

The original documents are located in Box 22, folder “Reagan, Ronald (2)” of the Gerald R. Warren and Margita E. White Files at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Gerald R. Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

(f)

Sandi ✓
then file

THE RONALD REAGAN COLUMN
(For Release In Papers Of Friday, June 13, And Thereafter)

By RONALD REAGAN

Copley News Service

Enough U.S. senators are so worried about Henry Kissinger's apparent determination to play "let's make a deal" over the Panama Canal that a Senate resolution (No. 301) by Sen. Strom Thurmond, reaffirming U.S. sovereignty over the canal, now has 35 co-sponsors, enough to block ratification of any new treaty.

Here's the background: in 1903, shortly after Panama declared itself a republic, the United States entered into a treaty, acquiring sovereignty over the land through which the Panama Canal was to be dug and operated. In exchange, the United States agreed to pay Panama an annuity for its loss of revenue from the Panama Railroad.



The Ronald Reagan Column -- 2

In a 1907 decision, the U.S. Supreme Court reaffirmed U.S. sovereignty over the zone.

On Oct. 11, 1968, the Marxist-dominated military of Panama overthrew the government of anti-Communist President Arnulfo Arias and prevented newly elected President Max Del Valle from taking office.

The next day, the military (working closely with the Communist Party of Panama) shut down Congress, abolished all political parties except the Communist, began censoring news media and removed the peoples' civil rights.

That done, they began a steady drumbeat of propaganda (abetted by the Soviet press) to achieve their aim of "Panamanianization" of the canal. This, too, was in line with Soviet objectives: disruption of U.S. maritime supply lines and ultimate Soviet control of the world's waterways.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 3

The de facto dictatorship of Gen. Omar Torrijos has tried, in recent years, to implant the ideas that the Canal Zone is really Panamanian territory and the U.S. presence represents "colonialism."

Torrijos & Co. have clamored for a new treaty whose aim would be surrender of U.S. sovereignty. They overlook the fact that Panama's own constitution makes their ratification of such a treaty illegal.

On June 23 last year, the de facto envoy of Panama to Washington told a U.S. television audience that if treaty negotiations were not successful "there will be no canal for nobody, not for us, not for the United States, not for the world."

Kissinger apparently took the sabotage threat seriously.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 4

Though he isn't talking about it, he is reported to be studying plans to turn over the Canal Zone's police and fire protection and postal service to Panama, the idea being that this will somehow damp down the anti-U.S. campaign.

Though transfer of police, fire and postal services alone may seem like a mild move, it has serious implications for the future operation of the canal. Police and fire protection would be essential in the event of civil disturbances or sabotage. In the matter of postal services U.S. citizens in the zone would have their mail subjected to monitoring by Marxist Lt. Col. Manuel Noreiga, Panama's G-2.

If Kissinger were to put together such a deal as a prelude to a new treaty, it's likely U.S. citizens rapidly would leave the zone.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 5

 Their presence there is vital. Keeping the canal open and operating is a difficult and exacting job as it is.

 It is hard to believe that partial Panamanianization of the Canal Zone wouldn't lead to its loss to the United States, for both commerce and military security purposes. The U.S. Department of Commerce estimates that the loss of the canal would mean a 71 per cent increase in average annual consumption of fuel by carriers of U.S. foreign trade; a 31-day increase in average shipping time; a \$923 million annual increase in the total delivered price of exports; and a \$583 million annual increase in the total delivered price of all imports.

 Our treaty with Panama granted us the Canal Zone in perpetuity. Giving that up would make about as much sense for us as it would for the USSR to invite the U.S. 6th Fleet to roam at will around the Black Sea.

6/9/75

-30-

mc

Jerry Weaver


THE RONALD REAGAN COLUMN
(For Release In Papers Of Friday, June 6, And Thereafter)

By RONALD REAGAN

Copley News Service

Despite the economic slump of recent months, the federal "boondoggle" business is still booming.

Awhile back, the federal government gave a grant to some researchers to study something called "The Demography of Happiness." They wanted to find out why some people lead happier lives than others. They discovered that younger people were happier than older people. Those with money were happier than those who were broke; and healthy people were happier than ill people. The cost: \$249,000. Nearly a quarter of a million dollars to find out that it's better to be young, rich and healthy than old, sick and poor!



The Ronald Reagan Column -- 2

In another case, a magazine receiving funds from the National Foundation on the Arts published a one-word poem, for which it paid the author \$500. The word was "Lighgt." That would be hilarious if it weren't for the fact that some Americans go to bed hungry or without jobs while the federal arbiters of taste hand out frivolous gifts from the public purse.

The Food and Drug Administration paid a Buffalo, N.Y., firm to study why children fall off tricycles. The research engineers made these profound conclusions: children fall off tricycles because they lose their balance or collide with an object! They also learned that children's legs grow longer as they grow older, thus complicating tricycle riding.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 3

The purpose behind the study was to help the FDA decide if it should issue safety design standards for tricycles. If the government has any business considering such things, it should only be after someone has shown that a lot of kids are injured riding tricycles. No word of such a problem preceded the study.

The venerable Smithsonian Institution (federally funded, of course) puts in for some of the most exotic boondoggles. One shopping list it sent Congress included the following research projects: Reproductive Rhythms of Catfish in India; How Fishing Boat Crews Cause Conflicts in Yugoslavian Peasant Towns; and a study of Polish Bisexual Frogs.

Such studies may serve a larger, more serious purpose, but one can only wonder why private research sources, colleges and universities aren't taking these projects on for themselves. The frog study, for example, was intended to test some new methods of distinguishing between one species of animal and another. That seems like a legitimate objective of scientific research, but is that what we have a federal government for?

While the auto and housing industries decline, there is a relatively new cottage industry that is thriving. It takes advantage of federal boondoggles in the name of science and culture.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 5

It consists of a small army of bright wordsmiths who will--for a fee--help prospective grantees dream up serious-sounding titles and rationale for their projects in order to impress Congress and federal agencies.

That Congress takes such stuff seriously at all is a measure of how far we have strayed from the original purposes of federal government. There are a few congressmen who battle the boondoggles, who say, in effect, "Hey, wait a minute--what business does government have paying for this? Where's the benefit to the taxpayers?" If only we had a few hundred more like them.

-30-
6/2/75
js

THE RONALD REAGAN COLUMN
(For Release In Papers Of Friday, May 16, And Thereafter)

By RONALD REAGAN

Copley News Service

When the Socialists came out ahead in Portugal elections, many in the West breathed a sigh of relief that the "moderates" had won. Everything seemed rosy, but it's turned out rosy Red.

The Communist Party ran a poor third--about 12 per cent of the vote--behind the Socialists and the Popular Democratic Party (PDP), but all are essentially different denominations of the same religion--socialism. The young officers of the ruling Armed Forces Movement (AFM) had already outlawed the potentially most effective centrists and conservatives (and a few Maoists).

MAY 19 1975

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 2

The AFM allowed the election to take place only after extracting promises from the remaining parties to abide by its forthcoming constitution, and to enforce AFM rules for at least five years. In other words, the AFM made sure the election would be meaningless. It was, instead, a sort of pacifier for the people; a nationwide public opinion poll. No doubt some supporters of the banned center-to-right parties voted for the Socialists or the PDP over the Communists on the grounds they were "least worst."

The Soviet Union has been pouring an estimated \$10 million a month into Portugal to support its small but well-organized Communist Party. With this horn of plenty the Communists hired brigades of street fighters to intimidate non-Communist voters and break up their rallies and meetings.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 3

The Soviet investment is paying off: the Communist Party has gained control of the press and the labor union movement--classic Red strategy.

As if to further nullify the election (the results of which they must surely have been able to predict) the Soviets have had their local party sonorously warn the Socialists to heed the word of the AFM. The AFM, in turn, they hope to dominate from within, using their supporters among its 200 or so members as stalking horses.

Recently in London, one well-placed observer of the Portuguese scene told me that the NATO nations should encourage the more moderate members of the AFM to assert themselves. Give them a chance to let democracy flower, he seemed to be saying, it's been a long time coming. But, it's probably too late.

Already, the banks and insurance companies have been nationalized and more businesses are likely to follow. The United States has been told its base in the Azores may not be used to resupply the Israelis in the event of Mideast conflict. The Soviets have gained permission for their "fishing trawler" fleet to use a Madeira seaport. Can Soviet naval base rights be far behind?

Perhaps all this is part of a national intoxication following last year's coup against the decade-old dictatorship, but the Portuguese seem to be heading, perhaps unwittingly, toward another one--a Red one.

Looking ahead, two likely scenarios add up to a bad news-bad news version of the good news-bad news story. In one, the USSR does a Czechoslovakia-type takeover, through subversion, to make Portugal a satellite.

That would be bad, but the second scenario is even worse, and current evidence suggests it's the more probable one. In it, Portugal remains ostensibly independent, with a left-wing military dictatorship, but with the USSR acting as stage manager. Communists already hold several key government posts. On stage, Portugal, appearing independent, would remain in NATO--our first line of defense--but in reality an ally not of the West but of the USSR.

This would have a profound effect among NATO allies. Italy is shaking already, with a large, powerful Communist Party. Spain would face the prospect of internal strife with guerrillas infiltrating from Portugal.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 6

Meanwhile, the United States does nothing to encourage the majority of Portuguese who don't want to be Communists. Indeed, the climate in the United States seems to be dominated by "liberals" who find American support of right-wing dictators intolerable but have yet to utter a peep about the left-wing military dictators in Portugal.

-30-
5/12/75
mc

THE RONALD REAGAN COLUMN
(For Release In Papers Of Friday, April 25, And Thereafter)

By RONALD REAGAN

Copley News Service

The bureaucrats, aided by Ralph Nader and a few determined liberal senators, are out to fleece the taxpayers by creating yet another federal bureaucracy.

This one will be called the Agency for Consumer Advocacy if Senate Bill 200 goes all the way through Congress and is signed by the President. It is a rehash of the Consumer Protection Agency bill defeated last year --and that one might as well have been named the Consumer Ripoff Bill.

There are existing federal agencies with the responsibility for preventing consumers from being harmed by bad products or trade practices.



The Ronald Reagan Column -- 2

These range from the Federal Drug Administration to the Consumer Product Safety Commission. Congress has it within its power to pass corrective legislation to improve the workings of these agencies any time it wants to.

Why then a new agency which, in effect, would compete with existing agencies, challenging their actions and causing a great deal of heat but generating very little light? One thing is certain: it would spawn a large new bureaucracy and it would set its own rules and regulations.

It would have the ability to harass businesses large and small, something that will inevitably cost you more money in the form of increased prices for goods and services.

It is doubtful that even the bill's sponsors think the new agency, if created, would do much real good, since it won't plow any really new ground.

What it will do is please some left-liberal constituents here and there, as well as the professional consumerists who thrive on finding more and more ways to tighten the federal vise on your life. These are the folks who are obsessed with the need to control every aspect of the marketplace, leaving little or nothing to the cycles of supply and demand which, till now at least, have served us best when left pretty much alone.

There is scant evidence of public clamor for the agency. In fact, a recent poll showed a majority of Americans believe they have ample access to redress of market grievances now.

Since consumers don't speak with a single voice, critics of the bill ask how can a federal agency develop a consensus? The answer is, it can't.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 4

It will, instead, reflect the opinions of the bureaucrats, the more strident consumerists and the politicians who created it.

Creating a new Agency for Consumer Advocacy, when already there are many of them but under different names, is a little like the situation a retail chain might find itself in if one of its own stores began to do poorly. In that case, it would take a good look at pricing, inventory, displays, advertising and personnel, and then make changes. What it certainly wouldn't do is open a competing store across the street.

Yet, that's just what Congress is about to do--all at your expense.

APR 18 1975

THE RONALD REAGAN COLUMN
(For Release In Papers Of Friday, April 18, And Thereafter)

By RONALD REAGAN

Copley News Service

LONDON -- While U.S. congressmen are reporting "overwhelming" voter opposition to further military aid to South Vietnam and Cambodia, British political leaders and press are expressing mounting concern that the United States has created a serious credibility gap for itself among its Western allies.

American voter reaction to the rapid collapse of our Southeast Asian allies is not surprising, considering the deep war weariness throughout the country and the aggravated, breathless and often distorted reports from the battle zone itself.

The American people have been given a steady diet of misinformation with very few actual facts for a decade or more. Now, Congress, being by nature more eager to follow than to lead, is probably happy to have at least what appears to be definitive voter response to the issue, whatever it is. Congressmen tend not to like to cast votes on the floor when they are uncertain about their constituents.

But there is no mistaking the fact that here America's Southeast Asia policy is viewed as a failure and the American visitor is asked constantly if the Asian debacle means that America might not continue to honor its commitments in Europe.

The undercurrent is one of questioning American leadership which has been taken for granted for so long by the British and the Western Europeans.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 3

Our failure to provide the South Vietnamese with the replacement arms, ammunition and fuel they have needed and now need amounts to a bad case of American myopia and a cause of celebration in Moscow and Peking.

Considering past patterns of behavior, the Soviets are likely to put pressure on the United States and its allies elsewhere now, since they are determined to nudge their perimeter of influence ever further away from their home territory. Our mettle having been tested and found wanting in Indochina, the Soviets may be encouraged to try us again soon.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 4

Although it's probably fair to say that the British have no specific interest in South Vietnam and Cambodia per se, they are very worried about the possibility of one of their oldest allies, Portugal, drifting into the Soviet orbit, and American failure to aid the Southeast Asian allies has symbolic importance here that cannot yet be fully measured.

Our abandonment of our allies and our failure to honor the assurances we gave them in signing the Paris accords already have influenced the collapse of the recent Israeli-Egyptian talks, and yet may prove to be the most haunting mistake the United States has made in nearly 200 years.

-30-
4/14/75
mc

APR 14 1975

THE RONALD REAGAN COLUMN

(For Release In Papers On Friday, April 11, Or Thereafter)

By RONALD REAGAN

Copley News Service



Most Americans are conservationists and environmentalists to some extent. Few want to see our scenic wonders spoiled, our waters polluted, our natural resources wasted.

Yet, from time to time, some environmentalists go overboard in efforts to protect a view, preserve a recreational area or save the natural habitat of the native American mosquito.

Take, for instance, the case of the Trident base at Bangor, Wash.

Trident is the follow-on to the Polaris and Poseidon missile systems.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 2

Basically, it consists of a multiwarhead, 4,000-mile (eventually 6,000-mile) missile launched from a nuclear submarine cruising beneath the surface of the ocean.

The Navy Department declares that a Trident base must be located in the Pacific because it "gives the Soviets another whole ocean to worry about." It goes on to say that strategically there is no alternative in the Pacific to the Bangor location.

For most Americans that would be enough. Few would object to construction of a desperately needed national defense base anywhere, especially when every effort is made (as it is in the case of Trident) to minimize its impact on the surrounding environment. And especially, also, when such a base will provide much-needed jobs in a state where joblessness is high.

Yet, an organization called Concerned About Trident (CAT) has been formed specifically for the purpose of halting construction of the Trident base on the grounds that the Navy has failed to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act.

To this end CAT has brought suit in federal court. Its avowed aim is to preserve the pristine beauty of the Bangor area at all costs, including the defense of the United States.

Well, fortunately, it looks as if CAT is not going to be successful. A major reason is the involvement in the suit on the side of the Navy of a small, relatively new public interest law firm, the Pacific Legal Foundation (PLF).

PLF has made some devastating points against CAT.

Among them are these:

1. That CAT is merely a corporate shell founded solely for the purpose of stopping in the courts the construction of the base.

2. That the actual people behind the suit have yet to be disclosed.

3. That undisclosed persons or organizations are funding the suit "by laundering funds to plaintiffs' attorneys through various tax exempt charitable organizations in possible violation of Internal Revenue Service guidelines."

4. That there are serious legal questions regarding CAT's right to sue.

Although the suit is still in the courts, federal Judge George L. Hart has already denied a motion for a preliminary injunction to stop construction, largely on points made by PLF.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 5

PLF lawyers are now confident of final victory for the Navy. This, alone, will be good enough reason to cheer for Americans who worry, with much justification, that America is falling behind the Soviet Union in defense capabilities.

Another good reason is the discovery that at least one public interest law firm is working on behalf of the public instead of, as so often is the case with such firms, working for left-wing special interest groups at the expense of the public.

I will come back to the subject of the Pacific Legal Foundation in other columns. It is chalking up quite a record.

APR 7 1975

THE RONALD REAGAN COLUMN

(For Release In Papers On Friday, April 4, Or Thereafter)

By RONALD REAGAN

Copley News Service

"He's an amateur crank." It was Paul Samuelson talking, professor of economics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and winner of the Nobel Prize. He was talking to Mike Wallace on "60 Minutes" about a self-taught San Francisco economist who wants to make every American worker a capitalist: Louis Kelso.

Kelso had been swimming upstream in the rarefied world of economics for nearly 20 years, until the last two years or so when some journalists and politicians began to listen and found he had something to say.

According to Kelso, "America's official policy is to have a 'full employment' economy.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 2

"This is irrational when technology and automation are destroying jobs faster than new ones can be created.

What we need to do is develop a way for the workers to own 'a share of the action'--a share of the machines that actually produce the wealth."

He points out that only about 6 per cent of the U.S. population derives a significant portion of its income from capital. The rest of the people must rely entirely on wages, salaries and commissions. No job, no money.

What if most of the workers also owned some of the capital and began to derive a healthy portion of their income from this source, he asks. In time, he says, the boom-and-bust cycle, wild stock speculation and the wage-and-price spiral of inflation would be a thing of the past.

Kelso points out that American industry has a steady need for fresh capital to update and expand itself. If, instead of turning to traditional sources for this capital, a company created instead an Employee Stock Ownership Plan for its workers, that "ESOP" could go to a bank, borrow the money to buy the new stock of the company, and pay it back out of dividends from the stock. After all, he says, industry now pays off its capital borrowings out of profits.

As soon as the loan was paid (typically in three to five years), the workers could begin to get their own dividends. And, it wouldn't cost them a cent out-of-pocket to become shareholders. Nor would it require present shareholders to give up any ownership. No "redistribution" scheme. All the while, industry would have its fresh capital at a cost less than it now pays.

That's Kelso's plan in brief. There's more to it, of course. Sen. Russell Long, D-La., chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, is seriously interested in Kelso's visionary solutions to some of our economic problems, and the energetic Kelso (who has put a version of his plan to work in several score private firms) is beginning to get a full hearing for his ideas in Washington. Those ideas may not be perfect, but they offer some real hope that the fraternity of ruling economists--captives of Keynesian orthodoxy who have held sway for four decades--may be near the end of the road.

Kelso's challenges to debate Samuelson (or any other orthodox economist) have gone unchallenged.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 5

But no wonder Mr. Samuelson was so tight-lipped when he dismissed Kelso out-of-hand on the television program. Kelso, after all, hasn't been annointed by the priesthood. Neither was Louis Pasteur.

-30-
3/31/75
pg

MAR 29 1975

G. Warren

THE RONALD REAGAN COLUMN
(For Release In Papers On Friday, March 28, Or Thereafter)

By RONALD REAGAN

Copley News Service

Last fall, Yasir Arafat came to the United Nations in New York. As head of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), the guerrilla group that wants everyone to believe it represents all the Arabs on the West Bank of the Jordan, Arafat spoke to an enthusiastic, cheering General Assembly. The enthusiasm stemmed from the fact that body is now dominated by so-called Third World members.

Curiously, for one who claims to have gone straight, Arafat wore a gun throughout his appearance on stage. Most in the audience ignored this, commenting instead on his colorful burnoose.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 2

Enthralled by his performance, the United Nations granted the PLO the right to have a "permanent observer" stationed at its East River enclave. This gentleman, Sadat Hassan, is urbane and courtly and is now traveling about the nation visiting with a variety of public figures. Politely, he states the case for the PLO in particular and for Arab historical claims to Palestine in general.

I'm not sure history supports the latter contention, but there is some truth in what someone has said about the difficulties in the Middle East: "There is so much right on both sides." Believing that, it would seem that men of good will could find a peaceful solution.

Hassan would have Americans believe that the days of terrorism are a thing of the past for the PLO.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 3

If so, there could be reason for optimism, but once the fox has gotten inside the chicken coop, does he ever lose his taste for blood until he's cleaned the place out? Tragically, we may have the answer to that already. If so, there's little room for optimism at all.

Early in March, PLO guerrillas attacked a Tel Aviv hotel in a savage raid that left 18 persons dead, including all but one of the attackers.

Now, one Zouheir Mohsen, head of the "military section" of the PLO, threatens to attack "Israeli targets" in the United States.

"We will strike at any Israeli strategic target wherever we can reach it, in Israel, or in Japan or in the United States," he said in an interview recently.

He also admitted that the hotel attack in Tel Aviv was aimed at sabotaging Secretary of State Henry Kissinger's delicate peacemaking negotiations between Arabs and Israelis. Mohsen described Kissinger as a "joker and a charlatan." So much for the PLO's peaceful intentions.

Clearly, the bandit group's actions belie its soothing words in international forums. Since this is so, any American leaders who are scheduled to hear the blandishments of the suave Mr. Hassan might just as well tell him to stay at the United Nations as waste their time.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 5

And, our counterintelligence people should take Mohsen's saber-rattling talk seriously, with appropriate steps to prevent his murderous cohorts from ever landing here.

Mr. Hassan, meet Mr. Mohsen.

-30-
3/24/75
pg

4

THE RONALD REAGAN COLUMN
(For Release In Papers On Friday, March 21, Or Thereafter)

By RONALD REAGAN

Copley News Service

The press called it a fetus.

The defense lawyer called it a fetus.

The jury called it a baby.

And, after they did, they convicted Dr. Kenneth C. Edelin of Boston of manslaughter. He had delivered, by Cesarean section, a male child to a patient with whom he had agreed to perform a legal abortion. The jury ruled, after lengthy deliberation, that the baby was alive when it was removed from the mother.

The press had described it as "a fetus of 20-24 weeks." The jury was shown photos and described it as a 6-month-old baby.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 2

The juror who held out longest against conviction said--after the verdict--that most of the jurors believed that the baby "was alive during the operation when it was taken out of the mother and that the doctor was negligent for not checking for a heartbeat. They thought his examination was too short."

Dr. Edelin was frustrated and angry at the outcome, not surprisingly. That he momentarily charged the jury with racial prejudice (he is black) can be attributed to the heat of the moment. There is no evidence to suggest that the jury based its decision on anything other than the charge put to them and the facts presented. In fact, most of them expressed personal sympathy toward the doctor.

One can give Dr. Edelin the benefit of the doubt and suppose that he harbored no malice toward the baby; he only performed his duty to abort the birth, both earnestly and professionally. He's now appealing the case and the final outcome cannot be predicted.

Meanwhile, it has given the right-to-life forces a great deal of encouragement. And, according to reports in the media, the verdict seems to have discouraged (at least temporarily) medical research into abortion and related life-control measures.

While we await the appeal and its decision, I have become increasingly concerned that there is a subtle, but nonetheless effective, move afoot to dehumanize babies unwanted by their mothers.

The latest chilling symptom: Dr. Edelin's lawyer says that he will argue in his appeal that a women's legal right to an abortion presumes that the aborted baby will be dead. If it isn't, as in the Edelin case, then it would have no right to live, under the law. What next? Euthanasia on a grand scale? Or, putting mentally retarded infants "to sleep?"

Before, during and after the Dr. Edelin case there has been--with increasing frequency--the use of the term "fetus" to describe a baby the mother wanted to abort. Fetuses, after all, aren't people, they're "things." If it's inconvenient to convert one into a "baby," then dispose of it.

Babies, on the other hand, are warm, lovable and cuddly. Altogether human. A fetus becomes a baby when it leaves the mother's womb alive.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 5

Even if it doesn't, it certainly looks like a baby when it is 6 months old.

One is reminded of all the pejorative terms applied to various enemies to rob them of human qualities, in order to make belittling them, ostracizing them or killing them more easy: wops, frogs, spics, micks, polacks, gooks and slopes, to name a few. Add now the "fetus." No human qualities. A faintly repulsive sound to the word. Easily disposed of by serious-looking physicians and their patients.

What can be done to combat the growing tendency to dehumanize infants in the womb?

If you're pregnant and thinking of abortion, think of adoption instead. If you're not in that situation, write a letter to the editor every time he publishes a story describing a baby as a fetus.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 6

It is time to say to all the world: we are not talking about a slug or a snail or a salamander. We are talking about a real, live baby, whatever the shortness of its life. Write that letter. The squeaky wheel gets the grease.

-30-

3/17/75

pg

THE RONALD REAGAN COLUMN

(For Release In Papers On Friday, March 14, Or Thereafter)

By RONALD REAGAN

Copley News Service

"No one cant rite hardly anytime." That was the headline. The story left little doubt about the matter. If you think your youngster is the only one in school who uses sentence fragments, run-ons, poor spelling and misplaced punctuation, you may find some consolation in knowing that this problem is more than an individual one; it's national.

In a recent survey of 436 colleges, the Association of Departments of English found that students are leaving high school with a much poorer training in fundamentals than before. The survey also showed that problems aren't exclusively those of students from lower-income families. Middle-class kids are apparently affected just as much.



The Ronald Reagan Column -- 2

Nearly half the entering freshmen at the University of California in Berkeley last fall had to take a remedial English course called "bonehead" because they failed a qualifying grammar and essay test.

Most teachers seem to agree that the problem isn't a new one. It's always been there, but it's more intense and widespread than ever before and it's probably being diagnosed more energetically. Some teachers think too much television viewing is the main cause. It's probably true that young people aren't being encouraged to read, either at school or at home. One educator summed up the importance of reading this way: "Students must read well to write well."

If you'll think back to your own high school days, you probably dreaded those endless grammar drills, plotting out subjects, predicates and objects; stuffing your head with rules and exceptions-to-rules until you could reel them off from memory. This was interspersed by singsong recitations of "Evangeline" or "The Rhyme of the Ancient Mariner," the purpose for which you never could divine. Well, it now appears that such rigorous drills, as part of compulsory courses and coupled with a well-planned and supervised reading program, are really the key to one's ability to write clearly.

During the 1960s the ferment in education didn't leave the English departments unscathed. In many states and communities compulsory English classes were reduced in number. More became "electives."

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 4

And, for many who did choose to take these courses, the choice was between such things as Creative Writing, Film Making, Mythology and Detective Story Writing. These may be perfectly legitimate subjects to study, but they should be offered after the student has a strong foundation of reading and grammatical writing--not before, or there may never be an "after." One has only to remember the standard, "Like...I mean...ya know, man" monosyllables of the youth of just a few seasons ago to see that the need for change is obvious.

One metropolitan curriculum director surveyed recently was concerned that students "don't zero in on a real, solid academic core." But, a representative of the Modern Language Association--an organization of college English teachers--sees some hopeful signs.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 5

She observes that all over the country English professors are reporting that students are becoming goal-oriented again and that they're asking for English courses that focus on essential writing skills. As she puts it, there is a shift away from "the touch-feely stage, the love-everybody-and-good-writing-will-result" days.

Amen to that! Maybe the advocates of plain old "readin' and writin'" were correct after all. In another decade or so we may finally be turning out more students who can organize a sentence properly than cannot. And, with plenty of nudging from concerned parents and teachers, they may begin reading again, too.

Copy
File

THE RONALD REAGAN COLUMN
(For Release In Papers On Friday, March 7, And Thereafter)

By RONALD REAGAN

Copley News Service

Salty tuna boat skippers bellowing in outrage at the seizure of their boats by a small South American navy year after year might seem slightly comic if it weren't a problem that this year will cost the American taxpayers more than \$2 million.

The nearly annual Tuna Boat War has been going on for two decades between U.S. tuna fishermen and the government of Ecuador.

In the early 1950s, Ecuador, Peru and Chile declared their territorial limits to be 200 miles out to sea, rather than the 12 miles recognized by international law.



The Ronald Reagan Column -- 2

Those 200 watery miles are the favored feeding grounds for huge schools of tuna during the first three months of the year.

Since the U.S. tuna fleet (based largely in San Diego) descends on the area each year for its lucrative catch, the South American coastal nations no doubt saw in their new 200-mile limit a rich source of revenue. They didn't waste any time proving the point.

With monotonous regularity, the Ecuadorians seize the U.S. boats, impound them in the nearest port and release them only when the fishermen pay hefty fines. They sometimes confiscate the catch, too.

Back when the Tuna Boat War began, the fishermen were instrumental in lobbying a bill through Congress called the Fishermen's Protective Act.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 3

It provides that the federal government will reimburse the fishermen for their fines and confiscated catches. To date, the cost to the taxpayers has been more than \$50 million.

When the "war" was renewed a few weeks ago, the Ecuadorians, using gunboats on loan from the United States, seized seven tuna boats and their catches.

The Ecuadorians had instituted a system of license fees, but rules out licenses for boats of more than 600 tons. Most U.S. boats exceed 600 tons--not a coincidence. Using their "Catch-22" rules, the Ecuadorians agreed to let the U.S. boats go only after they collected fines and cargoes amounting to more than \$3 million. The State Department will reimburse about 70 per cent of that to the fishermen.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 4

While the U.S. government has chosen all these years not to solve the recurring problem, preferring instead to muddle along with it, there are indications that later this year Uncle Sam will have to decide whether to fish or cut bait over the issue.

Pressure from lobster and salmon fishermen and oil companies is growing to extend our own territorial limits to 200 miles. A bill to do this will be before Congress this year. If it passes, the 200-mile limit might soon become the international rule rather than the exception.

If that is the case, Congress should, for the sake of consistency, rescind the Fishermen's Protective Act and let the tuna fishermen solve their own problem off the shores of South America.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 5

With the extended limit we might even recoup some of that \$50 million by fining Russian and Japanese trawlers caught fishing in our waters.

If Congress fails to pass the extended limit, however, and the 12-mile limit continues to be the international standard, the U.S. government next winter should send along a destroyer with the tuna boats to cruise, say, 13 miles off the shore of Ecuador in an updated version of Teddy Roosevelt's dictum to "talk softly, but carry a big stick." Ecuadorian aggressiveness might rapidly melt under such circumstances. Taking back those gunboats we loaned them wouldn't hurt, either.

-30-
3/3/75
jy

COPY

THE RONALD REAGAN COLUMN
(For Release In Papers On Friday, Feb. 28, And Thereafter)

By RONALD REAGAN

Copley News Service

It was Christmas Eve. The Great Depression had begun and unemployment was spreading across the land. There in our small town in Illinois, though, we thought things were going to be all right. All right, that is, until my father opened the envelope he thought was a Christmas greeting from his employer. I can never forget the long silence as he sat there holding that greeting, or his half-audible whisper: "That's a h--l of a Christmas present." He had just learned that, as of that Christmas Eve, he was one of the unemployed.



The Ronald Reagan Column -- 2

Today, or any time, if you have a family to feed and you're laid off work through no fault of your own, unemployment--with all its anxieties--becomes the central fact of your life. If you can't find another job and, unlike the auto workers, you aren't protected by a guarantee of 95 per cent of your wages during layoff periods, you have to turn to unemployment insurance or other public assistance to tide you over. And, that's why we have such programs, to help those who need it when they need it.

On the other hand, if you're an economist, you look for trends in the economy that will affect people by the millions. Both perspectives are valid. The economist knows that inflation, recession and unemployment can have a snowball effect and that a recession is, in part, psychological (not to discount such factors as federal deficit spending and too-easy consumer credit).

The very way in which unemployment statistics are reported contributes sharply to the psychological part of the problem. They are presented by the media as a sort of statistical fright wig. Scarifying headlines, with little analysis. In fact, the method of reporting such data by the Bureau of Labor Statistics is misleading, if not downright phony.

What the statistics provide is a reasonably good estimate (not an accurate count) of housewives who don't need but would like part-time work; young people still fully supported by their parents, but who are seeking their first jobs; and even teen-agers wanting paper routes or other after-school work.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 4

What the statistics don't provide is a sharp focus on the actual number of breadwinners involuntarily unemployed, looking for a job to support a family, and drawing unemployment benefits if they are eligible. That number would be a true measure of our economic situation. This is how England counts its unemployed. If we did it that way our rate would be about 1 per cent or less instead of the 8 per cent the federal government is talking about (or the 10 per cent George Meany is predicting). An official high in England's Labor government asked a friend of mine the other day if we were masochists. He said, "We know your figures are phony, and so do you."

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 5

The Bureau of Labor Statistics makes 50,000 random phone calls each month, and from that tells us our rate of unemployment as if they'd made an accurate nose count. In addition to those out of work because of economic trouble, their telephone "net" catches thousands in the other categories mentioned. Yet, as reported, all are lumped together as "unemployed," thus conjuring a picture of millions huddled in bread lines. Actually, more than half the unemployed will find jobs in five weeks or less (at any given time); the average for all is 10 weeks; and less than 7 per cent have been without work for 26 weeks or longer.

Why does the BLS lump the actually employed with the like-to-be-employed and others?

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 6

Part of the answer may lie in the fact that certain federal programs are triggered into action when the so-called unemployment rate rises to a certain level. When it does, of course, it "proves" that all those bureaucrats are essential, for they must administer such programs.

Full reporting of the true unemployment picture is essential if we're going to avoid "psyching" ourselves into a depression. It's time the secretary of labor overhauled the reporting system. The telephone survey may have value, but only if the results tell the public how many people are looking for part-time work, how many are teen-agers, how many are new entrants in the labor force and, finally but most important, how many are breadwinners out of a job through no fault of their own.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 7

The reports should also tell something else:

what job skills are in surplus in some localities and in short supply in others. The National Federation of Independent Business recently surveyed its members and found almost one-quarter looking for workers to fill job openings. The BLS could perform a real service by tallying such job skill needs so the truly unemployed can find them. It makes more sense than spending billions to create new public jobs which add little to national productivity.

-30-
2/24/75
jg