

Reshuffling election cards

In 1980 the players are Jimmie Carter, Ronald Reagan and John Anderson. But the game's the same as it was in 1824.

That is, if the scenario of no presidential candidate receiving an electoral majority becomes the playbill in November.

As mandated by the U.S. Constitution, the election for president would then go into the House of Representatives with each state delegation casting one vote.

This might get sticky where a state has an even number of Democrats and Republicans elected to the new Congress in 1981, but it could be even stickier when the politicians begin their dealing.

Back in 1824, just as today, three candidates vied for office.

First: John Quincy Adams, son of the first president, minister to the Netherlands and Prussia, Secretary of State, author of the Monroe Doctrine and a Federalist.

Second: Henry Clay, lawyer, orator, senator from Kentucky and one-time Speaker of the House of Representatives and a Whig.

Third: Andrew Jackson, child of the back woods, Tennessee judge, hero of the War of 1812, father of the modern day Democratic Party, and later, seventh president of the U.S.



Shirlee Iden

The election was decided when Henry Clay threw his support to Adams, making him president, and Adams, in turn, made Clay Secretary of State.

JACKSON raised a four-year hue and cry, accusing Adams and Clay of foul play and corrupt bargaining and wound up in the presidency himself in 1828.

Meanwhile, Adams had little popular support. His lot was an unhappy, ineffective administration, despite his well-intentioned plans to institute vital internal improvements.

After losing his bid for re-election he returned home to Massachusetts, but only temporarily.

He was later to serve in the House of Representatives from 1831 to 1848 as its most outspoken critic of slavery.

In retrospect, Adams' greatest contributions to the nation were his authorship of the Monroe Doc-

trine, which warned all foreign powers against meddling in either American hemisphere, and his support of the Smithsonian Institution. Neither accomplishment came during his term as president.

Adams' father, crusty old John Adams, Washington's vice president, and the nation's second president, was a great influence on his son.

JOHN QUINCY accompanied his father on diplomatic missions to Europe and in 1781, even went to Russia with Francis Dana while still a Harvard undergraduate.

His credentials established while serving in George Washington's administration, he was dispatched as emissary to Prussia during his father's presidency.

While Rosalynn Carter's qualifications to represent her husband in capitols around the world, and Billy Carter's expertise in lobbying for Libyans may be in question, John Quincy Adams' abilities in diplomacy were never in dispute.

His father, the former president, died one year before he became our sixth president.

Wonder what problems he'd have had if his dad was still around to give advice. The names change, but not much else.

Think John Anderson (or hey, Ted Kennedy) wants to be Secretary of State?



Tim Richard

Nix on that hand-cutting old religion

Some fellow from out Northville Township way dropped a political pamphlet on my doorstep the other day.

Ron Fisher says he is running for state representative in the Aug. 5 primary, though he never says whether it's the Republican or Democratic primary.

Nor does he bother to state his qualifications, so we don't know what he knows about taxes, labor law, highways and the rest.

What he does tell us is that "I believe the time has come for the MORAL BACKBONE of this State to say in a very powerful way — We want Biblical Morality back in our laws, and Now!!!!" The italics and capital letters are his.

WHAT WOULD it be like to have a state which enforced biblical morality?

For one thing, you would suffer the death penalty if you worked on the sabbath (Exodus 35:3). Meanwhile, there would be a life-or-death argument between the Christians versus the Jews and Seventh-day Adventists over whether Sunday or Saturday should be the sabbath.

We would have to leave our homes uneathed on the sabbath (Ex. 35:3).

We wouldn't be able to eat rabbit or pork (Leviticus 11:6-8), which will make Texas happy but hurt Iowa and the small game hunters.

Red Lobster restaurants and Chuck Muer will be in trouble because we won't be able to eat shrimp or lobster (Lev. 11:9-12).

A woman who bears a son will be considered unclean for seven days and may not enter the sanctuary for 33. If she bears a daughter, the mother is unclean for 14 days and may not enter the sanctuary for 66 days (Lev. 12:1-5).

Just to give you an idea of how bad "unclean" can be, note that lepers are also considered unclean (Lev. 13:1-17).

Rare steaks are out (Lev. 12:26).

A MARRIED man and married woman who fool around are subject to the death penalty (Lev. 20:10).

But if the man fools around with a female slave who has previously lost her virginity, then the errant man may atone for his sin by sacrificing a sheep — male, of course (Lev. 19:20). I have difficulty understanding that kind of biblical morality, because I was taught I would suffer for my own sins, not a sheep.

This one will drive women's libbers into a frenzy: A priest's daughter who fornicates must suffer the death penalty — by burning (Lev. 21:9). But there is no word on what happens to a priest's son who fornicates. The double standard is older than I realized.

The 1980 census would have been easier to take because we would only count males (Numbers 3:15). That will lead to enormous complexities in suburban government. We use snob zoning to keep young adults out of town, and under biblical morality, we would find ourselves zoning out widows, too, because they wouldn't count in the census and would reduce our federal aid.

A MAN WHO suspects his wife of adultery may take her before a priest and have a conditional curse placed on her, the curse applying only if she had been naughty (Num. 5:11-28).

Tough luck for the woman who suspects her husband of adultery. There's no provision for her to get a conditional curse inflicted on the man.

Here is one gem of biblical morality some parents might like: A "stubborn and unruly" son who is a "glutton and a drunkard" may be stoned to death if his parents wish (Deut. 22:18-21). That's known as detoxification the hard way.

A man who has sexual relations with a betrothed female shall be put to death. But if the woman wasn't betrothed, then the man's punishment is to marry her with no chance of divorce (Deut. 23:23-29).

If two men are fighting, and if the wife of one endeavors to help her husband by seizing the private parts of his opponent, she shall have her hand chopped off — "without pity" (Deut. 11:11-12). We'd better teach our wives karate.

Thus saith the Lord.

IF YOU WANTED to see biblical morality in action, you could travel to Iran, where that goofy ayatollah is doing a fair amount of head chopping and hand severing.

Even Saudi Arabia isn't going whole-hog on morality because that adulterous princess was executed quickly, by gunfire, and not slowly by stoning.

Myself, I think I'll pass on this biblical morality stuff. Give me a state representative who supports rapid transit and workers compensation reform.

What Birchers want us to believe

"I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience" — Patrick Henry

The John Birch Society isn't a minority party in the 1980 election.

But top Bircher Robert Welch has a lot to say about presidents and politics in general. And in a recent copy of the John Birch Society Bulletin he pleads, "Please believe us."

The quote at the beginning of this column refers to a statement in the bulletin. Welch maintains instead of being guided by that lamp, Americans take it for granted they will always be protected and favored and will never suffer the horrible fate being inflicted on the gentle, peaceful Cambodians.

Having said that, Welch takes off on just about every elected and appointed federal government official of the century.

It's not my intention to espouse or knock the John Birch Society in print. But just as I'm curious about the philosophies of the Libertarian, Socialist Worker's, Citizens and Anderson Coalition minority parties, I'm interested in knowing what the Birchers are up to.

In the bulletin, Welch blames the whole upper echelon of the State Department and the entire presidential cabinet for giving "powerful support to the merciless Communist drive for the enslavement of all mankind."

CONGRESSMEN encourage President Jimmy Carter in his rivalry with Richard Nixon for the love of the Chinese Reds, Welch contends. Welch claims almost every U.S. president had pro-Communist leanings.

Gary Handly, another bulletin writer, claims America is critically sick. He maintains Franklin D. Roosevelt, during his 12 years in the White House, marked the path and laid the groundwork for most of the tyranny of subsequent administrations.

"Immediately following Roosevelt's first nomination, he started to fill Washington with assorted revolutionaries of the left," Handly contends. "FDR began his intense promotion of alphabet socialism as the panacea for our national ills."

Handly also alleges that Roosevelt immensely improved the Soviet's position by extending diplo-



Jackie Klein

matic recognition to the Red dictatorship. The administration of Harry Truman was most notorious for continuing the destructive programs of the "Roosevelt gang," he says.

Truman, among other alleged boo boos, led the drive that saw the U.S. become a charter member of the Communist conceived and controlled United Nations, according to Handly. Truman, Handly emphasized, had an affinity for Communist causes.

On Nov. 4, 1952, nearly 34 million Americans voted for Dwight D. Eisenhower, believing things would be right again. But according to Handly, good citizens were duped by "Ike's phony campaign rhetoric."

"ENDORSED AND supported by some of FDR's most radical, pro-Communist backers, the overwhelming majority of Eisenhower's appointments were of a similar ilk," Handly maintains. "Ike gave full support to the pro-Communist policies to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. Eisenhower led a vicious campaign to destroy the life and career of Sen. Joseph McCarthy."

John F. Kennedy's short term in the White House virtually was an unceasing assault from first to last on the best interest of the American people, Handly says. JFK continued FDR's socialist programs, expanded federal spending, appointed left wingers to his cabinet and strengthened America's Communist enemies, according to Handly.

The Great Society of Lyndon Baines Johnson was great only for the architects of national disaster. Handly maintained. LBJ signed into law the Civil Rights Act of 1964, one of the most radical pieces of legislation ever enacted, Handly said.

"Lyndon Johnson also participated vigorously in the Moscow-directed attack on the rapidly develop-

ing anti-Communist movement in the U.S.," Handly alleges. "Along with his Marxist colleagues, he too singled out the John Birch Society for his most vituperous ridicule."

During the many campaigns in his long political career, Richard Milhous Nixon always ran as a conservative. But once elected, he aligned himself and voted with the left on almost all key issues, the writer maintains.

Nixon traveled to Red China to shore up Mao's then shaky regime, says Handly, and the Republican president terminated no programs of destruction begun by his Democratic forerunners.

"THE INEPT Gerald Rudolph Ford, America's first appointed president, served such a short time of office that he needs to be said about him," Handly writes. "But with or without his helmet, he continued to play ball with the Communists."

"There's no destructive national or foreign policy begun by his predecessors that James Earl Carter hasn't continued or improved upon with a vengeance."

Handly claims his article isn't meant to be a detailed list of various acts of national destruction perpetrated by successive residential administrations from 1933 to the present. He says the purpose of his writings is to detail some of the reasons which have brought the US to its sorry domestic and international state.

The Birchers are fighting a bill which would make the birthday of Martin Luther King a national holiday. And they want elected officials who are proven patriots as a way to reverse the headlong rush towards national destruction.

Welch points out that Birchers don't like Communists, even in striped trousers. It isn't difficult to get that drift.

"Education is our total strategy and truth is our only weapon," Welch announces. "We believe we can get more good people to read of our truth most carefully in an election year than at any other time."

Welch admits the Birchers aren't likely to be of any help selecting specific candidates. They simply want to explain issues which, he contends, apply to all candidates (he doesn't mention Ronald Reagan). And, most of all, Welch wants us to believe.

Vietnam war rolled along. But the make-up of the military that resulted from that system made subtle useless. Counting the ratio of black to white noses in Vietnam and comparing it to the National Guard in Gaylord and the campus at Ann Arbor usually made the point.

This inequity helped cause anti-war demonstrations — the second largest street conflicts in U.S. history.

And the complex military equipment that seems to make the draft make sense really makes the draft sort of stupid.

It takes months, sometimes years to learn how to use this complex gear; it doesn't make a lot of sense to spend that kind of time and money on a guy who's getting out in two years.

PERSONALLY, the draft seems pointless anyway. If the U.S. were ever truly threatened, the clerks sending out the draft notices would have to fight their way through the crowds of volunteers to find a mailbox.

And there's a better way.

An efficient, well-trained military would result if money now spent to train short-timers over and over again in the same skills were instead spent on making the already-trained more willing to stay.

Higher salaries, in other words. After all, you only get what you pay for.

Military draft — a chilling prospect

I'll tell you something: If the guys who run the Pentagon were baseball players, they'd be in over their heads against the Toledo Mud Hens. If they were boxers, they'd lose bar fights.

I mean, talk about not learning from your mistakes.

It's only five years since the end of the southeast Asian war. If there was anything to learn from that disaster, it was that asking draftees to fight for a cause they don't respect — never mind believe in — is stupid.

The soldiers won't stand for it and, if it goes on long enough and drags in enough soldiers, society in general won't take it anymore either.

But now the Pentagon guys are back for more. You can be coy about it, if you like. You can call it Selective Service Registration like the government. Or you call it the draft plan like me.

Either way, it makes no sense to have draft registration unless you have a draft. They're like Abbott and Costello, or salt and pepper — when you find one, you've found the other.

But it should be said that the Pentagon does make a sound point in its argument for the draft . . . theoretically.

The military today uses incredibly complex, incredibly expensive weapons. For instance, the last I time I priced anti-tank missiles, they cost about \$3,000. Each. Only the best recruit in every training class actually gets to fire a round.



Mike Scanlon

A draft would presumably draw from a wider spectrum of society. That would result in soldiers and sailors and such with a higher intelligence — as a group — than the volunteers. Theoretically.

THIS ALONE says a lot about the military — smart guys are too smart to sign up.

But anyway, that theory also isn't true. The U.S. has never had a limited draft — such as one that would conscript only 19- and 20-year-olds — without a dazzling array of rules and regulations to describe just what the limits of the limited draft are.

These blizzards of paper boiled down to this: People with money could avoid being drafted. Poor people did push-ups.

Sometimes the discrimination was blatant. The Civil War conscription let anybody who could scrape up \$300 literally buy himself out of the draft. This helped cause the bloodiest street conflicts in U.S. history, the 1863 New York draft riots.

The system was more subtle by the time the