



# The Phyllis Schlafly Report

VOL. 14, NO. 2, SECTION 2

BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

SEPTEMBER, 1980

## Single-Issue Voters

Are you a single-candidate voter, a single-party voter, a single-issue voter, or a no-voter? Those appear to be the four categories into which the American electorate divides as we gear up for the 1980 elections.

The current fashion is to decry or ridicule the latter two types. Anybody who reads or listens to much political commentary during this election year will quickly detect this recurring theme. There is an orchestrated attack on the "single-issue" movement.

The essence of democracy, however, is not only that each citizen can vote, but that he can vote for "none of the above," and that he can choose his own reasons for casting or not casting that vote.

In the George Wallace heyday, the no-voters proclaimed that "there's not a dime's worth of difference" between the two major parties. It is more likely today that the no-voter is even more disillusioned. He thinks that no matter who is elected, no matter what promises the candidates make, after election they all join the "tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect" club.

The single-issue voters are those all revved up by a single issue. They determine their support or nonsupport of each candidate based on his position on that issue. Among the single issues that have fired the emotions of those willing to work for or against candidates are the Equal Rights Amendment, abortion, gun control, tax limitation, and the Panama Canal.

Whether the epithet "single-issue" is applied to any given group seems to depend on whether it is liberal or conservative. Only conservative groups are tagged with the epithet "single-issue", whereas liberal groups which work for a single goal are said to have "legitimate concerns" and be working for the "common cause."

Senator George McGovern recently complained that 36 single-issue groups are active in South Dakota alone. He was glad to welcome the support of a strange collection of single-issue voters in his 1972 campaign for the Presidency, but today he recognizes that most of the 36 single-issue groups are a threat to his 1980 reelection to the Senate.

Several major conservative groups have served notice that support or opposition to the SALT II Treaty will be the single issue on which conservative money and volunteer help will be determined. One commentator belittled this tactic by labelling it "the 2-by-4 or mule-training school of educational psychology." That was a derogatory reference to the old story about how to train a mule: first of all you have to

hit him with a 2-by-4 to get his attention.

So what's wrong with that? Those who honestly believe that SALT II will disable the United States in its ability to defend its freedom and independence against Soviet expansionism and nuclear blackmail *should* put their money and volunteer work where their mouth is and translate their strong beliefs into action at the polls. It's much better to give the Senators fair warning beforehand.

The Panama Canal Treaties provide a good object lesson to Senators pondering SALT II. Of the 15 Senators who ran for reelection after voting for the Panama Treaties, 8 were defeated and only 7 were reelected. Of the 9 Senators who voted against the Panama Treaties and ran for reelection, all but one were successful.

Those who try to put down the single-issue voters would leave the politicking to the single-candidate and single-party voters. There is no persuasive evidence that those voting blocs are any more socially or politically responsible than the single-issue variety of voters.

The single-party voters are those who would vote for a candidate wearing their party's label even if he is a yellow dog, in preference to any good guy on the opposition ticket. The rationale behind this, to the extent that there is any, is that it is more effective and more efficient to hold the party accountable rather than the individual officeholder. In any event, single-party voting blocs have been in a no-growth stalemate for years.

The single-candidate voters are those who usually say, "I vote for the man, not the party," or who piously proclaim that they are "independent" voters. In reality, their criterion for candidate selection is simply personality, rather than issues.

Previous candidates whose personality preempted the political spectrum, quite apart from issues or party, were Franklin D. Roosevelt and Dwight Eisenhower. The current single-candidate voters are primarily those who belong to the cult of Kennedy worshipers; they will vote for a Kennedy, even though he lied about a young woman's death in his car on Chappaquidick Island.

The single-candidate voters also include that large bloc of voters who belong to the "cult of incumbency": they support any candidate who is an incumbent against anyone who has the gall to challenge whoever is already in office.

Each of us can make our own choice as to which kind of voter we choose to be. As for me, I think the single-issue voter has the most intellectual consistency, political savvy, and clout at the polls. 1980 will be an interesting year.

# Why Liberals Hate "Single Issues"

by Congressman John M. Ashbrook of Ohio

On issue after issue, in every part of the country, movements are rising against the liberal establishment. From abortion to taxes, from bureaucratic regulations to busing, groups are spontaneously erupting from the grassroots, each representing a major and growing challenge to a different aspect of liberal policy being forced on the country by the Washington establishment.

Liberals dismiss these groundswells as "single issue movements." But what really disturbs the powers that be is that they know they are not.

A "single issue movement" is a flash in the pan, a momentary rising of feeling about an isolated, temporary concern, like the Anti-Masonic Party of the 1830's. The pro-life, pro-family, anti-busing and tax revolts are nothing of the sort. Each is a part of a whole. Each represents a direct attack on a part of the whole fabric of liberal policy.

And the parts are joining together. That is what has the Washington establishment frightened, and they have reason to be. The ideologues who rule the Federal government do not believe their own propaganda. They are frightened because they know these movements are not flashes in the pan, and they are neither isolated nor temporary concerns. Each of these so-called "single issue movements" is an obvious part of the whole, and the whole is no less than a rising rebellion against bureaucratic control over our lives from Washington.

Every movement, including the liberal movement, has always been made up of parts. When the NAACP sends lawyers to argue for busing in court, in the teeth of nine to one popular opposition to busing in the country as a whole, no one calls the NAACP a "single issue organization." But when thousands of people march in Washington to protest busing, forced busing is suddenly just a "single issue." When the National Abortion Rights Action League goes to the streets on behalf of abortion on demand, no one calls it a "single issue movement." But when tens of thousands of people from all over the country come to Washington each year in a gigantic pro-life march, abortion is suddenly a "single issue."

Each part of the liberal establishment is, according to the establishment, a "legitimate concern." But each part of the rebellion against the establishment is a "single issue." It's a good propaganda tactic, but it doesn't change the fact that there is a political revolution underway all over America against the liberal establishment, and throwing labels at it isn't going to make it go away.

It's also a new tactic. Ten years ago the most active "single issue group" was the one that wanted to do what they called "giving peace a chance" in Vietnam and Cambodia. The liberals called this group "the constituency of conscience," and they liked it just fine. The "constituency of conscience" has now been running our foreign policy for three years, and today they're just as eager to avoid the clash of issues as they were to promote that clash ten years ago. The liberals' new-found hostility to so-called "single issues" is really a dislike of issues as such. Since their issues are about as popular today as King George III's tax policies used to be, this attitude makes perfectly good sense.

Of course, in a country as large and diverse as ours, different people are mounting the anti-liberal political rebellion on a wide variety of fronts. The tentacles of liberal power squeeze our people from a variety of directions. Some encounter it at the supermarket, in the form of inflation, some when their child is assigned to be bused across town. The tentacles are different, but people soon discover that the beast that is squeezing their lives by deficit spending and inflation is the same as the one whose other tentacle is forcing children to spend hours every week on exhausting and dangerous bus trips out of their own neighborhood for "racial balance."

Inevitably, the members of each movement are coming to realize that the only way to loosen the tentacles is to attack

the beast itself. To regain control of their own lives and their own country, they will have to stop attacking tentacles and go for the head.

And the head is in Washington.

## The Tax Revolt

The newest "single issue" movement is the tax revolt. Liberals who like to inflame the real or imagined grievance of every so-called "oppressed class" they can find, now suddenly face insurrection from the very group they had been counting on to keep divided, distracted, and plundered: taxpayers. Almost overnight, the wealth-producing, wage-earning, child-raising families of America have awakened to the fact that they are the chief victims of the liberal order.

The liberals fear this revolt even more than all the others, because it threatens to choke off the very fuel on which their engines run. Liberals want to think that the tax revolt is just a fad, which they hope will vanish after achieving a few victories at the state and local levels where high taxes are easier to see and to cut than they are in Washington. Fortunately, they are wrong.

The smooth workings of the Federal tax machine depend on a con-game. The game is to give workers higher and higher wage increases through the front door while robbing them through the back door via higher taxes and inflation. The wage increases don't keep pace with the price and tax increases, but the liberal establishment assumes that the average family is just too dumb to notice.

Unfortunately for the establishment, most people are a lot smarter than most politicians think they are. The average breadwinner knows that his family's real economic well-being has deteriorated since the triumph of liberal economics in the mid-1960's. He knows that it's actually harder for him to make ends meet than it used to be for his parents. And he knows that Washington is to blame.

Working Americans don't need statistics to see the truth, but the statistics show they're right. Since 1964 median income has climbed by 131 per cent for a family of four — from \$8,132 to \$18,815. During the same period, consumer prices have climbed even more — by 137 per cent. So the average family has actually lost ground even before you figure Federal taxes into the picture. Take into account the fact that the 1979 family is in a 21 per cent marginal income tax bracket, compared with 18 per cent for the 1964 family; combine that with a higher payroll-tax burden for Social Security, and the result is that the 1979 family's real after-tax income is \$1,056 lower than the 1964 family's. The average family's sense of growing oppression is no illusion.

To keep tax revolts from disrupting this con-game, the liberals have designed the machinery in such a way that Congress and the President have a vested interest in inflation. The so-called "progressive" tax system, which liberals pretend shifts the burden to "the rich", actually has the principal effect of giving Washington an earned revenue increase of 16 per cent every time prices rise by 10 per cent — almost entirely at the expense of the new "middle class poor." Congress could fix this blatant unfairness by means of a simple reform called "indexing," but the liberal Democrats who control both the House and the Senate have consistently thwarted any such proposal. They know that they need high taxes to finance their favorite vote-buying "social programs"; and their gain is working America's loss.

The liberal con-game depends on diverting the blame for economic misery. Liberals want workers to blame businessmen, and businessmen to blame workers. But the spread of the tax revolt shows that both these groups are starting to place the blame where it really belongs, in Washington. Far from being the mindless emotional spasm portrayed by liberal pundits, the tax revolt is a precision-

targeted crusade — waged by the producer class, directed against the parasitic class. Until it wins its goals, it's not going to go away.

## Busing

When liberals are left without a legal or moral leg to stand on, the media always pronounces the situation "complicated" and "controversial." There is nothing "controversial" about busing; the American people oppose it nine to one. There is nothing "complicated" about forcing a child to get up at five o'clock in the morning, ride two or more buses for two hours in the morning to a hostile school atmosphere, and spend another two hours on two or more buses to get home after dark. It is simple depravity.

As I pointed out on the House Floor after the defeat of the Mottl Amendment, there would be nothing complicated about it if a Federal judge ordered Congressmen to spend two hours on a bus each day to get to and from work. We would have a bill stopping such an outrage on the Floor, passed unanimously by both Houses, and on the President's desk before buses rolled the next morning. If a judge tried to make Congressmen's children spend this kind of time on buses each day, we would have him impeached within the shortest possible time. But Cleveland and Boston and Louisville are not populated by Congressmen. So the establishment's political puppets have decided the whole situation is "very complicated" and "highly controversial."

Forced busing is ordered by highly paid, suburban Federal judges, after suits by big money liberal lobbies in Washington, and enforced by bureaucrats who are also extremely well paid by tax money. None of these well-to-do pro-busing forces represents anybody with children in the public schools. Forced busing is a program by the affluent for the working middle class.

The essential point is easily stated: Federal bureaucrats stepped in, put local children on buses for long trips into a different part of town every day, and the communities protested. The liberal establishment reacted by protesting the fact that local communities would dare to question what it wants to do with their children.

Busing literally brought home to millions of Americans the complete power over our lives which the liberal establishment now holds. More than anywhere else, it is in busing that we see the liberal establishment's hypocrisy at its most blatant worst. And more than anything else, busing destroyed the myth that liberals represent the people against the wealthy and powerful.

The anti-busing movement is made up of people who have traditionally been stalwarts of the liberal establishment. It is not the traditionally conservative rural areas where busing occurs, or in the suburbs. It is the children of working people in the cities who are used this way, and it is these people who make up the anti-busing movement. Since the 1930's, these urban working people have made up the basis of union strength, and their votes made up a major part of the liberal coalition. It is no accident that Cleveland is now the biggest city in America with a Republican Mayor, or that Massachusetts, the most liberal State of the Union, now has a conservative Democratic Governor. The anti-busing movement has gone from the streets to the ballot-box. It has learned that the liberals' hypocrisy, arrogance, and refusal to learn from experience on this issue are not accidental. Busing has shown them what the liberal establishment is really all about, and the political effects of this revelation have barely begun to be felt.

## Gun Control

In many ways, the fight against gun control is the dean of the grassroots anti-liberal movements. If busing shows liberal hypocrisy at its most blatant, gun control shows liberal illogic at its most ludicrous extreme. Faced with a skyrocketing crime rate which is a direct result of liberal coddling of criminals, the establishment reacts by demanding that we

regulate all weapons owned by law-abiding citizens. This is an excellent introduction for the average citizen to the warped logic of the Washington establishment. The one and one-half million members of the National Rifle Association, after fighting this nonsense in action for years, find it easy to understand that the liberal reaction to Soviet expansion is to cut defense spending and negotiate arms reduction treaties.

One of the biggest problems in fighting liberalism is to get people to believe just how utterly perverted the logic on every issue which rules in Washington really is. It is very hard for our people to realize that intelligent people in high places could have such a totally warped view of the world. For millions of Americans, the gun control issue has been an indispensable political education.

Gun control also shows the establishment's ruthless side. In 1978, having failed to get gun control through Congress again and again, the establishment used the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (BATF) to go ahead and begin registration without Congressional sanction. I sponsored an amendment to head off this action by cutting off funds for such registration, and was successful.

My action was backed by an explosion of grassroots support, as thousands of Americans made it clear that they would not stand for this legislation by bureaucrats. Through the gun control issue, citizens throughout the country are made aware that the establishment does not consider the Constitution, the Congress, or the will of the people any barrier in doing what they want to do with Federal power.

The essential assumption behind gun control is a thoroughly liberal one: That guns owned by the government are legitimate, whereas guns owned by private citizens are suspect. It is hard to imagine a more dangerous concept for a free society. Gun issues are therefore an excellent introduction to the dangers of liberal thinking in general.

## The Pro-Life Movement

Another so-called "single-issue group" is the pro-life movement. Even back in the days when the pro-abortion push first began, there were those who could see what was coming. When abortion advocates presented only the "hard cases" and demanded changes in the law, those early profilers sensed the real danger in the precedent that was being set. They recognized immediately that if the basic and essential right of life could be denied to any one segment of humanity, it could also be taken away from any other group. To them it was totally obvious that if there could be "unwanted" unborn, there could also be unwanted old, unwanted sick, unwanted senile, unwanted defective. They believed that our unalienable right to life is indeed unalienable and that it is God-given, not state-granted.

Today the liberalization of abortion has gone well beyond the few "hard cases" to the current cry for abortion on demand with more than a million unborn lives a year sacrificed for convenience, comfort and careers.

When the advocates of abortion began their campaign, they realized, as we all shall realize, that the most important struggles are not the ones that take place on the battlefields of war, but those that are won or lost in the hearts of men. Their weapons were words; their missiles were labels; their strategy was to distract and discredit, to embarrass and to subvert. They questioned whether human life even existed in the pre-born stage and started using expressions like "potential life" and "glob of tissue" to reinforce that illusion in the public mind. They called attention to the plight of the pregnant woman who was "forced" to carry an "unwanted" pregnancy and to raise a child she had not planned. They pointed to rising welfare rolls, to the "population explosion" and its possible effects on the environment, to newly declared rights of choice and privacy as taking precedence over the right of life of the "fetus" — in short, to a whole array of single-issues and thereby tried to distract the public mind from any thought about the innocent unborn lives that were about to be sacrificed for the "greater good of society."

The laws they wanted to change were "repressive" and

"restrictive." The values they wanted to destroy were "entrenched," "archaic," and "out-of-step" with "enlightened" modern thinking. The people they wanted to discredit were labelled "reactionary" and "conservative," and what they had to say was "unacceptable."

They called for the repeal of laws against the "victimless crime" of abortion, and the act of abortion itself was called the "termination of pregnancy," as if it wasn't the killing of an unborn child inside its mother. But the stark reality is that the result of every successful abortion is a dead baby.

Today, the battle of words has become more intense and the labelling goes on. Abortion has moved from the status of a "moral" or "emotional" issue to a "non-issue" to a "controversial issue." Now they are calling pro-lifers "extremists."

But we should note that the term "single-issue" is itself a label. Apparently that tactic is based on the assumption that if you call it by a nice name, people will think it's nice and if you call it by a new name, people will think it's new. Name-calling, or labelling, is really just another form of deception.

Those first pro-lifers knew instinctively that the unborn child was indeed both human and alive. They knew that it had to be human, because there was no magic moment at which it suddenly was transformed from non-human to human. They knew that reality could not be changed by calling it by another name, and were courageous enough to lay the bare facts of the matter.

The pro-life movement's thrust has pierced the camouflage net of propaganda; it has cleared the verbal haze to get to the essence of the issue — a dead baby, a fellow human being whose destruction is not only permitted, but, in many cases, even paid for by the agencies of government.

The liberals have reserved a special hatred for this "single-issue group," because it has struck at the very heart of the monster we're fighting — a monolithic, and all-supreme bureaucracy that seeks to give us direction, supply all our needs, provide us with pleasure and convenience and the illusion of security, an all-powerful state on which we are to be totally dependent, a state that can give or take away anything — including human life.

## The Pro-Family Groups

A major push from the liberals is to bring change to the very structure of the family by calling for a White House Conference on Families. One of the proposals for this conference is to redefine "family," and to make recommendations for changes.

There is an interrelationship between the pro-life and the pro-family movements. If it continues to be accepted as legal and justifiable for parents to kill their "unwanted" children, then following this line of reasoning to its logical conclusion, it would also have to be legal and justifiable for children to kill their "unwanted" parents.

Unlike the donkey chasing the carrot, people are beginning to realize that the more they reach for the ideal world that the liberals are dangling in front of them, the more it seems to elude them. The "War on Poverty," the "Quality of Life" syndrome, "Freedom of Choice," "Innovations in Education," help for the American Family — all these sound good, until we examine what they really mean and discover what it is we have to sacrifice in order to reach utopia. So far, we have witnessed a drastic decline in education and a revolution in morality that produced an era of immorality. The "War on Poverty" seems to have produced only more poverty and a greater need for corrective measures.

Now we have the family in trouble. The next step is for a do-good bureaucracy to move in and try to cure it. If past experience is any indication, it will either make it sicker or kill it altogether.

The family is indeed in trouble, but to promote more innovations that tend to pressure it into further fragmentation is not the solution; it's the problem. Change is simply something different and that something different is not necessarily better.

Pro-family groups have been alert to the liberals' efforts

to pass so-called Child Development laws. These frauds would involve the government in a "full range" of services aimed at everything from early detection of juvenile delinquents to counseling and health services. We defeated these proposals but they keep coming back. As one bureaucrat said in testifying for the bill before my Education Committee: "We must zoom in on the home and correct the errors of home training." Liberal psychiatrists have always felt that our youth must be freed from the burden of puritanical sin. The "anything goes" syndrome is their approach. No wonder discipline has become one of the major problems in our public schools.

The latest liberal fad is to redefine the "family" along revolutionary lines. They would change the traditional Judeo-Christian concept to make abnormal the norm. To many anti-family activists, the government should legally define the family as "two or more people of mutual interest living together in the same abode." You can easily see where that would lead.

The liberals will continue to throw their labels and attack us but the pro-family group, another important element in the coalition of "single-issue groups," recognizes that the name-calling is really the only weapon the liberals have left.

## Conclusion

There are other aspects to the great American conservative renaissance although not specifically targeted as single issue trends. The growth of private, religious-oriented schools and the fervent drive for stopping the liberal dismantling of our military are but two. Being an anti-communist was successfully berated in the 60's and 70's — believe me I know. Those of us who have always been anti-communist now watch this basic survival issue return to the importance it deserves. Indeed, the resurgence of patriotism converges with all of these other citizens' initiatives. Note how haughtily the liberal dismisses renewed American patriotism, even branding it as a dangerous interference with their diplomacy and foreign policies.

The single-issue movement is exactly that — a single movement — and the issue common to all the groups is a revolt against what liberals have done to their country. Our servants have made their masters servants in their own homes and the masters have arisen. It isn't the word "single" that bothers the liberal although that is their usual lament. It is really the other word — "issue!" Their issues have wrought disaster. Their issues are dead. That we are going to win frightens them. The new wave of reform in America scares them to death and, oh how they hate our issues, every single one of them.

---

*Representative John M. Ashbrook, Republican of Ohio, has been a Member of Congress since 1960. He graduated with honors from Harvard University, B.A., and from Ohio State Law School, J.D. Before his election to Congress, he was an attorney and newspaper publisher, a member of the Ohio State Legislature, and Young Republican National Chairman. He has been one of the most consistently reliable conservative leaders in the U.S. House for twenty years.*

### The Phyllis Schlafly Report

Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002  
ISSN0556-0152

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 -- \$10 yearly (included in annual contribution). Extra copies available: 25 cents each; 6 copies \$1; 50 copies \$5; 100 copies \$8.