

LAW OFFICES  
**WEBSTER, CHAMBERLAIN & BEAN**  
1747 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE N W  
WASHINGTON D C 20006  
(202) 785-9500  
FAX (202) 835-0243

GEORGE D WEBSTER  
J COLEMAN BEAN  
ARTHUR L HEROLD  
ALAN P DYE  
EDWARD D COLEMAN  
BURKETT VAN KIRK  
FRANK M NORTHAM  
GERARD P PANARO  
JOHN W HAZARD JR  
CHARLES M WATKINS  
HUGH K WEBSTER  
DAVID P GOCH  
TIMOTHY W SMITH

OF COUNSEL  
CHARLES E CHAMBERLAIN  
ASSOCIATION ADVISOR  
HUGH MCCAHEY

April 21 1993

**BY HAND DELIVERY**

Honorable Joan D Aikens  
Commissioner  
Federal Election Commission  
999 E Street N W  
Washington, DC 20004

Re Proposed Advisory Opinion 1992-44, National  
Committee of the U S Taxpayers Party

Commissioner Aikens

Enclosed is the first issue of the official newsletter of the National Committee of the U S Taxpayers Party This is in further support of the National Committee s advisory opinion request and we respectfully request its consideration

Very truly yours,



David P Goch

DPG vvs  
Enclosure



# U.S. TAXPAYERS PARTY Quarterly Review

## EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Ted C Adams Jr  
Chairman

William K Shearer  
Vice-Chairman

Julie Makimaa  
Secretary

Joe Sanger  
Treasurer

William C Goodloe  
Parliamentarian

James N Clvmer  
Chairman Eastern States

Randon Bragdon  
Co-Chairman Eastern States

Waslev Krogdahl  
Chairman Southern States

Karl Falster  
Co-Chairman Southern States

Robert E Tisch  
Chairman Central States

Frederick A Woltmann  
Co-Chairman, Central States

Daniel Hansen  
Chairman Western States

Jack Phelps  
Co-Chairman, Western States

### Members ex-officio

Stephen C Graves  
Albion W Knight, Jr  
Howard Phillips

450 Maple Avenue East  
Vienna Virginia 22180

Published and paid for by the  
U.S. Taxpayers Party  
National Committee  
Joe Sanger Treasurer

Dear USTP Supporter,

We are pleased to send you this initial edition of the USTP Quarterly Review which will be produced once during each three-month period to keep you posted on the ideas, as well as the activities of USTP leaders and activists

This first edition features the remarks of 1992 U S Taxpayers Party presidential nominee, Howard Phillips, at the closing session of the post-election meeting of the National Committee of the U S Taxpayers Party (held at the Hyatt Regency Hotel in Louisville, Kentucky) on Friday, December 11, and Saturday, December 12, 1992

Sincerely,

Mark Weaver  
Executive Director

**F**irst of all, let me tell each of you how much I appreciate your travelling to Louisville, many of you in bad weather, many of you from long distances, to be part of this meeting. I don't see any dejection on any faces here—I see a spirit of optimism. I think everyone agrees that, for us, 1992 is a year of victory, because this is the year we got started. And, this is the year we kicked the door open. We got to the starting gate and we put ourselves in position to use the next four years. And, that is our intention.

There is no way that I could thank each of you to the extent that you deserve to be thanked. You are unusual people. You are people who have not only discerned the problems confronting our nation, you're people who reached correct conclusions about those problems and resolved to take action in an effort to deal with those problems. All of you made sacrifices during the past year—financial sacrifices, sacrifices of time, and potential sacrifices of reputation.

I enjoyed the year very much. I have no regrets, except that I was not wiser in some respects and that I didn't do certain things better. I regret the mistakes that I made.

In terms of the effort, in general, I am very proud of what you did and am very proud to be associated with a group of people who were paid the highest compliment that the national media could present. Having found nothing for which they could excoriate you, they chose to ignore you and me. You know, when you think about it, that really is a compliment. If we had been so outrageous as to be susceptible to extraordinary denunciation and ridicule, I assure you the media would have done it. But what we were saying throughout this campaign was simple, it was truthful, it was right on the money, and it was right on everything else. So those who disagreed with us chose to ignore us.

I think it is important for us to look back and recall what was discussed this morning and that is that the votes we got were not votes that came to us by accident. It would have been very hard for those people to vote for us by accident. They couldn't have found us. On many ballots we were buried toward the end. In Massachusetts, my home state, we were not only at the very end of the ballot, they didn't even list our first names or the name of our party. It just said "Phillips and Knight, Jr" as a part of a long list of candidates.

In the state of Utah, there was a vast array of candidates and we were in an entirely separate section of the ballot from many of the people who were presidential candidates. The people who supported our effort were people who were reached by you and, to some extent, by me, during the campaign.

Since we are not on the verge, yet, of cracking the national media wide open, for the foreseeable

future we have to focus on the real value of what we can do, one person at a time

I remember a discussion I had with Jan [Conner], and, to some degree, I discounted the value of write-in votes. And it's still difficult to get write-in votes. If your name is not on the ballot, you are not likely to have many votes accumulate.

I know of many cases where we were qualified as write-ins, where people voted for us, and their votes weren't counted. I received a letter recently from a woman who said x members of her family voted for us. They all swore that they did. But only a tiny fraction of those had their votes counted in this one community. That kind of thing happens. But, don't underestimate the value of what we do, one by one by one, one at a time.

Most of what I have to say about the election, I said in the two editions of my newsletter that I published after the election. Let me just go back over some of that and underscore those points.

I said that when President Reagan came to office, most conservative and Christian activists went to sleep. They had a wake up call when Bill Clinton was elected. But, unfortunately, I don't think they have learned much in the last twelve years. I don't think that the election of Bill Clinton helps us. It doesn't help our cause.

Many of you with whom I discussed the matter during the campaign, know that I believe that we would have been better off, practically, if Bush had won rather than Clinton. The reason is very simple. If the collapse comes under a Republican president, people don't look to the Republicans for the answer. If it comes under a Democratic president, they are more inclined to go back to the Republicans.

It's my strong feeling that, had George Bush been reelected narrowly this year, with less than 50% of the vote, with perhaps something like the 43% that Bill Clinton won, there would have been such outrage at his policies over the next two years that

---

*“. . . what we were saying throughout this campaign was simple, it was truthful, it was right on the money, and it was right on everything else. So those who disagreed with us chose to ignore us.”*

---

conservatives and Christians, in general, would be fleeing actively from the Republican ticket in 1994. I think, had that happened, we would not have had to do so much work on recruitment. A lot of people would have been coming our way.

Just take a look at some of the things that George Bush has done since the election, that he would not have done before. I don't remember them all, but I have some of them coming out in my newsletter in the next couple of weeks. He signed some executive orders that he didn't dare sign in the campaign. There was one signed on November 4, releasing substantial funds to international bodies. I think he knows that many people would have questioned his rapid moves for a New World Order, escalated since the election, if they had occurred before election day.

I think it is unlikely, had Bush still been campaigning, that Ronald Reagan would have

said what he did, embracing a New World Army as a desirable concept, when he was in London recently.

I don't think we would have had the degree of quiet, which there now is, about the statement of George Bush the other day, that the United States is, in effect, prepared to guarantee the safety of the Ukraine in the event that they are attacked by Russia. That is another place for us to go to war under the New World Order. It got hardly a note in the newspapers.

In one of the most significant decisions made by a modern American president—George Bush said that he would, in effect, promise the Ukraine that, if they signed up on his START treaty and surrendered some weapons, or at least moved them out of their silos, that he would bear witness to a pledge by the Russians not to attack the people of the Ukraine. Very dangerous!

I could give you 15 or 20 incredible things that have happened since November 3 on the part of George Bush that have barely been noticed.

In any event, my thesis is that, had he won, there would



Mrs. Howard Phillips (Peggy) and children Samuel and Alexandra listen attentively to platform proceedings at the USTP National Convention in New Orleans, September 5, 1992.



Presidential nominee Howard Phillips addresses USTP delegates, alternates, and other attendees, in convention assembled.

have been such outrage that we would have done very well in 1994. But, he didn't win. He could have won right up to the last minute. There have been all kinds of surveys that show a significant number of people did not decide until the last two weeks of the campaign.

There were enough people undecided, right up to 2 or 3 days before the election, so that Bush could have won. If he had attacked Clinton, for example, for proposing the homosexualization of the U S Armed Forces, that issue, in and of itself, would have caused Clinton's defeat.

Floyd Brown took a survey (it has been in my newsletter, if you have seen that edition), which was taken on election day before the results were announced and as the people were leaving the polls. Among the people who said on election day that they had voted for Clinton and Gore, something like 20% indicated that they would not have voted for Clinton and Gore if they had known that he favored the homosexualization of the Armed Forces. It was known he favored it because he publicly stated it and the pollster asked that question. But it didn't become an issue until after the November 3 results were in.

There were so many issues that Bush could have used if he had been comfortable with them. In state after state, even where the pro-family position was a minority position—as in Oregon on the homosexual referendum, as in Maryland on the Right to Life referendum—even in those states, Bush's vote was below what was perceived to be the hard core pro-family, anti-homosexual, anti-abortion position.

So, there were so many ways Bush could have won. From our standpoint, we would have been better off if he had, but he didn't. As a result, you have a situation in which (for the foreseeable future) the Republicans are going to stay Republicans. We are not (soon) going to get (armies of) refugees from the Republican Party. The Christian Coalition is going to be with the Republican Party for the next four years. Phyllis Schlafly is going to be with the Republican Party for the next four years. Pat Buchanan is going to be with the Republican Party for the next four years.

Let's not kid ourselves. Let's not fool ourselves into thinking that, because Bill Clinton is in the White House, they are going to conclude that the Republican Party is no longer their home. Uh-uh! More than ever, they are going to reinforce their ties to the Republican Party and say that, "Yes, the roulette wheel is crooked, but it's the only game in town." That's their philosophy. So they're going to keep playing that game on that crooked roulette wheel and they are going to fight over the carcass for the next four years.

It may well be that, if a conservative isn't nominated (and I really don't know anyone who qualifies [with the possible exception of Pat Buchanan] within the Republican context, as approximating the views of this party, and I think it is extremely unlikely that he would be the nominee), it's possible that someone might be nominated with the support of the Christian Right and of conservatives within the party, but that doesn't make that person a conservative.

Ed Fram of Wisconsin was pointing out to me that his Governor, Tommy Thompson, who is the hero of many national conservative activists because of his reputation on welfare reform, has basically said that he would ditch the pro-life position in order to win votes.

The reasons we left the Republican Party are still there. That doesn't mean that others are going to see it the same way. That is because they, and to a lesser extent, we, have confused the reasons for their political participation. There are many reasons why we get involved in politics, but the only good reason is to help protect our political rights, to help prevent our government from abridging those rights, to help, as we say repeatedly, restore this country to its Biblical and Constitutional

underpinnings and to make it, once again, a righteous nation, which it in no way is today.

That is why we got into politics. But what do we do after we are here? I would submit, and I did submit during the campaign, that, without in any way disagreeing with the propo-

sition that, in our republic, as initially conceived, the most important offices ought to be the ones closest to the people—the county governments, the state legislatures, etc.—the fact of the matter is that today that is mythology. We want to make it that way again, but today it is mythology.

The fact of the matter is the only government that counts today, ultimately—it's wrong, but it's true—is the Federal government. The Federal government has usurped the authority of the local governments. It has usurped the authority of the state governments. And we can't make local government important again until we strip the Federal government of the authority which it has unlawfully and illegitimately usurped.

In terms of doing that with the Federal government, as a practical matter, there is only one way we can do it. That's by capturing the presidency. We will never take this country back—(not 'never'—that is a big word), but in the foreseeable future, we are not going to take this country back until we first

---

*"Winning the election is not the only objective. It's taking back the government that is the objective. And that is what we have to keep uppermost in our minds."*

---

## 2-VETO-IRS



Brig. General Albion Knight (USA-Ret.) and his wife, Nancy, accept the convention's applause, as USTP Vice Chairman Bill Shearer looks on, following selection of Vice Presidential nominees.

capture the presidency We are not going to be able to get two thirds in both houses of Congress more readily than we can get a president The mathematics of the Constitution is such that it is much easier to recapture the government by controlling the presidency than in any other way

So our goal has to be to win an election in which we elect a president And as a predicate to fulfilling that goal, we do need to elect people to some state and local offices, so we can establish our credibility, so we can lay the groundwork for an effective national effort. But those state and local efforts will become truly meaningful only after we have done what we have to do at the Federal level

And it isn't just winning the election that should be our objective Each of us, at one time or another in our lives, has known someone who has won an election We may not have won them ourselves We may not have been on the winning side I have had a few victories But winning the election is not the only objective It's taking back the government that is the objective And that is what we have to keep uppermost in our minds

As I see it, my goal in politics is not to win every election, or two thirds of the elections, or a majority of the elections My goal is to recapture the government long enough and with enough potency to set things right and to do it in a way, that for a while, at least, it won't much matter who is in charge We can then go back to our normal pursuits

Aristotle to the contrary notwithstanding, man is not supposed to be "a political animal" He is supposed to serve his Lord and his family Not everything in life should be politicized Because we have departed from the original structures of the nation, our society has become governmentalized and politicized We need to degovernmentalize and depoliticize, and deregulate, and detax, and deconstruct the bad things that have happened

So our goal—my goal—is to capture the government once—to put in a president once—for one term, with the support of one third plus one in one House as a minimum, and with an agenda for action so that the time will be used—and with enough support so that, if the president is shot the vice president will have the same script, and if the vice president is shot, the person behind him will have the same script—so that everyone will be playing from the same sheet of music, and the personalities don't count nearly as much as the plan and the program

I believe that the day when we get the chance to do it will come more readily if we are soon prepared to exercise the authority of office well We need to think out in extraordinary detail, what must be done to deconstruct the humanistic globalist socialism which has been imposed upon us throughout this century

For that reason, I propose to Chairman Ted [Adams], and

Vice Chairman Bill [Shearer] that one of the things to be undertaken during 1993 by the U.S. Taxpayers Party be the establishment of a shadow government

We should involve people in preparing to govern We should identify the people whom we would put in charge of the Department of Health and Human Services, not because we think it should continue, but because we need to be ready to close it down We need to think about who is going to close down the IRS for us. We need to know whom we are going to put in charge of the Defense Department and the State Department

You know, most people who didn't read my newsletter didn't know that they closed down SDI as one of the final acts of the Bush administration Cheney and Bush closed down a key element of SDI, thus making it impossible for us to have a strategic defense until the year 2002, at the earliest All of these things are going on But we need to think ahead of time to what we are going to do when we win

We have to assume that, if the country is to be saved—if it is in God's Divine plan that America be restored and rescued—

we have to assume that we are going to be the instrument for doing it

We have to assume it is, therefore, our responsibility to figure out how we are going to do it It may well be that the reason George Bush didn't win is that we were not ready, and that we need at least four years Maybe we need more than four years

Let's use the time we have I urge Ted and Bill and the rest of you to give serious consideration to the creation of a shadow government

Another good thing about that is that we can involve

people in the party who are not interested in the nuts and bolts There are many great people who were at our National Convention, who are men and women of ideas, rather than of political involvement

By giving them assignments of a policy nature, so that they are charged with responsibility for an administrative and legislative agenda on the assumption that we are going to win, we can involve them, we can use the time

If we have a shadow government—if we have a shadow Defense Secretary—if we have a shadow IRS commissioner—a shadow Treasury secretary, etc—in addition to helping us hasten the day when we will have the chance to govern, it will also give us a group of additional spokesmen who will be available for commentary on radio talk shows, television programs, and in newspapers It will encourage them to think about the issues of the day It will mean that, whenever the new radical Marxist, Left-Wing HHS secretary appointed by Bill Clinton, does something outrageous, our HHS secretary has a statement on it

The media will know to go to our HHS secretary as the person for the U.S. Taxpayers Party comment on that issue That

---

*"It is very important in all of our thinking and in all of our discussions with others to recognize that, yes, someday, we want a situation where the most important office in the land, is the local county commissioner, or the person who runs the local government But, that day isn't here now, so whatever we do has to be directed toward recapturing the Federal government long enough so that we can put out of business so much of that which is harmful."*

---

is one inexpensive way for us to generate some coverage. It is also a good way to do what Bill spoke of earlier in context of the newsletters—to recognize people

We don't have real jobs to give out, but, just as they sell futures on the exchange, (I won't use the word sell, but) we can certainly anticipate future involvement by recognizing people who are qualified to be Cabinet secretaries, department heads, and heads of the regulatory agencies which we are going to abolish

I think that these are very important things for us to do. It is very important in all of our thinking and in all of our discussions with others to recognize that, yes, someday, we want a situation where the most important office in the land, is the local county commissioner, or the person who runs the local government. But, that day isn't here now, so whatever we do has to be directed toward recapturing the Federal government long enough so that we can put out of business so much of that which is harmful

I did a column for USA Today a week ago on the role of Hillary Clinton. It didn't run. They called me and asked me to write it, then they didn't like it, so they didn't run it. I didn't volunteer, I was drafted, but I was rated 4-F because of the approach which I took

In the article, I said more concisely and eloquently than I am about to say, that this country, under Ms. Hillary, is in for some real problems because she knows the territory. She was the head of the Legal Services Corporation under the Carter administration, and she has already gained experience in the assignment of hundreds of millions of your tax dollars to Left-wing activist groups. She knows the rules—she knows the regulations

There was an article in the *Village Voice* which said that Clinton is going to rely heavily on nonprofit organizations to carry out his agenda. The whole thrust of the Great Society was to change the political dynamic of the United States to go outside the political parties, to go outside the electoral process, to go outside the marketplace, by providing tens, and now hundreds, of billions of dollars in ideological patronage for activists of the radical Left

The tragedy of the Republican Party is they never closed them down. They never cut them off. They changed a few names at the top, but they never cut out the cancer. They even increased the money for the cancer. They even increased the money to go to their Left-wing enemies. Now, they have no basis for criticizing what Bill Clinton is going to do and what Hillary is going to do

Until we close down the armies of the Left, we are not going to win. It's bad enough that they can outspend us tens of millions to nothing, in the political process, and hundreds of millions to

nothing on the television screens. What is even more outrageous is they get hundreds of millions of our tax dollars to advance their outrageous Left-wing agenda. We have got to close down their public subsidies

Over the years, third parties which didn't succeed in becoming major parties or first parties, have tended to be parties which were out front on certain issues. And those parties tended

to go out of business when the major parties stole their agenda. The Socialist Party went out of business when the Republicans and the Democrats adopted their platform. They had lost their reason for existence. That's why there is no longer a Socialist Party. The old Populist Party of the 1890's died when Teddy Roosevelt, then Woodrow Wilson, in different ways, adopted much of the agenda of the old Populist Party

Now it is still true that our party can be out in front of the other parties, but there is a difference now. The other parties will never accept our position on these issues. They could buy what the Socialists were

saying—they could buy what the old Populists were saying—but they will never buy what we are saying. They have a vested interest in that which we oppose

Now, let me just throw out some thoughts on issues which I think are going to be increasingly important over the next few years

I think one way to build the party in many states is to advocate closing down the government schools. I did not always have this view. I went to a very good government school when I was a kid, and I used to believe that what we had to do was improve public education. I think it is long past that time. I don't think that can any longer be done. The reason public schools worked, was because there was a consensus about what we believed and who we were. And, yes, there were doctrinal differences and sectarian differences and other differences, but that which we had in common with one another was greater than that which separated us, one from another

It is no longer true, folks, no longer true. Look what is happening in New York City. You've got a commissioner, Joe Fernandez, who just published a book



**Dr. Stephen C. Graves**  
Vice Presidential Nominee  
Louisiana, Wyoming

*".. not one baby was saved by all the votes [pro-lifers] cast for Ronald Reagan and George Bush. What they did was give up seat, after seat, after seat, after seat on the U.S. Supreme Court to Justices who refuse to acknowledge that the unborn child is a human person created in God's image, which, under the Constitution of the United States, is not only entitled to, but is required to be accorded protection for its right to life ..The Republicans are not going to make an issue of that—they are embarrassed to be associated with all those pro-lifers."*

about his youthful experiences as a drug addict, who has fired the duly elected school board members—these are elected school board members fired by the commissioner, because they objected to training first grade kids to believe that homosexuality is something of which they should approve

What we have today in government schools is a nationwide network of training academies for all that we oppose. They are being trained in atheism and in humanism—they are being trained in sexual promiscuity—they are being trained to be citizens not of the United States of America, but of a New World Order, and it is beyond reform at this point, folks. It is beyond reform.

There are exceptions in this community or that. There are things which we ought to do, that we ought to insist upon in terms of asserting our rights, but I know when I get my property tax bill and discover that most of the exorbitant sums which I pay in property taxes in Fairfax County, Virginia, are being assigned to subsidize an education bureaucracy which teaches children to mock all that I believe and hold dear, it makes my blood boil. I think there are taxpayers, parents, and non-taxpayers all over America who, to the degree that they know what is being communicated in government schools today, are going to become increasingly outraged by what they see.

That is one issue where both major parties are locked in. At the risk of offending some of you, let me say that vouchers are not the answer either. Vouchers are a way of governmentalizing private and Christian schools. They are a way of making them subject to the "public policy" standards of the Federal government.

Many well-intentioned conservatives are saying, "Oh, we can clean it up with vouchers." But that is not the way the courts are ruling—that is not what the bureaucrats are ruling. The minute your Christian school—the minute your private school, parochial school, whatever, gets a voucher, it is a public institution. And it may be less bad than those which are directly subsidized, but the time will come when it has to bend the knee and bow down the way the others do in terms of its hiring practices, in terms of its discipline, its teaching, its textbooks, and its curriculum. We have to look at that.

Another big issue that the other side can't touch us on is the whole question of private property. Private property is being assaulted in every conceivable way all over this country. It used to be that we recognized that swamps bred mosquitoes, that carried disease, threatened our lives. Today, swamps are Federally protected wetlands and if you try to get the vermin out of the backyard you can be sent to prison for violating some wetland regulation. That is an assault on private property. It's an assault on our God-given rights.

I don't know anyone in the country who is not having his private property rights violated in some way by actions of Federal and state government, whether it's issues involving the Indian lands, or national parks, or Bureau of Land Management, or postal zoning, or grazing rights, or whatever it may be. This is a big issue.

I think just as the Christian Right rose up in the 1970's

because the IRS was assaulting the independence of Christian schools, just as the Right to Life movement rose up in response to Roe v Wade, many people will become politically active to defend their property rights.

I think on most things our people are asleep. I think on most things our people tend to be lazy. They tend to say, "Well, we'll give them the benefit of the doubt. They know more than we do. We don't want to get involved unless we absolutely have to, etc." But when things get bad enough, people will become involved and will become activated. The question is how will they become activated. Will they respond to politicians who mouth slogans and offer them a glimmer of hope, or will they see that they have a political party which is consistently with them on these issues?

The homosexualization of the U S Armed Forces is another issue where the major parties will not provide the leadership. There is a reason George Bush didn't use it in the campaign. His administration's party was infested with homosexuals. He didn't want to offend them. They don't really believe that it's wrong. The Republican elites believe that it is something to be tolerated, that it is not a moral issue.

And don't count on the admirals and generals to fight this battle for us. They work for the Commander-in-Chief. Once the

Commander-in-Chief says "this is it," then that is it! Very few people graduate from West Point who are independent thinkers. They may make Brigadier General, the way Al Knight did, but once they start showing signs of independence, they stop getting promoted.

That's why he is Brigadier General and not our Commander-in-Chief or Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, or whatever. That's why there are a lot of other people, not as distinguished or capable as Al, but others. I know many young men who dropped out of the service academies because they didn't want to be robots in the New World Order.

The homosexualization of the Armed Forces is a clear and present danger to the security of the United States of America. And it is the best thing the Soviets (or the ex-Soviets or reformed Communists) have going for them. Once you have an Army infested with homosexuals, each year an escalating percentage of the Defense budget will go for the medical costs of those homosexuals who are afflicted with AIDS, and a diminishing proportion of your Defense budget will go to defend the United States of America. It is a real issue—an issue that we have to be using and talking about.

Another real issue is the New World Order. Boy, are they moving fast. They are on the fast track to the New World Order. They are on the fast track to have U N commanders directing U S troops, to have U S policy shaped, not by the Congress of the United States, but by the Security Council of the United Nations. That's a fact! That's not a Bircher fantasy! It is a fact! JBS was right when they warned about it. It is a fact today. We have to talk about these things.

Alex Magnus was recently in the Soviet Union. Anybody who thinks we no longer have anything to worry about from the Soviet Union should talk to Mr. Magnus. Their weapons are still

---

*"...we can't make local government important again until we strip the Federal government of the authority which it has unlawfully and illegitimately usurped."*

---

aimed at us. They are still building them, still building those nuclear subs.

The treaties don't destroy their missiles—they have to take them out of their silos—if they wanted to—if they were observed—and if they didn't, there is no penalty, as a practical matter. Those treaties give them special rights that they don't give us. We are being disarmed as a nation. The former Soviet Union is not being disarmed. We are in the middle of the greatest 'stung' in the history of the world. And everyone of us could be blown up as a consequence of that 'stung'.

Right after the election, another thing Bush did was close down the COCOM restrictions, which limited the transfer of security-related technology to other countries. The flood gates are open today, thanks to George Bush. Phfff. Stroke of a pen! Not a word of opposition from elected leaders. There are a couple of exceptions here and there, Malcolm Wallop of Wyoming and Sen. Helms had a thing or two to say, but very, very little is being said about these things. These are extraordinary outrages.

On the abortion issue—I won't belabor it because we have spoken about it before. But all those wonderful people in the Right to Life movement, someday have to wake up to the fact that not one baby was saved by all the votes they cast for Ronald Reagan and George Bush. Not one baby was saved by it.

What they did was give up seat, after seat, after seat, after seat on the U S Supreme Court to Justices who refused to acknowledge that the unborn child is a human person created in God's image, which, under the Constitution of the United States, is not only entitled to, but is required to be accorded protection for its right to life, or as Dan (Hansen) puts it, for its right to be born. The Republicans are not going to make an issue of that—they are embarrassed to be associated with all those pro-lifers.

There are so many issues, I could go on and on, so many of those we talked about in the campaign—the Fed, the IRS. Clinton is going to be raising our taxes over and over again, or trying to. We have these issues but, again getting back to the main point, we need to have people who can be expert on these issues.

All of us have to become experts to some degree. Everyone of us should be careful newspaper readers, and should be well informed of what is going on. But we also have to divide the labor. We have to develop experts and specialists.

We will not have our own think tanks. I was at the 50th birthday party last week for Cal Thomas, who is a friend of mine and a columnist around the country. I was seated at the birthday party next to a fellow who is in a high position at the Heritage Foundation. I asked him what his budget was last year. He said it was \$19 million. We are not going to get \$19 million for anything, or \$12 million or whatever it is. We have to be realistic. But what we do have is \$19 million worth of talent in people like David Funderburk, Emanuel McLittle, Al Knight, and some of the other great people who have become a part of this effort during the year.

Let's give them portfolios. Different people have different skills and different objectives. So those are some things we need to do, I think, to make this a more viable operation in the future.

I could say a lot more on the same subject, but I'm not going to belabor the point. The main thing we have to recognize is that there is nobody else out there but us. If we get people to join us, it will be one at a time. We are not going to see any mass conversions until we are verge of victory and people decide that it is fashionable. We are going to get people one, by one, by one, by one. And we have to recognize that those single victories are important victories. Don't discount them. Don't diminish them.

In order to get to the position where we take back our government, we've got to elect some people to something over the next four years. That doesn't mean we have to elect majorities in a lot of districts. It means that if we are able to take a special election here or there, or a legislative seat here or there, it gives us a degree of credibility, which makes it easier for us to get ballot position, easier for us to get media coverage. In my own political experience, I know that the greatest opportunity for a movement just getting started is the opportunity provided by a special election. That is why I mentioned it several times today.

As I close my remarks, let me just talk about one experience I had when I was trying to be elected Chairman of the Republican Party of Boston in 1964.

In 1963, in a 10 to 1 Democratic district, Ward 21 in Brighton, Massachusetts, where I grew up, there was a Democratic legislator by the name of Bill Joyce. Bill Joyce sometimes hit the bottle a little too much. He had the misfortune of hitting the bottle too much on an evening when he was driving over the Boston

University Bridge. Now the bridge was fine, but Mr. Joyce had to stop the car in order to attend to some personal matters. When he stepped outside the car to attend to those personal matters, because he was not fully alert, he fell to his death in the Charles River at the bottom of the Boston University Bridge. That created a special election. Now Ward 21 happened to be a ward in which the local Republican leadership was hostile to my candidacy. They wanted to do everything they could to prevent me from being elected Chairman of the Republican City Committee of Boston.

Generally, they just went through the motions whenever there was an election of any kind. They put up the Chairman of the Committee to be the Republican nominee from the legislative district. Normally, I would not have had the resources to get involved in it, but, as it turned out, a fellow who had been a classmate of mine in college, was attending Harvard Law School and he happened to be living in that district. He had married and he, his wife, and his child had an apart-

---

*"You don't win by playing defense. You don't even win by having the right ideas. You win by having a will to victory and a strategy to implement that victory."*

---



**Hon. Robert E. Tisch**  
Vice Presidential Nominee  
Michigan



ment in that district. He had been active in the Young Republicans with me. He said, "I would like to run for that seat." I said, "Charlie, that's great. That Ward Committee is against me and, if you run, maybe we can get rid of the Ward Committee, put in some of our people and, obviously, you don't have a prayer of winning, but it will be a good exercise." He said, "Well, I think I can win." I said, "Well, if you think you can, I will be happy to help you, whether you do or not."

I got involved in the race. I became his campaign manager. And, to the surprise of many people, Charlie decisively won the Republican primary. He defeated the incumbent Ward Committee's candidate two to one and that paved the way for my taking over the Ward Committee. So, I said, "That is great, Charlie, good job, I'll see you later." He said, "No, no, no, don't go so fast. I am going to win." I said, "Charlie, you can't win. It's a 10 to 1 Democratic district. There hasn't been a Republican here since the 1930's."

He had won the primary in December, 1963, and the general election was three weeks later, in January of 1964. He said, "No, I think I can win." I said, "Charlie, I think you are crazy, but I'll be happy to help you." We went in, and because of the fact that it was the only race being contested and because I, at the time, was State Chairman of the College Republicans in Massachusetts and had a statewide network of 300 volunteers, we could move into a district any place in the state on a moment's notice, we were able to go into that district and have partners for almost every voter in the district. No—not quite that—but we were able to call every voter in the district repeatedly.

We set up a vote goal for every precinct. We had a 3 x 5 card on every voter, indicating what their pet issues were, their occupation, their age, in response to telephone inquiries.

We persuaded a substantial number of them, nearly a thousand, to accept a ride from us to the polls on election day, knowing that if we drove them to the polls, we had a pretty good chance of getting their vote. The press, day after day, was saying "the Democratic nomination is tantamount to election." We laid low—we did not seek newspaper publicity—we did not telegraph our punches—we just very quietly organized. We used the mails to communicate our message—we used the telephone to communicate our message—but we didn't do things that you take pictures of. We didn't do things that would wake up the sleeping giant.

On election day, as a result of that quiet, determined, organized activity, my friend, Charlie, was elected by a margin of 2 to 1 in a 10 to 1 Democratic district. There weren't a lot of votes involved. We got 2,000, the other guy got 1,000 (roughly).

There were not a lot of people involved, but it was enough to change the thinking for all the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. It was the lead story with big banner headlines in both Boston newspapers the next day. We were on the evening news repeatedly.

And, at that point, all the people who had been running against me for chairman of the Republican Party in Boston folded. They dropped out. When we finally came up to the election, I was unanimously elected, even though I had been opposed by all of the state leaders of the Republican Party, by the incumbent people, by the money people.

Our momentum dominated their morale. As Sun Tzu, the great military strategist many, many centuries [ago] said, "Great

victory is not defeating your enemy in 100 battles, it's defeating him without a fight." It's defeating his strategy.

That's what we have to think about doing. Each of us has to spend time reading Sun Tzu and other books on strategy. The Bible is one of the greatest books on strategy. We need to study and make these lessons applicable to what we are doing. We don't need to win every victory.

If we can find one special election somewhere in the country where we can mass our resources, where people from Florida, Michigan, and California, can quietly lend assistance to one candidate for one office somewhere, and if we can prevail, doing it quietly, surprising people when we ultimately prevail, it will send a shot around the nation, if not around the world. It will make it much easier for us to recruit other candidates. It will make it much easier for us to raise money.

I have been reading a great book by Holmes Alexander on Washington and Lee. I read it aloud to my children at our family Thanksgiving celebration. Holmes Alexander, who died 10 or 15 years ago, was a friend of mine. I knew him when he was in his 70's and 80's. He was a wonderful man and an outstanding journalist. This was one of the best books I have ever read.

He compared Washington and Lee. He talks about why Washington was a winner and why Lee, for all his gallant qualities, was a loser. He also reminds us of how utterly bereft of resources George Washington was, how the war for American Independence was a figment of George Washington's imagination. He had many key points.

That is really the case. As General Knight can well attest, at one point he [Washington] had fewer than 3,000 ragtag men to stand against the entire British Empire. He had been defeated time and time and time again. But he refused to lose. He said no matter how many times you beat my brains in, I'm going to keep getting up. He had only one military doctrine: strike the enemy—attack, attack, attack.

He never missed an opportunity to attack, even when the odds against him were very high. You don't win by playing defense. You don't even win by having the right ideas. You win by having a will to victory and a strategy to implement that victory.

My friends, I stand here not as someone who feels defeated in the last election. I feel victorious. Right now, that is still a figment of my imagination. Over the next several years, together, we're going to make it a reality.

Thank you all very much.



## YOU ARE INVITED

The Spring 1993 meeting of the National Committee of the U.S. Taxpayers Party will be held in Denver, Colorado on May 21-22. Please call 703-281-9426 for reservations or information.