In sum, we feel that it is bad from the viewpoint of the taxpayer who has to pay for it; we feel it is bad from the viewpoint of the recipients; and we feel that it is bad from the viewpoint of both in the arena of the national economy and the inflationary spiral as it exists today.

Thank you.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Hicks follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF W. B. HICKS, JR.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I am W. B. Hicks, Jr., executive secretary of Liberty Lobby. I am here to present the views of our 15,000 member Board of Policy, on behalf of nearly 200,000 subscribers to our monthly legislative report, *Liberty Letter*. The Board of Policy, consisting of patriotic Americans in every state, has specifically voted to oppose the institution of any kind of "guaranteed annual income" scheme.

Liberty Lobby opposes the basic concept of government income maintenance programs, and we would strongly oppose any attempt to enact legislation putting the idea into effect, whether in the form of cash payment, negative income tax, or other socialistic program.

The several proposed plans, while differing in detail, have the same basic approach and goal. The philosophy behind them is that every citizen, no matter how indolent, has an inherent right to be supported in a comfortable manner by the taxpayers. The goal is a massive redistribution of wealth, of a degree as yet unheard of in the United States. "Poverty" will be ended by the simple expedient of allowing unproductive people to live as well as if they were working, and contributing to the American economy. Every citizen would be promised that, no matter what the reason for his failure to support himself and his family, he will continue to receive from the government payments keyed to a predetermined schedule.

We feel that these hearings will serve a useful purpose if they bring the dangers inherent in the "guaranteed annual wage" to the attention of the American people. For, in spite of fact that the possibility of this travesty on the American tradition of hard work and individual initiative actually becoming law seems remote to most of our people, many highly influential Americans have indicated that that this will be the area in which the next major push toward a socialist America will take place.

Reliable columnist Paul Scott reports that the President himself was directly responsible for the inclusion of a guaranteed annual income recommendation in the report of his National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. Significantly, the President has appointed a Commission on Income Maintenance, the announced purpose of which is to develop a plan guaranteeing each American family an income of at least $3,000 per year, and then promoting public support for the plan. Ben W. Heineman, the Commission's Chairman, has stated that: "One of the commission's main objective will be to sell the idea of a guaranteed annual income as one of the best ways to fight poverty and head off further racial troubles in the large cities. This won't be done overnight."

The idea of the guaranteed annual income is actively supported by at least two of this year's major Presidential contenders. It has become one of the main demands of the so-called "civil rights movement," which seems to get most of what it wants.

Our first major objection to the guaranteed annual income, and this applies equally to all of the various schemes under consideration, is that it is simply unfair to the productive people of the United States. It amounts to a massive confiscation of the earnings of hard working taxpayers to support people who, in many case, are able-bodied and capable of working, but who prefer to live as parasites on the backs of productive Americans.

This committee would find it instructive to carefully consider the words of Dr. Robert Theobold, one of the principal formulators of the guaranteed annual income scheme. Dr. Theobold has made it perfectly clear that he feels that any guarantee plan enacted by Congress would be only the first step. He has stated ("The Guaranteed Income, P. 233):

"We will need to adopt the concept of an absolute constitutional right to an income. This would guaranteed to every citizen of the United States, and to