

# LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

## SENATORIAL SALUTE

WITH THE PASSAGE of the drug bill I wish to take this opportunity to extend my heartfelt appreciation to your Science Editor, John Lear, for his excellent articles over a three-year period on the drug industry. These articles provided not only facts and insight into problems with which we became concerned; they also provided us with the comforting thought that somebody else, whose judgment we valued, felt that there was something awfully wrong in the drug industry.

Having spent so many months investigating these problems I am acutely aware of the immense difficulties of trying to bring out the truth concerning this complex industry which for so many years escaped scrutiny by wrapping around its shoulders the mantle of scientific research. The argument that anybody who criticized any aspect of the drug industry was interfering with the process of creating wonder drugs is, as you have come to know, a most formidable barrier against objective inquiry.

That John Lear had the knowledge, imagination and tenacity to surmount this and other obstacles placed in his path by the industry is a magnificent tribute not only to Mr. Lear himself but to the magazine which has had the courage and sense of public responsibility to publish his articles. S. 1552 is a strong and effective measure. That it has become the law of the land is due in no small part to the contributions to knowledge in what was otherwise an almost unknown and unexplored area by the articles of John Lear appearing in the *Saturday Review*.

ESTES KEFAUVER, Chairman,  
Subcommittee on Anti-Trust and  
Monopoly,  
Judiciary Committee, U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

## RELIGION AND CITIZENSHIP

IN HIS "Manner of Speaking" [SR, Sept. 22], John Ciardi writes that the Supreme Court's decision "is fundamental to the idea of the American democracy. It takes religion away from no man and forces it upon none." If this were true, there would be very little reason to oppose the Court's decision. The fact is, however, that the Court begins to deprive religion of one of its ground works, the public expression of religion. If the thinking of the Court and Mr. Ciardi is carried out to its fullest extent, all recognition of God in public life will have to disappear. Religion will be confined to the Church and the home. God will have no place in the school, the Court, or any of our other public institutions. Religion as it must be lived—that is twenty-four hours a day, interiorly and exteriorly—will be taken away from the vast majority of men.

Those who support the use of prayers in the schools do not mean to ignore the



THROUGH HISTORY WITH J. WESLEY SMITH  
"I liked the old cave better."

frustration of the secularist. They have attempted to allow him peace of mind by permitting his children to remain quiet while the other students pray. However, the secularists in pursuing their own goals are paralyzing the majority; in attaining their rights, they are abrogating the rights of the majority.

JOHN A. LEONARD, S.J.  
Loyola Seminary.

Shrub Oak, N.Y.

HAVING READ JOHN CIARDI on the school-prayer decision of the Supreme Court I am moved to say "Bravo!" His key words are "A man's religion is his own business. . . ." No man, no government has a right to force a religion on anyone who doesn't want it, or to take a religion away from anyone who does want it.

JOHN A. POPE.

Washington, D.C.

CONGRATULATIONS and many thanks to John Ciardi for his magnificent article on "Religion and Citizenship." I wish reprints of it could be distributed to every literate person in the United States.

MIRIAM ALLEN DEFORD.  
San Francisco, Calif.

## PROJECT PROMETHEUS

I INVITE the attention of SR's readers to PROJECT PROMETHEUS, which was presented this past June at the Accra Assembly ("The World Without the Bomb") in Ghana. Under PROJECT PROMETHEUS the United Nations would invite the U.S.A. and the USSR to collaborate in building and orbiting a com-

munications satellite to serve as the medium for global radio and television programs of an educational and cultural nature, from, by, and to all nations of the world. These programs would be supervised by an international group of scholars established by and responsible to UNESCO.

The satellite, *Prometheus*, paid for in part at least by popular subscription, would be publicly owned. Here is one place where international cooperation is possible, without tensions and jealousies. If the USSR is unable or unwilling to collaborate, the U.S.A. could supply (not donate) the world satellite to the United Nations—thus bringing fire and light from the heavens above to the billions of people of the world. PROJECT PROMETHEUS is described in detail in an official document (GP/A1733/500/6/61-62), published by the Assembly in Accra, Ghana. Strong pressures from all the peoples of the earth could convert this dream into a practical reality.

OLIVER L. REISER,  
University of Pittsburgh.  
Pittsburgh, Pa.

## THOUSANDFOLD THANKS

RE THE APPEARANCE of "FRASER YOUNG'S LITERARY CRYPT NO. 1000" [SR, Sept. 29]:

A thousand thanks, with bows and salaams,  
For your thousand delightful cryptograms!

SISTER MOIRA, S.C.N.  
Nazareth College.  
Nazareth, Ky.

# Election 1962:

## Thunder on the Right

**W**HEN THE Conservative party of New York State cried out recently against the "tyranny of liberal interlopers" in the Republican party who had "again and again . . . imposed on the voters of New York a meaningless choice between Tweedledum and Tweedledee," their indignation echoed back over several decades. "Me-tooism" has been the recurrent cry of right-wing Republicans, as their party has brushed aside more orthodox candidates to nominate a series of men called "upstart" or "watered down" Republicans: Willkie, Dewey, the triumphant Eisenhower, and Richard Nixon. No wonder the public is bored, they assert, with pallid political debate. Let us be done with compromise; let us recover our integrity, and penetrate the prevailing political fog with stirring convictions, clearly stated and courageously defended.

And why not? The call to political purity has an enduring appeal; Eisenhower was elected in 1952 in part because of a public weariness with "politics as usual" and a yearning for a purer, more elevated governmental plane. It eventually became evident that despite the Eisenhower crusade and the President's genuine indifference to politics, politics as usual had not, after all, been abolished, and the minks and freezers of the Truman era were followed by the saga of Sherman Adams, which, in turn, was followed by Billie Sol Estes. Nevertheless, hope springs eternal that the body politic may one day be cleansed of its compromise and corruptions, that a new political day may dawn in which issues are faced and fought forthrightly.

The same argument is used on the other side, too; it is not only the Right which longs for freedom to speak its own voice. "Who needs the South?" impatient Northern liberal Democrats have been heard to suggest. But today, for the most part, the thunder is from the right, as conservatives seek to define a position against what they see as the predominant liberal consensus. Their hope is that Americans may be awakened, before it is too late, by True Conservatives able to bring the national peril into focus, and that candidates who stand rather than

straddle will bring to the polls millions of apathetic voters who have sat out years of "Me-Tooist" elections.

It is most unlikely to happen. Discontented New York Conservatives who claim the Republican leadership under Rockefeller has "made the Republican party on the state level virtually indistinguishable from the Democratic party" will do well to look back to the year 1949, when the parties and their candidates could be readily distinguished. That year, old-line liberal Democrat Herbert Lehman was running for the Senate against a Republican candidate who had had enough of Me-Tooism and took a clear conservative line—the late John Foster Dulles. Dulles spoke out firmly against the "welfare state" and was roundly defeated by Lehman by a margin of 200,000 votes.

Unfortunately for conservative hopes, those apathetic citizens who sit home on election day are not, for the most part, Republicans at all, either of modern or conservative stripe; they are Democrats. In 1960, when our pre-election surveys used a series of questions about past voting habits and present voting intentions to divide respondents into those likely or unlikely to vote, Democrats represented 49 per cent of the likely voters and 60 percent of those unlikely to vote. The same pattern was evident in 1956.

**I**N 1960, although no True Conservative was running for President, it was the Republicans who were more involved in the election. Asked in September how important they thought the outcome of the election, 59 per cent of the Republicans interviewed replied that it was of major importance that their candidate won. Only 49 per cent of the Democrats echoed this sentiment. One month later, 74 per cent of the Republicans and only 65 per cent of the Democrats reported that they were "very much interested in the coming election." The silent America is, for the most part, a Democratic America; the hidden America waiting to spring to voting action at the "True Conservative" call just doesn't exist.

If ultra-conservatives wish to contribute their convictions to the national

political dialogue, they have a right—and a duty—to do so. But they should not do so under the illusion that they can arouse a groundswell of latent conservative sentiment, that they can persuade the nation to follow them. The Republicans who might have large followings are liberals such as Richard Nixon, Nelson Rockefeller, Jacob Javits, John Sherman Cooper, Clifford Case. If the ultra-conservative Republicans kill them off, they will kill their party.

We are a moderate nation, long used to following the middle of the road, capable at most of brief attraction to intermittent eruptions from left or right. In the early Thirties, the nation was for a while willing to go along with *all* of Roosevelt's experiments, but by the end of the decade, the people were calling a stop to further social innovation. So, in the Fifties, McCarthyism, while never enjoying majority support, had for a time some popular appeal; but a few months before the Senator's death, only 16 per cent of the public approved of him, 20 per cent disapproved, and the rest were "neutral." Today, among those who have heard of the John Birch Society, only 8 per cent hold a favorable opinion of it.

This moderation is nothing new. American politics, like that of all healthy democratic countries, is based on compromise, and the way we work out our compromises is *within* our political parties. In such a large and heterogeneous country, any winner in the political arena must represent a coalition of forces; no single ideological or regional view can prevail. This has been true from the beginning, and the first Me-Too candidate was William Henry Harrison, who brought the conservative Whigs to power in 1840 through a frontier-flavored, Jacksonian-type campaign. Our political party history has been characterized by a series of shifting coalitions, as political, social and economic forces waxed and waned on the political scene. When one party has begun to represent too fixedly the limited beliefs or interests of any single group, becoming unresponsive to the popular forces of the day, that party has eventually lost power. Sometimes liberalism has found its best home in the Republican party, sometimes in the Democratic. Minority protests against the prevailing majority have only found effective expression through influencing a major party's policies; third parties have produced much oratory, but have left little mark in elected candidates. Dictatorship remains man's only escape from political compromise, because political compromise is part of the essential fabric of the democratic way of life.

—ELMO ROPER.