
FIRST DRAFT #19

Vol. 4, No. 1

17 Jul 64

which is Dave Van Arnam's other APA-F
zine, written on stencil, for the
delectation of the Triple-F and
especially the Fanoclasts

Anybody besides me take in the Republican Convention this week? Dull, maybe, far too late into the evening, with the conclusion almost certain from the start, and a pretty alarming conclusion, too -- the selection of Barry Goldwater as the Republican candidate for President of the United States of America.

There were some bright spots, though (apart from Nixon's excellent and heart-warming speech). Though I am a conservative in many matters, particularly in foreign affairs, and though at the same time I have been shocked at Goldwater's far more extreme positions in these matters, still, one thing about the country that is certain is that it is extremely hard to change its course radically, especially in times so relatively unstressed as ours (we are not engaged in a Civil War, a major depression, or a hot World War III, after all). In four years Goldwater could not dismantle TVA, Social Security, foreign aid, the Peace Corps, etc., etc., even if he desired these changes. There is just too much inborn resistance to change in this land.

But he could turn the country into a somewhat more conservative course than it at present holds. I imagine that Nixon, being only slightly to the right of the center, could have changed the country's course only slightly towards his views from the middle-left course it's now on. But Goldwater, though he might not be able to, or rather certainly would not be able to carry out all the domestic and foreign programs he might wish, would be able to carry it towards the distinct right of center, which from my point of view would be a desirable thing.

Why, after all, shouldn't we win in Viet Nam (indeed, why not in Laos?)? It is strongly analogous to the nasty little war fought against the Communist guerrillas in Malaya by the British (so the French couldn't win in Indochina -- maybe they just weren't as good as the British at fighting a jungle war). A war which the British won decisively. They didn't give in just because of Communist and Liberal propaganda to the effect that they were fighting a native movement to achieve independence for the oppressed people; the British knew full well that it was a part of the Communist strategy for taking over -- if not the world, at least for taking over that part of the world. Viet Nam is also analogous to the long struggle the Philippines had with the Huks, also communist guerrillas. Again, the war was won by Our Side. Why, and how? Certainly not the way the current war in Viet Nam is being fought.

Then there is the question of whether we should win in Viet Nam, in Cuba, in any place where postwar Communist aggression has hit us, and hit us hard. But as I'm a Nixon Republican, you must know already what I think about that one. It all boils down to a question of whether or not you believe that the Communists are actually trying to defeat the West by whatever means they can, or whether you believe that they have radically

Null-Q Press

Undecided Publication #21

modified or changed their previous ambitions. I wonder when this change occurred, though? Must have been since 1956, when Hungary was brutalized by Russian tanks. Yes, I'm aware that the Hungarian regime has since become much less oppressive; but do you doubt that if Czechoslovakia or Romania revolted tomorrow they would be bloodily repressed by the force of Soviet arms? (If you do, let me know; it might make a very interesting discussion.)

The night Goldwater formally won in the rollcall of the states, he mentioned in the brief pressconference afterwards that one of the things he was going to bring into his campaign was just exactly the thing I have been talking about in FIRST DRAFT -- in fact, he mentioned (botching up the story, I might add) precisely the incident I mentioned in the last paragraph of FD18, last week. He referred again to the growing menace in the big city streets, in his acceptance speech last night. Of course, as President he would be unable to interfere in the states' conduct of such internal problems, but it certainly will be interesting to see what he has to offer as a solution. (In the case of fearless Subwayman and his two Puerto Ricans, I suspect BG's solution would be to sent them back where they came from, or something; still, it will be interesting to see if Barry Goldwater, after all, is the man to solve the Involvement problem...)

Well, on to FISTFA Friday. There was a good house, with one newcomer, Bob Brown ("no relation"), and two oldcomers, Pat & Dick Lupoff, who contributed greatly to one of the more delightful meetings. Jon White, Jon White (I mention him twice because I accidentally left him out of the last Fanoclasts roundup) showed up, and also added to the hilarity. The more regular attendees included Mike McInerney, rich brown, me, Ted White, Steve Stiles, Andy Main, Andy Porter, and Arnie (Let's All Vote Him #1 Neo Next Year Too) Katz.

The first new-series Apa F Mailing was assembled and distributed to many gasps of delight and cries of "author, author!" It looks like Apa-F is certainly going to be a wonderful thing.

An interesting problem in the morality of gamesplaying came up; in a game such as Whammy, with alternating partners depending on who bids the whammy (and who happens to double, on occasion), you tend to have a point spread which eventually will inevitably put one certain player over if 1 he whammys and makes it, or 2 another person whammys and doesn't make it. The deal is made, and our prospective winner whammys. Another player, down several points, decides to double, and to throw the hand so that #1 cannot win a point this round. #2 knows he cannot win a point this hand either, but he figures that there is a long-shot possibility that he may be able to single-whammy the next few hands and still win. He knows he cannot win if #1 succeeds with his whammy this hand. The question: is the second player justified in throwing the hand to prevent the first player from winning at least until the next hand?

The problem partly stems from the weakness in the game that permits such a situation to arise; but it now occurs to me that there is, I think, at least one form of Pinochle in which the structure of the game is sufficiently similar to have made this situation come up in the past. Anyone know? And if so, has a solution to it been found? Simple morality would indicate that one does not throw a hand just to stop one's partner from winning, but ... any thoughts? Hoping you are the sane,