

The Individualist

A Pint-size Periodical of Pith, Punch and Perspicacity

VOLUME SIX

JANUARY, 1954

NUMBER SIX

WRISTON OF BROWN

Some ten years ago Dr. Henry M. Wriston, president of Brown University, wrote a pippin of a book called **CHALLENGE TO FREEDOM**. It was the best thing of its kind to appear following the onslaught of the New Deal scourge ten years earlier. It stressed the importance of the individual and warned of the dangers of planned economy. It bristled with quotable sayings, such as, to cite but a few:

The principle duty of democratic government is the maintenance and expansion of freedom. . . . to strengthen faith in the worth of the individual, to enlarge the opportunities for freedom. . . . Nothing has been more common than assertions that business has "failed" to provide full employment, that it has "lost" its democratic character, that it has gained its success by exploitation. Projects of regulation and reform, subsidized competition of public agencies with private enterprise, promotion of extension of public ownership — these and many other manifestations are familiar.

A nation in which individuals had created the steamship, the automobile, the airplane, the telegraph and cable, the modern technique of broadcasting, which has achieved the highest standard of living and the broadest scale of philanthropy in the world, lost faith in the ideal of individualism which had made all those things possible. It coasted downhill toward statism and government management of housing, finance, transportation, farming, education — and all the rest. It discounted the creative impulse and turned to the dreary business of manipulation.

The whole philosophy was summed up in a single sentence; the President said in 1939, "Today, in order to provide customers, your Government uses Government capital to provide jobs, to prevent farm prices from collapsing and to build up purchasing power when private capital fails to do it." Make work projects were devoted to the achievement of as little as possible, at as great cost as possible, with as many men as possible doing as little as possible. . . . with emphasis upon making work and not upon creating wealth. . . . Government as a major producer of customers is a new concept of public function. . . . Liberties are seldom surrendered consciously. They leak out through holes in the constitutional fabric. . . .

As bureaucracy grows, as the number of commissions, boards, and authorities expands, as their duties are subjected more and more to executive directors rather than legislative controls, dangers multiply. They have become extremely serious in the light of the social phil-

osophy under which we have been living, wherein the rights of the individual are thought no longer to be supreme but to be derived from society, and where reform, therefore, has not looked to individual liberty but to social engineering.

Dr. Wriston's book was acclaimed by the handful of individualists who were still abroad in the land — and by no others save to condemn. Dr. Wriston is still president of Brown University. Dr. Wriston is still talking common sense, as witness a recent article in *Foreign Affairs*, in which he writes:

"Current investigations — by congressional committees — are not fundamentally different from earlier examples. Nor do they cow public opinion. Despite all the uproar about 'terror' created by congressional investigations, I do not know anyone with something important to say which the American people ought to hear who has been silenced by the investigative procedures; many who have nothing to say pretend that the reason they do not say something significant is because of those pressures."

We'll lay you ten to one that you won't find any pinko professors lurking among the Fifth Amendments on the Brown campus. What this country needs is more Dr. Wristons — and fifty million Americans with sense enough to listen to them.

WHITEWASH OVER PINK

Thanks to a couple of old grads we have been able to read the Harvard Alumni Bulletin on Harvard's Pinks. Results, we are compelled to say, have been negligible. Our opinion of Professors Furry and Markham, and of Harvard's action in retaining that precious pair on the payroll, remains lower than somewhat.

President Pusey's address to the New England Association of Colleges, "To Produce Free Men," is admirable, save for the speaker's tendency to identify himself with education. "If there is anything which education does not lack today," he says, "it is critics."

We hadn't noticed it. Everybody favors education. Criticism of educators is something else again. There's been plenty of that — and with plenty reason. It is usually the result of some professor's refusal to say on the witness stand whether he is or ever has been a Communist, whether he has attempted to indoctrinate his students with the Communist philosophy, whether he has attended Communist meetings and done recruiting for Communist groups, and whether he has engaged in espionage. Any one who can't or won't answer all such questions with a top-of-the-lungs NO! isn't fit to teach, to preach or to hold a government job. To say the jerk ought to be fired is no more an attack on education than saying Bishop Oxnam is a sucker for red fronts is an attack on religion.

Livingston Ball, Vice-Dean and Professor of Law at the Harvard Law School, offers "The Furry Case—A Summary of the Facts and an Analysis of Their Significance as They Appear to a Harvard Lawyer." Professor Ball concedes that Furry ducked questions on the witness stand, that he was a member of the Communist Party from 1938 to 1947, and that he had "participated in activities which were secret or deceptive in varying degrees." He winds up endorsing the finding of the Harvard Corporation that Professor Furry has been guilty of "misconduct, though not necessarily grave misconduct."

What *would* a Harvard professor have to do to be guilty of "grave misconduct?" Shoot the president?

If the Harvard authorities knew that Furry was a Communist during those nine years, and let him stick around—that's bad. If they didn't know it—that's worse. Take your choice.

SO THEY SAY

"About seven years ago I voted for McCarthy. I wanted to get rid of the LaFollettes who, in New Deal fashion, always raved at the employers of labor, but themselves benefited handsomely from the unearned increment of land and property around Lake Mendota. I also voted for him in the last election. I am willing to admit my mistakes. If McCarthy has done anything to point out the weakness in our economic system that must be corrected in order to successfully combat the drift toward totalitarianism, I have yet to see it.

"I think the time has come for THE INDIVIDUALIST and me to part company."—K. L. Hansen, Wisconsin.

"If I were more fortunately situated than I am, I would subscribe for THE INDIVIDUALIST, purely out of a purpose to keep the tide of differing opinion running freely. I hope that we have at least that one desire in common.

"Our parting of company is made easier after reading QUIZZIFYING in the November issue. I find myself in agreement with you on only one of your 14 answers, though able to go part way with you on one or two others. But that is of no importance. What does matter is that I am quite familiar with all the points of view I find in THE INDIVIDUALIST, and so it goes unread while I attend to other publications which, if less spirited in style, do nevertheless refresh and inform me. For the attitudes and philosophies you present, I can depend on a number of troglodytes among my cherished friends.

"Along with my best wishes for the holiday season go my equally sincere hopes that your enterprise may profit you in all ways save the development of any significant number of converts and followers."—Lee A. White, Michigan.

"As I have told you in the past I enjoy all

your releases, but particularly I liked the answers to the 14 questions propounded by the Florida Congressman. On only two could I disagree with you in the least. In theory I am for free trade; in practice I'm afraid its ultimate consummation would result in a bunch of goofs like Roosevelt and Truman turning us over to Russia or some other totalitarian government by making us too dependent on the rest of the world.

"I am not in favor of popular selection of presidential candidates. I do not feel that the rank and file of the American people are intelligent enough and unselfish enough to select suitable candidates. Otherwise we are in complete accord as we are on pretty nearly everything you write. Keep up the good work."—Henry B. Bass, Oklahoma.

"In view of your December issue, I am enclosing the December 12 Harvard Alumni Bulletin.

"I hope you will find time to read Mr. Pusey's address 'To Produce Free Men' as this better than anything I know of, gives the Harvard point of view. If you can't make it, please turn it over to Gallup and get his reaction. I am sure that he will wag his tail and congratulate himself on the fact that he was not brought into your December issue even to the extent of one 'yip.'"

"We all make mistakes, as even Mr. Pusey admits. I think your record is just as good as Harvard's with only three-tenths of one per cent error. I am all for you, especially in your crusade against communism. More power to you."—Philip L. Warren, Harvard 1906, Massachusetts. (Editor's note: Says Gallup, "You sure stuck your neck out on that, didn't you?")

"You should easily obtain support from your 'clients,' the C. of C., who advocate Sales Tax at mfrs.' levels, allowing wholesaler and retailer to claim 41% of the Sales Tax paid by the consumers, government 59%. See your December issue—clever sophistry.

"So you don't like those who have a different social philosophy from you and McCarthy, so you give them the McCarthy treatment. If one challenges McCarthy that proves he *must* be a Commie, pink or fellow traveler. Bishop Oxnham is a heretic—burn him at the stake! Your type of journalism appeals to those who share your prejudices—which I do not."—Paul K. Harland.

"I have noted your article, 'Fair Harvard—But Fair To Whom?' I am asking the Harvard Alumni Bulletin to send you their November 28 issue because it contains an article on the Furry case, which has done much to clear up my understanding of what your article refers to.

"What Harvard is defending is 'The Freedom of the Ancient and Honorable Society of Scholars, without fear or favor, to seek out and publish the truth.' The average man and many Harvard graduates do not understand this freedom and why it is basic to all freedoms. However, I am convinced she is right to defend it, but admit she has done so in a negative way rather than in the aggressively positive way public opinion rightly demands, with the result the whole question has become puddled in a fuzzy and 'furry' fog of misunderstanding.

"I wish to do what I can to help toward

a better understanding. I gather from your article you are as fuzzy and furry on the question as other people. In light of the article in the Bulletin, I should appreciate some of your pith, punch and perspicacity if you care to give it.

"Merry Christmas to you."—Theodore T. Whitney, Massachusetts.

"Your paper is excellent. As a Methodist minister I assure you that I am in complete agreement with your article 'Well Red.' There are still a few clergymen who are not deceived by the 'good bishop.'"

"I appreciate your excellent style, your wit and your clear and logical thinking. Best wishes to you."—Norman S. Ream, Wisconsin.

"I see you have fallen under the spell of our windbag Senator Joe McCarthy. If you do any boosting for him you ought to get advertising rates—he has lots of money behind him. According to the committee that looked into his affairs, he banked \$172,000 since he has been in Washington, and his assistant banked \$96,000, so they are in business.

"However, your interesting paper has something beside McCarthy in it, so here is a check. Your pith and punch are there but your perspicacity is slipping."—Craig Ralston, Wisconsin.

"I thought your piece on the N. Y. milk strike was so timely, and such a masterpiece of sarcasm, that I sent it to Sherman Adams (whom I know well, and who nearly always replies to my letters) with your 'Individualist' caption attached.

"He may show it to 'Ike,' as I know he feels almost as strongly about labor-boss racketeering as we do. Unfortunately, 'Ike' seems to think that *appeasement* is the proper course; although I understand that he is now ready to listen to our side, and is doing it.

"If anything comes in, I'll let you know."—Ned Toland, New Hampshire.

FER OR AGIN?

We are fed up with girls jumping about in their girdles in magazine pages, with the Godfrey-LaRosa-Maguire episode with what'll happen to our cities when Russia begins sprinkling H-bombs around, with church conferences pointing the wickedness of success in business and the duty of the government to take money away from those who earn it and give it to those who don't. Things like that. And with the asinities of tariffs, the economic stupidity of price supports, the strangle-hold of labor monopoly. We've got a bellyful.

Now we have another peave—at least it threatens to become one. Ever since Brownell threw the Democrats and the anti-anti-communists into a screaming dither with his Truman-White exposure, President Eisenhower has been telling one group after another that "Everyone has a right to face his accuser," and "The right to speak your mind must be protected." He has dragged out those ancient bromides so often, during the very time when congressional committees have been giving reds in churches, schools and government the fright of their lives, we are almost beginning to wonder whose side the President is on. Is he trying to soft-pedal the whole business?

Truman could have confronted Brownell any time he wanted to—and the President knows it. Truman was invited to tell his story before a Congressional Committee and he ducked—and the President knows that. The President knows, too, that the "right to speak your mind" does not include the right to yell "FIRE" in a crowded auditorium when there is no fire. It does not give a highly placed and trusted official the right to fill his mind with government secrets and then "speak his mind" on those same secrets to a foreign nation, particularly to one that everybody but a feeble-minded nitwit knows is America's sworn enemy. Is a witness who refuses to answer for fear of incriminating himself—is that guy being denied the right to speak his mind?

President Truman did quite a job as a red-herringer. We hope President Eisenhower doesn't try to beat the Truman record.

UNCLE SAMA CLAUS

How would you like to put up six dollars a month for 18 months, and then, when you've paid in a total of \$108, stop paying and begin drawing \$85 a month for life—or \$127.50 if you're married? Pretty nice, eh, pretty nice? Sure, you'll say, it's nice enough but it's impossible. And that's where you will err, brother, that's where you will err. Nothing is impossible with this government of ours, this great big beautiful government from whom all blessings flow. For this, you understand, is government business.

It's all a part of President Eisenhower's plan for the old folks. We have been reading about it in U. S. News & World Report—the November 20 issue. We give you the date so you can check us on it, in case you are jubberous, and see for yourself. Then you won't be tempted to write: "I have long suspected you were an infernal liar and now I . . ." We'll save you the trouble.

The President wants to broaden Social Security to cover an additional 10.6 million workers—farmers and farm workers, physicians, dentists, optometrists, osteopaths, chiropractors, naturopaths, veterinarians, funeral directors, Christian Science practitioners, architects, professional engineers, accountants and then some, scattering. The biggest single group will be farmers.

If the President's proposals are adopted by Congress—and it's a cinch they will be since organized labor and practically all politicians are favorable—tens of thousands of those workers will need to pay Social Security taxes for not more than 18 months or two years before they can start drawing monthly checks at 65. Those, of course, will be the ones who are nearing 65 when the new rules go into effect.

But even if you are past 65 and retired, and not drawing Social Security benefits because you weren't covered when you were working—that doesn't mean you can't cut in for a handout. As the U. S. News puts it: "The new rule, if adopted, also means that millions of retired persons, 65 or older, can go back and 'earn' a pension in just 18 months. If they can earn \$3,600 a year for a year and a half, they can get lifetime pensions of \$85 a month, or \$127.50 for a man with a wife aged 65 or more. Cost to

the individual in taxes will be a top of \$108—or \$162 if self-employed.”

Of course, some sour puss will pipe up: “That’s crazy. Eighty-five dollars a month means \$1,020 a year. That’s 4 per cent on approximately \$25,000. How in hell can even the government do that when the guy getting the \$1,020 a year has paid in but \$108? Haven’t taxpayers got gumption enough to see that they’ll be left holding the bag? What are taxpayers, any way, the biggest lot of simpletons ever born?”

If some bird pops off that way, pay him no mind. There’s always a crape hanger around somewhere. But ain’t it dandy! Ain’t it just *wonderful*!

A LOT FOR A LITTLE

“Throughout the ages men and women worthy of their salt have provided for their own livelihood. Self-reliant, self-respecting individuals and nations with initiative have become great serving the needs of mankind. In so doing they have also prospered far beyond the limits of Social Security, without the disgrace and demoralizing effect of accepting charity or public aid.”

So runs a paragraph from material put out by University of Economics Foundation, 101 Park Ave., New York 17, N. Y. Here’s another: “A dynamic prosperity is the basic objective of all human activity. A better world and sound economic conditions can be achieved only through the process of education. . . . Samples of our releases will be provided without charge.”

We suggest you take the hint and have yourself a few.

A SCHOLARLY STUDY called “Bring Government Back Home” has been issued by the National Association of Manufacturers, 14 West 49th St., New York 17, N. Y. It is subheaded, “A Summary of A PROGRAM FOR THE RE-ALLOCATION OF TAX RESOURCES AND SERVICE RESPONSIBILITIES BETWEEN FEDERAL AND STATE GOVERNMENTS.” Its author is Dr. Harley L. Lutz, Professor Emeritus of Public Finance, Princeton, and a distinguished writer in the field of government economics. Dr. Lutz is Tax Consultant to the Manufacturers’ Association.

This 60-page brochure will arouse the heartfelt and enthusiastic disapproval of pink preachers and teachers, Americans for Democratic Action, leaders of organized labor, and Democratic and Republican voters who have been bitten by the welfare state bug. That means practically all Democrats and a shockingly large number of Republicans. Readers of THE INDIVIDUALIST will like it. It’s free for the asking.

DR. ARTHUR E. BESTOR, Jr., has written a pamphlet called “Education for 1984.” The title will give you the idea. Remember George Orwell? The pamphlet is published by The Foundation for Economic Education, Inc., Irvington-on-Hudson, N. Y.

Dr. Bestor is a history professor at the University of Illinois. Which is a break for the University of Illinois. And also, probably, for the Professor. It’s doubtful that he could get a job at New York University and certainly not at Columbia. The guy is outmoded. He believes that reading, writing

and arithmetic are essential parts of education. And he is not pinkish. His days as a teacher are probably numbered.

His pamphlet will be of interest to nobody except people who have children of school age and people who don’t. If you qualify either way, ask the Foundationers for a copy. It’s free. Better still, be a spendthrift. Send a dollar for ten and pass ’em around among your friends.

FANTASTIC

Congressman A. S. Herlong is quoted by the papers as having said in a recent address before the Florida Farm Bureau Federation that the government’s farm-aid program had cost about one billion dollars but that the increase in earnings to farmers amounts to hundreds of times more than that. “Hundreds” means a minimum of two hundred so, if we understand the gentleman aright, each billion of farm aid means an increase of at least two hundred billion in farm income.

Farm aid amounted to a billion dollars in 1953—probably more but we’ll let it go at that. Farm income amounted to 30 billion—probably more but that’s near enough. It follows then, unless Mr. Furlong’s little slide rule done him dirt, that *without* federal aid, farm income for 1953 would have been 170 billion dollars less than nothing.

It’s a little hard to believe—but we have the congressman’s word for it. And a congressman always knows what he’s talking about, doesn’t he? Or does he?

SKUNK JUICE

We were about ready to ditch Truman and his assortment of mutually contradictory alibis in the Harry Dexter White smell. Ready to ditch him, sprinkle on the lime and listerene and call it a day. But apparently a lot of the nation’s editors and news commentators want the obsequies postponed. It seems that they feel—and certainly with abundant reason—that they haven’t yet succeeded in whitewashing the former President, and they want to keep on trying.

It would be hopeless for them to try to defend Truman. The guy didn’t leave himself—or his would-be defenders, either—a leg to stand on. So they proceed to take the line they follow in congressional investigations. Some college pink is asked by the committee whether he is or ever has been a communist. He doesn’t dare say no because he knows they’ve got the goods on him. So he clams up for fear of incriminating himself and refuses to answer.

Then what do the scrivening pundits do? Instead of saying the guy is an enemy of his country and, at best, ought to be thrown out of his teaching job—as a normal American would—they begin to take pot shots at the committee members. They call the hearings an inquisition, a denial of academic freedom, a witch hunt. They say it hurts American prestige abroad.

They had a tough job on their hands in the Truman-White matter. Attorney General Brownell made this appalling revelation on November 6: “I can now announce officially, for the first time in public, that the records in my department show that White’s spying activities for the Soviet government were re-

ported in detail to the White House by means of a report delivered to President Truman through his military aide, Brig. Gen. Harry H. Vaughan, in December, 1945. In the face of this information and incredible though it may seem, President Truman subsequently, on January 23, 1946, nominated White, who was then Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, for the even more important position of executive director for the United States in the International Monetary Fund.”

That was a simple statement of fact. For all the squeals of anguish, the rantings, the ravings and the cuss words, no one has been able to disprove one jot or tittle of it. So, as you can see, the writers who squirm whenever it is mentioned that the Roosevelt and Truman administrations made a regular practice of playing footsie with the reds—they had a tough job ahead of them. They ignore the appalling enormity of the Truman offense in retaining in high office, and in promoting to an even higher one, a person repeatedly designated by the FBI as an espionage agent for a foreign country. They prate, rather, on the “timing” of disclosure, and charge that it was “politically inspired.”

Which gives one to think. Gawdamighty, must an incredible piece of criminal stupidity in the White House, threatening the security of the very nation itself, be hushed up until the time is “fitting” for its disclosure? Must it be kept under cover until some time in the indefinite future when it can be dragged out into the light of day without any suspicion of “politics?” Does the fact that the Brownell charge was politically inspired—if such was the case—does that let Truman out with a clean bill of health? And just when, one craves to know, would be the “proper” time for making public the astounding details of so ghastly an offense against the American people?

J. Edgar Hoover says that he sent Truman no less than “seven communications bearing on the espionage activities of Harry Dexter White.” Harry Truman himself sent a communication. It was addressed to Harry Dexter White and was dated eight days after that slippery customer had resigned from the International Monetary Fund. Here is the letter to the man Truman said he knew was a spy but whom he kept in office for more than a year so he could watch him:

“Dear Mr. White:

“With sincere regret and considerable reluctance I accept your resignation as U. S. executive director of the International Monetary Fund, effective on Mr. Gutt’s return from Europe.

“I know you can view with a great deal of personal satisfaction your career in public service, crowned as it has been by your ceaseless efforts to make a real contribution to the stability of international trade and the International Monetary Fund, which holds so much promise to a world desperately anxious for lasting peace.

“You have filled with distinction your present assignment as United States representative on the board of executive directors of the International Monetary Fund, and your unfaltering efforts have been a source of great pride to us.

“I wish you the very best of luck and will

feel free to call upon you from time to time for assistance in dealing with the problems we will be continually facing, in which your background and abilities make you peculiarly able to help us.

"Very Sincerely Yours,
"HARRY S. TRUMAN."

Incredible? It's the gawdstruth!

WRITE YOUR CONGRESSMAN!

Here's a resolution pending in the House of Representatives that will meet with the approval of every American except New-Dealish-tainted Democrats and Republicans, Americans for Democratic Action and other Socialists, so-called Labor Leaders, and pink college professors. It was introduced by Representative Ralph Gwinn of New York early in the year. If the members of Congress hear enough from the folks at home, they might pull the bill out of committee and proceed to do something about it. Here tiz:

83rd Congress, 1st Session, H. J. RES. 123

JOINT RESOLUTION

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to prohibiting the United States Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

ARTICLE

"Section 1. The Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution.

"Sec. 2. The constitution or laws of any State, or the laws of the United States, shall not be subject to the terms of any foreign or domestic agreement which would abrogate this amendment.

"Sec. 3. The activities of the United States Government which violate the intent and purpose of this amendment shall, within a period of three years from the date of the ratification of this amendment, be liquidated and the properties and facilities affected shall be sold."

The above "Proposed 23rd Amendment," sponsored by the American Progress Foundation, is a powerful legal instrument through which we can re-establish constitutional protection for our economic freedom.

We hope every reader of THE INDIVIDUALIST will write to the American Progress Foundation, 1540 North Highland Avenue, Los Angeles 28, Cal., for more particulars, not only about the above resolution and what is being done to speed its adoption, but about the splendid work the American Progress Foundation is itself doing in behalf of the preservation—not to say recovery—of economic freedom in this country.

TALKING TO A STONE WALL

President Eisenhower told the general board of the National Council of Churches of Christ in America that free government is impossible without a strong belief in God. As often happens with him, the President spoke a profound truth in a few simple words. But we wonder how it rested with his hearers.

The National Council of Churches is the successor organization to the notorious Federal Council of Churches, branded subversive by a Congressional Committee. Its leaders preached the evil of capitalism and the beauty of socialism, and displayed a marked propensity for joining red front organizations. There is nothing to show that Bishop Oxnham and the rest of the old gang who master-minded the show for the Federal Council aren't performing the same service—if that's the word for it—for the new outfit.

Lurking in the woodwork you'd probably find the Rev. Jerome Davis, who said: "Is it not probable that the greatest event of the 20th century thus far is the Soviet Revolution, and all it has meant to human welfare?"

Not far away—maybe in the same crevice with Jerry—you'd be likely to see Dr. E. Stanley Jones scampering about. E. Stanley is the sacerdotal gent who, a few years back, gave out with this: "When the western world was floundering in an unjust and competitive order . . . God reached out and put his hand on the Russian Communists to produce a juster order and to show a recumbent church what it had missed in its own gospel."

You would probably find the Rev. Harry F. Ward scurrying hither and yon. It was Harry who felt that "The Soviet Union is progressing and growing up economically and politically . . . while capitalist society is starving and going down."

If those few are discovered on the premises you can be certain that the rest of the old crowd are not far away. You know how it is with birds of a feather—even when they're termites. And you can be even more certain that the general boards' idea of free government would be one patterned after that outstanding model which has brought freedom and prosperity to the millions of Soviet Russia.

BREVITIES AND LEVITIES

SAYS WALTER REUTHER, recently re-elected president of the CIO, "During the past year much of what was accomplished in the two decades of the New Deal and the Fair Deal has been destroyed or threatened with destruction." That is the highest praise we've heard about the Eisenhower administration in a long time. We only wish it was deserved.

PARALLEL HEADLINES in our daily paper: "Former Aid In Truman Regime Is Indicted." In the next column, "Eisenhower Backer Is Indicted On Lying Charge." Who said there'd been a change?

AT THEIR CLEVELAND convention the CIO delegates made the welkin ring with cheers for Harry S. Truman in the Harry Dexter White matter. Truman, they resolved, "as one of the greatest living Americans needs no defense against this malicious attack." But whether they were cheering Truman's first statement that Brownell was a liar, his second statement that he had fired White as soon as he learned he was unfit for office, or his third statement that he had kept him on for a year after the FBI said he was a spy so he could watch him—that we wouldn't know. And we doubt that the delegates knew, either. They were told how to vote—and they voted how they were told.

IN THE OCTOBER, 1952, issue of THE INDIVIDUALIST, the perpetrator of this column opined:

"Eisenhower, if he is elected and wants to, can scuttle the Welfare State—if a Republican Congress is elected with him and it wants to. Gallup poll figures the chance of such things coming to pass at one in ten thousand." Who says Gallup poll is a dope!

PORTRAIT PAINTER JIRAYR ZORTHIAN is quoted by our paper as saying that only two per cent of those who paint pictures make a living at it. Did he ever try writing for a living? If he had, he wouldn't use such an exaggerated figure.

WHAT QUAIN ideas some of the old-timers had. Grover Cleveland, for instance—and old Grover was quite a lad in his day, too, and don't you forget that. Do you know what Grover said, what he once told the American people with a perfectly straight face? Get ready to hold your sides laughing and listen. Grover said—and it wasn't just campaign talk, and he wasn't joking, he actually meant it, believe it or not—Grover said, "The people should support the government and not the government the people."

We'll bet there's scarcely a man alive who ever heard an American president say anything like that!

HEAD LINES AND TAIL LIGHTS

"French Say Indochina Offensive Is Success." The enemy probably say the success was offensive.

"Briton Dies With Curses For All Tax Collectors." We hope he gets flowers on his grave, that guy. He deserves 'em.

"Don't Know Why Some People Are Smarter." Probably because other people are dumber.

"Only Two of 37 Suspected Spies in Government Went To Jail; Rest In Obscurity." People in jail usually rest in obscurity.

"Milton Eisenhower Gives Program To Improve Latin Neighbors' Living Standards." We hope he gave it to the neighbors so they can do their own improving. Then we'd have a better chance of improving our own.

"Congressman Complains U. S. Corners Feather Market." Which reminds us of the story of the kid who refused to accept the teacher's statement that a pound of feathers was as heavy as a pound of lead. "I'll go up on the roof and drop a pound of feathers on your head, and then I'll drop a pound of lead. You'll find out." We'll bet he would, too.

"How \$20 Helped Me Add \$3,000 To My Income." —Wall Street Journal ad in our Tampa paper. We've been reading the Wall Street Journal for 30 years but nothing like that's ever happened . . . yet.

"Runner Sets Record Of 159 Miles On Track In 24 Hours." Next to the peace talks in Korea, that's the most useless effort we've heard of in years.

"Have Shinier Hair Tomorrow," reads a hair tonic ad in our paper. We'd settle for any kind of hair any time over a considerable area of the editorial cranium. But we doubt that anything will come of our willingness.

"Idiot Brain' Does Collegian's Equations." Probably doing them himself. At least that was the way it was when we were doing equations.

"Wife Has Baby In Hotel Lobby Due To Father's Error." All babies are due to father's error—if you'd call it error.

THE INDIVIDUALIST

Published monthly by C. O. Steele,
2507 - 13th 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.