

## ‡13 Scrawlines

### A Squeezing Out Suicides

**A1** If legislatures wish to stop Jack Kevorkian (“Dr.Death”) by outlawing assisted-suicides, then those laws should also apply to tobacco companies. Otherwise, we have a situation where: it’s illegal to help painracked elders to die, but legal to help happy&healthy youngsters to die.

**A2** (In the days before assisted-suicide became an issue, it is said that crusaders had tried to wipe out unassisted suicide by making it a capital offense. . . .)<sup>1</sup>

**A3** Another way of interpreting Kevorkian’s persecutors: it’s illegal to end agony, but legal to cause it. Just the kind of logical consistency one expects of a nation whose laws are written by “legislator”-puppets, whose actions are responsive to those whose cash pulls the strings. (See, e.g., *DIO 2.1* ‡1 §A5 & fn 5.)

**A4** Why has a decent and selfless martyr such as Kevorkian been pilloried so often in the press — where lobbies can slant “news” so easily? Partial explanation: about 20% of all medical billings occur in the last 6 months of life. So Kevorkian is seen by medbiz as confronting them with a stark choice, i.e., do doctors want to: [a] keep Hippocritically extending “life” when it turns into 1-way misery, or [b] take a 20% pay-cut and thereby endanger doctors’ well-being, where yacht-deprivation is a critical risk-factor?

[Mention of the suicidally-inclined permits a seamless segue to organized baseball<sup>2</sup> . . .]

### B Shorts

**B1** *Gowdiamus*. David Halberstam reports that a condition for baseball player Joe DiMaggio’s appearance at any function is that he be introduced as: the greatest<sup>3</sup> living ballplayer. This is presumably what triggered my favorite Gowdyism,<sup>4</sup> when sportscaster Curt Gowdy blurted out that DiMaggio was: “the greatest living ballplayer of all time”.

<sup>1</sup> [Note added 1995.] A cute ploy by Susan Smith’s lawyer has been to generate court sympathy by saying she’s so depressed that she’s tried to commit suicide. I.e., don’t kill her because: she wants to die. [See *DIO 6* ‡4 §A.]

<sup>2</sup> [Note added 1995.] Baseball and tennis are fading, evidently from insufficient violence to sate the toooisie. [*DIO 2.1* ‡1 §B3 asked readers to ponder the evolution of a network-TV ad that scoffed at men who complain about soap-opera-addicted wives while they themselves watch 5 hours of wrassling. If the ad (as originally written) scoffed at the situation of women who are widowed to *football* not wrassling, then it would probably be altered — for the simple reason that football has become so critical, to distinguishing network TV from smalltime TV, that it is beyond attack.] Thus, baseball & tennis are increasingly dependent upon celebs. (The celeb-factor makes baseball vulnerable to strikes. Audiences will watch *anyone* box or play football. Not baseball, which is dead without its big-draw stars.) The trend has reached the point where even stars in the audience are used. But this can backfire. While the Atlanta Braves were vainly fighting for their lives in the 7th game of the seemingly endless 1991 World Series, their owners-in-attendance (Tarzan & Jane Turner) were viewed by national TV audiences vainly fighting off sleep. So it shouldn’t have required the 1994 strike to dampen buyers’ enthusiasm for paying \$100,000,000 for ball clubs. But all-day-5-set-obsessed men’s tennis has ingeniously turned its draining interminability to its ad: during the 1995 US Tennis&Tonsils Open, CBS cameras kept sneaking up on players’ girlfriends at ringside (usually B.Shields) to broadcast them yawning or nodding off, evidently with the idea of thereby enlivening the proceedings with candid-camera surprise-entertainment — i.e., using the spectacle of sleep to keep the TV audience awake.

<sup>3</sup> [Note added 1995.] In a city known for drawing charm & sprawling slums, Baltimore baseball shortstop & longstreaker (2131+ straight games played), admirably-square Cal Ripken, is paid \$40,000/hit: more [*DIO 6* ‡4 fn 9] than former-record-holder Lou Gehrig was paid in an average *year*. (World Series lifetime slugging averages: Rip .167, Lou .731.) If Rip played a full career at this rate, the cost would exceed \$100,000,000, easily enough to attain major political office. Hmmm: the agent (R.Shapiro) who arranged Rip’s 5-year \$30,000,000 contract is also the fiscal power behind Baltimore’s mayor. What a clever way to grow money. If Rip’s conscience is twinged by Ripoffing a poverty-blighted city (world’s champ in teenage pregnancy rates if not other sports), at least he’s taking the right therapy: reading Ayn Rand, the very bright rightist author-philosopher who (late in her career) used to go about with a dollar-sign emblem in her lapel. Now, how do you like the sound of a hitherto unspoken prediction: Senator Ripken? (Let’s hope he doesn’t end up with the dullest record in the Senate. He’s already got it in baseball.)

<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, some Gowdy alterations of trite phrases were excellent. He was at his best in his 1976 rewrite of an overworked&divisive reference to gentleman Joe Louis, whom Gowdy re-dubbed: “a credit to the human race.”

(This was the worst DiMaggio joke since Joe D retired & wed a filmstar, an event which simultaneously retired the previous top compliment you could pay a pro: “the ballplayer’s ballplayer”.) [Note added 1995: Joe D has now survived him upon whom his mantle fell.]

**B2** Why do not the US military academies get explicit media commendation for being the only group of US academic institutions that take cheating and other unethical behavior seriously enough to repeatedly & publicly expel offenders? For all its downsides, the military life has some credits we should not ignore: self-sacrifice and heroism are extolled (as also in most religious groups), which can — with alot of luck — act as a counterbalance when civil society becomes circularly (fn 17&25) degraded-corrupt beyond the likelihood of parliamentary self-redemption. (E.g., in 98 AD, Rome was finally saved from decades of intermittent bloody caesarian terror by an intelligent general [*DIO 14* ‡3 Fig.2], Trajan.<sup>5</sup>)

**B3** The US squalid poverty-cycle goes on&on — supposedly in spite of US pols’ nostrums. Leftist quackcure: tax the provident to subsidize improvidents’ fertility. Rightist quackcure: abortion-hating moral education. But, for both: whatever progress is effected occurs only among the brightest members of the (hopefully ex-)poor. OK, *these* will cut reproduction. But the dumbest fraction of the poor *will go right on reproducing at a high rate*.<sup>6</sup> (This was predicted by one of the Darwins a century ago, when the possibility of widespread effective birth control first appeared on the horizon.) Thus, any temporary progress against poverty will be numerically wiped out by sheer numbers in the next generation. (I.e., the media give out encouraging “progressive” data like, e.g., a 40 million majority of the US’ Roman Churchfolk ignore the pope’s ban on birth control, while merely 20 million RCfolk follow this sex-expert’s advice. The catch? The independent 40 million will have maybe 20 million kids, while the ditto-head<sup>7</sup> 20 million will have roughly 40 million kids.<sup>8</sup> This is “progressive”?)<sup>9</sup> Is such an elementary point simply too mathematical for our pols & press to figure out? (They never mention it.) Are they innumerate? (The Church isn’t.) Or just phony? It has to be at least one of these two options. Quite possibly both. (Each party has a stake in poverty: GOP loves the cheap labor; Dems get the poor’s votes.) If there’s no electoral choice, then taxpayer-revolt is the only non-violent exit from the subsidized-poverty cycle.

**B4** The three cleverest-logic murder-film plots of the 1950s were: *Witness for the Prosecution* (remake by M.D.Fuhrman?), *Strangers on a Train*, & *Dial M for Murder*. Contra the popular-stereotypical image of female logic: the ingenious schemes behind two of these 3 great films were (long before quotas) the creative productions of women. (Agatha Christie, *Witness*; Patricia Highsmith, *Strangers*.)

**B5** The GOParty will never solve the problems it got elected (in 1994) to alleviate, for the simple reason that: shorn of diversionary complaints about Dem-demons (crime, drugs,

<sup>5</sup> The founder of the society that gave us ancient knowledge’s pinnacle (3<sup>rd</sup> cy BC Alexandria) was the general-scholar Ptolemy Soter. And those who damned Gen. Douglas MacArthur’s 1952 presidential candidacy may be enlightened by comparing the mental health of the modern Japanese state (which he designed) to that of US society. (*DIO 1.2* fn 45 praised the prose skills of Rommel and Grant-Badeau-Twain, but the dramatic-poetic style of MacArthur cannot be compared to theirs. MacArthur’s dying speech to West Point — fortunately surviving on film — is the most affecting in the history of the US military.)

<sup>6</sup> Since leftists&rightists preach that making poverty, race, & class frictions atrophy requires *education*, then: why do their policies guarantee that the maximum number of children will be born to parents with the least *education*?

<sup>7</sup> Why has the brave&independent US press reserved this term strictly for Rush L’s audience, when most mass-religious leaders’ literal-minded followers are even more robotic?

<sup>8</sup> *Catechism of the Catholic Church* Vat City 1994 §2373 (emph in orig): “Sacred Scripture and the Church’s traditional practice see in *large families* a sign of God’s blessing and the parents’ generosity.” No acknowledgement (by the ungenerous male writers of this sentence) that high fertility enhances the Church’s political power (& the poverty it’s usually built upon). That’s just an unforeseen, entirely accidental byproduct. (Vat City is as chockablock with naifs as with wealth.) Question: how can there be peaceful multi-culturalism where 2 or 3 cults are competing to outmultiply everybody else? [Note added 2000: See *DIO 8.2* ‡5 §O2.]

<sup>9</sup> So any perceived gains against poverty are systematically swamped, generation after generation, while priests & other pols decree that interfering in the poor’s reproductive “rights” is immoral — though interfering-tax-forcing the endangered middle class to subsidize these human waves is not (fn 19).

welfare, & race-preference schemes), the *real* GOP platform would instantly be revealed nakedly for all it actually is, namely, a money-is-the-root-of-all-good program to make the super-rich even richer. (Not a crusade which, unadorned with anti-welfare-loafer whipped-cream, is likely to attract more than 1% of the vote.) So, for the GOP to ensure that welfare-related diversions will continue indefinitely, two prerequisites must be met: [a] abortion, RU 486, & Norplant (& thus women's freedom) must be suppressed, & [b] enough whipping-boy-Dems have to be kept in office to make it seem credible that the right-thinking GOP is (contra fn 21) doing its darnedest to wipe out social degeneracy, but those sneaky Liberal incubi somehow<sup>10</sup> keep foiling them. (Does the GOP *really* want Clinton out of the White House?) It's theatre-mythology that will persist indefinitely until retired by electoral intelligence or (less unlikely) a violent coup.

**B6** If Jesse Helms, the Republican Senator from Tobacco, is so much more upset at sex (e.g., the late R.Mapplethorpe)<sup>11</sup> than at his lovable weed's continuing enslavement of kids and torture-massacre of millions of adults annually worldwide, then: why is Helms not horrified at the vital support which tobacco-ad funds regularly provide the glossy skinmags? (Losing this support — perhaps 1/3 of the latter's ad-billings — would be crippling.) Mapplethorpe doesn't sully even a hundredth the number of innocent youngsters they do. (Which is exactly why the youth-targetting tobacco industry supports the glossies & not the artist.) So, we're waiting for the kickoff of Jesse's no-doubt imminent decency-crusade for an industry-wide tobacco-ad boycott of porn. . . .

**B7** *TV 'snews-Balance Unbalance*. In the US, when it's a matter of press-coverage or legal adjudication of cases such as those of TonyaH, MTyson, or OSimpson (where, *coincidentally*, millions in profits are to be made), we're told that *every* side — even the scummiest — merits a fair hearing and a tediously complete defense. (Which gives an open, just image to The System.) Question: why isn't this same fine, noble principle<sup>12</sup> applied to: [a] politically-incorrect heresies (persons & ideas), [b] modest-sized dissenting political parties, and [c] those who question the US' religiosity?

**B8** At the 1994/5/6-8 Dibner conference at M.I.T., I mentioned to Muffia capo Noel Swerdlow my delight at his entirely original solution of some Hipparchan numbers. (See *DIO 1.3* fn 277 & fn 280.) He replied with admirable modesty that it was a "lucky" hit. (See similar self-deprecation by Aubrey Diller at *DIO 4.2 Competence Held Hostage #2* p.55. See also *DIO 1.2* §D2 & fn 49.) But the comment reveals the very opposite of NS' genial implication, and we may formulate a general principle regarding the process:

The cleverer a discovery is, the more the discoverer feels it was lucky.

<sup>10</sup> This, even though the Libs are always hugely outspent by the GOP. Our rulers' desire for cover-maintenance of Plunkittesque (fn 17) electoral pseudo-choices is the only barrier that prevents Toles' recent *Buffalo News* cartoon (reprinted: *Wash Post* Weekly Ed 1995/9/18) from coming true. (Out in public, that is. In private, it's already effectively true; though not literally, since neither party's pols are running anything. Except errands. For forces even wealthier than themselves.) The cartoon envisions a near-future here's-the-latest-from-business announcement on TV 'snews: "[We have a new merger to report. It] makes good business sense, encouraging a creative synergy. We can keep our core areas of traditional revenue, but add potential for a new customer base. While in the past we have had periods of intense competition, in today's climate we have to look at our common bottom line: money. That's why this Republican buyout of the Democratic Party is such a terrific deal for both the players and the American public . . . (Voter layoff notices will be mailed out shortly.)"

<sup>11</sup> [Note added 1995.] Helms (on whose fractional wit, see 1995 Summer *Covert Action Quarterly* #53 p.4) has a point regarding Mapplethorpe: if The US Art World wants publicly to hang photos of homosexual s-m, it shouldn't expect het tax support. This is part of the wider question of whether such public support is appropriate for a private fraternity, advancement up which appears to depend on factors often not discernable in the artistic production — and where the suspicion thus lingers that mercantile & carnal talents have filled the void. (Lucky there's none of that in het showbiz. . . .)

<sup>12</sup> [Note added 1995.] Similarly, creationists affect love of free speech when trying to push creationism into bio classes, and the Roman Church (forgetting for-now alot of sacred history: †15 fn 33) loves freedom of religion (pope, Baltimore, 1995/10/8). So, will both cults be inviting representatives of dissenting organizations (including atheists) for open debate in classrooms?

## C Germs

- C1** The press loves the gun-control<sup>13</sup> quick-fix. Except for the military.<sup>14</sup>
- C2** Eternal frustration inevitably pushes US justice-seeking movements to paranoia.
- C3** Death Row's leading cause of death is: old age.
- C4** If abortion is damned as "killing-the-unborn",<sup>15</sup> then: why isn't celibacy?<sup>16</sup>
- C5** Primitive pleasures are fleeting; optimistic intellectual curiosity isn't.
- C6** I am therefore I think.

## D Questions & Answers

- D1** Galahad question: Why do lawyers seem to be supermen when they are preventing moron-sterilizations (§B3) and delaying murderer-executions, but virtually offers when suing tobacco companies? Answer: Even sharks have their 30 yr-losing-streaks? (Or: *DIO 4.2* †9 §R6?)
- D2** TV 'snews' straightfaced sole-permissible-options-(&-be-sure-to-vote) question: Which<sup>17</sup> will alleviate the US poverty&crime-cycle, [a] Libs' AFDC, or [b] Conservatives' prisons&mass-religion (physical&mental jails)? Obvious answer: Neither. (Try §D4.)
- D3** Doleful question: What do you get when you cross a weathervane with a puppet? Answer: a Leader. Case in point: the Senate Majority Leader.
- D4** Upfront question: What's the only prison that can stop crime? Answer: A condom.
- D5** The D-Bomb: *Wouldn't You Know It: [d]-Ultimate Weapon Is Made-in-[d]-USA* Today's multiple-choice question: Which of the following has destroyed more US cities? [a] Stuka dive bombers? [b] AIDS? [c] Nukes? [d] The Democratic Party? As US teenerdom (or any other echochamber) would put it: "totally-awesome".

<sup>13</sup> Irony: the establishment view is the inverse of the truth. I.e., no sane US city-dweller today seriously expects to be protected (by police or courts) from a street attacker. By contrast, we do (*DIO 4.2* †9 §K1) need international elitist control of atomic weapons. Anyone who believes he *really* wants egalitarianism in this connection should ask himself: does fairness mean that every one of the planet's more than 5 billion persons [in series? in parallel? — either option pure-fantasy] should have equal access to placing his finger upon the discharge-button of a doomsday-magnitude nuclear bomb? (The only idea crazier than this is: faith that nuclear weapons won't be built somewhere.)

<sup>14</sup> Same for the establishment's amusing claim (*DIO 4.2* †9 §A2) that the death penalty hardens society . . . but: it's OK (without 10 years of legal appeals) to attack — invariably with US media initial cooperation — bigbad nations like Grenada, Libya, Panama. (What large church is protesting this contrast? Those heroic Roman Church persons such as the Berrigans, who opposed the US war machine, have declined in public perception, as the hierarchy has delighted GOP morality by focussing its potentially useful idealistic energies on abortion instead of war-prevention — i.e., on preserving microscopic zygotes rather than thinking, feeling persons. See fn 16 & *DIO 4.2* †9 §A1.)

<sup>15</sup> If promoting abortion is such a brutalizing, murder-engendering way of life, then: [a] Why have all the shootings (so far) in the current US controversy been by the "pro-life" side? [b] Why are the nations where abortion is most taken for granted (the protestant nations of N.Europe) the very ones with the lowest rates of wifebeating and murder? [c] Why (and *how*) have questions [a]&[b] been virtually banned from public US discussion — here, in the Land of the Free Press and the Home of the Brave Pols?

<sup>16</sup> See *DIO 1.1* †2 §H & *DIO 4.2* †9 §D6. When pro-lifers ask what-if my mother had aborted me, I respond: same as if she'd become a nun — either way, I wouldn't be here.

<sup>17</sup> While TV 'snews continues an endless debate between these two guaranteed-disaster options — a "choice" which must surely tickle Plunkitt's shade (*DIO 2.3* †6 fn 23) — it (religiously) avoids reminding the public of either's actual record. We're still waiting for a single instance of TV 'snews asking US pols to cite historical examples of nations which have shrunk poverty either [a] by dangling AFDC-money in front of jobless 13yr-old highschool-dropout girlpersons, or [b] by religion. The US public is especially uninformed on the latter point because the US press has kept a child-proof lid (§E4) upon the fact that the least religious of the world's nations (those of N.Europe) are those with the smallest poverty classes. [The prime danger of thought-control religion is not just its power-elitism, but its self-perpetuating cyclicality: faith-damaged moms visit the same damage upon their kids' minds, etc, *ad infinitum*. (If churches think it's wrong to kill a brainless foetus by abortion, then why is it not wrong to kill an eager, loving, curious child's brain by one-sided and-or fear-drilling cult-rote-education?) Democratic remedies become impotent & irrelevant where rational minds are numerically swamped by waves of obediently-prolific programmed-minds. (How many nations have overthrown such cyclical control by democratic means — i.e., without violence?)]

## E Gutting the Best Hope for Cutting the Poverty-Cycle

Margaret Sanger promoted birth control primarily in order to help the poor out of poverty. (No other social-improvement program can long succeed if population control fails.)<sup>18</sup> However, modern political and religious leaders have outfoxed her (with ever-loyal media assistance) by:

**E1** Doling out welfare-pittances to subsidize poverty, barely enough to keep ever-abundant that immortal potential-scarb cheap-labor-pool which US employers encourage, in order to beat down laborers' wage-demands. (Coincidence: the US' interest in spending gov't funds on welfare only began shortly after birth control's use became legal & effective.)

**E2** Keeping RU 486 (mifepristone, aka "The Death Pill") from US women for a decade — regardless of whether the President is (purportedly) feminist or no. (How much longer is it going to take before women get suspicious of the depth of Clinton's commitment to this issue?) Note the provocative circumstance that RU 486 has been systematically kept from the citizenry of only one top nation, the US — which also just-so-happens to be the nation most unremittingly targeted by the foetus-hugger anti-abortion lobby.<sup>19</sup>

**E3** Virtually banning from govprop and from TV 'snews (excuse our redundancy) discussing birth control and-or abortion in any context but that of *individual rights* — **not as part of a social-repair strategy**. (See *DIO 2.3 ¶7 §A6 & DIO 4.2 ¶9 fn 44*. According to Willyspeak and Newtspeak,<sup>20</sup> the only permissible policies for dealing<sup>21</sup> with the US'

<sup>18</sup> §B3. *DIO* particularly stresses *societal*, not just individual, birth control for this reason — and because arguing its need (& the social consequences of ignoring it) is now almost as banned from popular US media as it has been under explicitly theocratic dictatorships.

<sup>19</sup> This has reached the point where (§E3) young men can now be held legally hostage *for eighteen years* at the whim of a deceitful sex-partner who wishes, e.g., to prey with holy condoms — whether she is seeking to bind the man (out of love) or to drop out of school into motherhood-as-a-paying-job (out of stupidity). If the father-to-be doesn't want the child, why can't the gov't tell the mother-to-be that it's up to her to either: Support or Abort. A society that did not want more low-prospect children would entertain that approach. Instead, such an obvious & central idea *isn't even mentionable* (fn 25) in the US' self-congratulatory Free Press. (And poverty continues to expand, as "leaders" [§D3] shake their heads in mock perplexity.) I note that one of the prime secular promoters of this almost priest-like letter-of-the-natural-law lack of perspective, ACLU (which never objects to US media thought-control in this connection), regards promotion of such an option as an application of unwarranted force upon the woman. By contrast (*DIO 4.2 ¶9 §R4*), ACLU does *NOT* see *point-of-IRS-gun forced-taxation* (to underwrite the growth of massive semi-literacy & poverty, which ACLU has been so instrumental in inflicting on the US) as applying unwarranted force upon the invaluable provident-securely-solvent middle class — the monotonic shrinking of which does not alarm pseudo-clueless ACLU in the least, *even though this is THE major longterm US threat to civil-liberties (ACLU's own middle-name)*: fn 25. ACLU's no-bad-means-to-good-ends fetish is equally priestlike, as is the instant to set that smokescreen aside the instant one's nation goes to war, & forthwith to acquiesce in the killing of foreigners, even by the formerly-scorned middle-classes one then depends heavily upon to manage such dirty work.

<sup>20</sup> At least Newt's orphanage-proposal faces (& hopes to sever) the self-perpetuating & cyclical nature of welfare-subsidized poverty. But it still falls short of asking why we must tax (into [relatively] low-fertility) providently-loving middle-class parents, in order to support the issue of improvident parents. I.e., the welfare-moms-vs-orphanages "debate" is (since neither option can stem the US' ongoing massive tide of careless parents' unplanned children) as phony as the parallel Dems-vs-GOP "debate". Just as the US needs a [genuine: *DIO 2.3 ¶6 fn 23*] 3rd party, so it also needs a get-serious 3rd option on poverty — simply placing the discouragement of unloved-child-creation ahead of guaranteeing every foetus' birth: fn 17, 19, & 25.

<sup>21</sup> [Note added 1995.] According to 1995/9/13 SeeBS-News, it was a "historic" occasion: the Senate changed everything about welfare. (E.g., time-limits.) Everything except, of course, *the* one unkillable item which, if not changed, will mean that nothing has changed: bastard-subsidization, the radical-revolutionary opponents of which were called "conservatives", while "moderate" was the label for the same-old it's-not-the-babies'-fault-so-gotta-fund-our-kids bastardy-lobby. (Starring the senator whose wisdom has been improving New York for decades now: *DIO 1.1 ¶2 fn 7*.) I.e., a national TV 'snews network characterizes those pushing continued tax-subsidization for the poverty-breeder-mom profession as: "moderates". Note the ironically perverse upshot of the GOP's improbable marriage-of-convenience between welfare-loafer-haters & foetus-huggers: if welfare for the jobless is now shrunk, then *even more* tragically poor folk (than previously) will, in short-term-thinking desperation, feel limited-option-corned into having kids just to get AFDC-pittance-cheques, hoping to fend off the wolf-at-the-door; thus, the slum-cornucopia of pre-doomed poverty-infants (with parents just that forward-looking) may get even worse. This is "historically-moderate"? (Well, the pol responsible for the final bill is named: Dole.)

bastardy-tidalwave are more-of-ineffectual-same: Dem postnatal [i] AFDC,<sup>22</sup> [ii] rehab,<sup>23</sup> and [iii] deadbeatdad-harassment;<sup>24</sup> and-or GOP prenatal [i] punitive-example<sup>25</sup> AFDC shrinkage & [ii] insanely quixotic just-say-no-to-sex attempts to stifle poverty-area youngsters' natural erotic drive.

**E4** *The Making-Murderously-Inclined-Women-Into-Moms Movement [MMIWIMM]*.

How can TV 'snews take seriously a GOParty that claims to be anti-welfare even while it fights abortion? — a crusade that effectively forces unwanted children upon unwilling parents (for-their-own-good and-or as punishment for carnality), and then affects perplexity at slums' immortality. In this connection, we note that, by their own abortion-is-murder logic, interceder-pro-lifers are insisting that pregnant *potential murderers* MUST become mothers, whether they like it or not — a highly efficient prescription for creating child abuse & poverty, which is customarily what one finds on a massive scale, worldwide, in areas dominated by such pious MMIWIMM mentalities. (See fnn 15&17.)

**E5** *Rendering Underachievers More Well-Rounded*. Will the US' virginity-as-the-cure-for-poverty-growth<sup>26</sup> copulation-control crusade culminate in a GOP-rewrite of the civil-rights hymn? All right-thinking-Americans ardently await the international-satellite-telvised spectacle-finale: an entire football stadium (loaned by the mob-affiliated NFL), jammed with flagwaving, certified-pure teens, throat-selling the monkish remedy envisioned — as THE prime solution to the poverty cycle — by those upstandingly-religious conservative-thinktankers currently inspiring Congress. And now, ladies & gentlemen, let us bow our unworthy heads, still our too-worldly mouths, & listen, as Nancy Reagan leads the ten-thousand-throng Chorus of Undefined Orifices, singing their platinum hit:

*We Shall Undercome*

<sup>22</sup> Question that effectively wonders just who *really* designs US inner-city disaster programs: Why is it that the very leftists, who swiftly realized that pouring money into late 1940s China wasn't helping the Chinese, have — even after 40 yrs — still not figured out that pouring money into inner cities (*DIO 2.1 ¶1 fnn 5&9*) is equally counterproductive? In both cases, so much of the money has systematically ended up in corrupt gangsters' & druglords' hands, that they live in splendor while the poor remain poor. Final question of our little quiz: who do you suppose has paid off Congressmen to continue such policies, [a] the allegedly-intended-beneficiary poor, or [b] the corrupt warlords?

<sup>23</sup> [Note added 1995.] As a USA Network 1995/8/30 spot (attacking racism as an adult sickness) unselfconsciously says: "It's much easier to build a child than to repair an adult." (Just as Christian cultists will often get selectively agnostic when asked about god's post-life intentions for less-fortunate but morally-blameless folks who lived& died without knowledge of Jesus, so bleeding hearts will selectively face rehab's limitations — when confronted with the prospect of rehabbing anti-rehabbers. [See *DIO 2.1 ¶1 §H*].)

<sup>24</sup> Question: how many of these purported "deadbeats" ever wanted the child in the first place? (See fn 19.) I.e., how many are actually victims of the bastardy lobby? — of those who wish to encourage accidental pregnancy because the gov't is too cheapskate to arrange longterm rational encouragement for parenthood, and so depends upon the improvident to produce plenty of new kids regardless. (The effect of this upon the nation's mean cultural level is too obvious to require detailed comment.)

<sup>25</sup> True, the punitive approach may dampen *rational* folks' fertility. But how does it deal with the very, very, very occasional citizen who may be a trifle less than rational and forward-looking? What is the objection to (fn 19) the imposition of limits, upon numbers of children born to those members of the population that (even if they bothered to marry) aren't anticipating how many kids they can afford? (Society nonguiltily sets limits upon these same citizens' amounts of less important creations than children, e.g., food, housing, & automobiles.) A societal blind-eye (actually dereliction), at this critical stitch-in-time juncture, is a prescription for either brutal mass-starvation or (more likely) an even higher shrinkage-rate for the intelligent fraction of the population than already holds. The disastrous effects (of this trend) upon the rationality & sanity of US politics are already oppressively ubiquitous — and indeed are now probably irreversible by purely democratic or laissez-faire means. This is, of course, one of those instances where it's not merely a matter of starting a trend but of reversing one, since at present it is impermissible in establishment public forums to propose (fn 19) that any poor mom, no matter *how* degraded her situation, should consider (or have considered) having an abortion. What is the *societal* use of having the technical right to an abortion, if it is off-limits publicly even to suggest, to those most in need of abortion-access, that they take advantage of that right?

<sup>26</sup> This approach is fine for the provident middle & upper classes. (Whose members are so endearingly prone, to project their own refined but rather innocently-insulated values onto the poor, that they don't understand why such crusades never make any headway against poverty.) Teen virginity is a commendable guard against (not only pregnancy but) disease — and against diverting&frittering-away kids' energies at a time when they should be concentrating more upon studies than upon premature hedonism (§C5). But, as a remedy for slums' poverty, such a programme accomplishes nothing beyond playwrights' ultimate nightmare: the tragic farce (§B3 & fn 25).

## F Trillions vs. Peanuts

The US military officially spends about 1/4 *trillion* of our tax-dollars per annum. (And its favorite GOP pols unfailingly wish to increase this paltry sum, so that the poor Pentagon can do more than — as now — just barely scrape by.) Why this monster outlay? Facts:

**F1** Nobody is invading the US. Except Mexico.

**F2** Foreign spies (e.g., Russian, Israeli) can buy a billion-dollar US weapon's plans for ordmag 1% of 1% of the funds we were taxed to pay for it. (I.e., c.\$100,000.)

**F3** And the US pols who rule the weapons' use can themselves be bought-controlled by foreign bribes, for similarly trivial outlays. (Ever wonder why Japan: [a] doesn't bother with massive military junk, & [b] is more prosperous than those nations who do?)

## G Who Says Our Taxes Are Wasted? Three Trilling Adventures

It should comfort all of us to learn that three difficult US problems can be solved by annually spending, on each, merely about a trill apiece: \$1,000,000,000,000.

**G1** We know [*DIO* 6 ‡4 §C7] that a defense-lawyerclan-subsidy trill can ensure that no one will ever go to jail again — so long as he's good-looking. And, as part of the US' medical trill (§G3), we can guarantee all citizens the plastic-surgery they need to get handsome enough to survive any jury's fussiness in such a critical department. (How to pay for the needed surgery? Simple, since we're not going to need prisons ever again, we can cancel all the current cruelly-anticrime era's outstanding orders for prisons and instead devote the funds to the doctors-of-beautification.)

**G2** And, of course, we ought to throw another trill/year at the Pentagon (§F). Look at it this way, wouldn't you spend *anything* to ensure that Clinton not only rules us but the whole world?

**G3** Finally: most medical plans the gov't is now mulling over will cost several thousands of dollars per year per insuree. Multiplying by the number of US citizens, we find that proper medical care will cost<sup>27</sup> the US ordmag a trill a year. Now, finally, we can close in on the true unspoken goal (of expending ever-more-astronomical portions of gov't treasure upon medical care): no one will ever again die. Instead, at roughly age 100, we'll just transform permanently (§A4) into immortal senility — wedded forevermore to artificial hearts & whatever.

**G4** A striking addendum to §G3: the US is the most totally & aggressively religious of all technologically advanced nations. The great majority of its citizens will swear to any pollster that they do verily believe in the standard Christian bye&bye-skypie:<sup>28</sup> eternal life. The deal being that, as soon as they die (if suitably confessed&blessed by an establishment-religion priest), they join Jesus in heaven and become angels who live in eternal bliss forever after. Despite the purported attractiveness & much-vaunted ethereal beauty of said vision, the US citizenry appears prepared to spend a trillion dollars/year to pay our doctors to forever bar us from entering this heavenly goal of our lives. Instead, we will linger on, for eternity, upon our soiled Earth. As ever-undead vegetables. Well, if the US is going to go bankrupt, at least it'll be for an upbeat vision of the future.

**G5** We can put this more succinctly and thereby face starkly what happens to logic when there is a conceptual conflict between two potent lobbies (in this case, medbiz & godbiz): the US is outspending all nations, in order to stay out of the Holy-Heaven paradise which it, above all nations, allegedly longs for.

<sup>27</sup> The medical establishment frequently gets roasted in these pages. However, [a] DR is not a proponent of kook "alternate" medicinal treatments. [b] He is well aware of the benefits of US medical research, which is the best anywhere in history. (In addition, only a very flush lobby can take on the tobacco industry — so even the fat in medbiz has at least one key side-benefit. Note a bit of ironic justice: the more people tobacco slowly tortures to death, the richer its medical-lobby enemy gets.)

<sup>28</sup> D.Hammitt *Maltese Falcon* NYC 1929 Chap.19: "Spade laughed [at fasttalking Gutman's glittering promises]. 'I know you'll give me millions later . . . but let's stick to this now. Fifteen thousand?'"