billions of dollars. Are we to believe it will be any less if government runs all the health care programs in the nation? Beyond the cost factor, do we have a right to order all citizens into a compulsory program? And what kind of precedent do we set if government can tell members of any profession or craft that in order to practice they must become employees of the government?

Let me suggest a possible alternative to a compulsory government program -- just for your consideration. About 130 million Americans are now protected by medical and/or hospital insurance policies. How many more would or could afford this if they received an income tax credit of their insurance premiums each year?

For those now enrolled in Medicaid, what if the government paid all or part of their premiums (depending on their need) in the medical and hospital insurance plan of their choice? Conceivably, everyone in the country could be covered by private health insurance with no need for a huge government bureaucracy.

The people could not only voluntarily choose an insurance company, they could also continue to choose their own doctor. Would government oppose such a plan and, if so, could government pretend its refusal was for any other reason than the fact that the program wasn't compulsory?

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Telescope I"

There is a magic in this marketplace economy of ours that we often forget as we worry about inflation, the dollar's decline, and an unfavorable trade balance. The magic is to be found in the way that someone with an idea sees a problem, and comes up with a solution. The motive, of course, is profit. Yet we all benefit.

For years now our urban sprawl has been troublesome to astronomers and to the colleges and universities offering courses in astronomy. One by one our great observatories are becoming less and less able to track the stars, as cities push their way out to the mountains and hilltops where the telescopes are mounted. The problem is sky glow from city lights which vastly reduces visibility. Moving these observatories would be a very costly business. They are very expensive to build in the first place. Now, two relatively young men in Atlanta, Georgia, have seen a need and recognized it as an opportunity. Alan Rand and E. James Grethe, president and vice president, respectively, of The Rand Instrument Corporation, have made a scientific breakthrough which will go a long way toward solving the astronomers' problem and at a big savings in cost. They and their colleagues have perfected a mobile observatory. It is a telescope with a lens size ranging from 16 to 40 inches, mounted on a trailer. It can be towed to any location, far from the city's sky glow. Then, in a matter of minutes, the astronomer can align the polar axis to the celestial pole and proceed with deep space research. Rand has also developed the world's most powerful light amplifier. By light amplification the telescope can instantly reveal galaxies which heretofore could only be seen on a photographic plate after hours of exposure.

There is more. Suppose a university is having trouble offering courses in astronomy because sky glow has interfered with its observatory. A professor can take the portable telescope 50 miles away, video-tape the heavens and transmit this to his students in the classroom who would at the same time be hearing his taped lecture.

To make this portable telescope fully operational, Rand offers the means of towing the trailerborne scope. It is called "RAMO" which is short for "Rand Astronomical Mobile Observatory." But "RAMO" is more than just a towing vehicle. It provides living quarters for the astronomers, support instrumentation, darkroom facilities, and can be a traveling classroom for as many as 15 students. It is a completely equipped motor home type vehicle and comes in several models and sizes.

Not only has Rand Instruments Corporation opened new vistas for astronomers at the same time it solved a vexing problem, but there is a spinoff which could be of tremendous value to national security. I'll tell you about that on the next commentary.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Telescope II"

On the last broadcast I spoke of the breakthrough in the field of astronomy the people at Rand Instruments Corporation in Atlanta have made. I don't know whether "spinoff" is the right phrase, but from their development of a portable telescope has come something called a "Surveillance Network."

If you didn't hear the previous commentary it had to do with Rand's portable telescope mounted on a trailer carriage. It is now possible to escape city sky glow, the bane of astronomers, without having to build great new observatories. Part of the breakthrough is a light amplification system which brings a 40 inch scope up to nearly the power of the largest telescopes. Or, as one of the men responsible for this development said, "We can see a man light a cigarette 20 miles away."

And that's the clue to what I called a spinoff. Rand has developed a system whereby we can look sideways instead of up. This can be "sideways" across a border, ground to ground, it can be from shore to sea, or ground to air. In other words, surveillance against a possible surprise attack is possible day or night with movement of even individuals visible at up to 20 miles.

Five portable telescopes 20 miles apart can give complete surveillance of a line 120 miles long. More important, they constitute a network tied into a central command post miles to the rear. There, a commander would instantly see on video screens whatever movement there was 20 miles deep on a 120 mile front.

In addition, there would be mobile field headquarters controlling the scanners about 100 yards behind each one. It is also possible, if there are time problems, to simply focus the 'scope and use it for direct viewing without the video hookup.

One can think of any number of places where such a surveillance system would be invaluable; The NATO line for one. Then there are places such as Rhodesia where terrorists are a constant and murderous threat, or the demilitarized zone between North and South Korea, the Middle East and countless other trouble spots.

The Rand people have not pretended they can solve all surveillance problems 100 percent or that their surveillance network will prevent war. But if it can reduce the element of surprise by 50 percent, that could mean perhaps 50 percent loss of life.

And all of this came to be because two men saw a market possibility in the fact that increasing numbers of observatories were being ineffective by the increasing spread of sky glow from city lights.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Miscellaneous I"

We're indebted to a Florida Congressman Skip Bafalis for some news from the Social Security administration you might have missed. With all the talk about wage controls and the fight to lower the inflation rate, Social Security has made some interesting projections. For example, if we could get the inflation rate down four percent -- it's close to 10 percent now -- and if wages could be held to a five and three-fourths percent annual increase, our grandchildren will see by the year 2050 the average worker earning \$656,000 a year. Now before you cut them out of your will as too rich to need any help from you, listen to the rest of Social Security's projections. A loaf of bread will cost \$37.50, new cars will sell for around \$281,000 and up, and if you step into a phone booth to call your wife to tell her you are on your way home, you'll drop \$9.50 in the slot.

The Congressman points out this is not some comic strip fantasy. It is exactly what will happen unless government starts now to spend only what it has. I'm sure anyone who lived in Germany between 1918 and 1923 will agree with Representative Bafalis.

Another item makes me doubt that our government is earnestly making that 180 degree turn. The Labor department has announced that a federal job placement program cut public welfare payments by \$400 million last year. But the program only costs \$378 million.

Incidentally, the recent 5.5 percent pay raise for federal workers means the average salary for federal civilian employees doubled in less than 10 years from \$9,367 to \$18,300. I wonder if they were included in that Social Security projection.

On an entirely different subject, the American Petroleum Institute filed suit against the Environmental Protection Agency under the Freedom of Information act. The Institute charged that the agency was suppressing a scientific study for fear it might be misinterpreted. Possibly you are aware that the E.P.A. has set ozone standards which industrial groups claim simply can't be met. Apparently, Industry is right. The suppressed study reveals that 80 percent of air pollution comes not from chimneys and auto exhaust pipes, but from plants and trees.

Professor Patrick R. Zimmerman of Washington State University, a key scientist in the study, did careful research in the Tampa - St. Petersburg, Florida region. This is a relatively urbanized area, but even there he found that 68 percent of ozone-causing substances came from vegetation, and only 32 percent was man-made. It is his estimate that nationwide 80 percent of air pollution comes from natural sources.

A spokesman for E.P.A. says the agency always intended making the report public and any misunderstanding was the fault of "misguided, mid-level employees." Maybe so, but let's have the truth before we spend umpteen more billions of dollars trying to solve an unsolvable problem. Or shall we cut down all the trees?

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Miscellaneous II"

Not too long ago there was a robbery reported in Key West, Florida. Now I know a robbery in today's world is hardly earth-shaking news, but still I thought you might like to hear about this one.

The victim reported his expensive Gucci bag and wallet had been stolen along with his \$180 Tiffany lighter engraved with his initials; \$50 in cash, his checkbook -- and \$30 in food stamps.

Datedlined Washington, the Associated Press announced early last July that a little know fish, the Tecopa Pupfish once found in small pools and thermal springs near Death Valley, California, had been declared extinct and thus removed from the endangered species list since none had been seen since 1970.

That last date, 1970, should be noted because in 1973 the Sierra Club persuaded the Bureau of Land Management to withdraw from use 25,600 acres of the Amargosa river basin most of Sperry Wash (a rock-hound collecting area) and all of the Dumont Sand Dunes, a favorite spot for the dune buggy set. All of this we were told was to protect the Pupfish which now we learn had been extinct for three years. The 25,600 acres are still withdrawn -- maybe in memory of the Pupfish.

With all the Washington talk about cutting unnecessary spending, it's funny they haven't zeroed in on the Davis-Bacon Act. The General Accounting office has urged that changes be made in the act. Davis-Bacon, in case you are not familiar with it, is the program which forces contractors doing government jobs to pay artificially high wages everywhere in the country. It is estimated that Davis-Bacon adds about \$10-billion a year to Federal costs. That's one-third of the proposed deficit.

With all of our inflation it's interesting to note that as a percentage of personal income, food takes 21 percent less than it did in 1960. Clothing takes 16 percent less. Even gas and oil take three percent less of our income than they did then. But government takes 19 percent more. These figures are from the Department of Commerce.

The language abuse of the bureaucracy is spreading. The California Department of Food and Agriculture has issued a memo to State employees on safety when working after normal duty hours. They were told "Travel between floors by elevator only in buildings having elevators." But a sign on the wall of North Dakota State University's library tops that. It says. "Due to the reorganization, the basement will be on the second floor. Half of the second floor will be on the first floor, but half will remain on the second. First floor will move to the basement. We suggest you ask for help."

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Miscellaneous III"

On December 18 -- the Monday following President Carter's surprise announcement about China -- Godfrey Sperling's article on public reaction to the announcement appeared in the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR.

Among other things Mr. Sperling quoted White House aides as saying telephone calls coming into the White House were "only a little more than normal." He went on to say, "On Friday night the call-ins were described as moderately heavy and mostly negative; but by the end of the day on Saturday, the flow for the previous 24 hours was being described as 'fairly light' with the 'pros and cons' running about even."

The wording of that last sentence is interesting. The aides didn't actually say what the call-ins were on Saturday. They said "by the end of the day on Saturday the flow for the previous 24 hours was fairly light." That means adding in Friday night's calls after the President's telecast with what came in on Saturday the traffic was "fairly light". That's like the fellow who drowned trying to wade across a river whose average depth was only three feet. You see, there were no calls on Saturday at all.

The White House aides were rather inaccurate if not downright devious in their story to Mr. Sperling. I know people who called in to complain about our betrayal of Taiwan Friday night. Those taking their calls asked only what state they were calling from, so obviously the White House was listing the pros and cons. I also know people who tried to call in on Saturday. They were told they would have to call back Monday between nine and five. Does anyone remember a time under previous administration when Americans could not register their opinion with the White House?

Another subject: An owner of an ordinary-size gas station has totaled up the time he spends completing forms required by government, federal, state and county. It comes to 610 hours. That's 15-and-one-fourth weeks out of the year or more than one-fourth of his total work time. That does not include filling out his tax forms.

Here is an encouraging item. Los Angeles County has found that the county-operated alcoholism out-patient program costs \$62 an hour for individuals and \$14.50 for group treatment. By switching to a private contractor, the costs were reduced to \$22 for individuals and \$6.70 for groups. That is less than half the cost for county operation.

One county agency contracts with the county garage and with a private garage for vehicle maintenance. The county charges \$18.68 an hour for a mechanic as compared to \$14.00 an hour in the private garage.

In landscape maintenance, private contractors under-bid the county cost by as much as 67 percent. Proposition 13 makes a lot of sense when you look at it under the right light.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "South Africa"

While activism on our college campuses today bears no resemblance to the stormy rioting of the '60's and early '70's, there is one cause that has stirred emotional ferment among our students. College and university trustees and regents on a number of campuses have faced demonstrators demanding that the school sell any stocks it may own in companies doing business with South Africa.

A number of corporations have received resolutions from some stockholders calling on them to close down their branches in that country. The reason, of course, apartheid, and the protesters insist the corporations are supporting injustice and exploitations of the black majority by maintaining operations there.

I've pointed out on a number of these broadcasts that we all find apartheid repugnant. I've also pointed out that South Africa's problem is quite a bit more complicated than our own struggle with bigotry and prejudice.

Now comes a voice from South Africa itself calling on the protestors to cease and desist. The most popular leader of South Africa's blacks, the elected chief minister of the Zulu homeland, founder and chairman of the National Cultural Liberation Movement, Gotsha Buthelezi, pleads with United States firms not to stop doing business in his country.

Listen to some of his statements. "The uninformed liberals abroad who would like to see a violent confrontation in my country are working for the very thing that everybody here wants to avoid. Our need is for peaceful change, and foreign investment is one of the best agents of that change." Buthelezi then goes on to say that foreign investment creates jobs and brings money to blacks who make up more than 70 percent of industrial labor. He also says the skills the workers are taught are those they'll need if they are to take their rightful place in South Africa.

He had few kind words for those visitors to his country who think they can understand Africa by spending a few days in Johannesburg. He calls upon them to come to Zulu land and learn of, "the remarkable gains we have made in the last few years."

Buthelezi speaks in warmest praise of American employers in his country. He cites their providing of housing for employees, eliminating discrimination in eating facilities, loans for housing and educational funding. As a result of this and to remain competitive in the labor market local employers have had to adopt the American pay scales and benefits in a number of cases.

This black leader with unquestioned credentials as a respected leader of his people says: "I challenge anyone to prove that the black people themselves are against American Investment."

RONALD REAGAN
RADIO COMMENTARY

DISC 79-2

TAPED 1/19/79
AIDED 2/5-2/23

79-2 A

1.	Phone	2:56
2.	OPEC	2:57
3.	Federal Trade Commission	2:50
4.	The Official Rules	2:52
5.	Anti-Poverty Abuses I	3:04
6.	Anti-Poverty Abuses II	2:51
7.	Wind Energy in Denmark	3:01

79-2 B

1.	Counterintelligence	2:47
2.	Australia I	3:13
3.	Australia II	2:37
4.	Peace Corps	2:39
5.	A Policeman	2:49
6.	Miscellaneous I	3:00
7.	Miscellaneous II	3:14
8.	Regulations	2:52

PLEASE NOTE

These programs are provided for airing from February 5 through February 23, 1979 inclusive. Maintaining this schedule will enable your station to air all newly recorded programs as received.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio broadcast entitled "Phone".

Before getting into today's commentary, I'd like to add a p.s. to a broadcast of a few days ago. I reminded you of Jim Hendricks, the paraplegic cowboy and his horse Calvin, and gave his address because many of you had inquired about it and expressed a desire to lend a hand. Well, everything in the address was correct except the name of the town. I had been told it was Bridgetown. It isn't. Jim lives in Beardstown, Illinois.

Now, on with the commentary which has to do with that government regulated, private monopoly, the telephone company, and that government owned monopoly, the post office.

What with busy signals, wrong numbers, and so forth, it's easy to have a grudge against "Ma Bell". Truth is, the old girl deserves a big thank you from all of us. For one thing, here is a major service none of us feel we can do without. Yet, in this age of continual inflation, that service keeps dropping in cost.

Back in the 1930's a long distance call across country cost \$9.50. That was 300 times as much as it costs to send a letter. Now that phone call is only nine times as expensive as a letter - \$1.30, while stamps have gone up to 15 cents. And the ratio is even lower if your call takes one minute; then the price is 54 cents. And remember, 15 cents isn't the total cost of a postage stamp; taxes pay the difference between the price of the stamp and what it really costs to deliver the letter. In 1977 the postal deficit was \$1.4 billion. By contrast, American Telephone and Telegraph in 1977 paid \$6.5 billion in taxes and only \$2.8 billion in dividends to its shareholders.

Not only has the telephone company lowered costs because it has continued to increase productivity, it has offered fantastic improvements that would have boggled the mind of Alexander Graham Bell.

Not too long ago the phone was a pretty hefty piece of machinery mounted on the wall. To call, you removed the receiver from its cradle with one hand, spun the crank handle -- which rang a bell -- with the other, and waited for the operator to ask "Number please". You told her the number and she then plugged a cord into the proper jack on the switchboard and, if everything went well, your call was completed.

Of course most of us could only afford party lines and we each had a particular ring by which we knew if the call was for us -- for example, two longs and two shorts. Everybody on the line knew everyone else's ring and the result was a total lack of privacy because everyone could listen in simply by lifting the receiver.

Today, the miracles we already have are going to be topped by video phone; there are recorder gadgets to take phone calls and messages when you are absent, and now they talk of electronic mail. If the cost differential continues at the present rate, it is possible the telephone may put the post office out of business within the next 10 to 20 years. Do you suppose that's why the government is suing the phone company?

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "OPEC".

The OPEC oil producers have told us the price of oil is going up and our energy agency has informed us that will call for an increase at the gasoline pump. But before we call them greedy monsters, guilty of adding to inflation, let me play the devil's advocate.

OPEC oil is priced in American dollars. In the last few years our dollar has been going down in value relative to more stable currencies such as the West German mark and the Japanese yen. And, guess what? The actual price of oil for Germany and Japan has been going down. It's pretty obvious that if \$14 will buy a barrel of oil, but 14 American dollars now are only equal to a lesser number of marks or yen, then the Germans and Japanese are getting their oil at a lower price. The OPEC nations have to "up" the number of dollars they get just to stay even. And it is we who are responsible for reducing the value of the dollar.

That is only a small part of our foolishness. With some plain common sense we could break up the OPEC monopoly. Item number 1 -- there are vast quantities of natural gas available in the U.S. if our own government regulations did not stand in the way of it being produced. This untapped natural gas would break the back of the OPEC cartel.

A deplorable tragedy was preventable and unnecessary in the bitter winter of 1976-77. There was cold and discomfort in homes, but even worse, was the loss of jobs, production and income as industry had to shut down for lack of fuel.

We had been warned in 1974 that we were in danger of running out of natural gas. Part of the problem is that deeper wells must be drilled. It costs \$3 million to drill a 20,000 foot well in Texas. Off-shore wells can be drilled for \$1 million, but it takes several years to get them into production. These harder-to-get-at gas deposits cannot be delivered to the pipe lines for the price the government allows them to charge. So that gas is neither drilled nor delivered. You can't sell a pencil for a nickel if it costs a dime to make it.

Right now in my own state - California - a shortage of natural gas exists, and it's getting worse. If we substitute coal or oil we aggravate an already serious smog problem. It is estimated that California could lose 800,000 jobs by 1981 because of reduced gas supplies. We are currently buying liquified natural gas from Indonesia for \$3.50 per 1,000 cubic feet. A study by the government's own Energy, Research & Development Agency tells us that at \$3.25 and below, there is enough natural gas available for hundreds of years. This study was done in 1974 and nothing has been done about it.

The magic word is "decontrol" of the well head price. It would take about five years lead time to get much of this production under way and we'll have shortages for those five years. This wouldn't have been true if we'd gotten under way in 1974. But decontrol now and production of the gas available in our own land would literally break up the OPEC cartel. What are we waiting for?

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio broadcast entitled "Federal Trade Commission".

Yale Brozen, professor of business economics at the Graduate School of Business, University of Chicago, has called attention in National Review magazine to a "strange notion brewing in the Anti-Trust Division of the Federal Trade Commission." It is a notion that, Professor Brozen says, would be suicidal for our nation to adopt.

In simple language, the Trade Commission and the Justice Department, are going to attack as monopolists firms that, by operating efficiently and making consumer goods available at a fair price, have won a large share of the market.

Now we all understand the purpose of the Anti-Trust laws. They are to prevent a single firm or a group of firms from getting together, holding back on production so as to create a shortage and then jacking up the price to the consumer. But now the F.T.C. is apparently going to punish a firm or firms who increase production, lower prices and, as a result, win a large share of customers. As Brozen says, Henry Ford, who captured about 60 percent of the automobile market (because he made a car the average man could afford when up till then they had been affordable only by the rich) today would have the F.T.C. assailing him as a monopolistic fiend.

A present day perversion of the anti-trust laws is being carried out against DuPont. That company developed a low cost method for producing titanium dioxide pigments. They passed these savings through to the customer in a lowered price, thereby capturing about 40 percent of the market. Business is so good they are building a new plant to make more available to the consumers. Now the anti-trust laws are supposed to prevent "restraint of trade", the fixing and raising of prices, not the increase in production to make more products available for purchase. But an anti-trust complaint has been filed against DuPont.

The F.T.C. is prosecuting Kellogg, General Foods, and General Mills. They are charged with "brand proliferation". In other words, because these companies offer us a variety of breakfast cereals they are guilty of "a shared monopoly". Apparently they are guilty of trying to give us what we want, bran cereals, vitamin-enriched cereals, grape nuts, and so forth. They'd be alright in the eyes of the government had they just stuck to corn flakes.

When the Sherman anti-trust bill was passed in 1890, Senator Sherman said it was intended to outlaw arrangements which tended to raise the cost to the consumer. Indeed, when the Senate Judiciary Committee explained the bill to the Senator, they declared that a man who "got the whole business because nobody could do it as well as he could" would not be in violation of the Sherman act. From 1921 to 1925 Ford supplied more automobiles than all the other companies combined. Then in 1927 Ford shut down for a year to retool for production of the Model A. The price of cars didn't go up because of the shortage - they went down. The Federal Trade Commission is embarked on a witchhunt which could very conceivably result in increased prices for all of us.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "The Official Rules".

All of us can remember various rules or maxims said to govern the way the world works. For instance, "battered toast always falls to the floor butter side down." Now, an enterprising author named Paul Dockson has published a large and entertaining collection of laws and maxims through the ages. The book is called The Official Rules, and it's published by Delacorte Press.

Perhaps the best known of such rules are those called Murphy's Laws. The most famous of the many versions of Murphy's Law are these three: "If anything can go wrong, it will." "Left to themselves, things go from bad to worse." "Nature always sides with the hidden flaw." These, and many others in the Dockson collection, are said to have derived from experimental scientists and, more recently, computer specialists. Quite a few, however, have a lot of relevance to our economic, social and political life.

One of the oldest is Gresham's Law, dating back to the 16th century. Sir Thomas Gresham studied the problem of money and exchange, and concluded simply that "Bad money drives out good." Today, in this age of dollar depreciation, Sir Thomas might have added, "governments which print bad money also forbid the use of other money."

Speaking of government, there are quite a few rules governing the working of bureaucracy. Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson is said to be the author of Acheson's Rule of Bureaucracy: "A memorandum is written not to inform the reader, but to protect the writer." Anyone with years of experience in the U.S. State Department can certainly be excused for believing that. Another rule of this kind is Smith's Principles of Bureaucratic Tinkertoys: "1. Never use one word when a dozen will suffice. 2. If it can be understood, it's not finished yet. 3. Never do anything for the first time." James H. Boren, who founded the International Association of Professional Bureaucrats, offers three similar Laws of the Bureaucracy: "1. When in doubt, mumble. 2. When in trouble, delegate. 3. When in charge, ponder."

Politics supplies quite a few droll laws. James Davidson, head of the National Taxpayers' Union, is credited with observing that "democracy is that form of government where everybody gets what the majority deserves." Former Assistant Attorney General for Legislation Michael M. Uhlmann observes, "when stupidity is a sufficient explanation, there is no need to have recourse to any other." My friend M. Stanton Evans, former chairman of the American Conservative union, is the author of Evans' Law of Political Perfidy. It goes: "When our friends get into power, they aren't our friends any more." The early American statesman John Randolph of Roanoke, embittered after two decades of legislative battles, arrived at Randolph's Cardinal Principle of Statecraft: "Never needlessly disturb a thing at rest."

One of my Republican friends up in Vermont, John McClaughry, offers his two laws of public policy: "Politicians who vote huge expenditures to alleviate problems get elected; those who propose structural changes to prevent problems get early retirement." He adds, "Liberals, but not Conservatives, can get attention and acclaim for denouncing liberal policies that failed; and Liberals will inevitably capture the ensuing agenda for reform." But there is hope even for those who think civilization is going down the drain. It comes from Allen's Law: "It is better for civilization to be going down the drain, than to be coming up it."

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Anti-Poverty Abuses - Part One".

In 1965 President Lyndon Johnson declared a war on poverty. The federal programs that emerged from President Johnson's declaration have been in business for thirteen years. In that time, the war on poverty looks as if it has turned into a war on the poor. Anyone who doubts that should read two recently published critiques of the major federal anti-poverty programs. The first was published in December in the Reader's Digest. It is titled, "Wake Up to the 'Nightmare' at CSA!".

CSA stands for the Community Services Administration, the federal agency that is primarily responsible for the anti-poverty programs. Reader's Digest investigated CSA and found --QUOTE-- "an ugly trail of mismanagement, corruption, waste and misconduct...tens of millions of dollars earmarked for the needy have been stolen or frittered away..." UNQUOTE. The article documents this claim. Here is my favorite example of blatant abuse of our tax dollars. The head of one Community Action Agency "drives a Mercedes-Benz which costs his group (and us) \$5940 a year to lease."

With friends like this, the poor don't need enemies. But I want to concentrate today not on the Reader's Digest article, which you can read for yourself, but on a document you probably will never get a chance to read. It is the Conclusions and Summary of a report by the Investigative Staff on the House Appropriations Committee of the ACTION agency, the federal anti-poverty agency that includes VISTA volunteers. VISTA stands for "Volunteers in Service to America". That report is devastating in its documentation of the mismanagement and abuse in ACTION under the direction of Sam Brown, a Carter appointee. Representative Bob Michel of Illinois, the Republican deputy leader in the House, asked the Committee to hold such an investigation after receiving numerous allegations of misconduct and irregularities at ACTION.

Now let me remind you that the Appropriations Committee is under the leadership of the Democrats, as is every other House Committee. So, although a Republican asked for the investigation, it is not, and cannot possibly be, a political hatchet job. Let's look at the frightening and open waste and mismanagement uncovered by the report:

--Under Brown, political appointees have tripled in number from 11 to 33. It would seem that anti-poverty is good business for political hacks in the Carter Administration. -- Sam Brown has hired so many so-called "experts" that the investigators state that Brown "has not observed Civil Service Commission rules for hiring of experts." One such expert just happened to be a former aide to the Governor of Colorado, a political crony of Sam Brown. This "expert" had exactly four years total working experience before he suddenly became an expert -- at \$100 of tax money per day. The report states: "Nothing in his background remotely suggests that he had the credentials for the jobs he supposedly performed for ACTION." But he was and is a friend of Sam Brown. Brown's attempt to reorganize the agency, which he announced with fanfare, was called by the investigators "largely an empty gesture". That gesture cost us almost \$150,000. But hold on. I've saved the best -- or is it the worst? -- for last. Next time I'll be telling you the incredible story of Sam Brown, ACTION, and something called the National Grants program. Hold on to your wallet!

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Anti-Poverty Abuses - Part Two".

Last time I was talking to you about the report of the House Appropriations Committee Investigations Staff that documented abuses and mismanagement in ACTION, the federal anti-poverty agency headed by Carter appointee Sam Brown.

Today, let's get to the National Grants Program, a new policy initiated by Brown. Its supposed purpose was to help the poor help themselves. Instead, this is just some of what the Congressional investigators found:

--One recipient of an ACTION grant, a group calling itself ACORN and CORAP, used volunteers from VISTA (that Volunteers in Service to America, an ACTION division) to get "involved in the Arkansas primary election last spring"...five VISTA volunteers were actively engaged in organizing a labor union, a violation of federal statutes...accounting procedures for the grant were called "careless and inadequate" by the report...monitoring of the grant by ACTION state-level officials is called "non-existent"...the grant was so abused, and the projects to help the poor so mismanaged, that this grant was the last ACTION grant that will be given to ACORN and its subsidiary CORAP.

--Next there is the Midwest Academy in Chicago, another organization receiving ACTION dollars -- meaning tax dollars. This group, dedicated to confrontation politics and the redistribution of income, is headed by a former officer of the notorious Students for a Democratic Society. Midwest Academy, according to the House report "did not meet any of the criteria" that ACTION itself asks for in a grantee. It has not provided uniform training, and of the groups that it trained with federal anti-poverty funds were described by the investigators as "organizations set up to improve the lot of working women." Now improving the lot of working women is a noble goal, but when you use poverty funds to help women who are already working, something has to be wrong. Need I add that again, just as in ACORN grant, federal money was used at one Midwest project in a labor union organizing drive...finally, one Midwest program had federally funded anti-poverty warriors...and this is a quote from the report -- "working more to save a middle-class neighborhood landmark -- a country club -- rather than serve the poor."

Then there is an organization receiving ACTION funds that, according to the report, receives 90 percent of its operating funds from the federal government, and yet lobbies for federal legislation. That's not the way the federal anti-poverty program is supposed to be run.

What can we conclude from all of this? Well, Sam Brown says he is a victim of the "political right" and "Conservatives" and that the report of a Democratically controlled committee is a "political attack".

Jimmy Carter appointed Brown. The question is what, if anything, is Mr. Carter going to do about these latest revelations of incompetence, scandal and abuse of our tax dollars?

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Wind Energy in Denmark".

Out on the North Sea coast of Denmark, is a little college called Tvind (TUH-VIND). It has 500 students and 80 faculty members. It also has a 175-foot concrete tower topped by three 89-foot rotor blades which generates 2,000 kilowatts of power. The remarkable thing about it, is that the entire wind generating plant was conceived, built and financed by the students and teachers at Tvind College.

For comparison, take a look at the wind generator two U.S. government agencies built in Ohio three years ago. It cost over a million dollars, and it generates 100 kilowatts of power -- when it works right. The Danish wind generator cost \$720,000 U.S. dollars; it produces 20 times the energy; and it works the way it was designed to.

There's an interesting story behind this project. In 1974, following the sharp increase in OPEC oil prices, the college found that it was paying \$43,000 a year for electricity, with more increases in sight. And yet, on Denmark's Atlantic coast, the almost incessant wind went untapped. The faculty and students decided that that wind could be harnessed as a source of clean, renewable power. But they didn't head off to Copenhagen to get a government grant. They decided to build and finance it themselves. None of them had ever attempted such a thing before. But their little college had a unique "can-do" tradition, and they were determined to succeed.

They recruited some volunteer help from aerodynamic engineers and computer specialists throughout Denmark. They got the Danish Army to lend them a huge tent to serve as an assembly plant. When no plastics manufacturer would agree to sell them the three 89-foot rotor blades they needed, the Tvind College people set out to learn what they needed to know about fiberglass molding. They built three fishing boat hulls for practice. Then they spent 18 months to craft the giant rotors.

Workers went to Holland and salvaged a drive shaft from a scrapped oil tanker. They found a 1:19 ratio gearbox at the elevator shaft of an abandoned Swedish iron mine. A Swedish paper factory sold them a second-hand generator. And, in only three years, without a nickel of government funding, Tvind College had a 2,000-kilowatt wind generator not only providing all the college light and much of its heat, but also selling electric power to the Danish national power grid. It is now estimated that the wind generator will result in annual savings of \$72,000 adding together the cost of the energy formerly purchased from the outside grid, and the proceeds of wind power sold to the grid. When in continuous operation, the Tvind generator will produce an average of four million kilowatt hours per year. That's what 450 tons of oil would produce. The college people point out that 1100 similar generators could be built instead of the proposed 800 megawatt nuclear plant at Gylling, at far less cost, and without any of the expense and problems associated with nuclear fuel.

When Danish government officials first heard of the Tvind project they laughed and said it couldn't be done. They aren't laughing any more. The government has appropriated \$11 million for advanced wind/energy research. Some people think the government would have been better off leaving that \$11 million in the pockets of people like those who built the plant at Tvind College, who have the enterprising spirit to tackle a big job and get it done. I think they're right.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio broadcast entitled "Counterintelligence".

I have commented before about what I think is the Justice Department's foolishness in rendering our F.B.I. and C.I.A. impotent, all in the name of protecting our privacy. Now, I don't want "big brother" to have a key to my front door or to listen in on my phone calls. On the other hand, when there is credible evidence that someone is plotting crimes and violence, I want agencies such as the F.B.I. to be able to do all the snooping necessary to apprehend the plotters.

The Copley News Service recently carried a story by James Cary. So far I've seen no word of the story in any of the rest of the media. I hope you won't mind my passing it on.

The "Black September" Palestinian terrorist group -- this is the outfit that murdered two of our diplomats in Khartoum in 1973 and 11 Israeli athletes at the 1972 Olympics -- this "Black September" band sent agents to the U.S. in 1972 to kill former President Nixon, Henry Kissinger, and Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir and Jordan's King Hussein who were visiting America at the time.

The plan was broken up by the F.B.I., thanks to tips received from Israeli intelligence. The plotters were quietly deported. So called illegal entry and wire taps were used by the F.B.I. to prevent the planned assassinations. Should the agents involved be arrested for violating the terrorists' privacy?

In January of 1973 a citizen of Iraq entered our country by way of Montreal. Again there were tips by Israeli intelligence which, by the way, is one of the most effective intelligence forces in the world. The suspect changed residences frequently while gathering explosive materials. Were our F.B.I. agents committing a crime by trying to keep him under surveillance?

Actually he almost managed to carry out his mission and would have if the hand of the Lord had not intervened. He placed his explosive devices plus five gallon cans of gasoline in automobiles which were then parked outside the Israeli airline at Kennedy Airport, and at two other locations in downtown New York. Fortunately, one of the cars was in a no parking zone and the New York police towed it away. The detonating devices failed to work in the other two, while the F.B.I. and police were desperately trying to locate them.

The police later exploded one of the devices in a remote area. They reported the fire ball would have killed anyone within 100 yards of the blast.

The terrorist fled the country and is still at large, although he has been traced through four different countries. If we continue our policy of handcuffing our own law enforcement officers, he may decide this is the safest country in which he can operate. He has been indicted by two federal grand juries in New York. "Black September" agents, Mr. Cary reports, are still in this country in considerable numbers and pose a serious threat in Washington, D.C. and Northern Virginia.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Australia I".

With inflation plaguing these United States, and our market place coming more and more under government domination, I thought you might like to hear of what has happened almost overnight to the land down under - our ally, Australia.

Less than six years ago runaway inflation there was at an annual 20 percent rate. Taxes were punitive, if not confiscatory, and government costs had gone up 50 percent in two years. Unemployment was high, the strike record was the third worst in the world, and labor costs were rising 70 times faster than productivity. Foreign capital, the lifeblood of Australian economic progress, had dried up and key industries were threatened with nationalization.

Then came a change. Taxes were cut by \$1 billion, annual budget increases were cut to two-fifths of what they had been, interest rates went down, strikes fell to one-fourth of what they had been, and the inflation rate fell from 20 percent to far less than what we have - 5.2 percent. Now foreign investment is back with hundreds of millions of dollars being invested in mines and other ventures. The turn around began when a coalition of parties opposed to the socialist policies of the labor party elected Malcolm Fraser, Prime Minister. The Prime Minister would be the first to say, however, that a most important element in the turn around was a new management organization which advocates better cooperation and understanding in labor/management relations. It is called "Enterprise Australia". Its chief executive says they are trying a new approach emphasizing consensus and cooperation between management and labor -- instead of conflict and confrontation.

The election of Fraser was the catalyst which brought former adversaries together. In short, they stopped talking about each other, and began talking to each other. Employers and employees found there was more they agreed on than they disagreed on. Labor turned away from nationalizing industries after they were shown that employees took home more than 10 times as much as there was profit. "Enterprise Australia" imported John Q. Jennings from New York, a one-time federal mediator and now a management/labor consultant. A breakthrough was made with R.J. Hawke, president of the Trade Union Congress, Australia's counterpart to George Meany of our AFL-CIO.

Jennings persuaded management to send their employees company statements -- annual reports clearly telling how the companies' income is shared between employees and stockholders. Prime Minister Fraser told management, "How can I explain to the people that free enterprise is the best system for them if you can't be bothered to explain it to your own employees?" One labor spokesman said, "The old enemy capitalists no longer exist. Today, in our society, corporate management has reached the stage where real ownership of capital is all of us. There are no capitalists of a form you can identify." And, all this came about by talking to each other. TRW Corporation, for example, sent its employees a highly graphic report showing among other things that, after other expenses are paid, out of every dollar available for payroll and profit 91.3 cents goes to the employees, 4.1 cents to the stockholders and 4.5 cents is reinvested in the business. Nationalization of a steel company was rejected by the workers when they received a report showing they were getting 95 cents out of the dollar. Would this work in America? I think so -- listen to the next broadcast.

RONALD REAGAN BROADCAST

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Australia II".

On the last broadcast, I told of how the new prime minister of Australia, Malcom Fraser, and a labor/management group called "Enterprise Australia" turned Australia's economy around. They knocked an inflation rate down to 5 percent from 20, cut government costs and taxes, increased productivity and cut man-days lost in strikes to one-fourth of what it had been.

One of the key tools was an idea brought to them by an American troubleshooter, John Q. Jennings of New York. It was the institution of annual reports by management to the workers with color graphics and illustrations. Workers learned that they took home better than 90 percent of the company's earnings. Only four and a fraction percent went to stockholders, and 4.6 percent was reinvested in the company.

On that last commentary, I asked if it would work here. I'm convinced it would, and I'm happy to say Dart Industries, working with the Graduate School of Business at the University of Southern California, is doing something of the kind.

With all of our knowledge and all of the "jillion" words of information pumped at us each day, we still believe in a number of economic and political fairy tales. When opinion research asked a cross section of Americans how they thought corporate income was divided between employee payroll and profits, the answer was 25 percent to employees, 75 percent for profit. Students at Kings College near New York City thought the split was 60 - 40 in favor of profits. The facts were 90.6 percent went for employee compensation, and the rest went for profits -- which had to be divided between stockholders and reinvestment in plants and machinery.

It's no wonder the kids made this kind of mistake -- 52 percent of their teachers said they believed the largest portion of national income went to owners. The fact is, after taxes, only three-and-a-half percent went to owners.

Another poll found Americans in general believed that 10 percent net on sales after taxes would be a "fair" profit. They believed however, that manufacturers were getting 20 percent profit.

So far "Enterprise Australia" hasn't aroused a lot of interest in either management or labor circles in America. That's too bad. The founder of the A.F.L., that great labor statesman, Samuel Gompers, would have understood "Enterprise Australia". He said management and labor were partners, and the worst sin management could commit against the worker, was to fail to make a profit.

I would add another -- it is a sin against the worker, it is a sin against the citizen at large, and it is truly a sin against our sons and daughters not to do everything we can to dispel the economic mythology so prevalent in our land. I hope enlightened employers will create an "Enterprise America".

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio broadcast entitled " Peace Corps".

For some years now we've had a "Peace Corps" operating throughout the world. Starting out as an idealistic effort to benefit people in the underdeveloped countries particularly, it has generally been accepted as something akin to those unselfish good samaritans, our American missionaries.

Young people were recruited mainly from our colleges. They were trained in a variety of ways. Then, they journeyed to far away places where they lived in native villages, teaching the people about sanitation, better ways to farm, health care, and helping in any way they could.

But what Congress will face is the the possibility that the one time idealism of the Peace Corps volunteer has given way to pure political activism somewhat out of line with the Corps' original purpose.

The Peace Corps is a branch of an agency called "Action". Action under this administration is headed up by a young man named Sam Brown. A number of congressmen of both parties have been concerned for more than a year that Director Brown has packed his agency with "New Left" activists, veterans of the Anti-Vietnam war, radicals and others, and that Action dollars are being used to finance the programs of the New Left.

Sam Brown was an organizer in 1969 of the so called moratorium demonstration. Well, after his appointment to "Action", he attended the rally in New York to welcome the North Vietnamese conquerors to the U.N. He listened to the denunciation of our country as "imperialists" who had fought a bloody colonial war, and openly expressed his joy at seeing a 15 year dream come true -- namely a communist victory over the U.S. Brown has surrounded himself with veterans of the riotous '60's -- Marge Tabankin to run the Vista program, Associate Director John Lewis, formerly of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee -- some of whose spokesmen were Rap Brown and Stockley Carmichael, Berkeley City councilwoman, who gained attention by refusing to stand for the pledge to the flag.

What Congress will be looking at is the recent ousting of the Peace Corps' Director, Carolyn Payton. Dr. Payton, a 53 year old black psychologist, had confronted her superior Sam Brown, protesting that the Peace Corps had been enmeshed in politics. She said it was "pursuing objectives which have nothing to do with promoting world peace and friendship." Dr. Payton made it clear that Peace Corps volunteers were being used to export a particular ideology and were being encouraged to engage in political activism. Their superiors would be pleased to see them demonstrate overseas against corporations which engage in practices with which they disagree.

I believe Sam Brown has a budget of about \$200 million. You can stir up a lot of trouble with that kind of money. I hope Congress listens to Dr. Carolyn Payton -- we all should.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "A Policeman".

Every once in a while I take the 20 minute flight from Los Angeles to San Diego -- usually to address a convention of one kind or another. I always enjoy the visit; San Diego is a beautiful part of our California southland.

Recently I made such a trip and, while the beauty was unchanged, one thing was sadly different. A familiar face was missing at planeside when I came down the ramp. Officer Gene Spurlock of the San Diego Police was not on hand. He had been laid to rest the day before my visit.

Gene became a policeman in 1966 at age 29. In all the years I was Governor, he would be one of those on hand whenever I visited San Diego. For a long time I didn't know he always asked for the assignment. I was very proud when I found that out.

A former high school athlete in San Diego -- he still holds the Lincoln High School broad jump record - Gene insisted on serving in the rundown southeast part of the city where he was born. He became the most decorated officer on the force, but he was much more than that. Probably no man on the force has ever been more loved and respected by his fellow officers. He was also loved, respected, and totally trusted by the people in the district he served.

At his memorial service, the police chaplain said "His ability to bridge the chasm between races and between all people was uncanny. He had what could be called a 'natural knowing' in handling delicate matters involving tensions between the races. He had the ability to create a trust whether arresting them or giving them the last five bucks he had in his pocket."

Mama Williams, a black woman of great dignity who'd had her share of troubles, said "He was my friend. How many people can say they had one?" Her seven year old grandson said "He gave me my nickname, 'Tiger' -- just say he was my friend."

He believed in justice; he would tear the town apart to clear someone he believed was wrongly accused. Sometimes he paid the bail for the very individuals he had arrested.

About five years ago he was attacked by a painful disease, Reiters syndrome. Still he refused to take a less demanding assignment. He stayed with his people in his neighborhood.

Gene met his wife Betty Lou when they were in sixth grade; he married her when they were in the 12th grade. Betty tells how their home was open house on weekends. Black, brown and white, "his people" would gather just to talk or to have him fix their cars -- he was good at that. It was only when his illness grew serious that anyone knew he'd been caring for several needy families for years.

He and Betty knew a great love for 24 years. They have a fine son and two lovely daughters. Gene Spurlock was a legend in the force He was proud to serve. He was 42 years old.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Miscellaneous".

Down at Texas A&M University, there is a Center for Education and Research in Free Enterprise. It was organized primarily to help Texas high school teachers understand and teach good economics. Its endowment and operating funds are now up around the \$2 million mark, and it has just published its first newsletter. In it is a fascinating collection of facts.

For instance, the recent shortages in lead-free gasoline had government officials talking about rationing again. We had rationing for a lot of commodities back in World War II, the newsletter points out. In 1944 the federal government issued five billion ration coupons per month. The government had to hire 65,000 bureaucrats to run the program. They were aided by some 325,000 volunteers. If Washington tries it again, it's not likely that it will be able to count on the free labor of all those volunteers. Think of that the next time someone calls for government rationing.

In 1976, the Center reports, the top five percent of American income earners earned 22 percent of all income -- and paid 40 percent of all federal income taxes.

New York City is on the financial rocks. Do you know why? One reason is suggested by this fact: New York's government in 1975 - the year the financial crisis began - spent \$1,900 per city resident. Los Angeles was second - it spent \$550 per resident. Chicago spent \$350 per resident.

Congress just increased the minimum wage schedule last year. Between 1976 and 1981 the minimum wage will rise nearly 10 percent a year. At this rate, the minimum wage in the year 2000 will be \$20/hour, or \$41,600 per year. If the inflation rate continues at 10 percent a year however, that \$20 won't buy any more than the minimum wage today. The public seems to think that after-tax corporate profits in manufacturing are about 30-35¢ on each dollar of sales. The Center points out that the real after-tax profit on sales is about five cents on the dollar. In other words, many Americans think manufacturing companies make six times as much as they really do. In some states, the Center reports, it is against the law to advertise the price of eyeglasses. In those states the price of eyeglasses is about 25 percent higher than in states where advertising is legal. The next time someone tells you that advertising merely costs the consumer money, point that out.

In 1976, compliance with federal regulations on consumer goods and services cost every American an average of \$300 apiece. By 1979 it will cost each of us \$500 apiece. Allowing for inflation, that would still be \$429 apiece. Do we get more by paying this extra amount? Perhaps - but we certainly get a lot less free choice. I say thanks to the folks down at Texas A&M for these thoughts, and hope that all of us hear a lot more from their Center for Education and Research in Free Enterprise.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio broadcast entitled "Miscellaneous 2"

Teresa Cardina of Buffalo, New York, handles the emergency - dial 911 - phone at police headquarters. Late one night she received a call, but the only sound she heard when she picked up the phone was heavy breathing and tapping sound. She gets a certain number of crank calls at the police complaint desk, but somehow felt this call was not one of those.

It would have been easy just to hang up, but 26 year old Miss Cardina said, "If you need help, tap once for yes and twice for no". There came a single tap. Somewhere in the city a human being needed help - but where? Teresa told the caller she would recite the alphabet and to tap when she came to the first letter of the caller's street. Then of course she had to go through all the streets beginning with that letter and finally the street number. Soon she had an address - Melbourne Street on Buffalo's west side.

A few minutes later a squad car and ambulance arrived at the home of a 75 year old woman who was having trouble breathing because of a throat operation that prevented her from speaking. Happy ending because of a young lady who went that extra step in doing her job. Teresa Cardina must be a nice person.

Another happy ending story took place in Colorado this last December. A family-owned business, the Coors Brewing Company, has been undergoing a strike for almost two years. I don't know the cause of the strike, but I do know the Coors family, as an employer, has been generous and thoughtful to its employees. It was no surprise, therefore, when the great majority of workers refused to abide by the union's call to strike and kept right on reporting for work. The union responded with a hurtful, nationwide boycott of Coors products. Both the union and Coors asked the N.L.R.B. for an election. The results were announced last December 15th -- 71 percent of the company's employees voted against their own union.

This next story is a good news - bad news item. Probably nothing is more visible as a mark of our continuing inflation than the changing prices of food items in our markets. Indeed the average housewife can be excused if her daily marketing leaves her with the impression that food for the table is where inflation is at. The truth is since 1960 the price of food as a percent of earnings has gone down 21 percent. The bad news is the cost of government as a percentage of earnings has gone up 20 percent.

An item that helps explain government's increasing cost comes from the Los Angeles County welfare director. Just 18 years ago Los Angeles County, which has 40 percent of California's population, had 22,000 families getting assistance from the Aid for Dependent Children program. Today there are 170,000 families getting such aid and 37,000 of these are second generation - children who grew up on welfare, married and set up housekeeping as a new family unit eligible for public assistance. Another reason for government costs increasing has to do with Washington's "buddy system". Representative John Brademas, Chairman of the House, Education & Labor Committee, which has jurisdiction over the National Endowment for the Humanities, found himself in a tough campaign last November. Joseph Duffey, head of the National Endowment, just happened by the Congressman's district with a \$425,000 grant for two colleges -- prior to the election.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio broadcast entitled "Regulations".

I've used this commentary many times to call attention to the ever-increasing burden of government regulations covering every facet of our lives. And here I go again:

Alexander Hamilton said, "It will be of little avail to the people that laws are made by men of their own choice if the laws be so voluminous that they cannot be read, or so incoherent that they cannot be understood; if they be repealed or revised before they are promulgated, or undergo such incessant changes that no man who knows what the law is today can guess what it will be tomorrow."

Hamilton was speaking of laws written by our elected representatives. He had no way of foreseeing that multitudinous regulations having the power of law would be written by permanent employees of government who were not elected by the people. Today, more and more Americans are discovering that, by obeying the mandate of one agency, they violate the rules of another. For example, the Environmental Protection Agency wants hoods installed over coke ovens in the steel plants to reduce pollution. The Occupational Safety & Health Administration wants them removed because they increase the noxious gases breathed by coke oven workers. The steel industry is blanketed by 5,600 regulations enforced by 26 separate agencies.

Officials of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology obtained approval from the Smithsonian Institute, National Park Service and the National Endowment for the Arts, to stage a laser-light show on the mall in Washington, D.C. The Bureau of Radiological Health let the show open and then closed it for failing to comply with federal safety standards.

OSHA requires vehicles at some construction sites to have alarm bells which sound as warnings to workers when the vehicles back up. OSHA also requires those workers to wear ear plugs as protection against excessive noise, which it turns out includes those warning bells.

OSHA is involved in another conflict -- this time with H.E.W. It seems H.E.W. claims jurisdiction over a hospital because federal money was involved in its construction. When an H.E.W. inspector found the hospital putting plastic bags in wastebaskets, it ordered them removed, charging that a careless tossing of a cigarette butt into a wastebasket could start a blaze and that the fumes of the burning plastic would be injurious to the patients. The hospital has a problem. OSHA ordered the bags be placed in the baskets to protect employees from contamination when emptying the wastebaskets.

A study published in the Yale Law Journal describes this bureaucratic chaos as "a patchwork of specialized and fiercely independent agencies with different perspective whose concerns necessarily overlap and whose actions may contradict one another". The report might have added they create problems instead of solving them because the problems are their only reason for existing. We are up to our necks in alligators, and it's time to drain the swamp.

TAPED 2/13
AIRED 2/26 - 3/16

RONALD REAGAN
RADIO COMMENTARY
Disc 79-3

79-3 A

- | | | |
|----|---|------|
| 1. | Proposition 13 and the Post Commission - I | 2:30 |
| 2. | Proposition 13 and the Post Commission - II | 2:20 |
| 3. | Deregulation | 2:57 |
| 4. | Dishonest Environmentalists | 2:46 |
| 5. | Fish | 2:51 |
| 6. | Constitutional Amendment | 2:38 |
| 7. | Pot | 2:56 |

79-3 B

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------|------|
| 1. | Saying "No" - Part I | 2:50 |
| 2. | Saying "No" - Part II | 2:50 |
| 3. | Conspiracy | 2:44 |
| 4. | Lawrence Welk | 2:51 |
| 5. | Income Tax | 3:02 |
| 6. | Hamburgers | 2:50 |
| 7. | Long Walk | 2:47 |
| 8. | Miscellaneous | 3:01 |

PLEASE NOTE

These programs are provided for airing from February 26 through March 16, 1979 inclusive. Maintaining this schedule will enable your station to air all newly recorded programs as received.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Proposition 13 and the Post Commission - I"

Last year in the spring primary election, the voters of California fired the first amazing shot in the nationwide taxpayers revolt. By a two-to-one margin they enacted Proposition 13, which cut property taxes in half and amended the California constitution to prohibit future property tax rate increases.

The big spenders in Sacramento -- kissin' cousins to the ones in Washington -- were caught flat-footed. Nothing like this had happened before. Right up to election week, Governor Jerry Brown had proposed new spending programs and derided Proposition 13 as "patent medicine", "consumer fraud", and "a rip-off".

But, when two thirds of the voters went against him, he was left with Hobson's choice. In just five months he faced reelection: should he stick to his liberal-spending principles and risk defeat, or should he foresake them in order to be reelected.

So much for principle! In an about-face, Brown became, over night, a champion of Proposition 13 and a born-again tax cutter.

He called for state tax cuts.

He proposed a constitutional limit on all taxes and government spending.

He turned over to local government the multi-billion dollar state surplus, which he had been accumulating for new state spending programs, and which the State Controller -- a member of Brown's own party -- had termed "obscene".

Finally, and with much fanfare, Brown created a "blue ribbon" commission -- the Commission on Government Reform -- to tell him and the Legislature how to make Proposition 13 work.

For awhile the strategy was successful. Brown was reelected. Despite property tax cuts, local governments were kept relatively fat and happy by the state surplus. Brown's reputation as a fiscal conservative and advocate of limited government grew by leaps and bounds.

Then the Commission on Government Reform made its report. And what did this creation of born-again tax cutter recommend? Higher state taxes, increased state spending, and a takeover of local functions by state government -- exactly the things the people of California had said they did not want.

Needless to say, the fanfare surrounding the commission was suddenly reduced, but not before the truth had been glimpsed. Brown's commission revealed what Brown's rhetoric denied: business as usual for the big spendiers. More taxes, more spending and more centralization.

How did they arrive at those conclusions? Next time we'll examine how they commission worked, and why, despite the objections of its more responsible members, it concluded that the public should be damned.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Proposition 13 and the Post Commission - II"

Last year when the voters of California passed Proposition 13 by a two-to-one margin, what they had in mind was less government.

But when Governor Jerry Brown appointed the Commission on Government Reform to tell him how to make Proposition 13 work, what he had in mind was being reelected.

The difference in motivation produced dramatically different results. The voters enacted a tax decrease; eight months later the Governor's commission recommended a tax increase.

How could a commission created to help implement a tax decrease end up recommending a tax increase? The answer is found in the arrogance and power of government bureaucracy.

Not that most of the commission members were bureaucrats. They weren't. Most of them were busy, productive people offering their limited time free of charge to make government work better. Behind the scenes the bureaucrats were preparing elaborate reports about the need for more spending, concocting horror stories about the deprivation tax cuts would bring. Doing, in other words, what bureaucrats always do -- justifying their existence.

Thousands of hours of the highly-paid time of these bureaucrats, and hundreds of thousands of taxpayers' dollars, went into these dismal reports to the Commission. In two short months, the bureaucrats produced enough reports to fill a six-foot shelf. Buried in the blizzard of paper, weighed down with the burden of other responsibilities, the commission lost touch with the people.

There were, to be sure, dissenters. One could hope aloud that the commission wouldn't make itself look foolish. But it did, by recommending tax increases, spending increases and more centralization of government -- the exact opposite of what the people had voted for. In his haste to create a crutch for his reelection campaign, Jerry Brown had given the bureaucrats another platform for their big government ideas, and the commission had gone along with them.

That, of course, is how high level commissions often operate. The background work, upon which commissions' decisions are based, is done behind the scenes by bureaucrats promoting their own interests and organizations.

For them, bigger government is always better government and the people are always wrong.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Deregulation"

"Deregulation" is talked about a lot these days. The President says he's for it, and there has been a spate of articles about the costs and bad effects of regulation. Still, I don't know how much deregulation we can afford, if natural gas is any criterion. The natural gas "deregulation: bill Mr. Carter signed provides for eight new categories of regulated fuel, and none of the deregulation starts till 1985 -- with options for further postponement if the then-President so decides.

All this brings to mind the Federal Trade Commission. Created in 1914, it was supposed to prevent false or deceptive advertising and unfair competition. The FTC was the second of the so-called independent regulatory agencies, but unlike the first (the Interstate Commerce Commission), it wasn't confined to a single industry. Rather, its reach covered a whole segment of the economy.

How, "independent" is the FTC? My friend Casper Weinberger tells of the time he was asked by the Senate committee which was considering confirmation of his nomination to the commission, he understood that the commission was "unwise enough" to reply that he thought it was independent and an arm of neither. That lengthened the hearing by several hours.

"Cap" Weinberger also recalls being asked by a Congressman if he thought the commission needed any additional powers. He says, "I replied that I could not think of any because the existent mandate of the FTC was broad and sweeping." As a result of its broad mandate, the FTC has spent years trying to prove that Carter's Little Liver pills don't have all the curative properties their old ads claimed; and that Campbell Soup can't take pictures of its vegetable soup with the ingredients artificially raised to the top of the bowl. Lately, the FTC has also been considering whether television advertising should be permitted on children's programs. It has also adopted rules which nullify state laws and forbid compliance with those laws.

We are all concerned with the fight to stop inflation, yet, next to government spending, one of the mightiest forces driving prices up is unregulated government regulation. When individual federal agencies require compliance with rules and orders to cover everything from housing to such matters as requiring Dow Chemical to lower all plant railings from 42 inches to the OSHA standard of 30-34 inches (though studies showed the higher railing was safer) you have an inflationary force running out of control.

What to do about all this? First, we have to have someone to regulate the regulators, and the President of the United States, the only nationally elected official, seems the most logical candidate for the task. But we shouldn't be beguiled by a President who, having correctly identified the desire of the people for far less regulation, then defines "deregulation" of natural gas as eight new varieties of regulation.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Dishonest Environmentalists"

The Natural Resources Defense council is an organization seemingly dedicated to keeping about the way it was when the Pilgrims landed. One of their principal targets of attack is the U.S. Forest service a unit of the department of Agriculture.

According to this Natural Resources Defense council, the Forest service is grossly mismanaging the nation's 187 million acres of national forests. To support its charge the council has distributed a booklet purporting to document the abuses tolerated or inflicted by the Forest service.

One picture in the booklet, captioned "Forest Serving or Forest Killing?" shows a logged-off hillside, covered with logging waste. It's not a pretty picture. The booklet identifies the photo as "national forests". Well, the American Forest institute did a little sleuthing and found the file from which the photo was taken.

The truth is it was taken June, 1940 -- 39 years ago, in Humboldt County, California. The area shown in the photo was not a national forest, but on private land. The clearcut hillside has long since been reforested and is well on its way to producing a new crop of forest products.

Another photo in the council's booklet - also said to be "national forest" - shows a creek choked with logging waste. It turns out that this creek is in Oregon, and runs along a private access road to privately owned land within the overall boundaries of Umpqua National forest. The picture was taken in 1952. The present owner believes that the photo was taken when the area was being cleared for ranching, and thus being removed from forest management.

Yet another photo in the booklet, also labeled "national forests", shows severe soil erosion on a skid trail on a clearcut area. It turns out that this photo was also taken on private land in Oregon, not in a national forest. The area had been burned over by a forest fire, and the remaining salvagable trees had been cut in 1953. The burning off of underbrush was the direct and unpreventable cause of the resulting erosion.

Now some will point out that a generation ago forest management practices were not as well-developed and environmentally sound as they are today. That may be. But, today's Forest service, responding to the mandates of Congress, has achieved a high level of professionalism in management of our forests - not to preserve them untouched forever, but to make them productive in terms of the needs of the American people. By trying to portray the Forest service as an irresponsible destroyer of the environment, the National Resources Defense council has engaged in the worse kind of dishonesty. The council owes the Forest service and the forest products industry an apology for the falsehoods in its booklet. And the rest of us owe the Forest service a vote of thanks for its efforts to make our forests a working, renewable resource, instead of a forbidden zone.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Fish"

A few years ago there was quite a fuss about foreign fishing vessels taking fish in American waters--sometimes within sight of shore. Environmentalists expressed fear that over-fishing would deplete our offshore fish stocks. The result was the "Fisheries Conservation and Management Act of 1977", which established the 200-mile limit off our coasts. Naturally other nations, too, have established similar limits.

Now many engaged in fishing, particularly on the East coast, supported this measure as a necessary protection. It is safe to say they no longer feel that way. There is no question that foreign over-fishing has been stopped, but so has a lot of American fishing. On top of this we may lose to Canada one of our finest fishing grounds because the 200 miles is measured straight out from shore. Geography being what it is, there are irregularities along the coast and thus overlaps. One such overlap now being contested by Canada and the U.S. could take from us the northern half of the Georges Bank, which historically has been considered ours. But then, on our west coast, the Canadians have been shut off from their usual salmon fishing grounds.

The greatest setback to our fishermen has been caused by the regulations which always follow a piece of well-intended legislation. For example, once the act was in effect, U.S. fishermen were given a quota of only 10 percent of the previous year's foreign catch.

The regional commissions on the east and west coasts set their quotas based on recommendations provided by government scientists. These scientists are supposed to be able to count the fish in the sea. Take one region for example--the coast from Maine to South Carolina. With only two boats, 12 scientists are supposed to take a fish census that will determine how many fish the industry can take from the waters off that stretch of coastline. As one executive of a fisherman marketing association says, "The regional commission itself admits there is no biological justification for their quota levels." But when quotas are reached, the Department of Commerce simply closes the fisheries. It is admitted even by members of Congress that no one anticipated putting so much power in the hands of the federal government. Funny how it always ends up that way.

The New England cod and haddock fisheries have been closed down four times since the law went into effect. One of these was in mid-summer at the height of the season. For the first time in living memory hundreds of workers in processing plants and crews on boats were laid off in midsummer.

Almost two years after the act passed, the U.S. is importing 90 percent of its fish. New England imported 30 million more pounds of cod in the year after the act than it did in the previous year. That does seem like a strange result for an act that was supposed to protect American fishing.

While scientists don't seem to be able to find enough fish to count, the fishermen say the fish are thick enough to walk on. One fishing spokesman, who once supported but now regrets the 200 mile limit, says, "We'd rather be fighting the Russians--at least we'd be free."

One of the most frequently asked questions these days has to do with the tax revolt fever sweeping the country. Of course, Proposition 13 in California is still the best known showcase exhibit but there is plenty of additional evidence that taxes and the entire subject of government spending are very much on people's minds.

Polls show that 73 percent of the people support a constitutional amendment to require a balanced federal budget "except in times of emergency such as war. Of course such an amendment won't mean a thing unless those emergencies are well defined. Where government spending is concerned, a loophole is an open door.

But going on with the poll, two-thirds of the people think it is more important for government to cut spending than to cut taxes. Almost 60 percent felt that cutting government spending would be a major step in controlling inflation. My own belief is that cutting taxes will have the effect of cutting spending if government can no longer run a deficit and that will bring the end of inflation.

Lost in the hullabaloo about Proposition 13 is the fact that several states in the '78 election--helped by a national committee on tax limitation--had ballot measures calling for a percentage limit on the amount of earnings the state could take in taxes. Most of these passed.

Now, a total of 25 state legislatures have passed resolutions calling for a constitutional amendment to end federal deficit spending. And in Washington the National Tax Limitation committee made up of business people and such noted economists as Nobel Laureate Milton Friedman, has unveiled a proposed constitutional amendment to control government spending as an alternative to requiring a balanced budget.

I hope we won't lose sight of the main target in a debate over which route we take to amend the constitution. Some want to call a constitutional convention. Others want to go the legislative way, with Congress passing an amendment to then be ratified by the states.

Among these latter, voices have been raised warning of danger that a constitutional convention would open the door to all manner of proposed amendments. In my view, those who warn of this show little faith in our democratic procedures. The Constitution provides for both methods and the convention is a safety valve giving the people a chance to act if Congress refuses to.

Frankly I'd prefer the legislative way, but maybe it will take the threat of a convention to bring that about. Any number of amendments to end deficit spending have been introduced in Congress and buried in one committee. Why shouldn't the committees learn that unless they let these proposals go to the floor for debate and vote there will be a constitutional convention?

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Pot"

If this were a true-false test and I should ask, "Smoking pot (marijuana) is no more harmful than smoking regular cigarettes or drinking alcohol--true or false?"..and you answered "true", I'd be sure of one thing--you didn't see NBC's special on marijuana several weeks ago called "Reading, Writing and Reefers". I'd also have to give you a failing grade on that test.

Edwin Newman hosted the TV special which featured medical experts, among them Dr. Robert Dupont, former director of the National Institute for Drug Abuse. He was one of those who formerly believed marijuana was no more harmful than tobacco or alcohol. On the program he stated that he now knows he was wrong. He said, "We know a lot more about the health hazards of marijuana now and how dangerous it really is." He went on to say that the earlier comparison to tobacco and alcohol was a disaster and that he felt badly about having contributed to that.

Dr. Carlton Turner, who works for the government analyzing the chemical content of "pot", told of finding more cancer-causing agents in a marijuana cigarette than in tobacco.

Dr. Sidney Cohen, director of marijuana studies at UCLA's School of Medicine, told the NBC audience, "It is entirely possible that youngsters who smoke lots of good pot over long periods of time sustain some mental impairment which is not completely reversible." He said that some "may be so impaired that they will never function at their best level of effectiveness." He cited a UCLA study which proved that smoking just five marijuana joints had the same effect as smoking 112 tobacco cigarettes.

NORML--the National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws--has campaigned for easing (if not actually eliminating) restrictions on sale and use of pot. But now, Keith Stroup, director of NORML, expresses worry that young people underestimate the danger in psycho-active drugs and he cautioned against making marijuana a habit.

I've talked to many young people who defended "pot" and were able to quote all the statements ever made about the harmlessness of the weed. Somehow they seem never to have heard the other side. Never heard, for example, that marijuana contains 300 or more chemicals and 60 of those are found in no other plant. The most potent is THC. Unlike alcohol, it accumulates in the body and remains there for a long time mainly in the brain and reproductive system. The more pot smoked, the greater the accumulation. Chronic users have to smoke more and more to get the high feeling they are after. They don't realize they are already partly intoxicated.

NBC did a real service. Youngsters have been propagandized by celebrities who admit publicly to marijuana use but who, of course, have no real knowledge of its long-range effect. The medical authorities we saw on TV have no axe to grind for or against the weed. They simply state the facts they have learned through research. If you would like transcripts of the show, write to: NBC, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "No" Part I

Just recently the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs launched what one man has called a vendetta against the social and service clubs of America. These clubs such as Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, Jaycees and so forth are typically male clubs, but there are feminine counterparts such as Zonta, Business & Professional Women and so forth. They all have one thing in common--they truly provide great service to our country and communities, ranging from ongoing permanent charities to resolution of one-time problems where a neighborly helping hand is needed.

James G. Schneider, President of the Kankakee Federal Savings & Loan association of Kankakee, Illinois, is the man who decided to speak out and act--or perhaps I should say refuse to act--when he received a request to file a report for the Senate committee.

The Committee wanted to know if Kankakee Savings & Loan paid membership dues in private clubs for employees, directors and officers. Of course, the query was not aimed at this one institution alone. It was part of a broad survey to determine whether such companies were subsidizing memberships for their people in organizations that practice discrimination. Remember most of these clubs are strictly male or female.

Now it is a general practice for many such businesses to pay for employee memberships in service clubs. The companies that do this consider it a kind of public service, a form of corporate citizenship to aid in the good works performed by such clubs. There is no question but that the employees could afford such memberships themselves. This is just the companies' way of encouraging worthy causes.

I'll wager that a great many if not most of the firms receiving the Senate Committee's request, dutifully sent it back with all questions answered. Very probably some of them pushed the panic button and informed directors, officers and employees they were now on their own.

But not Kankakee Federal Savings & Loan. President Schneider addressed a letter to Senator William Proxmire. His letter did not waste words. He wrote "Last week I received a request from the Federal Home Loan bank to complete your survey. I am not completing it because I object to both its intent and its content." He went on to say, "Although it smacks of comparing apples and oranges, I am willing to hazard a guess that during the last 10 years the service clubs of just your state alone have done more collective good for America than has the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs. If your committee now finds that it has the time, the funds and the inclination to start harassing the financial institutions of America over their strong backing of such "sexist clubs" as Rotary, Zonta, Kiwanis, Business & Professional Women, Lions, Jaycees, Credit Women International & Exchange, then I would suggest that you are drastically out of touch with the people of your state".

There was more but you get the idea. We should be grateful to Mr. Schneider for reminding us that government belongs to us--not the other way around.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Saying "No" Part II

On the previous broadcast I told of a survey being made of financial institutions by the Senator Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs and one man's reply. President James G. Schneider of the Kankakee, Illinois Federal Savings & Loan association, informed the committee he just plain wasn't going to answer their questions. He also told them how ridiculous he thought they were.

This was not the first time Mr. Schneider has expressed himself regarding government antics. Three years ago he wrote an article under the intriguing title, "Compared to our Present Federal Government--King George III was a Nice Guy". I thought you might enjoy a few excerpts from that essay.

Mr. Schneider gets right to the point in his opening lines: "Among the many reasons given by the framers of the Declaration of Independence was the complaint that George III, has erected a multitude of new offices and has sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and to eat out their substance." Well King George was really a piker compared to our present federal government. Mr. Schneider goes on to say of our government: Its irresponsible deficit spending is the main cause of inflation which is relentlessly eating out our substance every day of every year. And the swarms of officers that it has sent to harass our people would boggle King George's mind even more than it was. Of course George has been excused by many historians on the basis that he was demented. Can that also excuse our congressmen and bureaucrats? Perhaps. But really, the ones who must be demented are those of us who sit back and supinely take whatever the bureaucracy dishes out."

The essay then goes on concerning the subject that caused its writing which was the same thing I discussed in the last broadcast. If you didn't hear it, I was reporting on the federal government's challenge that companies paying dues for employees in service clubs must not do so if the clubs were all-male or restricted to female membership. This is supposed to be discriminatory.

Now remember the essay I'm quoting from today was written three years ago. It would seem that bureaucracy has staying power.

Continuing the essay, Mr. Schneider says, "We have our bureaucratic friends coming on board to tell us how we shall run our business and what we may or may not do in regard to public and community relations--even when these minor expenditures are of such great benefit to the people of this area. They don't understand about the fellowship that goes into convincing successful businessmen and women to take part of their time and their company's time to work for the community good."

He says very much more but concludes, speaking of the meaning of Concord bridge and the cause that made men do what they did there. And then writes--"If you sit and do nothing, you're in fact voting for the end of freedom in this nation. And that's just as certain as whether the sun will rise in the east tomorrow morning."

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Conspiracy"

Beyond the testimony about the police radio soundtrack with its alleged evidence that a fourth shot had been fired from the "grassy knoll" in Dallas, we haven't heard too much lately about the recent investigations of the assassination of President John F. Kennedy.

This matter will probably come back again and again, as witness the modern books purporting to offer new evidence in the assassination of Lincoln. I'd like to comment on a conspiracy theory in the Kennedy case that seems to have been overlooked.

So far the demands for further investigation stem from ideas that Lee Harvey Oswald acted not alone and that possibly his cohorts were agents of our own government. But have we hesitated to investigate the possibility that Oswald might have been carrying out a plot engineered by an international agency? Even the original investigation by the Warren Commission seems to have ignored some obvious clues and been rather in haste to settle for Oswald as a lone killer.

Former marine Lee Harvey Oswald gave up his American citizenship and moved to Russia. He had learned the Russian language before he defected. Someone must have helped him do this. Once in Russia, he married the niece of a colonel in the Soviet spy organization, the KGB. Thanks to that marriage, he lived at a level of luxury above that of the average citizen.

While he is supposed to have recanted his favorable views on the U.S.S.R., it does seem strangely unlike the Soviets that he was allowed to return to the U.S. with his Russian wife. He was not the usual, disillusioned returnee eager to blow the whistle on his onetime Soviet connection in good working condition.

The Warren Commission was evidently unimpressed by the fact that he was an enthusiastic member of the pro-Castro "Fair Play for Cuba" committee. Nor did the commission find it significant that two months before the assassination he went to the Soviet Embassy in Mexico City and was seen in the company of two known Cuban agents. After his arrest his wallet was found to contain the addresses of "The Communist Daily Worker" and the Soviet Embassy in Washington.

It has been reported by more than one source that President Johnson and the Commission were fearful that evidence of a Communist conspiracy involving as it would the Soviet Union and/or Cuba, would anger the American people and lead to a confrontation, possibly even to war.

It is also reported that the FBI files indicate there might have been a Communist conspiracy involving Oswald, but that the commission was unwilling to pursue this. The files further showed that the Justice Department and the Warren Commission wanted to establish Oswald as alone in the case and to get this conclusion to the American people as quickly as possible.

Maybe some day a new investigation will start down that trail.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Lawrence Welk"

As our country was approaching its bicentennial, a man wrote a book called "My America, Your America". In the foreword he says, "I know that this wonderful life of mine could never have happened anywhere but here. My parents knew this long before me. Searching for freedom, they came to this country as immigrants, from a land where they and their parents before them had been bitterly oppressed--trapped in a life where there was little or no chance to better themselves."

You can see and hear this man any week on TV. Just treat yourself to an hour's entertainment that will--if you're old enough--bring back nostalgic memories of the Big Band era. There he is, one-time farm boy, son of immigrants, telling us, "It's wunnerful, wunnerful".

And Lawrence Welk has done something to make life wonderful for those around him. Take a look at his company of more than 50 people and see if you can't feel the genuine warmth and camaraderie of his musicians and artists. You can, because it's there.

In this cynical world where too often a broken promise doesn't count unless it was in writing, the Lawrence Welk company operates with no written contracts. This is part of the "Welk Training and Sharing Plan". A great many business executives and industrialists could do themselves a favor by having Lawrence explain his plan to them.

The plan consists of three parts. Number one is the training program. Young talent is discovered, then trained by the employer and senior employees. Trainees are paid during a period which does not exceed one year. At the year's end, employee and employer review progress and decide whether to continue the relationship. If the decision is yes, the trainee becomes a full employee and begins from that day to share in the profits and other benefits of the business.

Part two of the plan is a profit sharing trust which sets aside an amount equal to 15 percent of the company's gross payroll. This money is deposited and invested for the sole benefit of the employees. If and when they retire or leave the company, they get their share. There are, in addition, special benefits and bonuses for meritorious effort. The corporation also assumes all or part of the payment for medical coverage, life insurance, union assessments and so forth.

And part three is the no-contract basis. As Lawrence explains it, "The prime goal of our job training and sharing program is to develop the individual person to the highest possible degree of his inborn talents and potential in every way--personally, professionally, morally and spiritually. This goal is the basic, underlying motivation for our entire system."

Does this system work? In the backstage life TV viewers never see, there is an unmistakable family spirit. They babysit for each other, take trips together and help each other in time of trouble. Sounds real American, doesn't it? Lawrence Welk's bicentennial book "My America, Your America" is worth reading. It's wunnerful, wunnerful.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Income Tax"

Up until a few years ago, single people had a legitimate beef about the income tax laws. They were grossly unfair to the unmarried. Then, in 1969, Congress yielded to the growing pressure and took action to end this discrimination. Beginning in 1970 the single person was given a separate tax rate schedule so that no single would pay more than 20 percent above the married rate.

But as so often happens with the government, Congress didn't quit while they and the people were ahead. Instead they carried on and made some drastic revisions in the rules for married couples.

The option of husbands and wives to file as singles was eliminated. Couples filing separately were required to use the old higher rate schedule the Congress had just reduced for singles. And couples filing separately and claiming the standard deduction were given maximum allowances that are only half as large as for singles.

With one-half the wives in America now in the work force, government is netting a tidy little bonus--\$2 billion last year and growing. A working wife is called a "secondary earner" and thus her tax rate is automatically the highest surtax bracket of their combined incomes. An example--hubby earns \$20,000 and his wife is picking up \$7,000 for a total combined income of \$27,000. Her \$7,000 is taxes at a full 30 percent. Incidentally, they are both paying social security tax also.

A couple with a combined income of \$25,000 pays \$535 more income tax than a single, \$785 more if their income is \$30,000. If they are both pretty successful and have earnings of \$50,000 between them they pay \$2,439 more than a single with comparable earnings.

A few years ago some married couples developed a practice of flying to the Bahamas during the Christmas holidays for a vacation in the sun and a quick divorce. After the new year had come in, they would remarry and fly home. The trip was paid for by their tax savings. The practice was so widespread the IRS finally passed a rule refusing to recognize such divorces.

Today married couples with equal earnings get no benefit from income-splitting and filing separate returns. There are special rules again, quite different from those for single persons and the married couple winds up usually paying a higher tax than if they filed a joint return.

Take it to court you say? Well, one couple did and the court, even though acknowledging that the tax laws encouraged living together out of wedlock, said there wasn't anything it could do about it. The Supreme court refused to review the case.

The administration in submitting last year's tax bill proposed no reform of this inequity even though the President was on record as favoring one. The lame excuse was that they didn't want to further complicate the tax structure.

I've only touched on the inequities. Another one is that a married couple can only deduct half the capital loss two singles can deduct and it goes on and on. I believe a congressional aide has given the real reason why there has been no change. He says the government just doesn't want to give up the revenue it gets from the marriage tax.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Hamburgers"

There is a famous resort community--an island off Massachusetts, Martha's Vineyard, rich in history, beauty and the nostalgic charm of yesterday. Now, thanks to my friend M. Stanton Evans, that lovely place is here in a commentary I'd intended to do about the "junk food" fuss.

In a recent National Review Bulletin, Stan reported on a battle that has brought rancor and bitterness to the normally peaceful vacation climate of Martha's Vineyard. It seems that McDonald's, the franchise purveyor of hamburgers, wants to open a place in the village there.

Standing in the way is a hostile mobilized group called the "No-Mac Committee". Stan quotes a spokesman for the group as saying, "The consensus of the community is to reject many of the 20th century values which have homogenized American culture."

Now, lest you think this is a problem of scenery and esthetic values, let me hasten to say that "Big Mac" has made it plain there will be no neon signs or golden arches. The plan is for building in keeping with the local architecture. It is described as "like a captain's house"--sea captain, that is.

One can't escape the idea that opposition to a "Big Mac" in Martha's Vineyard springs from a touch of snobbery. Elitists who'd have no objection to a new tea room are horrified by the low cost, mass merchandising of food. Well, there is no argument that McDonald's and all the other so-called "fast food" merchandisers are aiming at supplying food of guaranteed quality in clean--if not atmospheric--surroundings at low cost. They do not pretend to be gourmet cafes with exotic menus. But, just in passing let me point out that they also provide employment for thousands of young people who have no particular job skill or trade.

Well, as I said, I was going to do a commentary on all the fuss now being raised about junk foods. Stan's article sidetracked me only because the "fast food" chains are often lumped in with the sugar-coated tooth destroyers, soft drinks and so forth, which are supposedly threatening the health of the young. But, a research group in Wisconsin focused on McDonald's and found that a meal consisting of a Big Mac, french fries and a chocolate milkshake provides 70 percent of daily protein needs, 60 percent of niacin, 50 percent of calcium, 50 percent of phosphorus, 45 percent of vitamin B-12, 30 percent of iron and substantial percentages of other dietary requirements.

The director of Food and Nutrition of the American Medical Association agrees there is adequate nutritional value in such a meal and adds, "Most of the products used are just about as good or maybe even better than the products that are prepared at home." They make it plain, of course, that such a meal as a steady, daily diet would not meet all our nutritional needs.

Stan Evans in his article called attention to a coincidence which, of course, has nothing to do with the good people of Martha's Vineyard. New Times, a Soviet weekly paper, has accused McDonald's of exploiting youth, financing secret armies and a host of other sins. You know, it's funny, but all of a sudden I want a hamburger.

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Long Walk"

I'm indebted to a columnist in a movie trade paper, "The Hollywood Reporter" for today's commentary. In it, George Christy wrote of an amazing book, "A Walk Across America", and the young man who did the walking and the writing of the book.

In October, 1973, 22-year-old Peter Jenkins left his home in Connecticut and started a backpacking trip across America. This was no hike to get from one ocean to the other, or to see how quickly it could be done. The hike ended five years later in Oregon when he waded out waist deep into the Pacific Ocean.

When Peter left Connecticut he didn't think he'd discover America-- he thought he knew America and he didn't like it. He was ashamed of the American flag and he didn't believe in God. Peter Jenkins was one of the youthful rebels from the Woodstock era, convinced that whites in the South hated blacks and blacks were all barefoot. He was sure he'd confirm this as he headed south.

He arrived in Murphy, North Carolina flat broke on a Friday night. There was no point in looking for work on a Friday night, so he joined a group of black youths who were playing basketball. When the game broke up, some of them invited him to their home for dinner. He was afraid, but he went. He shared corn bread and fried chicken and spread his bed roll in their yard.

Continuing on, he decided Mobile, Alabama was the most beautiful city he'd ever seen. Then, he discovered the pleasure of a Louisiana "shrimp boil", where he waded with his hosts into the bayou for shrimp and helped with the cooking pots. In Texas he saw the children of oil millionaires and of workers happily going to school together and no way to tell them apart.

Zigzagging across country, moving north as spring came, he herded, wrestled and dehorned cattle. Somewhere in the five years of hiking this young rebel who had vowed marriage was not for him--that he would find and leave girls as it suited him--met and married Barbara. It's all in the book.

Marriage wasn't the only thing he changed his mind about. He describes his walk as a pilgrimage in search of himself. But he found America -- and God. He writes, "Finally I've come around to enjoying being an American. I appreciate being able to go to the grocery store to buy what I want, fish and hunt. I want to become involved with the operation of our schools and government. We often overlook the fact that everyone has an opportunity to have his own home, to create his own world here."

Last Christmas he and Barbara sent out Christmas cards inviting everyone they'd met on the trek to join them for the last mile in Oregon. More than 150 came, ranchers from Idaho, oil men from Texas, the black family from North Carolina, his and Barbara's families. They waded out waist deep in the ocean laughing, crying and embracing.

In his book, "A Walk Across America", he sums it up: "There is great love and wonder and hope here, and you're free to pursue your dreams."

RONALD REAGAN COMMENTARY

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Miscellaneous"

Here we are well into 1979 and we'll soon be working on those confusing and ever-changing forms the IRS requires with regard to our income tax. Of course we've been looking forward to what our share might be of that \$18.7 billion tax cut that was passed just prior to the '78 election. I hope you haven't spent any of your share yet because the odds are about six to one you won't have a share. First of all, cost-of-living pay raises may very well have pushed you into a higher surtax bracket and second, your social security tax has been sharply increased. The estimate is that about 85 percent of all earners will be paying higher taxes and only around 16 million citizens will come out ahead.

Every once in a while we need to be reminded that our public "servants" think it is their place to set government policy--not carry out policy as determined by our elected representatives. The American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees has launched an all-out drive to prevent proposed reductions in a variety of federal programs. Union boss Jerry Wurf says the cutbacks would "damage the quality of life in American communities." How dare Californians pass a Proposition 13 without his permission?

This next one has to do with crime and those who think guns should be restricted to those in law enforcement. Just recently in upstate New York the proprietor of a small grocery called The Farm Market became worried by numerous break-in attempts. Armed with a shotgun he decided to spend the night in his store. He was awakened by a noise which proved to be someone prying the front door open with a crow bar. He could see cars parked in front of his store. He called the New York State police and then moved in on the would-be burglars who had now gained entry. With his "scatter gun" cocked and ready he held two intruders at bay. His prisoners were on-duty uniformed sheriffs deputies armed with service revolvers. The three cars in front of his store were sheriffs patrol cars. A third officer was arrested later. There's no doubt it sure is dangerous--for burglars that is--to let us citizens have weapons.

Now an item proving how much you can trust the Communists. Back during the Vietnam war a Buddhist monk, Thich Thien-minh in Saigon, headed the opposition to South Vietnam's President Thieu. When the victorious Communists marched in, he welcomed them and urged his fellow citizens to rally behind the conquerors. Thich Thien-Minh died October 17 in a North Vietnamese prison--of undisclosed causes.

And speaking of trust, the President is still determined to pull our troops out of South Korea. But we now know the North Korean army, which we were told consisted of 25 divisions has, in actuality, 41 combat-ready divisions. Leaders of the House Armed Services committee have asked the President to reconsider the troop withdrawal.

Last item. Apparently old rebels neither die nor do they fade away. The man who staged an "international war crimes trial" of Lyndon Johnson in Stockholm back in the '60s has turned up in Iran complaining that he was beaten by the Shah's secret police.

By the way, does anyone remember that the Iranian rebels, who invoke the name of God in their cause, burned down a theatre last year killing several hundred people including women and children?