



The Phyllis Schlafly Report



VOL. 10, NO. 3, SECTION 1

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

OCTOBER, 1976

Issues of the 1976 Election

Platform Comparisons

Contrary to the popular belief that national party platforms tend to blur rather than clarify the differences between the two major political parties, and are so vague that they don't mean much anyway, the 1976 party platforms offer the voters a clearcut choice on many major issues.

The Democratic Platform favors hiring the unemployed to work for the Federal Government. That means passing the Humphrey-Hawkins bill. The Republican Platform favors the creation of new jobs by the "private sector" instead of carrying them on the backs of the American taxpayers.

The Democratic Platform favors a "comprehensive national health insurance system with universal and mandatory coverage," financed by the Federal Government (e.g., the Kennedy-Corman Bill). The Republican Platform "opposes compulsory national health insurance."

The Democratic Platform proposes a welfare system of "income maintenance," funded by the Federal Government. This is polite language for a guaranteed annual income plan, which the Republican Platform specifically opposes. The Democratic Platform favors federalizing welfare; the Republicans are opposed.

The Democratic Platform supports splitting up the major oil companies. The Republican Platform "vigorously" opposes this.

The Democratic Platform supports "mandatory transportation of students beyond their neighborhoods for the purpose of desegregation" as "a judicial tool of last resort." The Republican Platform flatly opposes "forced busing."

The Democratic Platform supports detente, more agreements with the Soviets, a \$5 to \$7 billion reduction in defense spending, and a delay of the B-1 bomber. The Republican Platform criticizes detente and endorses a "superior national defense," including the B-1 bomber.

The Democratic Platform encourages recognition of Red China. The Republican Platform promises that we will keep our commitments "such as the mutual defense treaty with the Republic of China."

The Democratic Platform pledges support for a new Panama Canal treaty. The only treaty now under consideration is the one negotiated by Henry Kissinger and Ellsworth Bunker which would abandon U.S. sovereignty over the Canal. The Republican Platform says that "negotiators should in no way cede, dilute,

forfeit, negotiate or transfer any rights, power, authority, jurisdiction, territory or property that are necessary for the protection and security of the United States." The difference between the two Platforms may well be the difference between whether we continue to own the U.S. Canal or not.

The Democratic Platform calls for "a coordinated Federal and state effort" to control the manufacture, distribution and possession of handguns. The Republican Platform flatly opposes "Federal registration of firearms."

The Democratic Platform opposes a Human Life Amendment to prohibit abortions, while the Republican Platform favors passage of "a constitutional amendment to restore protection of the right to life for unborn children."

Ronald Reagan was correct in saying that the Republican Platform is "a banner of bold, unmistakable colors with no pale, pastel shades."

If Gerald Ford would run on the Republican Platform -- and live up to its promises -- he would win the support of the majority of Americans.

The Ford-Carter Debate

The television commentators were disappointed in the first Ford-Carter debate. In their instant analysis and Monday morning quarterbacking, they complained that the debate was a dull show. The candidates didn't say anything new; they merely rehashed what they had been saying for months on the campaign trail.

That is exactly what the debate should have been! A nationally televised debate is no time for spontaneous announcements or trial balloons. The debates should have been a distillation of ideas and programs that each candidate had thought deeply about, studied, and tried out on local audiences until he has had enough feedback to be sure that these ideas are worth presenting to a national audience.

The principal defect of the first debate was not what the candidates said, but what they didn't say. They failed to come to grips with the question of how to reduce Federal spending in order to cut back on either Federal taxes or the inflation-causing deficit, or both.

For example, how about presenting a responsible plan to eliminate the waste, extravagance, and fraud that exists in so many Federal agencies today? Nearly every month there is a new example of bureaucratic ripoffs of our tax dollars through wrong payments and

over-payments, caused by reasons that range from fraud to red tape.

The Moss Subcommittee discovered that up to one-half of the \$15 billion spent each year on Medicaid is wasted through fraud, over-charging, treatment for nonexistent ills, fee-splitting, kickbacks, and poor administration.

The General Accounting Office spent a year investigating and studying the operations of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In a 72-page report last month, the GAO substantiated earlier newspaper charges that HUD is a \$4 billion scandal.

The GAO report described how HUD has destroyed property values and wrecked whole neighborhoods by its practice of financing homes that are eyesores and health and safety hazards. These abandoned homes are detrimental to the neighborhood because teenagers use them for partying, vagrants hide out in them, and others use them as dumping spots for debris, garbage, and dead dogs.

The list is endless of Federal programs that are plagued with bureaucratic cost overruns, inefficiency and fraud. It includes welfare, student guaranteed loans, food stamps, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and the billions doled out every year in giveaways to a hundred foreign countries.

In the first debate, the presidential candidates talked vaguely about how they might try to save money years into the future, maybe. Voters want to hear from a candidate who promises to cut spending *now*.

Ballooning Bureaucracy

One of the big changes that have come about in political campaigns in the last ten years is the practice of polling the voters to find out what issues they are concerned about. On the surface, this seems like a waste of good campaign contributions because, if the candidate is out meeting his constituents, he can find out himself what worries them.

I'm now ready to concede that voter surveys can be useful. Jimmy Carter's own polls taught him something he hadn't learned in a year of campaigning, namely, that government spending and the oppressive Federal bureaucracy are important issues with the voters.

That is the explanation for his sudden announcement of a promise to balance the Federal budget "before the end" of his term as President. This pledge is wholly incompatible with his other promises to start expensive new spending programs. Nevertheless, it is significant that Jimmy Carter recognizes that the American people know they are being ripped off by the Federal bureaucracy and are ready to show their anger on election day.

The anti-Washington tide that has been sweeping the country this year is even more a reaction to the excessive cost of the Federal Government than to the corruption that causes a stream of sensational headlines. People are just plain fed up with paying the price of the bloated bureaucracy.

Here are a few figures to stagger your imagination. The Federal Government employs 2.9 million civilian workers, issues 45 million "entitlement" checks every month, owns one-third of the country's land, holds title to 405,000 buildings, rents another 54,000 buildings, and collects 4,504 different types of Federal forms.

Beginning with Franklin D. Roosevelt, every President has promised to reduce the ballooning bureaucracy and cut Federal spending, but it continues to grow

at an accelerating pace. Even under Gerald Ford, ten of the eleven Cabinet-level departments and all the regulatory agencies have increased their numbers of employees.

The attempt to substitute government regulation for private enterprise accounts for the large number of professionals on the payrolls. There are now about 4,800 economists tinkering with our economy, graduates of universities where they acquired the arrogance to believe they can spend our money and direct our economy better than the free market.

Disillusionment with the Federal bureaucracy's ability to solve our economic and social problems started years ago with the businessmen because they were the first targets of regulation and controls. This disillusionment has long since spread to the general public, a fact which the politicians, thanks to voter surveys, are now starting to recognize.

It is an encouraging sign that this disillusionment has even spread to the academic community. Harvard President Derek Bok is one of a growing number of academicians who voice the concern that universities are now caught in a spider web of unnecessary, confusing, and expensive Federal red tape. Mr. Bok has finally realized that the universities are losing their academic freedom because of Federal interference in record-keeping, hiring, and other faculty decisions.

Now that the overburdened taxpayers have finally gotten their message through to the liberal politicians and the liberal professors -- the same ones who have been promoting a bigger Federal bureaucracy all these years -- we may at last see the end of the tunnel of Federal expansion.

Oil Divestiture

Senator Birch Bayh, whose claim to fame in recent years has been as proposer of several constitutional amendments (including ERA) and as the one who stopped passage of the proposed Human Life Amendment, bounced back into the news as the sponsor of a new bill which could have as much impact on Americans as a constitutional amendment.

By a slim margin, Bayh persuaded the Senate Judiciary Committee to report favorably a bill to break up the oil companies. Specifically, he wants the Federal Government to split apart the production, transportation, and refining-marketing operations of the large oil companies. This is called oil divestiture and it is endorsed by the Democratic Platform.

The purpose of the great Sherman Anti-Trust Act and other Federal actions against big business has always been to prevent monopoly and to promote competition. However, if there is any industry where there is no monopoly and plenty of competition, it is oil.

No one company dominates the oil industry. The largest company, Exxon, controls only eight percent of crude oil production, owns only eleven percent of crude oil reserves, and holds only nine percent of refining capacity.

Even the top four oil firms combined have only 27 percent of crude oil production and 30 percent of gasoline sales. In most other major industries, the four top firms have a much higher percentage of the market.

Under the Birch Bayh bill, 18 oil companies would be subject to divestiture. Compare the 18 in oil, for example, with the automobile industry where there are only three large companies, or with other vital industries in which the market is dominated by fewer than

half a dozen companies.

The splitting apart of the functions of the oil companies, as required by the Birch Bayh bill, is called vertical divestiture. Many distinguished economists believe that, if this is required, it will cause a horizontal merging of the 18 oil companies in order to sustain the high financial risks which are an inherent part of the oil business. Many of the small independent oil producers believe that they will be hurt most of all by divestiture of the big companies.

The result of the divestiture would be a much less competitive industry than we now have. Under the present system, the 18 large companies are keen competitors, and that competition operates for the benefit of the consumer.

The politicians who voted for the breaking up of America's 18 largest oil companies are, for political purposes, trying to pin the blame on big business for the shortage of gasoline and fuel oil, and their rise in prices, following the Arab oil embargo of 1973. For the most part, these are the same politicians who blocked the Alaskan pipeline for four years, and who have opposed drilling in the oil fields off Alaska and our east and west coasts. The failure to develop these tremendous American oil reserves is a principal reason for our dependence on high-priced Middle East oil.

There is no evidence to show that divestiture of the oil companies will reduce gasoline prices or even hold them at their present level. There is much more reason to believe that divestiture would deal irreparable harm to the American consumer by increasing oil prices, reducing quality, eliminating jobs, discouraging companies from prospecting for new oil, and would end up making us more dependent than ever on imported oil.

Postcard Registration

The first concrete evidence of the kind of legislation that Jimmy Carter would push for, if elected President, surfaced when he put his personal influence on the line in asking the House of Representatives to pass a bill to provide for postcard registration of voters for Federal elections.

Like most of Carter's ideas, the postcard registration bill would, of course, cost more Federal tax dollars. Estimates range up to \$300 million every two years. Of course, it would require a new Federal agency. Of course, we would have to hire more Federal employees. Of course, it would mean more Federal control over state and local activities.

The postcard registration bill supported by Jimmy Carter would have ordered the U.S. Postal Service to mail registration forms to every postal address in the United States at least once every two years. The voters would then return the postcards by 30 days before the election. The actual cost would have been disguised because the U.S. Postal Service would mail all 140 million registration forms with the Federal franking privilege. The volume and frequency of this mailing would have provided a convenient excuse to raise the cost of first-class postage another couple of cents.

Fortunately, the House rejected Carter's personal appeal for this mass-mailing boondoggle. The House then passed a less obnoxious version which requires merely that voter postcards be made available at post offices and other Federal buildings. This is a bad plan, too, because it would permit pressure groups to gather up the postcards and use them for intensive registration

drives to serve their special interests.

The postcard registration bill is based on two false assumptions. The first is that the Federal Government can and must solve all social problems immediately, even the sociological phenomenon that up to 54 million Americans do not want to vote.

The second false assumption is that it is a social good to drag everyone out to vote in every election, even though the individual may be too uninterested or indolent to vote on his own initiative. There is something inherently offensive about the idea that Federal persuaders should propel everyone to vote, whether he wants to or not. Uninterested, uninformed, or lazy citizens should not be reluctantly dragged to the polls by the Government and counted equally with the votes of conscientious Americans.

A recent survey of the reactions of county clerks, who under our system of government have the responsibility for voter registration, produced this type of comment about postcard registration. "It allows too many opportunities for fraud." "It would drastically reduce the efficiency of our election process." "I could register under the name of five or ten people if I wanted to." "Under that bill, I could vote in several states." "Why doesn't the Federal Government keep its fingers out of local business?"

That there is no demand from the public for postcard registration was demonstrated earlier this year by a petite and beautiful South Carolina legislator. In January the powers that be in South Carolina decided to put through a state postcard registration bill and it appeared headed for prompt passage with little debate.

Representative Norma Russell decided to filibuster in order to bring it to public attention. She spoke continuously for three and a half days, eight to nine hours a day, thereby getting the record for filibusters by women in state legislatures.

During that time, she rallied so much opposition to the postcard registration bill that it was buried under an avalanche of phone calls and telegrams from the voters.

The "Paramount Issue" of 1976

If you picked up a newspaper and read the screaming headline "Are We -- or Is Our Strategy -- MAD?", you would probably think you were reading a sensational tabloid. Would you believe -- such a headline was recently splashed across the dignified *New York Times*?

The contents of the article were just as blunt. It came to grips with two life-and-death problems: the threat to the very survival of the United States from the tremendous buildup of Soviet military power, and whether U.S. national strategy for dealing with this threat might be totally wrong.

The *New York Times* quotes with respect, if not outright endorsement, statements from the *London Times* and *London Economist* that the Soviet Union will have "valid strategic superiority by the end of this year" and that the Kremlin leaders believe they could then destroy America without suffering unacceptable reprisals.

For the past 15 years, U.S. strategy has been based on the theory that the Soviets won't attack us because they know we would strike back and kill millions of Russians. This theory of deterrence was once accurately explained by Professor Henry Kissinger as the product of three factors: military power, the will to use

it, and the assessment of those factors by a potential aggressor. But please note: since deterrence is a product, not a sum, if any one of them is zero, deterrence fails.

The deterrence theory might have been true in 1962 during the Cuban Missile Crisis when we had an 8-to-1 lead in nuclear power. But 14 years later, the strategic balance is reversed, and the theory is perilously obsolete.

Many experts believe that, because of Soviet bases in Cuba and our many cities which can be hit from Soviet submarines, the United States is at least ten times as vulnerable to nuclear attack as the U.S.S.R. is today. Foy Kohler, our former Ambassador in Moscow, summed it up like this: "Instead of a 'balance of terror' which equally restrains both sides, the 'terror' would be mainly on the part of the United States."

British and American experts now say that the Kremlin leaders believe they will this year have enough military superiority, combined with such elaborate civil defense installations and preparations, that they will be able to destroy America without suffering unacceptable retaliation. If this is true, deterrence has failed, our strategy is indeed "mad", and so are the architects who devised it.

In the understatement of the century, the *Times* concludes: "Surely the American people have a right to be informed about the truth of the statements . . . so that they can debate whether it is necessary to revise our strategic assumptions. Mere national survival should be the paramount issue of this autumn's election."

It's too bad we weren't told this early in the year, before 19 presidential primaries, so that the eager candidates would have all been forced to present their strategy for dealing with this "paramount issue." However it's still not too late to force policy commitments from Presidential and Congressional candidates on the matter of building adequate anti-missile and civil defenses. Even after the election, the American people should let their voice be heard on this "paramount issue." The life *you* save may be your own.

Solzhenitsyn and Belenko

Two exciting events occurred in September, 1976, that confirm that the rest of the world still believes the United States is the best country to live in.

On September 9 it was announced that Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, the great Russian Nobel Prize-winning writer, has moved from Switzerland to Vermont, where he bought a home. He has received a permanent visa to live in America.

On the same day as the Solzhenitsyn announcement, Lieutenant Viktor Belenko, a young Soviet fighter pilot, arrived in Honolulu on his way from Japan to live in mainland United States. Three days earlier, Belenko had flown the latest and best Soviet fighter plane, the MIG-25, to Japan from Vladivostok.

This twin-jet fighter plane was described by our Secretary of the Air Force, Robert C. Seamans, as "probably the best interceptor in production in the world today." Japanese and American aviation engineers eagerly inspected the plane in minute detail in an effort to discover the Soviet secrets that enable the plane to fly so much faster than our best fighter planes.

Of particular importance to U.S. and Japanese technicians examining the Soviet plane are its two 24,250-pound thrust engines, and its electronic counter-measures and counter-counter-measures

equipment which the Soviets have developed.

Lieutenant Belenko's flight to freedom provides new and dramatic proof of the high risks that individuals will take to escape from Communism when they get the chance. His escape was very hazardous because he was on a patrol flight under the constant surveillance of another Soviet MIG-25.

The first Japanese airport he reached was fogged in. The second airport he found had too short a runway, but he managed to land his plane safely anyway.

It is thrilling to note that such successful and intelligent individuals are willing to pay so high a price for a chance to enjoy the precious freedom we all take for granted in America.

Morality in Foreign Policy

At the Republican National Convention in Kansas City in August, the Reagan Delegates proposed and insisted on an Amendment to the Republican Platform called "Morality in Foreign Policy." It was intended and interpreted as a direct criticism of the policies of Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. The Ford Administration, realizing that the Convention Delegates would approve this plank by a large majority, moved to make it unanimous (rather than suffer a humiliating defeat on a roll-call vote). Since we have had so many requests for the text of this plank, and since it was not published in many newspapers, we print here the "Morality in Foreign Policy" plank which is an official part of the Republican Platform:

The goal of Republican foreign policy is the achievement of liberty under law and a just and lasting peace in the world. The principles by which we act to achieve peace and to protect the interests of the United States must merit the restored confidence of our people.

We recognize and commend that great beacon of human courage and morality, Alexander Solzhenitsyn, for his compelling message that we must face the world with no illusions about the nature of tyranny. Ours will be a foreign policy that keeps this ever in mind.

Ours will be a foreign policy which recognizes that in international negotiations we must make no undue concessions; that in pursuing detente we must not grant unilateral favors with only the hope of getting future favors in return.

Agreements that are negotiated, such as the one signed in Helsinki, must not take from those who do not have freedom the hope of one day gaining it.

Finally, we are firmly committed to a foreign policy in which secret agreements, hidden from our people, will have no part.

Honestly, openly, and with firm conviction, we shall go forward as a united people to forge a lasting peace in the world based upon our deep belief in the rights of man, the rule of law and guidance by the hand of God.

The Phyllis Schlafly Report Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002

Published monthly by Phyllis Schlafly, Fairmount, Alton, Illinois 62002.

Second Class Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois.

Subscription Price: For donors to the Eagle Trust Fund -- \$5 yearly (included in annual contribution). Extra copies available: 15 cents each; 8 copies \$1; 50 copies \$4; 100 copies \$8.