1

? 1963

1963

~~I believe~~

There are and always have been only ~~the~~ two proper

(PP) ~~The only~~ reasons for a ~~gray gov~~ ~~mob group~~

group of people to establish a government.

First,

~~are~~ ~~is~~ to ~~enact laws which~~ ~~protect~~

assist each them in ~~their~~ his privilege as a human being

~~each individual's~~ self-evident, ~~right~~

to individually pursue a truly happy life, and do what is right

second, to

protect ~~them~~ him from ~~any~~ any other person ~~one~~ — be ~~the~~ ~~other~~

latter one of ~~their~~ his number or ~~and~~ an outsider —

from interfering with that pursuit.

~~I believe that all~~ these were the only

~~All~~ other government action is

officious, ~~and wrong~~. and unnecessary

(P) ~~Obviously~~

Obviously ~~[illegible]~~, an individual can not do anything he pleases simply because it makes him happy or he believes it ~~to be~~ is the right thing to do. ~~But~~

His behavior must be limited to only that which does not interfer with another's pursuit of happiness.

But, too often we tend to ~~judge the~~ make a moral judgment of the propriety of his behavior in the abstract, rather than balance his elementary right to do ~~wat~~ what he chooses, against the degree to which it interfers with others.

Many times this is done by ~~judges, legislators,~~ law-makers
~~executors and influential prosecutors,~~
~~under the pretext supposition~~ pretext that otherwise
disguised by the argument
our country will fall to ruins

and we will then be without any protection
of freedom whatsoever. If the danger is real, I have no objection. But, in ~~most~~ many cases, what is

happening in fact is that these people
are imposing an unneeded additional limitation. ~~E~~

~~freedom~~.

That is, an individual is ~~not~~ free to do only what they believe is right and what they believe produces true happiness.

With this, I disagree. ~~I don't do not believe that~~ Whether they speak for the majority or not, a government ~~than their law, or an influential private citizen than intimidation~~, should abridge ~~the person's~~ one the freedom ~~only~~ of one person only when its security is threatened or when it interferes with the freedom of another.*

~~or when it threatens ~~national ~~security~~ the security of the government~~

Except when its ~~security~~ ~~is~~ ~~in~~ very existence is threatened, a government should abridge the freedom of one person only when it interferes with the freedom of another.

? 1963

1963

I do not intend to support by argument, nor expound at length upon the validity of the proposition that ~~one's~~ one has a right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, ~~is self-evident~~. That social axiomatic right, ~~basic principle understood and unanimously promulgated by our founding factors~~, is not ~~a~~ the clearly deduced conclusion of a syllogism containing some more general, more basic major premise. It ~~is induced~~ is produced by ~~owes its existence to~~ the process of induction; ~~that is, human experience~~

~~of a thousands of different~~

which means it is right because thousands of different considerations of human existence demonstrate its rightness. Which is the same as saying it ~~as our our founding~~ the way the people who started the United States said it, that is, that it is self-evident. It is the purpose of this ~~ma~~ paper to explane what I belief it means.

From the right to live and think and do as one pleases, frows the duty not to unnecessarily interfer with another's enjoyment of ~~the~~ the right to do as he pleases. If it pleases you to contribute money ~~so that~~ to erect a church ~~in which you~~ for you to enter and ~~can~~ worship your God, and it pleases me to burn your church to the ground, ~~one of us must~~ either I must be allowed, or you ~~be stopped~~. must be able to stop me.

Subject to this ~~one~~ limitation, if an individual pleases to do something, he has a right to do it, and it is the primary mission of a government to ~~determine~~ apply this test to determine the propriety of ~~whether~~ a specific act or failure to act.

In deciding ~~who~~ that it is ~~I~~ who must be stopped, it is ~~not~~ ~~enough~~ erroneous to ~~say~~ answer that ~~the right to~~ your ~~pleasure of~~ right practice ~~one's~~ your religion is paramount to ~~the~~ my ~~pleasure~~ right of ~~witnessing~~ setting and watching a great fire. ~~First of all,~~ ~~With you and me, that might,~~ in fact, ~~not be the case, Secondly and even if it is, it begs the question because you have not told me why. The reason is~~ Relating the quantums of happiness each us would receive ~~in our respective pursuits~~ if ~~permitted~~ allowed to

This decision begs the question, ~~If~~ we admit that the right of either of us to do ~~something~~ an act is derived from our pleasure to do it, ~~the~~ For it assumes that you take greater pleasure in your prayers than I do in my fins, which may indeed not be the case.

~~The It is likewise erroneous to say~~
If you retort that this is un-
~~If you say that~~

reasonable on my part, I might agree, but that also is an erroneous consideration because

it assumes that D may only pursue that which would make a reasonable man happy.

but then, in both cases you or someone else would be forced ~~—~~ to determine what pursuits would make a reasonable man happy. If you talk to anyone who has sat on a jury, ~~as a civil~~ you will learn that most of the time this question can be answered with no little difficulty.

1963 ?

1963

Psychoanalysis Anonymous

M.C. Ladies and gentlemen. In a moment, we shall look in on a meeting. The people at the meeting have come to discuss a problem which ~~they~~ they all share. In many respects, the group you are about to see resembles a local chapter of the famed Alcoholics Anonymous. But it is not. These people may or may not have a drinking problem. However, all of them, at some time in their past, were able to find relief from their personal problems only by visiting a psychiatrist.

a fellow member

takes him out of seeking ~~psy~~
psychiatric assistance

(over a snake pit)

