

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
Washington, DC 20008 [REDACTED]

Mr. Brian Lamb  
CEO Of C-SPAN  
400 Northn Capitol Street

June 8, 1999

*O. House*

Dear Mr. Lamb:

It is with reluctance that I contact you. I have a gripe with the media and as far as the media goes, C-SPAN is a jewel. Still, my complaint is related to C-SPAN. My complaint is that the major media including C-Span are unwilling to report that half the funds Congress is free to allocate go to the military. The enclosed copy of the budget from the Congressional Budget Office proves the 50% breakdown.

Today, Tuesday, June 8, at about 2:20 p.m. my call to C-SPAN was taken, allowing me to talk directly with the defense 'expert' being interviewed while the Senate was discussing the defense budget. He was Tony Cappacio of the Bloomberg group. I identified myself by my full name.

In reponse to my comment he flatly denied that half the funds Congress is free to spend go for the military. It's true, he did yield a bit when I objected to his comment to the effect that an ABM system would defend against incoming missiles, after I pointed out that after spending 100 billion on the ABM, none of the many test firings had been successful.

On the oppostie side of the CBO budget breakdown is a copy of a letter I sent to some 40 key media people. Copies of this letter were sent well before the release May 15, 1997, of the quadrennial military review. In this letter I predicted, correctly, that not one of the 40 key media people when reporting on this review would tell the public that half of free federal funds would go to the military. In each letter, I included a copy of the CBO breakdown of the budget, proving that the 50% figure was correct.

C-SPAN has been a part of this strange silence. A while back, on three successive days, the question of the size of the bite that defense takes from discretionary spending was discussed, but on these three days the silence remained, even if on the thrid day a pie chart was show for several seconds allowing a speed reader familiar with budget categories to glean the correct percentage.

The military contractors continue to rob us blind. Former House Speaker Newt Gingrich tacitly agreed with me with his oft-repeated mantra that the Pentagon should be reduced to a triange with no loss of military effectivness. His call for a 40% reduction in military spending he stated could be accomplished by dint of discipline and efficiency.

Please pass on this letter to the C-SPAN host who took my call. Mike who answered the phone at C-SPAN refused to give me his name.

Also, many, many thanks for C-SPAN, my favorite TV Program. [REDACTED]

CARBON to MR. CAPPACIO, OTHERS



**Table 2-5.**  
**CBO Outlay Projections, Assuming Compliance with Discretionary Spending Caps (By fiscal year)**

|                                     | Actual<br>1996 | 1997  | 1998  | 1999  | 2000  | 2001  | 2002  | 2003  | 2004  | 2005  | 2006  | 2007  |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| <b>In Billions of Dollars</b>       |                |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Discretionary                       |                |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Defense                             | 266            | 266   | 270   | 277   | 288   | 289   | 301   | 310   | 319   | 332   | 339   | 345   |
| Domestic and international          | 266            | 278   | 285   | 292   | 300   | 308   | 316   | 325   | 334   | 344   | 355   | 366   |
| Violent Crime Reduction             |                |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Trust Fund                          | 1              | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5     | 5     | 5     | 5     | 5     | 6     | 6     | 6     |
| Unspecified reductions <sup>a</sup> | 0              | 0     | -15   | -14   | -15   | -7    | -9    | -9    | -9    | -12   | -8    | -5    |
| Subtotal                            | 533            | 547   | 543   | 561   | 578   | 595   | 613   | 631   | 650   | 670   | 691   | 713   |
| Mandatory Spending                  | 859            | 916   | 976   | 1,037 | 1,110 | 1,161 | 1,239 | 1,310 | 1,390 | 1,490 | 1,571 | 1,654 |
| Offsetting Receipts                 | -73            | -79   | -85   | -78   | -78   | -80   | -83   | -86   | -88   | -91   | -95   | -95   |
| Net Interest                        | 241            | 248   | 253   | 261   | 267   | 272   | 279   | 289   | 300   | 312   | 325   | 340   |
| Total                               | 1,560          | 1,632 | 1,687 | 1,781 | 1,877 | 1,948 | 2,049 | 2,145 | 2,252 | 2,381 | 2,492 | 2,611 |
| On-budget                           | 1,260          | 1,320 | 1,363 | 1,449 | 1,530 | 1,586 | 1,670 | 1,751 | 1,842 | 1,952 | 2,044 | 2,142 |
| Off-budget <sup>b</sup>             | 300            | 311   | 324   | 332   | 346   | 362   | 379   | 394   | 411   | 429   | 448   | 469   |
| <b>As a Percentage of GDP</b>       |                |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Discretionary <sup>a</sup>          |                |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Defense                             | 3.6            | 3.4   | 3.3   | 3.2   | 3.2   | 3.1   | 3.0   | 3.0   | 3.0   | 2.9   | 2.9   | 2.8   |
| Domestic and international          | 3.5            | 3.6   | 3.5   | 3.4   | 3.3   | 3.3   | 3.2   | 3.1   | 3.1   | 3.0   | 3.0   | 3.0   |
| Violent Crime Reduction             |                |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| Trust Fund                          | c              | c     | c     | 0.1   | 0.1   | 0.1   | 0.1   | 0.1   | 0.1   | c     | c     | c     |
| Unspecified reductions              | 0              | 0     | -0.2  | -0.2  | -0.2  | -0.1  | -0.1  | -0.1  | -0.1  | -0.1  | -0.1  | -c    |
| Subtotal                            | 7.1            | 7.0   | 6.6   | 6.5   | 6.4   | 6.3   | 6.2   | 6.1   | 6.0   | 5.9   | 5.8   | 5.8   |
| Mandatory Spending                  | 11.5           | 11.7  | 11.9  | 12.1  | 12.3  | 12.3  | 12.6  | 12.7  | 12.8  | 13.2  | 13.3  | 13.4  |
| Offsetting Receipts                 | -1.0           | -1.0  | -1.0  | -0.9  | -0.9  | -0.8  | -0.8  | -0.8  | -0.8  | -0.8  | -0.8  | -0.8  |
| Net Interest                        | 3.2            | 3.2   | 3.1   | 3.0   | 3.0   | 2.9   | 2.8   | 2.8   | 2.8   | 2.8   | 2.7   | 2.7   |
| Total                               | 20.8           | 20.8  | 20.6  | 20.8  | 20.9  | 20.7  | 20.8  | 20.8  | 20.8  | 21.0  | 21.1  | 21.1  |
| On-budget                           | 16.8           | 16.9  | 16.7  | 16.9  | 17.0  | 16.8  | 16.9  | 16.9  | 17.0  | 17.3  | 17.3  | 17.3  |
| Off-budget <sup>b</sup>             | 4.0            | 4.0   | 4.0   | 3.9   | 3.9   | 3.8   | 3.8   | 3.8   | 3.8   | 3.8   | 3.8   | 3.8   |

SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office.

a. These reductions represent the cuts that would be needed to comply with the statutory cap in 1998 and the effects of those cuts projected into the future.

b. Social Security and the Postal Service.

c. Less than 0.05 percent of gross domestic product.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES  
 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

A REPORT TO THE SENATE AND  
 HOUSE COMMITTEES ON THE BUDGET



JANUARY 1997

NOTICE:  
 This Document is Not Available  
 for Public Release Until 10 a.m. (EST)  
 Tuesday, January 28, 1997.

# The Economic and Budget Outlook: Fiscal Years 1998 - 2007



[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Washington, DC 20008 [REDACTED]

Mr. Dan Rather  
CBS, 51 W. 57th Street  
New York, N.Y., 10019

May 2, 1997

Dear Mr. Rather:

Here's a prediction I'll make that is not kind to the media. When on May 15 the quadrennial review of our military spending is released, precious few journalists will report the most significant aspect, namely that it consumes 50% of the funds Congress is free to spend, even if we face no longer face significant, threatening enemies and <sup>THIRP</sup> even if the military tax cost per person is one thousand dollars a year. Few understand that two-thirds of federal spending is locked into items like transfer payments and interest on the debt. The other half is up for grabs and the military gets the largest bite. With a balanced budget and tax cuts looming, the military bite probably will increase. Bipartisan agreements keep the military off the table for reductions.

Vast ignorance pervades the nation as to the components of the federal budget, even if it's size is in vigorous play, politically.

What are the consequences of the media not reporting these salient and crucially important facts? It can be argued that one result is that our bloated military will continue to be force-fed by Congress with weapon systems, including those not requested by our military leaders. But the worst consequence may be that as a result, our physical and social infrastructure may continue to decline. The reason is obvious: funds are limited; spending for one item often precludes spending for another item--the opportunity costs of military spending, as economists would say.

It can be reasonably speculated that if the voting public were aware of these conditions, they would not tolerate them. But they are not. Surveys of public opinion indicate that many if not most voters think foreign aid, about one percent of federal spending, may be the largest item.

What are the causes of this shallow reportage? Lack of understanding of economics? Not studying the budget figures? Co-optation into the system? Whatever--the answer is of little consequence. It is a virtual certainty that when the quadrennial military report is released, likely stressing the need for increased military spending, that no major media person will bother to tell the public the relative size of the military bite.

I hope I am wrong. The enclosed pieces provide background that may be useful to you. This letter and the enclosures have been sent to over 40 national media units, anchors, columnists, media critics, among others.

This veteran is angry because we don't have a mean, lean, efficient military.

Sincerely,  
[REDACTED]



In "The U.N. as Scapegoat" [op-ed, April 22], Stephen Rosenfeld undertook a most useful killing—putting to rest the canard that an inept United Nations is mostly responsible for U.N. peace-keeping failures in Bosnia, Somalia and elsewhere. He's correct; we have met the enemy and it is us, or more precisely the leading nation of the United Nations and more exactly the United States.

In tandem a new U.N. secretary general and a new U.S. president called for measures to equip the world organization with the tools that the United Nations lacks but desperately needs to ensure world peace. Only one nation, the remaining superpower, has the global clout to effect the upgrading. But a myopic, nationalistic Congress in effect has prevented President Clinton from upgrading the United Nations in ways both have advocated. As a result, our nation, which preaches respect for international law, flagrantly violates it by refusing to pay some \$800 million to the United Nations in legal, treaty obligations, thereby hobbling the world organization. By the end of the year, we will owe the United Nations about \$1 billion or about the amount of the annual administrative U.N. budget, thereby encouraging the new world disorder.

Washington.

## EDITORIALS/LETTERS

THE NEW YORK TIMES

### To Change China

To the Editor:

Calls to revoke China's most favored nation trading status with the United States as a way of changing China's human rights practices neglect to point out that our country routinely bestows the most favorable tariff rates of that status on all but nine nations.

Expanding global trade is the strongest engine pulling the world toward peaceful relations and subsequent democratic governance. Of course, we ought to promote human rights with quiet bilateral diplomacy and through multilateral forums such as the United Nations International Labor Organization and Human Rights Commission. The alternative to free trade may be trade wars of the sort that led to Hitler's rise and World War II.

Washington, May 10, 1994

## Military Spending Kept Secret

By

WHEN ON MAY 15 the quadrennial review of our military spending was released, precious few journalists reported the most significant aspect, namely that it consumes 51% of the funds Congress is free to spend.

Few understand that half of federal spending is locked into items like transfer payments and interest on debt. The other half is up for grabs and the military gets the largest bite.

What are the consequences of the media not reporting these salient and crucially important facts? It can be argued that one result is that our bloated military will continue to be force-fed by Congress with weapon systems, including those not requested by our military leaders. But the worst consequence may be that as a result, our physical and social infrastructure may continue to decline. The reason is obvious: funds are limited; spending for one item often precludes spending for another.

It can be reasonably speculated that if the voting public were aware of these conditions, they would not tolerate them. But they are not. Surveys of public opinion indicate that many if not most voters think foreign aid, about one percent of federal spending, may be the largest item.

What are the causes of this shallow reportage? Lack of understanding of economics? Not studying the budget figures? Co-opting into the system? Whatever—the answer is of little consequence. It is a virtual certainty that when the quadrennial military report is released, likely stressing the need for increased military spending, no major media person will bother to tell the public the relative size of the military bite.★

has served for twenty years as a Washington, D.C. lobbyist in the public interest, with emphasis on international matters.

## Isolationist Mind-Set

To the Editor:

Republican leadership has become so nationalistic that it took President Jacques Chirac of France to warn Congress of the dangers of our nation's ignoring the rest of the world.

He's correct. Republican leaders make a big mistake in turning against foreigners by United Nations-bashing, hostility to immigrants, supporting English only, opposing help for Haiti and Bosnia, slashing foreign aid, reducing funds for diplomacy and withdrawing from the Interparliamentary Union. They add to their political mistakes by force-feeding the Pentagon with a budget of \$265 billion.

The contrast between the two parties is stark. President Clinton promotes global burden-sharing through an upgraded United Nations so the world can learn to take care of itself. The G.O.P. leadership seems to want to wreck the United Nations.

Washington, Feb. 10, 1996

It may take force to repel force, as Robert Wright comments regarding Bosnia ("Good Ghali," *TRU*, August 15). But his analysis jumps the gun. Prior to use of force, a series of dispute-solving means ought to have been exhausted. But there's the rub; the third-party dispute-solving machinery of the U.N. is thin to nonexistent. Moreover, it lacks a procedure allowing U.N. peace forces to be placed in timely fashion on threatened borders. Such a line of blue-helmeted soldiers on the borders separating Serbia from Croatia and Bosnia might have deterred the present conflict.

Suppose the U.N. had first-rate intelligence capabilities. If so, it would have learned that the Balkan area constituted a war waiting to happen. If in existence, the U.N. could have employed a self-triggering fact-finding commission to help sort out the difficulties, truth often being the first casualty of war. If not helpful, progressively more intrusive dispute-solving means could have been instituted, including mediation and compulsory arbitration. If the issues at hand were matters of law, then a strengthened World Court could have been apprised of them.

Had all these measures failed and had a U.N. trip-wire been breached, then U.N. peace forces could have been prepositioned to quickly bring to bear the necessary fire power to halt the aggression. And if the world organization had an international criminal court to deal with individual violators, as the World Court cannot, then those who planned to commit genocide might have been deterred, knowing they would face the global bar of justice for perpetrating an internationally recognized crime.