

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 79-10 through 79-12 (1979)

Box: 14

To see more digitized collections visit:

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

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Inventories, visit:

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

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

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

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

RONALD REAGAN
Radio Commentary

DISC 79-10

79-10A

1.	Busing Amendment (MUST AIR ON 7-23-79)	2:45
2.	Senator Jackson on SALT II	2:46
3.	Soviet Trade	2:41
4.	Trains	2:53
5.	Nigeria	2:35
6.	Assembly Line Medicine I	2:48
7.	Assembly Line Medicine II	2:47

79-10B

1.	Namibia I	2:57
2.	Namibia II	2:45
3.	The MSHA Test	2:40
4.	Free Speech for Business?	2:52
5.	Energy-Saving Computer	3:02
6.	Project Match	3:05
7.	Miscellaneous	2:54
8.	Elementary Energy Lessons	2:47

PLEASE NOTE: 79-10A program #1 must be aired July 23rd, 1979

These programs are provided for airing from July 23rd thru August 10th inclusive. Maintaining this schedule will enable your station to air all newly recorded programs as received.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Busing Amendment"

Tomorrow the House of Representatives is scheduled to vote on a Constitutional amendment which - if it becomes law - would have the effect of putting an end to mandatory busing of school children for the purpose of achieving racial balance.

Despite opposition by the House leadership and refusal of the key committee chairman to hold hearings on the proposed amendment by Rep. Ron Mottl of Ohio the author in late June achieved a rare distinction among his colleagues: he got enough signatures on a "discharge petition" to force the measure to the floor of the House.

The young Democrat from Cleveland, now in his third term in Congress, had to do it the hard way. Beginning in his first year, 1975, when Rep. Don Edwards, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights, refused to hold hearings on the bill, Mottl sought petition signatures from his fellow members. A majority of the membership -- 218 - is required to put such a petition over the top. That year Mottl got only 17 names.

In the next Congress he was up to 201 signatures. This time he made it. It happened about the time Howard Miller, Los Angeles School board president and a champion of forced busing, was losing a recall election. That fact may have provided something of a thermometer reading of public sentiment on the issue for the final few signers.

Though proponents of busing fear that the Mottl amendment, if it becomes law, would bring on an era of renewed discrimination and vastly unequal schools, I wonder. Many black Americans see a different and insidious kind of prejudice implicit in forced busing; one that says, in effect, a black student can't learn unless he's between two white ones. California's Superintendent of Public Instruction, Wilson Riles, himself black, has been openly critical of forced busing on these grounds.

Rep. Mottl's bill does nothing to prohibit open enrollment, voluntary busing, magnet schools and other non-compulsory methods for strengthening racial integration. The bill says, "no student shall be compelled to attend public school other than the one nearest his residence." In other words, neighborhood schools.

Will the Mottl amendment pass? On June 11 an education bill amendment by Rep. John Ashbrook, prohibiting federal funds for busing, got 62.7 percent of the vote. In 1977, a similar measure by Mottl got 58.7 percent. Mottl's allies are encouraged by the increase. In order to pass, the Mottl amendment will need two-thirds of the votes of members present. If it does pass, then passes the Senate, it goes through the ratification process - three-fourths of the state legislatures must approve it. That should provide plenty of time for full discussion of sensible alternatives to an expensive experiment which is becoming increasingly unpopular on all sides.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Sen. Jackson on SALT II"

When historians look back at the debate over SALT II, I suspect a certain speech by Senator Henry Jackson will be among the most quoted documents. The speech I am referring to is the Senator's address on SALT II to a Democratic political group in June, in which he compared American policy towards the Soviet Union today to Great Britain's policy of "appeasement" towards Hitler's Germany in the 1930's.

Jackson's continued references to American appeasement of the Soviets in his speech shocked the administration and many of the Senator's Democratic colleagues in Congress. The news media provided extensive coverage of Jackson's speech; and it has been analyzed and discussed ever since.

It was not Senator Jackson's hard-line, anti-Soviet position that surprised his colleagues. Jackson has never hedged on his advocacy of a strong posture vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. What caught the Washington political establishment off guard was the ferocity of Jackson's attack on the current direction of American foreign policy and on the SALT II agreements. Jackson's speech may be the most vivid illustration since the days of the Vietnam war of the deep division of opinion among recognized experts within our foreign policy establishment. The fact that this particular speech was made by Senator Jackson, a loyal Democrat, also provides a dramatic reminder to many Democrats that the spectrum of foreign policy thought within their own party is wider than they had imagined.

In addition to Senator Jackson's remarks on appeasement, his speech also contained a thoughtful analysis of recent U.S.-Soviet relations. Jackson views the history of those relations since the Moscow summit of 1972 as the testing of a proposition that "despite the lessons of history, it is possible to achieve accommodation with a totalitarian superpower through negotiated agreements." It has been the testing of this idealistic proposition that has motivated three national administrations - two Republican and one Democratic - not only to continue the process of arms talks, but also to agree on exchanges of science and technology, medicine, art and education - in short, "detente." What are the results of our seven-year trial with this proposition? Senator Jackson's tally sheet does not provide an encouraging picture.

Jackson is careful to explain that a policy of "detente" with the Russians is not, in itself, "appeasement." He said "Diplomatic accommodation becomes appeasement when we make concessions out of a fear that the Soviets will cause trouble around the world unless we yield to their desires." The Senator is particularly disturbed by what he sees as efforts within our government to silence officials who may have honest criticism about aspects of our policies towards the Russians.

So am I. In my next broadcast, I'll tell you about one example of a Commerce department official who is now in hot water for blowing the whistle on the Russians.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Soviet Trade"

Some years back the Russians built a gigantic truck factory know as the Kama River Truck plant. I say they built it - they couldn't have done more than dig a hole for the foundation without help from the U.S. We gave them a package that included everything from the money they needed to the machinery and technology they didn't have.

Of course this was done with the hope that if they began to have the things free enterprise has provided for us they might become a friend and neighbor. We were careful to point out that a truck plant wasn't like selling them something they could use against us in event of hostilities.

Now we've learned that motors made in the Kama plant are winding up in armored personnel carriers and assault vehicles.

Several weeks ago a Commerce Department official whose job is to monitor the sale of advanced technology to the Soviet Union so as to guard against giving them something that could be used militarily, blew the whistle on his own department. He said our system of export controls is a "total shambles."

In testimony to a closed meeting of the House Armed Services subcommittee on research and development, Lawrence Brady, director of the Office of Export administration, revealed that the Commerce department had not been candid with Congress. He said the system for approving sales to Moscow is in bad shape. This was in direct contradiction to the testimony of his immediate superior, Stanley Marcus, Senior Deputy Assistant Secretary for Industry and Trade. Mr. Marcus had told the committee our precautions "are sufficient to insure our national security."

A controversy is taking place in the administration brought on by a debate in Congress over moves to make it easier to sell advanced American products to the Soviets.

Senior administration aides including the Secretary of State favor increased trade. Understandably, aides in the Defense department and the National Security Council are opposed. Maybe we should remember World War II when a former trading partner returned tons of our scrap iron in the form of shrapnel that killed our young men.

What we are talking about today isn't scrap iron. Mr. Brady says that last year only a few hundred of the 7,000 requests to sell our products to the Soviet-bloc nations were turned down. We are supposed to insure that nothing we sell can be diverted to military use but that is virtually impossible to do. Truck motors turning up in assault vehicles is proof of that.

SALT II will concern itself with Russia's SS-18 missiles which carry 10 separate nuclear warheads each. Ours carry three. We didn't think they were within years of learning how to equal us in that department. Then we sold them technology for making infinitely small and precisely engineered ball bearings -- just the kind needed for multiple warheads on nuclear missiles.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Trains"

I suppose I could be called a "train buff". I've never been able to pass a toy store window or model shop without pausing if there is a toy train on display. I longed for an electric train when I was a boy but we weren't up to that spending level so I had to do with the wind up variety.

But it was as a grownup in the years following World War II that I found trains really becoming a part of my life. Turning my back on air travel I crisscrossed the country on the Super Chief, the 20th Century Ltd., the City of Los Angeles, the Great Northern, Sunset Ltd. and the Lark. I loved every minute of it.

Now all of this is to establish a position for what follows. I wanted you to know of my partiality to trains before bringing up the question of how far our nation should go in subsidizing passenger train travel.

Amtrak, a government corporation, has taken over passenger trains from the railroad companies. They could no longer run such trains without incurring great losses. The head of one major railroad has told me they might have run those trains at a profit if the government had given them the same relief from unnecessary regulation it granted to Amtrak.

Amtrak was launched on the premise of being a profit-making corporation. In 1973 it lost \$153 million. Last year the annual deficit had grown to \$587 million. It has never - repeat, never - made money on any of its routes. Passenger fares only cover about one-third of operating costs. Tax dollars make up the balance.

About two years ago it was revealed that Amtrak lost enough on the Chicago-to-Miami run that it would have been better off if it bought each passenger a plane ticket and paid the hotel bill. The fare for the run is \$88.00; the cost of operating is \$298.00 per passenger.

The horror stories continue. A study of 10 Amtrack routes revealed they would have lost money if every seat had been filled every trip. On the Chicago-to-Milwaukee run the government loses \$32.00 for every passenger it keeps from buying a \$5.50 bus ticket.

Are we subsidizing nostalgia? Do we just like to know the trains are there even though we know we aren't going to ride them? Of course there is the energy argument that trains are a form of mass transit carrying passengers at great savings in fuel over the automobile. Not so. Fuel use on Amtrak is 48 passenger-miles per gallon, exactly the same as the average automobile. Buses do two-and-a-half times better than that.

If Amtrak quit and the government granted the railroad companies now hauling freight the right to carry passengers under the same regulations now applying to Amtrak, maybe we could have trains without the subsidy.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Nigeria"

Someone once said that every form of government has one characteristic peculiar to it and if that characteristic is lost the government will fail. In a monarchy it is affection and respect for the royal family. If that is lost the monarch is lost. In a dictatorship it is fear. If the people stop fearing the dictator he'll lose power. In a representative government such as ours it is virtue. If virtue goes, the government falls.

Are we choosing paths that are politically expedient and morally questionable? Are we in truth losing our virtue?

Our government has refused to recognize the new government of Rhodesia claiming it is bound by the U.N. sanctions against that country. Our ambassador to the U.N. has hinted we may have other reasons for holding off. It seems that we received a gentle warning from General Obasanjo, ruler of Nigeria, that serious consequences might follow if we recognized the government of Prime Minister Abel Muzorewa, who was elected by Rhodesians legally and legitimately.

Now, how could Nigeria possibly threaten our nation and by so doing dictate our foreign policy? General Obasanjo rules not by any vote of his people. Yet he calls the Rhodesian election a "mockery of democracy" and his government-run newspaper charges Rhodesia with practicing "political fraud".

Our U.N. ambassador says we must take the general's threats seriously. You see, Nigeria has oil wells which produce one out of eight barrels of the oil we import. Oh, it's true that Nigeria also buys from our country but not enough to balance the oil they sell us. Still isn't our ambassador overlooking the fact that General Obasanjo's principle cash crop is oil and without our cash for that oil his country would have a hard time developing itself.

But isn't there another argument - one having to do with virtue - which our ambassador has completely overlooked? Zimbabwe - Rhodesia has taken a great stride toward the kind of democratic values we have always endorsed. Indeed, in this case it is the step we pressured them to take. But instead of holding out our hand to them in friendship we turn our back because the military rules of a country short on democratic values might decide to do without our money and keep his oil.

Are we as Americans so thirsty for oil that we'll forget the traditions upon which our country is founded and let our foreign policy be dictated by anyone who has oil for sale? If so, we may be nearer the dust bin of history than we realize.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Assembly Line Medicine I"

From time to time on these commentaries I've taken issue with the advocates of nationalized health insurance which is the title used for compulsory socialized medicine. Some time ago I called attention to Senator Kennedy's attempt to use Canada's national health plan as proof that such plans are better than our own pluralistic system.

Now with two plans for government health care, the Senator's and the President's up for consideration by the Congress, some further information about the Canadian plan might be in order.

In 1953 the province of Manitoba suffered the worst epidemic of polio to ever hit any part of the North American continent. Polio, of course, is a catastrophic illness and an epidemic, such as struck Manitoba, left some families totally destitute. There was no denying the need for some kind of community help for catastrophic cases.

Manitoba until 1969 had a fairly successful medical insurance plan run entirely by the medical profession. It offered unlimited medical and surgical care, laboratory tests, X-rays, drugs, ambulance service, nursing care and physical check-ups. And of course, free choice of doctors. It covered 65 percent of the population.

In 1969 this plan was ordered disbanded by the government of Canada which had introduced a program of compulsory, universal care. F.S. Manor, writing in the AMERICAN SPECTATOR, describes in detail what happened then. He calls the government program a conveyor-belt system administered through community clinics. These clinics consist of "all powerful administrators, social workers, paramedics and a small number of salaried doctors doing shift work and restricted in the number of X-rays or laboratory tests they can order per day." And believe it or not, the doctors are low men on that medical totem pole.

You arrive at the clinic as a patient. You are assigned to a social worker who determines whether you really need medical care or if it is all in your head. If the decision is that you probably do have some ailment you are turned over to a paramedic. This individual decides whether it's something he or she can treat or whether you should see a doctor. If you do see a doctor he or she diagnoses your case and makes an appointment for treatment. But treatment may be by a doctor you've never seen before because your appointment happens to fall on his or her shift.

Now obviously this whole procedure is backward. Your first interview should be with a trained doctor who decides whether you need a doctor's care, whether a paramedic can handle your case or whether you just need to be talked to by a social worker. The system is backward because it's cheaper that way. The top men on the totem pole - the administrators - have ruled that the conveyor-belt will run backwards.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Assembly Line Medicine II"

A former British cabinet minister once said of government medical care "The demand for free medical care quickly outruns any possible provision for it."

On the last broadcast I was talking about the Canadian health care system as described in THE AMERICAN SPECTATOR by a Canadian journalist, F.S. Manor. Mr. Manor also touched on a report from Sweden where socialized medicine has been in effect a long time.

In this report an official in the Swedish health service said he was very much against physical check-ups. He declared they were "expensive and wasteful since only seldom would a doctor find any pathological condition." But then he went on to say that if an incipient disease is discovered, "it prompts the patient to insist on expensive modern treatment that will often prolong life for as many as 20 years, during which time the patient will continue to make demands upon the state health services."

It is hard to believe but this man - part of the officialdom of government health care in Sweden, is saying the state prefers that you die young if the alternative is costly on-going care at state expense.

I have seen other reports from other countries bearing out this same idea that some patients should be left to die if their treatment would be too prolonged and costly to the taxpayers. This is done by simply putting them on a waiting list until nature takes its course.

Getting back to Canada, Mr. Manor cites the increasing number of doctors who leave Canada to practice in the United States. In Canada a moderately skilled doctor has to see three times as many patients each day to earn as much as his American counterpart. But it isn't just pay that prompts his move. His schedule is so heavy that he can only spend an average of 10 to 11 minutes with each patient - that is if they are all on time and passing each other on the way in and out of his office.

Recently the Canadian government put pressure on our government to halt this migration of doctors to the U.S. and our government has now made it difficult for Canadian physicians to move across the border.

Mr. Manor speaks from some personal experience. One third of every tax dollar in Canada goes to pay for that "free" medical care. He estimates that he has paid about \$12,000 over the last five years for his so-called medical insurance.

Last year he was knocked down by a hit-and-run driver. He woke up in a hospital where it was decided without benefit of X-rays that he only had swollen legs and multiple abrasions and that he could go home.

Fortunately he has a personal physician who happens to be associated with that hospital. X-rays were taken and a more thorough examination given. He had suffered a concussion, an injured eye and a broken back. Even so there was no room or hospital bed available so he remained on a stretcher in the emergency room. His \$12,000 over five years hadn't bought him much of an insurance policy.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Namibia I"

Our government and the United Nations among others are very upset because the terrorist forces of Joshua Nkomo and Robert Mugabe were not allowed to impose their rule on Rhodesia by force of arms. The Rhodesians by free and open election chose another leader and another more democratic course.

Now we find a sequel in another emerging country, South West Africa known as Namibia. This had been a German colony until World War I after which the League of Nations turned it over to South Africa.

In 1978 South Africa accepted a plan drawn up by our country, Britain, France, Canada and West Germany by which Namibia would become an independent nation. This plan was put in effect through the U.N. but, shades of Rhodesia, no sooner had South Africa given in than the U.N. began changing the plan to which South Africa had consented.

Last year the U.N. Security Council by a 15 to 0 vote declared that Walvis Bay must be integrated into Namibia. This was in direct contravention to the agreement with South Africa. The bay is one of South Africa's major sea ports but what is more significant it has been part of South Africa since 1884, Namibia was only mandated to South Africa in 1920.

It now appears that the U.N. and the five western powers changed their minds on Walvis Bay in an effort to persuade Sam Nujoma, leader of a Marxist terrorist band to accept the U.N. plan.

In a situation not unlike Rhodesia's Namibia has a terrorist force headed by Nujoma who does not want an election to establish a majority rule government in Namibia. His group calls itself the Southwest Africa Peoples Organization, "SWAPO" for short.

As the U.N. sputtered around, unilaterally changing the contract it had signed and postponing an election in Namibia, Nujoma's SWAPO forces - like the bandits of Nkomo and Mugabe in Rhodesia - were busily murdering and pillaging. The government of South Africa decided the only way to settle once and for all who spoke for the people of Namibia would be to hear from the people by way of a free and open election.

SWAPE was enraged, the killing increased and one of the leading black moderates who could have won a free election was murdered. Documents were found proving not only that SWAPE was responsible for the murder but that other leaders were on a "hit" list.

Our government sent observers to Namibia but their bias was showing - they only met SWAPE leaders.

One U.S. Congressman (who, incidentally, has been convicted recently of 29 felony counts) wanted the DTA, the moderate party, to turn the government over to SWAPO - apparently without an election. The U.N. has declared SWAPO is somehow the only legitimate spokesman for the country. Three U.N. bodies, the U.N. Commission for Namibia, the U.N. Council for Namibia and the U.N. Fund for Namibia channel millions of dollars in aid directly to Nujoma, the SWAPO Leader. UNICEF and UNESCO do likewise.

Chapter two on the effort to impose a Marxist government without an election on the people of Namibia will follow next broadcast.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Namibia II"

Last broadcast I was talking about the newest emerging country in Africa -- Namibia -- once under mandate to South Africa and soon to become an independent nation.

South Africa agreed to terms submitted by the United States and the U.N. but immediately thereafter the U.N. began unilaterally changing these terms. It is funneling millions of dollars to a terrorist leader Sam Nujoma and wants to recognize his terrorist band called SWAPO as the government of Namibia without benefit of a vote by the people. Our government is going along with this in spite of Nujoma's declaration that he is a revolutionary and that he isn't fighting for majority rule, but is fighting to seize power.

It isn't red-baiting to call Nujoma a Marxist. He has gone to East Germany where he signed a compact of cooperation. He visited Moscow where he was promised sophisticated weapons and journeyed to Cuba where he received promises of "unshakable support."

Violence has increased in Namibia. In May all of the people of that country were incensed by the bayoneting of a grandmother and her two young grandchildren. The U.N. made no comment about that but vehemently protested South Africa's attempt to capture and punish the murderers.

The interim government of Namibia has removed more than 95 percent of apartheid and has worked hard to achieve a non-racial government and complete majority rule.

South Africa attempted in the U.N. to present its side of the story. It was their first appearance in the U.N. in five years. The General Assembly voted 93 to 19 to not accept their ambassador's credentials. Even so, South Africa continues to say it will stand by the U.N. proposal it signed in good faith.

It boggles the mind to think that our government believes it is in our best interest to turn Namibia over to a pro-Communist government when it is obvious that the people of that country prefer a government favorable to the west and certainly non-Communist.

Namibia is rich in minerals and has great room for expansion with a population of less than two inhabitants per square mile. A former mayor of its capitol city says, "We believe that the United States has lost sight of what is really happening here. Its support of terrorism is not the policy you would expect from a great power."

No it isn't. And it's hard to understand our agreeing with a demand that Nujoma's murderous force be allowed to openly establish bases within Namibia. Possibly we think it is inconvenient for them to have to cross the border from their hideouts in Angola whenever they feel a murder coming on.

The Democratic Turnhalle Alliance, a multi-racial political party, representing the 11 black, brown and white population groups of Namibia, continues to strive for free elections, no thanks to the U.N. or the U.S.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "The MSHA Test"

Senator Malcolm Wallop of Wyoming was furious as he rose to speak on the Senate floor last May 21. An angry constituent has just brought to his attention a disturbing example of the arbitrary power the regulatory agencies have over individual lives in this country. The new Mine Safety and Health act of 1977 requires that each new miner be trained by a safety instructor who has been certified by the federal government. In order to be certified, a mine employer or his representative must attend a mandatory three-day session of classes at one of numerous training camps set up by the Mine Safety agency. While the course is provided free of charge to management personnel, courtesy of the taxpayers, all travel and living expenses must be paid for by the company.

Well, when Senator Wallop's angry constituent traveled to Albany, Oregon last April to participate in the government-mandated three-day training session, he and the other participants were forced to take an outrageous multiple choice test. The test is called "The Situation Adaptability Evaluations for Management Personnel." But don't let that stately-sounding title fool you. Although agency officials defend the test as a social icebreaker, the questions are disgusting and obscene. In fact, good taste prevents me from reading any of the questions to you now.

As you can imagine, many of the session's participants were shocked and offended by the test. And they were angry at having to spend their time and money engaged in such worthless activities as this. Yet the mining industry has no choice. The federal government will not allow companies to run their mines without the mandated safety courses for new miners. And management cannot provide that safety training until it attends the three-day workshop.

It is this abuse of government power that prompted Senator Wallop to stand before his colleagues in anger. But he could not bring himself to read this disgusting test out loud. It was simply reprinted in the Congressional Record.

This incident should not simply be filed away in the collection of the federal government's absurd actions and programs. This abuse of power demands corrective action and an examination of the entire Mine Safety and Health act. The law has apparently unleashed yet another team of arrogant government bureaucrats to protect us from ourselves. Senator Wallop put it very well. He told his colleagues "Americans take the safety of employees seriously. But employers and small businesses do not have time for government pranks...This type of absurd and obscene test is administered by government employees, on government time, and presumably with government materials... If this is the judgment, attitude and caliber of those in authority...then it is time to make some drastic changes."

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Free Speech for Business?"

Recently, a major corporation produced three messages for television, drawing attention to three issues it felt were of major concern to the people of America.

I'd like to read you the scripts for these messages. The first dealt with free enterprise and the voice over the picture said, "Is free enterprise an endangered species? How much government regulation is enough? Is business bad just because it's big? Or does a country like ours require a diversity of business -- both big and small? Will excessive control over big business lead to control over all business? The answers are up to you. Whatever your views let your elected representatives know. People, one by one, need to speak up now. You can help keep free enterprise free." Then followed the corporation's sign-off with a tag line added, "One person can make a difference."

The second commercial had to do with energy. The announcer's voice delivered this message: "Some people are calling the energy crisis a hoax. Others say that at the rate we're using up our oil reserves we'll be down to our last drop in our children's lifetime. Whoever is right, one thing is clear. America needs an energy plan for the future now. One that uses all resources available from coal and nuclear power to solar. But we're only going to get it if people, one by one, demand it. Whatever your views, let your elected representatives know now. There's not much we can do when the light goes out."

Now if you are wondering why I am reading these TV messages I'll explain right after this third and last one. It has to do with government red tape and opens with several voices overlapping, speaking the following lines: "Applications should be filled out in triplicate. Forms should be returned by the 19th or penalty charges. The Bureau requires all permits to. The Department must be notified. Send one copy to."

Then the announcer's voice says, "It's red tape. In 1977 America spent \$100 billion on federal paperwork alone. And in the end we all pay for it. But if people, one by one, start speaking out, we can begin untangling America's knottiest problem. A message from Kaiser Aluminum. One person can make a difference."

Yes, the corporation offering these messages was Kaiser Aluminum and Chemical Corporation. They submitted these to the three TV networks as commercials for which the corporation was, of course, willing to pay. The networks refused to air them. The networks said they were "controversial." One network cited the "Fairness doctrine", the FCC's requirement that a fair balance of opinion be presented on television. We're all agreed on that, but for the life of me I find no threat to such a balance in the messages I've just read and which Kaiser was going to present as paid commercials.

Well to quote from the second message if you think someone's right of free speech was denied by the networks, "let your elected representatives know now."

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Energy-Saving Computer"

When the 1973 Arab oil embargo triggered a nationwide energy crisis, the city of Los Angeles was forced to curtail power use among private commercial customers. Downtown businesses did their part and reduced their consumption by about 30 percent. If there was one thing these businesses did not expect after these reductions, it was higher utility bills. But that's exactly what they got. Many businesses experienced increases in their power bills of up to 15 percent, even though they had just cut consumption by a third. What was going on?

A number of flabbergasted businessmen got together and decided that they couldn't solve their energy problems separately. They had just learned that simply ordering across-the-board energy cut-backs in their own facilities didn't translate into dollars-and-cents savings. Their individual cut-backs did nothing to reduce the demands on the power utility during costly peak-load periods.

The businessmen didn't run to Sacramento or to Washington to demand help from government. They decided to cooperate with each other and experiment with a plan devised by a maverick energy consultant named John Phillips. In July, 1975, four private corporations and the city-owned electric utility in Los Angeles agreed to link their 11 buildings in a voluntary energy network. Fifty miles away in Newport Beach, computers Phillips Engineering monitor, analyze and control energy use in all the buildings. The computers not only trim the total consumption of the buildings' heating, air conditioning and lighting facilities, but reduce the network's use of the most expensive energy -- the electricity used during peak demand periods.

So far, the results of this unique energy cooperative have been impressive. By coordinating their energy usage, the companies have cut demand during peak hours by 10 percent and have saved hundreds of thousands of dollars. This was accomplished not by cutting back on convenience or comfort, but by simply plugging energy leaks, so to speak, and by rearranging the way the energy is used.

The news of this success has spread fast. Energy use in Chicago's 31-story Civic center is now controlled by John Phillips' computer 2,200 miles away. The building is already saving \$90,000 a year. Illinois Bell Telephone has tied its 13 buildings together in Chicago in an energy network monitored by Phillips' Newport Beach computer. Thanks to that computer, two boilers were completely shut down, even in sub-zero weather.

These results have produced benefits for Phillips' Engineering Supervision company. In 14 years, Phillips -- who dropped out of his Columbia University humanities program in 1955 -- has seen the annual revenues of his company grow from \$24,000 to \$2 million. The private energy network proves that a voluntary cooperative program in which the participating businessmen rely on private enterprise and technology can realize fast results without the inefficiencies of government allocation programs. Unlike government controls, it is hard to politicize the findings and energy adjustments made by the computer.

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Project Match"

With great fanfare in November, 1977, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Joseph Califano unveiled a new program designed to catch welfare cheaters. It is called "Project Match." Secretary Califano claimed that by matching the welfare rolls of 26 states against the rolls of five million federal employees in a complex computer process, HEW could weed out all those cheaters who were on the federal payroll at the same time they were receiving welfare checks. This would be the best way, Califano claimed at the time, to catch violators in what he admitted was a fraud-prone welfare system.

To give "Project Match" a big send-off, Califano decided to launch a trial run in Washington, D.C. by matching HEW's own employee rolls with the list of Washington welfare recipients. Lo and behold, the computer coughed up 15 names which were on both lists. The 15 were indicted last fall in a highly publicized round-up. According to HEW, this indicated that "Project Match" was doing its job.

But the disposition of those 15 cases indicates the opposite. Of the 15 indicted, five had their cases dismissed, four had their charges reduced to technical violations and the remaining six pleaded guilty to felonies. None served any time in prison, and a grand total of \$2,000 was repaid. These are not the results of a soft-hearted judge, but a complete breakdown in communications between HEW and the city of Washington's Department of Human Resources. In most of the 15 cases, the accused welfare cheaters had found jobs and reported this fact to the appropriate District authorities. But this information never made it to the HEW computers. Therefore, these 15 people appeared on "Project Match's" list as both HEW employees and welfare recipients. Their names were printed in both Washington newspapers as examples of HEW's successful, new program.

The case of one of the 15 victims of "Project Match" is particularly disturbing. A 32 year old working mother was forced to go on welfare when it was discovered that she had cancer. She quit her job in order to undergo a debilitating series of cobalt treatments for the cancer. Then one day her doctor had good news. Her condition has improved and she could go back to work. She found a job at St. Elizabeth's hospital. Elated, this woman called Washington's Department of Human Resources to tell them that she wouldn't need the welfare payments any more. The official she talked to told her not to worry if a few more checks came in the mail. The checks did keep on coming. A second call to the official didn't stop them either. Finally, she began to cash the checks in order to pay off some doctor bills.

Needless to say, when the woman's name was listed prominently in the Washington newspapers, she lost her job, and because of the publicity, cannot find another one. While faulting her for cashing the checks she tried to stop, the judge dismissed her case. Today she is back on welfare.

The trial run of "Project Match" cost the taxpayers more than it saved. And it cost many of the people involved undeserved embarrassment and the loss of their jobs. It's not exactly an incentive to try to best the vicious circle of welfare. For HEW, it's time to go back to the drawing board.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Miscellaneous"

With SALT II in the air I thought you'd like this bit of news from "Tass", the Soviet news agency. Tass reports that Brezhnev is annoyed with President Carter for talking about verifiability of the proposed treaty's terms. According to "Tass", "The President must know well that the Soviet Union has always, throughout the whole of its history, strictly adhered to and abided by the agreements it signed."

If memory serves me correctly, the Soviet Union has violated 52 treaties and agreements just since World War II.

I'm indebted for this next one, to Mike Royko, a Chicago columnist. An official of the Chicago Housing Authority discovered that a neighborhood priest was celebrating mass in two senior citizen apartment buildings. He did this once each month to bring a little peace of mind and happiness to these elder citizens who were unable to get out and go to church.

The official put a stop to this on the grounds of separation of church and state. After all, this was public housing financed by federal grants. The clause of the constitution he invoked, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion" concludes with the phrase, "or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."-- UNQUOTE.

Bless free enterprise! I've already spoken about the anti-nuclear power people and the fact that behind the scenes they are being manipulated by forces sympathetic to the Soviet Union. But now the Anti-Nukes (as they are being called by some) are squirming uncomfortably at the thought that their sacred cause is being commercialized.

An unscheduled speaker took the microphone at an anti-nuclear rally on Boston Common and told the "Clamshell Alliance" how its members could ward off radiation. He said that chewing wheat grass and planting it around your home would do the trick.

Classified ads are appearing in a Harrisburg newspaper offering "personal radiation detectors", plus home inspections for radiation. Then there is a Boston publication, a macrobiotic journal which claims that miso, a soybean product, is helpful in "preventing and curing radiation sickness". Miso, according to the article will also detoxify and eliminate heavy radioactive elements from the body.

The anti-nuclear advocates are fearful that all this commercial activity will discredit their cause.

And finally an item that might be light at the end of the tunnel -- like, say a pin point of light. A Congressional committee has been unable to find out how many programs there are in the federal government. Now the Office of Management and Budget, swinging a sword considerably smaller and more delicate than the one with which St. George smote the dragon, is going to attack the federal bureaucracy.

It wants Congress to abolish the United States Marine Corps Memorial Commission which completed its task (a memorial in Chicago) 20 years ago. The Annual Essay Commission, which hasn't had anything to do since we stopped using gold and silver in coins in 1965, and the low-emission Vehicle Certification Board, which looked for and couldn't find a pollution free vehicle.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Elementary Energy Lessons"

This story is surely a sign of the times. At the Top of the World elementary school in Laguna Beach, California, fourth, fifth and sixth grade kids meet twice a week for special energy classes in what is known as the "energy room." This unique classroom is equipped with appliances of all sorts; two stunted telephone polls, complete with insulators; a gas line which stretches across the classroom; and computer terminals. It's all part of a one-of-a-kind energy program designed to teach the youngsters that there is more to energy than a switch, a socket and a gallon of gas.

The \$400,000 project is being funded entirely by individual and corporate donors who figure that the best place to begin to teach Americans common sense is with their kids. And they are probably right. While many of their parents are conjuring up sinister oil company conspiracies, the children in this school are learning the nuts-and-bolts of how the energy is produced, how it gets to our homes, why it costs so much, and how the individual family can reduce its energy cost.

The most innovative feature of this special program is provided by John Phillips and his Engineering Supervision company. Phillips is the same man who devised a computerized energy savings program for large commercial customers that I described in an earlier broadcast. Now Mr. Phillips has installed a computer terminal in this energy classroom. Then, energy-monitoring devices were hooked up to the homes of a number of children who are participating in the program. This enables a student to see, projected on the computer screen, just how much energy his or her family uses -- and when they use it. The computer measures the energy consumption of each home appliance and shows how the family can save energy and money by rearranging its use of electricity to avoid peak-load hours.

One of the two teachers hired to teach the special energy classes says that the youngsters involved are excited and motivated about energy. The best way to measure this interest, she says, is to compare the rate of completed homework to that in other classes. About 90 percent of the assignments are completed in the energy classes, she explains, compared to less than 50 percent in other subjects.

Another learning technique of the program did not go over too well with many parents. Last fall, the students were assigned to spend a weekend without energy. That meant no car travel, electric lights, appliances, telephones and--heaven forbid -- no television from Friday at 6 p.m. to Sunday at 6 p.m. The purpose of the assignment was to learn what it might be like to have to live without energy.

The energy education program at this elementary school is an imaginative way to teach youngsters how our energy is produced, priced and allocated -- and how energy and money can be saved with a minimum of inconvenience. Perhaps some government officials should go to this Laguna Beach elementary school to observe -- and learn.

RONALD REAGAN

Radio Commentary

DISC 79-11

V Aged 7/31/79
Air 8/13-8/31/79

79-11A

1.	Congressional Promises and Performance	2:55
2.	Income Tax Indexation	2:55
3.	Chile	2:49
4.	International Year of the Child	3:00
5.	Tax Expenditures	3:08
6.	Another Side of the U.N.	2:45
7.	A Different Watergate Story	2:29

79-11B

1.	Miscellaneous I	2:44
2.	Neoconservatives	3:12
3.	Common Sense From A Neighbor	2:41
4.	America	2:47
5.	Miscellaneous II	3:08
6.	Free Speech	2:57
7.	Showcase U.S.A.	2:42
8.	Miscellaneous III	2:50

PLEASE NOTE:

These programs are provided for airing from August 13th thru August 31st, 1979 inclusive. Maintaining this schedule will enable your station to air all newly recorded programs as received.

It is not necessary to return discs.

American political observers are still marvelling at how swiftly serious change is being carried out in Britain as a result of last May's elections. As a candidate, conservative Margaret Thatcher proposed sweeping reforms in her nation's economic policy and tax laws to revitalize the stagnant British economy. Soon after her election she began to carry out her proposed program. This surprised many Americans because, as experience shows, our own system does not respond as swiftly or as clearly to the expressed wishes of the voters.

During last fall's Congressional campaigns, candidates of all parties and ideological persuasions seemed to be whistling the same tune. Americans were fed up with Big Government and the outlandish schemes it had devised to squander our money. Elect me, each candidate seemed to be saying, and I will help enact serious restrictions on government spending.

That was November, 1978. In June, 1979, the House of Representatives had a golden opportunity to deliver on these promises as it deliberated on next year's budget for the Department of Health, Education & Welfare, widely regarded as the department most in need of belt-tightening. On June 27, the House approved a spending bill. Let's take a look at it.

HEW was voted a budget of almost \$61 billion dollars, four billion more than it received last year. Now, these figures are deceptive because they don't account for programs beyond the control of the Congress. If you add the automatic expenditures for unemployment compensation, Social Security, railroad retirement and other trust funds, HEW will spend more than \$237 billion next year.

The House rejected numerous attempts to cut the budget appropriations of various HEW programs. But it did order the department to eliminate a half billion dollars in losses from waste and fraud. And to its credit, the Congress also resisted many efforts to fund new programs or add to the funding of existing programs.

If Congress did adopt a stand-pat approach on budgetary matters, it did take this opportunity to order some changes in the practices of certain government agencies. Since the Department of Labor's budget was attached to this same bill, members used this opportunity to correct some flagrant practices of the Occupational Safety and Health administration. Congress also voted against HEW's latest effort to collect information from hospitals. It prohibited the department from implementing its so-called System for Hospital Uniform Reporting on the grounds that it would place such a burden of new government paperwork on the hospitals that patient costs would be driven even higher. There's no telling how many representatives were convinced of the folly of this scheme when Rep. Doug Bereuter of Nebraska showed them the HEW manual hospitals would have had to use to comply with the system. The manual is 600 pages long.

At best, this major vote reflects a modest effort on the part of the House to hold the line on spending and correct some of HEW's more obvious bureaucratic abuses. But Congress did not deliver the serious change in the spending habits of the federal government that the voters asked for unmistakably last fall.

You've probably heard many politicians tell you over the years that inflation is the cruelest tax of all. That it spares no one. That it undermines the economy and the strength of the dollar overseas. They're right, of course. But what they might not have told you is that there is one beneficiary of inflation--government. In an inflationary year, the wages of many Americans are pushed up to compensate for that inflation with cost-of-living increases. Unfortunately, this raise often pushes the taxpayer into a higher tax bracket too. Since our income tax is graduated, this hapless worker will not only pay more dollars of tax, but a higher percentage of his income. Thus, you can see how Congress, simply by doing nothing in an inflationary year, can raise taxes without voting for an increase. Then as election time rolls around, it can vote a modest tax cut without putting much of a dent in its spending habits.

Well, the tax and economic experts have realized that the American taxpayer has been saddled with this hidden tax for years, and many have proposed a solution that has caught the eye of opponents of Big Government. It's called indexation. In a recent article, Joseph Minarik, a Brookings Institute economist, explains how it would work.

"The average wage-earner can be protected by a very simple kind of indexing--increasing the standard deduction and the personal exemption at the same rate as the price level. This would prevent taxable income from increasing if wages merely kept up with inflation."

Supporters of indexing say that since inflation has apparently become a long-term feature of our economy, we need this kind of system built into our tax laws to protect the cost-of-living wage increases of workers and to prevent the federal government from getting rich off the very economic ills it helps to create. Opponents of indexing include Big Government advocates who welcome the extra revenue inflation generates for the government. They see this hidden tax, because it is indirect, as a relatively painless way to increase the government's share of the national wealth without actually having to vote new taxes.

Since it appears that inflation will be around for awhile, indexing could provide needed relief for overtaxed American workers. However, it is not a step that should be taken lightly. Devising a system of indexing could produce new complications in our tax laws. That's something we sure don't need. And what about other forms of income such as capital gains and interest? Many would argue that a fair system of indexing would have to include inflation adjustments for these, too.

Finally, some observers feel that adopting indexation would be a tacit admission that we have given up on our efforts to fight inflation. If we eliminate the pain inflation causes, will we become more complacent about finding ways to put the brakes on an overheated economy?

These are some of the concerns voiced about indexing. But with inflation running at a double-digit pace and a greater awareness among taxpayers of the federal government's taxing schemes, indexing is an idea you are going to hear a lot more of in the coming months.

Let us start with the premise that all of us deplore violation of human rights wherever they take place. Let us agree we don't approve of authoritarian, totalitarian or collectivist governments. Let us also agree that it isn't our responsibility to change those governments. Nor to impose our tradition of individual freedom on other countries even though the world would be a better place if all people had our freedom.

This must be the philosophy guiding our State department with regard to the Soviet Union, where totalitarianism and denial of human rights is standard procedure. We continue to seek friendship with the rulers in the Kremlin, selling them our technology and our wheat. We even lend them the money so they can buy more. And so it is with any number of other dictatorships with which we have diplomatic and trade relations.

But what is hard to explain is our inability to forgive any character flaws at all in those nations which have been our friends and allies back through the years.

I won't attempt a listing of all our friends and neighbors who have felt the sting of our disapproval, but I would like to take the case of one for examination. Down in South America, probably no nation went farther in striving for democracy and individual freedom than Chile. That is, Chile before the election of the late President Salvador Allende.

Allende was a Marxist and took Chile down the road to socialism. Inflation reached 1000 percent. Businesses of all kinds were nationalized. Journalists who have made an honest effort to talk with the Chilean man-in-the-street report that there would have been a people's revolt if the military overthrow of the Allende regime had not taken place. After the Coup, General Augusto Pinochet (PEE-NO-CHET) was made President of Chile. He set out to restore the economy of the nation. He promised to restore democratic rule also and to allow elections. True, they haven't taken place as yet, but there is reason to believe that if and when they do the general might just be the favorite candidate if he chooses to run.

Since 1975 the government of Chile has employed the Gallup organization to do polling twice a year. Gallup does this under an arrangement which insures there can be no interference by the government. As of now 67 percent of the people approve of the present government and 70 percent want no election now. Regarding President Pinochet, 70 percent find him decent and humane, 82 percent find him capable and decisive, 63 percent find him moderate, 57 percent find him fair, 53 percent consider him suitable for public office and 70 percent find him likeable.

Maybe those polls are influenced by the fact that prosperity is coming back, inflation has dropped to a fraction of what it was and the food shortages are gone. Sounds like a country getting back on its feet -- and a good one to be friends with.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "International Year of the Child"

A recent article in a certain publication contains the following assertion. "Society's attitude to children is a yardstick for its character, humanism and observance of human rights...Soviet children enjoy in full the rights stipulated in the Declaration of the Rights of the Child, proclaimed by the U.N. General Assembly." You may think this incredible statement could have appeared only in Pravda. But no, this benevolent evaluation of the rights of Soviet children appeared in a recent issue of the "International Year of the Child" newsletter published by the United Nations. This same issue contains a front-page article which is highly critical of American attitudes towards children.

The newsletter is just one of many activities being conducted under the auspices of the "International Year of the Child." This special celebration and focus on the needs of the world's children was declared in a proclamation by the U.N. General Assembly last year. To sponsor special activities in the United States, President Carter created a national commission and appointed Jean Young, wife of his U.N. ambassador, to chair that commission.

On the surface, it would appear almost callous to criticize an effort designed to focus on the concerns involving the well-being of the world's children. But unfortunately, as the newsletter indicates, the "International Year of the Child" is being used as a platform to advance a particular ideology. Not only have the Russians seized upon the "International Year of the Child" to score propaganda points, but here at home, many liberal activists are using the U.N. proclamation as a moral mandate for new Big Government programs such as compulsory national health insurance and federally-funded day care centers.

I wonder how many people have actually read the U.N. proclamation--which the United States agreed to--proclaiming 1979 as the "International Year of the Child." Some of the provisions are innocuous enough, such as this one--"the child shall enjoy the right to affection, love and understanding." There's nothing new for most parents there. But in the very next clause the tone of the proclamation shifts radically--"the child shall have the right to adequate nutrition and medical care, including pre-natal and post-natal care, to child and mother." Of course, we want our children to have those things, and American society has done better than all others in providing for its children. But to speak of necessities such as medical care as "rights" is to adopt a familiar code-word. To say that medical care is a right is to say that it is the job of government--rather than individuals and families--to provide it.

By the time the "International Year of the Child" is over, American taxpayers will have contributed more than \$2 million to the national commission headed by Mrs. Young. According to a budget released by the commission, most of the money will be used to pay the salaries of its staff and university professors it has hired as consultants. What will we get for our money? Probably little more than a lecture on the virtues of new federal programs which are supposedly indispensable to the well-being of our children.

I have always believed that government has no right to a surplus; that it should take from the people only the money necessary to fund its legitimate functions. If it takes more than enough it should return the surplus to the people.

In carrying out that policy in California I ran into controversy from some members of the legislature who exemplified the truism that government doesn't tax to get the money it needs, it always needs the money it gets. Trying to get the legislators to return money to the people in the form of a tax rebate was a little like getting between the hog and the bucket. You got jostled about a bit.

The last surplus we gave back amounted to \$850 million. One angry legislator protested that "giving that money back to the people was an unnecessary expenditure of public funds."

There is a new term being used in Washington these days -- "tax expenditures." If you and I used that term we would be talking about things upon which the government spent our tax dollars. That, however, is not what government means. "Tax expenditures" is the name government has for the share of our earnings it allows us to keep. You and I call them deductions.

The U.S. government claims it is giving up tens of billions of dollars in tax revenues through some 90 deductions we are allowed to take in computing our income tax. And make no mistake about it, the government has an overpowering urge to shut off those deductions and get that added revenue. One congressman, Sam Gibbons of Florida, says that letting the people take these deductions is the same as if the government had written a check to the taxpayer, subsidizing him. In other words our money is not ours, it is theirs and what we think of as our after tax earnings is really a gift from the government.

A deputy assistant treasury secretary says these "tax expenditures receive minimal government control and coordination." Meaning that you and I spend our earnings the way we choose, without government directing us as to how they should be spent. Indeed, the President has proposed a review periodically by Congress to see if deductions should be continued. He told Congress "these programs (meaning the things we do with our money) involve spending money for social goals just as much as direct spending programs."

Did you know that your medical expenses, interest on your mortgage, exemptions for dependents and so forth, were "social goals"? Some of the so-called "tax expenditures" include charitable contributions, property tax on your home, state and local taxes on income and sales, social security benefits, pension plans and a host of others. Congress has already eliminated (starting this year) deduction of state and local taxes on gasoline. In other words we will pay a tax on a tax. That will be an additional one-and-one-fourth billion dollars for Washington.

All told, our rich Uncle Sam (who wants to be richer) has an eye on about \$170 billion that we think is ours because the Internal Revenue Service says it can be deducted when we compute our income tax. It is said Washington could balance the budget if it eliminated these "tax expenditures." I'm sure it could but it sure would unbalance ours.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Another Side of the U.N."

On these broadcasts I haven't been bashful about criticizing the United Nations, especially the General Assembly, which has shown on plenty occasions that it doesn't care much for free speech and that it can be long on hypocrisy and short on good sense. Just the same, for those of us who are skeptical about the U.N.'s performance, we can take a little comfort from the fact that some of its lesser known programs may not be such a bad investment, after all.

One expert on the technical aspects of the U.N., Francis Dale, now the publisher of the Los Angeles HERALD-EXAMINER, but formerly our ambassador to the Geneva half of the U.N., has given me some interesting facts. Frank Dale points out that Geneva is the nerve center for the technical agencies of the United Nations, while New York is the center of debate.

Mr. Dale says that the truth about the U.N. lies somewhere between the notion that it is mankind's greatest hope for democratic principles and the idea that it is a total waste of time and money.

Ambassador Dale contends that, on balance, we are really getting a pretty good return on our overall investment in the U.N. Here's how he figures it: First, he says, we have to see the U.N. as more than the General Assembly and Security Council. It is actually a system of 14 special agencies, including the World Health organization, the U.N. Educational, Scientific and Cultural organization, and so forth. In addition, there is a group of 19 funds and programs which are part of the U.N. system. Most widely known of them is UNICEF.

Mr. Dale estimates that our total contribution to all of these entities amounts to about \$2.37 per year for each American.

As for what we get for our money, he says, take a look at the World Health organization. Twelve years ago it initiated a campaign to remove smallpox from the face of the earth. Our contribution to this campaign amounted to about \$25 billion. But, as a result of its success, the Surgeon General in 1972 was able to terminate our routine smallpox vaccination program here in the United States, at an approximate annual savings of \$140 million.

According to Ambassador Dale, other U.N. agencies such as the World Bank and the U.N. Development program are also money-makers for the United States. Still other activities are worth the costs, he says, not only in financial terms but in less tangible ways, too. He points out that, despite its reputation for crazy resolutions and rhetoric, the debating society side of the U.N. in New York generates plenty of revenue for Americans. The U.N. diplomatic corps is estimated to spend some \$180 million a year on our shores.

That's only a sampling of some of the "plusses" that former U.N. Ambassador Frank Dale cites when he says we should look behind the facade of the U.N. to see that we are getting something--even if it isn't enough--for our investment.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "A Different Watergate Story"

Maurice Stans joined the Nixon administration as its first secretary of commerce. During the 1968 campaign, he had served the Nixon effort as head of its finance committee. He did his job so well that when it came time to get the campaign ball rolling for 1972, Stans was persuaded to leave his position at Commerce -- a job he liked -- to serve as chairman of the finance committee for the Nixon re-election.

What followed is well-known history. But, it is history Stans would like very much to correct. Many Americans associate Maurice Stans with that amorphous mass of crimes and indiscretions known as Watergate. After all, he raised the money in what was the most successful political fundraising effort in U.S. history. His name rolled off the tongues of many a newscaster during the days of the fever-pitched reports on Watergate. He went to trial in New York on conspiracy and perjury charges, along with former Attorney General John Mitchell. He was acquitted on all charges, though he did plead guilty to five highly technical fundraising violations, ones which could have been as easily applied to the Democrats, had the prosecution been so inclined.

Now, Stans has told his story in a new book, "The Terrors of Justice." He gives us an account of Watergate based on documented facts and a step-by-step unfolding of the various episodes which have been erroneously lumped together as "Watergate."

Stans' primary theme is that Watergate should not be examined only as a political scandal in which the "good guys" finally prevailed over the "bad guys." Watergate was also an episode in which the lives of many innocent individuals were disrupted. He exposes the tactics of the Ervin committee, which he said had a unique two-category classification system for witnesses: you were either "guilty with penitence" or "guilty without penitence." Those who were willing to come before the committee and the national television audience and bend over backwards to admit their guilt were treated well by the chairman. But those who had the nerve to insist on their innocence, as Stans did, were subject to plainly abusive treatment.

Maurice Stans waited for the sensationalism to cool before offering us his orderly, straightforward account of these events. It is not a spicy account that will provide Washington gossip-mongers with titillation. But, for those who wish to expand their understanding of Watergate beyond the one-dimensional accounts, Stans' book is worth reading.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Miscellaneous I"

About half-way through my years as Governor some members of my staff gave me a visual demonstration of government's appetite for paper. They brought in the forms required for hiring a single civil service employee in California's state government. We laid them out on the floor of one of the corridors end to end. They made a paper pathway 75 feet long.

I remembered that recently when I heard of another such demonstration: A group in California called "Californians for Environment, Employment and Energy through Planned Development", decided to measure the red tape involved in building a single-family house in California.

They made a banner of more than 100 governmental and regulatory permit and processing requirements that must be met by a builder in our state. The banner was 200 feet long. Even that, however, fails to measure what it means in time and cost. Home construction that used to take six months now takes up to two years. And that 200 feet of red tape is responsible for about 20 percent of the cost of a house.

While we are on the subject of paper, what is the situation at the federal government level? Well, in the last fiscal year the government used 66 billion sheets of standard eight-and-one-half by 11-inch paper.

You can draw all kinds of visuals with that. We could make a paper trail almost a half mile wide from Los Angeles to New York. But the one I like best is that you could cover Washington, D.C. with a blanket of paper 25 sheets thick. Now if we had enough glue--no, I better not think that way.

If you are curious about the institution it takes to shuffle that paper, try this for size. The Sears Tower in Chicago--110 floors--is the tallest building in the world. The U.S. government occupies space equal to 613 Sears Towers and more is being added every month.

Here is one with a little international flavor. Our government is still stubbornly refusing to recognize and thereby lift the sanctions imposed on the new government of Rhodesia. Under those sanctions adopted by the U.N. we no longer buy chrome from Rhodesia. Chrome is absolutely essential to the production of stainless steel. Rhodesia is the principle source of chrome in all the world.

So how have we been making steel for these last several years? Simple. We buy it for \$58 a ton from the Soviet Union, which ignores the U.N. sanctions and buys it from Rhodesia for \$32 a ton.

The London DAILY TELEGRAPH published that bit of wholesale-retail shenanigans which was in a report compiled from western diplomatic sources for the U.N. Sanctions Committee.

A favorite pastime of academicians is to categorize and label what they see as significant trends or movements in American life. Sometimes, however, these labels are misleading or premature. Still, Dr. Peter Steinfels makes an admirable attempt to characterize a political and intellectual group called "neoconservatives" in a new book of that title. One reason that this label has gained such quick acceptance among political observers is that many "neoconservatives" welcome the title. They don't mind being called conservatives as long as you tack the "neo" on the front of it!

Who are the "neoconservatives" and what do they stand for? Dr. Steinfels tosses out quite a few names, such as Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Irving Kristol, Daniel Bell, Daniel Boorstin, the late Alexander Bickel, Senator Henry Jackson, Zbigniew Brzezinski and many others. Steinfels claims that unlike other political labels, "neoconservatism" does signify a specific set of beliefs. Steinfels lists what "neoconservatives" believe. To begin with, he says, they are not hostile to the idea of the welfare state, but they are critical of the Great Society version of it. Second, they respect the market economy as the best way to allocate resources, though they are willing to interfere when they feel it is necessary. "Neoconservatives" distrust the so-called "counter-culture" of the 1960's and emphasize a return to traditional values of religion and the family. "Neoconservatives" are also highly critical of post-Vietnam war isolationism. They are suspicious of "detente" and advocate a strong national defense.

Dr. Steinfels emphasizes the strong belief of the "neoconservatives" that the concept of social stability must be reaffirmed. Many "neoconservatives" could be described as New Deal Democrats who became disillusioned with American society and politics during the 1960's. They deplored what they saw as a decline of morality accompanied by a decline of institutions such as religion, the family and government. They are a pragmatic group, more interested in keeping the machinery of society working in an orderly way, rather than in any particular ideology.

Steinfels does a good job defining the beliefs of "neoconservatives" and tracing their political and social backgrounds. He treats the group objectively, even though he reveals his own liberal perspective in the book's first paragraph when he makes this nebulous assertion: If "neoconservatism" should prevail, it "threatens to...diminish the promise of American democracy." I suspect that Dr. Steinfels and other liberals take comfort in the growth of "neoconservatism"--a conservatism that does not rock the welfare state boat or question, basically, the role of government in our lives. He is quick to declare "neoconservatism" as: "the serious and intellectual conservatism America has lacked." Well, that's a curious assertion. I'm sure that William Buckley, Bill Simon, Nobel Prize winner Milton Friedman and many others would be quite surprised to learn that their more traditional brand of conservatism is not 'serious and intellectual.' The author does not acknowledge the contribution of these leading conservative thinkers to the political dialogue. A discussion of the interesting relationship between standard conservatism and "neoconservatism" is sorely lacking.

But despite this reservation, Peter Steinfels' book is a respectable attempt to define what has become a potent political and intellectual force--"neoconservatism."

Dr. Martinez de Hoz was given the responsibility of rebuilding Argentina's ruined economy when, in March 1976, the armed forces took over the government of Juan Peron's widow. The country was on the verge of anarchy and terrorists had declared virtual civil war against the population.

Today, Argentina is at peace, the terrorist threat nearly eliminated. Though Martinez de Hoz, in his U.S. talks concentrates on economics, he does not shy from discussing human rights. He points out that in the process of bringing stability to a terrorized nation of 25 million, a small number were caught in the crossfire, among them a few innocents. Today, the number of people detained for suspicion of terrorist links is steadily declining.

Martinez de Hoz makes the point that you can't have true political freedom without economic freedom and that Argentina had been on a 30-year roller-coaster ride of massive inflation (over 1,000 percent a year at one point); big budget deficits; negative balance of trade; a currency black market; protected industries with almost no competitive incentives to improve products or services; and nationalization of industries that failed because of their own inefficiency. By early 1976, the average Argentine's peso was worth next to nothing.

The dips in the roller coaster were deeper and the intoxicating highs higher than here, but the symptoms were similar to the ones we wrestle with today. Can we learn from Argentina's experience? Consider this: Since 1976, Argentina has decontrolled interest rates on savings. The rates went up and so did the savings. Today, the average Argentine saves 27 percent of his pay--one of the highest rates in the world. Thus, new capital is provided for economic growth.

Rent controls were causing a chronic housing shortage. They were scrapped and buildings went up. Exchange controls on currency were lifted and the black market in money disappeared. State-owned industries have been sold off to private enterprise and new competition has been encouraged. Trade protection measures have been cut and foreign competition is now forcing domestic industries to become more productive and customer-oriented.

Though he has wrestled inflation down from 360 percent to 100 percent a year, Martinez de Hoz still has a way to go. But if you ask the average Argentine-in-the-street what he thinks about the state of his country's economy, chances are you'll find him pleased, not seething, about the way things are going. Maybe we could learn something from our neighbors at the other end of the hemisphere.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "America"

This commentary is going to be a condensed version of a love letter to America by a British journalist, John Rosen, who fell in love with this country at first sight. I'm sorry time won't permit all of his article, but you'll get the idea.

Mr. Rosen writes: "You Americans are spoiled rotten. You don't know how good you've got it. Here you are living in paradise--all of you--in the Utopian states of America and all you ever do is gripe.

"Compare this magical country of yours to any other place on planet earth. And in every case and from any angle this country comes out on top. Way on top.

"Very few of you ever realize how incredibly lucky you are to live in this marvelous, magnificent country. The freedom is simply intoxicating. There's precious little of it around the world and most of it is right here at your feet. But you Yanks take it all so much for granted.

"Your cops are the friendliest, toughest, fastest and most politely deferential defenders of your freedom of any cops in this galaxy. Yet all you do is bad mouth them. Go break the law anywhere else and see what happens.

"As I travel the suburbs, slums, cities, towns and farm lands of this most beautiful country in the world, people ask me what I think of the place. When I say it's the best place in the world I'm rewarded with suspicious looks. My crime? I dare to love America.

"My qualifications for making such glowing statements about your country are the 85 other countries I've been to. The people here are the world's friendliest, most outgoing individuals anywhere.

"People in other countries have so much less to live with and to live for. They live out lives of quiet desperation and deprivation, no hopes, no dreams. Just their stomachs to worry about.

"Only in America and no place else do you sometimes get a free refill for your coffee.

"Only in America can you walk across the road. In every other country you run for your life.

"Only in America can you get a drivers license the same day you decide you want it. In every other country 'they' keep you waiting (sometimes years) and automatically flunk you unless you grease the man's palm with cold cash.

"Only in America do the phones work, all the time. Only here do you get a bill telling you who you called, when you called and how much you pay for each call.

"The minimum hourly wage is higher than the average daily wage in most countries and the average weekly wage in others.

"So my American friends a word of loving advice:

"Love what you've got here because there is nothing better anywhere. And remember -- 97 percent of the world's people would like to trade places with you."

He's right you know.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Miscellaneous II"

A few months ago, about April Shower time, 130 million Americans (60 percent of our population) and hundreds of thousands of corporations filed income tax returns. Maybe we should have included a birthday card with our checks because the income tax was 65 years old. Wouldn't it be nice if it decided to retire?

Back in 1914 when it was born it gave no indication it was going to become the biggest kid on the block and the most prolific money collector the world has ever seen.

In these 65 years our population has a little more than doubled and our economy has grown to eight times what it was, based on constant dollars. But that lusty kid the income tax has grown to 76 times its original size--again figured in constant dollars so as to rule out inflation as a factor. It took in a little more than one quarter of a billion dollars in its first year and more than 200 billion in its 65th. From less than one penny out of each dollar of Gross National Product it's now taking more than 17. There are 243 times as many of us paying the tax now. Even though population barely doubled in 1914, only about 357,000 out of our 97 million people--those at the very top of the earning scale paid the tax compared to 87½ million--almost everyone in the work force today. And just as an added statistic, there are more than 20 times as many tax collectors. In 1914 we only had one for every 23,000 of us; now there is one for every 2500.

Well, those are the vital statistics of our most unpopular senior citizen. Here is a word about the future. We've heard about the balanced budget down the road a few years. Unfortunately if it happens it won't be because our government changed its course or made government less costly as it should. Those who made the promise are aware that inflation is an unseen helper of the Internal Revenue Service.

Take a married couple with two children and an income of around 20,000 dollars a year. If they get a cost-of-living pay raise--just enough to stay even, they won't stay even. That pay raise will nudge them into the next surtax bracket and they'll be \$180 poorer after taxes in spite of the raise. If we assume that inflation will continue through 1981, Internal Revenue will collect an added \$17 billion of undeserved revenue from cost-of-living pay raises alone.

Last item and it also has to do with money. As you know, our fiscal year begins in October now, rather than July as it once did. The President submitted to Congress a \$532 billion budget for the year beginning this October which he called "lean and austere" but which contained a \$28 billion deficit.

The Congress has in its wisdom reduced that deficit to \$23 billion and believe it or not, without cutting a single dollar from any of the thousands of federal programs. They have approved a \$532 billion dollar budget the same as the one submitted by the President and want credit for reducing the deficit by \$5 billion.

Congress after months of struggle has decided the tax revenues in 1981 will be \$5 billion greater than the President's estimate.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Free Speech"

Let me start this commentary by stating a personal position I take on freedom of speech and press. I believe a free press is essential to liberty. I believe we all have the right to express our opinions and beliefs so long as we don't incite riot, advocate violent overthrow of the government or impose on the rights of others. By that latter phrase I mean that freedom of speech shouldn't be taken to mean we have the right to shout our opinions under someone's bedroom window at 3 a.m. or shout down a speaker who is expressing his.

But there is another qualifier on free speech -- call it a restriction if you will. Does freedom of speech mean we must guarantee an audience to anyone who wants to express an opinion? Personally I don't think so. Do you?

Now all of this brings me to the point of expressing opinions to elected officials. We can and do write to our state legislators, our representatives and senators, to governors and to the President of the United States. But should a very busy congressional committee inviting testimony to aid it in recommending legislation have to listen to everyone who wants to express an opinion if they have no expert knowledge of the topic in question?

For that matter, should the committee feel bound to invite testimony from special interest groups which could do as the rest of us do and write the committee a letter? I bring this up because a while back Ralph Nader appeared before a sub-committee of the House Interior committee. If a John Doe citizen had written a letter to the committee advocating the same action Nader recommended I have a hunch his letter would have ended up in the wastebasket and a secretary would have sent him routine form letter Number 11.

Nader's pitch to the Congressmen was that Congress should scrap the 92 nuclear power plants presently under construction and the 70 plants already in operation producing the electricity we need. He waved off the billions of dollars this would cost as "a cheap price to pay compared to alternative risks," and added that the whole process should only take two to three years.

A man who is far better qualified to speak on this subject than Ralph Nader, Arthur Spitzer, for whom the Chair of Energy and Management at Pepperdine University is named, evaluated Ralph's testimony. He said: "It is easy for Ralph Nader to preach that he would rather live by candlelight instead of nuclear energy. Since he makes a living with this kind of preaching and he knows it will never happen, he can easily preach this kind of nonsense."

All of us are aware that there are risks and changes inherent in nuclear power and we want the utmost in protective measures. We also look both ways before we cross a street. In short common sense is called for.

To put things in focus, Dr. Alvin Weinberg of Oak Ridge brought a Geiger counter to a committee room of the U.S. Senate. It registered higher radioactivity than escaped at Three Mile Island. The radioactivity comes from the granite building stones -- just as we get radioactivity from sunshine or burning coal.

There is something about a catalogue that grabs everyone. When we were kids we called them wish books. I've wondered now and then if we didn't have a secret weapon we've never used. What if we dropped umpteen million Sears catalogues on the U.S.S.R.? When the people there saw the kind of consumer goods available to those who worked and earned in a free society there just might be another revolution.

Well, this commentary is about a magazine, not a catalogue, but there is something of a relationship. There is also further evidence of the magic of the free market; this way of life that allows an individual to dream, then turn that dream into a saleable commodity.

"Showcase U.S.A." is the magazine I'm talking about--the dream that became reality. It isn't on the news stands. It has a controlled circulation aimed at a particular reader list for which it performs a most useful purpose.

A young man named George St. John is the publisher. His dream became a six-issue-a-year magazine aimed at importers throughout the world who are interested in American exports. "Showcase U.S.A." brings them useful information on every facet of America's export business.

A look at the index of the current issue indicates why this magazine fills a heretofore unmet need. There are articles on trade shows and conventions, transportation, and information on American ports and shipping facilities. Others are titled "Small Business, The Available Resource" and "Expanding Trade for Small Business." There is another, "The Future's Market; an Essential Trade Tool."

A couple of those titles reveal what could well be a new chapter in international trade, the entry of small and independent American businesses in the export market. Then there are regular features listing companies in export and there's an industry round-up. In this latter are brief summaries of products available, separated into types such as food stuffs, manufactured goods, consumer goods, and so forth.

From the beginning, publisher George St. John encouraged correspondence from his readers with regard to inquiries directed to American companies. He sees that the correspondence reaches the proper business or provides the answer such as sending a foreign executive a complete roster of companies making automobile air conditioners.

This correspondence has led to a new feature in the magazine, "Trade Inquirers & New Products" which is published in cooperation with the U.S. Departments of Agriculture and Commerce. Adding to the flavor of the magazine is the colorful and great variety of advertising by American companies involved in export trade--another evidence of the free market in action.

"Showcase U.S.A.", published in Woodland Hills, California, is a handsome and interesting magazine, filled with illustrations, and it's performing a real service for buyer and seller alike. And isn't that what free enterprise is all about?

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Miscellaneous III"

Getting out of California into the other 49 states, I frequently am asked how California has fared under our famous (or notorious, depending on how you look at it) Proposition 13.

You'll remember loud voices warned that every disaster short of California sliding into the Pacific Ocean would follow passage of 13. Now FORTUNE magazine has turned its considerable reporting ability to that question and provides the answer.

The several billion dollar reduction in property taxes has resulted in a 14 percent increase in personal income in California. Consumer spending and retail sales rose by that same percent and while 17,000 government workers were laid off and 100,000 quit or retired, 532,000 new jobs were created in private business and industry. Government received an additional billion dollars in business and sales taxes alone, and the state ended the fiscal year with a \$3 billion surplus. So much for the great California disaster.

This next item is not so happy but it does have to do with California. Yosemite National Park has been described as one of the few spots in the world that completely lives up to its advance billions for sheer beauty.

Recently I received a letter from an old friend who backpacks into the high Sierra and therefore is a true environmentalist with real love for the beauty of this earth. He had just completed a four-day hike in Yosemite Park, from Tuolumne Meadows to Glen Aulin.

He wrote that he was appalled at the condition of the lodgepole pines. Needles are turning brown not only in the high country, but on the Yosemite valley floor as well. These trees have been attacked by an insect known as the Lodge Pole Needle Miner. If an effort isn't made to save those forests, the trees will die and much of the beauty of Yosemite will be gone.

There is a spray that will control those insects, but so far the forestry people are dragging their feet while the needles turn brown and fall from the trees. The environmentalists, vocal and well organized, are opposed to the spraying of the trees. The foresters, apparently, are intimidated.

One last item has to do with national defense and our all-volunteer army. It seems the army is having trouble recruiting young men who can read. This is an expensive problem because the inability to read requires longer training. It is a serious problem for another reason. The army is about to introduce an entire generation of new, sophisticated military hardware that will require study by these men who can't read.

Now before you jump to the conclusion that drop-outs and illiterates are being recruited--listen to this. The all-volunteer army has the highest percentage of high school graduates of any army in the history of our nation. Our problem isn't the army--it's our schools.

Taped: 8/13/79
Air 9/3-9/21/79

RONALD REAGAN

Radio Commentary

DISC 79-12

79-12A

- | | | |
|----|---|------|
| 1. | What to Expect From the Soviet Succession | 2:40 |
| 2. | Thank You, Chairman Brezhnev | 2:57 |
| 3. | Better Representation for Skilled Tradesmen | 2:35 |
| 4. | Government Housing Programs | 3:13 |
| 5. | Alaskan Anger | 2:54 |
| 6. | Waiting in Line | 2:49 |
| 7. | Citizen vs Chicago Transit Authority | 2:35 |

79-12B

- | | | |
|----|--|------|
| 1. | Tax Revolt Going Strong | 2:38 |
| 2. | The Magic Money Machine | 2:36 |
| 3. | Administration Report Clears Oil Companies | 2:53 |
| 4. | Marijuana | 2:52 |
| 5. | Voting Records | 2:59 |
| 6. | Power | 3:03 |
| 7. | Food Stamps | 2:53 |
| 8. | Living Dangerously . . . Sometimes | 2:49 |

PLEASE NOTE:

These programs are provided for airing from Sept. 3, thru September 21st, 1979 inclusive. Maintaining this schedule will enable your station to air all newly recorded programs as received.

IT IS NOT NECESSARY TO RETURN DISCS.

At the Vienna summit in June, the frail health of Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev was revealed to the world on television. Since the summit, speculation over Chairman Brezhnev's successor has heightened. Despite the best efforts of the Soviet hierarchy to effect an orderly transition of power, the process has already triggered intense competition, infighting and alliances around different prospective leaders.

What kind of leader are the Soviets looking for to assume the all-important post of General Secretary of the Communist party? Most likely, the new chief will have to be a Russian, the dominant nationality of the Soviet Union, even though Russians account for only half of the population. He will have acquired a solid background in fields such as agriculture, foreign policy and industrial management. Much more so than an American president, he will have to have strong ties with influence in all facets of the party.

Of primary concern to Americans is the kind of foreign policy we can expect by the new Soviet leadership. Will it follow the present Soviet course of meddling in various ways in all corners of the globe? Or will it adopt a lower profile abroad and focus instead on the U.S.S.R.'s serious economic problems?

The odds are that Soviet aggressiveness will not diminish upon the succession of Brezhnev. If any change occurs, it could be in the direction of even greater Russian adventurism in the international scene.

The odds are that Soviet aggressiveness will not diminish upon the succession of Brezhnev. If any change occurs, it could be in the direction of even greater Russian adventurism in the international scene.

Many Western observers assume, erroneously, that a wide range of opinion on foreign policy options divides the top echelon of Soviet leadership. Richard Harrison, a foreign policy expert for the Heritage Foundation, a Washington-based think-tank, explains that there is a tendency in the United States--"to see Soviet politics as basically a 'mirror image' of ours, replete with 'hawks,' 'doves' and other contending factions." The hope that there is a more peaceful faction in the Soviet hierarchy poised and ready to fight for power upon the passing of Brezhnev from the scene is a naive over-simplification, he notes.

The more plausible possibility is that the new leadership will be even more adventuresome than the Brezhnev regime. The reason, Harrison, explains, is that--"the next leadership team will be the first to achieve power when the Soviet Union is not recognized as militarily inferior to the United States...This new sense of power might actually encourage expansionist tendencies within the new leadership."

However bitter and messy the struggle to succeed Brezhnev turns out to be, we should not assume that this dissension reflects significant policy differences among the competing factions. Rather, it may be little more than a cut-throat power-grab which is characteristic of Communist dictatorships during periods of leadership succession.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Thank You, Chairman Brezhnev"

In the summer issue of Strategic Review, the quarterly publication of the respected United States Strategic Institute, Walter Hahn suggests that Soviet chief Leonid Brezhnev has profoundly affected the debate over SALT II here in the United States.

He did so when he stood before President Carter and assembled diplomats at the Vienna summit in June and declared that Senate amendments to the treaty would have--"grave and even dangerous consequences for our relations and for the situation of the world as a whole."

This statement, along with additional warnings delivered by Soviet foreign affairs minister Andrei Gromyko, awakened many Senators and other thoughtful participants in the SALT dialogues to the fact that the Soviet leadership feels confident enough to dictate the way we should go about formulating foreign policy.

Hahn explains--"That incident in Vienna put a certain floodlight on the whole dramatic production called SALT. The numbers, in the sophisticated and deadly game of modern strategy, weaponry and survival, are terribly important. But the real issue lies beneath and beyond those numbers."

In Hahn's view, the real issue--and the ultimate benefit of the SALT II debate--is that it is providing a forum for America to finally come to grips with its "Vietnam hangover." Among supporters and opponents of the treaty alike, SALT II is triggering a time of reflection about the role of the United States in a troubled world since our exit from Vietnam.

Thus, Senate opponents (and those who are undecided) are not responding so much to the technical "war of numbers." As Hahn puts it--"they are responding more meaningfully to a pronounced popular uneasiness...about what SALT II symbolizes and presages for America's role and fate in a world in which the shadow of the adversary's power is growing ever more conspicuous."

By the same token, a liberal senator such as George McGovern who, political logic suggests, should be one of SALT's strongest supporters, is examining the treaty in the wider context of his overall foreign policy beliefs. He may yet vote against SALT II.

Most notably, the imminent signing of SALT II in Vienna prompted Senator Henry Jackson, a loyal Democrat, to break dramatically with a President and foreign policy team of his own party. In a speech delivered in June, Senator Jackson used the occasion of SALT II to weave together the events, policies, actions and reactions of American foreign policy since "detente" began in 1972. The pattern which emerges Jackson claims, is a policy of "appeasement" towards the Soviet Union.

So Hahn believes that a word of thanks to Chairman Brezhnev is in order. Whether the SALT II treaty passes or fails, his dictum to the United States Senate--delivered with the arrogant confidence of one who anticipates nothing but blind obedience--helped expand what might have been a debate over numbers into a comprehensive nationwide re-evaluation of America's role in world events in the 1980's.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Better Representation for Skilled Tradesmen"

One of the tasks of the National Labor Relations board is to protect the workers' rights to choose union representation under proceedings which are fair and democratic. Yet a sizeable section of the American work force has discovered that the board is infringing on their rights instead of protecting them. Thanks to certain board rulings, hundreds of thousands of skilled tradesmen find themselves trapped in unwanted industrial unions for the purpose of collective bargaining. These are workers with special training with machinery, electrical systems and such. The effect of the board's recent rulings has been to lump these workers together, for bargaining purposes, with production workers. Skilled tradesmen feel that their interests and concerns get lost when they are represented by large industrial unions.

Labor experts point to a particular ruling of the National Labor Relations board in 1966 as the source of the current problems. In that ruling, the board adopted new, restrictive criteria for allowing a particular craft unit to bargain separately with management. The board makes it extremely difficult for a group of specially skilled tradesmen to sever themselves from large industrial unions.

This has disturbed Senator Orrin Hatch and others who view the board's decision as catering to big labor at the expense of the rights of skilled tradesmen to choose their own representatives. Hatch points out that since the board's watershed labor decision in 1966, it has received seventy-one requests for severance from groups wishing to form their own bargaining units. Of these requests, the board has granted only eight.

As a result, Hatch has introduced a bill which would change critical wording in the National Labor Relations act. This would have the effect, Hatch says, of "unshackling the thousands of skilled tradesmen in our society who find themselves trapped in unwanted industrial unions for the purpose of bargaining...They are in essence discriminated against in the selection of a bargain representative when compared to the treatment afforded other kinds of employees under the National Labor Relations act."

Hatch's bill has been referred to committee. He anticipates strong opposition from organized labor. But this bill would be an important step in the efforts of skilled tradesmen to seek separate and more effective representation. Our skilled work force has been an important force in the productivity gains of the economy. In recent years, skilled workers have decreased in numbers. Demand for highly skilled industrial workers far outstrips the number of such workers available. Senator Hatch's bill would be a significant contribution towards creating a more favorable employment climate for skilled tradesmen.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program titled "Government Housing Programs"

You may be surprised to learn that most federal welfare is no longer paid to beneficiaries in cash. The lion's share of welfare today is dispensed in the form of various benefits. The government plays "doctor" to millions with its Medicaid program, and it plays "grocer" with food stamps. But Washington Post reporter Peter Milius has discovered that the fastest growing welfare program of all is housing subsidies. The federal government has now become landlord to millions of Americans.

Housing subsidies will cost the taxpayer \$5 billion this year, an increase of \$3 billion in just five years. Based on commitments Washington has already made, these costs will double to \$10 billion in a few years. The Office of Management and Budget has estimated that by 1984, housing subsidies will cost as much as the ever-expanding food stamp program.

Government budget watchers are concerned that, now unleashed, the housing program will expand out of control, just as the food stamp and medical programs have. As Mr. Milius explains--"The Medicaid and food stamp programs snuck up on government policymakers; their costs were high before many people were fully aware they even existed. Medicaid in just fourteen years has become the largest of all federal welfare programs. Food stamps are second-largest--faced now with a third in-kind program still in fledgling form, OMB has been understandably wary." Together, these programs have transformed the national welfare system. Less than half of all welfare is now paid in cash.

What are these little-known housing subsidy programs which already aid one out of every twenty-five American households? Most federally subsidized housing falls into two categories. The first is the traditional public housing program. The government owns the land and pays construction costs. Tenants pay only the operating costs of their units.

The other housing program--the one that is expanding at a breakneck pace--is called "Section 8." In this program, the housing remains in the hands of a private owner. A fair rent is determined by the owner and the government. The tenant pays part of the rent, usually set at twenty-five percent of his income. The government pays the rest. The "Section 8" program has been under attack of late in Congress because of Congressional fears that its costs will continue to spiral out of control. In this year's housing authorization bill, the House has voted to make some tenants of Section 8 housing pay thirty percent of their incomes in rent. The Senate has yet to act on these changes.

Strong supporters of federally subsidized housing programs argue that it is only fair that low income Americans receive this support. Middle income taxpayers, they point out, are granted homeowner tax deductions for mortgage interest and property taxes. These forms of tax forgiveness will cost the U.S. Treasury \$16 billion this year. But we should not lose sight of the fact that tax breaks are not subsidies. By granting tax relief, the government is graciously allowing these homeowners to keep a little more of what they earn.

Without careful monitoring and continuous re-evaluation of the public housing and "Section 8" programs, we will witness the uncontrolled growth of another federal welfare program. As Senator William Proxmire put it--"It is simply not possible for the program to increase at past rates while the federal budget as a whole is constrained.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Alaskan Anger"

Many Alaskans are furious these days over a bill, sponsored by Representatives Morris Udall and John Anderson. The so-called Alaskan Lands bill would set aside an area of Alaskan land as big as California for the purpose of creating reserves, national parks, and wildlife refuges. This proposal, the largest land conservation measure in history, has sparked resentment by native Alaskans who contend that their economy would be irrevocably damaged. Nevertheless, the bill has already passed in the House of Representatives by an overwhelming majority. The Senate will consider the measure this fall.

At present, less than one percent of Alaska is privately owned. The remainder of the land is under federal or state control. And development is severely restricted on most of the government land. Developers claim that the bill will severely limit production of Alaska's great timber, oil and mineral resources, all of which are essential to the American economy. The oil and coal resources are of particular interest to the United States, not to mention the state of Alaska. It is estimated that Alaska contains sixty percent of the nation's undiscovered oil reserves and the bulk of the undiscovered coal reserves.

Business and government in Alaska have joined hands in an effort to stop the Alaskan Lands bill. Polls show that Alaskans are solidly opposed to the high-handed intrusion of the federal government in the economic development of their state. Some Alaskans are so angry that they are calling for their state to secede from the Union. A group of more vehement opponents have even talked of taking their case to the United Nations to have the world body enforce Article 73 of the U.N. Charter which prohibits "colonialism."

Alaska's economy is already feeling the repercussions of ever-increasing government intervention and regulation. Unemployment is running at an annual rate of twelve percent and business expects a significant slowdown in the economy if the bill passes. Says Bruce Kennedy, president of Alaska Airlines, "The state is demoralized, and the economy is in the doldrums."

This overwhelming opposition in Alaska to the Alaskan Lands bill has failed to move environmentalists in the "lower forty-eight." They argue that the Alaskan Lands legislation represents our last chance to protect some of the nation's most beautiful natural terrain. The bill, they say, is necessary to protect some of the nation's last virgin forests and unpolluted rivers.

But the Alaskan Lands legislation will disrupt the lives of Alaskans and the development of the state's major industries. Seven major mines, which would produce various metals, will be blocked from developing. This will cost the state 11,000 new jobs and a billion dollar industry. Other major industries, such as oil and timber, will face economic hardship or ruin because of the strict regulation of Alaskan land proposed in the legislation.

With the concern over our future supplies of domestic energy at their peak, the Senate should take advantage of its opportunity to strike a more balanced approach between environmental and development interests. The House bill fails to do this, and Alaskans have every reason to be angry.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Waiting in Line"

Tempers flared often when, several months ago, many Americans were forced to wait in lines for hours to buy gasoline. When we didn't have to wait in those lines, we were fascinated by the phenomenon. News media interviewed frustrated motorists, asking them how long they had been waiting, or what they did to pass the time. Camera crews took to the air to get good aerial pictures of the long lines.

These reactions are understandable for a society not used to the experience of facing shortages of popular consumer goods. But in the midst of our frustration with gas lines during the early part of the summer, in Russia writers reminded us that waiting in line for almost everything is an everyday occurrence in the Soviet Union.

Yuri Druzhnikov is a dissident Russian writer of children's books who still lives in the Soviet Union. Recently he reminded Americans of the dreary reality of life in the Soviet Union in an article for the Washington Post. This writer was born in a line. That's right. His mother was waiting in line to be admitted to the maternity hospital when she discovered that she had forgotten her internal passport, which is required of all citizens. By the time her husband retrieved the passport from home, the baby was born in the corridor.

If you wish to see a movie in the Soviet Union, you must purchase a ticket a month in advance, then stand in line for about six hours before the movie.

It would take you about three years on a waiting list to buy a new refrigerator. Do you have any complaints about the phone company? If so, consider this: in the Soviet Union it takes from five to seven years just to buy a telephone. And it takes about seven years on a waiting list to buy a car.

Citizens of the Soviet Union must wait in countless other lines simply to secure the basic necessities of life. Food lines are common. So are waiting lists for government-owned housing.

But there is one class of citizens who can go to the head of all lines. In this supposedly classless society, large numbers of government and party officials have special allotments and privileges. This writer explains--"As to higher officials in general...Their chauffeurs, secretaries, and maids go to special distribution centers and serve as stand-ins for the VIPs. VIPs are busy pondering our future and cannot stand in line for caviar, French wines, American cognac and out-of-season fruits flown in from exotic places. Ordinary people stand in line for ordinary potatoes."

Druzhnikov was born in a line--and when he dies, his obituary will have to wait in line. For when a writer dies in the Soviet Union, his obituary is held back from the newspapers until his life has been investigated for any political indiscretions.

When considered next to the endless lines which are a way of life in the Soviet Union, our month or two of long gasoline lines seems like a minor inconvenience.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Citizen vs. Chicago Transit Authority"

This is one of those modern day David and Goliath stories, and it comes to us courtesy of Mike Royko, a columnist for the Chicago SUN-TIMES.

A few weeks ago, eighty-three-year-old Irving Naiditch was visiting his two sons in Chicago. Mr. Naiditch lives in Minnesota. Since he prides himself on his independence (even at the age of eighty-three), Mr. Naiditch struck out on his own one day during his visit to see some old friends.

As he boarded a bus on Clark Street in Chicago, he was pleased to see a sign which said that senior citizens could ride for twenty-five cents, half the regular fare. Mr. Naiditch dropped a quarter in the coin box, content that he had found such a bargain.

But he certainly didn't bargain for the trouble that ensued. As he moved slowly toward his seat, the bus driver stopped Mr. Naiditch and asked for identification. That was no problem, and Mr. Naiditch quickly produced identification which proved that he was, indeed, eighty-three years old.

"No," said the driver. You have to have a special card issued by the Chicago Transit authority which certifies that you are a senior citizen."

Mr. Naiditch protested. "The sign says nothing about a card," he said. "It says simply that senior citizens ride for half-fare."

The driver refused to give in. "You have to have the special card," he told Mr. Naiditch. "Either put another quarter in the box or get off the bus."

Well, Mr. Naiditch decided to leave well enough alone. He agreed to get off the bus and asked for his quarter back. But the driver said he couldn't get his quarter back for it was at the bottom of that coin box.

"Then I'm not getting off this bus," Mr. Naiditch said, and he took a seat.

But rules are rules to this bus driver. He refused to give an inch. He shut off the engine, stood up and ordered every single passenger off the bus. Then he called for the police.

The Chicago police struggled gallantly to solve this dispute between the stubborn bus driver and the stubborn Mr. Naiditch. Their final solution was to drive the eighty-three-year-old to the transit authority offices so he could apply for a special card. But the bureaucrat in charge refused to give Mr. Naiditch an ID card because he didn't have the required photo of himself. Mr. Naiditch insisted that he get his quarter back, and after consultations with his superiors, the bureaucrat agreed.

Outside the offices, the policeman who had escorted Mr. Naiditch downtown asked him what he was going to do now. He replied that he intended to get on the next bus and go to visit his friends as he originally had planned. The policeman watched as the eighty-three-year-old boarded the bus, dropped a quarter in the box and declared, "I'm a senior citizen."

This bus driver just looked at Mr. Naiditch and nodded. He didn't know how lucky he was for letting this man pass!

I've said often that the more localized the government, the more responsive it is to the wishes of its constituents. This has certainly proven to be the case in the nationwide effort to limit government spending and reduce oppressive tax burdens. The overwhelming passage of Proposition 13 in California in June, 1978, sparked a national outcry for governments at all levels to hold the line on spending and return some revenue to its place of origin--the working people of America.

But while the federal government in Washington has paid little more than lip service to this national expression, state governments have been taking significant action to cut taxes and spending. The tax revolt may not get as many banner headlines as it used to, but more than a year after Proposition 13, it shows no signs of abating. The work of the tax revolt is being done quietly and effectively in state houses across the nation.

A recent New York TIMES survey of the fifty states confirms this. The survey found that--"the trend toward reducing or repealing taxes and imposing spending limits on state and local governments has been a strong and pervasive one, with virtually all states curtailing revenues or spending, or both, in some fashion."

The New York TIMES discovered that so far this year, twenty-two states have reduced property taxes. Fifteen have curtailed sales taxes on certain products and services. Eight state governments have placed spending limits on themselves that will result in tighter state and local budgets in the future. Finally, twelve states have reduced or repealed assorted other taxes.

That's an impressive record for a nationwide movement that many commentators say has run out of gas. And there's more to come this November, as a number of ballot initiatives will be presented to voters. In California, an initiative called "Spirit of 13" will be on the ballot this November. It proposes that no government in California can spend more than the percentage of increase in population combined with the increase in the Consumer Price index. A similar spending curb will be considered in the state of Washington. Ohio and Florida voters will have the opportunity to vote themselves substantial savings on their property taxes.

The past record of results and the prognosis for the future are good for the nationwide tax and spending revolt. These developments have demonstrated that government on some levels can successfully translate the desires of citizens into policy. The tax revolt has Americans looking to their state and local governments for creative initiatives, rather than to the federal government. All that remains is for the federal government, which has become so used to telling the states what to do, to play "follow the leader" for a change.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "The Magic Money Machine"

The long delayed Presidential energy address has come and gone now, but there may be some costly echoes. The President called for a windfall profits tax on the oil industry and he made it sound as if no one but those "greedy oil barons" would have to pay.

A closer look at what he was proposing reveals that he would, if Congress went along, have himself a magic money machine. The total take could amount to \$146 billion over a ten year period. And no matter how many times they say it would be paid by the oil companies, we should be asking, "Where will the oil companies get \$146 billion?" The answer, of course, is from their customers, and guess who they are? The truth is, no matter how much we pretend the President has come up with a magic money machine, the \$146 billion will be an added \$146 billion the government is removing from the private sector.

Now when our public servants see a windfall like that, they just naturally prove the truth of a century-old statement by the French statesman Bastiat: "Public funds seemingly belong to no one and the temptation to bestow them on someone is irresistible."

The White House wants to use the money for an energy trust fund, but liberal do-gooders in Congress want to use it for welfare. Other members (and we should be grateful for them) want it to substitute for an income tax cut. In other words, our tax burden wouldn't be increased--we'd just collect it in a different way.

Then someone realized the windfall tax would be an excise tax and, therefore, deductible in figuring the corporate income tax. Thus, it wouldn't add a net 140-odd billion dollars to government's haul. Suddenly the President countered with wanting to earmark part of the regular corporate tax for his pet program, the energy trust fund.

Then some of those in Congress decided to exempt some oils from taxes in order to restore incentive for exploring and finding the new oil we need. And who can quarrel with that?

If we follow the figures closely, the 140 billion dollars becomes with one idea only twenty-eight billion and, with another, two or three times that much. Then there is a new proposal to ease the tax to roll back social security taxes, but that inspired someone to suggest a new conservation plan financed by the, by now, not-so-magic money machine.

The battle will rage, but hasn't everyone forgotten that we started out to find a way to encourage the discovery of more oil so as to reduce our dependence on the imported stuff? I have a feeling that if our government was as good at getting oil out of the ground as it is at getting money out of us, we'd all be driving gas guzzlers with nothing to worry about except how to pay for them.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Administration Report Clears Oil Companies"

While American citizens enjoy the legal right to be considered innocent until proved guilty, apparently the same does not hold for the oil companies. When the first spot shortages of gasoline appeared in California in May, many angry motorists assumed that the oil companies were deliberately withholding supplies in order to force prices higher. President Carter ordered two in-house investigations, one by the Department of Energy and one by the Justice Department, to determine whether the oil companies have entered into a conspiracy to manipulate prices.

To many Americans, the oil companies were guilty until proved innocent. Well, now we may have that proof. The Washington Post reported recently that the Justice Department has told the White House that it has turned up no evidence of anti-trust violations. Of greater significance is the private Energy Department study which expands the scope of the investigation beyond the narrow legal concerns of Justice. The report was made public by the White House only after the Washington Post obtained a copy and printed excerpts.

The report clears the oil industry of hoarding supplies to create an artificial shortage. "DOE has not found evidence of hoarding of oil by refiners, but some refiners have been conservative in their use of stocks. But this conservatism appears to be due in large part to their pessimistic views about future availability of oil imports."

Well, then what did cause the energy crunch? The report confirms that U.S. companies were able to import 200,000 fewer barrels a day during this period than during normal times. They might have compensated for some of this shortage by purchasing higher priced oil on the spot market, but the federal government discouraged this practice. Meanwhile, domestic production of crude oil was running more than 200,000 barrels a day under the previous year.

The other major factor contributing to our oil crunch, the Energy Department's report says, is the government's own system of price controls and allocation program. The report offers a laundry list of evidence which demonstrates the various ways which the allocation system has exaggerated, and, in some cases, caused gasoline and heating oil shortages. The fundamental flaw of the allocation program is that its provisions cannot be realized fast enough to take into account sudden changes in the market. The free marketplace can do a much better job than the government in allocating gasoline, the report infers. "Any allocation system is likely to be ineffective in responding quickly to continuing changes in demand."

The reports of the Energy and Justice Departments should silence those who have used the oil companies as a scapegoat for our energy problems. Those who are not silenced will be flying in the face of an increasing body of facts and research. As more evidence emerges, it is becoming increasingly evident that the Energy Department's allocation program is creating the very problems it was created to solve.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Marijuana"

From time to time I've used these commentaries to report an update on the continued research into marijuana. Medical science has come a long way since the 1972 report by the National Commission on Marijuana & Drug Abuse which gave the weed a relatively clean bill of health.

Everyone who had the urge to light up a joint somehow became aware of that report and could recite it as a litany, exhaling smoke at every line. Strange to say, however, (or maybe not so strange) the confident and happy pot smokers overlooked a follow-up report by members of the same commission which in effect says, "Oops, we overlooked a few things in the first report."

Further research has continued to repudiate that first report, research by increasing numbers of scientists here and abroad. And yet, none of these subsequent findings seem to have caught the attention of the estimated 16 million regular users in our land -- four million of whom are between the ages of 12 and 17.

Those who have no axe to grind, except to report the scientific facts they have uncovered, say that marijuana has a far greater potential for harm than was previously believed.

The toxic ingredient which provides the effect pot smokers want has a jawbreaker of a name which I may not pronounce correctly -- Tetra-hydracannabinol -- which I will henceforth refer to as T.H.C. This T.H.C. lodges in the body's fatty tissues and that includes the brain and the reproductive organs. Now, for those hard to sell souls who liken a "joint" to a martini, the difference is our body eliminates the martini in 24 hours. T.H.C. stays in the body for a month. A person who lights up a couple of times a week is keeping his most essential bodily organs permanently soaked in this toxic drug.

Does this have an effect? You can bet on it. Science now knows that it reduces the ability of the brain to transfer information from short term to long term memory, in addition to other adverse and irreversible effects on the mental processes.

It slows the body's production of the white blood cells which play a major role in fighting infection. And it lowers the male hormone and sperm count in men which, if I may be blunt, leads to sterility.

But there is another effect, which, in this day and age of warnings about the danger of cancer from smoking tobacco, should give an pot smoker pause to think. The smoke from burning marijuana contains many more cancer causing substances than tobacco. And, if that isn't enough, it leads to bronchitis and emphysema.

If adults want to take such chances, that's their business. But surely the communications media and those public figures whose words get some attention should let the four million youngsters I talked about earlier know what they are risking when they light up a "joint" and pass it around because they think it's the in-thing to do.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Voting Records"

There is an old saying that you can accomplish much if you don't care who gets the credit. Miller Nichols, President of J.C. Nichols Company of Kansas City, has been observing that truism in a project which promises to fill a great need in our political process.

For too long now our elected representatives in Congress have enjoyed a freedom from close scrutiny that has enabled some to carry water on both shoulders. They can come home to their own district or thier own state and make speeches to the appropriate forums, and they can get local press attention and voter approval of the views they express. No check, however, is made to determine whether their voting record is in line with their public declarations.

Then there is the device of voting "yes" on an issue of immediate concern to their constituents (and which will get home town attention), while voting "no" on things not quite so obvious. The truth is there is great difficulty in keeping score on them. Miller Nichols has finally solved our dilemma. He has produced a small booklet which provides an instant checklist on senators and representatives. His booklet enables you to find out their total voting record more easily than you can look up a word in the dictionary.

In this eight-page booklet are listed four recognized conservative organizations, plus a brief statement of their principals and four groups considered liberal. These groups annually rate members of Congress on the percentage of votes they cast for and against legislation favorable to the principles advocated by these various groups.

All the 100 senators and 435 representatives are listed in alphabetical order along with the state and district they represent. Following that, their names appear grouped under their respective states with their year of re-election and their percentage rating by each of the eight organizations, plus their average conservative and liberal vote. For example, in my own state, Senator Cranston is shown as having voted less than seventeen percent conservative and over seventy percent liberal. The other California Senator, Dr. Hayakawa, is eighty-two percent conservative and twenty-five percent liberal. You can find instantly where any senator or congressman stands in relation to your own views on national affairs.

Mr. Nichols has spent countless hours and many thousands of dollars in creating this booklet and sought no copyright. Anyone, any business organization, political action group or whatever, can buy copies or duplicate this and put it out under their own banner or commercial message. Miller Nichols' only interest is in seeing that his fellow citizens have the information they need to vote for those who support their viewpoint.

Just write to Smith-Grievess Printing Company, P.O. Box 19573, Kansas City, Missouri 64141. You can buy as few as ten copies, or as many as you like. Or you can print your own.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Power"

The emotional campaign against nuclear power not only exaggerates the hazards of using such power to generate electricity, but is equally irrational in its advocacy of a solar power as a substitute. This is the theme of a book authored by Professor Beckmann of the University of Colorado entitled "Why Soft Technology Will Not Be America's Energy Salvation."

Perhaps I should explain that "soft technology" is the term applied not only to the sun as an energy source, but to others as well--geothermal, hydropower, and so forth.

Now before you get a chip on your shoulder thinking the Professor is writing off solar power entirely, let me assure you that his book starts out by declaring that: "Solar energy is a good thing." And he advocates using it wherever it's practical. I think it's safe to say we all agree.

Quoting him, he says of solar power: "It can supplement more concentrated and more versatile sources of energy when only small amounts of energy are needed. It is well suited for residential space heating and cooling and for domestic water heating, certainly in Florida and the Southwest."

Here are some of the examples he uses to point up the reality of solar energy and its limits. Visualize the sun shining unobstructed and perpendicular on a collecting panel of about eleven square-feet. That is what it takes to produce one kilowatt. Now, compare that to coal. It only takes a little under one pound of coal to make one kilowatt of electricity. Held in the sun, that lump of coal would cast a shadow of about fifteen square inches. The sun would have to shine on that fifteen inch square for almost three months out in the Arizona desert where it shines twelve hours a day to produce one kilowatt hour of energy.

Dr. Beckmann says the energy source which, per unit of energy produced, costs less in human lives and health than any other concentrated source is nuclear. Then he draws another comparison, illustrating that solar energy would have a considerable impact on the environment.

To construct a 1,000 megawatt solar plant, you'd assemble 35,000 tons of aluminum, two million tons of concrete, 600,000 tons of steel, 7,500 tons of copper, 75,000 tons of glass, 1,500 tons of chromium, titanium and other materials. All of that totals an amount of materials 1,000 times greater than the amount needed to build a coal-fired or nuclear plant that would produce the same power.

Professor Beckmann suggests that proponents of "soft power" aren't just against nuclear power, they are against an increase in power, period. They oppose dams for hydro-electric power, off-shore drilling for oil, pipelines and even geothermal development. One environmental group actually opposes geothermal operations within one mile of thermal pools, hot springs, mud pots, and so forth. That means that they are for geothermal development anywhere except where there is geothermal energy to be had. In other words, they are against growth. Dr. Peter Beckmann should be required reading. The title again, "Why Soft Technology Will Not Be America's Energy Salvation."

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Food Stamps"

Energy and SALT II seem to be all that is concerning Washington these days, but that isn't true. Any number of special interest axes are being ground and the sieve through which our tax dollars are leaked away is being passed from hand to hand in the marble halls of government.

Those halls, it is true, are resounding with the usual rhetoric about cutting budgets, fighting inflation and all the other things that became fashionable after California's Proposition 13 passed. But let's pay heed to "what they do, not what they say."

For instance, we should be more than a little concerned about what is being done to the food stamp program. Now food stamps are supposed to be an additional help to those who might not be able to afford a nutritional diet for themselves. And none of us want anyone in this land to go hungry. Food stamps exchangeable for groceries in the marketplace came into being in the '60s. They were free to some and purchasable by others, depending on income, but the cost could not exceed thirty percent of their value. And of course there were strict rules that food stamps could be used only to purchase staple foods. Remember that point please, because in a moment I'll refer back to it.

In 1965 there were less than half a million people receiving or buying food stamps and the budget for them was thirty-five million dollars. By 1977 there were fifteen million recipients and a budget of 5.6 billion dollars. There were also charges of extensive fraud. Official figures suggested at least three million recipients were ineligible.

Congress declared the need for reform of the runaway program was imperative. So they reformed it. And what do you know? They made it easier to get food stamps and they made them entirely free; there would no longer be any charge for them.

Opponents of this kind of reform were thrown a fish to quiet their protests--a ceiling of a little over six billion dollars was put on the budget for fiscal 1979. And, oh yes! There would be tighter certification of eligibility to crack down on fraud.

The bureaucrats over at the Department of Agriculture put the cancellation of any charge for the stamps into effect immediately. It took them several months to get around to any of the provisions about tighter eligibility. Now this fifteen million recipients have become nineteen million, and the estimate for this year is that another three-and-a-half million will be added. And that six billion dollar ceiling is now over seven billion dollars. There is also a projection that the program is 650 million dollars in the red--so the White House is telling Congress they'll have to lift the ceiling or there will be a cutback which will result in hardships for the truly needy. This is an old welfare trick; a form of blackmail in which the elderly and infirm are held as hostages to extort more money from Congress.

All of this came from a supposed reform. I told you I'd refer back to the rule that food stamps can only be used to purchase food. In Missouri there is a theatre which runs mainly "X" rated pornographic films. Its lighted marquis reads "We accept food stamps."

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Living Dangerously...Sometimes"

Would you pay \$200 for possible protection from a cause of death which kills one out of every 7,000 Americans each year? I'm talking about automobile accidents. The federal government has decided that you will. It has ordered American auto-makers to include airbags as standard safety equipment on all new cars, beginning in 1984. But polling research conducted by Gene Pokorny for "Public Opinion" magazine indicates that the majority of Americans oppose airbags. The costs are not worth the benefits.

We are faced with questions such as this every day. Recognizing that there are risks inherent in modern living, Mr. Pokorny set out to discover just how much risk Americans are willing to take in order to enjoy all the benefits of an industrialized society. His findings are interesting.

Pokorny's first discovery is that the environmentalists have apparently left a deep imprint on many Americans. You could say they have succeeded in scaring the majority into believing that the dangers to a person's health and safety are greater today than fifty years ago. They believe this despite clear advancements in medicine, transportation and occupational safety, and longer life expectancies.

However, while a majority feel that environmental factors have placed their lives in greater danger, an equally sizable majority believe that the benefits they receive from modern life are equal to or greater than the risks.

And Americans are sharply divided over whose responsibility it is to reduce risks such as pollution, travel hazards or a potentially harmful product. Forty percent say that the government should play an active role in reducing these risks through regulation. Of late, the federal government has certainly taken this forty percent up on their belief. But forty-five percent say it is the responsibility of the individual--not government--to make himself aware of potential hazards and to make intelligent choices, balancing risks versus benefits.

Pokorny discovered that most Americans have a rule of thumb by which they determine whether or not the government should take charge in reducing an environmental risk. In cases such as the use of airbags or saccharin, most Americans believe that the federal government has no business making consumer choices for them. But Americans are more likely to accept some kind of government watch-dog role in controlling potential hazards over which the individual has less control--for example, air pollution.

Pokorny found that the great majority of Americans look at life realistically: seventy-two percent believe that no matter what we do, it is just not possible to create a society without risk. But more interestingly, even if it were possible, about forty percent say that they wouldn't want to live in a risk-free society anyway. The costs would be too great in comfort and personal freedom. A society without risks would most likely be one without opportunities, too.