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WHAT HAS BEEN THE KENNEDY RECORD ???

TAXES AND ECONOMICS

1. We have gone so consistently into debt that our motto on our coins should be changed to read: "IN DEBT WE TRUST."

2. So far -- failed to balance the budget in 3 years

   -- $22-billion more spending now than in 1960, with more than half of this in non-defense increases

   -- Promises at least three more deficits

   -- No solid reason to ever expect balanced budget from Kennedy, to say nothing of enough surpluses "over the economic cycle" to have a balanced budget.

3. Kennedy wants a transitional deficit (one to get us over the hump.) The only way to have a transitional deficit, is to have a transitional President, and get back to sound Republican philosophy of govt.

4. Tax program -- It was carefully planned with only one thing in mind: will it win or lose votes? The motivating force was political, not economic. What he has in mind is not the welfare of the economy, but the welfare of his own political administration.

5. Examples of "reforms"

   a. A retired veteran found it would be 23 years before he would benefit by the reductions -- and that is longer than his life expectancy.

   b. A homeowner with an $8,000 income and a mortgaged home, could lose $1,000 in deductions because of the "five per cent floor" on deductions in the reforms.
6. This is a planned deficit — the Whit Kids in the White House actually enjoy wallowing in red ink.

7. They condemn as PURITANS those of us whose standards of conduct make us believe it is honorable and right to pay our taxes so that the government pays its own way.

   Meanwhile, they exalt KA Professor Walter Heller who advocates pump priming with your tax dollars as the solution to all our economic ills.

   Personally -- my choice is clear. I'S RATHER BE A PURITAN THAN A Heller.

8. What Republicans believe: we should have lower taxes at all levels. They are now too high and in some cases discriminatory.

   The tax burden -- prevents business growth.

   -- limits America's prosperity

But honesty and morality demands that we not burden our children with our errors and high living -- we must have lower spending by government if we are to have lower taxes.
Editor

This Is a Tax Cut?

Although I am in the lowest tax bracket, President Kennedy's proposed tax charges would increase my Federal income tax as follows: In 1963 by $274; in 1964 by $315; and in 1965, 1966 and 1967 by $186 per year. In 1968 I will become 65 years of age, and my tax will be $57 per year less than at present. At that rate it will be 23 years before I gain by the proposed law, which is greater than my life expectancy.

I am not an exceptional case, but one of the tens of thousands of persons such as policemen, firemen, teachers, members of the Armed Forces, etc., who retired before they were 65 years of age under a public retirement system, one established by the Federal Government.

JEMAN W. PEIRCE

The Tax Floor

Frank C. Porter's article of Feb. 14 is headlined "5 Per Cent Tax Deduction Floor Widely Misunderstood." Mr. Porter's error is that he misunderstands the opposition to the 5 per cent floor.

The Secretary of the Treasury on Feb. 7 made it clear to the House Ways and Means Committee that the sole purpose of the 5 per cent floor amendment is to raise revenue, not to remove any inequity or unnecessary preference in the tax structure.

Proceeding from this fact, the question properly arises: "Who will bear the brunt of this recovery of $2.3 billion?"

A taxpayer with an adjusted gross income of $6000, who is not a home owner, finds that his estate and local taxes, church and charitable contributions are $900 or less. He takes the standard deduction of 10 per cent of income, or $600. However, the home owner with the same taxes, church and charitable contributions as the non-home owner discovers that the interest on his home mortgage and the real estate taxes bring his itemized deductions to $1800. He will, of course, itemize his deductions and, under the Administration's proposal, he will be able to deduct only $1100 because his deductions up to 5 per cent of his income are disallowed. Thus he loses $400 in deductions. The reverse effect is particularly evident in new home purchases because of the high interest charges in the early years of the mortgage.

Obviously the home owner, under the Administration's 5 per cent floor amendment, is going to be "nicked" for the $2.3 billion. None of the impressive statistical tables submitted by the Treasury Department stands up under the impact of this incontrovertible fact.

JOHN C. WILLIAMSON

As President Kennedy stated, this floor would decrease considerably the number of persons who would be able to itemize deductions. This, in effect, would eliminate tax savings which individuals have in the past received because of the present provision where a deduction for all charitable contributions up to 20 per cent, and in some cases 30 per cent, of adjusted income is allowed. This would affect not only the giving programs of donors in the middle-income brackets but also those in the higher income brackets.

For example, a man with an adjusted gross income of $1000-$2000 would receive no tax deduction on a gift to charity unless his total deductions exceeded $5000 and only that amount over $5000. This bill, therefore, would undo all of the work that university fund raisers and thousands of volunteers have done in the last few years. This would eventually bring about complete dependence by our private institutions on Government support.

C. E. GRIFFITH III

Nashville, Tenn.
ELECTION RESULTS IN 1962

Governor's races: expected 8, got only one
House races: hoped for 20 or more, got only three.

caused by Gerrymandering, a term originated in Boston, the home of a number of well-known politicians

Senate races: hoped to hold our own, but lost four.

POOR SHOWING

However..... Some bright spots too. Overall national strength is equal to the Democrats'. If you add total vote of all races for Governor, House and Senate, we got 49% of popular vote.

That means..... The Kennedys have NO GREAT POPULAR MANDATE for their radical ideas.
That means..... The White House Whiz Kids have a claim on only half the country, and some of these are conservative Democrats who oppose them.

We did better because: (1) The South throwing off Democratic yoke
(2) Breaking Democratic armlock on the big cities

As for possible splits in the Democratic Party — we have found in Michigan that any splits among the Democrats are usually 50-50.
speaking about unity.....

THE MICHIGAN EXPERIENCE .... one of the brightest spots in 1962.

For 14 years Michigan suffered. — Paup! age

12 years under Soapy Williams — Many Republicans told me that if they knew John Kennedy was going to send Soapy to Africa, they would have voted Democratic in 1960.

2 years under an even less able man: John Swainson.

What happened in those 14 years?/

deficits... decay ... loss of industry ... loss of prestige... the only thing we gained was ridicule...

laughing-stock of the nation.

Why did it happen?

Republicans were splintered --- personality clashes

--- more prima donnas than voters

The party was fractured --- philosophical differences were small

--- the spirit of compromise was lost

THE IMPORTANCE OF COMPROMISE -- see page

How did we change?

We learned that holding grudges was a terribly expensive luxury

We learned that in at least half of the 8 elections involved (1948-60), the state was the loser because of intra-party fights.

We learned that when you carry differences with you very long, you carry them to the grave -- the result is disaster for the party for the state for the people

We got a top candidate: George Romney

We found there is room under the Republican umbrella for lots of opinions

THE RESULTS -- Romney's tax program

New spirit in the state; new confidence.
The Republicans *definitely* can win.

We have a good stable of candidates. You and I both know who they are or might be. No candidate worth his salt can linger in the wings or stand aloof from the political scene today. Must get off the bench and get out to:

1. Help Build Party Organization
2. Speak out on issues -- clarifying the wide differences between the parties
3. Build Party Unity
4. Inform public of their own varying attitudes on important subjects.

Sure, we have differences but our basic philosophy of free enterprise and limited government permits differences and invites compromises to attain our well-known basic goals.

We have to get out and work. **YOU** have to get out and work.

If, because of inertia, dissent or reluctance to compromise our differences we were to delay a united effort until the convention time in 1964, we shall have demonstrated to the people of America that they probably were right to elect a Democratic President and Democratic Congress in 1960 and 1962.
Mr. Kennedy says things when he wants to and how he wants to -- without consideration for anything other than its political consequences.

When the Cuban prisoner exchange was going through last Christmas, I wrote the President a long, specific letter asking some pertinent questions about the ransom deal -- which I still think was beneath the dignity of the United States to agree to. I have received no answer to that letter, written two months ago.

Kennedy is one of the WORLD'S GREAT NEWSMANAGERS. If you were to send a bale of hay to Caroline's pony Macaroni, the Salinger machinery would move into high gear and you would get your picture in the Washington Post. The President would write a long letter of thankson his best engraved stationery. Jackie would squeeze into her slacks and go out and pitch hay to Macaroni on the White House lawn -- with photographers. Bobby and his brood would come over for the afternoon -- in hiking shoes of course -- and the television cameras would grind out the happy family scene. America would cheer on schedule and the Gallup Poll would register another Kennedy public relations triumph.

BUT -- if you sit down in your office and write a long, deliberate letter expressing concern over the HONOR of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA -- well, don't bother -- you'll get nothing -- nothing.
Differences between Democrats and Republicans are wide and irreconcilable.

Republicans have many difference within their organization. True.

What organization, what family, does not?

But — with very few exceptions, these differences can be accommodated and resolved. Honest compromises can be reached.

Is it fundamentally or morally wrong to achieve an honorable compromise. I SAY "NO."

Forefathers, men of high purpose and solid principle. They all were dedicated to ideals and principles as clearly enunciated as any we know today. And they didn't all think alike.

George Washington — James Madison (often called the Father of the Constitution) — Benjamin Franklin — Governor Morris of Pennsylvania — and many others.

How do you suppose men of this type were able to agree on subjects and wording of such fearful importance? The essence of the Constitution — and of all legislative activity which has taken place under the Constitution — is Compromise.

Compromise is fundamental to business, to marriage, and to politics. Compromise is good, and when you fail to remember that and fail to apply the same principles of compromise our founding fathers applied to the Constitution — then failure is your reward.

I doubt that there is a Republican in America with whom I don't differ on at least one issue. AND I DIFFER WITH MRS. FORD ON MORE THAN THAT.
SOME RECOMMENDATIONS ON CAMPAIGNING

Tell the Republican Story in simple, logical words.

1. Stop talking in millions and billions of dollars -- that's too much for anyone to understand.

   Example: the **federal debt**. Explain how much it **debt** costs him each year.
   Example: **Medicare**. Explain how much it **Medicare** cost him as compared with private insurance. And how the policy varies.
   Example: Public Housing. Explain the cost of this to the govt. and to him, and the cost of the slums they will create.
   Example: **Schoolrooms**. Explain the cost of local schools and its effect on individual taxes, and relate that to the plans to construct federal classrooms in other parts of the country with federal tax money.

WE REPUBLICANS HAVE CONTENTED OURSELVES SIMPLY WITH SAYING THAT CERTAIN THINGS ARE DISHONEST, IMMORAL AND WRONG. WE HAVE NOT SPELLED OUT IN THE SIMPLEST TERMS THE COST OF GOVERNMENT PATERNALISM TO EACH INDIVIDUAL.

2. Start spending money on television and radio.

3. Debunk the silly idea that the Republicans are the party of the privileged. Democrats believe this NOT because they have any strong evidence, but simply because they haven't been convinced to the contrary. They are apt to forget Hyannis Port or the massive wealth represented by the Kennedys, the Harrimans, the Soapy Williams Clan, the Stevensons and others. Believing in the brotherhood of man, they tend to applaud the President's action in resigning from racially segregated Metropolitan Club in Washington. And they forget that Hyannis Port and Palm Beach, where the President plays his golf, are as segregated as any club or community in the country.
More Recommendations on Campaigning

4. Tell the truth and tell it often and tell it loudly.

--- It is beginning to get through to the American People that you can manage the news just so long.

--- The folks at home are beginning to realize that there is no substance to the fog of publicity put out by the Kennedys and McNamara and Bokie.

By the election in 1964, Americans will know there is a very shaky foundation under the House that Jack Built.
INTRODUCTION

Texas Longhorn Story
Great, Great Man
Thank Goodness Something Still Done by Hand
If it wasn't for the honor of the thing, I'd rather walk...

Career Survey on politics and politicians

"blood in the veins and breath of life in the still bones..."
POLITICAL LABELS -- scorecards .... voting records

These ARE useful, but they are neither infallible nor entirely objective.

Their accuracy depends on what record votes are used to determine the Congressman's vote pattern.

Last year there were 293 record votes. But only a dozen are usually selected by an organization for its purposes.

I DENY THAT TEN OR TWELVE VOTES A YEAR TRULY DETERMINE A LEGISLATOR'S PHILOSOPHY.
And certainly it does not accurately reflect a legislator's ability, honesty, attendance record, reputation, knowledge of his district, imagination, efficiency, effectiveness or determination.

Example: 1962 vote on federal pay raise separated the spenders from the savers.

I was one of 20 members of the House who voted "No."

This bill gave pay raises to 2,400,000 government employees, and added about $1,000,000,000 to the budget every year.

The point — this vote, which was a good measure of fiscal attitude, was not used by any Conservative rating agency as a measure of political conservatism or liberalism. It should have been — and if it had a lot of so-called conservatives would have received lower scores.
WHAT HAS BEEN THE KENNEDY RECORD ?? -- 2

UNEMPLOYMENT  ** We have had a lot of bally-hoo, but unemployment at the beginning of this year was just where it was when Kennedy took over in 1962. In fact, it's slightly worse.

FOREIGN POLICY -- Around the world in 30 seconds

Europe -- falling into disarray
Canada -- disrespect for our government's amateurish handling of the sensitive nuclear warheads situation
Laos -- Teetering on the brink of disaster
Viet Nam-- In for a long, and very costly war
South America -- chaos in most areas. Alliance for Progress not producing any progress and not reducing the threat of Communism.

Is this the best the Democrats can do? Surely if our State and Defense Departments had employed the proven principles of foreign policy utilized under the Eisenhower administration, we would not be facing the shambles of American prestige which face us today.

Cuba -- see next page

One comment from a letter I received recently puts this situation well: "We are disarming our overseas bases. Khrushchev told us not to. He is building his up. We told him not to."
Stifling criticism -- Mr. George Ball, undersecretary of state, objected last week to political criticism of the Cuban situation. I agree that in times of severe peril (war) we should have a bi-partisan foreign policy. But in TIMES OF VACILLATION, MISREPRESENTATION, DRIFT and UNCERTAINTY such as we have today, responsible criticism is required to put the government back on the track. I'm just sorry for Mr. Ball, but I won't keep quite just to let his think. His thoughts haven't been too productive lately.

Legitimate criticism -- the period from Sept. 5 to Aug. 14.
--- George Ball's statement about "no evidence of ballistic missiles" was erroneous.
--- Defense department had reason to make more of a surveillance effort than they did at that time.
--- "Downgrade the threat" was the official policy at that time.

Proper Action -- taken from Aug. 22 to about Nov. 1

Now -- we are putting our head in the sand again. Rusk's misstatement about Cuba not being used as base for subversion
--- Need better reconnaissance; should resume low-level flights
--- Should take strong action -- replace quarantine and make it stick
FOREIGN POLICY CONCLUSION

What we need is cool, clear-headed, well-advised leadership in the White House.

We have a life-and-death struggle on our hands and we have got to have a man in there who will SLAM HIS FIST DOWN IN FRONT OF CASTRO'S LONELY BEARD RIGHT NOW — before the pestilence of Communism sweeps across Central and South America and consumes us all.
REPUBLICAN PARTY PROPOSALS

1. Cuba — reimpose quarantine and low-level reconnaissance flights
2. Foreign Aid — retain it, but be extremely careful to see that it produces the desired results
3. Taxes — reduce them and remove inequities
4. Budget — cut it — Cut it $5-billion and challenge Kennedy to find another $5-billion to cut
5. Farm legislation — Begin to free the farmer from the regimentation of a wasteful farm price support law, and begin to save the consumer money which is otherwise paid to support prices and pay farmers for needless production.
6. Defense — Retain the MIXED FORC concept of defense as opposed to placing all our defense eggs into one missile basket.
7. Constitution — protect it as the most masterful document conceived in the mind of man.

Protect it against the efforts of the Kennedy administration who want to take unto the Executive Branch undue power. Also, prevent Senator Fulbright from giving up any power to President in foreign policy field — (which he did not specify but which can only be treaty powers.)