

The Individualist

A Pint-size Periodical of Pith, Punch and Perspicacity



VOLUME SIX

SEPTEMBER, 1953

NUMBER TWO

WE'LL BE FEPC-ING YOU

You, let us suppose, manufacture a line of jingglewhizzits that has caught the public fancy no end. Sales are increasing so rapidly you are by way of becoming big business. You are bidding on a government contract—the government wants a couple of shiploads of jingglewhizzits for one of the underprivileged nations it's taking care of. You've got a good chance of landing the contract, too, since you are the country's low-cost jingglewhizzit producer.

Now, as it happens, over the years you have found that of all people, blue-skinned Abbytionians are the best adapted for the intricate operations involved in the making of jingglewhizzits. Moreover, the blue-skinned Abbytionians are sober, reliable, industrious. They demand top pay, to be sure, but you don't mind, they're tops as workers. You are not a blue-skinned Abbytionian yourself, but you like the breed. More than half your workers are of such racial descent, though now, of course, they are all good Americans.

Word comes that you have qualified for a whopping big government contract. But there's a catch. Remember this FEPC business, the anti-discrimination measure which would compel you to discriminate by hiring people you don't want to hire, and firing people you do want to fire? You've got too many Abbytionians on your payroll, and not enough of the other strains. Less than five per cent of the population are Abbytionians. More than fifty per cent of your workers are. 'T won't do—not if you hope to get this government contract.

But, you say, your blood pressure rising, there's no such law. Congress knocked it into a cocked-hat, or at least it was filibustered to a frazzle. Sure, sure, you are told, but the President has appointed a committee, or is going to appoint a committee, on employment practices. The President, you understand, does not favor a "compulsory" FEPC but thinks a "voluntary" plan to the same end would be right nice. The President is said to have given his "full personal and moral support" to a program whereby the new committee is to see to it that no government contracts shall be awarded to private companies which do not agree to make their employment practices conform to those set forth by the new committee.

As Vice-President Nixon, head of the new committee, so neatly puts it, "Since the government spends annually on government contracts \$40 billion, or one-fourth of all the money spent on production in the United States, we can deal with 25 per cent of the problem because we control the purse strings . . . where public funds are involved, all segments of the population should enjoy the benefits."

So-o-o, you are told, there you are. There is no FEPC law on the statute books. You are free to do as you please about your employees. If you want to hire them on the

basis of merit alone—that's your business. There's no compulsion—perish the thought. Of course, if you don't feel like playing ball with the committee—well, in that case the jingglewhizzit contract will go to some other firm. But there's no compulsion about it—get yourself clear on that point.

Must be some mistake. You don't think for a moment, do you, that the President and the Vice-President and the committee would try to circumvent the will of Congress by imposing employment restrictions unwarranted by law? Why, that would be as bad as Truman's dodging Congress to drag us in the Korean "police action." Surely, you don't believe any dirty work like that is going on, do you? Or do you?

IN THE PINK

The committees torn 'em up but the colleges don't turn out—often. There's the case of Helen Deane Markham, member of the faculty at Harvard Medical School.

The Jenner Committee had sworn evidence that Helen Deane had long been a member of the Communist Party, and active in campus recruiting. The committee prepared a list of questions, based on the information supplied them concerning the lady's red pranking. Invoking her privilege against self-incrimination, Dr. Markham refused to answer any one of them. Here are the queries that caused her to clam up:

Had the Navy taken disciplinary action against her husband, Lt. Comdr. George Markham; was she then a member of the Communist Party; had she attended secret meetings of the Communist Party while a faculty member of Harvard Medical School; did she know of any Communist Party members on the Harvard faculty; was she a party member while a lecturer at McGill University in Canada during 1943 and 1944; was she a party member while obtaining her M.A. degree at Brown University in 1940; was she a party member as an undergraduate at Wellesley prior to 1933; had she tried to recruit her students into the Young Communist League or the Communist Party; had she ever attempted to recruit fellow teachers into the Communist Party; had she been a faculty member of the Samuel Adams School in Boston; had she attended classes of that school; had she attended party meetings under an assumed name?

The committee had the dope on the gal. The gal had nothing to say. The Harvard Corp. had this to say: "On March 27, 1953, Dr. Markham appeared before the Jenner Committee in response to a subpoena. She refused to answer questions as to whether she is now or ever has been a member of the Communist Party, and as to activities connected with the Communist Party, on the ground that answering such questions would tend to incriminate her. . . . Dr. Markham is not and never has been a member of the

Communist Party. She became interested in what she calls the progressive movement . . . We think Dr. Markham's use of the Fifth Amendment is misconduct . . . We regret that Dr. Markham did not see fit to supplement the official record before the committee . . . we find that Dr. Markham has not been guilty of grave misconduct . . . and we will take no action against her."

What do you have to do at Harvard before they do take action against you—shoot the president?—Of course, the lady was zephrimanded. That cruel blow on the wrist must almost have broken the feather. At last reports, Dr. Markham was still on the Harvard faculty—and the Harvard payroll.

And then there's the case of Professor Maurice Halperin of Boston University. He was so overcome with shyness that he couldn't answer a one of the questions the committee shot at him, all of them based on sworn evidence in its possession. The bashful one, however, did manage to say that his refusal to answer was based on fear of self-incrimination. Here are some of the questions he wouldn't answer:

Member of the Communist Party? Member of Elizabeth Bentley's espionage ring? (She swore he was.) Had he paid dues to her? (She swore he had.) Member of the Communist Party while teaching at Oklahoma U.? Attended meetings of the central committee of the Communist Party in Mexico? Member of Communist Party while consultant for Economic and Social Council of United Nations? When participating in United Nations Conference on International Organization in San Francisco in 1945? While Division Chief of OSS from '41 to '45? While with the State Department in '45 and '46? Did he know Alger Hiss? Had he attended secret meetings of the Communist Party while teaching at Boston University?

Maybe the gentleman couldn't remember, or maybe he just couldn't be bothered. At any rate, nary a question would be answer. And what did Boston University think of it all? A news report reads: "On June 30, 1953, Boston University announced that it was censuring Professor Halperin for his refusal to testify but was retaining his services." Professor Halperin was head of the Latin-American Department at Boston U. He still is.

On the other hand, there's the case of Edwin Berry Burgum, a professor at New York University, who had ducked questions on the same old plea that to answer would tend to incriminate him. Here is what N.Y.U. had to say about the reticent Mr. Burgum:

"Whereas no person may be forced under the constitutional government of these United States to incriminate himself and no member of the teaching profession should be denied the legal protection accorded to all citizens under the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution, the Committee finds that the first charge is not sustained;

"But whereas the university has a civic duty to the free society of which it is an institutional part, and whereas a member of the teaching profession in our society may be expected to do to conduct himself that his activities meet the tests of responsible exercises of academic freedom, both in the classroom and elsewhere, the committee finds that the second charge is sustained;

"And further, this committee of his colleagues consider that the dismissal of Associate Professor Burgum for his abuse of his university position under the cover of academic freedom would not be inconsistent with the statement of policy in regard to academic freedom, and tenure at New York University."

That is from "Statement of New York University on the suspension, hearing and dismissal of Edwin Berry Burgum, associate professor of English, Washington Square College of Arts and Sciences." It is professors at its unmitigated worst, but in simple English it means that the guy had a right to do it but he shouldn't have done it, and so he gets the can.

In spite of the jumbled prose, we think N.Y.U. did better than Harvard and Boston U. at that. At least they tossed the jerk out on his—they tossed him out. Which is more than either of the other institutions of higher (?) learning saw fit to do with its pinko.

A "TWO-MUSTER"

The world situation in 1953 may be described as a race between education and catastrophe. Nearing the three-quarter pole catastrophe is so far out in front that education, unless it gets a swift kick in the rompers, won't even finish in the money. It's as bad off as Pittsburgh in the National League. Worse—Pittsburgh will have another chance next year.

From the turn of the century, the forces of Chaos have been steadily gathering strength. They've been taking every round. It is becoming more and more clear to Americans who look—and use their brains while doing it—that the whole future of Western civilization is pretty well tied in with what happens to our Constitutional Government. And what has been happening so far is plenty.

The late Albert Jay Nock, who not only wrote some of the best English prose published in the 20th century but had a brilliant mind, wasn't overly hopeful as to the outcome—that is, as to the possibility of saving our free republican institutions. But he did say that if only 5,000 leaders and molders of public opinion in America could be induced to read Herbert Spencer's *THE MAN vs. THE STATE*, and act on the philosophy of government set forth therein, then our cherished freedoms could be handed down to our children's children.

THE MAN vs. THE STATE was the first of what The CAXTON PRINTERS, Ltd., calls its Books for Libertarians, now a long list. Those books have been published not to make money, the publishers say, "but as our dedicated contribution to this great struggle for the minds and hearts of men; the struggle is of course between the advocates of an all-powerful centrally directed bureaucracy—The State—and those who believe in the phil-

osophy and values which produced the American Constitution."

Nock was right. *THE MAN vs. THE STATE* is a tremendously important book—and a highly readable one. Quite as much could be said of Nock's own masterpiece, *OUR ENEMY THE STATE*. It, without question, is one of the most important books published in this country since the turn of the century—and its polished prose is a sheer delight.

We suggest you buy both books. They are \$2.50 each, five bucks for the pair. You may send your order to THE INDIVIDUALIST, or direct to THE CAXTON PRINTERS, Ltd. Either way, you'll never as long as you live, spend five bucks for better books.

AMERICA'S DANGER

(Following is the text of a talk delivered July 27 before the Anna Marie Klenz Club by C. O. Steele, Editor of THE INDIVIDUALIST, and Associate Editor of THE ISLANDER.)

An after-dinner talk should be the occasion for mirth and merriment. It should abound in sparkling witticisms—even if you have to get 'em out of a book. It should exude good humor. It should make people smile. If it touches the heart strings, so much the better. People like to have their emotions stirred. Above all, an after-dinner talk should not make people think. Nobody likes to think—especially on a full stomach. The talk you are about to hear, I am afraid, will violate all those good rules.

I am going to talk on Communism versus Capitalism, and how, right here in our own land of the free and home of the brave, capitalism is losing out to Communism. Capitalism is losing the fight because millions of American citizens don't give a tinker's damn about what happens to capitalism. The subject bores them. They haven't the slightest conception of that profound truth that capitalism is the only economic system the world has ever known under which men at all levels may attain to any appreciable measure of freedom.

In addition to those millions who don't know and don't care about capitalism, there are other millions who are openly antagonistic. They prize the evils of capitalism. They hold that a profit is a shameful and wicked thing. They deplore competition in trade. They clamor for production for use and not for profit. Those sentiments, of course, are preposterous nonsense, every one of them. They are economic jackassery of the lowest order. They reflect the basic tenets of Communism. Yet you will hear them voiced every now and then here and there throughout the land, in colleges, in pulpits, in the upper hierarchy of organized labor. And every time they are voiced, the cause of Communism takes aid and comfort. And every time they are voiced, the cause of Capitalism takes a kick in the pants.

To speak of the evils of Capitalism is like speaking of the evil of good. By its very definition, good means the absence of evil. There can be no evil in good. By the same token, there can be no evil in freedom. Freedom means merely the absence of restraint. Freedom means the right to do as you please so long as you respect the other fellow's equal right. Do as you like, and harm no man—

that's freedom. It follows, then, that there can be no evil in capitalism, for capitalism is nothing more than freedom as applied to trade and industry, freedom in the production and exchange of wealth. There can be no evil in capitalism.

The evils commonly attributed to capitalism are due to the restraints imposed upon capitalism, to the denial of capitalism, to the absence of capitalism.

Give big business a monopoly, and evil will result. And men everywhere will find it harder to make a living. Give organized labor a monopoly, and evil will result. And men everywhere will find it harder to make a living. Give the pressure groups—here's where I step on a lot of toes—the farmers, the veterans, the oldsters—give those birds the right to dip their fingers into other men's pockets and help themselves to dollars that other men have earned, and evil will result. And men everywhere will find it harder to make a living. But in each case the evil springs not from capitalism but from the restraints imposed upon capitalism, from monopoly, from special privilege. Why, in heaven's name, should some old guy be paid for reaching sixty-five? I've known people that ought to be shot for it.

The expression, "Production for use and not for profit" was coined by Karl Marx, father of Communism. No sillier slogan was ever thought up by the mind of man. Everything that is made—if you get above the level of children's mud pies—is made for use. Men don't waste their time making things that have no use. If a thing is useful it will be traded. And when it is traded, there's a profit—two profits, in fact, one for each party to the trade. For a profit, mind you, is merely an excess of return over output. When you take in more than you lay out, there's your profit. And that's what happens in every trade. You get more than you give, as you value things at the moment. If you didn't, you wouldn't trade. And that goes for the other guy. He values what he gets more than he values what he gives. If he didn't, he wouldn't trade. He's no sap, either. So you can paste this in your hat—and leave it there. There's never a trade without a profit. It is equally true that there is never a profit without a trade. A farmer may have a million bushels of wheat. That million bushels won't do him a bit of good until he trades them. Remember those two great truths—there's never a trade without a profit, and never a profit without a trade. They will help you to realize the importance of trade, and the damage that results when men's freedom to trade is curtailed in any manner—whether by tariffs, cartels, quotas, embargoes, or whatever.

To have production for use and not for profit, you'd have to do away with profit. To do away with profit, you'd have to do away with trade since, as I have told you, there's never a trade without a profit, and never a profit without a trade. To stop trade would mean an end to specialization and division of labor. It would mean that each man would have to make everything he and his family needed. Such a course would reduce the most prosperous country on earth to a howling wilderness in no time at all. It would mean the end of civilization. The

profit motive, which is merely man's inborn instinct to better himself by trade—the profit motive is responsible for all the material progress the world has known since the beginning of time.

Anyone who tries to tell you otherwise is nuts. And that goes for those soft-headed preachers—not many, but too many, as even one would be—who go around preaching the evils of the free market, the wickedness of competition and profits, the beauty of the all-powerful state that would own and operate the tools and machinery of production, do away with property rights and, in its infinite wisdom, would tell each man what he must do for “the common good,” though they never mention what would happen to some poor guy who didn't want the job the state handed him. Men who talk like that are 100 per cent socialist in their thinking. They may mean well, but they are economic illiterates—and gullibles.

I am not being disrespectful to religion. I was born and reared in a Methodist parsonage. Though I have been known to take a drink now and then, and to raise a little Cain when the occasion offered, and though I have never lost my eye for a pretty girl—and hope I never will—that's not being irreligious. That's merely being human. I count myself a deeply religious man. I have unshakable faith in the efficacy of prayer. But I'll be eternally damned before I'll sit back and twiddle my thumbs while any man, preacher or no, seeks to undermine the very foundations of freedom on which this great nation of ours was established by the Founding Fathers.

What I have said goes, too, for those 90 or more college professors who in the past couple of years have refused to say on the witness stand whether they are Communists. And it goes for practically all of organized labor's higher-ups, who are working incessantly to strangle our free enterprise system, and set up in its stead the iron-fisted regimentation of the socialist state.

Poverty doesn't breed Communism. There are more Communist college professors than Communist sharecroppers. Communism breeds poverty. The highest level of Communism on earth is to be found in the country with the lowest standard of living—Soviet Russia. Nations are prosperous to the extent they are capitalistic. That's why our own U.S.A. leads them all. They are poor to the extent they are Communist. There isn't a rich Communist country on earth. There isn't a poor capitalist country. Great Britain, about fifty-fifty, is a puny thing compared with what she was before she began monkeying with socialism—which is merely Communism with false whiskers.

The American free enterprise system, the price system, the free market system, the capitalist system—they all come to the same thing—is threatened today as never before—not from without but from within—by our own foolish and misguided gullibles who have been brought to believe that the average man hasn't sense enough to take care of himself, and that the all-powerful welfare state should do it for him. They haven't the wit to see, those millions and millions of dupes, that such a state could operate only by force and that it would inevitably develop into the same

kind of police state, terror state, that rules Russia with an iron hand.

I told you at the outset certain things an after-dinner talk should be. I'll now tell you one more. An after-dinner talk should be like a pretty girl's bathing suit—long enough to cover the essential points, short enough to hold the interest. I hope mine has been—just that. I thank you.

SCRAMBLED

We have just finished reading President Eisenhower's message to Congress on the Taft-Hartley Law. We were a little late getting around to it. Better late than never isn't always true. In this case never would have done just as well.

The President writes: “Without the individual liberty which is the cornerstone of our American heritage would be a mere abstraction with no practical meaning in our everyday life. And without protection of the economic freedom of one individual from abuses of freedom by other individuals, the economic freedom of all would soon vanish.”

There seems to be a word missing in the first sentence quoted but that's the way it appeared in the Wall Street Journal. It is clear, however, that the President thinks highly of economic freedom and the rights of individuals.

He goes on: “The economic freedom of millions of our fellow citizens depends upon the institution of free trade unionism.” That's where the President, for all his sincerity and intelligence, jumps the track. There is no such thing as “free trade unionism.” You might as well talk of a “free trade tariff.” More than sixty years ago a great American economist and philosopher, Henry George, summed up the matter in these words:

“Trade unions and all other similar organizations of labor . . . are in their nature not good, but evil. They involve coercion, and can only be effective through coercion or fear of coercion. The organization of men into trades unions, like the organization of men into armies, must necessarily be at the sacrifice of individual liberty, and while the methods of the one are those of passive war, they are both destructive methods—both aim at the infliction of loss and suffering upon those who oppose them, even at the expense of loss and suffering to those who belong to them . . .

“The great fact that underlies all labor difficulties in the fundamental wrong which . . . compels men to beg and fight for those opportunities of employing labor in the production of wealth which the lavish bounty of a merciful Creator has provided in practically limitless abundance.”

A more up-to-date view of unionism—and one with which the President might well have acquainted himself before dropping a note to Congress in the matter—is set forth in UNIONS AND CAPITALISM, by Charles E. Lindblom, associate professor of economics at Yale. Mr. Lindblom puts himself frankly on the side of organized labor but he writes with an obvious effort to be fair. In his preface, he states with complete candor: “For the thesis of this book is that unionism and the private enterprise economy are incompatible; that once unions become strong,

the attempt to maintain our economy as it now stands produces unemployment and inflation.”

No labor baiter, to use the term of derision dear to the hearts of socialist-minded labor leaders, could ask for a more forthright indictment of unionism than that. It would not, of course, be an indictment of unionism if the private enterprise system were worth saving. Professor Lindblom makes it pretty clear that he doesn't think it is—worth saving.

“They (the liberals),” the professor continues, “fight the admission that unionism is disruptive in a competitive economy. But if it were not how could it deserve the claim that they as liberals have made for it as an instrument of social betterment. Is the power to reform not also the power to disrupt?”

We are told that the union “seeks to protect him (the worker) through seniority, dismissal pay, regulation of innovation, benefits to unemployed members, the annual wage, work restriction, regulation of hours, control of entrance to the trade.”

When employers indulge in similar shenanigans to “regulate,” “restrict” and “control,” they are hauled on the carpet by the Department of Justice, but then employers haven't been exempted from the provisions of the Sherman anti-trust law, the anti-racketeering law and the kickback law—as has organized labor.

A further word from Mr. Lindblom: “In short, the union will be a success when it is disruptive—and because it is disruptive. . . . The success of unionism is measured, however, only by achievement; and the hard fact is that it cannot be attained by good behavior. . . . Yet since the union will disrupt the competitive system primarily through its control over the price of labor, there is no better way to demonstrate its power than to consider it—but not to condemn it—as a monopoly. The union is a monopoly because it can and does raise the price of labor to levels which in a competitive price system inevitably causes waste, unemployment, inflation, or all combined. And union monopoly destroys the price system because it produces these consequences to a degree which the economy cannot survive.”

There you have it, straight from the horse's mouth. Too bad President Eisenhower hadn't skimmed through Professor Lindblom's little classic before undertaking the impossible task of scrambling economic freedom and individual right with labor monopoly, and making the mess smell good.

NICE WORK—IF YOU CAN GET IT

There was a little beggar maid Who wed a king long, long ago; Of course, the taste that he displayed Was criticized by folks who know Just what formalities and things Are due to beggar maids and kings.

But straight the monarch made reply; “There is small difference, as I live, Between our stations. She and I Subsist on what the people give. We do not toil with strength and skill, And, pleasing Heaven, never will.”

HORNSWOGGLED

It's beginning to look as though we bought a pig in a poke last year—those of us who voted the Republican ticket. What did we get for all the millions spent on the election? We threw out the old gang, to be sure, but what's the country got now it didn't have then? What did it have then that it hasn't got now? Less than little, we'd say. True, we got rid of Truman, which was worth billions, but that didn't cost a penny. The guy took care of that himself, thanks be.

There are new faces in the picture, to be sure. First, there's the President himself. He's a gentleman, of good average intelligence, and he means well. His predecessor, of course, flunked in those three. Humphrey and Wilson, in the cabinet—distinctly high class—Weeks and Durkin—they'd be right at home with Truman's collection of mediocrities that he called a cabinet.

True, it's a little early yet—maybe another audit six months hence will disclose a better state of affairs. As of the moment—have taxes been cut, as was promised? Not so you'd notice. Aren't we sending about as many billions abroad as ever in support of socialist regimes? And getting as little for them? Aren't the farmers getting the same preferential treatment that they got from Roosevelt, when he realized how many votes they had, and from Truman, who was just as vote hungry? Isn't organized labor, a gigantic racket which preys alike on its helpless captives, employers of labor and the public—isn't it being coddled as before? Has any one so much as whispered that a man has a right to work even if he doesn't choose to join a union?

We hope we're wrong—but that's the way it looks from here. And it looked something like that to the Washington correspondent of *The Times* (London) who wrote a few weeks ago:

"The most important achievement of the first session of the 83rd Congress—the first Republican Congress to share power with a Republican President for 20 years—has been, paradoxically enough, to give the stamp of permanency to the achievements of the New and Fair Deals.

"The first session of a Republican Congress and the first six months of a Republican President have come and gone—and the basic patterns imposed on American life in the last 20 years have been preserved intact. . . . Certainly economic controls have been largely relaxed and an anti-inflationary pattern set. . . . But in the only field where the New Deal would have crumbled without controls, agriculture, they have been scrupulously maintained. The New Deal. . . is now part and parcel of the American system initiated by Roosevelt, strengthened by Truman, and conserved by President Eisenhower. . . . This session of Congress proves conclusively that with either party in power the New Deal has come to stay."

We wish some one could prove to us the guy is wrong—the one who wrote that for the *London Times*. But we're afraid, awfully and sorrowfully afraid, that he ain't.

NO WAY TO WIN FRIENDS

A customer writes: "It must take a good deal of thought and study to be on the wrong side of public questions as often as you are." And then, after a few more cracks like that, all spoken, of course, in a spirit of good-mean fun, he asks, "What do you think you are, an elder statesman?"

Taking up the second point first, No! We haven't years enough to be an elder—only 72—nor brains enough to be a statesman—unless a statesman is merely a dead politician. In that case we couldn't qualify, anyway. Moreover, we don't know how to beat the stock market, which seems to be an indispensable requisite for elder statesmanship these days.

Now as to being on the wrong side of so many public questions, that's a little like saying the other guy has no sense of humor because he doesn't laugh at your jokes. That doesn't prove he has no sense of humor; it merely proves that one of you has no sense of humor. Which is the wrong side? Very largely that must be a matter of opinion.

We do give a good deal of thought and study to public questions, but we are never on the wrong side—not as we view the situation at the moment. That, of course, goes for everybody else. Nobody, if he is in his right senses and honest, will take what he thinks is the wrong side. But we are in the minority, on the unpopular side, often. That, we must admit.

For instance, we think the income tax is an abominable piece of legislation because it gives the government the power to take up to 100 per cent of what a man earns. It was the income tax—that is to say, the adoption of the Sixteenth Amendment—that opened the door to Socialism in this country. Moreover, the income tax is not based on ability to pay, as claimed. If it were, the man with an income of \$60,000 would pay ten times as much as the man with an income of \$6,000, instead of some 24 times as much. Furthermore, a tax should be based on benefits received, not on ability to pay. When you buy a loaf of bread you pay for what you get, not on what you've got.

Not many people agree with us as to the income tax.

We think Franklin D. Roosevelt, instead of being one of the country's great presidents, took us further down the road toward Socialism than did all his predecessors put together. A lot of people will call us crazy for that. We know—they have done it already.

We think organized labor is a gigantic racket, with the overlords exacting tribute from their captive underlings, from industry, and from the public alike.

We consider social security a monumental fraud. It collects billions of dollars for old age security—which people must buy whether they want it or not—and then most of those billions are spent as fast as they come in for purposes having nothing whatever to do with social security. A day of reckoning coming? The government laddies should worry. They can always rob Peter to pay Paul, can't they? As long as Paul doesn't care and Peter can't help himself?

And then there are socialized medicine and public housing and tariffs. Millions will dis-

sent from our thumbs down attitude in those matters.

And, of course, there's Joe McCarthy—which is the straw that broke the Chesterfield's back—or was it the camel's? We think the guy has guts and intelligence. He is carrying on where Martin Dies left off, and now that Dies is back in Congress you can look for more fur—red fur—to fly. It was Martin Dies who publicly branded nearly 1200 members of the State Department as Communists, or near-Communists. He sent the list to the Attorney General for action. Nothing, of course, was done. On that list was the name of Alger Hiss. Three and a half years later President Roosevelt selected Alger Hiss to accompany him to Yalta. We liked Martin Dies for what he did. We are ready to like him again for what we hope he will do. And we like Joe McCarthy. As to the innocent people who have been ruined by McCarthy while he hid behind the cloak of Socialism—innocent—innocent!

There'll be few to go along with us on that topic. As if all those things weren't enough, we believe in land-value taxation. And everybody knows that's a crackpot idea if there ever was one.

Oh well, we weren't planning to enter a popularity contest anyway.

HORRORS!

"Back in Denver on Thursday, the vacationing President was up at 6:30 a.m., enjoying his morning cold shower. . . . We knew all the time there was something wrong with the man.

LOOK, YOU!

September renewals are now due. And renewals for October, November, December and so on, ad infinitum, will be gratefully received. Also it would be nice if you sent not merely your renewal but two or three new subscriptions, don't you think? You do want to help keep *THE INDIVIDUALIST* going, don't you?

BREVITIES AND LEVITIES

HEADLINE: "Patient Detective Uses Seive to Recover Ring from Beach." Nice work. We just hope he didn't strain himself.

WHERE ELSE is human nature so weak as before a dish of salted peanuts?

CAL TINNY says if that gal's dress was any higher at the bottom and any lower at the top—she'd be wearing a belt.

THE INDIVIDUALIST

Published monthly by C. O. Steele.
Anna Maria, Florida. Subscription \$2 a year.

THIRD CLASS
PERMIT No. 2
SEC. 3466 P.L. & H.
BRADENTON, FLA.

Mr. Nabel L. Rees
39 Winthrop Street
Brooklyn, N.Y.