

The Individualist

A Pint-size Periodical of Pith, Punch and Perspicacity

VOLUME SIX

FEBRUARY, 1954

NUMBER SEVEN

BRICKBATS AND ROSES

Those missiles you see sailing through the air are not flying saucers. They are brickbats heaved at the Bricker Amendment.

Among the hurlers are President Eisenhower, Secretary of State Dulles, and a raft of not quite-so-big bigwigs. They say that adoption of the Amendment would make our treaty machinery "the most cumbersome in the world"; that the forty-eight states would have to legislate on international agreements on narcotics, navigation, and like subjects; that it would enable Congress to destroy the President's power to meet international emergencies, and that, finally, a treaty can't conflict with the Constitution any way so it is unnecessary.

Supporters of the Amendment ridicule such claims. The facts are, they say, that the United States is the only major power where treaty law becomes automatically the supreme law of the land, and thus invades domestic law. So adoption of the Amendment would not make ours "the most cumbersome" but it would serve to place us on an equal footing. And to say that under it the Congress can destroy the President's power in emergencies, or that all the states would have to legislate on international matters is to overstate the case widely.

Active in the fight for the adoption of the Amendment are such authorities in constitutional law as Clarence Manion, former Dean of the Law School of Notre Dame, and Frank E. Holman, Past President American Bar Association. Dr. Manion says the controversy "is the hottest question since the Civil War."

According to Mr. Holman, "Powerful forces are arrayed against the Amendment. Many false reports are being circulated by the International Party Liners. They do not even believe in free speech. One of my speaking engagements in New York has been cancelled due to their pressure . . . The issue is entirely non-political. It is American rights versus treaty power. It is the greatest constitutional issue since the historic controversy over our original Bill of Rights."

In its amended form, as approved by two-thirds of the Senate Sub-committee, the Amendment reads as follows:

"Section 1. A provision of a treaty which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

"Section 2. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty.

"Section 3. Congress shall have power to regulate all executive and other agreements with any foreign power or international organization. All such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties by this article."

In 1952, before he became Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles outlined to a group of lawyers in Louisville the dangers inherent

Change of Address

THE INDIVIDUALIST

C. O. STEELE, *Publisher*

2128 - 9th Avenue W.

BRADENTON, FLORIDA

in the present system. "The treaty-making power," he said, "is an extraordinary power liable to abuse. Treaties make international law and also they make domestic law. Under our Constitution, treaties become the supreme law of the land. They are, indeed, more supreme than ordinary laws, for congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution, whereas treaty law can override the Constitution.

"Treaties, for example, can take powers away from Congress and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body; and they can cut across the rights given the people by the constitutional Bill of Rights."

Mr. Dulles, of course, is now fighting the adoption of the Amendment. He concedes that those who support the Amendment have done well in pointing out dangers in certain treaties. But he holds that the Amendment is not necessary because the present Administration would be careful about treaties and would not agree to bad ones.

Few will question Mr. Dulles' good intention, or even his ability to tell a good treaty from a bad one. But it will be recalled that Franklin D. Roosevelt once said that certain powers that Congress had granted him would be dangerous in the wrong hands. There be people who hold that the powers were not only dangerous but that they were in the wrong hands when Mr. Roosevelt was exercising them, and that great harm to the country resulted. Mr. Dulles will not always be Secretary of State.

To this observer, the Dulles statement, 1952 model, wins hands down. Until we hear arguments against the Bricker Amendment that are more convincing than any we have yet heard, we're for adoption. And let the letters to the editor fall where they may.

HOME SWEET HOME

Streaks of commonsense and innate fairness continue to crop out in the Eisenhower make-up despite the Presidential proclivity for following advice which does violence to both concepts.

Take, for instance, the President's program for revising federal housing laws, recently submitted to Congress, which aims at provid-

ing "good housing in good neighborhoods" for every American. The idea, of course, is borrowed from the New Deal. It is thoroughly socialistic since the government has no business providing any kind of housing in any kind of a neighborhood for anybody.

Good homes in good neighborhoods cost money. Money doesn't grow on trees—it has to be earned. The money for a good home in a good neighborhood should be earned by the guy who gets the good home in the good neighborhood—and by nobody else. That the President senses this elemental truth is seen in his warning that "actions and programs must be avoided that would make our citizens increasingly dependent upon the federal government to supply their housing needs."

The sentiment is laudable, but it is plain to be seen that when a home buyer gets a lower price, a longer-term mortgage, a lower rate of interest and a smaller down payment than he could get but for government intervention, then he is not paying his way in full and he very definitely is being encouraged to depend in increasing measure on the federal government for his housing.

The President says, too, that his program, which calls for approximately one billion dollars, should be based on "full and effective utilization of our competitive economy." That's wishful thinking. It does credit to the President's heart but not to his head. Whenever the government chuckes a billion bucks into the jackpot you can bet your sweet life free competition takes a rooking.

The President is a fine gentleman. We just wish he knew a little more about fundamental economics. Enough, say, to see that a man is entitled to what he earns—and no more; and that when the government helps pay for his home, he is getting something he hasn't earned. Just as the taxpayers, who must make up the deficit, are earning something they don't get. We wish the President could see that—and the wrongness of it.

CARDINAL SPELLMAN SPEAKS OUT

(The following editorial, written by Mr. E. T. Tompkins, appeared in the New York Journal American of November 5, 1953. It was reprinted in The American Mercury for January, whence we lifted it with the idea that not all readers of The Individualist read the Journal-American or The American Mercury, any more than all readers of the Journal-American and The American Mercury read The Individualist—drat it!—and that our own customers will like it—most of 'em.—Editor.)

Cardinal Spellman has given some of his fellow citizens who go abroad a much needed lesson in patriotic good manners.

Returning from Italy, the Prelate paused at Brussels to address a church group. He expressed great concern over "the bitterness, suspicion and distrust of America which, I am told, has been engendered in the postwar years." Particularly, he said, America is subjected to "widespread criticism in Europe"

because of "its Congressional inquiries into the infiltration of Government by Communists."

The Cardinal staunchly upheld America's position.

"Judging from the hysterical tone of the criticism," he said, "one would imagine that it is no longer possible in America to keep one's good name. Nothing could be farther from the truth. . . . No American uncontaminated by Communism has lost his good name because of Congressional hearings on un-American activities. . . . The anguished cries and protests against 'McCarthyism' are not going to dissuade Americans from their desire to see Communists exposed and removed from positions where they can carry out their nefarious plans."

Cardinal Spellman imputed the anti-American attitude to two elements — "Communist sources" and "many non-Communist spokesmen and writers in Western Europe."

He might have mentioned a third group— itinerant Americans who not only fail to defend America against aspersion, but have also even encouraged the calumnies.

Last July, for example, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, on a world tour, was Marshall Tito's guest in Communist Yugoslavia. In an interview at Ljubljana she said that "everywhere" she has been "astounded and astonished" by questions asked about "McCarthyism" and Senator McCarthy. She added: "McCarthy's methods, to me, look like Hitler's."

At a Vienna press conference, Mrs. Roosevelt "informed" the Austrians that "some of the methods used by McCarthy are not unlike those of Hitler and Stalin."

Back home, on October 17, Mrs. Roosevelt told the League of Women Voters at Kent, Connecticut, that Senator McCarthy's exposes of Communism, "did harm" to America abroad—"more harm than Alger Hiss could have done if he had not been caught."

No doubt, these words of hers were published abroad.

Aldai E. Stevenson likewise made a world tour. At London, on July 28, he was asked if he could "say something complimentary" regarding Senator McCarthy. The former Presidential nominee answered "Nothing"—but qualified by saying he "approved his objectives, opposed his methods."

On his return from visiting thirty countries, Mr. Stevenson denounced "book-burnings, purges and invasions of executive responsibility," declaring that our "prestige and moral influence abroad have declined."

Did anyone ever hear of a high-placed English traveler publicly bemoaning British patriotism to foreigners, or reflecting adversely upon the lawful procedures of Parliament?

Or when did a distinguished Frenchman ever come here to say that anti-Communists in France are character assassins and persecutors?

The keynote of Cardinal Spellman's address at Brussels was: "Patria." There, amidst the memorials of many battles, he told the Belgians: "You have proclaimed in a deathless way how holy a thing is the love of one's native land."

FARMERS AND BUGGY WHIPS

A leading Florida agriculturist, who has made himself a very wealthy man through his farming activities, gives out with this: "The national income is going to be the largest in history next year and the farmers' income is going to be the lowest in percentage. The farmers' share in the consumer dollar is going down to an all-time low."

So what? Time was when the makers of buggy whips enjoyed a substantial portion of the national income. Now look at 'em. Should the rest of us be taxed to put the buggywhippers back on the old basis?

Thanks to technological advance and greater know-how, farm output per acre, per man, is more than double what it was not a great many years ago. Ergo—that's not a disease or the name of a sleeping car; it means hence, or therefore—ergo there are too many farmers, even though Americans are eating more and better food than ever before.

Farmers are producing more than can be sold to consumers at artificially inflated prices. They are not, of course, producing more than consumers would buy at free market prices. Except in isolated instances and for short periods, there is no such thing as surpluses in farm products. There is merely more of some items than can be sold in the rigged market.

The situation would quickly be corrected if (a) a third of the farmers, say, should go into other lines, or (b) government price supports were withdrawn and farm products allowed to find their own level in a free market. The first alternative would be but a palliative, and a poor one at best. The second would remedy the situation, once and for all.

Which course will be followed? Neither, brother, neither. Why should a farmer leave a business in which he has a guaranteed market for all he produces at far above free-market prices? No reason, of course. The farmer's no sap. He'll stay put.

As to the second alternative, the discontinuance of farm price supports—don't be silly! Have you heard of anybody in Washington from President Eisenhower down to the newest congressman who favors such a common-sense step; who so much as hints that the natural law of supply and demand be allowed to fix prices of what farmers produce? You have not, mister, you have not—and that ain't all. You ain't going to.

WHY THE PRESIDENT SAID NO!

(Grover Cleveland, February 16, 1887)
(The following reprint of "Clipping of Note," No. 69, issued by The Foundation For Economic Education, Irvington-on-Hudson, N. Y., appears in *The Individualist* by permission of the publishers—and because we think it's damn good. Additional copies may be had on request to the Foundation: 5 free, then 1c each—Editor.)

I Return Without My Approval House bill No. 10263, entitled "An act to enable the Commissioner of Agriculture to make a special distribution of seeds in the drought-stricken counties of Texas, and making an appropriation (of \$10,000) therefor."

It is represented that a long-continued and extensive drought has existed in certain por-

tions of the State of Texas, resulting in a failure of crops and consequent distress and destitution.

Though there has been some difference in statements concerning the extent of the people's needs in the localities thus affected, there seems to be no doubt that there has existed a condition calling for relief; and I am willing to believe that, notwithstanding the aid already furnished, a donation of seed grain to the farmers located in this region, to enable them to put in new crops, would serve to avert a continuance or return of an unfortunate blight.

And yet I feel obliged to withhold my approval of the plan, as proposed by this bill, to indulge a benevolent and charitable sentiment through the appropriation of public funds for that purpose.

I can find no warrant for such an appropriation in the Constitution, and I do not believe that the power and duty of the General Government ought to be extended to the relief of individual suffering which is in no manner properly related to the public service or benefit. A prevalent tendency to disregard the limited mission of this power and duty should, I think, be steadfastly resisted, to the end that the lesson should be constantly enforced that *though the people support the Government the Government should not support the people.* (Emphasis added.)

The friendliness and charity of our countrymen can always be relied upon to relieve their fellow-citizens in misfortune. This has been repeatedly and quite lately demonstrated. Federal aid in such cases encourages the expectation of paternal care on the part of the Government and weakens the sturdiness of our national character, while it prevents the indulgence among our people of that kindly sentiment and conduct which strengthens the bonds of a common brotherhood.

SQUEEZE ON THE PRESS

It would tax the imagination to conceive of circumstances in which even the United States government itself could close down New York City's daily newspapers; and certainly no enemy nation could do it with less than a full assortment of A bombs and H bombs and all those other fascinating and delightful engines of destruction which men have perfected in this enlightened age for the common good of all mankind.

But the 400 members of the photoengravers union did the trick overnight, and without firing a shot. They couldn't have done it, of course, without the fifth-column help of 16,000 other unionized newspaper workers who refused to cross the engravers' picket lines and thus forced the papers to suspend. The papers could have continued without the engravers by simply discontinuing the use of pictures for the time being, but they couldn't carry on without the 16,000 other workers, and so they had to shut up shop.

Since the 16,000 had no grievance against their employers, their refusal to work was a flagrant infringement of the constitutional freedom of the press. Whether or not the photoengravers were entitled to the additional \$15 a week they were asking is largely beside the point. A worker is entitled to *all he can*

get in a free market. The engravers were being paid \$120 to \$131 a week for a basic week of 36½ hours. With overtime, some of them made as much as \$10,000 a year.

The point is that a picket line which threatens or intimidates is itself a denial of the free market and invariably an admission that other workers would take the strikers' jobs at the old rate of pay if allowed to do so. That they are prevented from doing so sort of knocks the idea of the free labor market into a cocked hat. However, it's all part and parcel of what President Eisenhower calls "free labor unions," and from the direction of the wind in Congress at the present time—with congressional elections coming up—it looks like the real payers of wages, the consuming public, will continue to take it and like it. Or, at least, take it.

OUR OLD MAN OF THE SEA

(Below we print one of Mark Granite's famous "Granitegrams," No. 701 this time. Mark Granite is one of the clearest thinking Americans we know. Too bad there aren't more of his kind, not only in the Republican Party but the Democratic, too. We suggest readers of The Individualist write to The Granite Foundation, Lancaster, New Hampshire, for further information concerning the grand effort this elder statesman is making to save the country from socialism.—Editor.)

Extra Perkins looked up from the newspaper he was reading down to the Store and said to the folks around the Stove: "Eisenhower reminds me of the Fisherman who was worrying about catching enough fish for his family when he met up with the Old Man of the Sea. And the Old Man said to him:

"If you'll just take me on your back and carry me across this stream, I'll show you how to catch more fish than you've ever caught in all your born days." So the Fisherman heisted the Old Man of the Sea onto his back and started across the stream. The Old Man got heavier and heavier at every step and when the Fisherman staggered up the other bank the old codger just plain refused to get off his back.

"Now Ike has met up with Welfare-State and all its big family. And Welfare-State says to him: 'If you take me and all my folks on your back and carry us where we want to go, we'll see you catch more votes than even Franklin Roosevelt ever caught.' And Ike says to Welfare-State: 'I'd like to carry every single one of you, and I sure could use those votes. I ain't got enough back to tote such a load, but the American people have a lot of backs: I'll get them to carry you.'

"So Ike proposes, out of the kindness of his heart, that we load ourselves up with all this big crowd. Some of us sort of mildly object a little, saying we're already carrying quite a load, but Ike says to us: 'Big strong guys like you ought to be ashamed to let just a few million folks like them walk on their own feet.' So he heists more and more millions of people onto our backs, for us to stagger under year after year, as the load gets heavier and heavier. . . . The Fisherman finally got the Old Man of the Sea off his neck, but we won't get this bunch off ours—ever."

"The picture you have painted," I said, "is too close to the truth to be taken lightly by thoughtful Republicans; yet there is some

ground for hope that Eisenhower himself will come to see the danger in taking these steps down the newdeal road to socialism. He has an analytical mind and is steadily growing in his grasp of public problems.

"Left to himself, and given enough time to think through the implications and consequences of his welfare-state proposals, his normally sound and conservative nature may lead him to reject and withdraw these socialist measures inserted in his program by the little group of Republican newdealers around him.

"Meantime, it is up to our Senators and Congressmen to ask themselves these questions: How many more millions of leaners can the rest of us support? What effect will this wholesale government charity have upon the character of the American people? Will this ape-ing and trying to out-do the newdealers win us this coming election, or will it alienate and sicken those who voted for us in 1952?

"But there is a far larger and graver question than the winning or losing of votes involved in this matter. The American people returned us to power on our solemn promise to put an end to newdeal state socialism. Is the Republican Party, pledged to preserve our American system, about to destroy it?"

THE DIFFERENCE

In November, '52, the people voted for more economy in government and less socialism. In January, '54, it is plain they are getting less of what they wanted more of and more of what they wanted less of.

The administration which came into office on a pledge of economy has reached the debt limit and is begging for the privilege of borrowing additional billions. In its first year it has increased government holdings in farm commodities—to cite but one bottomless rat hole — by 2½ billion dollars. Such "surpluses" bought outright or held under loan, now total 4½ billion dollars. By June of this year money thus tied up will exceed 6 billion.

That's neither economy nor a reasonable facsimile thereof. It is socialism. It's never economy when you borrow to buy things you have no use for, especially when you are already head over heels in debt. It's always socialism when you take money from those who earn it to give to those who don't.

The administration, of course, doesn't call it socialism. It calls it social welfare. The difference? Socialism has 9 letters, social welfare 13. That's the difference.

BUSINESS OUTLOOK

The President's Board of Economic Advisers says there will be no depression this year. Nothing more than a mild recession—if that. Let's hope the boys are right—this time.

But suppose they aren't. Suppose business takes a nosedive. Suppose auto makers, for instance, who are hoping for a seven-million-car year, are able to sell only five million. What then? Will the federal government step in and take the two-million-car "surplus" off their hands at 90 per cent of market prices? Or, if not that, will it pay the auto makers for not producing the two million?

It works like that for the farmer; why not for the auto maker? Maybe it's because there

are a lot of farmers with a lot of votes, and only a handful of auto makers with a handful of votes. Or, is that slandering the politicians?

The "good" business of recent years hasn't really been good. There has been tremendous industrial activity, to be sure, with high employment and high wages, but the seeming prosperity has been largely based on an inflationary program of borrowing, arming and squandering.

Business will be good when restrictions to trade and production are broken down, when people are encouraged to work and depend on themselves rather than loaf and depend on government, and when the insane armament race has come to an end. When men everywhere are able to avail themselves freely of the bounties which the good God has placed in this rich old earth in unimaginable abundance, and are free to do as they will with the fruits of their toil, provided only they wrong no man—then, and not until then, will business be good.

THE RIGHT TO WORK . . . AND TO OWN

The fifteen automobiles standing on the employees' parking lot at the South Bend Studebaker plant were not ornamenting the landscape. On the contrary they were an eyesore, not to say a pain in the neck—at least to the union bosses who rule the roost at Studebaker. For the cars weren't Studebakers, they were other makes.

The union demanded that management fire the fifteen owners because the Union's stated policy "required ownership of a Studebaker automobile as a condition of employment." More Studebaker sales meant more jobs, the union implied. And fewer jobs in other auto plants, too, but that little circumstance was not mentioned by the Studebaker representative of the great labor solidarity.

So Studebaker management, exercising its right to fire any worker the union ordered fired, gave the fifteen the bum's rush. Thus was exemplified freedom at its highest level, for no one can deny that the discharged fifteen are free to take jobs elsewhere—if they can find 'em. And if, too, maybe, they own the right kind of cars.

LAUGHING MATTER

A Seattle apiarist—bee man, remember?—says a whiff of laughing gas (nitrous oxide) puts bees to sleep and destroys their memories, so that when they wake up they submit quietly to being moved and make no effort to return to the old home.

The stunt may be new in bee circles, it's old stuff to politicians—except that the politicians do the laughing and they use holoney instead of gas. The effects are the same. Franklin D. Roosevelt started it. Twelve years later there was scarcely a man alive who remembered, much less yearned to return to, private enterprise, the free market and individual rights, including the right of the worker to the fruits of his toil.

Harry S. Truman carried on the practice begun by Roosevelt, but he had little to do, most of the people having completely forgotten the old ways.

And so thoroughly has the populace been gassed—or bolomed, to be more accurate—by now, that nobody pulls a gun and almost no voices are heard in protest at the plans being announced daily for more billion-dollar handouts to agriculture, more billions for old-age benefits, more federal home building, more federal health insurance, more monopoly privilege to organized labor, more “From each according to his ability, to each according to his need,” as patron-saint Marx put it.

The Seattle bee man who thinks he has discovered something new is kidding himself. He's just an old copycat.

LINE BUCKING PARSON

What this country needs, among other things, is more preachers like Dr. Daniel A. Poling, pastor of New York's Marble Collegiate Church, and editor of the *Christian Herald*, read by 43,000 ministers and 350,000 Protestant laymen.

At 68, this husky cleric is still spoken of as the “Preaching Fullback,” a hark back to his Oregon college days when he was heavyweight boxing champ, track star and captain of the football team. He is a gentleman of the cloth who doesn't pull his punches, who calls ‘em as he sees ‘em, and who doesn't use pink-tinted spectacles in the seeing.

How the Reverend Dan'l hits the line was well illustrated last fall in the episode of Dr. John A. Mackay and his *Letter to Presbyterians*. Dr. Mackay is Chairman of the General Council of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A. He is also president of Princeton Theological Seminary, a circumstance which has brought him less publicity than his proclivity for supporting Communist fronts.

In the letter to his fellow churchmen, Dr. Mackay held that “Communism is . . . a secular religion of great vitality,” that the present method of fighting Communists is a prelude to fascism in America, and that “anti-Communism is as dangerous as Communism and may be even more so.”

Characterizing such sentiments as so much garbage, Dr. Poling thundered: “It is unbelievable but true that there are a few, but a potent few, in Christian leadership who call for recognition of Communist China by the United States . . . In Korea, Communism has executed more than 600 of his brother clergymen . . . Would this leader among us have us believe that anti-Communism is as dangerous and may be even more dangerous than that?”

Nor did he pussyfoot, as did a number of clergymen, when J. B. Matthews, himself an ordained minister, declared several months ago that the Communist Party had, over a period of seventeen years, enlisted the support of at least 3,500 professors; and followed up that statement with an article in *The American Mercury* in which he stated: “During the same seventeen-year period the Communist Party has enlisted the support of at least 7,000 Protestant clergymen—Party members, fellow travelers, espionage agents, Party-line adherents and unwilling dupes.”

Instead of ducking the issue, Dr. Poling jumped in with the flat declaration: “He made a statement that I believe he will be able to support with facts.”

Dr. Poling was similarly forthright when the World Council of Churches at its Amsterdam convention in 1948 condemned capitalism equally with Communism, and called for the rejection of both by churchmen. He refused to subscribe to such a Socialist attitude, and declared in a ringing editorial in his *Christian Herald*:

“While ‘capitalism’ is no longer an adequate phrase, what it connotes is inclusive of what we Americans are, have been, and, under God, purpose to become. The very essence of freedom, with the particulars of all the freedoms and the right to correct abuses and to perfect our form of democracy, centers in this so-called ‘capitalism.’ We face our faults and failures, our too little practice of great principles, but capitalism (or to use another and synonymous term, the American way if life) is also man's open door to better things, and from it comes food for his journey and light for his way. To pillory all this, to condemn it equally with Communism . . . is, to an overwhelming majority in all faiths, rank hypocrisy.”

Ourselves, we sort of like this here Dr. Dan'l A. Poling. We'd guess that God does, too.

SILENT PARTNER

In those distant days of our youth, when Fannie was a girl's name and a pansy was a flower, it was the custom of many of the smaller communities of this fair land of ours to cut themselves a slice of the local prostitution business. The arrangement took the form of fines, which the “madams” paid without the formality of a police court appearance, at stated intervals and in fixed amounts, whereupon the ladies—so to speak—were free to go and sin some more—until the immunity ran out again.

The city fathers defended the system on the ground that the fines were merely a tax—maybe they called it an amusement tax, we don't remember—which afforded the city a substantial chunk of much-needed revenue. On the other hand, a goodly number of citizens said it made them partners in the brothels. They didn't mind being patrons, some of them, but that could be kept hidden—usually. The partnership business was different.

In any event the practice was discontinued in time, its end hastened no doubt by the growing habit of precinct collectors to add a shakedown of their own—the proceeds of which, you may be sure, never reached the city coffers. That, of course, was in addition to the sizable exactions of the city itself.

So the industry went underground, and red lights are now used to guide another kind of traffic. The public concern these days is over reds in government and red fronts membered by red preachers, red teachers and red dupes, and not over red light districts. But in the view of those wily gentlemen, the tax collectors, the basic idea of the old system was sound. Don't stop lawbreakers breaking the law, just make them give you a divvy in the loot. The thing started in a big way back in the days of Al Capone. They put that greasy thumb away for a spell not for having committed practically every crime in the calendar but because he failed to share the spoils with

the powers that be. He didn't pay his income tax. That was what made him a touse.

It's been that way ever since. In Florida and New York and other states they'll fry your ears if they catch you taking bets on the dogs and the hosses. Because betting on races is wrong? Don't be silly! Because the state wants a monopoly on the racket—that's why. Slot machines, liquor licenses in dry states—name your crime and you'll find government right there taking its cut.

We don't know whether crime pays or not—it didn't for us—but it pays the government big and plenty. You can gamble on that. And you can gamble in the open too, if you split the swag with the right people.

BREVITIES AND LEVITIES

HEADLINE: “Senator Says Former U. S. Worker Got Lifetime Pension Of \$2,748 By Paying Only \$63.”

WE READ that the Hamilton Watch Company has perfected a clock that will tell what time it is on Mars. That's wasted effort—as useless as the Big Four Conference that is now going around in circles in Berlin. Not a single international conference in which the Soviets have participated since the close of World War II has resulted in anything but talk, talk, talk.

Nobody wants to buy a clock that tells what time it is on Mars. And nobody wants to buy the gold brick the Soviets are offering at Berlin—we hope. We hope, but we can't be too sure. Remember Yalta? Remember Potsdam? Remember Teheran?—and every other time we've tangled with those guys?

The Berlin conference won't achieve a single objective that couldn't have been attained through regular diplomatic channels at a far smaller expenditure of time, effort and money—save to provide another sounding board for Soviet propaganda.

Won't we ever learn?

WE ARE INFORMED by Ambassador to Italy—Clare Boothe Luce—if “informed” is the word for it—that dollar aid to Italy must be continued if that country is not to go over to the Communist side.

We are also informed—again in a manner of speaking—by Harold Stassen, the gent who has the job of giving away American money abroad, that bigger gifts to India might cause Nehru to swing over a little toward our side and away from the Reds.

Friendship that has to be bought is never worth the price. The friend who will run out on you as soon as your dollars run out—well, the sooner you ditch him the better, for the sake of your own security as well as your pocketbook.

This country of ours, fabulously rich as it is, can't keep on pouring out billions abroad forever. We should let Russia have Italy and India and all the other nations that have to be bribed to stay on our side. We'll be better off, and Russia, which has already bitten off more than she can chew, will be further weakened—and that much nearer her inevitable collapse.

THE INDIVIDUALIST

Published monthly by C. O. Steele,
2128 - 9th Ave. W., Bradenton, Florida.
Subscription \$2 a year.

Entered as second-class mail matter at the post office at Bradenton, Florida.

Mrs. Mabel L. Rees
39 Winthrop Street
Brooklyn, N.Y.