

Dear Ed,

The enclosed revision of my preamble draft incorporates changes which I believe will resolve the problems which led to your revision of 7-21-72. I'd also like to list for you the objections I have to most of those changes.

1. The clause "in opposition....today" is necessary stylistically to set a philosophical note and context and make a forceful descriptive (by negative implication) reference to who we are, and to awaken interest and make a challenge from the beginning to serve the (legitimate) purpose of this document as a manifesto.

As I said on the phone, I also think this would appeal especially to the "freethinkers" who do have a lot of patriotic feeling and are dissatisfied with current domestic abuses, as well as those who have strong feelings against communism, fascism, or third world authoritarianism in general. In a world as full of dissatisfaction and disgust with government in general as today's, the immediate reaction will nearly always be "they oppose the bad guys" instead of "they oppose me".

2. The change to "all individuals", and subsequent pluralisations in this area, tends to focus attention on or connote the group, public, etc. The concept and feeling should be kept entirely singular; this is a party of individualists! It comes down to a matter of psychological emphasis.

3. Use of redundant modifiers like "own" should be avoided for conciseness and flow.

4. The phrase "(sovereign judgment) of each of them" is an indefinite relationship grammatically—i.e. whose judgment applies to whom? It has possible connotations of something like dictatorship of the proletariat!

5. Phrase "rights of individuals" leaves open the connotation of possible rights of other entities (groups)—which is not so and should be avoided emphatically. Phrase "such rights" bears similar connotation that there may be other kinds of rights.

6. Repetition of "initiation of force" instead of "such action" is awkward; better to repeat the pronoun-phrase, which is also more generic in sense, or psychological emphasis (i.e. threat and fraud).

7. After "purpose whatever", minimum grammatical requirement is a comma, but semi-colon (which is also grammatically valid) gives a better break in flow and logical transition.

8. I take particular exception to this. Your phrasing states (or implies) "objective law" as sole function of government, and not as a metaphysical necessity upon which the right to institute government is founded—a double error. Law is only one necessary function of government (albeit the primary one) and the (natural and universal) necessity for objective law (the generic—not laws) is indispensable to a statement of the right to institute government (which must be sovereign by its nature over a given territory). I deal with this question in more detail in the paper I'm working on; but if this is not stated here correctly, we will be left without a principle that will be indispensable to many



problems which we will encounter very soon (if the party grows as it should).

9. The phrase "according to these principles" is necessary as a reassertion that we are a party of principle, and that the problem is one of principle. The reference to defending dignity also must be modified; rational politics is necessary but not sufficient to dignity, and our defense of it as a political organization can extend only to these principles explicitly.

10. "against their rights and consent" is a more concise and forceful phrase; the solution to the problem there is better I believe in the revised draft.

11. The word "thereby" is necessary to the argument and style of a manifesto and to keep desired concrete ends in touch with causative principles; i.e. the preceding part of the paragraph is necessary to and the primary cause of such a society. It is also a necessary link over the semi-colon, which is needed for transition.

12. "...the political program necessary to achieve these objectives" is stylistically and logically redundant. ("In order to do such-and-such, we set forth what's necessary to do such-and-such.") The idea of "advocate and seek to implement" is the summation of the party's purpose, and for a manifesto a necessary call to action. We are seeking to implement our specific (issue-oriented) positions (at the polls), and our general policies of government; if not, then we have proclaimed ourselves a society for debating and petitioning (pleading) for others to do it for us, and no more!

I invite your further comment on this, and will show this to Jerome for the same purpose today.

Sincerely,