

The Bootblack Stand



Dr. George Washington Plunkitt, our prize-winning political analyst, has just completed a penetrating study of the last Congolese election. Published in August, it focuses on the unique position of minority groups in the Congolese electoral process; it can be purchased in all bookstores. It is titled **Escape! A New Demand Response System**. Now, the distinguished Dr. Plunkitt has agreed to, through this column, advise American statesmen in this time of troubles. Address all correspondence to *The Bootblack Stand*, c/o *The Establishment*, R.R. 11, Box 360, Bloomington, Indiana, 47401, Continental U.S.A.

If on the other hand, he does believe that survival is the only thing that counts, he must have some reason for wanting to survive. But the only reason to survive is to be able to live your life the way you want to, and not the way other people want you to lead it. This, however, is precisely one of the things wars are all about, and why men have been fighting them for five thousand years.

This kind of intellectual dishonesty permeates the film at every level. There is a performance by Orson Welles which is incredibly bad. He plays the arch-typical semi-fascist general, with about as much conviction as a fire hydrant. But what else can he do with such a cardboard character? This kind of strawman has been with us since God knows when, and if there is any point in dragging him in at this late date at least he should be given something to do. But no, it is enough for Nichols to have paid ritual obeisance to the Liberal taboo.

There is a scene where the men about to go on a mission are going crazy over a well-proportioned female aide to Welles. We have seen this obligatory scene in every film about World War II since *This is the Army* and it still is not funny, but Nichols does not know that and lingers on the moaning and groaning of the men as if it were a witty scene out of high Restoration comedy.

For those who love really sophisticated Liberal commentary on the meaning of it all, don't miss Martin Balsam sitting on the bowl defecating. Yes, that's right kids, right there in living color good old Martin Balsam on the bowl. It's really bold and daring and it really says something really profound about daring Mike Nichols, and about the daring Liberal ethics out of which he created this pointless, mindless, tasteless, hypocritical, phony movie.

John Avey

Dear Mr. Plunkitt:

My advisers have urged me to write you, for they fear I have made a shortsighted decision which may imperil my future political career—or my destiny, as Mrs. Fulbright is wont to call it.

Several weeks ago, I publicly announced that I intended, upon my death, to bequeath my organic remains to the University of Arkansas School of Medicine. Do you think this was politically unwise?

Sincerely,
Senator William Fulbright

Dear Senator Fulbright:

Much, of course, will depend upon when you depart terra firma for points north. But I should think your decision to leave your body to the University of Arkansas School of Medicine is at least wasteful. I suggest that your noble remains could be put to far better use if bequeathed to the Tit Tat Canneries, producers of Tit Tat Cat Food and Deodorant.

However, if you do feel that your political career has already been damaged, I suggest you back out of this arrangement with the Medical School by using a subterfuge. See that there is a crackdown on the moonshine trade at the

University of Arkansas. The whole medical school will have to pack up and head for the Ozarks.

—GWP

Dear Mr. Plunkitt:

You might not have heard of me. My name is Richard Friedman, and I am the Republican candidate in Chicago's mayoralty election this April. My Democratic opponent is Mr. Mayor J. Daley, the present Mayor of Illinois. How do you suggest I run my campaign?

Cordially,
Richard Friedman

Dear Mr. Friedman:

I am delighted to hear from you, for I was almost certain the Republicans would challenge Mayor Daley's bid for a fifth consecutive term (Incidentally Mr. Daley's first name is not, contrary to popular opinion Mayor. His birth certificate clearly bears the name Richard J. Daley, Mayor).

As to your campaign strategy, I suggest you make your pitch for the sympathy vote. But, in your neighborhood appearances, beware. Do not speak in those neighborhoods adjacent to insane asylums; they might not let you out—even to vote.

—GWP

Editorial I

(continued from page 2)

imbecilic episode, of course, but not uninstrusive. For it is typical of our nation, while attempting to realize ethnic justice for its disparate groups, to fall prey to demagogues. When such a nation allows itself to drift from constitutional moorings, it is vulnerable to blustering winds. Today, America is culturally adrift; if its leaders do not anchor themselves in reason and intelligence, the humane values of American civilization will quietly fall away along with the discredited vices of yesteryear.

As startling as it is for a nation to, in less than a decade, silently reverse its sanctions (some a century old) against pornography, drugs and abortions, it is more startling still to reflect on the absence of debate that these abrogations have caused among intellectuals, religious leaders and statesmen.

Our past has embraced prejudice and inequality, but it has also respected tolerance, lawfulness and more recently—reason and non-violence. Within the contemporary screeds denouncing American racialism and war has come a contempt for lawfulness and reason, a confusion over violence and the use of illicit force. Much of this has come—most paradoxically—from the intellectuals hot on the trail of justice. Their criticism of America's imperfections has been transformed into disregard and finally distaste for their country. The American intellectual has grown weary of debating principles and discriminating vices and virtues. Indeed, so dissipated has he become that today the American intellectual is—at his best—a first-rate juggler of second-rate ideas, and—at his worst—a religious fanatic mindlessly intoning a litany of buncombe. Obviously, the paradigmatic American intellectual is no intellectual at all. And his actions show

that he is no lover of democracy.

A new form of anti-Semitism has grown on the fringes of the intellectual class along with the American intellectuals' increased anti-intellectualism, intolerance and justification of violence. It flourishes in the brutal rhetoric of black nationalists and often creeps into the utterances of white new leftists. Among the former it rides tandem with their anti-capitalism; among the latter it issues from their tendentious critique of American foreign policy. Black militants claim that Jewish landlords and shopkeepers exploit and oppress slum dwellers. They attack (at times, physically) Jewish school teachers for practicing "cultural genocide" on black school-children. The black militants also condemn Israel as a white, racist, colonial state that is an enemy of the anti-imperialists' "Third World" with which they identify.

As in so many other instances, white radicals follow the lead of the black militants and add their own slanders. American Jews are vigorous advocates of the liberal democracy the radicals despise, and participants in the capitalist system they want to destroy. Parroting Soviet propagandists, they characterize Israel as an expression of "bourgeois reactionary nationalism" that stands in the way of "revolutionary internationalism," i.e., Arab nationalism. The anti-Semitism of many Jewish radicals seems to be a manifestation of Jewish self-hatred. Many intellectuals have provided ideological justification and political support for this anti-Semitism. The Department of Defense might well envy their seemingly inexhaustible arsenal of apologies for the intimidation of and assaults on Jews working, teaching or living in predominantly black slums. And their suggestions for Israeli demarche are as inventive as they are disingenuous.

(continued on page 20)

"They're attacking whites, not Jews."
 "They're against Zionists, not all Jews."
 "Israel should be more reasonable" (that is, it should make itself available for annihilation).

Thus, in the intellectual class we see a growth of illiberality among the majority, and an arrant ethnic hatred among the dynamic—but unhinged—minority.

Meanwhile, out in Middle America the scene is not so clear. Like the intellectual, the middle Americano is uncertain. He has never inhabited a land fecund with principles, and today his environs are more barren than ever.

Regarding minorities, we are all painfully aware of his insentience to the plight of the blacks, and, in 1942, he allowed over two hundred thousand Japanese to be shipped to "the interior" by FDR, the nation's most Liberal president yet. Finally, as Seymour Martin Lipset and Earl Raab assert in *The Politics of Unreason*, the Twentieth Century was his century for anti-Semitism.

Further, the middle Americano is suspicious of the intellectuals and uncomfortable about their direction of American foreign and domestic policy. Unexpected repercussions from Southeast Asia and reversals in those domestic areas that the intellectuals have proctored these last few years (i.e., welfare, the mixed economy, social planning) could trigger a mindless, but ferocious backlash against the intellectuals.

The significant point is that for many middle Americanos the intellectual is a Jew! Nathan Glazer has pointed out that though Jews form but three per cent of the population, they compose "more than a third of the faculties of elite schools, and more than ten per cent of the faculty population as a whole." The situation among students is roughly the same, and the publishing industry "has been transformed in the past fifteen years into a largely Jewish industry."

Thus, in a nation of withered principles where the intellectuals suffer a kind of intellectual palsy, and the potentially anti-Semitic masses confront blatantly anti-Semitic intellectualized extremists, it really makes no difference who wins this cultural and political struggle. Either way the Jew loses.

Ironically, it has been the Jew whose traditions in religion, learning, government and the arts have been essentially conservative, holding fast to the slowly accumulated experience of the ages and renewing that knowledge only in light of what had gone before. If the Jew in America is in peril, then it is the conservative who must come to his rescue, for the liberal, expedient as ever in his alliances, has found it useful to countenance anti-Semitism as a grotesque form of compensatory social justice. Liberals are rather more artful than reactionaries at the dirty business of finding scapegoats; their self-serving maneuvers are even now exposing the Jew to the fury of the Third World liberationists and the Black revolutionaries.

Conservatives must likewise repudiate the know-nothing populists whose aboriginal anti-Semitism is still grounded in the protocols of the Elders of Zion.

In sum, it might be wise for Jews to invite conservatives home to lunch.

□

Editorial II

Where the Lemmings Are

For centuries the behavior of the Scandinavian lemming (species, *Lemmus*) has baffled the most eminent scientists. These tiny rodents bedenizen all Scandinavia and after breeding in the cool mountain reaches, transacting their business in lightly wooded areas and indulging their muses in the delightful meadows of the upcountry, they suddenly pack their bags and enter upon a most tragic journey. They congregate into dense masses and stream down from the mountains, abandoning themselves to the tender mercies of the snowy owl, drowning by the bushful in ponds and streams, and leaving their brethren in splats of matted goo on city streets. Hysteria seizes Nordic

civilization as vast armies of lemmings scurry through the cities and on. Peace does not return until enormous swarms of these most pitiful of God's creatures repose belly-up in the oceans—which seem their ultimate destination.

Now much has been written about this perplexing phenomenon, but no one seems to understand the lemming. Some consider him an inherent malcontent. Others, adherents to behavioral analysis, lay his fate to ecological depredations, generation conflicts and possibly technological imprudence—for instance, exposure to DDT. Still others consider the lemming a victim of mass hysteria or just plain stupid. All are concerned about the lemmings' self-destructive travels, but certainly none condones them. I cannot think of a single scientist who—upon viewing the perverse behavior of lemmings during the sixties—was moved to applaud their actions or even to admire their motives. Certainly no man with a ray of light in his cranium would call this "the most idealistic generation ever" or write a book prophesying a peaceful, irresistible, revolution by lemmings. And if anyone would write such a book no one would read

(continued on page 21)

Summer in Asia with THE WYCF ASIAN TOUR

- STUDY CHINESE HISTORY
- MEET NATIONALIST LEADERS
- VISIT CHINA AND KOREA
- GAIN ACADEMIC CREDITS

The WORLD YOUTH CRUSADE FOR FREEDOM is pleased to announce its third annual Asian Tour. This summer a group of 50 students and teachers will visit Taiwan and Korea under WYCF sponsorship to study firsthand the socio-political and economic situation in Free Asia. The cost of this trip will not exceed \$600, transportation included.

The main portion of the tour consists of six weeks' study and travel in Taiwan. Participants live and study with Chinese students while attending credit courses at National Chengchi University. In addition, tour members will meet and discuss the issues of the day with the highest officials of the Republic of China. The stay in China is climaxed by a tour of the island, including a visit to Quemoy, the off-shore island within range of Communist guns.

HOW CAN I APPLY?

If you are a high school or college instructor or a college student you are eligible to join the 1970 WYCF China Tour. Just fill out the attached form and forward it to the World Youth Crusade for Freedom offices in Madison, Wisconsin immediately. The total cost of the tour, including transportation and housing in China and Korea, will not exceed \$600.00. Partial and full scholarships are available.

1970 WYCF CHINA TOUR

- ☐ I am interested in participating in the 1970 WYCF China Tour. Please send an application form and additional information.
- ☐ I am interested in participating, but will need scholarship assistance.
- ☐ I am a student.
- ☐ I am a teacher.

Name _____

Address _____

Street

City

State _____ Zip Code _____

World Youth Crusade for Freedom, Inc.
 3610 University Avenue, Madison, Wisconsin 53705



The World Youth Crusade for Freedom, Inc. is a non-profit educational organization dedicated to the study of freedom and the struggle to achieve it throughout the world. The Crusade maintains a close working relationship with affiliated organizations in thirteen nations in Asia and Europe. In addition to holding symposiums on the important questions facing young people today, the Crusade provides literature for campus distribution and sponsors the International Freedom Corps which allows American young people to travel to other nations to study and witness Communist activities and tactics in those countries at first hand.

All contributions to the Crusade are deductible for Federal Income Tax purposes.

CORRESPONDENCE



To the Editor:

Until today, I had great hope in The Alternative as a responsible organ for conservatism, and ergo, democracy. I had envisioned your fine journal as the voice of "what's right with America", tolling the sweet bell of insight in lucid contrast to most contemporary student journalism. But now I have been let down, and my disillusionment is not banished by Mr. Buckley's compliments to your work. (Buckley's nationally published column recently extolled The Alternative's zaniness-ed). Not until today, when I received my February issue, did I become suspicious of your real intentions and begin to probe your positional innuendoes. My incredulity has become disappointment — I had believed in you!

First, you ridicule the keystone of our democratic, or republican, system in "Great Moments in the Ninety-First Congress, Part I". This alone I might have

been able to understand as an example of the occasional irresponsible journalism that slips into any literary accomplishment. Unfortunately, coupled with your article by Mr. Moynihan, I fear my suspicions are correct. You people are leftists! In Moynihan's calling for "great complexifiers" he has insulted the native simplicity of Middle Americans, and you allowed this tripe to go un-rebutted! Your toleration of such ideas implies espousal of them.

Even this I could excuse, as imagination, but all of the aforementioned indications plus my final observation left me no doubt. You probably could have maintained your facade of conservatism and continued to warp your readers by little subtleties—that they were-not-even-conscious-of-being-influenced-by, if your cover had not given you away. Really, Abraham Lincoln portrayed in a thinly-veiled black-power salute, don't you think that was a little flagrant? You might under-estimate our perceptive powers.

In conclusion, I would like to commend your ingenuity in emulating a true conservative stance, and hope someday that you find yourself giving up this fraud and turning to the true conservatism. I recognize that in one's youth it is difficult to restrain radical tendencies, but I must caution you that we don't need any more extremism. I shall remain on your mailing list to keep my well-trained eyes upon further subversive tendencies.

Really conservatively yours,
William Quigley, Jr.
Purdue University

To the Editor:

Enclosed is a check for a one year

subscription to your excellent, and I must say fair, magazine.

Keep up the good work. There is support perhaps more than anyone realizes for your position.

Sincerely yours,
Robert F. Johnston, Jr.
Denison University
Granville, Ohio 43023

To the Editor:

The Alternative is fantastic! I have never read anything as intellectually stimulating and funny.

Sincerely,
Ronald R. Hauser
Cleveland State University
Brook Park, Ohio 44142

TO THE EDITOR:

I was recently introduced to your devious publication by a member of that insidiously rightist organization, ISI. Being a poor graduate student (no pun intended), I am curious about the possibilities of free subscriptions. This may sound like a clever leftist bid, but I find that your equally clever and dastardly extremism provides the nourishment I need while I fight out my time in one of our country's citadels of learning, morality, etc.

Any encouragement, nourishment, revolutionary-extremator kits, etc. (not to mention a subscription!) will be humbly and rightfully accepted.

Plottingly yours,
William C. Johnson
Denver, Colorado 80222

(Continued from page 21)

it. For these massive demonstrations accomplish no palpable purpose aside from attracting seasonal headlines and fleeting recognition for the singular lemming who manages to get himself photographed in the Oslo Times, committing a hideous indiscretion at a public sauna or floundering into the King's soup. For the march of the lemmings appears to most conscious thinking persons as inconsiderate, obnoxious, mindless, justified only on the most morally imaginative premises and probably counterproductive.

How different are the men who produce scientific monographs about the march of the lemmings from the pundits who produce hot air about the march of the "anti-war" demonstrators. The scientist rests his case on facts; the pundit stands on myths. The scientist's method is reason; the pundit's is emotionalism. And where the scientist judges every creature's behavior against a single standard, the pundit has a whole deck of standards. The pundit applies his most fastidious standard to Presidents, Vice Presidents and in fact any individual achiever possessed of talent and quality. For conservatives, moderates, or just plain average persons uninterested in cultural or political revolution (Joe

Frazier was the most recent to suffer this judgment), he maintains a rigorous standard of conduct in contrast with which the behavioral standard of his predecessors shows Zeus to have been a slacker and Yahweh to be hopelessly permissive. But for the peace demonstrator and cultural or political revolutionaries he reserves a standard that is admirably tempered, reasonable and understanding—indeed, his heart skips a beat at the merest thought of them.

Imagine the response of the pundits if a group led by, say, Bob Hope, Billy Graham, Senator Goldwater and the Grand Shaman of the Ku Klux Klan planned an April march on Washington supporting Mr. Nixon's strategy for peace in Vietnam. And imagine that this was about their third march for this purpose. Further, imagine that violence and destruction had always attended their demonstrations and that the war continued unaffected by their displays.

First of course, Hope, Graham and Goldwater would be reviled by the New York Times for associating with known racists, and the demonstration would be described as racist-inspired or as a racist front. Secondly, no CBS correspondent would ever appear on the evening news

standing incongruously before a gas station in desolate Valdez, New Mexico and reporting how the citizens of Valdez have collected their nickels to send Johnny Pruitt to represent Valdez at Bob Hope's Peace March. And of course the march would never be called a peace march because according to the pundits' standards only leftists are "peace" marchers. Anyone who views foreign policy differently from Senator McGovern is ipso facto not interested in peace. This demonstration would be termed "hawkish" or "patriotic" or "pro-administration", and the epithet "peace" would remain safely reserved for those demonstrators that the pundits feel are really interested in peace. Finally some editorialists would have to remind us that participants in Mr. Hope's last demonstration were "provocative" or violent and anyway this is Hope's third time around on this stunt, "which neither seems to represent the will of the majority of citizens nor to be terribly effective in ending the war. So what is the real point of one more demonstration?"

As winter's sobering winds fade before spring's balmy breezes, we again hear the rustlings of the peace demonstrators. Last spring they massed on Washington with