IT MUST SEEM presumptuous to some of you for a member of my profession to stand here and attempt to talk on problems of the nation. It would be strange if it were otherwise. We in Hollywood are not unaware of the concept of our fellow citizens have of us and of our industry. We realize that our merchandise is made up of tinsel, colored lights and a large measure of make-believe. It is also true that our business methods and practices have reflected this footloose and fancy-free mode of life more than the very real side of our very real business. However, a few years ago "a funny thing happened to us on the way to the theatre." Ugly reality came to our town on direct orders of the Kremlin. Hard core party organizers infiltrated our business. They created cells, organized Communist cells, and for a time, deceived numbers of our people, who with the best of intentions, joined these fronts while still ignorant of their true purpose. The aim was to gain economic control of our industry and then subvert our screens to the dissemination of Communist propaganda.

Whatever the shortcomings, Hollywood had achieved a great deal. In the finest traditions of free enterprise, 70 per cent of the playing time of all the screens of the world had been captured by the output of the American film capitol. You may agree sometimes with our "boy meets girl" plot, but all over the world our pictures were a window through which less fortunate humans had a glimpse of freedom and of our material comforts as well. The men in the Kremlin wanted this propaganda medium for their own destructive purposes.

Confident of their power, the Reds in our midst made one mistake in judgment. They mistook their ability to deceive for access in conversion. Under the guise of a jurisdictional strike, they made an open effort to destroy the guilds and unions who remained free from their control. Ultimately, they hoped for a vertical union of motion picture people under the umbrella of the Communist party's maritime union. After the first shock, the people of the movie colony rallied quickly—we lived through it. Thousands massed pickets overturned cars, homes were bombed, and tears of acid in the face were directed at performers. Months later their power was broken. The studios had remained open to the refusal of management and the majority of our people to be intimidated.

We now know of course that we only won an isolated battle. The "spirit of Camp David" the Communist party has only enjoyed once again the infiltration of the picture business as much as the theatre and television. They are crawling out from under the rocks; and memories being as short as they are, there are plenty of well-meaning but misguided people willing to lend them a hand.

We don't mean to present ourselves as "being able to run circles now that we've seen the monkey," but it is possible we have an awareness not shared by many of our fellow citizens.

Most people agree that the ideological struggle with Russia is the number one problem in the world. Millions of words are used almost daily to record the fluctuating temperature of cold war. And yet, many men in high places in government and many who mould opinion in the press and on the airwaves, subscribe to a theory that we are at peace, and we may make no overt move which might endanger that peace. Then cry peace, but there is no peace." The inescapable truth is that we are at war, and we are losing that war simply because we don't, or won't, realize that we are in it.

True, it is a strange war fought with unusual weapons, but we cannot yell foul, because it is a declared war. Karl Marx established the cardinal principle that Communism and Capitalism cannot co-exist in the world together. Our way of life, our system, must be totally destroyed; then the world Communist state will be erected on the ruins. In interpreting Marx, Lenin said, "It is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue to exist for a long period of time by side with imperialistic states. Ultimately, one or the other must conquer."

Last November, the communist parties of 81 countries held a convention in Moscow; and on December 6, reaffirmed this principle of war to the death. In a 20,000-word document, they called on Communists in countries where there were non-communist governments to be traitors and work for the destruction of their own governments by subversion and treason.

Only in that phase of the war which causes our greatest fear are we ahead—the use of armed force. Thanks to the dedicated patriotism and realistic thinking of our men in uniform we would win a shooting war. But, this isn't a decisive factor in the Communist campaign. They never really intended to conquer us by force unless we yielded to a massive peace campaign and disarmed. Then, the Russians would resort to armed conflict if it could shortcut their time table with no great risk to themselves.

In 1923, Lenin said that they would take Eastern Europe, next organize the hordes of Asia, then surround the United States, and, he predicted, "... that last bastion of Capitalism will not have to be taken. It will fall into our outstretched hands like over-ripe fruit." Eastern Europe has been taken, and they are organizing the hordes of Asia around the red colossus of China. Even now, it would appear we are preparing to drink the bitter cup of capitulation in Laos only partly dulled by face-saving devices. Cuba is a Soviet beach-head ninety miles off shore, and more than 250,000 communist organizers are spread up and down Latin America.

Meanwhile, other communist tactics are also working on schedule. Bulganin said, "The American working man is too well fed; we cannot appeal to him, but when through inflation America has priced herself out of the world market and unemployment follows—then we will settle our debt with the United States."

American apathy is due at least in part to our belief that the small number of American Communists is evidence of weakness and a lack of threat. But, history makes no secret of the fact that Lenin became the leader of the world conspiracy on just that issue—that the Communist party would remain a small, dedicated, highly-trained cadre which would use and manipulate the masses when necessary. Lenin termed us the "willing idiots." In our life time, this dedicated handful has enslaved one-third of the world's people on one-fourth of the earth's land surface.

The Communists are supremely confident of victory. They believe that you and I, under the constant pressure of the cold war, will give up, one by one, our democratic customs and traditions. We'll adopt emergency "temporary" totalitarian measures, until one day we'll awaken to find we have grown
so much like the enemy that we no longer have any cause for conflict.

Three months before his last visit to this country, Nikita Khrushchev said, "We can't expect the American people to jump from Capitalism to Communism, but we can assist their elected leaders in giving them small doses of Socialism, until they awaken one day to find they have Communism." This is not a new thought. In 1788, James Madison told the Virginia convention, "Since the general civilization of mankind, I believe there are more instances of the abridgment of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachment of those in power than by violent and sudden usurpations."

Others much more recently have counted on this with no realization they would one day be furthering the Soviet cause. A socialist clergyman, writing in the New Leader, the socialist magazine of 1927, called for a new strategy. He said Socialists should place themselves in government jobs and work for government ownership of power, and control of railroads, banking, and key industries. He called his program—"Encroaching Control." Not too long ago, Norman Thomas, six times a candidate for President on the socialist party ticket, commented that "the American people would never knowingly vote for Socialism but that under the name of liberalism, they would adopt every fragment of the socialist program."

Appealing not to the worst, but to the best in our natures, they have used our sense of fair play—our willingness to compromise—and have perfected a technique of "foot in the door" legislation. Get any part of a proposed program accepted, then with the principle of governmental participation in that field established, work for expansion, always aiming at the ultimate goal—a government that will someday be a big brother to us all.

Traditionally, one of the easiest first steps in imposing statism on a people has been government paid medicine. It is the easiest to present as a humanitarian project. No one wants to oppose care for the sick. Today, we have the costliest and hospital care. However, today three out of four Veterans of senior citizens desperately needing medical care and unable to pay, out of four Veterans whose property was seized and their cattle sold at auction to enforce their payment of Social Security taxes. The DeLange has now been published in school textbooks. A former chairman of the education committee of the House of Representatives has said, "We never taught our children that the American people would never knowingly vote for Socialism but that under the name of liberalism, they would adopt every fragment of the socialist program."

The last session of Congress adopted a measure known as the Kerr-Mills bill to provide money for state administered aid to these people. However, without even waiting to see if this meets the problem, a revised version of the once defeated Forand bill is advocated to force all people into a compulsory government health insurance program, regardless of need. Why? Well, ex-Congressman Forand provides the answer. He says, "If we can only break through and get our foot in the door, then we can expand the program after that." Walter Reuther has said his group makes no secret of the fact that they want nationalized health service for all. New American, a socialist magazine, writes, "The Forand bill will not be paid for on the insurance principle according to facts of estimated risk. It will be paid for through the tax mechanisms of Social Security . . . Once the bill is passed, this nation will be provided with a mechanism for socialized medicine."

In 1935, Social Security started with a 3 cent per dollar contribution on $3000 of income. Now it is 6 per cent of $4800, and if the proposed expansions plus the medical program are adopted, by 1969 it will be 11 per cent of $15000. It is no secret that pressure is being exerted to remove even the $5000 ceiling and make Social Security payments be based on total gross income.

Social Security was never intended to replace private savings, pensions, or insurance. It was to provide a basis for savings so that outright destitution would not follow unemployment by reason of death, disability, or old age. In that light, the actuarial experts in charge estimated in 1943 that by 1957 Social Security benefit payments would total $1.2 billion per year, but the temptation to politicians to vote people a raise, particularly in election years, was too great. In 1957, the total outgo was more than $7 billion and in 1959, outgo began exceeding intake. The recipients of Social Security benefits today will collect $65 billion more than they paid in. You and I, who are paying into this program are unfunded to an amount between $300 and $600 billion.

The average citizen has been led to believe he and his employer are contributing to a fund and that some day he will call upon this, his own money, to carry him over his non-earning years. But this isn't what Social Security representatives said before the United States Supreme Court. They stated that Social Security was not an insurance program and was not based on any actuarial standards. They stated that Social Security dues are a tax for the general use of the government, and the payment of that tax does not automatically entitle anyone to benefits. Benefit payments are a welfare program which can be curtailed or cancelled anytime Congress should so decide.

And what of our sons—the young man joining the work force in the next few years? He will be taxed to try and catch up on that mounting debt. If he could have his Social Security Tax to invest in private insurance, it would provide for almost double the benefits provided by Social Security. This is not the only price we are paying in individual freedom.

The press recently told of a group whose religious beliefs forbade their participation in any government welfare program. Their property was seized and their cattle sold at auction to enforce their payment of Social Security taxes.

In education, the foot in the door was the Federal Aid to Public Schools. Their property was seized and their cattle sold at auction to enforce their payment of Social Security taxes.
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At sixteen-to-eighteen thousand dollars of income, a man reaches the 50 per cent tax rate. From 50 per cent on up to the confiscatory 91 per cent rate, the government can only justify these brackets on a punitive basis, for the gross revenue derived from all the tax of 50 per cent or above is less than three-fourths of $1 billion.

There can be no moral justification of the progressive tax. Perhaps that is why the bureaucrats pretend it is proportionate taxation. Proportionate taxation we would gladly accept on the theory that those better able to pay should remove some of the burden from those least able to pay. The Bible explains this in its instruction on tithing. We are told that we should give the Lord one tenth and if the Lord prospers us ten times as much, we should give ten times as much. But, under our progressive income tax, computing Caesar's share is a little different. If a $5000 a year man today is prospered 10 times, his income tax increases 53 times as much.

Does this help the little man? A man with a gross income of $3500, a wife and two children will find when he has finished paying the hidden and indirect taxes, that the tax collector's share of his gross $3500 is $1059. Some suggest the answer to his problem is to tax the upper incomes even more—but what leeway is left? If the government confiscated all personal income above $6000 a year, the increased revenue wouldn't pay the interest on the national debt.

No nation in history has ever survived a tax burden of one-third of its national income. Today, 31¢ out of every dollar earned is tax and of that 31¢, 23¢ goes to the federal government; leaving 8¢ to be shared by the state, county, and local community. No wonder we are told to ask for federal aid! But wouldn't it make more sense to keep the money here in the first place instead of running it through that puzzle palace on the Potomac only to get it back minus a sizable carrying charge?

Lenin once said, 'The way to destroy Capitalism is to debase the currency. Through a process of planned inflation, a government can quietly and unobservedly confiscate the wealth of its citizens.'

Henry VII substituted copper for silver in his coins, and we have been no less deliberate in our inflationary policies. Our dollar has lost more than half its purchasing power in twenty years. Of course, we are told that incomes have kept pace, that the earnings of a $500 a year man in 1940, must earn $14,000 today to break even and pay his increased surtax. The $10,000 a year man faces an increase of $12,000 in his tax bill and must now earn $31,000 just to maintain the same purchasing power.

Project these figures ahead just 15 years, keeping the same annual rate of inflation and the same tax rate, and could anyone even pretend that free enterprise will exist? By 1975, the $5000 a year man will have to earn $353,000 and the $10,000 a year man will have to earn $84,000 just to maintain their 1940 standard of living.

Here is the main battleground! We must reduce the government's supply of money and deny it the right to borrow. Two years ago, I appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee as a representative of the motion picture industry to urge tax reform. This was an experience similar to going over Niagara Falls in a barrel—the hard way, upstream. In a month of hearings, representatives of practically every segment of our society appeared before the committee. All of them urged some kind of tax reform. It was obvious that the majority of the committee had little sympathy with our plea, so it was no surprise when, several months later, the committee decided to hold new hearings. This time no volunteers were allowed. A hand-picked group of predominantly campus economists appeared and talked of plugging loopholes to increase the government's tax revenue. Most of these so-called loopholes are the legitimate deductions without which the whole tax structure would have long since proved unworkable. The suggestions included disallowance of property taxes and interest on loans for income tax purposes and even the elimination of 100 per cent deductions of charitable contributions.

The biggest lobby in Washington pushing tax reform has a bill which will increase the government's tax take about $18 billion. It is no coincidence that they have, on the other hand, recommendations for $18 billion worth of welfare legislation. This measure will actually be presented as tax reduction with some cut in surtax rates.

Those of the "liberal" persuasion say they "reject the notion that the least government is the best government." They claim our citizens are not intelligent enough to spend their money properly. They feel the government should take the money through taxation and then buy the welfare programs for the masses which they are not smart enough to buy for themselves.

When the old fashioned idea of living within our means and paying something on the National debt is suggested, these same liberals tell us that "only State and local debt is bad." Through some exotic bookkeeping methods, they seem to feel that the Federal debt is meaningless. It is—it is incomprehensible.

If I had a four inch stack of thousand dollar bills in my hand, I'd be a millionaire. If we had the national debt of $293 billion before us in thousand dollar bills, the pile would be more than 18 miles high. Maurice Stans, former budget director, has said that this debt is only the part of the iceberg which shows above the surface. Legislation already enacted into law has obligated our government to more than $750 billion. Add to this the local and state debts plus the private debts of our citizens, and we find that we are mortgaged in an amount more than double the market value of every tangible asset and every foot of real estate in the United States.

When we point out the danger of more deficit spending, we are told, "we are sacrificing our security on the false altar of a balanced budget." This is not so. Our individual freedom and our free enterprise system are the very sources of our strength, and there can be little security any place in the free world if there isn't fiscal stability in the United States.

With no one using the term "Socialism" to describe these encroaching controls, we find that today, one out of seven of the nation's work force is on the public payroll. In just 15 years a 50 per cent increase in employees has been met with a 170 per cent increase in the public payroll. One fourth of our medical manpower is socialized. Senator Byrd estimates that forty million Americans receive some form of direct cash payment from government. We have a tax machine that, in direct contravention of the Constitution, is not designed to solely raise revenue but is used, openly and admirably, to control and direct the economy and to equalize the earnings of our people.

Do not forsake the other issues; but as Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes said, "Strike for the jugular. Reduce taxes and spending. Keep government poor and remain free." Write to your Congressmen as individuals. Fifty letters from a group to your Congressmen as individuals, fifty letters from a group to your Congressmen individually will make a difference. In this last hour of your power to affect the world, let us make a determined effort to save our country from the insidious infestation of subversion.
If your Congressman should say we must cut costs first and then reduce taxes—don’t stand for it. Remind him that no government in history has ever voluntarily reduced itself in the Governments don’t tax to get the money they need. Governments will always find a need for the money they get. There can only be one end to the war we are in. It won’t go away if we simply try to outwait it. Wars end in victory or defeat. One of the foremost authorities on Communism in the world today had said we have 10 years. Not ten years to make it all be slave or all free. In this land occurred the only true revolution in man’s history. All other revolutions simply exchanged one set of rulers for another. Here, for the first time, the Founding Fathers—that little band of men so advanced beyond their time that the world has never seen their like since—evolved a government based on the idea that you and I have the god-given right and ability within ourselves to determine our own destiny. Freedom is never more than one generation away from extinction—we didn’t pass it on to our children in the bloodstream. It must be fought for, protected, and handed on for them to do the same, or one day we will spend our sunset years telling our children and our children’s children, what it once was like in the United States when men were free.

# Discipline In A Free Society

## PERSONAL ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY

By ARLEIGH A. BURKE, Admiral, United States Navy, Chief of Naval Operations

Delivered at the Management Course for Professionals, American Management Association Academy, Saranac Lake, New York, July 11, 1961

It is a great pleasure for me to meet and talk with you today. I don’t intend to talk too long this morning because I am looking forward to your searching questions. However, this occasion provides a welcome opportunity to express my personal and official thanks for the tremendous contribution that American industry, that American industrialists and management skill make to the continuing improvement and effectiveness of our modern Navy. We in the Navy appreciate your support.

You, the presidents, the executives, the leaders of our nation’s industry are to be congratulated for many things: the vitality you have brought to American business for strength and vigor your efforts have imparted to our national economy. Perhaps most importantly, you deserve congratulations for your keen interest in the future of our country. To borrow the words of Charles Kettering “We are all interested in the future, because we plan to spend the balance of our lives there.” Your discussions here will do much to ensure that we will have a brighter, better future, that we will achieve the great hopes of this country.

But I don’t believe you asked me here this morning to tell you how good you are or how well you are performing. I don’t believe you expect any easy plaudits from me today, I don’t intend to offer any. So without attempting to be didactic, I’m going to be absolutely candid with you.

Now I have no use for the “apostles of doom” who predict an imaginable catastrophe for our Nation. At the same time, however, we must be soberly aware of what is going on in the world. We must be realistic enough, frank enough to admit that we are at a critical juncture in this year of our lives. Your discussions here will do much to ensure that we will have a brighter, better future, that we will achieve the great hopes of this country.

The insidious cancer of communism inching down the mountains of southeast Asia, the festering sore of Cuba, the growing infection spread by Communist infiltration and subversion throughout the underdeveloped areas of Asia, Africa, and Latin America are only the latest symptoms of a world and troubled world.

To put it bluntly, the future of the world is being determined now. And many competent observers believe that the coming decade, perhaps the coming year, will be decisive.

That is why when it was suggested that I discuss discipline with you, I found the topic particularly appropriate. For in a very real sense, the challenge of our age, the conflict we face today is a conflict between two forms of discipline. It is a competition between the type of discipline a free society must possess to remain free: the self-discipline that free men and free nations choose to govern their lives and insure their progress versus the alternative, a ruthless, godless form of discipline imposed by external pressure, the discipline of force, of coercion, the discipline of terror and intimidation.

As a military man ending 42 years of naval service I have personally seen the importance that discipline plays in battle. I’ve seen good discipline pay off when the odds appeared hopeless. And I’ve seen the lack of discipline destroy the effectiveness of combat forces, as it did, for example, to the Italians at Adowa, to the Spanish fleet at Manila and Santiago, to the Russian army on the eastern front in the First World War. Without effective discipline a military force becomes little more than an ineffectual mob. Disaster follows hand-in-hand with weakened discipline. All of you as chief executives understand very well the indispensable role, the vital function, that discipline plays in any organization. You are well aware that a business can stay alive in this highly competitive world only if it can meet the very real and demanding disciplines of the marketplace.

Unfortunately, too many citizens look upon the word discipline as something severe, as something designed to curtail initiative, to restrict their individual freedom. They think of discipline—in any form—as an unreasonable demand by arbitrary authority. These people who seek to avoid discipline fail to recognize that everyone is subject to some form of control, to some system of rules and regulations. They fail to realize that while the freedom to think and to feel is absolute, the freedom to act must be restricted by the needs of society.

Most importantly, those who view discipline as an irksome imposition, do not realize that our democratic system is based on discipline. They do not understand that a free government depends absolutely on disciplined individuals who freely adhere to a set of rules which prescribe the relationships within their own society. When George Washington with remarkable perception expressed his belief that freedom was “staked on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people” he envisioned a disciplined people motivated by fundamental