

**J. BRACKEN LEE
UNMASKS
THE
INCOME TAX
LAW**

By MYRON C. FAGAN

No. 56

Published by

CINEMA EDUCATIONAL GUILD, INC.

MYRON C. FAGAN, NATIONAL DIRECTOR
Organized to Combat Communism

APRIL, 1957 - News-Bulletin

Based on the Hon. J. Bracken Lee's address to the
Fellows of the Cinema Educational Guild at their
Meeting on March 25, 1957, at the Wilshire-
Ebell Theatre in Los Angeles, Calif.

REPRINTED by:

CPA BOOKS

33838 SE KELSO RD #6
P.O. BOX 596
BORING, OR 97009

WHY C. E. G. SUPPORTED LEE

For a number of years J. Bracken Lee, former Governor of Utah, has been a "hair shirt" for all the traitors in the Great Conspiracy to destroy the sovereignty of the United States and the Freedoms of the American people.

He was the first Governor to refuse to proclaim a "United Nations" Day in his State — and to banish the UN *so-called* flag from all his State Buildings.

In the eyes of the Internationalists — *and Eisenhower* — that was rank heresy. Because by that deed Governor Lee publicly proclaimed that the UN is a DEATH TRAP for the U.S. . . . it was a signal *and a challenge* for all the other State Governors to proclaim *in like manner* that the UN is a mortal enemy of the U.S. The panic that swept through the Internationalist gang was quite understandable — because if only half of the State Governors would follow Governor Lee's example it would mean the end for the UN. Right then and there Lee was marked for political destruction.

But Lee went even further with his "heresy": He was the first man in high office to refuse to pay the Federal Income Tax — on the ground that the Internationalists who are now in control of our Government are employing the confiscatory powers of the 16th Amendment to squander our money in a so-called Foreign Aid program that is bolstering a "One-World" conspiracy to destroy the Sovereignty of our Nation.

In the eyes of Eisenhower — *and the Internationalists* — that was a CARDINAL SIN! Because if only a few Governors and just a few thousand courageous *Americans* would do likewise the entire machinery of the Income Tax monstrosity would grind to a halt — and the Great Conspiracy would be smashed!

Thus, Governor Lee became the Great Conspiracy's greatest Menace. If he continued in his high office — if the people of Utah approved his "heresy" by re-electing him, it would automatically establish him as a Symbol of Freedom for *all* of the American people of this day and age even as Patrick Henry was the symbol of the American people of *his* day and age . . . even more important, re-election of Lee would be an inspiration and a spine-stiffener for other politicians. Hence the panic of the Internationalists — Lee had to be *stopped!*

There was only one way to stop him: he would have to be destroyed at the voting booths — he would have to be so *disastrously* defeated that it would look like an angry repudiation by his own people of his charges against the UN and the 16th Amendment.

Furthermore, it was imperative he be "knocked out" at the primaries and prevented from running as an Independent. In other words, he had to be made "a horrible example" as a warning to *all* politicians to walk the Internationalists' political chalk line.

The Internationalists left nothing undone to accomplish their objective. They poured tons and tons of money into Utah. Simultaneously, the powers-that-be in the so-called Republican Party instructed their Utah hatchet-man, Senator Watkins to "do a job" on Lee . . . *it is to be remembered that this same Watkins was Eisenhower's hatchet-man in the reprehensible McCarthy Censure conspiracy.*

Mr. Lee knew that he could have saved himself from defeat and liquidation by simply retracting his stands against the UN and the Federal Income Tax law. But he refused to sell his birthright for a mess of political pottage. He knew that with all political cards stacked against him he would be defeated, but he determined to go down fighting. But he quickly discovered that even that was not to be so easy. A political campaign requires money — the "thumbs down" edict of the Internationalist-controlled Republican Party political machine had driven away all his former financial supporters.

In short, Lee discovered that if he was to run independently, he would have to get his financing from sources not controlled by the politicians. And that was when the "*Cinema Educational Guild*" came to his support. We made a *national* issue of it — we wrote to all our members in all parts of the country and urged them to send "*one dollar or more*" to the Lee Re-election Campaign Fund. And, *in Mr. Lee's own words*, the response was nothing less than sensational — contributions, *ranging from one dollar to a thousand*, poured in from all 48 States;

Here is why we did that:

As an organization, we (CEG) are not "political" in the accepted meaning of that word. Our sole objective is the salvation of our country. Our primary "jobs" are:- 1) Drive the REDS out of "Hollywood", Radio and TELEVISION — and thus destroy the brain-washing apparatus of the GREAT CONSPIRACY in those Media 2:) Get the U.S. out of the UN and the UN out of the U.S. In addition, we are wholeheartedly in support of the repeal of the confiscatory powers of the present Income Tax Law — and, by that token, we wholeheartedly support all organizations and individuals, regardless of Party labels, who are working for that objective.

That was why we went all-out to support J. Bracken Lee. In our sight he was not just a politician fighting for his *political* life — he

was an AMERICAN fighting for the salvation of our country.

Well, we know what happened. Lee was “knocked-out” in the Primaries — he was “quarantined” from all *political* sources of financing. But he *did* run independently. He was defeated — *as was expected* — but he went down fighting a fight out of which he emerged an indestructible Leader of a nation-wide movement to smash the confiscatory Income Tax law — to smash the UN Death Trap — to smash the entire Great Conspiracy.

On March 25, 1957, at the Wilshire-Ebell Theatre, in Los Angeles, Mr. Lee told a gathering of CEG members just how that job can and MUST be done. One of the most important features in that address is Mr. Lee’s “answer” to the oft-repeated contention that the “confiscation” in our tax laws cannot be repealed, or even modified, because it is the only way the Government can get the funds with which to operate — *and to safeguard the security of the nation . . .* that contention is the alibi for Eisenhower’s continually spiralling Budgets !!!

And, *amazingly*, many Ike-lovers, even while groaning under their tax-loads, accept that phony contention and refuse to “see” that it is railroading our nation into bankruptcy and utter disaster.

In appraising Mr. Lee’s address the reader should bear in mind that his statements are based not on *theory*, but on his own experiences as a head of a State, who, like the man in the White House, had to depend on taxes to operate *his* Government.



Following the usual introductory comments, Mr. Lee went right to the heart of his subject. In his very opening statement he pointed directly to the man who is responsible for all the chaos in our national affairs, and to our hero-worshipping folly that enables that man to pile chaos upon chaos:



THE ADDRESS



My one great fear is the trend—and perhaps it isn’t a new trend—that the people who believe as we do, believe in our form of government, as well as those who believe in some other form, have the tendency to put an individual upon a pedestal where he does not

belong. I know that my feet are made of clay. I know that I'm a human being just like everyone in this room. I'm subject to all the weaknesses of every other individual. I am not a hero worshipper myself. I cannot believe that simply because we've elected somebody as President of the United States that he has all the answers for all of our human weaknesses, because after all, he's a man just like I am. A human being just like the rest of us. And I think it might be wise to say this to you: Don't put your faith too much in man, you'd better put it in God and in Law itself.

You had an example of Government by Man in this little film that you watched tonight . . .

(NOTE:— The "little film" mentioned is "IT CAN HAPPEN HERE", a 30 minute film we (CEG) produced in 1950. It depicts the tyranny and despotism of Communist Dictatorship in Bulgaria. This film made a profound impression on Mr. Lee — he saw it as a perfect example of what happens to a people when they are governed by MAN, not by LAW. More important, he saw in it the drift of America to the same kind of "government". Ed.)

That is the kind of government I have great fear of — and I don't care who the man may be. Our government was founded in the belief that we would have Government by law — which means the law was written down and all of us would be treated equally under that law . . . Equal justice, as near as it was humanly possible to administer. But now we have this trend of disregarding our Constitution, disregarding the laws, doing what our leaders think are right, and many of us are inclined to believe that simply because we have elected a man to public office he automatically has all the answers and that we should follow his plan blindly. That is something I can not do. I've served in Government and I know that I'm the same kind of an individual that I was basically when I lived in the little town of Price. Furthermore, there is nothing changed about me. I know what was right and what was wrong in my little community. My friends knew me, as your friends know you. When I was elected the Governor of my State, it didn't make me a better man. Perhaps I've learned a few things, but, fundamentally and basically, I'm the same man. Men that we elect to Congress, men that we send back to the Senate, you people who know them, knew them in their communities — you knew all their weaknesses, and yet many of us are inclined to believe that simply because we've elected that man to office he has all the answers. In other words, they elected me, twice, as Governor of my State and I'm sure that at least a few people thought — "well, there is a man that has all the answers and he

can cure all of our ills" — *but I have no doubt that many of them also said: "he shouldn't be talking about the Federal business because he is running the State — he doesn't know anything about the Federal Government."*

But now let's turn that around — if they should elect me and send me to Congress, the people will say: "he has all the answers now, he knows how to settle all the world's problems." The point is, we are inclined to sit here and let Congress decide all of these things, when the truth of the matter is that there's undoubtedly more people in this audience who are better qualified to fill that job than the men you send to Washington. So, I say: put your faith in God and let's get back to Government by Law instead of by man.

As a concrete example, if you have read today's paper you will have noticed that an agreement was entered into whereby we are going to furnish some of these so-called warheads to foreign nations. We find that the paper states it is against the law — that under the law we cannot turn any of these warheads over to any foreign nation, and yet the men who head our government turn right around and inform us that they are getting around the law by saying that they are going to put them in storage in those countries — then they will be turned over to the nations when they need them. Well, now, if it's against the law, that's the very thing I'm talking about. Here are our leaders who are stating and showing us how they are getting around what they know is against the law!

Now, I've talked many times on the fundamentals of our Constitution, and I think that I should do it every opportunity that I have, such as this evening, because to me Government is rather a simple thing and not the complicated thing that our leaders like to make us believe it is. Actually, there are only two fundamental forms of Government. You saw in this film tonight where they talked about the Fascists and Communists as if they were two entirely different forms of Government, but actually, they are one and the same thing. There are only two fundamentally different forms of Government and they are these: either the people are going to run their government, or their government runs the people.

Our Constitution was drawn with the sole thought in mind that the people are going to run this Government — our Constitution is drawn on that basis. Our Constitution was also drawn upon the theory that you must not put your faith in man. The Constitution is not an instrument that limits the powers of the people, or tells the people what they can do and what they can not do. The Constitution was intended to be the law to govern and regulate and control the men who hold public office. That's all that this Constitution is.

CITES ANOTHER EXAMPLE

I will now give you another example of what I mean. To clarify that example I'll have to tell you that I have picked up a little case of Flu. I don't know whether I picked it up before I crossed the border into California, or after. I came in yesterday, just feeling fine. I usually feel good all the time. In fact, I had several people call me on the phone today and the first thing they said was: "how are you feeling?" My reply was: "I'm feeling fine." Actually, I didn't feel good and I don't feel very good now — all due to this little flu bug—and that reminds me of something that happened when I came through your Border down here: there were some armed guards who stopped my car and had me open the trunk to see if I had any seeds or diseased plants that I was bringing into California. Those guards were there to guard you California people from rotting seeds and diseased plants. Now, supposing I had picked up that little flu bug before I arrived at the California border. Those guards weren't able to see that bug, or, if they had seen it, they had no way to keep it out. Those guards could "protect" you from a bad orange, or a bad banana, or a ridiculous little seed, or a diseased plant, but they couldn't protect you from a flu bug or some other contagious, but invisible disease that came through in my car.

But what makes the whole thing even more ridiculous — and totally unnecessary — is that I can come into California by plane, or by train, and bring in fruit or shrubbery of any kind, and nobody would stop to search me. The only way you can't bring in contaminated fruits or vegetables is by automobile — every other way is wide open! And as I drove through I thought to myself: there is a pretty good example of an unnecessary Bureau. And I wondered how much it costs the taxpayers in California to keep all those unnecessary people on the State payroll — it certainly costs something. In my opinion, that is one Bureau you Californians surely could eliminate to your advantage — aside from the saving of the salaries — because all it does is annoy people without it doing much, if any, good. It is like a lot of the Washington Bureaus — as you will see as I get further into this talk.

What I am getting at is that under our present form of Government your own government doesn't trust its people. Your government regulates and controls everything we do as citizens. We are regulated and controlled on the highways — and that's all right.

We're regulated and controlled in the operation of banking business. We're regulated and controlled in the handling of food and drugs and other things. In fact, every line of business today is regulated and controlled, and it is always done with the one thought in mind—that we are going to protect the people from being exploited by others! In other words, they don't say that all bankers are dishonest, but they do say that enough of them can't be trusted so we must regulate all of them so that they won't beat the people. We must regulate those who handle foods so that they won't sell us contaminated food. All right — we're doing all of this to protect the people. Now the only thing that protects the people from abuses by government is this Constitution. That is the one document that says what a man in public office can do and can not do. Therefore why should a politician or a man in public office be placed in any other category than the rest of us? After all, if we can't be trusted in the conduct of our businesses, then how in the world can you trust the man in public office, or a politician? They are the same kind of people that we are. They come from every walk in life, and I am sure that there are as many of them that can't be trusted as there are of us who can't be trusted. That is why I want that Constitution lived up to! That's why I want this government kept in the hands of the people!

I had a debate here not long ago with an attorney on the subject of the constitutionality of the Federal Government taxing the American people for the support of foreign governments. I held that it was an absolute violation of the Constitution. No doubt there are also many people, who have probably never given the Constitution much thought and believe in the theory that whatever the leader says is right is a good thing, who would question my intelligence. But, read your Constitution — and if you believe that men in public office should be limited in their powers, as those who drew the Constitution believed, then you have to go along with the theory that if you are going to preserve freedom, you must retain this Constitution. There is nothing in the Constitution that even remotely authorizes the Federal Government to tax its people for the support of any foreign nation. In fact, it specifically sets forth what the Federal Government can do, and cannot do, and it says that the Federal Government can only do those things that are specifically set forth therein. All other powers are retained unto the states and/or the people. It means that every single power that isn't specifically permitted men in public office is retained unto the people, and the only way they can take that power away from us is for we, The People, ourselves, to change the Constitution.

This attorney said to me, "Why, that isn't the intent of the Constitution at all? You can't make me believe that it was ever intended

that men in public office would be held down by the limits of the Constitution." And I retorted: "Why not. Where are the freedoms of the people unless you do." In reply, he said: "The freedom comes about in the fact that you have the right to vote a man in or out of office at election time." In other words, if he has abused that power at election time you can vote him out. Well, now, let's just stop and analyze this and see if his argument is sound.

In the first place, how much difference did you have between the two political parties last time so that you could vote one rascal out and another one in? You had no choice! Then he argued with me that if you read the Constitution it says something under the General Welfare Clause that our Government should be run in the interest of the people. So he, as a man in public office, has been entrusted by the voters to run this Government as he thinks is best. Now let's analyze that: Let's suppose that, as the Governor of my State, I operated upon the theory that whatever I thought was best for my people I could do. Let's suppose that a man is honest to begin with; that he has no ulterior motives, and many people, believe me, are honest in their theories on this. As an illustration, certainly a man who is deeply religious and believes in a certain political faith would be absolutely honest in believing that everybody would be better off if they believed as he did. That's a natural thing. Well let's suppose that, as the Governor of my State, I should decide that we'd only permit one religion in Utah, and, in honesty, won't permit any other religion, because I know what is best for my people. Well, then you wouldn't have freedom of religion, would you? Then, let's suppose that the newspaper should come out with an editorial condemning me and stating here that I was doing something that wasn't right — then, by the same reasoning of deciding what I think is best for my people, couldn't I shut that newspaper up and say you're interfering with my right to do what I think is right? That's what Peron did with the paper, La Prensa.

That's the reason why we must stay with this Constitution! That's the reason why we must repeat over and over again that we want to retain this government in the hands of the people — and that we want those in public office limited under the Constitution, as we are limited in our powers in everyday life. The way we have been regulated on the highway — as we must be as long as we are living with someone else.

Another thing this Constitution is founded on is, most assuredly, a belief in God, but the thing I find in it that is most appealing to me is the fact that, actually, it is based on one of the finest principles known to mankind from the very beginning of history — taught by

all religious groups, as far as I know, and that is that old Golden Rule of treating the other fellow as you would like to be treated. That is something that we must have if we're going to live with other people. I know that we're humans, and I know that we all have weaknesses, and I know that we all at some time or another violate these little rules. We get mad and do things and say things that we shouldn't; we hurt the other fellow when we know it if was reversed, we wouldn't want to do it. But at least, we must try to live up to it. We must keep preaching it. Now, if I'm out somewhere alone, miles away on the desert, I can do anything I want to do. I can shoot my gun in any direction, I can get in my automobile and go any place I want to, as fast as I want to, or as fast as the road will permit, as long as I'm alone. But the minute you get other people involved, then it seems to me that you've got to get back to preaching and trying to live up to this rule of treating the other fellow as you'd like to be treated yourself. It's just that simple.

I have had college professors tell me that this constitutional government of ours is obsolete. It is obsolete, they contend, because we're living in a new modern age. We now can fly to Europe in matters of hours, when it used to take months. We can talk all around the world with our telephones and radios. We have this communication — a new, modern age. Therefore, we have got to change this Government. Well, my contention is this: that there is no government on the face of this earth, or in all modern history, that is as up-to-date and modern, and considers the human individual more than our Constitutional form of Government. So what are we going to change it to? Are you going to argue simply because we can fly to Europe in a matter of hours instead of months that we must change the Golden Rule? And, after all, that's all the Constitution is — treat the other fellow as you'd like to be treated yourself. Instead of that is our Government treating the other governments as we would want to be treated if we were in their position? I doubt it very much. I certainly wouldn't want any nation to treat my nation the way we have been treating them. The reason why I say that is because we are interfering in the government and in the lives of peoples all over the world on the theory that we have discovered the secret way of living, and we want to impose our way of life upon everybody else. I know that it's a good thing for Henry Ford to have an automobile in the hands of every African in Africa, but I wonder if those fellows want a Ford automobile, and I don't think it's any of our business to try to force it upon them.

We think our way of life is the best and as groups here in this country, each group who believes one way, one another way, may honestly have the feeling that we know the best way to live and we may want to impose it upon someone else. But that is not practicing

the Golden Rule! That is not living up to our Constitution! Because our Constitution guarantees that each of us, as an individual, or a minority group, are entitled to the same rights and privileges as every other group. That's what our Constitution does, and it does not say that the majority shall rule — it doesn't say any such thing! It says that the rights of the minorities shall be protected, and, after all, isn't that the best theory? Because do you know of any such saying as a majority, only upon an occasion? We're all minorities: we are, in fact, just individuals who have our certain beliefs, and we have no right to impose or force that upon someone else — just as they have no right to impose theirs upon us. Conversion, yes! Like I'm trying to sell you people tonight on a thought, but to rule that you must think as I do, as my party now insists that I do, when I know and feel in my heart that many of these things are wrong — oh, no! How could I consistently and honestly campaign for about 12 years in my state against the New Deal and then turn around and say it's all right if my party does it? I just couldn't do it — not in the face of the fact that every talk that I made when I was campaigning in my state as a Republican, in a state that had been Democratic for 24 years by a majority of two to one, I kept promising the people that if my party ever stooped to doing things that the Democratic party was doing, I'd be one of the first ones to condemn them, — and I was!

Now, before I get into the subject that I'm going to enjoy talking to you about, I think I should tell you a story about a man who was trying to sell a deep freeze, or one of these freezers to a housewife. He said to her — "You know, this pays for itself — you'll save so much on your meat bill and your food bill that this will pay for itself in not time at all." She scratched her head and said, "You know, we're paying for a washer and a dryer from the money we are saving on our laundry bills, and we're paying for a car from the money we're saving on our bus fare, and we're paying for our home from the money we are saving on rent, and," she said, "You know, I just don't think we can afford to save any more!"

I told you that to illustrate to you the growth of government. You must remember that there are some pretty good arguments for almost anything. This man had a good argument for selling his freezer. Every one of these Bureaus that we set up, or permit to be set up, in Government are all "sold" on exactly the same basis, and they'll show you how it is going to save you money. I've seen it happen in my own state, I know how you can start a Bureau from a non-paid job. You start it out by just setting up the job with no money, and before you know it you have a real Bureau on your hands. It is a natural

thing. These things are human weaknesses with all of us. I'm certain that many of the people in this audience, if you were put in the same position in one of these Bureaus, and were honest about it, and wanted to do a good job, you could see many things that you could do if you just had a little more money and a few more people to work for you. It is just like in your own line — if you just had more money you could expand. You could have a better automobile. You could do a lot of things. Well, government is the same way. I've watched these groups come in, with all these fine ideas. I will cite one in particular, which I vetoed, but which I see the new Governor has signed. It was an "idea" which, this group assured me, would save the State many millions of dollars — the "idea" was to set up a "Divorce Counselling Service" to stop the divorces. They pointed out that we had many divorces in the State of Utah and that, as a result, many of the divorced wives and their children were thrown onto the State's relief rolls. They brought out a lot of figures to show how many millions we would save — in time — if we just stopped all those divorces by setting up their "idea" of a "Divorce Counselling Service."

I promptly pointed out to them that by the time the couple who wanted to separate had reached the stage where the Government found out about it, it would be too late.

You see, I always try to put myself in the other fellow's shoes, and I thought to myself — now if I were having trouble with my wife I'd listen to my friends, I'd listen to members of my church, but when they'd send a government agent, that would sure make it a cinch for me to divorce her.

Then I pointed out to these people that that would be just the beginning of another Bureau, and would just pile more taxes upon the people. I said: "here is what will happen — you will discover after you set this thing up that you have people working — you will find out you haven't stopped any divorces at all, so you will come to the conclusion that you should have more money to hire more men to check these people before they get married, because that is where the trouble starts."

Then I thought to myself that if they'd had that law in effect at the time I met Mrs. Lee, they'd certainly decide I wasn't fit for her, so I wouldn't have this wonderful woman I've got.

So you get this "do-gooder" attitude, and a lot of it may be honest; but, you know, I've come to the conclusion that I'm a long way from perfect. If I spend all my waking moments trying to improve

myself I've got a lifetime job, without trying to improve you or anyone else. That is a job that all of us must do.

Now, we've got this growth of Federal Government where we have a budget that comes out 73-1/2 billion — and when they dig a little deeper, they find that it's more than 80 billion, — then, if they dig a little deeper, they can find that it is more than that, because we've got so we leave a lot of things out. But — that is a lot of money. So the government says that we have to continually have more and more to keep these things going that they contend the people want. I wonder, and have often wondered, whether the people — when you speak of the people — do want these things? I had a man campaign for office with me four years ago and he was running for the State Senate. He endorsed everything I stood for — got up and told the people so, really made a fine talk on it. Then after he was elected and we got into office, I noticed that he started to vote just opposite to the way he had talked. So I called him into the office one day and said: "don't you remember telling the people what you stood for when you ran for office?" He assured me he did remember, "But," I said, "Now you're supporting these things that you said you were against — why did you change?" He promptly retorted: "I haven't changed, the people have changed."

You see, when that fellow went out and talked to the voters — the people who work for a living and pay these taxes — they listened to him and they supported him. But those hard working people go back to work and the organized minorities who want something are the ones who lobby. So you have the pressures in Washington from the professional Lobbyists, people who live off the payroll, and one reason why I wouldn't spend any time talking to anybody in Washington is because you're just asking the impossible when you ask a man to reduce his own income. So I'm out talking to the people who are footing the bill. And this is the only individual that I've got any hopes of convincing that we must do something about our government. Because when you ask those people — who are living like kings, traveling all over the world, who are getting big salaries, and none of them working too hard, some of them not working at all — you, well you're just asking too much. Now my answer to Government is not the usual answer — that you can change this by simply electing some particular individual. I know there was a statement made here tonight that was very complimentary to me, to the effect that "if you just had a president like me" — but did you ever stop to think just how far I'd get as President with that Congress? Why, I wouldn't get any place. So you see, the answer, and I've always

contended it, is that we've drifted away from our Constitution — and the real answer is that we've got to get back to it . . . because our forefathers knew that with that Constitution you can stand bad government and bad leaders once in a while — they can't do you much harm. But when you disregard it and you let the leader do anything that he thinks is best, and you give him the powers that we've given to Washington today, think what is going to happen to us if we get a bad leader. We are just fortunate that we haven't got a real bad leader, under the powers that we have given them. We have poor leaders, in fact, we've got no leaders, in my opinion, in Washington — they are followers. So, how do you go about trying to do the thing that I know most of you people are praying for? This man, Myron Fagan, is fighting his heart out for it, so are his many followers, so are many other organizations. Believe me, I endorse every single one of them that's fighting for this American cause — every single one of them! And don't get discouraged. If you belong to some particular group, as long as they are fighting for this cause, support them. When you feel they are not doing as well as they should, then help some other man or group — because you are going to make headway under this. I'm not a bit afraid about the American people if they can hear the story. They'll come up with the right answers. We need everyone of these little groups that are fighting for this cause to keep fighting — because the time is going to come when we can get behind one thing and do something about it.

Now, my answer regarding government is — do the best you can in every one of these elections to get the best men you can, because, after all, until you can do something about returning the Constitution you've got to do the next best thing. So the next best is your Congressional elections, and I'll tell you what I'm going to do: I'm going to talk to both the Democrats and Republicans and if they don't give me a pledge to repeal the 16th Amendment, they'll never get my vote. Because I want a pledge out of them!

You know, the only way to cure the evil of government, the spending of government, is to take the money away. If you doubled the income of your State tomorrow, you can be assured they'd spend every nickel of it — and if you doubled the money of Washington, they'd spend every nickel of it; if you doubled the money in your city, they'd spend it, because a politician can find a thousand ways to spend a dollar. If he can't find enough men to put on the payroll, he'll find another way to spend it. That's why you have these overloaded payrolls all over the country — 30,000 employees in the State Department alone . . . which is a department, in my opinion, we'd be better off without, the way it is run!

But when I say that we must repeal the 16th Amendment, people immediately begin to worry about where the government is going to get its money. Well, let me tell you that that's what I want to take away from them. As far as I'm concerned, I'm not worried about giving them more money, I'm worried about taking away from them the money that they are mis-spending! But, you see, everything isn't as simple as it sounds; you have to have, oh, some answers at least, for these things, I've found that out. In fact, a newspaper reporter will say: "Well, how's the Government going to run?" My answer is: "they've got plenty of money" He'll say: "But if you take the income tax away, they won't have." "Well", I say, "the Government estimates an income this year, something like 75 billions of dollars — your income tax last year on personal incomes was less than 33 billions, so if you take the 33 from the 75, you've still got 42 billions of dollars — and that is more money than the average annual budget under Mr. Truman, whom I thought was terribly wasteful. If you can't run this government on 40 billions of dollars, there is something wrong with it, but I'll admit that you can't scatter your money all over the world and live within 40 billions of dollars — and you can't defend the whole world and live within it . . . You can't pay the farmers for not farming and live within it — and you can't pay veterans who don't deserve anything for it."

We've got to be realistic about this. I'm a veteran of World War I and I don't feel I'm entitled to any more privileges than anybody else. The man who is entirely and truly injured, the widow who was left — I don't think we can do enough for the people who were actually injured. But what in the world do we owe an able-bodied man who came home better off than when he went to war? It is just silly to think we can go on and continue to buy the whole world and buy these votes, and throw our money away, as we have been doing, without destroying this wonderful country of ours. Believe me, it's worth fighting for — I'm fighting for no other reason than the fact that I have 4 children who've got to help pay this tremendous debt.

Then they say to me: "how are you going to pay this debt if you abolish the income tax? The Government needs all that money to run the Defense Department and all the other things". Well, are they paying the bonds now? They don't intend to, apparently — except by inflating our currency and robbing the people out of the money that they've saved and put into bonds and life insurance and into banks. Another form of stealing the American Taxpayers money is by the government in one breath telling us that a bond is a fine investment, and in the next, it is cheating us out of its value every day it operates — by "warning us" that the Russian government is a threat to a third world war and may bomb us at any minute —

and yet we provide them a haven in New York in the U.N. where they can bring a lot of spies to come over here and find out everything about us. I don't understand this double talk — I just do not understand it!

Yes, we must, in my opinion, fight to do away with the 16th Amendment. I now represent an organization with headquarters in Washington, known as "For America", with some very fine Americans as its Board of Directors, men that I'm proud to be associated with. They stand for a number of the same things that you people here are fighting for. And yet, we have come to this conclusion: that actually most of these things that we are fighting for will pretty well solve themselves if we succeed in taking all that money away from the Federal Government. They couldn't do a lot of these things, things that are wrong — they wouldn't have the money to do them with. You know, an interesting thing about government that I've found out is that when you honestly want to do something, you don't have any trouble at all. There was a time about three years ago when it looked like my Utah state budget would be out of balance — we figured perhaps about 15%. So I immediately notified every department in the State government to reduce its expenditures by 15%. All of them did. No one was hurt, and we ended with a surplus.

I was talking not long ago with a man from Denver, one of the head men in the Denver office in charge of the Department of Interior. I happened to be serving on one of the Hoover Commission Task Forces and he said to me: "What a silly thing this Hoover investigation is." Naturally, I pricked up my ears — and I rather resented it. He said: "let me tell you something. They spend a lot of money to have men go over the country and investigate the different departments; in fact, I've had 4 men in my office for 2 months. They are supposed to assemble the facts and show Congress what can be cut out of my department without hurting it. My contention is that it is impossible for any 4 men in any 2 months to go through the vast department I have and tell me where the weaknesses are. If Congress used any judgment at all, they'd just simply cut my appropriation by about 25% and I'd get rid of the waste, because I'm the fellow who knows where it is."

You know, you first have got to believe in doing the right thing before you can get it done, and when you hire honest, sincere men to go out to investigate and find out where things can be cut and you don't do anything about it, then, to me, there is something wrong about the motive in the first place. How simple it would be, in my opinion, if the President of the United States wanted to call in his Chiefs of Staff of the Air Force, the Army, the Navy, and just say—

"Gentlemen, you should know where the waste in your department is and the things that can be cut without hurting the defense jobs that we want to do. If you don't know, you're not big enough for the job. I'll get somebody else. But I'm going to assume that you do know, so I'm going to cut your budget by about 25% and I expect you to do a better job than you've been doing, or I will get somebody else to do it."

To me it is just that simple. But you have to want to do a thing—you can't just talk about it. So we've come to the conclusion that if we can just take the money away from the Federal Government—but, first, let me tell you something about this income tax: it's an immoral thing to begin with, because it places in the hands of government officials the power that no government official should have in a free country, and that's the power to go into your private life to check what you made and where you spent it. That power alone destroys the freedom of the American people.

So it's our opinion that if we talk to people like you, and you'll talk to your neighbors — and don't let anybody stump you on these questions: when they start telling you, "Oh, we can't get along without this" — you just ask that fellow what kind of a job he is holding . . . ask him how much he is getting out of this thing — you just might shut him up. Because that's the fellow who is going to defend it. But, you know, there's a funny thing about these people who try to talk you out of the desire to preserve the Constitution — they always want to know what you are going to do if that happens, but they won't let you tell them what's going to happen when and if they put their program over, such as, for one thing, the Federal Aid to Education. See? When you ask them where the money is coming from and what is going to happen to our school system — oh, no! you've got to swallow it blindly. So just stand up and fight; and when you talk to someone who is hard to convince ask him to find out how much income tax he is paying — most people really don't know — then ask that fellow how he would like to have a raise in pay of about that much? Remember, he'd have that much more to spend for himself and for his own. There is one thing for sure — I think that you people can do a better job of spending your money than anybody in Washington. I know I don't take my hat off to them. So — but here I've talked too long, so I'll close with this suggestion: Don't let anybody fool you that you are not fighting for the right thing. And there is a satisfactory answer to every one of these questions, because, we want to be honest about it, we don't want to mislead anybody, nor do we want to fool anybody as they have been fooling us for years. We want the whole story to go before you people and we want you to analyze it yourself — whether your freedom is worth getting some of your own money back, to be-

gin with. And, believe me, your freedom goes with your money. When the government takes it, they take a certain amount of your freedom with it. So keep up your spirits — we're on the right side. And — do get in with some group — take an interest in this! If we can't do something this next election about voting the people into office who are going to restore our Constitutional rights and restore our money to our pocketbooks where it rightfully belongs, then we will get somebody else to run.

You've been mighty fine to sit here to listen to me and I appreciate it very, very much, and I've enjoyed every minute in spite of the California flu bug — but I think I've missed just one thought that I want to leave with you — and that is that when we will take all our money away from the Federal Government, there'll be a lot of Federal employees out of jobs; but, you know, it is a darn sight easier to put them on relief — and a lot cheaper. And — let them stay there awhile. They've lived in luxury off the American people long enough, in my opinion. Thank you.

HISTORICAL FACTS AND FIGURES

Mr. Lee's penetrating appraisal of our tax-enslavement hardly requires elaboration. However, there are many among us who, as Mr. Lee has described, are inclined to shrug off the entire matter on the theory that it is a necessary evil. The following HISTORICAL facts and figures should serve to shock such individuals out of their complacency.

April 15 is the last day for filing Federal income tax returns — and paying balances due under that law. In many States it is the date for doing the same with State returns and payments.

Every taxpayer knows all that. But that date (April 15) has another significance which few of us realize — and still fewer stop to think about: April 15 is the day, give or take a few adjacent days, when the average American stops working for government and can look forward to using the rest of the year to make a little money for himself and his family.

The average American — the small merchant, the doctor, lawyer, the more highly paid industrial worker — pays between 25 and 35 percent of his yearly income in various taxes. The greatest part of this *extortion* — and we use that word in its true sense — goes to the Federal government in straight income taxes.

Now, from January 1 to April 15 we have 105 days. Excluding Sundays, that means exactly one-third of the year . . . one-third of *every* year of his life that the average American can no longer call his own. Every American celebrates the Fourth of July as the symbol of the freedom of our nation . . . every man in Labor celebrates the first Monday in September as the symbol of the Freedom of Labor . . . in time to come, every American may celebrate April 15 — because from that day until December 31 he is free from the obligation to pay the wages of bureaucrats and *tribute* (*the men in Washington call it "Foreign Aid"*) to foreign governments.

In the first three and half months of the year everything, *but everything*, you earn goes to pay policemen for maintaining law and order, to farmers for not planting too much, to legislatures for spending too much . . . it goes to pay also for schools and teachers, for pensions, for subsidized airlines, for parks and playgrounds, for dams to irrigate more land so that farmers may grow more surpluses. It goes to pay a tax on your dog, and if you produce a baby, to pay taxes on almost everything that baby needs — taxes which counterbalance the exemptions the Federal Government so graciously allows for your offspring.

In the early years of this century, schoolbooks told children that the now defunct Turkish Empire had one of the most oppressive taxations in the world — it was one of the chief causes for its decline. Why, said one horrified schoolbook author, the Sultan even taxed the glass that went into the windows of the houses in Constantinople. It may amuse present grownups, if they remember that particular observation, to know that all window glass in the United States is taxed *at least twice* — and that well-windowed houses are assessed higher for real estate taxation.

Today, Americans pay more taxes in real value than any other people in the world. We pay more than the French did, *in the ratio of taxes to income*, when they (the French), chiefly for tax reasons, destroyed the monarchy and chopped off Louis' and Marie Antoinette's heads. We pay more than the medieval peasant, history's prime example of the oppressed. The church wrung a tithe (10%) from him, and his lord, in the more civilized areas of Europe, took another 10% in goods and services. If today's "free" average American surrendered no more than that tithe and the lord's 10%, he would be at least \$1,000 to \$2,000 better off every year.

Some of our taxes we are perfectly willing to pay. For one example, take school taxes: In most communities we vote for them directly *and cheerfully*, without interposition by any Legislature supposed to represent the taxpayers. But in the case of Federal taxes, particularly the Income taxes, the individual has no direct say, and his representatives usually ignore him. Now let us see how

the men (and women) we have elected to represent us have betrayed us:

Federal taxes, *mostly income taxes*, in the last seven years, from July 1, 1949, to June 30, 1956, exceeded by about 27 Billion dollars ALL the Federal taxes collected in this nation for the prior 158 years of its existence. In other words, through the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, World Wars I and II, and all the years between from 1792, when the Congress met to levy its first tax, the U.S. Government did not take from the citizens quite so much as it has gouged from them in the last seven full fiscal years.

In short: in the first 158 years the Federal government collected a total of 406 Billion dollars in taxes . . . in the seven years ending last June 30, 433 Billion dollars — *let alone the 86 Billion it will take in 1957!*

This terrific *extortion* is due in large part to the determination of our BIG BRAINS in Washington to make the U.S. the warden of the world. The Billions we have sent abroad in gifts and *tribute* are history's most amazing national profligacy.

But there is another factor besides "foreign aid" in this awful tax debauch. It is the doctrine of a new breed of so-called economists who infiltrated into the administration in New Deal days and have never been expurgated. Their doctrine insists that as Americans grow more prosperous the government must continue to confiscate an equally growing part of their income in taxes. The measure of taxation, therefore, is not what a *prudent* government really needs but what Americans earn. And as they earn more the government will *invent* new ways to spend its fixed percentage of their income. *at home and abroad!*

Politicians and bureaucrats think they have discovered that the average American angers very slowly and ineffectually about taxes — and that once the taxes are paid the anger dies. Acting on that belief, those politicians and bureaucrats gleefully take advantage of him. They are even brutal about it, as none other than Speaker Sam Rayburn was recently, when he intimated that any American who expects tax relief is just an utter fool.

ORDER FROM:
CPA BOOK PUBLISHER
P. O. BOX 596
BORING, OR 97009