

**The original documents are located in Box 39, folder “Reagan - Newspaper Columns” of the Ron Nessen Papers 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. Ron Nessen donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections.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.

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

Re:  
Sultz.

By RONALD REAGAN

Copley News Service

If there's one thing that sends Soviet leaders into orbit faster than a Soyuz spacecraft could, it's the mere mention of the name of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn.

And apparently some of President Ford's foreign policy advisers are so nervous about bruising the sensibilities of the Soviets that they have persuaded him not to meet the man who is considered by many to be the world's greatest living writer and its most profound spokesman for human freedom and morality.

There are two ironies in this.



The Ronald Reagan Column -- 2

First, that the White House refusal to see Solzhenitsyn came during the very week the United States was celebrating its independence as the haven of human liberty. And, second, that the Soviets--despite their sweet talk to us about detente--carry on elsewhere a constant barrage of speeches and articles vilifying the United States and its Western allies. Presumably, in the "spirit of detente," we are expected to ignore the worldwide anti-U.S. campaign.

Solzhenitsyn was in Washington the week of July 4 for his first public appearance before an American audience. George Meany and the AFL-CIO sponsored the event, and Solzhenitsyn held spellbound an audience of 2,500, including many dignitaries.

He was frankly critical of Western policy toward the Soviet Union.

He described detente as a "senseless process of endless concessions to aggressors" which can only get worse unless we decide to become visibly firm in our dealings with the Soviets.

No doubt this kind of talk is unsettling to Secretary Henry Kissinger and his diplomatists, but Solzhenitsyn's credentials are hard to deny. He is a Russian who loves his country, but not its government. He understands, certainly better than most Americans, the Russian psyche and Soviet behavior patterns.

White House representatives were conspicuously absent from the dinner. Press Secretary Ron Nessen gave out a succession of reasons why there wouldn't be a meeting between Solzhenitsyn and the President. First, the President couldn't attend the dinner because he was scheduled to be at a party for his daughter.

Then, it seems, there wouldn't be a subsequent meeting because Solzhenitsyn hadn't requested one. Next, Nessen said, the President doesn't ordinarily meet with private foreign personages (he met that very week with Brazilian soccer star Pele).

Then, "For image reasons, the President does like to have some substance in his meetings. It is not clear what he would gain in a meeting with Solzhenitsyn." For "substance," the President has met recently with the Strawberry Queen of West Virginia and the Maid of Cotton.

Finally, the real reason for the snub surfaced: a visit with Solzhenitsyn would violate the "spirit of detente."

Frequently, the West German government uses the phrase "detente without illusions." The phrase suggests that detente offers both hope and danger. Apparently, our government hasn't learned it yet.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 5

If past Soviet behavior is any example, they might even have responded--indirectly--in a positive manner to a Ford-Solzhenitsyn meeting. They might have responded with some signal--however slight--of relaxation of some of the more visible signs of repression. (Remember how they stepped up approvals of emigration of Russian Jews from the Soviet Union about the time the trade bill was being debated?)

On the other hand, the Soviets might have flown into a rage, as the President's advisers feared, and even cancelled the latest grain deal. One thing is for certain, though. They wouldn't have stalked out of the Strategic Arms Limitation (SALT) II talks. The proposed agreement already tilts in their favor.

-30-

7/14/75

tb

*Ron Nessen*

THE RONALD REAGAN COLUMN

(For Release In Papers Of Friday, Aug. 15, Or Thereafter)

By RONALD REAGAN

Copley News Service

The price of hot air is going up! Congress has just given itself a pay raise.

With the nation facing the prospects of "double-digit" unemployment and several public officials setting an example for austerity (one new governor rides the bus to work; another a bicycle), the House of Representatives has voted to fatten its members' paychecks by nearly \$4,000 a year, going from \$42,500 to \$46,112.

To the credit of a good many congressmen, the vote was close. It passed by a single vote, 214 to 213.



In fact, had it not been for some last-minute histrionics on the part of Democratic Caucus Chairman Philip Burton, the electronic voting device in the House would have recorded it the other way around.

In the final seconds of voting, with the tally at 214 "against" and 213 "for," Burton hollered: "The machine's broken! The machine's broken!"

He later told reporters that this was a ruse. The machine wasn't broken at all, but Burton's theatrics had given him the time he needed to get the machine turned back on to record some switch votes he was arm-twisting. Speaker Carl Albert helped Burton by using some stalling techniques at the podium.

So much for congressional "leadership" at a time when public opinion polls show the average American ranks Congress at its lowest point in history in terms of confidence.



By tacking their pay raise measure to a post office bill, which also raised salaries of federal judges and upper-level bureaucrats, Burton & Co. hoped to make their move inconspicuous. Their plan to rush it through without a roll call vote (thus avoiding embarrassing questions from voters at election time) was thwarted, but it's a safe bet that those voting "aye" aren't going to shout from the rooftops about it back home.

Burton and his allies were luckier a few weeks ago when the House Administration Committee granted the entire House a juicy \$10 million package of perquisites. These benefits will come automatically to each member--the committee's decision didn't even require ratification by the full House.

It was rammed through in express-train fashion by Committee Chairman Wayne Hays, who said he would deal with opponents of the measure by simply eliminating their staffs. That silenced the opposition.

The "perks" include extra money to put out those puff-piece newsletters to constituents twice a year (previously they were paid for from each congressman's office budget) and nearly twice as many paid-for trips back home to their districts. As many as 12 of the total of 64 trips can now be assigned to staff members.

If you're upset about all this boom-time generosity in the middle of a recession, don't bother writing your congressman about it this month. He's off on vacation.

*Nissen*

THE RONALD REAGAN COLUMN  
(For Release In Papers Of Friday, Aug. 22 or Thereafter)

By RONALD REAGAN

Copley News Service

With government virtually its only "industry," Washington, D.C., may be the only recession-proof city in the United States. When it comes to job security, the veteran officeholders of the Washington "family" forget their differences and close ranks.

Take the pay raise Congress voted itself just before going on a month's vacation. They tacked it onto a bill granting raises to upper-level bureaucrats, Supreme Court justices, other federal judges, Cabinet officers and the vice president.



The Ronald Reagan Column -- 2

The beneficiaries, including members of the House and Senate, already are in the top 1 per cent of all Americans in terms of income. The full amount of the raise would boost congressmen from \$42,500 a year to more than \$46,000. The total cost to the taxpayers would be \$52 million--this in a year when the federal budget deficit already is nearly \$100 billion.

When Congress failed to defeat its own pocket-filling measure, it blew its chances to set a good example of belt-tightening for the nation, but it handed President Ford a golden opportunity.

It gave him a chance to deliver a veto message that would drive home the point that while Congress talks a good game about easing the taxpayers' burden, it really is engaging in double-talk by handing itself an automatic "cost of living" wage increase.

Considering the public's low opinion of Congress right now, the President would have had most Americans agreeing with such a veto. But he signed the bill.

There are other ironies in Washington, too. In the last 20 years, Congress has increased its staff by 265 per cent and its budget by 681 per cent. The argument often is that expanded duties account for this "need." More to the point is the fact that senior senators, for example, can and do allocate all committee staff positions to themselves, thus building power and influence.

Instead of correcting this power concentration problem, the Senate recently gave itself an over-all staff increase, thus allowing junior members who aren't cut in on the committee staffing to hire an extra two employes for themselves.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 4

Not to be outdone, the House this spring gave its members additional funds to crank out "newsletters" as well as expanded travel and staff allowances.

What about that increased work load they talk about? The number of bills enacted in 1973 was exactly the same as it was 10 years before, but in those days Congress had one-third the staff and budget. It seems Parkinson's Law is alive and well on Capitol Hill.

Congressmen needn't worry too much about losing at the polls, either. One-half of those who weren't reelected in 1974 are now working in Washington as lobbyists, lawyers or appointed government officials. The Washington family takes care of its own.

-30-  
8/18/75  
pm

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

TO: Ron Nessen

FROM: Margita E. White  
Assistant Press Secretary  
to the President



THE RONALD REAGAN COLUMN  
(For Release In Papers Of Friday, Aug. 29 Or Thereafter)

By RONALD REAGAN

Copley News Service

Turn around an old U.S. history course maxim that "trade follows the flag" and you have a hint of the government's strategy for normalizing relations with Cuba.

Last week the State Department announced that Latin American subsidiaries of U.S. companies may now obtain licenses to sell to Cuba "in countries where local law or policy favors trade with Cuba." In effect, this means indirect trade in those Western Hemisphere nations which have begun trading with Cuba since the recent lifting of the OAS (Organization of American States) blanket ban.





The State Department took pains to minimize any diplomatic significance in the new policy. Since it is only one step removed from resumption of direct trade, however, one doesn't need much imagination to believe that a modest amount of indirect trade will make the American people so accustomed to the idea that full trade won't be far off.

Presidential Press Secretary Ron Nessen said of the move, "There is no advantage that we can see in a permanent antagonism between the United States and Cuba." Sen. George McGovern, D-S.D., who has been tub-thumping for normalization for months, said the U.S. sanctions against Cuban trade have been a "self-defeating mistake."

Others of the Washington establishment have been talking in the same vein.

What is missing is any official or even off-the-cuff declaration from our leaders that trade and diplomatic relations won't be resumed unless minimum U.S. requirements are met.

If such requirements have been established, no one is talking about them. In fact, the State Department keeps as low a profile as possible on the matter, not wanting to stir passions among Cuban ex-patriots in the United States or risk a barrage of criticism from conservatives.

The absence of any talk about the need for a quid pro quo in order to normalize relations with Cuba suggests either that the State Department is afraid to insist on one or is keeping secret its plans to get one. Critics of detente in State's misguided tiptoe diplomacy over the Panama Canal are fearful it's the former.

There is plenty of ground for quid pro quo negotiating with Castro. One item should be an agreement by Cuba to deny landing and refueling rights to Soviet aircraft. This last spring, Soviet warplanes refueled in Cuba during the worldwide Soviet naval maneuver "Okean 75." They then proceeded to make simulated attack runs off our East Coast.

Other U.S. objectives in quid pro quo bargaining could include denials by Cuba of naval base rights to the Soviets; reaffirmation of U.S. naval base rights at Guantanamo; compensation to Americans for property seized by Castro; free movement between the two nations; written guarantees by Castro that he won't attempt to export his revolutionary tactics to other Western Hemisphere nations; and restoration of human rights and freedoms in Cuba, including religious freedom.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 5

There hasn't been a single election in Castro's "paradise" since he came to power. That's a point worth talking about, too.

Recent conciliatory gestures by Castro, including the return of \$2 million ransom money he had impounded in connection with a U.S. airliner hijacking, indicates that he is ready to talk turkey with the United States. Since we can accomplish both humanitarian and national objectives in the process, it's time for the Washington establishment to lift its Cuban dialogue above the level of that advertising slogan, "Since we're neighbors, let's be friends."

-30-

8/25/75

jt

THE RONALD REAGAN COLUMN  
(For Release In Papers Of Friday, Sept. 5, Or Thereafter)

By RONALD REAGAN

Copley News Service

Earlier this summer, in a western state, a young man approached me and asked if I would sign the Declaration of Independence.

He handed me what looked like the center spread of a newspaper. On one half was a reproduction of the Declaration of Independence backed by spaces for signatures. I tore it off, signed it and handed it back to him. The other half was something else again.

It was an ad for something called Peoples' Bicentennial Commission.



Despite its mild name and easy confusion with the official American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, the PBC doesn't represent the people, isn't interested in celebrating the Bicentennial and is not a federal commission.

Instead, it is a self-appointed band of political radicals intent on twisting the nation's 200th birthday to its own purposes.

Its leader is a self-proclaimed Socialist revolutionary, Jeremy Riskin, whose understanding of American history is hazy but whose zeal is not.

He says, "It makes no sense for the New Left to allow defenders of the system the advantage of presenting themselves as true heirs and defenders of the American Revolutionary tradition.

"Instead, the revolutionary heritage must be used as a tactical weapon to isolate the existing institutions and those in power by constantly focusing public attention on their inability to translate our revolutionary dream into reality."

Riskin's idea of translating "revolutionary dream into reality" is to organize a crowd of about 20,000 demonstrators (many of them apparently fugitives from the anti-Vietnam War movement, looking for a new cause) and have them try to break up official Bicentennial events.

That's what they tried to do in April, heckling President Ford as he spoke at Concord Bridge in commemoration of "the shot heard round the world."

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 4

Never mind the fact that the American Revolution was a war of independence from foreign domination and not an ideological class war of the type Riskin supports, the PBC hasn't the slightest hesitation gulling government bureaucrats into giving it some of your tax money to support its radical rhetoric and activities.

Stating as its purpose, "to research, assemble and disseminate to workers and students historical information on the lives and roles of working people during the Revolutionary War period, with an emphasis on the ideas and events that shaped the formation of the early Republic," the PBC sought--and got--a grant of \$7,210 from the National Endowment for the Humanities. Once the federal dollar faucet was turned on, it didn't stop. Last year, the NEH approved a grant of \$394,000 for some of the PBC people to lecture throughout 13 western states.



The Ronald Reagan Column -- 5

Presumably, Riskin and his followers could have sold the NEH the Brooklyn Bridge if they'd wanted to, for, while submitting innocuous-sounding grant applications, Riskin was declaring to all who cared to pay attention that the PBC's real aim was to show that "...a genuine understanding of revolutionary ideals links Thomas Paine, Sam Adams and Benjamin Rush and the American people with Lenin, Mao, Che Guevara and the struggle of all oppressed people..."

So much for U.S. history.

-30-  
8/29/75  
pg

mailed 9/8

THE RONALD REAGAN COLUMN  
(For Release In Papers Of Friday, Sept. 12, Or Thereafter)

By RONALD REAGAN

Copley News Service

So angry are many U.S. senators over the State Department's tiptoe diplomacy toward Panama, that one of these days the Senate may pass the Byrd Amendment to cut off state's funds for negotiating away our rights to the Panama Canal.

Ever since Secretary of State Henry Kissinger signed a memorandum with his Panamanian counterpart in early 1974 agreeing to hand over the Panama Canal, congressional and public reaction has been mounting in intensity.

No wonder. The canal belongs to the United States.



The United States acquired sovereignty (not rental or lease) to the Canal Zone in perpetuity shortly after Panama seceded from Colombia in 1903. The Panamanians seceded because they wanted to participate in the benefits the canal would bring to their part of the world, and they identified future success with the United States, having watched the French fail at attempts to build a canal. Today, Panama has the highest standard of living in Central America.

In all, the United States has spent more than \$166 million in acquiring the Canal Zone. We pay Panama an annuity in lieu of payments for the Panama Railroad amounting to more than \$2 million a year.

The Panamanian government isn't about to kill the goose that laid the golden egg, as evidenced by a series of expensive, full-color, double-page ads in many U.S. magazines this summer, beckoning U.S. tourists to the Central American nation.

Panama's government won't (and can't) kill the goose, but they're banking on the State Department's timidity and a hazy view of history by Americans to lay title to all the goose's eggs in the Isthmus.

Memories are so short that relatively few Americans recall that the leftist propaganda coming out of Panama today, asserting "sovereignty" over the canal, hinting at sabotage and condemning the United States for "colonialism," is all coming from the same regime that overthrew an elected, pro-U.S. government just seven years ago.

The incubation of the present Marxist government goes back a long way. When the Communist Party of Panama was founded in 1930, its charter spelled out two key goals: 1. gain control of the government through the armed forces; 2. nationalize the Canal Zone via treaty negotiations.

Goal No. 1 was realized when, on Oct. 11, 1968, the armed forces (called the National Guard) overthrew the newly inaugurated government of President Arnulfo Arias. Arias, president twice before (and denied office a third time by apparent vote fraud), had been an outspoken critic of Soviet designs on the canal since his first election in 1940.

Slowly, over the years, a cadre of young, carefully indoctrinated Marxist military officers grew in size in the National Guard until it was strong enough to bring off the coup.

On seizing the government, they immediately disbanded the National Assembly, censored the press and suspended civil rights. There hasn't been an election since. Today, the government speaks not for the people of Panama, but for the guns of the National Guard.

So far, it has succeeded in intimidating our State Department. As columnist M. Stanton Evans commented recently, "The arguments used to justify this course of action (giveaway of the canal) are vintage Western guilt complex, familiar to students of our diplomacy."

In addition to Kissinger's memorandum (which, by the way, contradicts a 1907 U.S. Supreme Court decision reaffirming U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone), the Panamanian government has acquired from the so-called nonaligned nations group a resolution supporting its claim.

This spring it added a similar resolution from the Organization of American States. This fall it will seek one from the U.N. General Assembly.

Close observers of the Panama scene believe that, with or without this last document, strongman Omar Torrijos will make propaganda hay over these resolutions "legitimizing" his claims. He may move on the Canal Zone, not with guns firing, but by walking (possibly hand in hand with another Latin American head of state or two) into the zone and delivering a document announcing its "nationalization."

Should that happen, the United States would face some unhappy choices, for almost any response could be used as a pretext for well-coached rioters to go to work.

It can be prevented. Congress' balky mood over a new treaty can show stiff popular resistance to a giveaway.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 7

The government can go further with preventive steps by making it clear to Torrijos & Co. (well in advance) that it will not permit a "walk-in" or any attempt to forcefully take over the canal. Deny Torrijos entry at the gate and he's lost his propaganda advantage; let him stroll in and he's sitting in the cat-bird seat.

-30-

9/8/75

pg



THE RONALD REAGAN COLUMN  
(For Release In Papers of Friday, Sept. 19, Or Thereafter)

By RONALD REAGAN

Copley News Service

Having spent some of my boyhood and, later on, my college years in small towns in which it could be said you never were more than a few blocks from ploughed ground, I am aware of how important that ploughed earth is to our welfare. Indeed, our very existence.

Would you believe that it's possible our three million farmers, as well as countless other landowners, soon may discover they can't plough or cultivate their land or even have a garden patch without getting a federal permit? And I mean a federal permit every time they plough the same piece of land.



Strange things happen as legislation winds its way through the marble halls of government. Sometimes accidental changes in wording make an ordinary bill become a monstrous mutation. Sometimes the accidents are suspect of being accidental on purpose. Take a minor word change from "shall" to "may" and suddenly a legislator finds his law to make a government agency perform in a certain way has become a permissive measure in which the agency can do or not do what the law says.

Sen. Edmund Muskie authored the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. It was passed over President Nixon's veto. I doubt the lawmakers, who, like all of us, want clean water in our lakes and rivers, were aware of a slight change in wording until a court decision was handed down explaining what the bill really calls for.

Section 404 directs the Corps of Engineers to issue permits for the discharge of dredged or filled material in navigable waters. Underline that word "navigable." We all know it defines waters that are sizable enough to be used for interstate travel by barge, boat, etc.

In the legislative process, a bill passed out of the Senate undergoes changes when it gets to the House. Then, a conference committee of senators and congressmen iron out the differences in the two versions. In the case of Muskie's bill, the word "navigable" was dropped. The effect of that deletion is staggering. A federal court has ruled that the law now applies to all waters, even the tiniest trickle, and, therefore, the federal government has a greatly expanded authority over land use.

Now there have been increasing attempts in Washington to pass land planning bills that would give the federal government control over land use. The Department of Agriculture, in analyzing the law, says "dredged material" means any material in excess of a cubic yard. Now, ploughing one acre of ground to a depth of only one-half inch moves some 50 cubic yards of soil, so therefore, ploughing or cultivating is covered by Muskie's "clean water" bill.

The opportunity for mischief is enormous. The ecology lobby and the powerful Environmental Protection Agency are pressing for adoption of strict regulations which, even though they deny it is their intention, would still mean a farmer would have to get a permit every time he ploughed. Environmentalists have threatened that if they don't get the strict regulation they'll go to court.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 5

It takes about four months to process a permit. The Corps of Engineers has testified to the Senate Public Works Committee that the expansion of their duties will require an additional 5,000 federal agents in the field investigating farmers and even homeowners for possible violations. The bill to the taxpayers is estimated at another \$100 million.

All of this for the dropping of one nine-letter word. Accident? If so, why did the conferees in resubmitting the bill to both houses continue to speak of "navigable waters" even though the word "navigable" no longer was in the bill?

Maybe it's only a coincidence, but those of a liberal bent in Congress have been trying since 1970 to enact land-use legislation.

-30-  
9/15/75  
lm

THE RONALD REAGAN COLUMN  
(For Release In Papers Of Friday, Sept. 26, Or Thereafter)

By RONALD REAGAN

Copley News Service

Public figures acquire "images" which may accurately reflect what they say and do or may instead reflect the reaction to them by the news media. As tastes and issues change, some images may change, but others may stubbornly stay the same, even though they should change.

Take the images of two U.S. presidents, for example: Calvin Coolidge and Dwight Eisenhower.

Coolidge, the dry, unexciting New Englander, is more often than not remembered as a lackluster, almost laughable figure who just happened to occupy the White House for awhile.



The Ronald Reagan Column -- 2

Eisenhower, though remembered with affection and respect for his great military accomplishments, has the image, as president, of a genial golf player who didn't stir things up much and who--in the main--presided over a country that rode at anchor for eight years. The late John Kennedy, who followed him, actually campaigned on the slogan, "Get the country moving again."

Are these images true or false? Consider this:

H.L. Mencken said Cal Coolidge has been "weaned on a pickle." Was Coolidge a do-nothing president in one of those lulls in our nation's history? If so, we should have such lulls today.

There was better-than-full employment. Jobs were competing for workers. The cost of living went DOWN 2.3 per cent.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 3

The federal budget was actually reduced and some of the national debt accumulated in World War I was paid off.

During "Silent Cal's" presidency the number of automobiles owned by Americans tripled and a great new industry--radio--went from \$60 million in annual sales to \$842 million. They laughed when Calvin Coolidge said, "The business of America is business," but we had true peace and prosperity--those things we are promised so often, but given so seldom.

In the "Eisenhower years"--1952 to 1960--we were told an entire college generation was "apathetic" and had stagnated (perhaps because they didn't burn down the campus libraries). Yet, Ike ended a war in Korea that had killed tens of thousands of young Americans. For the rest of his eight years in office none were being shot at anywhere in the world.



Ike also halted--dead in its tracks--the advance of communism. And, Big Government didn't get any bigger. A citizen could go for an evening stroll in the park without getting bopped over the head. Wages went up steadily, but prices held. Steak was 85 cents a pound and a gallon of gas cost 29 cents. You could be well-dressed in a \$50 suit and a pair of \$9 shoes.

The workday and the workweek grew shorter and our taxes were reduced. Suddenly, more kids were going to college than ever before; more families were buying homes; never had our nation's wealth been so widely distributed; and we were so strong that no one in the world thought of challenging us.

You'll have to make up your own mind about the image versus the real man, but maybe we ought to go back and see what they did that we aren't doing today.

THE RONALD REAGAN COLUMN  
(For Release In Papers Of Friday Oct. 10 Or Thereafter)

By RONALD REAGAN

Copley News Service

Cuban Premier Fidel Castro is anxious to normalize trade and diplomatic relations with us, we are told, but he picked a funny way to prove it when he staged an international conference in Havana in September to promote the "liberation" of Puerto Rico from the United States.

Back in March, the World Peace Council, an organization controlled by the Soviet Union, called for a preliminary meeting of Marxist representatives in Cuba to discuss the matter of Puerto Rico.



The delegates to that meeting issued a call for the larger September gathering, all of which was designed to promote one Juan Mari Bras' tiny Puerto Rican Socialist Party.

The "call" was the usual Marxist harangue: "The people of the world must redouble their efforts to defeat in Puerto Rico the promoters of crime in Vietnam, Chile, Palestine and other places, so that the liberation of the Puerto Rican people will signify a new victory in the cause of freedom..."

It is always ironic to see representatives of the Soviet Union joining in denunciations of "imperialism" by the United States, since the USSR holds the world championship for imperialism.

All this led to the September "international conference on solidarity with Puerto Rico's independence" in Havana. Some 300 delegates attended, including a smattering of U.S. Communist Party functionaries.

The object of their affection, and of the superheated rhetoric that flowed from the three-day conference, is an "open" movement for Puerto Rican independence that is about as popular there as ants at a picnic. The issue of independence versus continuation of the commonwealth status of the island was put to a vote of its people just eight years ago. Out of more than 700,000 votes cast, fewer than 1 per cent voted for independence.

This, of course, hasn't deterred Mari Bras or the terrorists of the Fuerzas Armadas de Liberacion Nacional (FALN).

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 4

The FALN has claimed it bombed New York's historic Fraunces tavern last January. Five people died in that bombing. According to the FBI, the FALN leadership got its training in sabotage in Cuba. Sounds like the "old" Castro Cuba which routinely exported guerrilla warfare and violence all over the hemisphere.

The fine hand of the Soviet Union in all this mischief isn't hard to see. A Russian actually served as a vice chairman of the Havana conference, and the Soviets' puppet World Peace Council appears to have provided the over-all strategy for the propaganda service. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger took a properly dim view of the proceedings. He said the "meeting in Havana can only be considered by us as an unfriendly act."

Castro's best-known U.S. fan recently has been Sen. George McGovern. His wife, Eleanor, who visited Cuba with him a few months ago, said of the bearded dictator: "The most impressive thing about Fidel is his mind. The breadth, depth and width of his knowledge is enormous. Fidel knows the specifics of everything."

If that's so, perhaps he can grasp the idea that he can't have things both ways. He can't have normal trade and relations with the United States and, at the same time, be the Western distributor for Soviet Marxism. Indeed, if he wants the former, one of the points we must insist on is that he deny the Soviets base and landing rights on Cuba and that he guarantee in writing that he'll stop training guerrillas for revolutionary export around the Western Hemisphere.

THE RONALD REAGAN COLUMN

(For Release In Papers Of Friday, Oct. 17, Or Thereafter)

By RONALD REAGAN

Copley News Service

In the 1950s Russian physicist Andrei Sakharov was known as the "father" of the Soviet Union's hydrogen bomb. Today, he is known as the winner of the 1975 Nobel Peace Prize.

It's been a long, difficult and courageous road for the man who now ranks alongside Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn as a champion for human rights in the Soviet Union.

Solzhenitsyn was expelled from the USSR early last year, but Sakharov continues to speak out for amnesty for Soviet political prisoners with a courage which soon may earn him the same fate.



As early as 1958, Sakharov's misgivings about the awesome consequences of nuclear warfare led him to circulate "Samizdat" (literally, "self-publishing"), calling for a ban on nuclear testing.

If you read Solzhenitsyn's monumental "Gulag Archipelago," you know that a Soviet citizen does not do such things lightly, for it can easily lead to a 10-year sentence in a concentration camp, followed by years of exile.

Sakharov continued, however, and made a personal appeal to Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev in 1961. It was ignored. Five years later, he took a further step. He participated publicly in a one-minute vigil for human rights. He was fired from his high post in the Soviet nuclear program.



But the fact he wasn't arrested showed that the Kremlin was concerned that harsher reprisals against such an outspoken public figure might trigger even more protests against repression.

In 1968 his book, "Progress, Peace, Coexistence and Intellectual Freedom," was published in the West, but circulated only in "Samizdat" form inside the USSR.

Now, the Nobel Prize Committee has cited him for his "fearless effort in the cause of peace among mankind," for his warning "against the dangers connected with the bogus detente, based on wishful thinking and illusions," and for his fight "not only against the abuse of power and violations of human dignity in all its forms, but...for the ideal of a state founded on a principle of justice for all."

All that Sakharov stands for contradicts the Soviet system, with its denial of human rights, punishment for dissenters, intimidation and the use of fear.

Despite its love of propaganda as a weapon to advance the Marxist cause, the USSR has a clumsy track record in handling its most famous citizens who dissent. When Boris Pasternak won the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1958, the Soviets pressured him into turning it down, an act which simply underscored their heavy-handedness. Solzhenitsyn won it in 1970 but couldn't go to Oslo to receive it for fear of being unable to return home.

Following their expulsion of Solzhenitsyn last year, the Soviets launched a continuous propaganda barrage to discredit him. It has had the opposite effect.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 5

His own compelling testimony on Soviet repression and his profound moral stand about human freedom simply have been verified by the shrill propaganda.

The betting in Oslo is that Sakharov won't be allowed to pick up his prize, since the very awarding of it by the committee will appear to the thin-skinned Soviet regime to be a criticism of its repressive nature. And it is.

(Note: The courageous writings of Soviet dissenters in "Samizdat" form are collected and published in English several times a year by the Samizdat Bulletin, P.O. Box 6128, San Mateo, Calif. 94403. If you ever had any doubt about the way the Soviets treat their defenders, subscribe to this publication.)

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

TO: Ron Nessen

FROM: Margita E. White  
Assistant Press Secretary  
to the President

FYI



THE RONALD REAGAN COLUMN  
(For Release In Papers Of Friday, Oct. 17, Or Thereafter)

By RONALD REAGAN

Copley News Service

In the 1950s Russian physicist Andrei Sakharov was known as the "father" of the Soviet Union's hydrogen bomb. Today, he is known as the winner of the 1975 Nobel Peace Prize.

It's been a long, difficult and courageous road for the man who now ranks alongside Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn as a champion for human rights in the Soviet Union.

Solzhenitsyn was expelled from the USSR early last year, but Sakharov continues to speak out for amnesty for Soviet political prisoners with a courage which soon may earn him the same fate.



As early as 1958, Sakharov's misgivings about the awesome consequences of nuclear warfare led him to circulate "Samizdat" (literally, "self-publishing"), calling for a ban on nuclear testing.

If you read Solzhenitsyn's monumental "Gulag Archipelago," you know that a Soviet citizen does not do such things lightly, for it can easily lead to a 10-year sentence in a concentration camp, followed by years of exile.

Sakharov continued, however, and made a personal appeal to Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev in 1961. It was ignored. Five years later, he took a further step. He participated publicly in a one-minute vigil for human rights. He was fired from his high post in the Soviet nuclear program.

But the fact he wasn't arrested showed that the Kremlin was concerned that harsher reprisals against such an outspoken public figure might trigger even more protests against repression.

In 1968 his book, "Progress, Peace, Coexistence and Intellectual Freedom," was published in the West, but circulated only in "Samizdat" form inside the USSR.

Now, the Nobel Prize Committee has cited him for his "fearless effort in the cause of peace among mankind," for his warning "against the dangers connected with the bogus detente, based on wishful thinking and illusions," and for his fight "not only against the abuse of power and violations of human dignity in all its forms, but...for the ideal of a state founded on a principle of justice for all."

All that Sakharov stands for contradicts the Soviet system, with its denial of human rights, punishment for dissenters, intimidation and the use of fear.

Despite its love of propaganda as a weapon to advance the Marxist cause, the USSR has a clumsy track record in handling its most famous citizens who dissent. When Boris Pasternak won the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1958, the Soviets pressured him into turning it down, an act which simply underscored their heavy-handedness. Solzhenitsyn won it in 1970 but couldn't go to Oslo to receive it for fear of being unable to return home.

Following their expulsion of Solzhenitsyn last year, the Soviets launched a continuous propaganda barrage to discredit him. It has had the opposite effect.



The Ronald Reagan Column -- 5

His own compelling testimony on Soviet repression and his profound moral stand about human freedom simply have been verified by the shrill propaganda.

The betting in Oslo is that Sakharov won't be allowed to pick up his prize, since the very awarding of it by the committee will appear to the thin-skinned Soviet regime to be a criticism of its repressive nature. And it is.

(Note: The courageous writings of Soviet dissenters in "Samizdat" form are collected and published in English several times a year by the Samizdat Bulletin, P.O. Box 6128, San Mateo, Calif. 94403. If you ever had any doubt about the way the Soviets treat their defenders, subscribe to this publication.)

THE RONALD REAGAN COLUMN

(For Release In Papers Of Friday, Oct. 24, Or Thereafter)

By RONALD REAGAN

Copley News Service

New York's Gov. Hugh Carey has appealed to Congress to avoid "a national policy of punishment" toward the nation's largest city and to avert "an economic Pearl Harbor" that would be "the most costly mistake in the history of the nation."

There, in a nutshell, is New York's strategy for arm-twisting a \$5 billion bailout loan guarantee from Congress: shame them and scare them into it. After all, if you tell Congress often enough that bond default by New York will cause financial chaos in every other city (even though it's not true), maybe they'll believe it.



The Ronald Reagan Column -- 2

While it isn't quite true that all New Yorkers think the world ends at the banks of the Hudson, Carey's comments reflect New York parochialism and a notion that the rest of the nation considers New York City its crown jewel.

I have news for him. To large numbers of Americans across this now decentralized nation, New York symbolizes what's wrong: too-powerful union leaders and news media, timid elected officials, wild spending, mismanagement, dirty streets, pornography and a general decline in civility.

Tell an audience in Ohio or Texas (or almost anywhere else outside of New York) that you don't think the federal government should be in a rush to bail out New York, and they erupt with applause. Whether their reasons are fully justified or not is not the point. The point is they just plain don't like New York.

Most of New York's financial woes are its own fault. Politicians, constantly hustling votes from this or that group, promised more public jobs and services or more handouts than the city possibly could afford. For each group that successfully ground its ax at City Hall, a new one sprung up with its own demands. The politicians listened and spent more and, surprisingly, the bankers, who could have brought sanity to the situation by refusing to buy more bonds and extend credit long ago, simply went along with the madness.

Of course New York isn't 100 per cent responsible for its plight. The federal government's lusty appetite for more and more of the American people's income over the last four decades or so had something to do with it. The persistent myth that, somehow, federal dollars were free dollars helped this growth process in Washington.

Tincupmanship for the cities was one result.

Today, there is scarcely a big city mayor in America who hasn't been to Washington to rattle one for his town.

Federal growth has cramped nearly every city's ability to raise money. New York's city fathers simply ignored this reality and mortgaged more and more of the city's future. Now, the city is nearly bankrupt. The reality wasn't ignored by the many businesses which moved to other cities and towns or into the countryside. They took jobs with them, and the city's tax base began to shrink.

But, instead of trimming expenses, New York let its city budget swell larger and larger. Today, it's up to \$11 billion a year. With a population of seven million, it has a public work force of 400,000. The state of California, by contrast, has 21 million people and only 100,000 state employes.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 5

Once Congress samples opinions of its increasingly suburban-oriented constituents, it's likely New Yorkers will have to eat several courses of humble pie in order to get even limited federal help. Even then, it may come with so many strings attached that a generation may pass before any New York City politician gets up the nerve to tell his constituents that the moon is really made of green cheese.

-30-  
10/20/75  
jt

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

TO: Ron Nessen

FROM: Margita E. White  
Assistant Press Secretary  
to the President

FYI



THE RONALD REAGAN COLUMN

(For Release In Papers Of Friday, Nov. 7, Or Thereafter)

By RONALD REAGAN

Copley News Service

Everything from chicken manure to windmills is being touted as America's great energy hope. Most of the talk is just that. All the exotic energy sources put together won't provide more than a fraction of U.S. energy needs in the next several decades.

Solar power is the most talked about exotic source. It is being used today to heat a few buildings and swimming pools. Its advocates conjure up visions of heating the whole country with it. They ignore its limitations, which are great.

The sun's power is very diluted when it reaches us. It takes about 10 square feet to gather enough energy for a single kilowatt of power.





While a building's roof may be large enough to hold solar "collectors" for a nearby swimming pool, the size requirements for the collectors are staggering when you begin talking about power plants.

A nuclear power plant with a capacity of 1,000 megawatts needs a 25-acre site. A solar power plant with the same capacity would need 50 square miles of collectors, and to equal the nation's projected nuclear capacity by the mid-1980s (200,000 megawatts), you'd need an area larger than the state of New York to hold all the collectors!

Like other exotic energy sources, solar power has some useful limited applications, mostly in warm weather areas. In fact, any discussion of its merits and risks should include a calculation of the number of people in heavy winter areas who would fall off their roofs trying to scrape snow from their solar collectors.

Some power companies are considering limited efforts to extract methane gas from manure, but it would be hard to find a scientist who would bet that this "source" ever will amount to more than a small percentage of our needs.

Windmills are in the same category. They can be useful where strong winds prevail, but their cost per kilowatt is high and it's hard to imagine Americans covering their landscapes with them.

Harnessing the tides, though feasible, would provide for only a small amount of the nation's energy needs, even if a massive, expensive development program were undertaken.

Tapping the heat of the earth's core is many years away, although use of steam near the surface is today providing a small percentage of our energy.

While talks go on about "alternative sources" to fossil fuels, the United States has the largest proved reserve (not total reserve) of oil it's ever had--enough for 11 years' supply. On the continental shelf alone, there are an estimated 98 billion barrels of oil, plus natural gas. The bulk of it has been tied up, not by lack of technology but by bureaucratic red tape and the political maneuvering of so-called environmentalists.

Dr. P. Beckman, a quiet but plain-speaking University of Colorado professor who specializes in the study of energy, says this about solving our short-range needs:

"Use all the oil you can get till other sources come in." He's referring, of course, to domestic oil. Those "other sources" are coal and nuclear power.

But why not use conservation to combat energy scarcity?

Because politically inspired scarcity, which we've been wrestling with for two years, cannot be solved by legislated conservation, such as rationing and price controls. They only rearrange the problem.

The forces of a free marketplace are the best means of achieving conservation, Dr. Beckman observes.

"There is no rule that says you can't throw diamonds out the window, but people just don't do it," he says. "If gasoline costs more, people will conserve it and economize in other areas."

Coal, of which we have a huge reserve, may offer the best alternative to gasoline for powering our automobiles not too many years from now, if political roadblocks can be cleared away.

Pilot projects have shown that by drilling down into a coal field, exploding the coal and reducing it to rubble, injecting water and oxygen, you produce methane gas. Piped out, it can be refined into methanol, which can power an internal-combustion engine. Its heating value is only that of gasoline, so cars would need larger tanks, but this is outweighed by its potential abundance and the fact that it is nearly pollution-free. We could do away with costly gadgets such as catalytic converters, which replace one type of pollution with another.

The methanol-from-coal program suffers primarily from investment anemia at present.

The Ronald Reagan Column -- 7

And, should serious talks begin on developing such a fuel to replace gasoline, it probably would trigger a major campaign by the environmental extremists, who seem intent on reducing the mobility and freedom of choice of the workingman in order to recapture for themselves a bucolic past that never was.

-30-

11/3/75

mc