

IF I WERE A JOURNALIST

For a long time I have been promising (threatening) to write something for publication in *The Polk Progress*. It seems that since childhood I have occasionally encountered the phrase "If I were king . . ." as the title of a book, play or other writing. That strikes a response (felt or spoken) in most people I know. Almost everyone can think of something he or she feels ought to be done differently—if I were king I could cause some change to be made.

If the pen is mightier than the sword, it would seem that writing should have the greatest influence on society. If I was a columnist, I would find very little I would consider worth my time other than the subject of government. Readers would find it hard to discern whether or not I am a Democrat or a Republican since I do not believe either party is even in the ball park in the supposedly diligent search for solutions to the very distressing problems of our nation and the world. Also, I am neither liberal nor conservative. I do not consider those to be opposite ends of any useful scale, since both derive their explanatory background from the same abysmal errors perpetrated by "academia."

I believe I cannot be categorized "left" or "right" since I see little more difference between the political left and the political right than I see between Iowa football and Oklahoma football as it appears to a bystander who objects to football. As I see it, the left and right are just two factions competing for the job of managing a collectivist economy and they get their economic education out of the same academic school of thought.

I avoid multiple-meaning words such as "politics" to which my dictionary assigns a good meaning "the science of government" and another meaning "the art of management so as to secure the election of particular candidates." The use of the word elicits, in most minds, the second meaning. This meaning separates politics from education by a wide gulf. It is not a classroom situation. It is the art of the quick fix, the medium of the clever catchphrase, the foggy bottom of professional obfuscation. It is an arena where conflicting privileges battle for their own supposed advantages, usually without regard to, and often at the expense of, the general good. (At this point, I suggest you check with your local algebra teacher to calculate whether you gain with a ten percent larger fraction of a ten percent smaller pie). It is highly possible for one man's supposed gain to be no one's gain, not even his own.

One time I talked to a local service club on "Utopia and Language." I stated I could be considered Utopian if Utopia is defined my way as the practical correction of a few major fundamental injustices. But you can leave me out of your list of Utopians if you define Utopia as an impractical scheme of social order. (See such writers as Alvin Toffler.)

If I was a columnist, my theme would be about economic processes and their relation to government. Unfortunately, the economic beliefs which inform and advise most of the world's leaders and rule-makers, including Russia, have nothing to offer that will solve anything. About the only remedy the current advisers offer is to inflate the money supply, under one guise or another, and they cannot even explain why that seems to affect a slight relief for a time, and then later, to intensify the same problem it was intended to relieve.

I think I have a case to present. No, I did not think it up all by myself. It is an explanatory framework for economics which I stumbled upon almost four decades ago. Its explanations make sense when other theories make the world appear to be filled with hopelessly complex mysteries and people doing wrong intentionally.

I hope to be back here soon.