

*Testimony submitted. Not
scheduled to appear.*

Statement of: COL. CURTIS B. DALL, Chairman, Board of Policy, LIBERTY LOBBY
300 Independence Ave., S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003
202 - 546-5611

Submitted to: SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 7, RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE
REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION, Miami Beach, Fla.

August 11, 1972

This statement is submitted representing the views of LIBERTY LOBBY's 20,000 member Board of Policy, and on behalf of approximately a quarter of a million readers of our monthly legislative report, Liberty Letter. As many of you know, LIBERTY LOBBY is a non-partisan, action-oriented organization of concerned Americans which seeks to preserve and foster the traditional values of our constitutional system.

Since its founding in 1955, LIBERTY LOBBY, through votes of its Board of Policy and by means of its newsletter and various other publications, has articulated positions on virtually every significant public policy issue. This statement concentrates on six such issues--those which we believe are the most compelling of the many problems confronting the Nation at the present juncture, and which we are therefore convinced deserve particular attention in the platform of the Republican Party.

FOREIGN POLICY--A NEW APPROACH

First and foremost is the complex array of problems connected with the efforts of the U.S. to ensure its survival and protect its vital interests in the world of the 1970's. If anything is clear about the public mood in this summer of 1972, it is that our citizens have rarely before in our history been more confused and uncertain concerning America's role in world politics. There is widespread uncertainty not only about the proper course which the Nation ought to follow in the decade ahead, but about the very purpose of foreign policy itself. Given the record of America's involvement in international politics in the 20th century, this is hardly surprising: during the lifetime of at least some of us, the U.S. has twice engaged in global war, undertaken on two additional occasions major military efforts on the Asian mainland, and intervened with ground, air, or naval forces on literally scores of occasions in every corner of the globe. No one would argue that the U.S. today is more secure than when the process began, and public disillusionment with our diplomacy has grown apace.

But the confusion of our public, I believe, has roots deeper than a mere dissatisfaction with the apparently unsuccessful character of our foreign policy. More significant is the fact that the purposes of policy have long since ceased

to be articulated in terms which our people find convincing or relevant. Since 1917, in fact, the assumptions and principles of what Robert A. Taft used to call "utopian liberalism" have constituted the foundations of American diplomacy. At its core, utopian liberalism assumes that the purposes of foreign policy are essentially moral in nature. The most fundamental objective of American diplomacy in this view must be aiding the world in the American image: the entire globe can be influenced in accordance with the political values enshrined in our Constitution; all people everywhere should enjoy a fair standard of living; and we are obligated to do whatever is necessary to realize these goals.

For 55 years, with only a few intermittent gaps, we have attempted to do exactly that. Woodrow Wilson's crusade to "make the world safe for democracy"; Franklin Roosevelt's program that great power cooperation in an international organization might replace power politics; Lyndon Johnson's war to bring "one man, one vote" to Southeast Asia; dozens of military interventions and billions of dollars in foreign aid expenditures: all these and more indicate clearly the inadequacies of conceptualization and analysis which have inspired our diplomacy for most of this century.

We of LIBERTY LOBBY believe that the time has come to recast the foundations of American foreign policy--not in the ambiguous molds of "lowered profile" or "realistic internationalism," but in accordance with the realism of America's traditional policy of non-intervention. The time has come to recognize, forthrightly and explicitly, that America's political principles and values, whatever their foundation in ultimate truth and wisdom, are not necessarily attainable by all peoples and cultures. The time has come to recognize that not all nations of the world have the material or human resources necessary to support a modern economy or a standard of living comparable with our own. Most of all, the time has come to accept the limitations which reality imposes upon American policy: powerful though our military machine is from some perspectives, there is in fact little that we as a Nation can do to re-make the political and economic systems of other countries, and it is a tragic error to base our foreign policy on a contrary assumption.

LIBERTY LOBBY urges this Committee to recommend to the Republican National Convention a foreign policy plank which embodies something more than routine praise of the present Administration. We urge you vigorously to reassert the traditional goal of American diplomacy as defined by the Founding Fathers and the greatest statesmen who followed them: the purpose of foreign policy is nothing more nor less than the enhancement of our ability to survive, in a world

of competing nations, with our values and our way of life intact. This standard should also be the dominant criterion determining the particular policies we pursue: when we ought to employ our political and economic resources, when we ought to use military force, to whom we ought to extend assistance of various kinds.

Such a standard, we believe, will make possible a true re-examination of our foreign policy priorities, and stimulate coherent action based on contemporary realities. A few examples will illustrate the thrust of the strategy we favor. We believe, for example, that there are grounds for revising our policy toward the Castro regime in Cuba. Indeed, should the Russians proceed with the development of a ballistic missile submarine base on the island, in the process enhancing their capability to threaten the survival of the American strategic bomber force, an appropriate military response will be required. Similarly, it would be extremely dangerous, bordering on treason, if the Panama Canal fell under the control of a regime potentially hostile to American interests. No modification of the Canal treaty should be accepted if it abridges the right of the U.S. to maintain, utilize, or defend the Canal.

We also believe that it is time to review critically the need for a large U.S. troop contingent in Europe, given the now-evident ability of our NATO allies to assume the major share of the burden for their own defense. While LIBERTY LOBBY has not yet polled its Board of Policy on the issue of a U.S. troop withdrawal from Europe, we plan to do so shortly. In this connection, let me note that our doubts about the wisdom of maintaining U.S. forces in Europe at existing levels do not indicate that we perceive the Soviet threat as substantially diminished. On the contrary, we believe that both militarily and politically the Soviet challenge to American security has never been more dangerous. For this reason we have the deepest reservations about the SALT accords. We strongly urge a platform plank which will commit the Republican Party to proceed as rapidly as possible with the procurement of the newer strategic systems essential to the restoration of an adequate American deterrent force. In particular, work on the B-1 bomber should be substantially accelerated, so that it may be deployed before the end of this decade.

THE ENERGY CRISIS

Finally, LIBERTY LOBBY calls attention to an area which impinges on both domestic and foreign policy. I refer to the national energy crisis, and in particular to the end of the 3½-century era in which the U.S. has been self-sufficient in energy resources. Present oil consumption in the U.S. exceeds

14 million barrels a day, while domestic oil production stands at 9 million barrels a day. Imports from Latin America up to now have compensated for the deficiency, but these reserves are also drying up; hence it is estimated that by 1980 the U.S. will be looking to the Middle East for nearly 40% of its daily oil requirements. The natural gas picture is quite similar.

Such briefly-stated facts highlight the shortsightedness of both our foreign and domestic policies in this area. Our totally one-sided Middle East policy has alienated many of the nations upon which we will be dependent for oil supplies within a decade; at home, we have allowed a variety of factors to delay the development of nuclear power facilities on a scale sufficient to reduce our dependence on fossil fuels.

LIBERTY LOBBY therefore recommends a two-pronged approach to the energy problem. First, we urge that the Platform commit the next Administration to a policy of strict neutrality in the Mideast. Secondly, we urge the adoption of a plank stressing the need to commit substantial federal resources to the rapid development of advanced nuclear technology, especially the liquid-metal fast-breeder and fusion reactors, in order to make the U.S. self-sufficient in energy sources by 1990.

FORCED BUSING

I turn now to domestic policy proper. For citizens of the U.S., one of the most troublesome issues of the past three years has been that of compulsory busing of school children for the purpose of racial integration. LIBERTY LOBBY has consistently opposed massive compulsory busing of school children for any reason, believing it to be legally unsound and educationally pernicious. What was, in the 1950's and early 1960's, an effort to eliminate forced segregation of the races has been transformed, in the 1970's, into an intrusive, costly, and futile effort to regroup the school-age population of America by cumbersome transportation schemes.

Under compulsory busing programs, freedom is severely restricted, rather than enhanced: large numbers of children, black and white alike, are prevented from attending nearby schools in their own neighborhoods, and instead are compelled to travel long distances under inconvenient conditions, in order to implement an abstract formula calling for a specified racial balance. We see nothing whatever in the Constitution which dictates such programs.

Available evidence indicates, moreover, that such programs contribute little or nothing to the educational advancement of the underprivileged minorities which

they are in theory designed to serve. More than six years ago the Coleman Report pointed out that racial integration per se had no effect on achievement levels of minority students; it is only integration of socioeconomic groups which has a positive effect on the academic performance of lower strata students. Even then, according to the Report, the effects are quite limited.

A more recent study by the Harvard sociologist David Armor, published in the July 1972 issue of Public Interest, raises even more serious doubts concerning the educational wisdom of busing programs: after careful study of busing in five northern cities, Armor has discovered that black children bused to white suburban schools made "no significant gains" when compared with the other black children who stayed in inner-city schools. His research also confirmed previous findings that compulsory integration brought about by busing does not improve relations among school-age children of different races; on the contrary, it exacerbates them.

From the beginning LIBERTY LOBBY has opposed forced busing programs for integration purposes. To that end it sponsored the meeting at which ACTION NOW, a national organization coordinating opposition to compulsory busing schemes, was created. ACTION NOW has been providing legislative information and Congressional liaison in Washington for interested anti-busing groups for several months. It is also publishing a newsletter to keep participating groups informed of developments, and is working actively on behalf of H.J. Res. 620, which provides for a Constitutional Amendment forbidding all busing on the basis of race, color, or creed.

A variety of legislative approaches has been suggested to deal with the busing problem in ways that protect the legitimate rights of minority groups and at the same time advance the cause of quality education for children of all races. However, in a series of recent decisions at the federal district, appellate, and Supreme Court levels, most notably those dealing with the Detroit, San Francisco, Charlotte, and Richmond school systems, the old distinction between de facto and de jure segregation seems to have been obliterated. It is therefore extremely doubtful that the legislative approach will survive the court challenges certain to be utilized against it. The sole remaining method which seems adequate to deal with the problem is the Constitutional Amendment process.

Accordingly, LIBERTY LOBBY strongly urges the Republican Party to go on record now, in this platform, in support of an anti-busing Amendment to the Constitution, a measure which will end once and for all what has become a legal

and educational travesty.

THE FISCAL HORROR

I discuss now the fiscal status of the national government of the U.S. The relevant but discouraging fact is that the federal budget once again is substantially out of control--a conclusion reached by economists of every persuasion, from Paul Samuelson to Paul McCracken and Alan Greenspan. Herbert Stein, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, recently admitted that the \$23 billion deficit of the recently concluded fiscal year may be surpassed in FY 1973, for which a deficit of more than \$30 billion is projected. Stein's admission emphasizes that budget management has been one of the conspicuous failures of this Administration. For FY 1971, the President forecast a \$2 billion surplus and wound up with an incredible deficit of \$23 billion. A deficit of \$12 billion was originally forecast for FY 1972, but then it was revised upward to \$38.8 billion last January; fortunately, the latter forecast proved to be excessive by no less than \$15.8 billion, due to poor estimates of tax withholding revenues.

According to a recent analysis published by the Brookings Institution, even if no new federal programs are enacted during the next two years, and even if the economy expands to full employment--both of which developments are extremely improbable--federal government spending will increase more rapidly than revenues by an estimated \$17 billion. Amazingly enough, the Brookings analysts also concluded that even if money were available for new programs for pollution control, mass transit, poverty alleviation, urban renewal, and the like, the federal government does not know how to spend it effectively: much past spending, they assert, has done more harm than good.

It is heartening to observe that the economists of the intellectual establishment are beginning to think cogently about public policy at the federal level. For far too long it has been an accepted dogma among our academics that for every problem which besets our Nation, there is a single appropriate solution: create a new branch of the federal bureaucracy, and spend a few more billions of the taxpayers' money. Incredibly enough, despite the sums of money which have been poured into domestic programs in recent years, we continue to be inundated with rhetoric about the "swollen" defense budget and the "strained" social services budget. The facts show, on the contrary, that spending for social programs tripled during the 1960's and that defense now consumes less than 30% of the federal budget, a drop of 15% in less than four years. We are spending far too much, not too little, on social service programs.

It is quite clear that the U.S. has rapidly approached a fiscal crossroads.

If another massive round of inflation, perhaps to be succeeded by national financial collapse, is to be avoided, we need a massive cut in federal spending or a substantial tax increase.

The members of this committee will not be surprised to learn that LIBERTY LOBBY opts strongly for the first alternative. Taxes at all levels of government now amount to 32% of the GNP, and the individual tax burden of Americans has nearly doubled since 1960. Forty-four cents of every dollar earned by the average American is devoured by taxes, and tax revenues for government during the past five years have grown $1\frac{1}{2}$ times as fast as the expansion of our economic base. There is little reason to believe that another round of tax increases would be accepted supinely by our citizens; on the contrary, there is evidence that a tax revolt of major proportions may be building up at the grass roots level all over the U.S. Through the National TaxAction movement, LIBERTY LOBBY has for a number of years both observed and encouraged resistance among Americans to soaring tax rates. We were not surprised, therefore, when a Harris Poll showed that 70% of the Nation's taxpayers would sympathize with a people's tax strike should that action materialize.

LIBERTY LOBBY recommends a four-pronged assault on the national fiscal problem. First, we believe that the Republican Platform should commit the next Administration to work for a total moratorium on all new federal spending programs as well as to aim at a flat \$225 billion ceiling on federal spending for a three-year period, in order to bring the federal budget into balance under full employment conditions. Secondly, the Platform should urge Congress to create a Special Joint Committee on Public Policy, whose purpose it would be to examine all existing programs in the domestic area and recommend the abolition over time of those which have ceased to produce meaningful results. We believe the number of those falling into this category will prove to be legion indeed.

TAX EQUITY

Finally, LIBERTY LOBBY once again urges the Republican Party to commit itself to a program of real tax reform, based on the ancient common law principle of equity. Real tax reform, in our view, would first of all be based on the elimination of all tax loopholes, including and especially those which permit many individuals and organizations either to pay no tax on income whatever, or to pay at a rate substantially lower than that of the average American. LIBERTY LOBBY believes that all income, all estates, all business revenue (including capital gains), regardless of the receiver, should be subject to equitable taxation without loopholes or allowances.

Secondly, LIBERTY LOBBY believes that real tax reform should result in substantial increases in the present individual exemption to a level sufficient to maintain a decent standard of living. Putting the matter positively, tax reform should include substantial tax reduction for the average American by making immune from taxation sufficient income to enable him to live comfortably. Such a sum could be \$8,000 for an individual and \$10,000 for the head of a household, with an additional \$1,000 exemption for each dependent child, without any lower total tax "take" provided that tax favoritism were completely eliminated. Beyond these levels, all income should be taxed at the following rates:

- (a) 20% on any portion of taxable income below \$15,000
- (b) 25% on taxable income between \$15,000 and \$50,000
- (c) 50% on taxable income exceeding \$50,000.

Such a program of taxation would vastly simplify our incredibly complex revenue laws. Moreover, studies indicate that LIBERTY LOBBY's proposed tax reforms would actually increase rather than decrease federal revenues, contrary to frequent charges. We urge the Republican Party to commit itself thoroughly to tax simplification and tax reform in its 1972 platform.

GUN CONTROL

One additional issue we believe deserves special attention in the Republican Platform: gun control. It is unnecessary once again to present the evidence indicating that there is little or no connection between crime and the possession of firearms by our citizens. The National Shooting Sports Foundation, Inc., has published three statistical studies which, as a whole, refute the basic assumption of the proponents of gun registration. Alan S. Krug, author of the studies, summarized the results this way:

What this means in practical terms is that if firearms were to be completely eliminated from society (granted, an impossibility), and no criminal substituted any other type of weapon for a firearm, the U.S. would still have 96.6% of its serious crime, and 99.6% of its total crime.

Moreover, there is no evidence that death through firearms is increasing. On the contrary, not only was the total number of homicides by use of firearms and explosives 40% lower in 1971 than 1931, but the number of accidental deaths resulting from the use of firearms in 1971 was lower than from falls, fire, or drowning, and only slightly higher than that caused by industrial accidents and poisoning.

The fact is that registration of guns will have little or no effect on the ability of criminals to acquire or use firearms, and only the most marginal

impact on the ability of law-enforcement officials to apprehend individuals after a crime has been committed. Critical constitutional questions can be raised about any legislation which restricts the right of our people to possess firearms; more practically, in a society characterized by growing disorder, it would seem extremely anomalous to restrict the right and ability of our citizens to defend themselves. The way to reach the criminal who uses firearms in breaking the law is to provide for a mandatory sentence of specified length for anyone utilizing a lethal weapon in the commission of a crime. Former Sen. Wayne Morse of Oregon, who in the course of a long career was both Republican and Democrat, summed up the case against gun registration rather well in a 1968 speech on the floor of the Senate:

I have come to the conclusion that the Federal gun control legislation before us is unsound constitutionally. It is unsound as a matter of public policy. It is unsound because it invades important rights of individual privacy. It is unsound because it will not produce the reduction of crime claimed for it by the proponents. It is unsound because it proposes to extend Federal police powers over important phases of the administration of criminal justice which should be left to the states.

LIBERTY LOBBY strongly urges the rejection of any proposed gun registration or gun confiscation plank in the 1972 Republican platform.

These are merely some of the many significant national issues in which LIBERTY LOBBY has expressed interest and on which the 1972 Presidential campaign will be waged. We single them out for emphasis only, and urge this Committee generally in its deliberations on all issues to heed the advice of John Adams:

There can be no just society unless policy in all its aspects shows due regard for liberty and personal dignity of each and every citizen.

Thank you for this opportunity to present our views.

###