

Losing Our Freedom by Installments

President Ronald W. Reagan

At first glance I'm sure some of you will question the pertinence of drawing a parallel between the great problems besetting the world today and a jurisdictional dispute involving a handful of workers (no more than 26,000) in the Motion Picture industry more than a decade ago. Yet the parallel is there, like a scale model of the real thing.

On the surface two unions claimed the right to a type of work known as "set erecting." Some 43 Unions and Guilds chose up sides in the foolishness of a jurisdictional strike. Ugly violence flared, cars were overturned, homes bombed, men maimed and injured.

The Actors' Guild elected to honor its basic contract and dare the massed pickets—many of whom were supplied by Harry Bridges. Daily the little glamorous starlets and the heroes and bad men of fiction rode through the lines, kneeling on the floors of police-escorted busses to escape the flying rocks. All of this took place in the most publicized spot on earth and yet today right in Hollywood among these same picture workers there is great confusion. Some of those who risked the dangers I've described aren't sure today that they did the right thing—certainly they have little understanding of what the issues were. This is the classic pattern of communist conspiracy. For this was a story of deliberate communist infiltration.

Hard-core party organizers had created cells in many of our Guilds and Unions in a move to get economic control of the picture industry and subvert our screens to the dissemination of communist propaganda. According to sworn testimony, the immediate goal of the strike was the replacement of our many Guilds and Unions by one huge union under the charter of Harry Bridges' International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union.

Agree on Problem

Today all of us are convinced that the No. 1 problem in the world is the dispute between the free world and Soviet slavery. Here too the situation has been highly publicized and yet the American people are confused, disturbed by a frustrating sense of failure, a desire for action but at the same time a concern that action might result in war.

The enemy is not confused—to him the course is very clear—he knows he is in a war now. This conflict was declared more than a century ago by Karl Marx. Half a century later Nicolai Lenin [Vladimir Ilyich Ulianov], the interpreter of Marx, made of this phony philosophy a Godless religion, with himself as the Messiah. He reaffirmed that declaration of war by stating it was inconceivable that Communism and Capitalism should exit for a long period side by side in the world, and that ultimately one or the other must conquer. Carefully and painstakingly, but openly, they put into print their plans for our destruction. All of it including the timetable, is available and as near as our public library.

With the most arrogant cynicism they say that our ignorance of their tactics and strategy, their aims and objectives is Communism's greatest weapon. In 1923, Lenin announced that Communism would take Eastern Europe, organize the hoards [sic] of Asia and then surround that last bastion of Capitalism, the United States, without even having had to take it. In Lenin's own words, the United States would fall into his outstretched hand like overripe fruit. As we look at the beachhead 90 miles our Florida coast we know how far they've progressed with that plan.

Last November the Communist Parties of 81 countries, meeting in Moscow, pledged anew the destruction of our way of life and the building of a world socialist state on the ruins. They called on Communists all over the world to perform acts of treason against their own governments.

Over and over again the communists have assured us that everything they say or do has the single purpose of our defeat. Everything is a weapon from [ballot] to bullets.

Predict Voluntary Surrender

Carefully, with great calculation, the communists gauge their aggression—slicing each new gain just thin enough so that we'll say, "That isn't worth fighting for." They predict that when we reach the final slice our surrender will be voluntary because we will have been weakened from within—morally, spiritually, and economically.

They have harnessed the fear of war instead of war itself—knowing that surrender at the conference table can be just as complete as surrender on the battlefield. Indeed, they probably have no intention of testing our armed might. They know, even if we don't, that ours is the greatest military power in all the world. You and I, and all free men everywhere, owe our freedom to the determination and dedication of our men in uniform who stand as the only barrier to world slavery. For this reason the communists have chosen to go around this deterrent to their unholy aims and erode the ramparts of freedom from within.

Mr. Khrushchev has said that Capitalism will inevitably evolve into Communism, but not all at once. He says there will first come an intermediate stage of socialism. Supremely confident of victory, the communists say we will give up more and more of our democratic practices under the pressure of the cold war until one day we'll waken to find we have become so much like the enemy that the reasons for enmity will have disappeared.

Are We Fighting Communism?

Well, haven't we been trying to fight communists without really fighting communism? There is a liberal philosophy that seems to think of communism as simply an extension of extreme liberalism and that Soviet police state brutality

is not an integral part of communism but is rather an error superimposed on the political system. Those motivated by this so-called liberal philosophy believe the solution to the cold war is to refrain from any overt act that would anger the men in the Kremlin, while our own system is reshaped into a government controlled and directed economy. As we move left, the roughnecks in the Kremlin, ashamed of their ways, will supposedly come a little right and the conflict will dissolve into one-world Utopia.

The liberal campaigns for more and more participation by the Federal Government in areas heretofore the province of the state, community and individual. The only common denominator needed to win their support of any legislation is the extent to which it will increase the power and authority of the central government.

It would be immoral and the height of folly to infer these people are less patriotic than ourselves. They are sincerely motivated by the most humanitarian of ideals, but it would be equally foolish to let them have their way without opposition. If someone is setting fire to the house, it doesn't really matter if he is a deliberate arsonist or just a fool playing with matches, the damage will be the same.

We can lose our freedom all at once by succumbing to Russian aggression, or we can lose it gradually by installments—the end result is slavery. A well-known professor has stated that the political argument for the welfare state is that the welfare state is the best insurance against revolution. This just isn't true. Our defense against communism is individual freedom and our free economy.

Compulsory Systems Menace Rights

This fight isn't new. In 1917 one of the truly great labor statesmen, Samuel Gompers, founder of the A.F.L. said, "Compulsory social insurance is in its essence undemocratic and it cannot remove or prevent poverty. The worker of America adheres to voluntary institutions in preference to compulsory systems, which are held to be not only impracticable, but a menace to their rights, welfare and their liberty. Compulsory sickness insurance for workers is based upon the theory that they are unable to look after their own interests and the state must interpose its authority and wisdom and assume the relation of parent or guardian."

Under high flown phrases "freedom from want," "human rights," etc., we see the Federal Government laying its hand on housing, health, farming, industry and education.

An illustration of this is the legislative battle that has raged over federal aid to education. Knowing the normal desire of all of us to provide the utmost for our children, we have been told that an adequate educational program is impossible unless we turn to the Federal Government for subsidy. An emergency situation is described involving crowded classrooms, teachers who are underpaid and too few in number. In the face of this we learn that 99½ per cent of our school districts have not reached their limit of bonded indebtedness. The construction of classrooms has been increasing at a faster rate than that of student enrollment in the past decade. A 41 percent increase in student enrollment from 1950 to 1960 has been matched by a 125 percent increase in spending at the state and local levels over the same period. According to the education lobby, 60,000 classrooms must be constructed every year for the

next 10 years if every child is to have the opportunity of a full-day education in an adequate classroom. These people seem to have forgotten to mention the fact that we have been building an average of 70,000 classrooms a year for the last five years. A continuation of this rate, according to some informed sources, may give us a surplus of classrooms by 1970 and it is more probable that sometime in the 1960s school construction will start to decline. Nor do they tell us that it has been estimated that the post-war baby boom has been passed and that in the immediate years ahead the increase in the rate of enrollment is expected to decrease.

Progress without Federal Aid

Teachers have been, and I'm sure are, underpaid, but we are making progress without Federal aid. In these first several years the average salary of teachers has risen from \$3,110 to \$5,200 a year for generally nine months of work. Little evidence has been introduced which indicates a need exists for Federal aid. The professional educationalist's lobby (one of the biggest spenders in Washington) denies Federal control plays any part in their plans, but in truth, a Federal school system is the entire basis for the school aid plan. The foot in the door was the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Mr. Graham Barden, the former chairman of the House Education & Labor Committee, reportedly said that the purpose of the 2 ½ billion dollar Federal aid bill was to centralize power over the school system in Washington so that it would be easier to apply concentrated pressure.

Twenty-seven years ago the government assured the farmer that subsidy didn't mean control. Then a farmer named Haley discovered he could be fined \$4,000 for raising wheat on his own land and feeding it to his own cattle. The fine was upheld by the Supreme Court with a single sentence ruling that said, in effect, that an agency of the Federal Government has the right to tell a citizen what he can grow on his own land for his own use. Thus the Court practically cancelled out the 4th Amendment to the Constitution—our protection against search and seizure. If Federal farm agents think a farmer is violating a regulation—not a law mind you, but a regulation of a bureau—they can pronounce the farmer guilty and impose a fine without even a formal hearing, let alone a trial by jury. If the fine is not paid, they can seize property (farm machinery, etc.).

Farm Program Inconsistent

The farm program's reason for being is the control of overproduction. Billions are spent to store surplus farm products, and additional billions are spent to reclaim desert land and put it into production. The government will pay you not to plant and it will also pay you to fertilize your land so as to increase the crop yield.

For three years, six agencies have loaned upwards of \$35 million to help poultry raisers increase egg production, while a seventh agency spent \$12 million to buy up surplus eggs.

One man buys a 7,000 acre ranch for nothing down and \$13,000 a year for 10 years. He arranges in advance for soil bank payments on the land of \$27,000 a year, so will wind up with the ranch and \$140,000 at the taxpayers' expense.

In New Mexico citizens learned they could rent state-owned land for 25 cents an acre and immediately apply for

and receive \$9 an acre in soil bank payments for not planting that land.

You and I approve of \$46 billion to be spent to defend us against Soviet aggression, but the communists in Poland and Yugoslavia could buy American wheat for 55 cents to 60 cents a bushel less than an American could. The responsible agency said, they thought it was consistent with National Policy.

All of this "farm mess" involves only 1/5th of agriculture—80 percent of the farm economy is still out in the free market regulated only by the laws of supply and demand. Common sense would indicate the answer should be to get that subsidized 20 percent out into the same free market; indeed responsible farm groups have so advocated. Government has a different answer. To the bureaucrats the only solution was to bring the other 80 percent into the government program. Congress was presented with a bill that could have resulted in the licensing of every farm in America, the complete control of production and price, and artificial shortages to bring about a 15 to 25 percent raise in the price of foodstuffs.

Medical Care for Aged

Medicine is an area dear to the heart of the statist. Government participation can be so easily justified on humanitarian grounds. No one wants to appear unsympathetic to those in need of medical care.

During the 86th Congress, former Congressman Forand introduced a bill, HR 4700, to provide a National program of government health insurance. His bill was overwhelmingly rejected. Now a re-write of that bill, limiting the benefits to citizens of Social Security age, is introduced. Proponents of the measure present an emotional appeal describing the plight of millions of senior citizens, ailing and without the means to provide adequate care. To oppose this measure is to be accused of throwing our elder citizens out to die. But, what are the facts?

In the last ten years, 127 million Americans have acquired some form of medical or hospital insurance. Seventy percent (70%) of our people are so protected, including 2/3rds of our senior citizens. At the present rate of increase, it is estimated that 90 percent of the population will be covered by 1970.

As nearly as we can determine, the problem involves less than 10 percent of the elderly who would not be able to finance needed medical care. To this end, the 86th Congress adopted the Kerr-Mills bill to provide Federal funds to the states. Without waiting for this to be put into effect, the advocates of the insurance measure claim the only answer to the problem is compulsory government health insurance for all, regardless of need. Never mind if the individual is already insured, has an ample income or possesses great wealth. Perhaps there is a clue to their true purpose in remarks made by now Ex-Congressman Forand who has said that if we could only break through and get our foot inside the door, then we could expand the program after that. Like an echo comes a pamphlet from the Socialist party entitled, "The Case for Socialized Medicine." It says "we can do everything possible to encourage Federal intervention, the financing of medical costs on a bit by bit basis, and we can work to direct such intervention, so that if it isn't socialized medicine proper, at least it paves the way for socialized medicine." It would be

well for us to keep in mind that if you socialize the doctor, you can socialize the patients as well.

Social Security Tax

The flagship of the liberal cause is Social Security. It is offered as the proven vehicle for the medical insurance program. We are told that here is a government insurance program in which we and our employers pay into a fund so that someday in our non-earning years we will call on this, our own money, to see us through. Of course this isn't what officials of Social Security told the Supreme Court in a recent lawsuit. They said Social Security wasn't actually insurance—but they used that term to sell it to the people. Social Security dues are a tax for the general use of the government and payment of that tax does not automatically entitle anyone to the receipt of benefits. The benefits are a welfare program which can be cancelled or curtailed by Congress at any time.

In 1935 that tax was 2 percent of \$3000 of income. Today it is 6 percent of \$4800. If this medical aid bill is passed, the individual and employers' combined contribution will, by 1968, increase from \$288.00 to \$444.00. This is based on a ceiling of \$5200 of income, but the Secretary of Health Education and Welfare recently told a congressional committee that he foresees a ceiling of perhaps \$9000 on the amount taxed for Social Security. There are others who oppose any ceiling—who say the tax should be levied against total income.

In this insurance program that is not insurance, we who are participating are unfunded to an amount more than \$300 billion. In a proposal to make Social Security voluntary, Congressman Rousselot has pointed out that the young man 20 or 21 years of age, starting out at an average salary, must, with his employer, contribute \$1.69 for every dollar he'll receive in benefits.

'Temporary' Foreign Aid

Turning from domestic welfare to the international scene, we find the same pattern of getting a "foot in the door" then freezing into permanence the temporary expedient. In the days following World War II, Senator Arthur Vandenberg gave his bi-partisan blessing to foreign aid with these words, "We are not suddenly resolved to underwrite the earth. That would be fantastic, improvident and impossible. The plan is for 15 months." It is now 15 years and more than \$100 billion later. The original 19 countries to be helped have become 97. Let's ignore the temptation to talk about items such as the road in South Viet Nam which we started to build for \$18 million and which isn't finished yet, at \$125 million.

All such things we could swallow if free world strength, solidarity and friendship had resulted. We spent more per capita in Laos than in any other country. Cuba is on the book for \$2½ billion. In these 15 years, Communism has, in addition, absorbed China, North Viet Nam, and Tibet. Inroads have been made in Indonesia, Iran, and Syria. They've tightened their grip on East Germany, Poland and Hungary. We've financed socialism in India, where the Communist Party has grown from 4 to 12 million in 5 years. In Bolivia part of our money was used to nationalize the tin mines, which reduced their output to 50 percent. Thanks in part to Yankee dollars, the cost of living in Bolivia rose over 250 percent in 1958

alone. Last year the Bolivians staged the worst anti-American riots in South American history. Creating bureaucracy here and in the receiving nations we have in effect exported Socialism under the utopian ideal of world democracy and social revolution.

We talk private enterprise at home, while we finance nationalization of industry all over the world. But that shouldn't surprise us.

Government in Business

In May 1960 during testimony before the Senate Small Business Subcommittee on Relations of Business with Government, Elmer B. Staats, Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget, said that as of July 31, 1959, the government owned and operated 17,507 businesses. A Subcommittee of the Hoover Commission found that as of the end of 1954, the Department of Defense alone was actively engaged in activities covering 47 categories ranging from coffee roasting to manufacturing surgical and dental equipment. Operating these businesses in most instances, tax free, rent free, dividend free, in competition with our own citizens, the government loses billions of dollars each year.

The Depressed Areas bill enacted into law on May 1st of 1961 has put government's foot in the door of direct control of job training and placement, including subsidy and relocation of industries and at the same time has created the biggest potential pork barrel of all time.

We subsidized public housing originally so that no one should be forced to live in degradation. Now people of better than average income are declared eligible for such a subsidy and the Chicago Public Housing Authority announces a plan to add swimming pools, and recreation facilities, including professional recreation directors.

These are just a few of the things that have led to the creation of a permanent structure of government so complex it is virtually beyond Congressional control, and certainly is self-perpetuating. Congressman Utt has suggested that we are rapidly coming to a point where a complete change of elected officials, including Congress and the White House, can mean little change in policy. We are governed more and more by people for whom we have never voted—for whom we never will vote, and whom we cannot recall by our vote. Even at Cabinet level, much of the policy is set by Civil Service employees who have been with the department for 20 years. They have no intention now or ever of recommending to the Secretary any policy which does not fit their personal philosophy of government. This is a form of invisible government and can lead to the most oppressive type of tyranny.

Bureaucracy One-Way Street

Two years ago a sub-committee of Congress reported there were almost 2½ million Federal employees. In 1942 there was one top salaried executive for every 89 employees. Now there is one for every 17. The committee reported it found little evidence that any bureau, agency or department created in answer to an emergency every went out of existence, even after the emergency disappeared.

This shouldn't have been too big a surprise to the Congressmen. Congress abolished the Reconstruction

Finance Corporation in 1957, but it has spent over \$1 million since then. The current budget contains an item of \$65,000 for administrative expenses. The Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation formed in January 1934 has made no loans since the Depression. The authority of the Commissioner expired in 1947—since 1950, running expenses have amounted to \$4 million. Congress ordered the immediate liquidation of the Spruce Products Corporation in 1920. In 1930, they tried again. In 1947, it was still in business. In 1948 they found an answer—they cut off its appropriation. This was the agency created in World War I to find spruce wood for airplane fuselages.

Some people have claimed justification for all of this on the basis that government, through its central power, can be more efficient than local communities, or even individuals. Exactly the opposite is true. A short time ago, when Congress was asked to provide Federal funds to extend the unemployment benefits because of a recession, they were told that the non-industrial states with no unemployment burden such as Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas and Missouri should contribute to help hard-pressed industrial states like New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Ohio and Illinois. Three weeks later the school aid bill was presented and Congress was told the populous, well-to-do states like New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Ohio and Illinois should contribute to help the less prosperous states of Alabama, Mississippi, Missouri, and Arkansas.

All of this vast government complex has been created by a tax system which refuses to recognize any limitation on its right to confiscate the earnings of its citizens.

Unprecedented Tax Burden

No nation in history has survived a tax burden that reached a third of the National Income. Today the tax collectors take 33 cents out of every dollar earned and of that 33 cents, 23 cents goes to the Federal Government, leaving 10 cents for the State, County, and local community. Is it no wonder we turn to the Federal Government for aid, but wouldn't it make more sense to leave that money in the local community to begin with instead of running it through that puzzle palace on the Potomac, only to have it returned minus a carrying charge?

Early in our history we were warned that the farther the spending was removed from the source of taxation, the less restraint there would be in its spending. Today, shocking figures prove the truth of this. When you contribute to your local charities, you must give \$1.10 for every dollar that is to be spent in good works. County welfare sees an increase in this overhead to where \$1.23 must be raised for every dollar actually spent on welfare. At the state level it takes \$1.49 and the Federal Government must raise \$2.10 for every dollar it will spend on the recipients of Federal welfare—a \$1.10 overhead for each \$1.00.

To meet this overhead, we are burdened by hundreds of hidden and indirect taxes, accounting for 1/3 of our phone bill, ¼ of the price of a new car, ½ of the gas and oil we use. More than a hundred make up half the price of a loaf of bread.

Income Tax Grown Tenfold

All of these pale into insignificance besides the enormity of the graduated income tax. It too follows the pattern of

a modest beginning. It began as a 2 percent levy and that on only the top incomes. In the lifetime of most of us, this simple 31-word law has grown to more than 440,000 words. It begins at 20 percent and has its steepest rate of increase through the middle income brackets, where are to be found the bulk of our small businessmen, professional people and skilled craftsmen. At \$16,000 a man begins giving the government half of the dollar he can earn and from there it goes up to the confiscatory 91 percent. There is no moral right in a government taking anywhere from half to 9/10th of the dollar a man can earn by his own ability. Beyond that is the fact the government cannot justify such confiscation on the basis of real need. The government's total grab from all the 50 percent to 91 percent brackets is less than 3/4ths of the \$1 billion.

Because of our willingness to accept the idea that those best able to pay should lighten the burden of those with lesser earnings, we have adopted as proportionate taxation this progressive system spawned by Karl Marx and declared by him to be the prime essential for a socialist state—the method prescribed for taxing the middle class out of existence. For an illustration of the difference between the proportionate and progressive tax, we can look to the Bible. There tithing is explained as the economic basis of our Judaic-Christian religions. The Lord says you shall contribute one-tenth and He says, "If I prosper you 10 times as much you will give 10 times as much." That is proportionate—but look what happens today when you start computing Caesar's share. A man of average income suddenly prospered ten times as much would find his personal income tax increased 43 times.

Even with our graduated tax we really haven't helped the so-called little man. Today a man with a wife and two children and a gross income of \$4000 a year will find the hidden and direct taxes at the end of the year have taken \$1059 of that \$4000 income. Some people have suggested the answer to the problem is a still higher rate on those of better income but the economic planners have already destroyed that source. If the government confiscated all taxable income above \$10,000 a year after exemption and deductions the increased revenue wouldn't pay the interest on the National Debt.

Non-Defense Spending Grows

Defense is given as justification for the tremendous increase in the Federal budget and yet since 1953 (the end of the Korean War) until this past year, defense spending has only increased 1 percent, while non-defense Federal spending has increased 63 percent.

We are told by some Congressmen that spending programs are forced on them by pressure groups. Two years ago I was a member of a pressure group. I appeared before the House Ways & Means Committee to present the demand of thirty-three unions and the management of the Motion Picture Industry for a tax reform program. In a month of unprecedented hearings, every segment of the national economy was represented before that committee and every representative demanded tax reform. Eighty-five percent of those testifying asked the committee to bring forth one particular bill which three years later is still buried in the committee. It would seem pressure groups are irresistible

only if they favor spending.

Several months later they held additional hearings, but this time no volunteers. A group of hand-picked Campus Economists appeared before the committee and spoke only of the government's need for more revenue, not less. Their idea of tax reform involved rate reductions to make it "more palatable," but called for an end to deducting real estate tax before computing income tax. Interest on home mortgages should not be deductible, nor should contributions to educational groups at 100 percent. Capital gains should be taxed as straight income. Government should use the tax as a police power to determine what constitutes necessary business advertising and expense. Most of the legitimate deductions, without which the programs would have long since been proven unworkable, were called loopholes. A man, now Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in charge of tax policy, saves by owning his own home and then paying income tax on that amount.

All told, these economists were sure their program would get the government \$18 billion a year more in revenue, and they just happen to be standing by with \$18 billion worth of welfare programs they want the government to adopt.

Taxation Shield for Social Legislation

The big spenders reject "the idea" that the least government is the best government. According to them, you and I are not smart enough to spend our own money. Government should take it from us through taxation and buy for us the welfare programs we are too stupid to buy for ourselves. Their high ideals cannot excuse the fact that it is dishonest to seek social legislation under the guise of taxation. If we are to adopt Socialism, then let it be presented to the people as Socialism.

Thomas Jefferson placed economy among the first and most important virtues and considered public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared.

Proponents of Keynesian economic theory tell us the National Debt is meaningless: It is—incomprehensible. Who can understand \$248 billion? If I held a stack of \$1000 bills in my hand just 4 inches high, I'd have \$1 million. If we had the National Debt piled up before us in \$1000 bills, the pile would be more than 18 miles high. It is a greater amount than all other governments have spent since the beginning of government itself.

Reduction of and economy in government is where we must start. We must demand that Congress put an end to deficit spending; that government stay within the limits of its revenue; and that provision be made for regular payments on the National Debt. Then we must demand tax reform of the kind that will reduce the percentage on National Income confiscated by the government. We must restore the right of a man to keep the fruit of his toil.

Tax Reform Essential

To this end, may I suggest the bi-partisan bill still buried in the House Ways & Means Committee—the Herlong-Baker bill (Herlong is a Democrat, Baker a Republican). This is one of the better prepared tax reform measures to be presented in half a century. Over a five-year period, it gradually reduces corporate and personal income tax to a 15 percent level with

a 47 percent ceiling on surtax.

In the vast permanent structure of government, you and I cannot recommend specific areas where savings can be effected—nor can Congress, beyond a certain point. However, every businessman knows that if you reduce government income and then issue a blanket order to every department-head and bureau chief that his budget is reduced by that same percentage, he'll know where the useless fat can be trimmed.

Of course there will be screams. It will be said that it is dangerous to reduce taxes before reducing spending. They are talking through their hats. Government doesn't tax to get the money it needs—government will always find a need for the money it gets.

We can do this by accepting our responsibility as citizens. In the coming election year (regardless of the party, because this struggle crosses the party lines) we must pin down those who solicit our votes as to where they stand on old-fashioned economy and tax reform. We must write to our Congressmen and Senators giving our objection to specific bills where the money cost and the price in individual freedom is too high. Write them now and then just to praise them when they are on the right track. Don't belittle this simple procedure. It was just this kind of pressure that stopped (at least for a moment) the school aid bill, headed off the socialization of our farms, restrained some areas of foreign aid, and so far has delayed the medical aid program. Writing isn't complicated—just put his name on the envelop, then address it "House Office Building" or "Senate Office Building, Washington D.C."

Containment Not Enough

We must do more than just stop spending measures. "Containment" won't save freedom on the home front any more than it can stop Russian aggression on the world front. We must roll back the network of encroaching controls. WE can do it as individuals—we don't need any great new organization. If we could gather 1000 people together every

day and enlist their support, it would still take us 500 years to reach the population of the United States. But the magic of geometric progression takes over when we act as individuals. (If I were to contact just one person a week and request that he in turn contact another with the same message, our influence would pyramid and in less than a year it would be possible to reach all the people on earth.)

James Russel Lowell, as Minister to England, was asked how long he thought our Republic would endure. He answered, that our Republic would endure as long as the people keep the ideas of the men who founded it.

And what were those ideas? The founding fathers—that little band of men so advanced beyond their time the world has never seen their like since—created a government based on the theory that you and I have the God-given right and ability to determine our own destiny. Here took place the only revolution in all history that didn't just exchange one set of rulers for another. They shaped a government, bound it with the Constitution, and said its only function was to be a watchdog over man's freedom. They never planned that it should become a cow to be milked.

Here for the first time the individual genius of man—every man—was unleashed. Six percent of the world's population on 7 percent of the earth's land surface created and owns more than 50 percent of the world's wealth and that wealth has been distributed more widely among our people than in any other society since time began.

There were no fringe benefits at Valley Forge. The West was won without an area re-development program.

Now you and I must answer once again whether life is so dear and peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery. If we are unwilling to pledge our lives, our efforts and our sacred honor, then we must one day spend our sunset years telling our children and our children's children what it once was like in America when men were free.

This essay was published as a booklet by the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons Publishing Company in 1961.

WILL YOUR GRANDCHILDREN BE ABLE TO SEE A PRIVATE PHYSICIAN?

The answer to that question probably depends on this one:

Will AAPS, the voice for private physicians, remain strong?

AAPS has defended private medicine for 77 years—since 1943.

AAPS relies on the generosity of its members to survive and thrive.

Please remember AAPS in your will or charitable annuity.

This is your opportunity to send a Final Message in support of freedom and private medicine.

Every gift helps, no matter how small.

For information on making a bequest, call or write:

Andrew Schlafly
AAPS General Counsel
939 Old Chester Rd.
Far Hills, NJ 07931
(908) 719-8608
aschlafly@aol.com