

# Which Candidate Understands Communism Best?

*(Cont'd from Page 14)*

dirty work for the Soviets.

What would a blockade of Cuba have done? It would have thrown a monkey wrench in Cuban plans to communize Central America. It would have squeezed the Cuban economy to the breaking point and perhaps led to open revolt against Castro. It would have

interrupted the Cuban supply line to its troops in Africa. It would have forced the Russians to divert their efforts from Afghanistan to the Caribbean. In short, it would have served notice on the Soviet Union that the expansion of Communism by military force will be countered by American military action at a time and place of our own choosing and where the Russians are most vulnerable. We may not be able to do much to help Afghanistan, but we can certainly apply pressure only 90 miles from

Florida on an island where the United States still maintains a naval base.

Actually, it is about time that we began to think seriously of ridding the Western Hemisphere of the Communist cancer in the Caribbean. The longer we wait, the more difficult it will be to clean up the mess created by Castro. We are in a life and death struggle with the Communists. President Kennedy's half-hearted efforts to remove Castro led to his own undoing. He did too little too late.

President Carter's decision to do nothing about the Soviet troops in Cuba and Cuban subversion in Central America and the Caribbean has led the Russians to believe that we are impotent, that we lack the will to resist them in our own backyard. This will only encourage the Communists to take advantage of

what seems to be a paralyzed America. The President has not told us the truth. He has not told us why he backed down on the matter of Soviet troops in Cuba, which he said were unacceptable. Is Carter a coward, or has he been told by the Soviets that any move against Cuba would result in the nuclear bombing of American cities by missiles from that island?

We need a President in the White House who understands what Communist world strategy is all about and can begin to do something about it. We know that Carter is totally incapable of such understanding. Why? We don't know. But the longer he remains in power, the more dangerous the situation will get.

On election day the American people will have the chance to do something about that lack of knowledge in the White House. They can elect a President who has no illusions about the Communists, a President who will put teeth back into America's armed forces. I agree with Reagan that we have no need to apologize for what we tried to do in South Vietnam: defend a small nation from the horrors of a Communist takeover. We failed because the Johnson administration did not understand how Communism must be fought. Only the overthrow of the Red regime in Hanoi would have saved South Vietnam from Communism. But we thought that we could persuade the North Vietnamese Communists to give up their plans to conquer all of Indo-China. We lost because we thought that peace was possible without victory. We made the mistake, but others have had to live or die with the consequences.

Americans in general are very poorly informed about Communist strategy. If you would like to learn more I would suggest that you write to the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade, Box 890, Long Beach California 90801 and ask them to send you their Newsletter. It is the best newsletter on the subject, and it is free.

## The State Of The Family

By SAMUEL BLUMENFELD

Dr. Onalce McGraw, author of **Secular Humanism and the Schools: The Issue Whose Time Has Come**, has written another interesting and enlightening booklet on another critical issue of our time. Its title tells it all: **The Family, Feminism and the Therapeutic State**. Mrs. McGraw, education consultant to The Heritage Foundation, was a delegate from Virginia to the White House Conference on Families, held during the summer of 1980. The purpose of the conference was to study how government policies strengthen or weaken families.

Mrs. McGraw found that the traditional definition of the family was conspicuously absent, despite the efforts of grass roots pro-family groups. How could a conference on the family get anywhere without an agreed-on definition of the family? It didn't. But that's neither here nor there. The prevailing secular humanist orthodoxy reflected at the conference places man at the center of the universe. Thus, it is argued, all individual choices in conduct are equally valid--and are protected by the Constitution. This philosophy became the basis of much public policy in the last decade. The profusion of government social programs which resulted has placed the state "in opposition to traditional family values," according to Dr. McGraw.

"Government intrusion into the family has spread under the slogan that only the state can solve human problems in 'health,' 'education,' and 'welfare.' Without benefit of public consensus, an unwritten federal 'family policy' has evolved. That federal policy, implemented through layer upon layer of federal programs, is that the state, rather than the family,

has the primary responsibility to define and satisfy the full range of human needs."

The secular humanist state's response to human problems -- divorce, child or spouse abuse, teenage pregnancy, for example -- is "therapeutic." Thus, instead of identifying and treating the causes of these problems, the so-called helping professionals create remedial programs to help "cope" with the situation.

Dr. McGraw analyzes and challenges the assumptions of the family professionals. She suggests that government would do better to remove the obstacles to the growth of the family -- inflation, excessive taxation, and wasteful and misdirected government spending. She notes a growing and active grass roots movement in defense of the traditional family. This is necessary, she concludes, because "The family ... is the essential unit by which all individuals find their identity and the means to grow into participating members of society."

To get a copy of this informative eighty-page booklet, write to The Heritage Foundation, 513 C Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002. The price is \$2.00. If you haven't read Dr. McGraw's booklet on **Secular Humanism and the Schools**, ask for that one also and enclose an additional \$1.00.

The Heritage Foundation, incidentally, is a conservative think-tank dedicated to the principles of free competitive enterprise, limited government, individual liberty, and a strong national defense.

## Phyllis Schlafly Award Goes To Mary Carroll

By SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD

There were those who said that Ronald Reagan would lose the votes of American women when he failed to endorse the Equal Rights Amendment. But Phyllis Schlafly knew otherwise. She predicted the Reagan would indeed get the women's vote, and she was right.

I've known Phyllis Schlafly for many years. She was active in conservative politics long before the ERA became an issue. In 1963 she testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the Moscow Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. In 1964 she wrote her famous book, *A Choice Not An Echo*, which gave conservative Republicanism a strong boost and resulted in the nomination of Barry Goldwater over the strong objections of the liberal Eastern Establishment.

Phyllis has been particularly effective as an analyst and critic of our defense policies vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. Her book, *Safe But Not Sorry*, published in 1967, exposed liberal defense policies as dangerous to our nation's security. She has a keen understanding of global politics and understands communist strategy better than most of the men who sit in Congress. Having read much of what Phyllis has written on defense and foreign affairs, I could easily see her as the nation's first female Secretary of State or Secretary of Defense.

But in 1968, the feminists launched the Women's Liberation movement by picketing the Miss America Pageant in Atlantic City. Little did they know that Phyllis would be waiting for them when their drive to pass the ERA would reach almost unstoppable momentum. But Phyllis stopped them.

Of course she did not do it alone. But it was she who organized the Stop ERA movement and created the Eagle Forum as a rallying point for the nation's conservative women. It is doubtful that the movement would have ever gotten off the



MARY E. CARROLL, Massachusetts Eagle of 1980, with her son, Robert, at his graduation from the Massachusetts Maritime Academy.

ground; let alone succeeded, had it been organized by anyone less sophisticated in the ways of politics than Phyllis Schlafly. Her years of preparation paid off.

Phyllis's main strength has always been her ability to attract good conservative women to the cause. They follow her because she knows what she is doing. They trust her judgement, her political know-how, her understanding of the enemy. The result is that the Eagle Forum has become the gathering place of the most active, patriotic, conservative women in America. These are the women who helped elect Ronald Reagan to the Presidency.

Each year, the Eagle Forum honors a woman in each state for the work she has done in behalf of the cause. This year the Eagle Forum awarded its plaque of recognition to Mary E. Carroll (Mrs. Robert F.) of Milton. The award was made on October 25 at the Cardinal Mindzenty Foundation dinner at the Park Plaza. The plaque reads: "To Mary E. Carroll, from Phyllis

Schlafly and the Eagles, with appreciation for your dedicated work for God, family, and country."

Anyone who knows Mary Carroll knows that the award could not have gone to a more deserving woman. Mother of five children, all now grown up, she has nevertheless found the time and energy to be a member of the Pro Family Forum, Women for Constitutional Government, The Cardinal Mindzenty Foundation, and the Eagle Forum. She is known among Milton school teachers as a parent who cares about what is going on in the schools and makes it a point to find out.

It is the Mary Carrolls of America who made it possible for Phyllis Schlafly to have the enormous impact on this country's future that she has had. Phyllis will go down in the history books not for her keen analyses of our defense policies, but for having stopped ERA. And Mary Carroll can be proud that she helped Phyllis do the job.

# Looking Ahead

By SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD

The New Year always presents possibilities of future success for those with vision, for vision must precede action if action is to be successful. That is what Jimmy Carter lacked -- a sense of vision -- and that is why the American people rejected him. Everything he did led to a sense of frustration and impotence.

But he did two things which are praiseworthy. He placed the wheat embargo on Russia and kept us out of the Olympics in Moscow because of Afghanistan. But here, too, he did this to punish the Russians for their bad conduct. They disappointed him. He expected better of them because he has no real vision of Communist global strategy or of Russian ambition.

Carter did one other good thing. He helped Israel and Egypt achieve peace. That is an achievement to be proud of, but he was in the process of blowing that by leaning in the direction of the PLO at the United Nations. How stupid can you get! Fortunately, his defeat stopped him in his tracks.

Ronald Reagan is becoming President under very tough conditions. Many people expect an overnight miracle and will complain if it doesn't happen. They don't realize that our economic problems are the results of long-term government social policies. We live in a debt economy because the government takes too much of our earnings, leaving the average wage earner with little to save or invest. Any

large purchase, any major capital investment requires borrowing. So most of us are heavily in debt.

This is particularly true of our federal government which simply will not live within its means but which can pay its bills with a printing press. But who is at fault? It is the Congress which keeps passing laws authorizing the expansion of the bureaucracy and the spending of tax money for anything and everything.

Only when the majority of our law makers are men who understand the need to reduce the size of government will we begin to put our economic house in order. Senator Tsongas hit the nail on the head when he criticized his fellow liberals as being too much concerned with the redistribution of the golden eggs and too little with the health of the goose.

But what Tsongas forgets is that among the so-called liberals has always been a large contingent of Marxists whose goal has always been to kill the capitalist goose. It is unlikely that the Marxists will give up their goal to please their liberal friends.

But now for the first time since Calvin Coolidge we will have people in the White House and a majority in the Senate who understand basic free-market, capitalist economics -- men who understand that the goose has got to be fed, cared for, and even a little pampered if it is to thrive. If we want them golden eggs, we'd better learn to love our goose a little better than we have.



## Home At Last!

By SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD

The American hostages are back in the U.S.A. after 444 days of hellish captivity. The Iranians released them because, by their stupid barbarism, they had painted themselves into a desperate economic corner. The hostages had become an albatross around their negotiations to follow. But the Carter administration chose otherwise.

At this point we shall have to accept the agreement only because it involves so many other parties. But where it strips the hostages of their rights to sue the government of Iran for their illegal imprisonment and brutal treatment, there must be further action. The former prisoners and their families are entitled to compensation and ought to take the matter to court.

Congress may enact a law compensating the ex-hostages with our tax money. But if Congress does this, then the U.S. ought to make Iranian compensation a condition for the re-establishment of normal relations between the two countries. Before a single American visa is issued to another Iranian student; before the Iranians can reopen their embassies and consulates here; before Air Iran can land a plane on our soil, the Iranian government should be required to pay the hostages for their suffering.

The stories of torture, humiliation and terror are just beginning to be told. Apparently

the Iranians, who complained so bitterly about the Shah and his secret police, have a tradition for using torture and mistreatment. Considering the irrational, hysterical, and somewhat savage nature of the Iranian people, the Shah must be credited with having governed Iran very well. A little repression went a long way. He gave them military strength, peace, unprecedented prosperity, world respect, and stability. He made it possible for thousands of them to attend American universities, where they showed their gratitude by plotting his downfall. What do the Iranians have now? War, economic ruin, instability, and the contempt of the entire civilized world.

There must be a growing number of Iranians who wish they could reverse the time machine and return to the good old days. But nations, like individuals, must pay for their mistakes, and Iran will pay for hers.

Meanwhile, in an ironic sort of way we have gained a lot from this painful, frustrating experience. We have shown the world how much we care for our own people, how patient we can be in the face of incredible provocation, how stable we are as a nation. We've achieved a rare degree of unity, and Americans are once more proud of their country.

In a way it was fitting that the hostages should have been freed on Inauguration Day. The New Beginning is more than just a slogan. There is now a real sense of hope and confidence throughout the country. President Reagan put it very well when he said that we can solve the economic problems of this nation. And why not? We are still the world's greatest, freest, and richest nation. In a world of barbarism, we have set a standard for decent, humane behavior. It makes one stop and think how lucky we are to be Americans.

Each month the South Boston Marshal brings you the best in news and issues affecting our community and our lives. For first rate reading, don't miss The South Boston Marshal.

# The Reagan Revolution

By SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD

Those of us who have toiled in the vineyards of conservatism for the last twenty years can finally say that one of our own is now in the White House. I remember when I met Ronald Reagan at a reception in Santa Barbara in 1966, I shook his hand and told him to remain true to his principles and not to compromise. I'm sure that thousands of conservative well-wishers told him the same.

In those days we were used to being betrayed by conservative-sounding politicians who veered to the left once they got into office. Conservatives supported non-ideologic moderates like Nixon and Ford because the Rockefeller liberals in the Republican party would not let a conservative get elected even if he won the nomination. That was the case with Goldwater in 1964.

But so much has happened since then to change the mood and perception of the country: Vietnam, Watergate, Iran,

Afghanistan, the OPEC squeeze, inflation, high taxes, forced busing, a declining standard of living. All of these have turned the country against the liberal and moderate politicians who brought us to this state of affairs.

So the conservative tide became irresistible. Of course Jimmy Carter helped with his monumental incompetence. He was surrounded by liberals who fed him the standard claptrap. He was bound to fail because liberalism had reached the end of the line in America. It could go no further without destroying the very fabric of our system, and the American people were not ready for that.

The American people do not want Socialism. Although our Marxist intellectuals have been telling us for decades that Socialism is inevitable, the American people have decided that it isn't. In fact, Americans have not only rediscovered capitalism as a vital and progressive economic system but also as

a morally superior one. The result is going to be a capitalist renaissance.

The Marxist stranglehold on Western ideology has finally been broken. Supply-side economics is the academic term for the counter-revolution. Now that the counter-revolution is taking hold in America, it will soon spread to the rest of the world. The world has been waiting for America to take the ideological lead in the struggle for men's minds, and the election of Reagan is a signal that America is ready to do so.

Reagan is surrounded by conservatives, libertarians, supply-side economists and anti-communists. This is not just a new administration; it is a revolutionary one with widespread popular support. Reality has finally broken through the liberal fog and made Americans see the world as it is.

The withdrawal of the U.S. from Vietnam did not bring peace. It brought the full horror and brutality of communism to the South Vietnamese and Cambodians. The overthrow of the Shah did not bring justice and democracy to the people of Iran. It brought firing squads, intolerance, persecution and ruin. The overthrow of Somoza did not bring freedom and social justice to Nicaragua. It has brought a nascent communist dictatorship engineered by Fidel Castro.

In economics, social security has not brought security; the war on poverty has not eliminated poverty; public housing has not solved the housing problem; forced busing has not improved public education; and budget deficits have not helped improve the American standards of living.

These are the realities that have turned many liberal voters into conservatives. And for the first time in decades we have a President who is not afraid to confront these realities and deal with them honestly. What a victory for America!

## The Embattled Parent

By SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD

Gloria Lentz, author of *Raping Our Children: The Sex Education Scandal*, a powerful indictment of our schoolhouse sex educators, has written a new book which should be read by anyone who has children or works with children. Its title is *The Embattled Parent*, and it deals with the whole gamut of problems that parents must face today as they raise children in a society that seems to have lost all moral direction. "While parents still subscribe to certain behavior as unthinkable," writes Mrs. Lentz, "their children have no such inhibitions." The result is moral chaos which is leading to social chaos and millions of family tragedies.

The obvious question is why do our children not have the inhibitions that we had as youngsters? The answer is equally obvious, especially to those of us who've watched the social scene closely for the last fifteen years: our dominant cultural, social, and moral leaders, most of whom are Secular Humanists, have decided that sin no longer exists and that all of those "Thou Shalt Nots" are a terrible bore inflicted on mankind by theological tyrants. And where do the Secular

Humanists do most of their work? Where else but in the public schools.

"Every atrocity that has befallen our youth," writes Mrs. Lentz, "can be traced back to the time that the schools took on the role of 'change agents' or 'experimenters' or pushers of 'social programs,' whatever name you want to call it."

So the moral restraints of Judeo-Christianity have been swept aside, and anything that the social planners say is okay is okay. So what do we have? Widespread drug abuse, premarital sex and promiscuity, venereal disease, unwanted pregnancies, teenage abortions, unwed mothers, shoplifting, prostitution, rampant crime. All of this is turning the teenage years of many American youths into nightmares.

And what can parents do to counter the seductive message that comes loud and clear to our children through movies, television, music, magazines, books, teachers and superstars? The author says that they can do a lot. They can organize into pressure groups, they can educate their children at home or enroll them in private schools of their choice,

they can support pro-life groups or organizations like Morality in Media and the National Congress for Educational Excellence; they can put pressure on the public schools to clean up their act.

So while the book's message is a grim one when the statistics of V.D., abortion, and teenage suicide are added up, it is also one of hope. Now that we have new allies in the White House and in Congress, it will be easier to challenge such bastions of liberal morality as the Supreme Court, the American Civil Liberties Union, Planned Parenthood, the National Educational Association, and the various departments of the federal government that have funded so many of these programs and experiments sponsored by the Secular Humanists.

If you are a parent, I advise you to go out and get a copy of this book for your home library. Read it carefully. It's a much needed supplement to the family medical encyclopedia, for our children are being assaulted by moral diseases for more dangerous than the physical ones. *The Embattled Parent* by Gloria Lentz is published by Arlington House of Westport, Conn., price: \$10.95.

## Castro's Hand In El Salvador

By SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD

Pres. Reagan's announcement that the U.S. is going to help El Salvador fend off a Communist takeover is welcome news. But it is not going to be easy to crush Communist terrorism and subversion in Central America and the Caribbean as long as the Kremlin maintains Cuba as its super base in this hemisphere. We lost in South Vietnam because we were unwilling to destroy the source of aggression against the South: the Communist government of North Vietnam. And it is doubtful that we shall be able to establish democratic stability in Central America as long as Communist Cuba exists. The San Salvador guerrillas, like the Nicaraguan Sandinistas, were trained in Cuba and are being armed by Cuba. To fight this cancer at its edges and not its heart is a strategy that will not lead to victory.

For over twenty years we have

tolerated the existence of a Communist base in this hemisphere in complete violation of the Monroe Doctrine which was the cornerstone of our foreign policy in this hemisphere until then. When Pres. Kennedy doomed the Bay of Pigs invasion by calling off U.S. air support, he doomed the Western Hemisphere to continued Communist subversion. Of course, he tried during his short administration to undermine Castro and even assassinate him. But Castro proved to be a much more formidable enemy: JFK was assassinated, not Fidel Castro.

Meanwhile, the Cuban refugees, frustrated by American paralysis vis a vis Castro, shifted their main base of operations from Florida to Nicaragua, where Pres. Somoza gave them freedom of movement. Somoza and Nicaragua then became the target of Communist insurrection. That Castro succeeded in overthrowing Somoza and putting the

Sandinistas in power is a chilling indication that Castro has the power to expand Communist influence in countries once thought to be secure from such influence.

Some Americans are concerned that Pres. Reagan, in time, may commit American soldiers in San Salvador. The spectre of Vietnam haunts and paralyzes us. In the old days U.S. Marines were sent all over Central America and the Caribbean to re-establish political stability in areas threatened with revolutionary upheaval. Today gunboat diplomacy is no longer acceptable because Castro is under the protection of the Soviet Union, a nuclear power. In fact, Cuba itself not only has Russian troops on her soil, but missiles aimed at American cities and strategic targets.

So what do we do? How do we get rid of Castro and bring freedom back to Cuba? And how do we do it without using American soldiers? There is a way. Thousands of Cuban refugees are ready to fight for the liberation of their country if only they are supplied with the wherewithal to do so. America should join with other sympathetic governments in this hemisphere to help the Cuban exiles overthrow Castro. That force should be made strong enough to succeed and it should have the full backing of the U.S. and other governments in the hemisphere.

We tend to do a lot of wishful thinking when it comes to dealing with the Communists. They represent an evil of such magnitude that we prefer to believe they really don't exist. We hope that by not thinking about them, they will go away. But the reality is quite different. Communism is like cancer. Either we defeat it, or it will defeat us.



## Cutting Back City Hall

By SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD

Robert Poole, the editor of *Reason* magazine, the nation's leading libertarian monthly, was in town the other day to address local libertarians and promote his new book, *Cutting Back City Hall*. He couldn't have come at a better time, for the book is loaded with suggestions that can help the cities and towns of Massachusetts deal with the dilemmas caused by Proposition 2½.

Poole contends that the citizens of Massachusetts have a golden opportunity to cut the costs of government dramatically without eliminating any really necessary services. This can be done, he says, mainly through privatizing many of these services or charging realistic user fees.

For example, there is no reason why public libraries should not charge a reasonable subscription fee for a card, with lower rates for children and senior citizens. Also, there is no reason why tennis players should not pay a reasonable fee for using public tennis courts. Why should every taxpayer be forced to maintain tennis courts for the few who use them?

Libertarians believe that in a free society government force should be used only when absolutely necessary and only for very important reasons. Forcing

everyone to support public tennis courts, or golf courses, or any number of such nonessential services is really an abuse of government power, especially when we know that the private sector can provide these services quite well.

In his talk, Poole suggested ten ways in which Boston could cut government costs and thereby ease the tax burden on everyone. Here are the ten ways, many of which, incidentally, have been tried successfully in other cities: (1) Sell the deficit-ridden MBTA to private ownership, perhaps the union, and let them operate it like a business. (2) Deregulate the cab industry and private bus transit and permit the use of smaller vehicles, or Jitneys, on lines with small patronage. (3) Sell off the city hospital to one of the big private hospital companies with the understanding that the city would pay the emergency medical bills of the uninsured, so that no one will be turned away from a hospital in an emergency. (4) Get out of the garbage collection business entirely. (5) Privatize the city ambulance service. (6) Contract for street and park maintenance and data processing. (7) Charge full cost user fees for recreational programs. (8) Use paid reservists in the fire department. (9) Open the police

academy to private security personnel. (10) Increase class size in the public schools, decrease the number of nonteaching personnel, and enact tax credits for parents who send their children to private schools. A parent who puts a youngster in a private school saves the taxpayer about \$4,000 a year in educational costs. So these parents deserve a reasonable tax credit in return. By encouraging the growth of private education, the state will be lowering the tax burden for everyone.

For too long the property owner was forced to bear the lion's share of the tax burden. The unfairness of that situation was so blatant that the citizenry gave Proposition 2½ an overwhelming endorsement. But now the politicians, instead of seeking ways to cut the cost of government, are trying to find new sources of tax revenue to maintain their bloated bureaucracies. Apparently, the politicians have not yet gotten the message. The public doesn't want a shift of the tax burden from the property owner to some other group. The public wants a permanent tax reduction for everyone. And that means reducing the cost of government across the board.

I strongly recommend that a copy of Bob Poole's book be sent to every selectman, city councilman, town manager, or mayor of the commonwealth's 351 cities and towns. It might dawn on these men that there are indeed answers to the dilemmas posed by 2½, answers that will lead to lower taxes, smaller and more efficient government, and greater prosperity for everyone in the state. Can you imagine how much more industry we could attract with a much smaller tax burden?

This is indeed a golden opportunity for Massachusetts to take the lead in showing how cities and towns can reduce the tax burden of their citizens and yet maintain all essential services. For copies of *Cutting Back City Hall* by Robert Poole, write to Universe Books, 381 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y. 10016.

## Would Gun Control Reduce Violent Crime?

By SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD

Everytime a celebrity or President is shot at by some demented citizen the cry arises among liberals for "gun control." It has become such a reflex reaction, that one wonders if the advocates of gun control really know what they are doing or saying. In the first place there is already a very high degree of gun control in the United States. In some cities it is impossible for lawabiding citizens to get permits to own handguns for their own legitimate self-defense. None of these laws have ever prevented criminals from getting guns illegally. If the government can't stop the traffic in heroin, what makes the liberals think that the government will be able to stop an illegal traffic in handguns?

Less than 1% of those who possess handguns in the United States use them to commit violent crimes. The other 99% use their handguns for sport, target shooting, or self-defense. If the problem of violent crime is caused by a tiny minority who possess handguns illegally, then how are we going to reduce crime by requiring the law-abiding gun owners to give up their handguns?

You don't reduce violence by harassing and regulating those who don't commit it. You reduce crime by going after the criminals.

Nowhere in the world are the

rights of criminals more pandered to and safeguarded than here in the United States. They have the run of our streets, while law-abiding citizens must lock themselves up in their houses to be safe from criminal attack.

There was a time when you could ride the subways of New York and walk the streets of the South Bronx at 3 in the morning without the slightest fear of being mugged, assaulted, or murdered. Today you can be attacked in broad daylight, not only on the street, but in your own home. When criminals are so unafraid that they can commit their mayhem virtually at will, what good will gun control do in stopping them? The criminals are not going to turn in their handguns.

Besides, only 50% of the murders in this country are committed by handguns. Is anyone less dead because he or she has been murdered by a knife or a rope around the neck? The children in Atlanta have all been strangled to death. Would a gun-control bureaucracy harassing law-abiding citizens be of any help to the frightened parents of Atlanta?

In America we coddle criminals, especially murderers. Charles Manson is alive and well in a prison in California. So is the murderer of Robert F. Kennedy.

From 1967 to 1977 there were no executions of convicted murderers at all in the United States. The presence of so many murderers in our prisons is one reason why there has been such an increase in prison violence. Many prisoners complain that they live in deadly fear of these murderers.

But try executing a convicted murderer and you get an outcry from the American Civil Liberties Union and a candle-light vigil by the bleeding hearts who wouldn't spend a dime to help the victims of the murderer.

The only way to reduce violent crime in this country is to begin coming down hard on those who commit it. And that means bringing back capital punishment. We don't need a war against "crime." We need a war against criminals -- those anti-social misfits who make our cities unsafe, commit abominable atrocities, and victimize millions of innocent people each year.

Are the gun-control advocates really interested in preventing violent crime or are they merely using that issue to bring about more government control over our lives? The right to bear arms is as important to us as our rights to freedom of speech, a free press, and freedom of worship. It required the same battles, the same sacrifices, the same exertions for liberty.

Gun control would greatly diminish the freedoms for which Americans of every generation have fought and died. But it would in no way hamper the criminal. A disarmed public would, in fact, be an even easier mark for the killer. Gun control would make America even safer for criminals than it is now. And that we don't need.

## Can Public Schools Be Saved?

By SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD

Newsweek is currently doing a three-part Special Report on "Why Public Schools Are Flunking." The purpose of the series is to examine the crisis of confidence in American public education, the flight from public to private schools, the problems of teacher education, and how faith can be restored in public schools. The rule of any such series in the mass media is to end on a note of hope if not optimism. The conclusion usually is that if we do such and such, public education will be restored to some state of competency or acceptability.

I have been writing about public education for the last ten years, and I have come to the conclusion that, as an institution, public education has outlived its usefulness. Its diseases are terminal. Whatever bits and pieces of the system survive its present decline will probably be reorganized into community institutions bearing little resemblance to what we have now.

It's not that Americans lack

faith in education; it's that they've become skeptical about the government's ability to do anything right. The government can't defend our people abroad, it can't win any wars — even domestic ones against poverty or crime, it can't manage the economy, it can't balance the budget, it can't solve the energy crisis, and it can't teach our children to read. The space shuttle is the only successful government project since the walk on the moon. But it's the glaring exception to the rule.

The problem with a government as big as ours is that it becomes paralyzed by the conflicting interests trying to use it. Which suggests that if things are to be done in our system, only the private sector can get them done. And that is why private education is expanding and public education is declining. The conflict of interests within the public schools has made true education impossible in them. And since this conflict of interests is part and parcel of the democratic process, it is unlikely that it can ever be

eliminated from public education. Which means that parents will have to rely more and more on private alternatives for the education of their children.

This is all well and good, for the school ought not to be an arena of social conflict, academic confusion, and moral uncertainty. It ought to be the means whereby parents pass on to their children their own values, traditions, and hopes for the future.

In a country where the cultural and social consensus has become fragmented, educational diversity is not only needed but desirable. The private school has become the only means whereby parents can give children that sense of order and continuity that the maturing consciousness needs in coming to grips with reality.

We ought not to mourn for public education because it has outlived its usefulness. Better to remember it as a great social experiment that did much good but proved, in the end, to be incompatible with the ideals and practices of a free, democratic society.

# The Boston School Crisis

By SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD

The Boston public school system is the oldest government-run educational system in the country. It represents a commitment to tax-supported schooling almost as old as Massachusetts itself. But like so many government institutions, it seems to have reached the end of the line. People have lost faith in the government's ability to educate and they are getting tired of bearing a burden that gets heavier each year but produces more

dismal results.

Take the school budget crisis, for example. Mayor White expected the school system to get by on an austerity budget of \$210,000,000. But by the time the school year is over, the educators will have spent about \$250,000,000, racking up a deficit of \$40,000,000. The taxpayer, of course, will be required to make up the difference. Despite the difficulties of the time, the educators have shown little concern for the taxpayer. They were and still are firmly opposed to

Proposition 2½. Why? Because it no longer permits them to run their profession in the extravagant manner to which they have become smugly accustomed.

A look at the figures tells all. On paper there are 64,000 pupils enrolled in the Boston schools. In actuality, daily attendance is closer to 42,000. With 5,000 teachers on the payroll, that gives us a student-teacher ratio of about 9 to 1. Even if all of those enrolled attended

(Cont'd on Page 2)

Page 2 THE SOUTH BOSTON MARSHAL May 7, 1981

## The Boston School Crisis

(Cont'd from Page 1)

classes, the student-teacher ratio would still be only 12 to 1. That's better than a lot of private schools.

As for cost per pupil, the figure runs between \$4,038 and \$5,900, depending on what attendance figure you use and which budget figure finally prevails. Whatever the final figure is, the cost is far higher than the tuition at South Boston Heights Academy, which is not quite \$1,000.

In other words, if the city of Boston paid private schools like

Heights Academy to educate the city's children, the taxpayer could save at least \$3,000 per pupil — or, multiplied by 64,000, about \$192,000,000.

Don't expect the Boston Teachers Union to suggest anything as sensible and economical as that. It would mean an end to forced busing, an end to

the bloated educational bureaucracy, an end to teacher power, an end to educational palaces. The bureaucrats would lose, but the students would gain, for it would also mean an end to institutionalized failure, social promotion, functional illiteracy, and substandard academics.

Recently the Boston Teachers Union issued a tabloid purporting to tell "the true facts behind the school budget crisis." According to the BTU, school enrollment has gone up, not down, and regular teacher expenditures have gone down, not up. If you can believe that, you can believe anything. Apparently the BTU used the New Math in calculating their figures. Is it any wonder that the kids aren't learning anything in the Boston schools?

The BTU tabloid reeks of professional arrogance and intellectual dishonesty. It has the integrity of a common, two-bit shell game. And these are the educators to whom are entrusted the intellectual and moral welfare of Boston's children! If public education is going down the drain, it's because the educators can no longer fool the public. Their credibility is beyond salvage. Meanwhile someone ought to tell the BTU that the party is over.



# Some Thoughts On Japanese Cars

By SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD

I have never owned a foreign car. In fact I've been driving Chrysler cars since 1965 and will probably keep buying American cars as long as I can find one that suits my needs.

Nevertheless, I think it is awfully unjust for us to blame the Japanese for our automobile industry's problems. The "problem" is really caused by the American consumer who insists on buying Japanese cars over the domestic product.

Americans like Japanese cars because they are attractive, reliable, cheap to maintain, and

they save lots of gas. In fact, the reason why Americans have done so well in conserving gas is because there are so many small Japanese cars on our highways.

So we ought to be glad that these cars have been available to the hard-pressed American consumer. When American companies produce cars that can do as well as or better than the Japanese, Americans will no doubt buy them.

Meanwhile, consumers ought to be free to get the best value for their money by shopping in a free market. The Japanese won American consumer acceptance

because they supplied fuel-efficient cars when they were badly needed and were not available from Detroit. They've also been smart enough to cater to American tastes in styling and options. So we ought not to penalize them for having given us the cars we wanted and needed.

Besides, putting a limit on Japanese imports, voluntary or otherwise, is no guarantee that the American consumer will turn around and buy American. He may very well buy European, thereby not helping Detroit one wit. Also, by limiting the supply of Japanese cars, consumer demand will inevitably drive the price of these cars higher. So who will win?

The Japanese have worked hard to gain their share of the American market. Their success has been a measure of their ability to compete within the free-enterprise system with intelligence and energy.

There is strong resentment among American car makers and auto workers against the Japanese for their success, and this resentment, I suspect, is the true motive behind Detroit's cry for protection. After all, it's the almighty consumer who voted against Detroit in the marketplace, not the Japanese car makers.

It is said that restrictions on Japanese imports will give Detroit the time it needs to catch up and compete. But that's not cricket. Detroit's problems are a result of Detroit's short-sightedness, Washington's overregulation, and the American worker's sloppiness. For the past ten years Detroit has been plagued with lemons and recalls. Government regulators have diverted Detroit's concern away from quality to compliance with impossible regulatory goals.

So, while Ralph Nader and the regulators were busily putting Detroit through the ringer, the Japanese were producing cars Americans badly needed. If it weren't for the availability of Japanese cars, the American economy might be in much worse shape than it is today. And if it weren't for the Japanese competition, Detroit would have no realistic standard against which to measure its own quality and productivity.

Meanwhile, there are signs that Detroit is making a comeback with a host of attractive, fuel-efficient cars. Let's not spoil our success by penalizing the Japanese for theirs.

# The Campaign Against Nuclear Power

By SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD

The "No Nuke" movement is part of the general leftist drive to weaken America militarily so that we will be unable to stop or resist Communist expansion and aggression. "No Nuke" people in general support the ERA, favor legalized abortion, oppose U.S. help to El Salvador, oppose increased military spending, etc. Their reasons for opposing nuclear power are scientifically weak, but they state them with an hysterical urgency in order to scare the living daylights out of a gullible public.

They contend that nuclear power plants are unsafe. They point to Three Mile Island as an example of what can happen. But they fail to point out that not a

single person was killed at Three Mile Island nor were any homes damaged. The only damage done at Three Mile Island was done internally to the plant itself. No one working in the plant was injured by the accident.

The simple truth is that nuclear power is probably the safest, cleanest, and most efficient form of energy production devised by science. The operational safety record of the nuclear power industry is an outstanding achievement. That doesn't mean that accidents can't happen or won't happen. It doesn't mean that there are no risks involved in using nuclear energy. But it does mean that cheap electrical power can be safely produced by harnessing the

atom.

The advantages of nuclear power are obvious. It will help us cut down our dependence of fossil fuels, reduce air pollution, and help us achieve energy independence. These are important benefits that make the risks of using nuclear power worth taking.

What are the risks? Possible radiation leakages should a plant be destroyed. A nuclear power plant cannot explode like a bomb because its components are not put together like a bomb. Therefore, while possible radiation leakages, due to catastrophic damage, pose a risk, the overall risk to the population is considerably less than the risks we accept every day in using fire in our homes, driving cars, crossing streets, flying airplanes, riding subways, smoking cigarettes, drinking alcohol, taking medications, getting X-rays, undergoing surgery, etc. Modern life is full of risks, but the risks involved with the use of nuclear power are so remote that one can hardly use them as legitimate reasons to give up the benefits provided by such power.

The "No Nuke" people not only want us to stop building new atomic plants; they want us to start closing down the plants already in operation. At the same time, they argue, we must get rid of all of our nuclear weapons in order to avoid a nuclear holocaust. What about the Russians? They contend that the Russians will destroy their weapons after we've destroyed ours. But, of course, they can't guarantee that this will happen. But they argue, that's a risk we must take if there is to be lasting peace. To the "No Nukers" the real risk of Communist enslavement is preferable to the remote risk of radiation leakages.

The nuclear power industry does have problems, but these problems are quite soluble by today's technology. Much has been learned about nuclear power during the last thirty years. If we can make nuclear power even safer and more efficient than it's already been, we shall not only have learned from our mistakes, but also reached higher levels of technological development.

South Boston Marshal - June 18, 1981

## Israel Sounds Nuclear Alarm

By SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD

Israel's pre-emptive strike against Iraq's nuclear facility near Baghdad was an act of great daring, courage, and intelligence. It eliminated in one fell swoop the threat of nuclear holocaust in the volatile Middle East and it has given the nations in that area a few more years of breathing space in which to consider the possibilities of peace instead of nuclear war.

The attack was amazingly skillful. "The central building is entirely collapsed," said one of the French technicians who flew back to Paris. "The atomic reactor is unreachable and the antiradiation shield has disappeared." The Frenchman also reported that one of the bombs did not explode, thereby making it impossible to rebuild the reactor without first destroying everything that remains. The technician complimented the Israelis on their skill. "The precision of the attack was stupefying. The Israelis chose their hour perfectly to avoid the maximum of losses of human life."

It was expected that the world would condemn Israel for its "aggression." But is a pre-emptive strike aggression? If you know that your enemy is preparing to destroy you, must you wait until he attacks first before fighting back? The pre-emptive strike is Israel's best way of defending itself against destruction. Being a tiny country with long vulnerable frontiers and mortal enemies, it has no choice but to strike first if it is to survive.

We all know what happened

when Israel permitted itself to be caught by surprise by Syria and Egypt in 1973. That two-week war cost Israel proportionately more casualties than the entire ten-year Vietnam War cost the Americans. Unlike the United States, Israel cannot afford long, passive, fruitless military operations that squander resources, drain the will, cripple the morale of its soldiers, and end in defeat. So we ought not to judge Israeli military strategy by American standards.

Israel has also awakened the world to the dangers of nuclear proliferation—particularly among small countries with ambitious dictators. Apparently, some Western atomic powers have decided to ignore all the danger signals when it comes to selling nuclear know-how. John Phillips, the Princeton student who wrote a paper on how to build an atomic bomb, was interviewed on TV recently. He told of how he had been approached by a Pakistani who wanted to buy his plan. He reported the incident to the FBI. He had no doubt that Iraq was building an atomic bomb with French technical help. "France is the whore of nuclear proliferation," he said bluntly.

Israel's attack against the Iraqi nuclear plant is merely a preview of things to come in the world of nuclear proliferation among smaller unstable nations. If we cannot stop madmen from getting the bomb, then the present reign of terrorism in the world will seem like a picnic compared to what will come in the not too distant future.

South Boston Marshal  
August 1981

# Greed As A Noble Cause

By SAMUEL I. BLUMENFELD

If the air controllers have not been able to arouse much sympathy from the American public, it's because of their greed. True, they have yelled a lot about air safety and stress on the job. But when they are asked why they broke the law and actually went out on strike, they always return to the issue of money. They want a \$10,000 raise in pay across the board, a 32-hour work week, and earlier retirement benefits. They thought that by holding the nation's air transport system hostage, they could get away with such exorbitant demands.

The President did what he had to do: order the men back to work and fire those who refused to do so. If he hadn't done this, the government would begin falling apart with strike after strike of federal employees. There would be no end to the chaos and disruptions such strikes would cause. If the air controllers were truly concerned with air safety, they would have never walked off their jobs to begin with.

The Canadian air controllers have been the most hypocritical of all. In the name of safety they forced plane-loads of people to circle aimlessly in the air for hours. They forced other planes in the middle of the Atlantic to return to their points of origin. It's a wonder an accident didn't occur in the middle of all that confusion. Now the Portuguese have threatened to close down their air control stations on the Azores. These are the same controllers who gave us the world's worst air disaster involving the collision of two 747 jumbo jets on the ground!

It is no surprise that the strikers have not gotten the support of the rank and file members of organized labor. One union man told me, "No union should be permitted to run this country." The air controllers made the mistake of showing that their loyalty to their union was stronger than their

loyalty to the government that hired them, trained them, and paid their salaries. They made the mistake of showing that the no-strike pledge they signed when they took the job was nothing but a scrap of paper.

One of the reasons why the taxpayers are willing to support a government-run air traffic system is because this vital service is protected by no-strike laws that guarantee against stoppages and disruptions. And some of the reasons why civil servants like working for the government are because they are paid well, have job security, are provided with excellent medical plans and get generous retirement benefits.

But the air controllers have convinced themselves that they are different, a breed apart who should be pampered and catered to. So they rejected the FAA's offer of a \$4,000 raise, a 38-hour work week, plus other benefits. They wanted much, much more.

It's amazing that 12,000 supposedly responsible middle class, well-educated men and women could talk themselves into disregarding their own signed oaths and become fanatics for greed. It's a peculiar form of fanaticism based on an inflated sense of self-importance and the perverted need to bite the hand that feeds you.

When Reagan urged them to return to work or face firing, they should have known better than to test the will of a strong and popular President. But, blinded by their fanaticism, they were unable to heed the warning.

The tragedy is that many of the controllers who have lost their jobs only stayed out because of peer pressure. Which makes me believe that any union that rules its members by fear and fanaticism ought not to be permitted to exist. We don't need the Jonestown mentality among our air traffic controllers.



## Terror And Assassination

By SAMUEL I. BLUMENFELD

It is no small coincidence that the world's three most important anti-communist leaders — Ronald Reagan, Pope John Paul, and Anwar Sadat — have all been the target of assassins within less than twelve months. And it is no small coincidence that all of the assassins have been connected with international terrorist and fringe organizations.

The young man who shot at President Reagan had been a member of the American Nazi Party, a tiny group of misfits who parade around in Nazi uniforms shouting "Seig Heil" like characters out of a surrealistic movie. The American Nazi Party is part of a world-wide network of such groups that engage in openly provocative activities that tend to discredit anti-communism. All of which suggests that the communists may be the moving force behind these activities.

After all, it is not very difficult for communist agents to rent a few Nazi uniforms from a theatrical costume house and create at little cost the useful impression that Nazism is alive and well in the 1980's. And it certainly isn't difficult for clever communist agents to manipulate the misfits who are drawn to such groups by the inordinate media publicity they get.

The young Turkish terrorist who tried to kill the Pope belonged to a fringe group in Turkey identified as ultra-rightist. But the young Turk had no trouble traveling from ultra right groups to ultra left groups, suggesting that both groups are controlled or manipulated by one central command.

The assassins of President Sadat of Egypt are also associated with a tiny far-out group of fanatics,

— supposedly Islamic. Not much is known about them, but they could very well have been organized and encouraged by Soviet agents to get rid of the communists' number one enemy in the Arab world, Anwar Sadat. They could have also been helped by the demented leader of Libya, who provides international terrorism with its safest haven.

And we should not forget that there is considerable evidence that Lee Harvey Oswald, who lived in the Soviet Union for two years, was working for Fidel Castro when he murdered Pres. Kennedy.

In other words, it is becoming clearer every day that international terrorism has become an important weapon of the Soviets in their war against the West. They want to get rid of the Polish Pope in order to demoralize the Poles, and they particularly wanted to get rid of Sadat because he was the only Arab leader actively helping

the rebels in Afghanistan fight the Russians.

The Soviets are in Afghanistan to stay. It may take them ten, twenty, even fifty years to absorb Afghanistan, but they are prepared for the long haul because the conquest of Afghanistan is part of their objective to reach the Indian Ocean. And as any student of Russian history knows, the Russians have been trying for centuries to obtain a warm water outlet for their huge empire. The route they have chosen is through Afghanistan. Once they have consolidated their hold over Afghanistan and made it into a Soviet Socialist Republic, they will head southward toward the sea — through Baluchistan, which straddles both Iran and Pakistan.

And what can the West do about it? We can supply the Afghani with weapons they need to stop the Russians in their tracks.

# Reaganomics Is Working

By SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD

It's obvious that the Democrats have wanted President Reagan's economic policies to fail. They have been talking about the failure of Reaganomics since day one of the administration. Every downward turn in the economy, every plant layoff has been media-hyped into the start of a new Great Depression.

But the truth is that we won't know the full story of Reaganomics for at least a year. That's how long it will take for Reagan's policies to begin having their desired effects on the economy.

Meanwhile, President Reagan is being blamed for growing unemployment. But in what sectors have the layoffs been most prevalent? In those that compete

with Japanese imports. The American consumer is still buying Japanese cars in record numbers despite the high interest rates in auto loans. He is still buying Japanese TV sets, typewriters, cassette players, stereo equipment, etc., despite the pleas of American labor to buy American.

Ralph Nader and his gang have been waging war against the American auto industry for years, and the American consumer has come to believe that Detroit's products are unsafe, unreliable, shoddily made, and overpriced. The result has been a massive consumer turnaway from the domestic product. Yet, have you ever heard a labor leader denounce Ralph Nader as being even partially responsible for the lack of patriotism in American auto

buyers?

There is not much that President Reagan can do to restore American confidence in American products. Only the companies and unions can do this themselves, and there is no indication on the part of American labor leaders that they are prepared to do anything else than price themselves out of the market, press for import quotas, or simply blame the President for their problems.

If American labor wants to restore American confidence in its workmanship, it had better start cooperating with management in ways to make American products the world's best. There is simply no other way to overcome the Japanese competition or counter the Nader negativism. Nader's

(Cont'd on Page 9)

December, 1981 THE SOUTH BOSTON MARSHAL Page 9

# Reaganomics Is Working

(Cont'd from Page 1)

attacks on American corporations are attacks on American labor as well, for the prosperity of American labor depends on the good fortunes of these corporations.

Meanwhile, Reaganomics has already done what Carter could not do: slow down the inflation rate. This alone has saved Americans billions in costs. It has restored confidence abroad in the American dollar. The deregulation

of gasoline has ended the fuel crisis without increasing fuel costs. This is another important Reagan success that the Democrats ignore. The Reagan successes are enjoyed by all Americans but given little publicity. Instead, the media spends week after week worrying about Stockman's doubts, Richard Allen's \$1,000, and PATCO's whining.

But the signs are good. Investors have decided that Reagan is serious about stopping inflation,

and the stock market is beginning to feel the effect. Defense industries will soon begin hiring a lot of the unemployed at top wage scales. The \$200-billion defense budget will create an enormous amount of economic activity, and the further deregulation of the energy industry will permit the market to solve the energy crisis. We have a lot to be thankful for in this first year of the Reagan administration: a stronger, more confident America. And this is only the beginning!

## Poland And The American Response

By **SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD**

Poland has traditionally considered itself an integral part of Western civilization. Its people are overwhelmingly Roman Catholic, its culture is based on Western values. It wants to be a Western democracy like France or West Germany. Yet its people must suffer to live under a communist dictatorship totally subservient to Soviet Russia.

It is interesting to remember that both Britain and France declared war on Nazi Germany in 1939 when the latter invaded Poland. Russia invaded Poland at the same time from the east. Hitler and Stalin had secretly agreed to partition Poland, yet the Allies declared war on

Germany only. The Allies were in no position to stop Germany or help Poland, but they declared war anyway because they could no longer accept Germany's flagrant expansionism.

We now know how woefully unprepared the British and French were to fight against Germany, and it was this appalling lack of preparation that resulted in the catastrophic fall of France and a year-long siege of Britain.

Forty years later, Poland is still a captive nation yearning for freedom. But the West can do little more than complain to the Soviets and impose sanctions. The latter are more symbolic than real, but to the Poles they are an important signal saying that we in

the West care and that we oppose Soviet oppression.

But is that enough to ward off a growing communist threat to freedom not only in Poland but everywhere else? We have read a lot about the impending disintegration of the Soviet empire. But all of that is wishful thinking. The Soviet empire is stronger militarily than it's ever been. It has consolidated its hold over Afghanistan, Yemen, the Horn of Africa, and it is making substantial gains in Central America. It is in the process of neutralizing Western Europe by its threat of nuclear destruction.

The West seems unable to score a single significant win over the communists anywhere. Why? Because the communists use the salami tactic. Each gain they make seems too small for us to go to war over. But they all add up, and soon they may have an irreversible advantage over us.

Notice how used we have gotten to the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan. No sanctions, no calls for withdrawal, no aid to the Afghanistani freedom fighters. Our defeat in Vietnam has turned us into pacifists and defeatists.

What the United States needs very badly is a victory somewhere. It need not be a big victory, but enough of a victory to rekindle a sense of confidence in our ability to win. Whether we like it or not, we are still the leader of the free world. Soviet oppression in Poland will make American leadership more important, more needed than ever. Our response must be strong, it must be effective. Only then will the countries of the free world rally behind us, for without us they will all in time become Polands.

# The Reagan Budget

By **SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD**

To understand President Reagan's 1983 budget proposal, you have to first understand what's been happening to federal spending for the last twenty years. In 1960 Uncle Sam spent \$76.5 billion to run the government. In 1970, a mere ten years later, that figure almost tripled to \$194.9 billion. And ten years later, in 1980, federal spending tripled again to a whopping \$579 billion.

By then Congress had lost complete control over federal spending. It had enacted so many entitlement programs that the budget had become a locomotive going full-speed down-hill with no brakes. The momentum is now so great that President Reagan has been unable to do much more than merely slow down the rate of growth just a little. And that is why his 1983 budget has reached a new high of \$757 billion, with a projected deficit of \$98.6 billion.

When you consider that the federal budget in 1939-40 was a piddling \$9 billion, you wonder how it was able to reach 84 times that amount in 1983. In 1939, a hotdog cost a nickel and so did a phone call. If the price of these two items had risen in cost as much as the federal government, we'd be paying \$4.20 for a hot dog or a phone call today. Nothing in America has gone up in cost like the federal government!

And yet even the smallest attempt to slow down the growth of government spending has produced so much liberal yelling and screaming that the President can barely be heard above the protests. Plans are being made

for marches on Washington to keep the federal locomotive careening toward the trillion mark.

How did we ever get into this spending spiral? It was President Johnson who thought that he could solve all of America's social problems by passing laws that authorized a flood of spending. A liberal Congress went along with the scheme. In four short years, LBJ's budget went from \$97.9 in 1964 to \$186 billion in 1968.

The result has been a burgeoning bureaucracy, rampant inflation, growing deficits, over-regulation of the economy, and back-breaking taxes. The federal government has grown much too big, much too involved with anything and everything; and Reagan won the election on the pledge that he would bring the runaway locomotive under control and slow it down to a reasonable rate of growth.

Can it be done? Only if the American people want it to be done. So far, Pres. Reagan has made a good start. He's brought

down inflation, cut some government spending, and given the taxpayer some badly needed relief. The tax cut is an important component of the President's plan, for only a reduction in tax receipts will convince Congress that it must help slow down federal growth. It must realize that there is a limit to how much they can tax us.

The budget deficit stands like a monument to Congress's irresponsible spendthrift practices. Naturally Congress wants to raise taxes to cover the deficit. But this would be the cowardly way out, and Reagan knows it.

It is time for Congress to realize that it must change its ways, that it must help the President carry out his long-range program of reducing the size of the federal government, of cutting taxes, of returning powers to the states, of encouraging business and production, of maintaining peace through strength. Let the critics say what they will. The simple truth is that the President's program is the only one that has a chance of saving us from economic chaos, social demoralization, and military defeat.



March 1982

## The Communist Military Threat

By SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD

The United States is now militarily in its most dangerous state of weakness since World War II. Communist countries all over the world are engaged in massive military buildups which can only mean more aggressive Communist expansionism in the future. Cuba has already contributed troops and equipment to help Communists in Nicaragua, Ethiopia, Angola, Yemen, and elsewhere to consolidate the Red stranglehold over these nations. Communist governments are always weak infants in their early stages because they create increasing opposition among the people they are in the process of subjugating. There is always the threat of a counterrevolutionary coup as in Chile. That is why Cuban help was so crucial in Ethiopia and Angola. It enabled the communists in these countries to hold on to their power and destroy the opposition.

The great arsenal for communism is the Soviet Union, which has the largest military production system on earth. It is supplying sophisticated arms and weapons of every description to communist governments all over the world. What is the purpose of all their military preparations? The answer is very simple: to wage war.

The communists are at war with capitalism, and they will not stop until they have destroyed every existing capitalist society. World conquest has always been the ultimate goal of the international communist movement, and the United States has always been

considered by the communists to be the chief obstacle to their total triumph. Therefore, if they can neutralize or paralyze us, they will have won the world.

Yet the American people seem blind to the danger facing them. A national debate goes on daily as to whether or not we should help the Salvadoreans defend themselves against a communist takeover. It seems like Vietnam all over again. The "rebels" are portrayed by the media generally in a positive light, while the Duarte government, like the Thieu regime in South Vietnam, is characterized as corrupt and repressive. Nicaragua has become the North Vietnam of Central America, supplying arms and tactical help to the rebels while, in turn, receiving supplies from the Cubans and Russians. A veritable Soviet invasion of Central America is taking place by proxy, and Americans argue over whether our ten advisors may carry rifles to defend themselves.

Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, in his famous Harvard speech, commented on the West's tendency to delude itself when interpreting the contemporary world situation. "It works as a sort of petrified armor around people's minds," he said. "Human voices from 17 countries of Eastern Europe and Asia cannot pierce it. It will only be broken by the pitiless crowbar of events."

Must we wait until bombs are dropped on our heads before we decide to stem the communist tide? We lost in Vietnam because we had no realistic or realizable military goal. We did not want to

carry the war to North Vietnam where the enemy could have been destroyed because we were afraid of what the Russians or Chinese would do. Yet we did everything to help the Russians and their eastern satellites build up their economies. We thought that sacrificing 50,000 young Americans would do something. It did nothing because we carried on business as usual with the Russians while their weapons were destroying our men. We cannot have it both ways. We cannot fight communists and help them at the same time and expect to win. So the west extends credits to the Reds hoping that they will give up their global ambitions and behave. Instead, we get an invasion of Afghanistan, a crackdown in Poland, a takeover in Nicaragua, a civil war in El Salvador and ominous warnings of worse things to come.

But fortunately we have a new President who understands the communist threat and is determined to do something about it. Most important of all, he understands why we lost in Vietnam. It is taking time for Americans to adjust to this new tougher stand. They are still not convinced that we need the military buildup the president has asked for. But "the pitiless crowbar of events" is beginning to break through our complacency. If we don't act, we shall see boat people by the millions streaming from Central America to our shores. But when and if we decide to act, we should mobilize our efforts for victory, and that must include withholding aid of any kind for any communist state.

# Why Interest Rates Are High

By SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD

A lot of people are confused about interest rates. They want to know why they are so high and why they can't be lowered by some decree of the President or by the head of the Federal Reserve System. The reason for the present interest rates is very simple: more people want to borrow more money than there is available to lend out. The interest rate is simply the price of money, and when there is a shortage of lendable money with lots of people clamoring to borrow, the price goes up. It's the old story of supply and demand.

In such a situation, the people who do borrow money are those who really need it and can afford to pay for it. The others who can't afford it simply put off borrowing, postpone their plans, sell some assets, or find some other way to raise the needed funds. Some companies, in desperate cash-flow situations, go bankrupt.

Meanwhile, those who have money can make a lot of money lending it out. This includes people with savings accounts, pension funds, retirement funds, or those in good cash-flow situations. Apparently there is no shortage of borrowers out there willing to pay top dollar for money. This creates a tremendous incentive for people with savings to lend them out.

There is, of course, a way that the Federal Reserve can lower the cost of money to satisfy everyone who wants to borrow: print more money. But this would simply increase the cost of everything else. Cheap money would drive the

price of goods and services upward—this is what we call inflation—because now there would be more buyers chasing fewer goods. You can never escape the law of supply and demand. Even OPEC has learned that lesson.

So what is worse, inflation or high interest rates? I would say inflation is worse because it destroys the value of the money we have worked for and saved, it forces us out of paper money into gold, gems, real estate, collectibles, etc. It makes it foolish to save money, encourages borrowing, destroys our trust in our currency. It wipes out those on fixed incomes and creates monetary chaos.

High interest rates, on the other hand, sober us up. They discourage us from borrowing and make it profitable to save. They stabilize prices and, in many cases, lower them. They force us to work harder and become more productive to increase our earning power.

The reason why the transition from an inflationary economy to a price-stable one is so painful is because during inflation everyone goes into debt and nobody saves. We borrow to buy assets which we intend to pay off with cheaper money. (Aren't we smart, we think.) This creates a climate of dishonesty and rip-off in which the biggest gainers seem to be those who can rip off the most. It creates a vested interest in continued inflation.

Suddenly, when the printing presses are slowed down and people must pay a more realistic

price for money, those who borrowed the most during inflation are the hardest hit, because now they must repay their loans with ~~less~~ money. And if their cash flow is poor, they'll have to borrow more money at high interest rates to pay off loans they made under inflationary conditions. This has led to massive bankruptcies of weak companies. When companies go out of business, a lot of people have to find other ways to earn a living.

While high interest rates are keeping many of us from borrowing money or using our credit cards, the Federal Government must continue to borrow because for the last twenty years Congress has been acting like a rich uncle with a soft brain, dispensing more benefits than people can even use. Unfortunately, the taxpayer can no longer afford to pay for all of Uncle Sam's follies. So Congress is in a bind. It doesn't want to reduce the benefits to its constituents who include artists, dancers, public television stations, college students, professors, scientists, farmers, businessmen, and the rest. It doesn't want to stop playing rich uncle.

It is Congress that stands in the way of economic recovery. It would prefer to crank up the printing presses than bite the bullet of budget cuts. It prefers to tax, borrow, and spend than cut its precious programs that have built empires for bureaucrats.

The question is: will the American people support President Reagan in his effort to kill inflation, stabilize the value of our money, cut government spending and lower taxes? Or are they so addicted to easy credit, high taxes, massive public subsidies, and runaway consumer prices that they can't kick the inflationary habit? We'll know the answer in November.

# How To Eliminate Poverty And Retire Rich

By SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD

For years we Americans have been relying on bureaucracies to cure our nation's social problems. And the larger the bureaucracies get, the worse the problems become. Why? Because no bureaucracy wants to work itself out of a job, so it manages to perpetuate the problem rather than solve it.

A case in point is Title One of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which for the last 17 years has provided funding for compensatory education in 17,000 school districts across the nation. What has been the result? Reading scores are worse than ever, and academic standards have taken a nose dive. Seventeen years and about 68 billion dollars later we are no nearer to improving the academic skills of American students than we were in 1965.

The reason why schemes like Title One do not work is because we give the money to the bureaucracy to spend instead of directly to the people who need the improvement. If we rewarded children who succeeded academically with a nice cash prize, you'd see a lot of kids suddenly becoming interested in academics. They'd find a way to learn if the cash incentive was large enough.

In the matter of old-age retirement, we've created a government controlled social security system which has collected billions from American workers but which is now on the brink of bankruptcy. Social security has produced a lot of social insecurity.

May I suggest a better plan to deal with the problem of old-age.

Why doesn't the U.S. government place \$1,000 in a private

IRA trust account for each newborn child in the U.S. and let the money accumulate compounded interest at a rate of, say, 10% a year until that individual has reached the age of 65. At that age the person would have about \$490,000 in the account for his retirement. He could pay back the government \$10,000 and live very nicely off the yearly interest earned by the account, paying taxes on whatever money was drawn out.

Such a system would have enormous benefits for the economy and it would cost the federal government a mere \$4 billion a year -- the price of one nuclear aircraft carrier or the cost of Title One for one year. It would provide the economy with a large pool of lendable capital, eliminate the need for social security payments by these individuals thereby lowering their tax burden, solve the problems of the aged by making them all rich, providing them with wealth that could be passed on to their heirs.

It would also give Americans a vested interest in economic growth and stability to insure that inflation did not destroy the value of their IRA accounts.

While the scheme would not solve the problem of poverty during the pre-retirement years, it would solve it over the long run by building family estates that could be passed on to future generations thus breaking the

cycle of poverty.

A retirement system of this kind would require a minimum of bureaucracy. An account for a newborn child could be opened at any private financial institution authorized to handle such accounts. Once the U.S. government made its initial deposit of \$1,000 it would have no further supervision of the account. The bank would automatically pay back the government when the beneficiary reached 65.

Meanwhile, the beneficiary would receive periodic statements on interest earnings. It might even be possible for the bank to lend money to the beneficiary secured by the account itself. In short, there is no end to the possibilities of such a retirement system.

Its greatest benefit, however, would be psychological. It would eliminate the fear of growing old, permit senior citizens to enjoy their retirement and give all of us something wonderful to look forward to: a jackpot at the end of the rainbow.

If you think that this plan makes sense, cut it out and send it to your congressman or President Reagan. Who knows? They might agree with you.

## The Future Of Lebanon

By SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD

It is not yet clear what Israel will be able to accomplish by its invasion of Lebanon. But if it succeeds in restoring Lebanon as a sovereign country free of the PLO and the Syrians, it will have accomplished a great deal. It was Lebanon's misfortune not to have been able to prevent the PLO from taking over that country and using it as a base of operations against Israel. But it is clear now that Lebanese would like nothing better than to get rid of the terrorists who have brought nothing but bloodshed and destruction to what used to be known as the Switzerland of the Middle East.

But where can the PLO go? Jordan doesn't want them. Neither do the Syrians. Lebanon was the most convenient place for them to be—close enough to Israel, but out of the Arab countries. Jordan fought a bloody civil war to get rid of them in 1970, but Lebanon has been too weak to expel them. Besides, the only direction the PLO could go was toward Syria. So Syria marched into Lebanon to make sure that the PLO stayed where they were.

Lebanon is a half-Christian, half-Moslem country in which both religious communities have

lived side by side for generations. It was a social equilibrium based on common sense and a philosophy of live and let live. But the invasion and occupation by the PLO changed all of that.

The PLO has been the major destabilizing force in the Middle East since its formation. It would have never acquired its power to do so much damage if it had not been financially supported for years by Saudi Arabia, the Soviet Union, and Libya. But it is hard to see how they can survive this Israeli move to dislodge them. But it is also hard to imagine that they are going to melt away. Much will depend on whether or not they are offered "refuge" by the Syrians. If they can find no other host country close to Israel, they may yet survive as an organized terrorist force in Libya or Iran. But their days in Lebanon seem to be numbered.

While the PLO terrorists have gotten lots of moral support from Third World and Arab countries and military support from the communists, they are really not loved by anyone. Having seen what they've done to Lebanon as "guests," no one is eager to invite them anywhere. They were merely used by Israel's enemies as a means of harming Israel. They are pawns in the political game.

It will be interesting to see what Syria does. We suspect that Syria went into Lebanon to make it ultimately part of a Greater Syria. The Lebanese had invited the Syrians in during the civil war to help them get rid of the PLO and restore Lebanese control. But the Syrians did just the opposite. They protected the PLO from the Lebanese in order to keep the country in a continued state of division and turmoil, thus justifying their continued presence.

Now the Lebanese realize that they will never be able to restore Lebanese sovereignty until both the PLO and the Syrians are expelled. But the PLO must be disarmed and demobilized first. Otherwise the Syrians will never leave.

Lebanon has been the unwitting victim of Middle East power politics. It has been obvious for a long time now that Israel is the only power willing and able to help Lebanon free itself of its unwanted guests so that it can once more be sovereign in its own land. It must be hoped that Israel will be permitted to complete this important task. If it is not, then the PLO will continue to make life miserable for Lebanon indefinitely.



# Israel And The Media

By SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD

The American media's treatment of Israel in its efforts to free Lebanon of the PLO is indeed strange to behold. Sympathy is clearly with the PLO even though that terrorist organization is as much an enemy of the United States as it is of Israel.

Southern Lebanon under the PLO had become a training ground for world terrorism of which the U.S. is a prime target. The Israelis captured about 2,000 non-Palestinian trainees serving with the PLO in Sidon. Evidence was also found showing that the PLO has links to 33 different guerrilla organizations throughout the world. Yet the American media has shown little interest in these sensational findings.

Instead, the media has concentrated ad nauseam on the

bombing and shelling of West Beirut where the PLO has hidden its military forces behind innocent civilians. The PLO has literally high-jacked West Beirut, but the media concentrates on the heart-breaking scenes of wounded civilians. The inference is that Israel is to blame for the tragedy, but that the PLO terrorists who refuse to leave West Beirut are innocent of any responsibility.

What accounts for the simplistic bias of the American media? Part of the problem is the very nature of the television media itself which thrives on visual shock and is least able to deal with the complexities of what is going on in that part of the world.

Then there is the bias of the reporters themselves who seem to have discovered that "war is

hell" and are determined to convey this message over and over at the expense of all intellectual curiosity about how and why this particular war got started. So they drag their TV cameras and lights and mikes into hospitals to get as much visual shock as possible. Questions in depth about anything are never asked.

For example, one TV reporter interviewed a PLO "fighter" in West Beirut who readily admitted that the goal of the PLO was to destroy the state of Israel. All Jews who had come to Israel after 1948 would have to leave, he said. The reporter didn't blink an eyelash at what the PLO "fighter" was telling him. He just went on to the next topic. It would have been interesting to question the PLO further on its plans for Israel.

And certainly the PLO takes its plans very seriously. They had built an incredible military force on Israel's northern border and there is no doubt that they intended to use it.

Then there is the strange case of John Chancellor of NBC News talking about "imperial Israel" the other day in his report from Lebanon. According to Chancellor, Israel is now "imperial" because it is fighting more than fifty miles away from its border. A strange new definition of "imperial" indeed. Forget about the fact that Israel gave back the Sinai to Egypt only a few months ago -- a territory larger than Israel itself. In America some people drive more than fifty miles just to go to the beach or the movies or to work. But if Israel pursues its deadly enemies more than fifty miles to its nest of operations, it becomes "imperial".

In a way Chancellor's ignorance of history or military tactics is characteristic of the average media reporter. When the ignorant try to interpret the important events of current history, you get superficial reportage, unfair bias, and sheer misinformation. The result is an American public made doubly ignorant by the ignoramuses who run their own media.



## What Happens Next?

By SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD

The expulsion of the PLO from Lebanon is one of the most important military victories for the West since the end of World War II. Yet the Israelis, who made it happen, are being portrayed more as villains than heroes, and Yassir Arafat is being hailed as the victor. The Lebanese, who suffered under PLO tyranny for the last ten years, have been forgotten. But the Palestinian cause is being pushed by the Reagan administration as if it were the world's most urgent problem.

Reagan defined the crux of the Arab-Israeli problem as the "homelessness" of the Palestinian people. It's surprising that after losing their war against Israel in 1948 -- some 34 years ago -- the displaced Palestinians, many of whom have passed on to the next world, have not been able to find a "home" in the millions of square miles of Arab territory that stretches from the Atlantic to the Indian Ocean. The only "home" they'll settle for is that tiny piece of land now occupied by Israel. When Arafat left Beirut, he told well-wishers, "I am leaving this city, but my heart will always be in Beirut."

As the saying goes, home is where the heart is.

What do the Palestinians want? What they really want is the destruction of Israel and the creation of a PLO state in all of Israel's territory. But they know they can't get that. So they'll settle **now** for a PLO state in the West Bank area and work at getting the rest later on. Israel knows this and therefore refuses to agree to a PLO state of any kind or any arrangement that can lead to a PLO state.

But Reagan believes that a compromise is possible -- the same kind of compromise that led South Vietnam to her destruction. Henry Kissinger got a Nobel Peace Prize for that compromise agreement that wasn't worth the paper it was written on. But he persuaded the South Vietnamese to sign it in the hope that the Communists would live up to it. They didn't. And when the South Vietnamese were being overrun by the Communists, we took off from the roof of our embassy in Saigon and said "so long suckers".

Had we exerted against North Vietnam the same kind of military pressure that Israel exerted against the PLO and Syrians in Beirut, history would have been

written differently. Instead, the U.S. lost its nerve and settled for a dishonest compromise -- a piecemeal sellout that resulted in catastrophe for our ally.

The U.S. can afford to compromise because what we do in Southeast Asia or in the Middle East does not affect the lives of Americans on their own soil. We don't feel the consequences of our actions. But others do. And their suffering is no joke.

But even in our own hemisphere we've lacked the will and backbone to do what should have been done long ago. For twenty years we've tolerated a communist Cuba to where it has become a dagger pointed at America's throat. But do we dare do anything against Cuba?

I suppose if Castro started lobbing rockets at Florida we'd return in kind. But Castro is too smart to jeopardize Communism's most strategic advanced military base. He's no Yassir Arafat.

It would be wonderful to have peace in the Middle East. But the Arab-Israeli conflict is not the only conflict in the area. There is Iraq against Iran, North Yemen against South Yemen, Egypt against Libya, Russia against Afghanistan, Armenians against Turks, and other intramural conflicts.

# Is This Election A Referendum On Reaganomics?

By SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD

Political analysts agree that, in a midterm election, the party in the White House usually loses seats in Congress. So if the election on November 2 is anything like those in the past, we can expect Democrats to gain and Republicans to lose.

Naturally the Democrats will claim such a victory as a no-confidence vote on Reaganomics. We shall have to examine the results very carefully before coming to such a conclusion. Certainly, people are concerned about growing unemployment. But they certainly don't want a return to higher inflation, higher taxes, and higher interest rates.

Actually, at this stage of economic development, growing unemployment may not be as negative a sign as it seems. It means that the economy is making the adjustments necessary to curb inflation and get interest rates down. It also means that people must start retraining themselves for work in other fields.

We are going through more than just a slowdown in economic activity. American is also going through a mental retooling, in which it is adjusting to changing conditions in the world marketplace. It seems that Americans are not willing to give up Japanese cars, stereos, or television sets in order to restore American jobs in those industries. Although we can produce all of these products right here in the USA, too many Americans prefer the foreign import.

In fact, many of the liberals complaining about Reaganomics, will drive to the polls in their Volvos, Toyotas, Datsuns, Hondas, Mercedes and BMWs and will watch the election returns

on their Sonys, Panasonics, and Hitachis. If they are as concerned about growing unemployment as they say they are, they have a strange way of showing it.

Actually, the unemployment rate was at about 7% when Reagan took office. Which means that it has risen only 3% as a result of the President's policies. But the good news is that inflation has been cut significantly and interest rates are coming down. In fact, lower inflation has saved the consumer billions of dollars. This is hardly something to sneeze at. Yet Democrat politicians have a way of ignoring Reagan's successes and concentrating on unemployment, the lagging indicator.

And the stock market. American investors know that marvelous things are going to happen in the 80's. Post industrial technology is going to transform America the way industrial technology transformed it eighty years ago. Only the private sector can do this, and that's why American investors are getting back into the stock market.

Reaganomics has created this positive, bullish economic climate for investment. But the Democrats are trying to frighten the country into a depression. A depression the investors with the spectres of higher taxes, runaway government spending, higher inflation and more regulation.

For the last two years Americans have shown that they are willing to swallow strong medicine if it will lead to the recovery of American economic health and strength. The President's motto has been: "Stay the course." Columbus had the same problem in 1492 when his discouraged crew wanted to turn back in the mid-Atlantic. But he persuaded them to "stay the

course." It would be a pity if Americans abandoned their resolve to hang tough and surrendered power to the very politicians who have gotten us in this mess to begin with.

In Massachusetts voters will have a chance to show if they have the strength and fortitude to "stay the course" and reject liberal big spenders and big taxers like Teddy Kennedy, Mike Dukakis, Joe Moakley and Barney Frank. Will they do so? We shall know soon enough.

# The Best Of Times

By **SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD**

There are generally two ways to look at the world: either as an optimist, or a pessimist. An optimist accentuates the positive and rejects the negative. He sees rain as needed moisture for abundant crops, snow as serene beauty, and disaster as a blessing in disguise. Each day is full of possibility and pleasure, beauty and growth.

The pessimist is just the opposite. He sees the cup as half-empty, not half-full. He harps on the ten percent who are unemployed and forgets the ninety percent who are earning money, buying cars, taking vacations.

For the last half year, Americans have been subjected to a propaganda blitz to make them see America in its most negative terms. The six o'clock news, the liberal press, the PBS documentaries have brought us an endless parade of calamity and catastrophe: the jobless, the homeless, the hungry, the imprisoned.

All of this was done to convince Americans that their lot was indeed depressing, their economy miserable, their lives pretty near hopeless. They were urged to change all of that by voting for the Democrats.

It would have been a miracle if

the Democrats had not made the gains they did in this midterm election. But they hardly made the kind of gains their campaign of negativism was supposed to produce. In fact, the nation seemed to say, "Let's give Reaganomics a little more time." And why not? Inflation is down, interest rates are coming down, the stock market is bullish. Things are going in the right direction.

True, we aren't out of the economic recession yet, but we are nowhere near a depression. In a depression people will take any kind of work they can get. This is not the case in our country where many menial jobs go begging while the unemployed collect their benefits or earn money by working under the table.

Nor are Americans clamoring for a return to New Deal welfarism or make-work jobs programs. The average wage earner is now a lot more sophisticated than his counterpart in the 1930's: he uses a checking account, charge plates, and credit cards. He is interested in condos, stocks, IRAs, money funds, etc. He may even have set up a trust fund for his kids. He rarely belongs to a union or believes that he is in conflict with his employer. Many workers own homes, cars, campers, summer cottages, and even stock in the companies they work for.

People in America are becoming economically educated. They read The Wall Street Journal, which is now the largest

national newspaper in the country. They subscribe to dozens of financial newspapers, magazines and newsletters. They attend investment seminars by the droves, and many even have stock brokers.

Television may have brought Vietnam and the siege of Beirut into the living room. But it has also brought the stock market, Wall Street Week, and daily gold prices into the living room as well.

America is undergoing a vast and profound change in its economy. The smokestack industries are giving way to cheaper foreign competition, while new computer technology is creating new information industries. The personal computer is giving tremendous economic potential to the individual at very low cost. There is no doubt that it will lead to the growth of many small businesses and greater economic decentralization.

The future is unfolding before our very eyes, despite the negativism of left-wing journalists and sociologists. While Russia is still wedded to the 19th century through the stultifying and obsolete doctrines of Karl Marx, the U.S. is about to leap into the 21st century with an optimism and sense of promise that characterized this nation at the beginning of its great industrialization. What a marvelous time to be alive and to be an American!

## Foxfire: A Beautiful Play About Life's Changes

By SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD

One of the advantages of living in Boston is that you get a chance to see Broadway shows before they actually get to Broadway. As a theater goer you can test your ability to predict a hit or a flop before the New York critics come to their earthshaking verdict. It's good practice for a budding theatre critic.

I'm not exactly a budding critic, but I did get a chance to see Hume Cronyn and Jessica Tandy in "Foxfire" last month, and I had the feeling that the play would be a hit in the Big Apple. At least I wanted it to be a hit because I personally was very moved by the play and totally mesmerized by the sheer perfection of Jessica Tandy's performance.

Cronyn and Tandy are absolute masters of their craft. They create real people going through all of the agonies of life's different stages. They hold up the mirror to us and they illuminate our trials and tribulations in a manner that goes to the essence of existence.

The play is about an old woman (Jessica Tandy) living on a farm in the hills of the Appalachians. Her husband (Hume Cronyn) has been dead for several years, and she is

determined in a quiet way to live out the rest of her life on that farm. Her son (Keith Carradine) is a country-music star who lives in Florida with his wife — "the fastest credit card in the South" — and two small children.

The play opens with a visit from a real estate developer who wants to buy the land. The old woman, of course, does not want to sell. She clings to the old ways, the old values.

Her son, who has come back to the area to give a concert, visits his mother and tries to convince her to leave the old homestead and come live with him and his family in Florida. The old woman resists, until she learns that her son's wife has run off with another man and left Keith to bring up the kids alone.

This is a barebones outline of the plot. But what we see before our eyes is the struggle between the past and the future, old ways and new imperatives, the endless cycle of birth, marriage and death.

Those of us who live in the large cities of the north where old neighborhoods have disappeared know what change is all about. It is painful wherever it happens, wherever old people are displaced

to make way for the new.

The dynamism of American civilization produces vast material changes in a short period of time. In a way we are all nomads migrating hither and thither searching for the future. But it is difficult for old people who cling to the security of a past which no longer exists to constantly adjust to the future. Yet they must.

There is no culture, no part of the globe immune from change. Look at Japan and China. Look at Cambodia where the past was uprooted and stamped out in a space of three years.

At least in America change, for the most part, is for the better. Even when city folk buy homes in the Berkshires and become artisans, they represent progress toward something richer, something better. In this case, the future preserves the richness of the past.

What I also liked about "Foxfire" is that there was no political message hidden between the lines, no editorials: It seemed to tell it like it is, which is what we should expect from an honest play. So, if you get down to New York soon, you might want to see what you missed in Boston. You'll enjoy it.

# In Defense Of Capital Punishment

By SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD

Although Massachusetts now has a law permitting capital punishment, it may be some time before the first convicted murderer is executed in this state. The liberals in the new legislature are out to repeal the law, and the new Governor has long expressed his opposition to the death penalty. So the citizens of Massachusetts may not get the tough-on-crime stance in the new administration they want.

This is unfortunate, because the death penalty is a very essential component in any serious war against criminals. The liberals insist that the death penalty is no deterrent against murder. Yet they forget that an executed murderer is one who will never murder again.

We are all familiar with the recent tragedy in Mattapan where a 40-year-old mother of six was

murdered by a convicted killer who was released on parole. Had the murderer been executed for the first murder, he would have not been around to commit the second.

Another recent tragedy that made headlines was the murder of a young actor in New York's Greenwich Village by a convicted killer who had been released from prison because author Norman Mailer said he was rehabilitated.

How many other people have been murdered by convicted killers pronounced rehabilitated by their advocates, whose interest in the preciousness of human life always seems to bubble over whenever a murderer is sentenced to death?

How many prisoners have been murdered by the killers kept alive and well in American prisons? There are 1,100 men on death row in the United States waiting to be executed. Many of them would kill

again if they were given the opportunity.

It would cost the American taxpayer over a half-billion dollars to keep these killers alive in prison for life. They would have to be treated humanely: clothed, fed, educated and entertained for life, while many honest taxpayers can barely make ends meet. Where is justice in such a system? Should murderers be given material security for life as a reward for their crimes? The victims' families, too, are being taxed to keep these killers in comfort.

It's amazing how many liberals oppose the death penalty on the grounds that it is "taking a precious human life" or "murder". But many of them favor abortion on demand which, in their books, is not murder. If human life is so precious to them, why don't they picket abortion clinics instead of death row?

One solution to the problem might be to let those liberals, who want to support the killers for life, do so on their own without forcing everyone else to do so. They might set up an adopt-a-killer program through which they might lavish their benevolence and affection. After all, organizations that oppose abortion are willing to find good adoptive parents for the unwanted babies.

Some liberal sickos are attracted to murderers for some demented reason. They are the ones who stage candlelight vigils on the night of an execution and sob softly as the switch is pulled. Forget about the rest of suffering humanity. Their devotion to the murderer is clearly a case of misplaced sympathy.

It is this twisted moral logic that has made liberalism so irrational and so unacceptable to anyone who values a humane civilization. Those of us who favor capital punishment do not enjoy the idea of executing anyone. But we understand that civilization imposes responsibilities on all of us, and that those who violate the very essence of civilized behavior cannot expect to be supported for life by those honest, hardworking citizens whose burdens are already difficult enough to bear.



## Can The Communists In Nicaragua Be Overthrown?

By SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD

Of late, "liberal" American journalists have become hysterical over the alleged involvement of the CIA in the efforts of anti-Sandinista Nicaraguans to overthrow the Marxist government in their country. Not only is the CIA being lambasted, but the counter-revolutionaries themselves are being characterized by Tom Wicker in the *New York Times* as "gangsters" or by Pamela Constable in the *Boston Globe* as "disaffected Nicaraguans," even though some of the "disaffected" took part in the struggle to dislodge Somoza. The "disaffected" wanted freedom, not a communist dictatorship.

But it's unthinkable to Wicker or Constable that these men and women who are risking their lives might possibly be "freedom fighters" trying to prevent their country from becoming another brutalized Soviet satellite like Poland or Cuba.

You would think that Tom Wicker and Pamela Constable knew nothing about how Fidel Castro came to power in Cuba and turned that once-free island nation into a communist gulag. You would think that after having seen a half-dozen so-called "people's revolutions" end up as full-fledged communist tyrannies, that Wicker, Constable and colleagues would somehow get the message, see the pattern, understand the techniques of Marxism-Leninism. After all, the Communists consistently use the same techniques over and over again. They are very proud of the fact that Leninist techniques have worked so well all over the world.

The communists know that the imposition of Leninist tyranny creates counterrevolution. In fact, every communist state uses the pretext of counterrevolution to impose its terror more absolutely. Why should Nicaragua be any different?

What is now happening in Nicaragua is a classic example of what happens when the communists consolidate their power. After having gained positions of power through the use and

manipulation of a broad coalition of democratic forces, they can only attain total power for themselves by destroying their former allies or rendering them impotent. They do this internally by terror and concentration camps, accusing the opposition of trying to overthrow the government.

As for the external opposition, made up of exiles and refugees who now form a new anti-communist coalition, the communists turn to the "liberal" press for help. The "liberals" discredit the anti-communists, publish lurid exposes of CIA "secret wars," and destroy the moral credibility of the anti-communist leadership. Sometimes the campaign against the anti-communists can reach hysterical proportions.

Any astute observer of the liberal press would have to assume that there is a conspiracy among "liberal" journalists to make resistance to communism a

crime. And, of course, they also infer that it's insane to help anyone resist communism. If you do, you wind up with another Vietnam or Bay of Pigs on your hands. And Americans certainly don't want that, do they?

And, of course, there are those Congressmen who seem to specialize in thwarting any attempt on the part of the U.S. to help those who wish to resist communism. Rep. Gerry Studds of Massachusetts is one of them. He was quoted in the *Boston Globe* as saying: "The ideologists in this Administration see the world through hopelessly opaque lenses; everything is communism versus the free world. We're lecturing the Sandinistas for not having elections, when we shot Somoza into power with the Marines."

Apparently the Administration believes in democracy for the Nicaraguans, but Studds doesn't. If he does, why doesn't he lecture the Sandinistas?

## Was The Bombing In Beirut A KGB Operation?

The bombing of the U.S. Embassy in Beirut by an Islamic terrorist group was a shocking and horrible deed. But it is nothing new in Lebanon. It was a similar bombing that killed Bechir Gemayel, the young Christian leader who was to become president of Lebanon. It was that bombing that sparked the refugee-camp massacre. And it was another terrorist bombing that destroyed Israeli army headquarters in Tyre with a heavy loss of life.

There is only one thing to do under such circumstances: pick up the pieces and continue to do what has to be done. For Israel it means trying to get a peace treaty with Lebanon and permanent security on her northern border. For Lebanon it means trying to reestablish herself as a sovereign state, free of foreign troops and terrorists. It will not be easy.

Israel is being accused of dragging her feet in the negotiations. But the many complex problems involved simply defy quick solution. To expect Israel to jeopardize the hard gains won at great sacrifice just so that an American diplomat can wave a piece of paper around and proclaim "peace is at hand" is pretty dumb. Henry Kissinger rushed to get a "peace" agreement with the North Vietnamese because of constant media

pressure in the U.S. He brought back a piece of paper that was nothing but a surrender. But the media called it peace. Meanwhile, the killing goes on. (Remember the slogan, "Stop the killing in Vietnam"? Funny, you don't hear it now when it's the communists doing the killing.)

We also helped pull the rug out from under the Shah of Iran because we thought that Iran would get peace and harmony under a new democratic government led by a saintly religious leader. Again, the pressure came from the liberal media to dump the horrible Shah, and again the U.S. government caved in.

Curiously enough the terrorist group that took credit for blowing up the U.S. Embassy claims to be a Khomeini group. The Islamic revolutionaries in Iran have long made it known that they intend to carry their revolution throughout the Islamic world, toppling any government they don't like, meaning any government favorable to the United States.

Meanwhile, the Russians have rebuilt Syria's missile capabilities, creating a new military threat for Israel. The Russians may have lost their PLO base in Lebanon. But they seem determined to remain in Syria and to expand their military presence there. All the more reason

for the United States to assert its presence in Lebanon.

Whether we like it or not we are locked in a life-and-death struggle with the Russians for control of the Persian Gulf. The Russian takeover of Afghanistan puts them only a few hundred miles from the Arabian Sea. All of their strategic moves in the Horn of Africa, in Yemen, in Ethiopia indicate that they are positioning themselves for a major military move toward the Gulf states. When will it come?

It will come when the U.S. is too weak or too irresolute to resist it. A major sign of American weakness would be a loss of will in Lebanon and an abandonment of our commitment to the Lebanese.

The Islamic revolutionaries are obviously doing the work of the Russians in the Middle East. They don't bomb Soviet embassies even though Communist atheists are killing devout Moslems in Afghanistan and persecuting them in the Soviet Union.

Some intelligence people believe that the Islamic revolutionaries are controlled by the KGB. The pattern of terrorist targets seem to bear that out. The attacks fit in nicely with overall Soviet strategy to isolate Israel, terrorize Americans, murder moderates, and keep Lebanon in turmoil. To the Soviets, it's a global chess game. So far, they're winning and we're losing.

*For The Record . . .*

## Bridges That Go Poof! In The Night

By **SAMUEL L.  
BLUMENFELD**

I have just returned from a 2,000 mile drive across America, from Boston to Evansville, Indiana, and back. I could have gone by plane but decided that I wanted to see the country on the ground.

As my readers know, I am not a great admirer of government enterprises. In fact, I consider most government programs wasteful and inefficient. The private sector could no doubt do them better at less cost. However, the federal government has sponsored two programs which seem to have achieved a noticeable measure of success: the space program and the Interstate Highway System.

I drove most of the way on Interstate highways and can attest that some of them are marvels of engineering, particularly the newer ones. On my way west I had to stop off to see my publisher in Old Greenwich, Connecticut. I got a glimpse of the piece of the Connecticut Turnpike that fell into the Mianus

River at 1:30 a.m. on June 28, killing three people. Since I've driven over that spot many times, the idea of a well-used bridge collapsing right under you is sort of scary.

How was it permitted to happen? The Connecticut Turnpike has been collecting tolls for years supposedly to pay for its upkeep. How come the turnpike authorities weren't aware that the span was becoming unglued? Residents of the area reported that bridge noise had increased greatly in the weeks prior to the collapse. The noise was a symptom that something was pulling loose. But the complaints got no response from the authorities. Why?

We don't know who is the head of the Connecticut Turnpike authority, but we are certain that the man was derelict in his duty and ought to be fired. The road collects enough money to keep it in good repair. Why wasn't it?

We used to think that Connecticut was an efficiently run state. Now we know it ain't so. Remember the roof of the Hartford

Civic Center that caved in a couple of years ago?

From New York I headed across New Jersey and Pennsylvania on Interstate 80, a very good road with great scenic views around the Delaware Water Gap and central Pennsylvania. In Ohio I switched to Interstates 76 and 71 as far as Columbus, and 70 to Indianapolis. In Ohio I encountered a furious thunderstorm and had to wait under an overpass for the rain to subside. But the trucks continued to zoom through the torrent.

From Indianapolis I drove on well-maintained state roads to Evansville. Returning east I took Interstate 64 through Indiana and Kentucky to Charleston, West Virginia -- an excellent road all the way with good rest facilities and beautiful rolling hills and mountains to look at.

Interstate 79 from Charleston to Morgantown is a spectacular road, cutting through mountains with ease. In Pennsylvania Interstate 81 took me through some incredibly beautiful mountain terrain.

The engineering is unbelievable. You ride on the tops of mountains with breathtaking views below. At Scranton we switched to 84.

When you cross into New York at Port Jervis, you get a rude awakening. The road must have been paved by amateurs. Your tires go ker-plunk, ker-plunk, ker-plunk all the way to Connecticut (except for the Newburgh bridge), and each bump makes the ride awfully uncomfortable.

In Danbury, 84 is a mess. They've been repairing that road for ten years. After Hartford 84 becomes 86. A good portion of that is being rebuilt. The new section is wide, smooth and impressive.

It's a relief to cross into Massachusetts. The pavement of the Massachusetts Turnpike is like a waterbed. It rolls and moves under you with occasional small bumps. I wonder who paved that road?

The Interstate system is one of the great engineering feats of all time. Now's a good time to get out and use it. You paid for it.

*For The Record . . .*

## What's Wrong With The Pro-Life Movement?

By SAMUEL L.  
BLUMENFELD

I have always considered abortion to be a horrible way to deal with the problem of unwanted pregnancy. However, for a short time I was persuaded by the arguments of women that first trimester abortions should remain legal because of the great number of teenage girls who were becoming pregnant. What were these poor girls to do? I thought

Then I attended a pro-life convention in Boston and learned that human embryos were being encased in clear plastic by a reputable medical supply house in Chicago for sale as paper weights or classroom exhibits, and I recognized immediately the horrors that legalized abortion of any kind could lead to.

So I became a committed member of the pro-life movement and have followed the movement's

growth and strategy closely over the years.

When the Supreme Court recently nullified state abortion restrictions, thereby reaffirming the legality of the mass killing of the unborn, I had to conclude that the pro-life movement had not done its job very well. An outraged public could have forced Congress to act against the court's ruling, putting a stop to this continuing holocaust. But public opinion seemed inert. Why?

The pro-life movement has used the wrong strategy in fighting for the lives of the unborn. Since I am on the mailing lists of several pro-life organizations, I get lots of mail from them.

The letters usually consist of detailed legislative alerts with urgent messages to write or call one's Congressman or Senator.

Sometime's they'll include the reprint of a column arguing in favor or against some other column or

editorial.

Rarely does one find this mail anything with real dramatic or emotional punch that one might want to show one's neighbor who may be undecided on the issue.

But recently I received from a pro-life group in Kansas a four-page documentation of some of the horrors of the abortion holocaust. It showed pictures of some of the 17,000 murdered babies discovered in February 1982 in a dumpster in Los Angeles. It reminded me of the sickening pictures taken in the Nazi concentration camps after their liberation by the allies. These pictures more than anything else convinced the public of the total evil and depravity of the Nazis.

The organization that put together this powerful piece of anti-abortion literature is the center for Documenting the American holocaust, P.O. Box 99, Palm Springs,

Calif. 92263. Only the most hardened pro-abortion advocates would not be shaken by these pictures.

It took only one picture of a human embryo encased in clear plastic to get me to see the total evil in legalized abortion. Imagine the impact these much more gruesome photographs would have on the public if they were widely distributed. If the public is inert, it's because it doesn't actually see what is happening to these preborn infants.

If the pro-life movement wants to win, it will have to awaken public indignation. It will have to spend more of its energies turning public opinion against abortion than simply advising the already committed to write another letter to another congressman. Congress will move when the public is aroused against this wholesale, inhuman, barbaric slaughter of the pre-born.



*For The Record . . .*

## Teachers And Politics

By SAMUEL L.  
BLUMENFELD

The National Education Association, which represents about 1.8 million public school teachers, has formerly endorsed former vice president Walter F. Mondale for President. Even though the Democratic convention is almost a year away, the NEA wants to make sure that its preferred candidate is nominated. Obviously Mondale won the endorsement because he has promised to give the teachers whatever they want. Also, he apparently sees eye-to-eye with the NEA's radical, leftist stand on social and foreign policy issues.

By endorsing Mondale, the NEA has served notice that it intends to put its national political machine to work in his behalf. And quite a machine it is! There are 12,000 local NEA units across the nation as well as 50 powerful state associations. In Massachusetts, it was the teachers who brought Mike Dukakis back into the governor's chair.

The NEA has from 4,000 to 6,000 members in each of the nation's 435 Congressional districts. In 1980, they supplied the Carter-Mondale campaign with 300,000 volunteer workers. In 1984 they expect to increase the number of volunteers to 700,000.

The NEA's commitment to political action is total. In 1980 the association sent 302 delegates and 162 alternates to the Democratic convention. The NEA's influence in the Democratic Party is now quite dominant. What used to be decided by a small group of party politicians in a smoke-filled room, is now decided by a small group of NEA officials in their Washington headquarters. However, the fact that more teachers in 1980 voted for Reagan than for Carter means that the NEA power

brokers do not necessarily represent the wishes of their membership.

Why this discrepancy between NEA leaders and members? Apparently the organization and its machinery have been taken over by radical, leftist activists who intend to use this new political machine to advance their political and social agendas. They are currently forming a coalition with other government-employee unions to create a powerful army of public employees whose salaries depend on taxes. By controlling the Democratic Party, they will make sure that the elected politicians serve the bureaucrats rather than the taxpayers.

Thus, the Democratic Party now represents the special interests of the public sector, while the Republican Party represents those of the private sector: businessmen, entrepreneurs, and individuals who produce the nation's wealth and must support the public sector with their taxes.

Public servants are no longer satisfied with merely serving the public. They, especially the teachers, want to become political masters. And their means of doing so is to take control of the nation's political process.

This development is one of the most dangerous results of the unionization of public employees. Actually, the NEA has been engaged in lobbying for decades. But until 1976 it never formally endorsed any candidate. Previously it invited the candidates to state their views on education and let their members vote accordingly. The public schools were supposed to be nonpartisan and neutral.

But with the unionization of teachers, all that has changed. In the 1960's a new militant breed took over the NEA. Sam Lambert, NEA executive secretary, predicted in 1967: "NEA will

become a political power second to no other special interest group....NEA will organize this profession from top to bottom into logical operational units that can move swiftly and effectively and with power unmatched by any other organized group in the nation." (What would we think if policemen organized themselves nationally and made such a statement?)

It's obvious that Lambert's prediction has come true. America's public school teachers have become militantly politicized and are now in a position to control the destiny of the entire nation. Is this what we want from our school teachers? Is this what we are paying their salaries for?

Meanwhile, the schools are falling apart and academic standards are at their lowest. Perhaps it's because teachers are now so busy with politics that they have little time left to teach. All the more reason for parents to get their kids out of public schools into private ones. In France, the teachers brought socialism to power. In America, if not stopped, the teachers may very well do the same.



*For The Record . . .*

# Larry McDonald's Legacy

By SAMUEL L.  
BLUMENFELD

Larry McDonald was one of the few Congressmen who truly understood the evil nature of communism. He wrote about it, spoke about it, and became president of The John Birch Society, the nation's leading anti-communist organization. When the society chose him for that position it could not have chosen a better man. He was fully aware of the kind of enemy we face, and he dedicated his life to informing and awakening Americans to the enormous danger that communism poses to the Judeo-Christian civilization of the West.

That he was killed by a communist missile while flying in a scheduled airliner that happened to stray over the edge of the evil empire is more than just incredible irony. It is a sign, an omen, a warning to us all of much worse to come. With a man as totally evil as Yuri Andropov at the helm of the Soviet empire, we can expect an intensification of the communist drive for total power.

There has been a lot of speculation on why the Soviets shot down the plane. Did the order come from the Kremlin? Did they know that Larry McDonald was on the plane? Did they mistake a 747 jumbo jet for another aircraft? Whatever the reason, the consequences are what count in this tragedy. The world has been awakened as nothing else could have awakened it.

That the Soviets justify

what they did and refuse to offer any compensation simply reinforces the brutal, inhuman, merciless image that the evil empire projects on the free world's mind. This may very well be the psychological turning point in the war against communism. Carter was awakened by Afghanistan. The average man has been awakened by the massacre of 269 people on a passenger plane.

Many have criticized President Reagan for not taking stronger measures against the Soviet Union. After all, 61 Americans were killed in that massacre, more than the number of hostages held by Iranians. But he obviously weighed the options and decided against imposing sanctions. What he revealed was that we live in a very dangerous world and that the communist enemy is far more powerful than many people in the West are willing to admit. This realization will be translated into greater support for the rebuilding of our defenses and those of our allies. The idea that communists are "like us", as the disarmament activists want us to believe, has gone down the drain.

The President's weak action has had its positive effects. The frustration of not being able to punish the Soviet Union will be translated into a stronger antipathy toward communists and their supporters. People will be turned off by Soviet circuses, ballets and vodka. The Soviet refusal to pay compensation has stigmatized them forever as

unfair, uncivilized and cruel. It is something like this that will turn ordinary people into strong anti-communists, for the Soviets have violated the fundamental sense of justice that is at the heart of civilized behavior. They have put themselves beyond the pale.

People understand that serious mistakes can be made in which lives are lost. But they also understand that when a world superpower makes a mistake, refuses to accept responsibility and callously announces that no compensation will be paid, ostracism or boycott are the only responses possible.

People have been told for years that trade is the way to tame the communists. But the Soviet Union acts as if it could just as well do without our trade. If more and more people in the West decided to boycott goods from the communist bloc, we would at least reduce our contribution to communist power.

It is time for conservative, anti-communist organizations to take full advantage of the awakened consciousness of millions of people who want to punish the Soviet Union. No one is ever going to forget the murder of 269 men, women and children on flight 007. Nor will Larry McDonald be forgotten. The cause he led will grow stronger as a result of his death. Larry McDonald was murdered in cold blood by the communists. That is a fact of history. If that fact does anything, it strengthens the legacy he left us.

## Reagan's Finest Hour

By SAMUEL L.  
BLUMENFELD

Pres. Reagan's decision to send American troops into Grenada to rescue the Americans there and restore democratic government was not only the best thing he could have done, but also the only thing he could have done. Had he waited and permitted the communist murderers to consolidate their grip on the island, we would have been faced with a far more difficult and dangerous situation. The American students would have been held hostage while the Cuban and Soviets turned Grenada into a full-fledged communist military base.

The Cuban troops on the island were there to impose their will on the Grenadans and prevent resistance to the full Soviet takeover. There were not enough of them to stop an American invasion, but there were enough of them to quell Grenadan resistance to their plans.

Did the Cubans and Soviets back the coup against Prime Minister Bishop? It is likely that they did, for there were enough Cubans and KGB agents on the island to have prevented such a coup from occurring. Did they approve of the murder of Bishop and the other members of the government? Most likely they

did, for the Soviets carried out a similar plot in Afghanistan when they murdered one communist government and replaced it with another which then "invited" them to occupy the country.

Obviously Bishop and other members of his cabinet were resisting the idea of turning over Grenada completely to the Cubans and Soviets. The hardliners in his cabinet who overthrew him could not have hatched their plot without Cuban and Soviet complicity. The Cuban troops on Grenada did not come to Bishop's rescue when he was imprisoned, nor did they protect him when he was released by his followers, then recaptured by his enemies and executed.

What were the Cubans doing while the violent change in government was taking place? What were all the Soviet-bloc "diplomats" doing? The fact that they all stood by and let Bishop be overthrown and murdered indicates that they not only approved of the plot but probably helped plan it. Perhaps they did not plan the murders, not because they are against murdering, but because it risked provoking American intervention.

Fortunately, Pres. Reagan did not ask the editors

of the New York Times or the Boston Globe for their opinion before taking action. He moved swiftly and decisively in a situation that required immediate action.

Should the press have been permitted to go in with the American troops? Since speed, secrecy, and the safety of the American students were uppermost in the minds of the military, it was not unreasonable for them to have kept the press out of the planning. They had enough to worry about as it is.

American journalists, for the most part, seem to be pacifists who hate everything military, especially if it's American. They hate to see America win. They usually portray the Marxist revolutionaries as heroes and the anti-communists as right-wing villains. And they love to discredit anyone who opposes socialism.

The American people are sick of an American press that hate victory. They are sick of seeing Americans blown up, taken hostage, and shot out of the skies in civilian airliners with no retaliation. They have longed for a substantial American military victory somewhere in the world for a very long time. Pres. Reagan finally gave them one in Grenada. Let's see the Democrats beat that.

# 'The Day After' And Other T.V. Annoyances

By SAMUEL L.  
BLUMENFELD

I am one of the few Americans who did not watch "The Day After". I refused to succumb to ABC's phony media hype or have my emotions manipulated by a bunch of mushy-brained liberals. So, while my fellow Americans were wallowing in an orgy of masochism, I was at a Chinese restaurant having chicken with cashew nuts.

However, I did get home in time to see the tail end of the great debate put on after the movie. Apparently the movie changed nobody's mind. It had the impact of "The Towering Inferno," which only proves that America loves a good disaster show.

Incidentally, I've been thinking of starting a National Association of Independent Americans Who Didn't Watch The Day After. Membership would be open to anyone who could describe a nuclear attack without using pictures.

Meanwhile, here it is, the middle of December, and even those who saw "The Day After" have forgotten it. Television has a strange way of obliterating everything that happened the day before yesterday. That's so they can have your full attention for what's on the tube tonight and

tomorrow.

So it's not that Americans have a short attention span. It's that the producers and advertisers have invested millions in tomorrow's programs, and those are the shows they want to think about.

These days it's difficult not to be come addicted to television. I know of homes where the tube is on even if no one is watching. And of course the news has grown and grown. The MacNeil-Lehrer Report now runs interminably for an hour while, thanks to satellites, Ted Koppel can now ask dumb questions to four persons on three continents all at once. The marvels of technology now permit dazzling displays of stupidity to cover the globe instantaneously.

Television has become a window to a world gone mad — because the camera is always looking at the latest manifestations of insanity: another car bombing in Beirut, anti-nuclear demonstrators, in Germany being dragged to police vans, American women going to Honduras to stand on the front lines and be shot at, strikers going berserk at Greyhound terminals, Arafat ducking bullets from his beloved fellow Palestinians. Watching Palestinians

killing one another in Lebanon is a weird experience. Nobody seems to care.

We watch all of this slaughter and mayhem from the comfort of our living rooms, taking for granted the order and civility all around us. No wonder the American students kissed the ground when they were brought back from Grenada. They were witnesses to the same psychotic madness on a paradise island in the Caribbean. God gives us Edens to live in, but men turn them into hells.

Yet liberal and left-wing commentators get special pleasure in denouncing America whenever they can, particularly on the tube where it is the fashion to give such anti-American opinions plenty of expression in the interests of "fair play" and "objectivity."

It's a wonder Americans

aren't more confused than they are. Somehow there seems to be a sizable number of people in this country who still can tell freedom from slavery, up from down, good from evil. These people exist despite America's obsession with self-doubt, a moronic education system, and non-stop Soviet disinformation.

Christmas will soon be upon us, and more and more Americans will enjoy it with the knowledge that this country and its people have been amazingly blessed. But

looming ahead is 1984: to remind us that we can lose it all if we betray the Judeo-

Christian heritage our forefathers bequeathed us.

# '1984' Hasn't Arrived Yet

By Samuel L. Blumenfeld

Now that 1984 is here and the United States has not become the totalitarian nightmare depicted in George Orwell's famous novel, it seems appropriate to speculate on why we are still, essentially, a free country. I say essentially because there are aspects of our society where freedom is very close to being lost.

For example, educational freedom has already been lost in those states that have passed laws implementing the National Education Association's policy of total government control of education. In Nebraska, fundamentalist owners and teachers of private religious schools have been thrown in jail for refusing to accept state control over the education of their children. The NEA's law is on the books and it is being enforced. If the NEA has its way, educational freedom will be a thing of the past very soon in all fifty states.

A second area where freedom is being lost is in our ability to earn money and dispose of our income as we see fit. The federal

government now acts as if it owns our income before we even earn it. We are allowed to keep only what it says we can keep. The IRS, in order to enforce its powers of tax collection, is now snooping into everyone's economic transactions in order to get its take. If Big Brother does arrive, he will get here through the joint efforts of the IRS and the NEA.

The power of computer technology is making it easier for big government to set the stage for Big Brother. If he hasn't arrived yet, it isn't because he's given up on getting here. He's simply been delayed by the resistance of the American people. That resistance is not coming from our beloved educators or from big business. It's coming from the religious fundamentalists who are on the frontline of the battle for educational freedom and

from the tax resisters who are facing a government with an insatiable appetite for its citizens' money.

This country made two major mistakes in its two-hundred-old-year history:

putting the government in charge of education and enacting an income tax. Both have done more to destroy freedom in this country than anything else, and both, oddly enough, are measures called for in the Communist Manifesto. You cannot have communism or socialism without a government education system and confiscatory taxes. And we have both.

If we want to guarantee that "1984" never arrives, then the simplest thing Americans can do is get the government out of the education business, where it never belonged in the first place, and repeal the income tax. Obviously we'll need some sort of tax to pay for the army, navy, Congressmen and bureaucrats. But it ought to be a tax that does not make us slaves of our government or create Big Brother.

The problem with the income tax is that it gives the government a greater right to our income than we ourselves have. And it makes the earner responsible for figuring out how much he may keep of his own earnings. And if he figures wrong, he may be punished with fines or imprisonment. A tax system as oppressive and intrusive as that has no place in a free society, and as long as we have it, Big Brother will always be lurking close behind.

Many will say that we need the income tax to support our big government. But what many don't understand is that the income tax created big government by giving the lawmakers an inexhaustible source of revenue for their social programs. As long as we supply them with the money, they will find ways to spend it.

# The Lebanese Danger

By SAMUEL L.  
BLUMENFELD

The United States gave up in Vietnam, not because it lacked military power, but because it lacked the will to win. The catastrophe that befell South Vietnam and Cambodia after our retreat has resulted in human suffering beyond calculation.

Our failure to support the Shah of Iran was another failure of will. We thought we could do business with his enemies and bring "democracy" to Iran. Instead we helped set the stage for Iranian terrorism, brutality and revolution that threaten world peace today.

And now we are setting the stage for a similar catastrophe in Lebanon that will make everything that came before it seem like a picnic. Our nervous nellys in Congress, who run for the hills the moment an American soldier is shot at anywhere, are at it again. Their resolution to pull out the Marines immediately represents another shameful abdication of responsibility that will lead to much worse troubles. We shall see boat people streaming out of Beirut by the thousands, more destruction, more refugees, and the probable creation of another Soviet satellite.

The Democrats in Congress have done all in their power to undermine the Gemayel government in Beirut. If the Lebanese cabinet has resigned, it isn't so much because of Syrian pressure as it is because of American weakness and unreliability. The men in Gemayel's government sensed American weakness in the face of Syrian and Soviet determination to prevail. They also read *Time* and *Newsweek*.

When Walid Jumblatt, the Lebanese socialist, went to Moscow for consultation, he was no doubt told that if he hung tough, America would cave in. We caved in Vietnam and Iran. Why not in Lebanon?

What will be the results of

such a cave in? It will encourage the Arab radicals and their Soviet suppliers to press their luck where it will really count: in the Persian Gulf. Senator Goldwater, in his senility, has already loudly proclaimed that we don't need anything in the Middle East, so we might as well chuck it all.

While it would be nice to retreat to fortress America and let the rest of the world stew in its self-inflicted misery, there is no guarantee that our enemies will then leave us alone, for the goal of the Iranian revolutionaries and world communism is the total defeat and humiliation of the United States.

So retreat from Lebanon will bring neither peace from war nor peace of mind. It will be considered a devastating American defeat and a blood-curdling victory for America's worst enemies. It will put American credibility on the garbage heap and simply move the battle lines closer to home or to areas where the stakes are higher.

The Democrats, and some Republicans, want a world in which American soldiers do not get killed. The TV news has a field day whenever an American gets a scratch anywhere. The soldier's parents, friends and girlfriends are interviewed ad nauseam. They all seem to be living in Disneyland and can't understand why there is tragedy in a world of Mickey Mouse and Donald Duck. They forget that during the Civil War a half-million Americans died shooting at each other right here on our own soil. Somehow, we managed to survive that.

But 300 Americans get blown up in Beirut because of the negligence of their officers and we are supposed to cut and run. Grenada was supposed to have changed all that. But winning one battle doesn't mean winning the war. And the irony is that we haven't even tried to use American power in Lebanon.

South Boston Marshal  
Feb. 1984



# The Ferraro Factor

By SAMUEL L.  
BLUMENFELD

Now that the euphoria and hysterical excitement over Mondale's choice of Geraldine Ferraro as his vice presidential running mate has simmered down, it is becoming easier to evaluate her as a candidate. Ms. Ferraro (or Mrs. Zaccaro—take your pick) comes across as a forceful, tough lady, but underneath the bravura is a political lightweight in terms of philosophy and ideology. Mrs. Ferraro sees the world according to Tip O'Neill, and that's a pretty twisted view of things. I don't know where she took her courses in political science, but she seems to have accepted Democratic demagoguery as the embodiment of truth, and when you begin to believe your own party's lies, you're in big trouble.

Much praise has been heaped on Mario Cuomo, Jesse Jackson, Gary Hart, Ted Kennedy and Fritz Mondale for their wonderful oratory. But who's kidding whom? The demagoguery was so thick, so gooey, so overwhelming that most TV viewers must have thought they were watching a new version of

the Wizard of Oz. It reminded me of those mirrors at carnivals that distort your figure. Anyone who uses these speeches to get an accurate picture of the United States will wonder where that country is. It certainly is not the one I'm living in. So, when Pres. Reagan accuses the Democrats of being out of touch with reality, he's perfectly right. The convention in San Francisco was a mass exercise in pure and simple escapism.

According to the Democrats, there is no Communist threat, we are in the middle of a depression, the Russians are sincere negotiators, our schools are failing us because Republicans refuse to spend more money on them, and Pres. Reagan is looking for any excuse to blow up the world. Also, there are soup kitchens on every block, the poor are dying of starvation, and half the nation sleeps on park benches and subway grates at night.

The American people were fed this wretched picture of America for a week while the delegates rode the cable cars, dined at Fisherman's Wharf, went to

many parties, and enjoyed the material abundance of prosperous San Francisco. It must be awful for Democrats to live in the United States and psych themselves into believing that they're really living in the equivalent of Ethiopia. The Democrats weren't merely bad-mouthing Pres. Reagan, they were bad-mouthing every hard-working American who has struggled to make this country what it is: the world's cornucopia of abundance.

The Democrats' vision of America, the world, and the human race is so twisted that Ms. Ferraro will have a tough time convincing voters that her presence on the ticket means anything substantial. What it simply means is that a nice-looking lady, with a flare for politics can sound exactly like Tip O'Neill, and the speaker hasn't said an intelligent thing in at least twenty years.

The problem with Geraldine Ferraro is that she's come to believe that she owes more to the Democratic Party than to America as a whole, which includes a lot of Republi-

cans. The fact that she accepts all of the party's demagoguery and lies indicates to what extent she takes her cues from Tip O'Neill, who is nothing more than the most self-serving politician in Congress. He even got the Federal government to build a new office building in Boston, which it doesn't need, with his name on it.

We are told that Geraldine represents Archie Bunker's district, but that it was the Edith Bunkers who voted for her. I never got the impression that Edith Bunker was an expert on politics. Edith probably likes Ms. Ferraro because she's a "nice lady." I too think she's a nice lady, but not a potential President of the United States. Can you imagine Geraldine making the kind of decisions for our country that Margaret Thatcher had to make concerning the Falkland Islands? Who would she go to for advice, Tip O'Neill, Jesse Jackson, Jimmy Carter?

The Republicans are right. There will be a woman president some day, but she'll be a smart, philosophically sound individual — like Phyllis Schlafly.

# N.E.A.: Trojan Horse In American Education

By SAMUEL L. BLUMENFELD

A Review by Sam B. Peavey, Ed.D., Professor Emeritus, School of Education, University of Louisville.

This book had to be written. Most of us, including the author, wish it had not been necessary. It was certainly not written out of pride or pleasure. It was written out of profound regret and sadness. It offers a thoroughly researched and documented account of what happens when a distinguished professional association is infiltrated and taken over by a powerful, self-serving labor lobby dedicated to controlling public schools for its own purposes.

Those of us who are life members of the National Education Association are particularly aware that this book had to be written. We have witnessed, as has Samuel Blumenfeld, the tragic transformation of a once respected and responsible association of professional educators into a radical, power-hungry, political octopus with tentacles thrust into every school community. The funds and favors of NEA now go largely to promote the power and programs of the political left all the way from Washington to the local P.T.A. Blumenfeld

traces and describes that takeover well.

Those of us who have had lifetime careers in teacher education seeking to dignify the status and image of the professional, dedicated teacher also know this book had to be written. Teachers at large have been lured or forced into a militant and ruthless labor union determined to wrest control of the public school from the school's parents and patrons. No political lobby has ever been more bold and blatant than NEA in its announced intentions to seize and exercise raw power to its own advantage. A tightly structured headquarters bureaucracy works through its far-flung political organizers to maintain control of those teachers willing to trade their professional birthright for a mess of political pottage. NEA has now moved far beyond its initial and honorable effort to improve the salaries and situations of teachers to its present position of demanding control of public education and the right to redefine and redirect American life and learning in the most radical terms.

Those of us who still believe that successful teaching must be measured by successful student learning find that Blumenfeld shares that conviction.

The educational establishment, in which I have spent my life, has traditionally maintained its status and influence largely through its power to dictate the criteria for teacher certification and school accreditation. NEA now demands and maintains a strong role in those areas. Educators are loath to admit that a half century of frustrating research has failed to show that our extensive legal requirements for approving teachers and schools have any significant bearing on student achievement. However, those who control those criteria for certification and accreditation determine who will teach, what is taught and under what conditions. Although NEA demands a strong hand in determining who shall be allowed to teach, it refuses to allow its teachers to be evaluated or rewarded on the basis of *how well they teach*. Control, not learning, remains paramount. Blumenfeld takes a hard look at that grasping and protective position.

*Trojan Horse* examines the breakdown of manners, morals and motivation in schools as an outcome of a Godless, amoral philosophy permeating modern educational thought and practice. NEA with its penchant for "liberating the oppressed" has promoted much of the materials and methodology for freeing children from their traditional religious and family values. Children are required to discover and design their own standards of right and wrong through adventures in situational ethics and values clarification. Vice and virtue are discussed and defined as variables not as verities. Teachers indulge in psychoanalytic games and psychological probing. NEA defends these intrusions into personal and family privacy as exercises in academic freedom. They fight legislation to halt such

practices. They label parental objections as right wing extremism.

The gross deterioration of student achievement in recent times is not the basic problem facing our schools. Rather, low achievement is the natural outcome of a cumulative chain of events and circumstances in which Blumenfeld sees NEA. Control through power is the name of the game. The past two decades of NEA's ascendancy as a bloated labor lobby closely coincide with the greatest increase in educational expenditures and the greatest decrease in educational achievement. As NEA has won, education has lost.

Yes, *NEA, Trojan Horse In Education* needed to be written. Now it needs to be read. Blumenfeld presents his information, assumptions and conclusions in a penetrating and provocative manner. I can only hope that my colleagues in the educational establishment can open their minds to the challenge offered in this timely book. Even more importantly, I shall hope that public school parents and patrons across this land will read and reflect on this stirring presentation of the situation they face today.

#### Personal Data:

The reviewer has recently retired after a 40-year career in public education as a school teacher, school administrator and university professor of education. He is a life member of NEA and has been active in its national, state and local affiliates. His advanced study includes a Master of Arts in Teaching from the Graduate School of Education of Harvard University and a Doctor of Education degree from Teachers College of Columbia University. Areas of specialization are teacher education and curriculum development. He was active in teacher certification and school accreditation.

To order a copy of

NEA: TROJAN HORSE IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

by Samuel L. Blumenfeld

call 1-800-528-0559

or write:

The Paradigm Company  
P.O. Box 45161  
Boise, Idaho 83711  
(208) 322-4440

Price: \$9.95 plus \$1.50 U.P.S. Delivery