

LEFTOVERS

10¢

April 1968

VICTORY AND VIGILANCE

President Lyndon Johnson's decision not to run for re-election in 1968 has unexpectedly broken the deadlock which had threatened to make electoral politics a mockery. Before his announcement of 31 March, the American people seemed doomed to a distasteful choice among Lyndon Johnson, Richard Nixon, and George Wallace. Now there is hope.

The President's withdrawal, together with the suspension of bombing in North Vietnam, is an unbelievable victory for the peace movement. In three years, the opponents of the American invasion of Vietnam have grown from a small group of unheeded and laughed at, to a powerful movement commanding the support of a majority of the American people. Sometime in the fall of 1967, the peace movement passed from minority to majority status. Polls, military prospects in Vietnam, and the relative turn-out at anti-war and pro-war parades have been strong indications. By the beginning of 1968, men who have no interest in the well-being of Vietnam but great interest in their own political survival had begun to shift away from support of the war. Finally, in March, the realization that peace now commands the allegiance of a majority of the people was made by the two most astute politicians in the country - the 36th and 37th Presidents of the United States of America.

For there can be no doubt now that Robert Francis Kennedy will be nominated and elected President this year. His support overreaches McCarthy's as his late brother's overreached Stevenson's eight years ago, and the other potential candidates of both parties are too closely linked to a pro-war policy.

For people who have been active in the peace movement the collapse of the Johnson position is manna in the desert. For years we had been meeting, arguing, marching, demonstrating, filling the newspapers with anti-war ads, to no apparent effect. Now this work has paid off beyond our wildest dreams. Peace not only became an arguable position, it became the dominant position, the position which any politician who wants to be elected must take.

Despite the bravado of his speech, the President's remarks did represent a capitulation. In effect, he said, "I am yielding to demands that we stop the bombing. I am pleading with President Ho Chih Minh to negotiate, in the hope that he will find my potential successor more reliable than myself. And I realize that my war policy has become so unpopular that I cannot be re-elected on my record." Naturally this could not be said in so many words. As a human being and a Texan, an admission of error and a recantation do not come easy to him. At this time we should not cavil over his choice of words, or demand that he beat his breast and cry "Mea culpa" on a coast-to-coast hookup.

Ever since President Johnson committed himself to a war policy in Vietnam, the peace movement has fought him with all the strength of our conviction that he is misleading and misgoverning America. It now behooves us to be magnanimous in victory, to avoid figuratively kicking him when he is down. In admitting to himself and to us that the dominating theme of his administration has been a mistake, and the direction of his policy must be reversed, President Johnson has acted courageously.

But it also behooves us to be vigilant. The people who support one of the various expressions of the desire for peace, whether it be the Peace and Freedom Party, the McCarthy campaign, the Kennedy campaign, or some other organization, should continue their efforts. If some devious plot like a Johnson "draft" or a military escalation is being tried, we should prepare to resist it. The politicians who have come out for peace solely through political expediency must be continued in the impression that peace is expedient. The military draft still has to be repealed, lest it serve as an instrument for any future President who is tempted to intervene elsewhere with "military advisers". And,

although peace negotiations now seem to be getting under way, fighting is still going on in Vietnam. The further maintenance of the war still had to be resisted. And it should be made eminently clear to the Johnson administration's negotiators that they are to find a solution leading to peace and American withdrawal from Vietnam.

So the meetings, the campaigns, and the petitions should continue. The planned week of demonstrations and marches at the end of April, against the war, should go ahead on schedule and with the full support of the people who had originally intended to participate. This is no time for complacency.

Nor should the election of Robert F. Kennedy be an occasion for complacency. We have won a signal victory in the struggle against war. But it is only a single victory. It must be followed up and consolidated, until a political figure would no sooner support war than he would support the black plague.

WHO'S LOYAL NOW?

Ever since opposition to the American policy in Vietnam became politically evident, the proponents of peace have been accused of being pawns in a shadowy and suppositious "International Communist Conspiracy". Something new has entered the American political dialog here. When Henry David Thoreau spoke out against the American invasion of Mexico, in terms quite appropriate to the Vietnamese war today, no one accused him of being in the pay of President Santa Anna. The Americans who spoke out against the American take-over of the Spanish Empire in 1898 were not accused by the most frenetic patriots of being Spanish agents.

But the hawks have contrived to make love of American equivalent to love of war. Our flag, which was once the banner of all citizens, has been made by them the standard of the pro-war faction alone. In New York City it has become the custom for fire engines, police cars, and garbage trucks to fly the American flag, and the men who run these vehicles make it quite clear that they regard this act, not merely as a gesture of love and loyalty for their country, but a support of the war in Vietnam.

The alleged "loyalty" of such people is now being put to a test, and the results will be of great interest to the rest of us. The President of the United States has decided to give it up as a bad job. Now let us see their loyalty. Let them say now what they have been saying all along, that the President has more facts than we do, that we should support his leadership as loyal Americans, that whatever betide, he is their President. Let them continue to say these things after President Kennedy has succeeded President Johnson.

It should be an edifying display. Already the grumbling has begun. The columnist William S. White complains about Kennedy as if he had led an armed coup against Johnson. William F. Buckley claims that "a series of exquisite humiliations had been programmed for him((the President))" and that "The enemy prevailed. The victory was theirs - General Giap's, Bobby Kennedy's, and Ben Spock's". But he also accuses Johnson of leaving this curious coalition an opening by not using all-out force in his prosecution of the war. And Governor Reagan has been growling about the President letting down the boys on the ramparts.

If their previous adulation for President Johnson has restrained the hawks' criticism of his present stand, they should be under no such inhibitions in the Kennedy Administration. Then you will see what their "loyalty" means. The people who have invoked "loyalty" in their support of President Johnson's war policy are, in fact, loyal to nothing but conquest, destruction, and death.

ESSAY CONTEST

For the past quarter-century, various pieces of restrictive legislation have been enacted, and more have been proposed, under the assumption that the United States of American is menaced by an International Communist Conspiracy of such great power and

(continued on p. 11)

"Such welcome and unwelcome things at once
'Tis hard to reconcile."

- Shakespeare, Macbeth

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Victory and Vigilance.....1	The Second 1968 Presidential Preference Poll Conclusively Proves That Nobody Can Be Elected President This Year.....5
Who's Loyal Now?.....2	Postal Savings.....8
Essay Contest.....2	OPERATION AGITATION.....9
Table of Contents.....3	
Editorial Remarks.....3	
The Fifth Annual Eleven-Foot Poll.....4	The Accessories Before the Fact.....10

History is moving too fast for the amateur press these days. The poll reported on page 5 was compiled before 1 March. Pages 4-9 of this issue of LEFTOVERS were put on stencil and printed on 30 March. On the following night, President Johnson announced that he was stopping the bombing of Hanoi, undertaking peace negotiations, and retiring from the presidency. A lead article on this amazing development was stenciled. And now, 4 April 1968, Dr. Martin Luther King has been assassinated by one of the southern whites in whose moderation we have been taught to trust. Your editor's feelings on this tragic event appear on page 10.

Usually, in the composition of an OPERATION AGITATION publication, this page is the last to go to press. It ties up any loose ends and last-minute news that were missed in the rest of the publication. But now all the news is last-minute news. That period of time, beginning with the Tet Offensive and continuing through the present, will go into the history books as one of those periods when history races, when events overwhelm the individual consciousness until the mind cries out for respite. The wild months of 1794 in Paris, the turmoil of 1848, the year which Russia began as an absolute monarchy and finished as the world's first Communist state, and that week in March 1933 when the U. S. A. and Germany installed the governments which would eventually collide in history's greatest war - these are the only precedents.

Against this background, the poll results on page 5 seem as relevant as the voting of the jury in the Hall-Mills case. But the readers of LEFTOVERS have done their part in persuading the politicians that peace is a potential winner at the polls.

The material in this issue of LEFTOVERS is oriented more towards the political. Apologies are tendered to the readers inherited from KNOWABLE, whose interests lie more towards the literature of science-fiction and fantasy. Articles along this line had originally been planned for LEFTOVERS #4. But it seemed more important to get said the things that had to be said, and get them mailed out before they become cold. For the same reason, a letter column has also been put off to the next issue.

Some readers might be asking "What happened to LEFTOVERS #3?" This one-sheet publication was mailed out to a few people in December, but not to the entire mailing list. Anyone who wishes a copy should send a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

LEFTOVERS is published at irregular intervals by John and Perdita Boardman, 592 16th Street, Brooklyn, N. Y. 11218, USA. It continues POINTING VECTOR and KNOWABLE, and continues subscriptions originally directed at those publications. Subscriptions are 5 issues for \$1.00. LEFTOVERS is also available for trades, or for letters of comment. Eventually, when a backlog of letters is used up, LEFTOVERS will be succeeded by another publication of general coverage. Subscriptions to LEFTOVERS will be transferred to this new 'zine, as yet unnamed.

These words are being written on the evening of Friday 5 April. The shock and frustration at Dr. King's assassination has begotten violence - and certainly the alternatives to this course have not come off well in recent years.

And what is to be done? Prompt passage of the civil rights act now before Congress is only the beginning. President Johnson has estimated that it would cost 80

THE FIFTH ANNUAL ELEVEN-FOOT POLL

The Eleven-Foot Poll (for science-fiction, fantasy, and funae you wouldn't touch with a ten-foot pole) continues this year with judgments on the worst productions in these fields for 1967. Ballots were mailed out with LEFTOVERS #2, and distributed at fan meetings throughout the New York area. In addition, Andrew Porter also mailed out Eleven-Foot Poll ballots with his newszine, Science-Fiction Weekly. As usual, complaints that the vote was unrepresentative of the views of fandom will not be entertained from anyone who received a ballot and did not vote.

This year 23 fans voted. "No Award" means that voting in that category was so widely scattered that no single favorite appeared. Winners who have repeated are given one asterisk for each previous year that they have won. Results of the first four Eleven-Foot Polls appear in LEFTOVERS #2.

Results of the 1967 voting are:

WORST NOVEL: no award

WORST NOVELETTE: no award

WORST SHORT FICTION: no award

WORST DRAMATIC PRESENTATION: "Lost in Space" *

WORST PRO WRITER: Lin Carter *

WORST PRO ARTIST: Vaughn Bode

WORST PROZINE: Amazing **

WORST FANZINE: no award

WORST FAN: no award

WORST FAN ARTIST: no award

WORST NEW FAN FACE: no award

SPECIAL AWARDS: Sam Moskowitz's WorldCon speech.
The Statler-Hilton Hotel in New York.

The editor would like to register a vigorous dissent to the award voted to Vaughn Bode - a good artist and a good human being. The attention of those fans in the publishing trade is called to his book The Man, which deserves a wider audience than it had thus far received.

As a member of the NYCON 3 committee, it is gratifying to note that special awards went to two aspects of the NYCON which its organizers were powerless to control. Fandom got its revenge on the Hilton chain though; it is being reported that Los Angeles lost the bid for the '68 WorldCon solely because they planned to stage it in a Hilton hotel.

Participants in the Fifth Annual Eleven-Foot Poll were: Ken Beale, Paul Blass, Terry Carr, Douglas O. Clark, Sherma Comerford, Leigh Couch, Edward V. Dong, Leonid Doroschenko, George Heap, Thomas Jacoby, Jay Kinney, Jerry Lapidus, Bill Linden, Frank Lunney, Dick Lupoff, David MacDonald, Mike McInerney, Rick Norwood, Lawrence Peery, Jan Slavin, Edward R. Smith, Bob Vardeman, and John B. Wilson. Their assistance is greatly appreciated.

*

"Ask not what your country is doing to you, but rather what you can do to your country." - old New Left proverb

THE SECOND 1968 PRESIDENTIAL PREFERENCE POLL CONCLUSIVELY PROVES
THAT NOBODY CAN BE ELECTED PRESIDENT THIS YEAR

Or very nearly. The results of the first 1968 poll were published in LEFTOVERS #1 and gave the two party nominations to Robert F. Kennedy and Ronald Reagan. Trial heats in the general election between President Johnson and any of three Republican opponents showed the President losing so many Democratic votes to a peace candidate that Nixon, Reagan, or Romney could be elected.

The second poll was arranged much like the first, except that Eugene McCarthy had by then announced as a candidate for the Democratic nomination and was therefore included on the ballot. George Romney withdrew just at the deadline for submission of poll ballots, so his withdrawal did not affect the voting. This time 66 people sent in ballots, compared with 56 for the first poll. Of these, 38 were Democrats and 23, Republicans, with 5 independents. (Perhaps these last could be called "illiterates" rather than "independents". They ignored the poll instructions and marked ballots in both the Democratic and the Republican primaries.)

Participants in the poll were asked whether they were eligible to vote in their states, and if they were registered voters. A tally among all voters is headed by (A), among eligible voters by (E), and among registered voters by (R). (W) denotes write-in votes. "Dem.", "Rep.", and "Ind." have their obvious meanings.

Democratic Presidential Nomination

	(A)	(E)	(R)
Eugene McCarthy	20	17	17
Lyndon B. Johnson	9	4	4
Robert F. Kennedy	6	6	5
Edward M. Kennedy (W)	2	2	2
Benjamin Spock (W)	1	0	0

Democratic Vice-Presidential Nomination

William Fulbright	18	16	16
Hubert H. Humphrey	9	4	4
Steve Allen (W)	1	1	1
Julian Bond (W)	1	1	1
James Gavin (W)	1	1	0
Dick Gregory (W)	1	0	0
Martin Luther King (W)	1	0	0
Eugene McCarthy (W)	1	1	1
Ed. Proxmire (W)	1	1	1
none	4	4	4

Republican Presidential Nomination

Nelson Rockefeller	10	9	6
Richard M. Nixon	4	4	4
Ronald Reagan	3	3	2
George Romney	2	1	1
William Westmoreland	2	0	0
James Gavin	1	1	1
Charles Percy	1	0	0

Republican Vice-Presidential Nomination (W)

Charles Percy	8	7	5
Ronald Reagan	3	2	2
Nelson Rockefeller	3	3	2

Republican Vice-Presidential Nomination (功) (cont.)

	(A)	(E)	(R)
Mark Hatfield	2	2	2
Jacob K. Javits	2	2	1
Clifford Case	1	●	0
Richard M. Nixon	1	1	1
James Rhodes	1	1	1
none	2	0	0

Results in the general election trial heats are broken down by party of the voters. Independent candidates Benjamin Spock and George Wallace were on the ballot; space was left for other names to be written in. The first tabulation analyzes votes by the voters' parties, and the second by their registration.

	Dem.	Rep.	total		Dem.	Rep.	total		Dem.	Rep.	total
Johnson	13	5	18	Johnson	14	9	23	Johnson	11	5	16
Nixon	3	10	14	Reagan	1	8	9	Romney	6	9	17
Spock	15	3	19	Spock	15	3	19	Spock	14	2	17
Wallace	●	1	1	Wallace	0	0	1	Wallace	0	3	3
McCarthy (功)	2	2	4	McCarthy (功)	2	2	4	McCarthy	2	1	3
Rockefeller (功)	1	2	3	Rockefeller (功)	1	1	2	Reagan	0	1	1
none	3	1	7	none	4	1	8	Rockefel.	1	1	2
								none	3	2	7

Apparent discrepancies between the sum of the Democratic and Republican votes on the one hand, and the totals on the other, are due to the presence of independent voters in the poll.

	(A)	(E)	(R)		(A)	(E)	(R)		(A)	(E)	(R)
Johnson	18	12	10	Johnson	23	16	14	Johnson	16	10	7
Nixon	14	12	9	Reagan	9	8	7	Romney	17	13	10
Spock	19	16	14	Spock	19	16	14	Spock	17	14	13
Wallace	1	1	1	Wallace	1	1	●	Wallace	3	2	2
McCarthy (功)	4	2	2	McCarthy (功)	4	2	2	McCarthy (功)	3	2	2
Rockefeller (功)	3	3	3	Rockefeller (功)	2	1	1	Reagan (功)	1	1	1
none	7	5	4	none	8	6	5	Rockefeller (功)	2	2	2
								none	7	7	6

Interpretation of these data is difficult, partly owing to the small and not altogether representative sample and partly because the scene is changing so rapidly. The response to the second poll is considerably more Dove-ish than the first. On the first poll, Republican response was split fairly evenly among Reagan, Nixon, Romney, and Rockefeller, but now Rockefeller shows a decided lead. Among all Republican candidates for the presidential nomination, moderates and conservatives tied 11-11 in the first poll, but moderates lead conservatives 14-9 now.

In the general election trial heats the same pattern shows. Johnson trailed Reagan 11-16 in the first poll, but beats him 23-9 in the second. In the second poll, Johnson beats Republican conservatives who are more Hawk-ish than he, but loses to a man with a reputation as a Dove. Remarks by voters indicate that Rockefeller would defeat Johnson handily.

The vote by which Kennedy beat Johnson in the first poll for the Democratic nomination was transferred almost wholly to McCarthy in the second poll, when McCarthy replaced Kennedy as the leading Dove hope.

Other people than poll-takers are detecting a rising tide of public outcry against war. At the time the poll ballots were prepared, both Robert Kennedy and Nelson Rockefeller seemed uninterested in running, and were consequently left off the

trial heats. Now that Eugene McCarthy has dramatically proven in New Hampshire that a pledge to get out of Vietnam will bring a heavy response of approval from the voters, these two birds of passage are trying to creep into the Dove-cote.

Two weeks ago most Americans were resigned to a choice between Johnson and Nixon, with Wallace yapping at the right heel, and Spock non-committal. Now it is becoming evident that the peace movement is not merely a splinter group populated by oddly clad people in student and Bohemian communities, but a representation of the wishes of a broad spectrum of the American people. Sometime in late 1967 or early 1968 this faction became a majority, and is now looking for a candidate who will carry their program into action.

Other minor indications appear in the two polls:

1. George Wallace will get more Republican than Democratic votes outside the South. In the poll, he received votes only from Republicans. The more Dove-ish the Republican candidate is, the more Republican votes Wallace will get.
2. There is a sizable bloc of votes, mostly Democratic, which wants peace and will vote for the candidate most likely to provide it without regard for his political affiliation - or even his identity. Nor do they care whom the major parties run.
3. Since Democrats outnumber Republicans, a Republican candidate will have to win over Democratic votes. But Ronald Reagan is not even able to hold the Republican vote, much less attract Democrats.
4. Hubert Humphrey commands now support other than as President Johnson's man.

Note how, in the Democratic primary vote, his vote exactly parallels Johnson's.

The editor was all prepared, on the basis of this poll, to make predictions based on the assumption that Johnson and Nixon would be the candidates. He still feels that Richard Nixon, who already has almost enough pledged delegates to win, will be the Republican nominee. But now that it is evident that Lyndon Johnson can be had this year, all bets are off on the Democratic side.

LEFTOVERS would like to acknowledge the participation of the following voters in the Second 1968 Presidential Preference Poll: Nick Allen, Ken Beale, John Benson, John Beshara, Arthur and Helen Boardman, John Boardman, Stewart Brownstein, Mr. and Mrs. Camille Cazedessus Jr., Jack Chalker, Douglas O. Clark, Norman Coe, Peter Comber, Edward V. Long, Leonid Doroschenko, Joyce and Ray Fisher, Ben and Daisylee Fuson, Margaret Gemignani, George and Sherry Heap, Doug Hoylman, Thomas Jacoby, Arnold Katz, Jay Kinney, Terry Kuch, Jerry Lapidus, Leonard and Marilyn Levine, Paul Lewis, Stephen H. Lewis, Bill Linden, David MacDonald, Robert Maloney, Harry Manogg, Mike McInerney, Richard and Suzanne McNamara, Tom Meissner, Ivan Musicant, Madalyn and Richard O'Hair, Ted Pauls, Lawrence Peery, Dick Plotz, Eugene Prosnitz, A. Ratner, Richard Roberts, Ted Serrill, Noreen Shaw, Elliot Shorter, Jan Slavin, Edward R. Smith, Joyce and Kenneth Stein, Roy Tackett, Charles Turler, Rob Vardeman, Conrad von Metzke, Chris Wagner, Rodney Walker, and Robert Ward.

A four-way poll similar to this one was taken by the Gallup Poll in January. With McCarthy as the independent peace candidate, he received 12% of the vote, compared with 39% for Johnson, 30% for Nixon, and 11% for Wallace. Of course, the public temper has changed so much since then that by now this is ancient history. Besides, McCarthy has pledged that he will support Johnson rather than run as an independent if Johnson is renominated.

At about the same time, a student poll at Columbia University ranked 20 possible candidates in order of preference. The 201 students polled preferred Nelson Rockefeller, followed by Kennedy, Lindsay, McCarthy, Percy, and Fulbright in that order. The highest-ranking Hawk was Hubert Humphrey, who placed tenth, one vote ahead of Johnson. This poll included a "control", a non-existent "candidate" named "David Carson". "Carson" lost to everyone else, but beat George Wallace!

A third poll will be attempted after the presidential primary campaign develops, and a few more weak sisters fall by the wayside.

*

Do you play Diplomacy? (The board game, not the Rusk thing.) Then you'll be interested in subscribing to GRAUSTARK, the oldest bulletin of postal Diplomacy. GRAUSTARK, which will celebrate its 5th anniversary in May, is 10 issues for \$1.00 from the editors of LEFTOVERS. Back issues are 10¢ each, or 15 for \$1.00.

POSTAL SAVINGS

The January postal rate increases for domestic mail have been so unpopular that the U. S. Post Office Department has taken an unprecedented step - spot announcements on radio to convince the public that postal service is still a big bargain. Be that as it may, this is the first time postal rates have been increased in a presidential election year since 1932, and you know what happened to the incumbent then.

However, the Post Office has not publicized some of the ways by which its patrons can save on their postage bills, so this article will correct that deficiency. For one thing, air mail as a separate service is on its way out, save for overseas mail. Whenever it can, and to an increasing degree, the post office is sending first-class surface mail by air for distances of over 300 miles. Mail paid at the air-mail rate of 16¢ an ounce has a reserved place in these flights, but mail at 6¢ an ounce is also being included.

Last October I ran a survey on the relative speed of surface and air mail. Ten pairs of letters, one at surface and one at air rates, were sent to ten GRAUSTARK subscribers in five different states: California, Illinois, Michigan, Texas, and Washington. In every case, both letters took two days to reach their destination, and obviously had both gone by air. The replies, sent to me at surface mail rates, came back in two days.

There is clearly no saving of time in using air mail between two points in the "old 48" states. In addition, mail sent to American occupation forces in foreign countries is also sent by air, even though it may be stamped at the rate of 6¢ per ounce. I don't know whether this also applies to third-class mail.

Air mail is still recommended for mail going between the "old 48", Hawaii, and Alaska, or to overseas points. This includes the Caribbean islands, and possibly also the further reaches of Canada and Mexico; these latter two countries take the same first-class, air-mail, and third-class rates as the United States.

Another little-stressed aspect of the new rules is that any surface or air first class mail weighing less than one pound travels at a maximum of 80¢, and is guaranteed air mail handling if mailed at this rate.

The new postal rates are listed below for gradations in ounces up to one pound. "Third class" is printed matter weighing one pound or less. Check with your post office if you are in any doubt as to whether a particular item is a "book" or "printed matter".

There are two book rates, in addition to the domestic rate of 12¢ for the first pound and 6¢ for each additional pound. Rate A holds for Canada and the countries of the Organization of American States; rate B is for all other countries. Both rates continue up to a maximum of 11 lbs.

POSTAL RATES (in cents)

number of ounces	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1st class, domestic surface	6	12	18	24	30	36	42	48	54	60	66	72	78	80	80	80
air	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80
1st class, foreign*	13	21	29	37	45	53	61	69	77	85	93	101	109	117	125	133
3rd class, domestic	6	6	8	10	12	14	16	18	20	22	24	26	28	30	32	34
3rd class, foreign	6	6	10	10	14	14	18	18	22	22	26	26	30	30	34	34
books, rate A	3	3	4	4	5	5	6	6	7	7	8	8	9	9	10	10
books, rate B	4	4	5½	5½	7	7	8½	8½	10	10	11½	11½	13	13	14½	14½

* - These rates are for surface mail. Air mail rates, computed by the half-ounce, vary depending on destination.

For larger items, printed matter goes at the same rate up to a maximum of 6 lbs. 9 oz. (3 kgm.) for most countries. The same is true for books. However, printed matter of over one pound is fourth-class rather than third-class. Unlike many other countries, the United States has no special rate for printed matter sent by air.

For publishers of fanzines and other amateur journals, one particularly important point is the 6¢ minimum for 3rd-class mail. This means that there is no longer a saving in sending printed matter by 3rd-class mail if it weighs less than one ounce. (As a general rule of thumb, five sheets of mimeo or ditto paper, stapled together and mailed without an envelope, weigh just under one ounce.) However, if you want to keep your address list up to date, there is still an advantage to using 3rd-class mail. If the addressee is no longer there, the 'zine will be sent back to you at your own expense. First-class mail is forwarded if the postmaster feels like it; if returned to you, you are not charged postage due. I have been getting some first class mail returned as "non-forwardable matter".

The Post Office Department has a plethora of confusing regulations regarding the checking of addresses. Undeliverable third-class mail, if stamped "Return Postage Guaranteed", will be marked with the new address of the addressee (if known) and returned to the sender at a cost of 8¢. Two different regulations state that the Post Office can search for and send you the last recorded forwarding address of someone who has moved. One of these regulations states that the fee for this search is 15¢, while the other charges \$1.00. But you can get a whole mailing list checked and corrected at a fee of 5¢ per name, with a minimum of \$1.00. The relevant sections of the Postal Manual are 113.53, 123.514, and 158.24.

OPERATION AGITATION

LEFTOVERS #4 follows rather quickly upon the heels of its predecessors, so there are only a few OPERATION AGITATION publications to report this time:

357 GRAUSTARK #150	360 GRAUSTARK #153	363 LEFTOVERS #4
358 GRAUSTARK #151	361 GRAUSTARK #154	364 GRAUSTARK #156
359 GRAUSTARK #152	362 GRAUSTARK #155	365 GRAUSTARK #157

A few back issues of KNOWABLE #10 and of LEFTOVERS #2 are still available for 25¢ each. Send a stamped, self-addressed, legal-size envelope for free copies of LEFTOVERS #1, LEFTOVERS #3, or an introduction to science-fiction fandom entitled SO YOU WANT TO BE A FAN?

Subscribers to STRUBECK, understandably, are beginning to run out of patience. The 3rd and last issue of this chess fanzine was promised for January, and it is still pending. But time pressure is great, and I felt it was necessary to get out the results of the presidential poll before the rapid development of events made it completely moot. Chess, however, is eternal.

This is

O At
P Great
E Intervals
R This
A Appears
T To
I Inflamm
O Optic
N Nerves

363

We still have not settled upon a name for our forthcoming new genzine. However, one is not yet required, because a large number of leftovers still have to be cleared out of the files, including an accumulation of letters extending back over the past three or four years. Articles by Robert Rodriguez, Judith Glattstein, and C. O. Ingamells are also on hand and will eventually be printed. Among the things you will not see in this or future issues of LEFTOVERS is a snide commentary by Stephen Pickering, thief and lunatic, on Marcello Truzzi's sociological satire "Volks-Soziologie", which appeared in KNOWABLE #10. Pickering missed the whole point, thought it was intended seriously, and fired a blistering attack on Truzzi with doubts about his qualifications to speak as a sociologist. Since it develops that Truzzi has a doctorate in the subject, while Pickering was a college freshman sociology major with delusions of grandeur and several other things, the editor has declared it "No Contest". Readers are assured that they will not be subjected to any more outpourings by Stephen Pickering, thief and lunatic, in the pages of any OPERATION AGITATION publication.

LEFTOVERS, or whatever our genzine will be called, is 25¢ a copy or 5 issues for \$1.00 from John and Perdita Boardman, 592 16th Street, Brooklyn, N. Y. 11218, U. S. A. This publication is not edited under the supervision of Bangs Leslie Tapscott.

THE ACCESSORIES BEFORE THE FACT

Tonight, 4 April 1968, the rising crescendo of conservative violence has struck down its greatest and noblest victim. Dr. Martin Luther King, Nobel Laureate and dedicated fighter for civil rights, social justice, and peace was murdered in Memphis, Tennessee, by the same kind of redneck who has done the dirty work for American conservatism for long and bloody decades. It now becomes tragically evident that conservatism has not been diluted by the failure of its programs, or the enactment of so many of the laws against which they so bitterly fought. Instead, these hoodlums have been encouraged by the failure of the civil authorities to punish their previous murders. If they can get away with killing black farmers, they escalated to white ministers and college students. And if they get away with these killings - as they did - they go after the greatest men in the land. And now they have won their sorry triumph by taking the life of the man whom many regarded as the greatest living American.

A direct line of responsibility runs from the Tennessee thugs who killed Dr. King, into the skyscraper offices and suburban homes of the high-minded and high-handed spokesmen of conservatism. This is how William F. Buckley put it in the pages of his magazine National Review:

"The central question that emerges...is whether the white community in the South is entitled to take such measures as are necessary to prevail, politically and culturally, in areas in which it does not prevail numerically? The sobering answer is yes - the white community is so entitled because, for the time being, it is the advanced race...The question, as far as the white community is concerned, is whether the claims of civilization supersede those of universal suffrage...National Review believes that the South's premise are correct...Sometimes the minority cannot prevail except by force; then it must determine whether the prevalence of its will is worth the price of using force." (24 August 1957, page 149)

These words, never repudiated, frequently defended, make William F. Buckley an accessory in the murder of Dr. King. His cultivated manner, his elegant vocabulary, his wealth and reputation, cannot shield the fact that Mr. Buckley is the comrade-in-arms of the sorriest gang of bushwhackers, backstabbers, and childkillers since the time of Lee and Quantrell.

I trust that now there will be no more cavils among the LEFTOVERS readership about the policy, announced in PILLYCOCK #25, of banning conservatives from the pages of my publications. Conservatism does not represent a political position, nor is it entitled to a place in the public dialog of a democracy. It is basically nothing more than a conspiracy to commit murder, to excuse murder, and to defend and exonerate murderers. Tonight's event represents the culmination of more than a dozen years of bitter attack by conservatives, from Senators and editors to illiterate rednecks, upon King, his supporters, his followers, and the legislation and social reforms for which he fought so long and so effectively. Conservatives do not have the right of free speech and organization, any more than do embezzlers, kidnappers, murderers, or any other criminals. They do not even have the right of free breath.

Let us not be diverted, at this critical time, by attempts to blame Negroes and their white allies for the murders which have been committed against them. Numerous studies, culminating in the recent report of the presidential commission on riots, have demonstrated beyond the least doubt that the present race problem is a white problem, that the major problem is white hatred against blacks in particular and all racial minorities in general, and that murders of blacks by whites far exceed in number and lack of provocation murders of whites by blacks.

Each of us can do little. But we can do something. We can isolate these murderers and friends of murderers from our homes, our professional contacts, our society. By setting up a solid front against them, we can turn their hatred back upon themselves where it will destroy them.

In the little community represented by the amateur press, of fandom and its sub-

urbs, we can identify these butchers and turn our collective scorn upon them. I will do so here.

The persons who have been banned from LEFTOVERS and its kindred publications for their support of conservative racism are: Poul Anderson, Rick Brooks, Mike McQuown, Fred Lerner, Stephen Barr. Other known racists in fandom include John Kusske, Larry Montgomery, and George Wetzel. In the last LEFTOVERS Presidential Preference Poll the following people voted for George Wallace: Camille Cazedessus Jr., Douglas O. Clarke, Thomas Jacoby, Robert Ward. (Granted, the votes were collected confidentially. But if we know who these people are, our chances of living and our country's chances of surviving as a democracy are improved. The rights of criminals are negligible by comparison.)

At this late date it would be superfluous to recapitulate once more the conclusions which make the identification of "conservative" with "racist" so obvious. Ever since conservatism began reviving as a political force in the middle '50's, it has been inextricably linked with the opposition to full effective civil rights for the black people of America. Its favored candidates and publications have attacked civil rights bills and civil rights demonstrators - sometimes with haughty editorials, sometimes with clubs or shotguns. Perhaps it was put most concisely by the conservative editor Ned Touchstone, in his fortnightly Councilor:

"A true conservative is even more interested in preserving white civilization and racial purity than he is in conserving just tax dollars." (30 September 1966)

Councilor is the most widely circulated conservative journal, with more than a quarter of a million readers. The lines are drawn clearly enough for anyone who can read.

The assassination of Dr. King, coming as it does after almost a hundred other murders designed to terrorize integrationists, should not be let drop in future confrontations with conservatives. If they try to engage us in debate in the future, let them be continually reminded of this deed of theirs. Let the answer to all their catchphrases be "Who killed Martin Luther King?" If they say, "Aren't Negroes getting too much power?", reply "Who killed Martin Luther King?" If they say, "They haven't earned the things they're asking for," reply "Who killed Martin Luther King?" If they say, "We must preserve states' rights," reply, "Who killed Martin Luther King?" If they say "What about the riots in Detroit?", reply "Who killed Martin Luther King?" If they say, "But whites have a higher level of civilization than blacks," reply, "Who killed Martin Luther King?" Except for steel and lead, this is all the dialog we need with conservatives.

How does this affect you and me? Well, did you march in Washington in August 1963? Then conservatives have also marked you for death. Did you speak out for the Civil Right Acts in 1964, 1965, or 1966? Then your life is also in danger. Did you help register voters in Mississippi, or did you merely send \$5.00 for CORE Christmas cards in 1962? Then, in the eyes of these murderers, you are also culpable in the vast conspiracy which they have sworn to extirpate.

ESSAY CONTEST

(continued from p. 2)

portant that all other considerations must be sacrificed to wiping it out. These laws are intended to hamper the functioning of this conspiracy.

It is no secret to the editor of LEFTOVERS that many readers feel he is wrong in dismissing this conspiracy as a chimaera. It is real and worth worrying about, they write. The laws against it are said to be necessary for our defense.

These readers will be given a chance to support this argument, with reference to a specific anti-Communist law. LEFTOVERS hereby announces an essay contest, open to all readers, on the following topic:

WHY THE NEW YORK STATE LAW, PREVENTING A COMMUNIST FROM GETTING A DRIVER'S LICENSE, IS JUSTIFIED IN VIEW OF THE MENACE OF COMMUNISM.

Contestants should stick to the point, and address themselves to the relationship of Communism and highway safety or other appropriate considerations. There should be no digressions about the Berlin Wall, Gallant Little Latvia, or Who Killed Carlo Tresca? The following points might be worthy of consideration:

1. Communism is related to Anarchism, and Anarchism opposes all laws including traffic laws.
2. Communists in Vietnam have been acting in open disregard of their own safety, and such people should not be permitted on the road.
3. All drivers are required to have insurance, and since insurance is a capitalistic enterprise Communists will have nothing to do with it.

Entries may be of any length up to 2563 words. The deadline is 1 June 1968. First prize will be a year's free subscription to an anti-Communist publication of the editor's choice. The editor's decision will be final.

If this contest proves a success, another contest will be held concerning the Maryland law which prevents Atheists from getting married in that state.

EDITORIAL REMARKS (continued from p. 3)

billion dollars to implement the recommendations of the riot commission report. This program must be enacted and begun at once, without regard to any other considerations, including the Vietnam war, the space program, or the price of gold. Deficit spending should be of as little concern in this campaign against poverty as it would be in time of war.

Something can also be done about curbing the campaign of hatred which has incited this murder. There is presently before the New York Legislature a "group libel" bill, making the incitement of racial or religious hatred a criminal offense. This bill was passed last year, but vetoed by Governor Rockefeller. It must become law this year. Other states, and the federal government, must follow suit. The bill is designed on an Illinois act which was upheld as constitutional by the U. S. Supreme Court in 1952. (Illinois vs. Beauharnais.)

But the laws are no better than the men who enforce them, and we have seen too many good laws fail for lack of enforcement. These measures must be backed by a resolve on the part of the public, that the further functioning of the men, organizations, and publications which have instigated this murder will not be tolerated. Justice must not end with the man who killed Dr. King, but must also deal with the men who encouraged this act, and the men who condone it.

LEFTOVERS #4

John and Perdita Boardman
592 16th Street
Brooklyn, New York 11218
U. S. A.

There is sobbing of the strong,
And a pall upon the land;
But the People in their weeping
Bare the iron hand;
Beware the People weeping
When they bare the iron hand.

printed matter only
return postage guaranteed

- Herman Melville