

LETTER FROM A WHIG (continued from page 4)

every city council will have a piece of the action.

6) The "check off" plan as drafted contains no effective provision for policing the use of these substantial sums. Every presidential campaign generates millions of bills, receipts, budgets, etc. Who is going to monitor the mountain of paper to see that the money is spent for legitimate campaign expenses? Who is going to prevent some sub-Wallace figure from putting his relatives on the campaign pay-roll at \$50,000 a month? The answer is that no one will prevent it because there is nothing in the bill to prevent it. It would be perfectly legal.

7) Note that the money is given to individuals, not to parties. This will further weaken parties and party responsibility, while making strong (and particularly charismatic) candidates increasingly independent of party organization. Party organization, it is well to remember, is the place where real participatory democracy is practiced in this Republic.

8) So this will just leave the parties free to do what they do now — that is, raise as much money as possible. But then the parties can spend the money for other political chores, such as funding voter registration campaigns. Quick now, guess: What party benefits most from aggressive registration drives that fill the voting rolls with people who, under normal circumstances, would be too lethargic to bestir themselves for any civic activities?

9) And what about the individuals who get the money? If they have only modest means of their own, they will supplement the public funds with the usual private fund raising activities. If during pre-Pastore amendment days X million dollars were spent in Presidential campaigns, and the Pastore amendment makes Y dollars available, then it is a lead pipe cinch that approximately X plus Y dollars will be spent in the next election. I realize that the bill stipulates that not more than X dollars should be spent, but there is no way to police this.

10) The real effect of the Pastore amendment will be governed by a version of Gresham's law. This version, henceforth known as Will's Law, is that public campaign money drives private money into the primaries. That is, guarantee that the candidate will be well funded in the final race, and you encourage people to put their private money behind candidates seeking nominations. The rich will be especially free with their own money in primary races. Thus the effect of the Pastore amendment may be to make it harder for men of modest means to get nominated.

11) Once the Government begins to pay for campaigns, it will not be long before a variety of Federal controls — "guidelines" — will be forthcoming. That has been the pattern in Federal aid to agriculture; and Federal aid to education, at every level; and Federal aid to everything else. There is no reason to believe that campaigns will be exempt from the iron law of Federal aid: strings follow cash.

I do not know what the guidelines are apt to be. But I am sure that they will work for the short term gain of the party that controls the Congress that passes them. And the fact that I cannot think of what these guidelines will be only convinces me that they will be unimaginably pernicious. To repeat, we can be sure that the Pastore amendment will give birth to a variety of "guidelines" designed to influence who runs, and when and where and under what circumstances the campaigns take place.

12) So for four years good Democrats "check off" a dollar for the Democratic Party. Presumably these good Democrats are not supposed to care who will be nominated or who will wind up spending their money. Will it be Kennedy? Jackson? Shirley Chisholm? The ethic implicit in the Pastore amendment is: Shut up and fork over, and

CORRESPONDENCE



To the editor:

I just heard that the current *Alternative* contains a letter written by me.

Egotist that I am, I would like to have a copy. Enclosed please find a check for fifty cents (please bill me if that's not sufficient).

Thank you!

Lynn Kinsky
Santa Barbara, California

To the Editor:

For two months now we have been receiving what we consider a very vulgar, smutty sort of magazine entitled *The Alternative* addressed to a Sister Paschal. We have not subscribed to this disgusting type of printed matter and ask you to please discontinue sending the booklet to us. We are ashamed to have our mailman even deliver such poor literature to us.

(Anonymous)
St. Gabriel School
Greenville, North Carolina

(*Ah how sophisticated are the ways of the modern Klan in its schemes to discredit Mother Church — RET.*)

To the Editor:

I find your publication an excellent and timely commentary.

Craig Edwards
Hanover College
Hanover, Indiana

pay for whomever we decide to run.

13) Yes, the Democratic Party is in debt and has its problems. These problems — and not public revenues — should be the wages of sin. Make no mistake about it. There are only three reasons why the Democratic Party is in trouble with the electorate: its past record, and its current issues and candidates. Now comes the Pastore amendment to guarantee that no matter how much more incompetent and unrepresentative the Democratic Party becomes, it can still count on a sizeable slug of public revenues.

14) There is a case to be made for the position that this "check off" practice is unconstitutional because it denies "equal protection" of the laws to minor parties. This is so because it tends to freeze the three existing parties into well-subsidized existence, while making it very difficult indeed for any other parties to compete by starting from scratch.

Admittedly this is not the first law which works against the proliferation of parties. Many state laws concerning procedures for getting a party on the ballot are designed to make it difficult for minor parties to prosper. I must admit, I at least enjoy this practice while questioning the principle — and I am not even sure the principle is bad. That is, a stable two-party system is so beneficial that I would hate to see an attack mounted against these laws. But if the Pastore amendment becomes law, then perhaps we will have reached a point at which justice and utility are no longer served by what will then be an excessive pattern of discrimination against unestablished parties.

15) The mechanics of administering this "check off" system will be complicated and expensive. The Internal Revenue Service has always said that it can not handle each tax return individually. That is one very good reason why the basic IRS audit is limited and random. But now each return will have to be scanned for the "check off" detail.

16) The cost of administering this — sorting out the dollars, categorizing them, distributing them to the individuals — will be substantial. It will require a lot of new programs, a large staff, a director to direct this empire: can he live without a car and driver? Then there is land to be purchased and a new building to be built. This is how Washington's empires grow. I would not be at all surprised if, at least in the first years, the cost of administering the "check off" system equalled or even exceeded the amount of money actually disbursed to the parties. In that case the cost of the "check off" plan to the Treasury will be more than double the figure originally anticipated.

But enough of this. Is it possible that this "check off" plan might be aborted?

As I write this the tax bill is on the way to conference with the House where conferees will iron out the differences between the two versions of the bill. It is almost certainly too much to hope that the House Conferences (a majority of whom will be Democrats) will oppose the Pastore amendment. Thus the only possibility for eliminating the "check off" plan resides with the Presi-

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, through this column, the distinguished Dr. Plunkitt has agreed to advise American statesmen in this time of troubles. Address all correspondence to The Boot-

black Stand, The Establishment, R.R. 11, Box 360, Bloomington, Indiana 47401, Continental U.S.A.

Dear Mr. Plunkitt:

I'm the only Senator who hasn't been considered by a national magazine as a front runner for the Democratic nomination. What can I do?

Cordially,
Lawton Chiles, U.S.S.

Dear Mr. Chiles:

I am returning your letter unanswered. This column is to assist statesmen, and I doubt that you actually are a U.S. Senator since no one has ever mentioned you as a Presidential candidate.

—GWP

Dear Mr. Plunkitt:

If I am raised to the Supreme Court can I possibly avoid sitting next to Justice Douglas without hurting his feelings? I have heard that he never wears

any clothing under his judicial robes and that he talks in his sleep.

Sincerely,
Lewis F. Powell, Jr.

Dear Mr. Powell:

It is most unlikely that you will hurt Justice Douglas' feelings, for he is going to be in the hospital much of this winter. You see this summer the Justice suffered severe brain damage while sitting under a women's hair dryer at a sit-in at the Luscius Skull Beauty Salon in Arlington, Virginia.

Of course more brain damage is not a terribly serious debility for a man like Justice Douglas, but Liberal critics of the court feel his commentaries will lose some of their old zing if he does not undergo surgery by February. Thus he will be under treatment at the Arlington Veterinary Clinic this winter where he will undergo a brain transplant replacing his own damaged instrument with that of a four-year-old Guernsey cow.

—GWP

dent's veto power. (There are moments, and this is one of them, when I almost—but only almost—wish the President was armed with an item veto.)

The problem is that, artistically speaking, the Democrats did a very stylish job of attaching the Pastore amendment to the tax bill. Before moving the amendment, they helped load the bill with sugar plums. Sugar plums, of course, are supposed to serve as insurance against a veto.

The tax bill does three things which a substantial number of Americans would not like to see undone by a Presidential veto.

First, it raises the individual exemption from \$650 to \$750 or \$800. A direct \$100 or \$150 bonus is a rarity: it is a noticeable, tangible benefit from the Government. It is worth more, politically, than a slew of trips to Peking.

Second, the bill contains the repeal of the excise tax on automobiles. The repeal will mean an average rebate of \$200 for each person who has purchased an automobile since the freeze began on 15 August. The promise of that rebate, plus the price freeze on 1972 models, plus the general wave of optimism about the economy caused an enormous spurt of automobile sales. More than three million cars have been sold during the freeze. If two thirds of these have been bought by married adults, there are five million voters who stand to lose \$200 if the excise tax is not repealed. And they would like to have that \$200 in time for the Christmas shopping. And given the current consumer boom, the politicians in the Administration and the economists at Treasury (the two categories are not exclusive) would like to put that \$200 into the hands of consumers anxious to put it right back into the economy.

Third, the bill contains a provision whereby working mothers in families with a gross income of \$18,000 or less deduct up to \$400 a month for child

care. More than 40 percent of American wives work. So a lot of voters are already counting this chicken and they will be peeved if it does not hatch.

Still, the President might veto the tax bill and get away with it. In fact, he could veto it and put the monkey on the back of the Democrats if he were to go on television and explain that the Democrats were raiding the Treasury and that he would not stand for it. He could express his anxiety about the good things in the vetoed tax bill. Then he could end his five minute speech by announcing that he is calling the Congress back into emergency session and that he hoped the Democratic-controlled Congress would have the decency to act with dispatch to redecorate the Christmas tree, up to but not including Pastore's star on top.

The real moral of this story is that, given enough rhetorical rope, the Democrats have hung themselves. For several years now the principle Democratic slogan has been that it is time to reorder our priorities." In ramming through the Pastore amendment, the Democrats clearly stated that subsidizing the Democratic Party is their first priority. It ranks higher than national defense, increased aid to education, or more spending for the environment—it ranks at the very top of their list.

PROPOSAL (continued from page 11)

condoned by our modern liberal society.

There would be a salutary by-product of this practical sociologic innovation. The rich, impressive, ceremony attendant to these infant sacrifices would lend color to our drab existences and would rekindle the flames of patriotic fervor which are so lacking today. The Phoenicians and later their descendants, the Carthaginians, found that these ceremonies, and the necessary sacrifices involved, brought their people together and heightened

their religious and civic sensibilities.

Of course, I do not intend that the people of this world revert to worshipping the god, Moloch. A few of us may have read in the Bible that such pagan worship was considered by some of the prophets as an abomination. The Christian religion, among others, would likely take a dim view of this proposal were we to worship any other than our present deities. But today there seem to be a number of secular institutions widely acclaimed by the organized religions to which various sacrifices are deemed proper and are encouraged. Perhaps our little human sacrifices could be made to the United Nations, that organization dedicated to the solution of world tensions and problems, not the least of which is the population explosion. Since atheism, the creed of the socialists and communists, is becoming so popular in our universities, the liberal clergy is anxious to free us from the restraints and shackles of traditional dogma, and our Supreme Court has declared that official encouragement of Christianity is unconstitutional, perhaps we need a new religion, a religion without God, yet dedicated to social welfare. This would seem to be the trend of our times.

The above is the second satire on abortion which has appeared in The Alternative under the pen name "Johnathan Quick," who is in fact Dr. George B. Markle, a Carlsbad, New Mexico medical doctor.

The Alternative Educational News Service is a bi-weekly publication which offers feature stories, book reviews, research and background material for student publications. For a free subscription send the name and address of your campus publication to: The Alternative Educational News Service, R.R. 11, Box 360, Bloomington, Indiana 47401.