



CADENZA #10, NOVEMBER, 1964

CONTENTS

Fugato (editorial)	2
Guest Editorial (Phil Harrell)	6
The Concept of Justice	7
Remarks Addressed to a Feline Parent	11
The Quatt Winkery (mlg comments)	12
Counterpoint (letters)	16

mundus mea patria

Cover: "Gerrymander" by c.w.

Edited and published one or two times a year by Charles & Jane Wells, 815 Demerius Street, Apt. M-1, Durham, N.C. 27701, U.S.A. This issue is distributed in the 109th mailing of the FAPA, and shortly thereafter to those who trade, send a letter of comment, or subscribe at the rate of 15 cents an issue, 8 for one dollar. Code on the address label: t - trade, s - subscribe, x - sample, no letter - some other reason. A number, if there is one, is the number of the last issue you are currently due to get. Those who trade also get HEX, a small OMPazine. CADENZA is an amateur magazine distributed principally among science fiction fans; it is not professional and is not beholden to anyone but the editors.

introit

PLAIN WORDS

There is a new computer language called LISP in which you (if you are a programmer) can talk about the words which make up the language LISP in LISP. I expect the computer people will get all excited about this, just as logicians have been excited for the past forty or so years about languages in which you can talk about the words you are using. Of course, English has always been able to do this, which is why there can be such things as textbooks of grammar. This editorial is not about computers, about which I know little, or logic, about which I know a little more, but about grammar and the use of English words. (It would be very unfair if some reader were to ask how much I know about grammar and the use of English words).

The science of linguistics, which is the study of language-in-itself rather than the study of language for some purpose (like in order to translate the Bible) is almost never taught in our public schools, and rarely taught in colleges to anyone but those who specialize in it. What is taught in schools is a series of rules to be obeyed, rules made up over the past few centuries by various grammarians, and known collectively as "Correct Grammar". Correct Grammar was invented, in the sense that baseball was invented -- not by one man but by a sequence of people. It is not something that has always existed nor is it something that can be found out by the exercise of pure reason. There is no logical reason, for example, for the shall-will rules. These facts are obvious, once thought about; but one does not often think about something about which no question has been raised -- look at Kant assuming that Euclidean space is the only possible way space could be arranged, not twenty years before Lobachevski blew up that notion forever -- and certainly the public school teachers never raise the slightest question about the philosophical underpinnings for Correct Grammar. I am going to raise them here, and I am going to educate youse guys as to the truth.

Language is behavior. As such, its study should be a branch of that incompletely-unified science, the different parts of which are called Psychology and Sociology. When you discover that most educated people are surprised, perhaps jarred but in any case notice it when someone writes "youse guys", you have discovered a fact about behavior. When you discover that most people get the meaning of the sentence, "Therefore I shall now educate my readers, so that they will know the Truth and experience various emotional states in reaction to the meaning of the sentence, such as throwing up, etc., but do not noticeably react to the form of the statement, you have also discovered a fact about behavior.

Commonly, "youse guys" is known as Incorrect Grammar, and the last sentence I quoted is Correct Grammar. But what makes them correct or incorrect is not that they do or do not violate a law of nature, nor that they state the truth or are false (for a false statement can be grammatically correct); what makes them correct or incorrect is the attitude of people. And since the attitude of people changes over time and space, so does what is correct and incorrect.

Because fashion designers realize that people's attitudes on clothes are largely determined by their contact with fashion magazines, the designers are able to manipulate their attitudes -- and cause millions of women all over the world to raise or lower their hems in a given year. But since few people grasp the source of grammatical authority, we have very little control over where our language goes; we have abdicated responsibility for our language and the responsibility has been assumed by high-school and college English teachers who are all too often concerned less with clear expression than with a few arbitrary shibboleths of "good writing" such as not splitting infinitives and avoiding dangling participles. And, I might add, by crusty professor-types who worry about etymology, with consequent ludicrous insistence that "nostalgic" should mean longing for faraway places rather than for long-ago times, that "television" is a bastard (Greek + Latin), and "reliable" should mean "able to rely" rather than "able to be relied upon".

It happens all too often that someone is interrupted in the middle of a perfectly clear statement to be **told** that "between you and I" is wrong, or, if the interrupter comes from a different social class, that "between you and me" is wrong. Or a poor fan-ed opens a letter to discover to his disappointment that the writer didn't care what he said in his last issue, but was grossly upset that he misspelled "misspelled" or wrote "it's" for "its".

And too often the people who are corrected in this very impolite manner allow themselves to be browbeaten and meekly submit that they were wrong and they are sorry. To me it seems all the difference in the world between doing this and consciously and intelligently choosing to say something in a certain way in the knowledge that other possible ways might call attention to the locution rather than to the intent. Awareness of the reasons for one's choice is the cornerstone of a free society; I have a nagging fear that the person who allows himself to be browbeaten into talking a certain way will be more easily browbeaten into voting or praying a certain way.

Each social class in this country has certain standards of language which it expects its members to conform to. College professors often feel complete contempt for someone who says "between you and I", the same sort of contempt that one construction worker feels for another who says, "goodness gracious!", when a brick falls on his toe. These are both examples of attitude towards language; they are similar from every rational point of view. The fact that many people would regard the first as Bad Grammar and the second as Not the Way Construction Workers Should Talk if They Don't Want to Get Kicked is symptomatic of what I believe to be a very confused attitude towards language.

Of course, the rules for the way college professors write are much more complicated than the rules for the way construction workers talk, but that's an understandable result of the fact that college professors are often concerned with words.

It is desirable that Man exercise as much control over his fate as it is possible for him to do; this goes for control over his environment, control over his economy, and control over his language. Though some people on the Right may disagree with me, I think most will agree when I say that it is possible for the government to intervene in the economy with beneficial effect; not that all intervention is good, but that some intervention can be good if done properly. It is simply not true that there are inexorable laws of the marketplace that are set up so as to work out to the best possible conclusion only if left alone; it can be demonstrated with elementary mathematics that a market may be improved by a small amount of redistribution of income, for example, or by breaking up monopolies.

Of course, there can be no governmental agency to tell us how to talk; the sort of control that is necessary here is the same sort of control that we now exercise

over other mores. Society can exercise a degree of self-control; this is shown by the increased politeness with which Negroes are nowadays treated (naturally I am not saying we need progress no further in this area). Many people are polite to Negroes because they have been browbeaten, but a reassuring number of them do it because they honestly believe it is reasonable and right to do so. I believe it is perfectly possible for society to exercise the same sort of conscious control over its language, a control which is effective but under which those who consent to speak or write in a certain way do so because they have been convinced that that is the best way, not because they have been shamed into it.

This is not happening today. Most people do not exercise rational control over their own speech and writing, and what pressures there are for linguistic change are concentrated in peripheral and largely irrelevant areas like the who/whom question and whether words like "finalize" should be used. "Meanwhile those practices that make for blurry communication are generally left to grow and change unchecked. Part of the reason for this, of course, is that the causes for blurriness and unclearness are hard to pinpoint, whereas specific violations of Good Grammar are very easy to spot.

There are rational guidelines for desirable linguistic change. I will mention a couple here to illustrate what I would like to see the horror of preposition-ending replaced by. For one thing, it is undesirable that words should change in meaning, because if this happens the works of the past become unintelligible. It is much better that new concepts be talked about with new words, rather than older words being changed to fit. Naturally this is a general rule and I don't expect it to be applied completely.

Another guideline is that different concepts be talked about with different words. Of course if the two concepts are widely different and will never be confused the situation is less serious than in a case where two closely-related concepts are blurred together with a single word. It matters a great deal, for example, that "discrimination" means both "separation into types" and "the deliberate preference of one type over another". (Compare "discriminate against" and "discriminate between" --the prepositions help but unfortunately people are not used to thinking in terms of word-phrases, but in terms of single words.)

"Due to the fact that" is undesirable, simply because it is longer than "because" but means exactly the same thing, which illustrates a third rule. Note that the former phrase is perfectly grammatical according to traditional standards. "Between you and I" is ungrammatical according to the same standards and yet it is perfectly clear in intent and cannot be replaced by anything shorter. Of course, the expression "between you and me" is just as short and just as clear, and even if good grammar required something clumsier than "between you and I" to express the same meaning I would still recommend to anyone talking to educated people to use what good grammar required, since the "I" version calls your speech to attention. In fact it may even incur your listeners' contempt. The point is to avoid "bad grammar" when you want to impress your listeners and when your listeners are educated. It is not important to avoid it otherwise.

"Finalize" is desirable because it says something that no other word says. The nearest synonymous phrase is "put in final form". I am aware that one of the big objections to the new Webster Third International is that it allows this word, but none of the objectors as far as I am aware has come up with a single good reason why the word should be banned. Please note that saying it is "barbarous" or "not good English" is mere name-calling. Whether a change in language is to be accepted or not should depend entirely on whether or not it makes the language a better instru-

ment for communication, and on nothing else. "Finalize" is an annoying word; it annoys me, too. But I cannot reasonably ask someone else to avoid using a word merely because I don't like it. And neither can an English teacher.

What I have claimed in this editorial is that "good grammar" is merely fashion and that it would be far preferable to accept or reject innovations in language on a more objective basis -- whether it improves the language as a tool of communication. I certainly do not want to say that there is no art in using language or that "good" writing is distinguished from "bad" writing solely on the basis of how well it communicates. There is such a thing as beautiful writing, and there is enough agreement among people who care about such things that Shakespeare's English is often beautiful but Grace Metalious' is rarely so that it is clear that the beauty is not entirely subjective and is not completely determined by whether or not the language used communicates the meaning effectively. I daresay Grace Metalious communicated what she was trying to get across better than Shakespeare did, but only because she had so much less to communicate. But again "good grammar" has little to do with beauty of language; good grammar is fashion, and it should be instructive to remember that sometimes fashionable clothes are beautiful, and also sometimes unfashionable ones are.

It should be apparent that my point of view is in the middle between the absolutist doctrines of High School English teachers and the anything-goes views of someone like Bergen Evans. A book which presents similar views, although I disagree with many of its specific recommendations, is The Complete Plain Words, by Sir Ernest Gowers, which is available from Penguin. It contains a wealth of observations on the usage and misuse of words and I recommend it to anyone whose business or hobby involves the use of words. It was written primarily for officials, but it will be useful to a wider class of people than that.

--CW

Turn around, Miss Liberty...

MISCELLANY

Next issue will see illustrations, absent from this issue (had you noticed?) and it will be mimeographed on the third different mimeo in as many issues. It should be out in May, unless I discover a solvable problem between now and then and find it possible to complete my thesis this spring (highly unlikely).

The article, The Concept of Justice, Part I, this issue, is reprinted from HEX and cannot count as FAPA credit.

Barries are out of season in November.

HHH

MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT

This Department is specially for the growing number of mathematicians and people who work with mathematics in fandom. I am interested in receiving results which are neither too esoteric nor too well known. They may be old or new. The following is a good example of what I'm looking for; it is well known to number-theorists but perhaps not to others.

Let m and n be integers and p a prime. If you want to know whether p divides $C_{m,n}$ (the number of combinations of m things taken n at a time), express n and $m-n$ to the base p and add them up (to get m). If you have to "carry" in doing the addition, and only then, p divides $C_{m,n}$. This is rather intricate to prove, but requires no deep results.

Guest editorial

BY PHIL HARRELL

I am a fan and have been one now for almost nine years. I am not a feudist, I hate feuds and I don't care if as one person said, "There's enough people on both sides so no one should feel lonely." Tell me, Fandom, is that all friendship means to you? Is your collective friendship so shallow and callous that an argument over someone you hardly know and could care less about is enough to break up friendships of long years standing? Does the word "friendship" mean so little that the words "I favor So and So and if you favor the other side than you're a rotten S.O.B" are so easily said?

Does getting publicity mean so much to you that you have to jump on a bandwagon by saying all you can for the sheer joy of being able to have something to publish and something to fill up page space?

Fandom used to be fun and my sericon Jophans are killing it by degrees; all it needs now is a post-mortem to be pronounced fully and most assuredly dead. Is this what you really want? To be fighting a senseless war that no one can really win, where everyone loses? The casualties are mounting and the dead litter all fandom. Well know and respected fans that should know better are acting like stupid little kids saying, "If you don't play the game my way I'm going to take my marbled and go home," -- as if they owned all the marbles in town and had a monopoly on the rest of the world.

WHY? I ask you, must some people that should know better act like insensitive clods? Can't you try to use your influence to heal up the wounds instead of trying to start other skirmishes yourselves? Each side has now taken the tack, "Either you are against me or you are for me," and refuses almost to a person to have anything to do with anyone on the other side. And anyone who has steadfastly tried to remain neutral is automatically "on the other side" to both sides. Idiotic? You bet your life it is, but that's the way it is. I ask this of both sides, and if you can't answer it positively and without feeling the least bit ashamed than I advise you to see what you can do to pick up the pieces and try to put fandom back together again, and what I ask is, "Is what you are doing actually helping make a better place of fandom? will it be a better place and create stronger friendships?" And -- "Are you sorry you didn't know ----- better and that your friendship couldn't stand this small test of strength?" Fandom used to be fun -- why are you stomping on it with hobnail boots?

This latest feud tells me some of you take it more seriously than you thought you took it. Please stop, before it's too late. Fandom was meant to be enjoyed -- not lived.

--Phil Harrell

ENEY

FOR TAFF

!

The Concept of Justice

I. Equality

It is one of the eternal wonders of humanity that the Common Man's attitudes are often more enlightened than they would be if his own description of them were accurate. This is such a common happening that philosophers, particularly political philosophers, are wont to make use of it in elucidating their principles. Such a philosopher is likely to hold up some widely-held platitude for inspection, ask questions of the Common Man about various implications of the notion, point out to him the roughness of his description (but not of his real attitudes) and wind up with a nicely-honed and consistent philosophical abstraction. Socrates liked this sort of thing so much that his name has been attached to the method.

Nowhere is the Common Man's misstatement of his own attitudes more apparent than in the case of the concept of equality. The usual statement of the principle of equality is so oversimplified and inaccurate and full of inconsistencies that elitists, like Adolph Hitler and John W. Campbell, Jr., usually spend all their time ridiculing it and never go into the concept any deeper. This is a blessing for the elitists because when it comes to giving positive arguments as to why their particular elite should rule the world they are rarely able to do anything but appeal to the emotions. (Hitler's elite was the "Aryans" and Campbell's is the "successful" people, defined in some unclear manner).

But when you look beyond the usual inept expression of the principle and find out what the Common Man says about specific situations you often discover that the notion in action is quite sensible and sophisticated. The most usual statement is that all men are created equal, which is patently untrue. People are born unequal in intelligence, in physical strength, in beauty, and in the ability to wiggle their ears. Nevertheless, many people are bamboozled by the unfortunate wording of the Declaration of Independence into believing that anyone can become "smart" by studying hard, strong or skilled at sports by exercising hard, and even beautiful by thinking beautiful thoughts. And that the differences that show up between people are entirely their own doing, and not inborn.

However, most people are not so foolish as to believe such things, and I will not consider the evidence here. There are several common replies to the observation that all men are not created equal. One is that they nevertheless have equal value in the sight of God. The inference is that therefore they should have equal value in the sight of man as well. This is essentially a moral assertion that cannot be argued. Very few people carry it out in practice, however: it is clear from statements people made about "them" that people "valued" Albert Einstein, Ernest Hemingway and John F. Kennedy more than most.

Although there is not much one can say about the notion of equal value, it should be pointed out that even if men have equal value this does not mean that their actions and accomplishments are of equal value, nor does it mean, as Campbell has

pointed out, that their opinions are of equal value in questions of fact. The notion that all actions and opinions are equal is one of the more unfortunate ones circulating today in the ranks of the progressive educationists. In a discussion in KIPPLE Marion Z. Bradley once argued that the high-school boy who was respected by his fellow teenagers, was a leader of the crowd, who could get dates any time he wanted one with any one of a great many girls, and so forth, was a "success" just as much as the other student who excelled in academic subjects. In both cases they accomplish easily and well what they set out to do. But obviously in the eyes of society (not in the eyes of his peers!) the second boy is more of a success. The fact that both boys are successful in what they want to do is immaterial to society, which makes its own demands. Thus the notion that the school, instead of demanding things of the pupils, should meet the pupil's demands, does no service to society and, even more important, does no service to the pupil, since he will be less able to meet the demands of society upon graduation).

Another "interpretation" of the concept of equality is that all men should have equal opportunity to develop their own potentials. This, like the following one, involves a rather jarring shift from what all men are to what all men should have. This appears necessary: there simply is no sense other than the moral one mentioned above in which men are actually equal. This notion of "freedom of opportunity" is widely supported by conservatives and liberals alike, but neither group seems to take it literally. One of the more obvious consequences is that people should not be allowed to inherit money, a notion which few people support. In practice, the usual belief seems to be that one person or group of persons should not be singled out by law for special privileges or specially punitive measures, unless the group of persons in question is defined by a pertinent criterion -- orphans, for example. If one person has special privileges as a result of someone's private actions, there is not so much inclination to do anything about it; the emphasis seems instead to be on remedying the position of underprivileged people who are underprivileged because of external circumstances.

This notion then in practice borders on the third "interpretation" of equality, that of equality under the law. Here, the usual statement is that the law should treat all men equally. This, like the other statements, needs a terrific amount of qualifying and defining. Although this was briefly discussed in another article I wrote which appeared in CADENZA #5, I think it is worthwhile going over some of the same ground here. An example used in that article was that murderers should not be treated the same as other people. If we follow the same line of reasoning as employed in that article, we come to the conclusion that the law should treat men equally in like circumstances. The punishment for murder should be the same for white and Negro murderers, for redheaded and beetlebrowed murderers (and redheaded beetle-browed murderers), and so forth. Distinctions should not be made on the basis of differences in the cases which are irrelevant.

There are two difficulties. First, how do we tell what is relevant? Second, what is "equal" treatment?

Continuing the example of murder, we find that in actual cases there are a great many things which courts and legislatures have held relevant, including the following: was the murder premeditated or a spur of the moment thing? were there extenuating circumstances? was the murderer sane? was he feeble-minded? had he murdered before? and so forth. Some other things have caused considerable controversy: American southerners, for example, have held that race is relevant. Some American courts have held that the police cannot use tactics on uneducated, unintelligent people that are allowable on educated people of sharp wit (confusing questions and four-hour sessions and the like), a holding that has struck some people as unfair and

other people as quite enlightened. And until recently the U.S. Supreme Court has held that certain court practices which are all right in a state court (if allowed by state law) are not allowable in federal court, which many political scientists thought was a totally unsound notion. (One such practice was the use of illegally obtained evidence. This has now been held unconstitutional in state courts as well).

It is not easy to find a common thread running through all these decisions as to what is relevant and what is not. One constantly held ideal is that court procedures should be designed to find out the truth and any practice which is obviously biased *a priori* should be abandoned. Asking confusing questions of dimwitted people is obviously biased against dimwitted people independently of the particular case in question. Similarly biased is the presumption that a man is guilty if he is a Negro. It may be true that the murder rate among Negroes is higher than it is among whites, but such statistical evidence says nothing whatever about the particular case in question, and so is biased *a priori*. On the other hand, whether or not the accused's fingerprints were found at the scene of the crime introduces no bias into the trial, since it is a relevant fact, it says something about the particular case.

But the principle that everything should be directed towards finding out the truth is not the only one underlying the question of relevance. The question of extenuating evidence and the harsher treatment of murderers who plan the murder beforehand make it clear that society's treatment of murderers varies with the details of the crime. In other words, society makes a judgment on the relevance of various conditions in which murder may take place, usually operating through the legislature. Thus we have the situation that race is irrelevant to both trial (finding out the truth) and sentencing, fingerprints present at the scene of the crime is relevant to the trial but not to the sentencing, and on the other hand whether the murder was premeditated is relevant to the sentencing and therefore (since the question has to be answered) to the trial.

Now, whether or not a certain procedure helps or hinders in discovering the truth is not a terribly hard question in most cases. But the question of what factors should be taken into account for the sentencing is very hard indeed and as a result there is a wide variation in the answer over time and place. One country (or even state) rides pretty harsh over the man who murders his adulterous wife; another lets him off scot-free. The most that can be said by way of generalization is that the community determines, in light of its own system of values, what will be relevant to the sentence. The principle of equality under the law is then that if two people are in the same position relative to the government as far as it is relevant then they should be treated the same way. This is the way the phrase "in like circumstances" should be interpreted, since obviously if all circumstances are taken into account, no two people are ever in like circumstances.

The question of what is equal treatment is a very tricky one, too. Obviously, if two people are both hanged, they are being treated equally. Or are they? What if one is 22 and the other 85? But that goes right back to the question of relevance. Indeed, the question of equal treatment is in a sense the question of relevance all over again. A beautiful illustration is the example of taxation. It is one of the headaches of all governments that a tax which seems to fall equally on everyone from one point of view (i.e., considering certain things relevant) turns out to be highly unequal from another point of view. You say, charge everyone the same tax, say \$300 a year. That's equal treatment. Well, it is if you ignore the fact that it denies one man's children their milk while another man is so rich he hardly misses it. All right, then, you say, charge a flat percentage of annual income; say 15%. Well, that would seem eminently fair, unless you consider that poor people of necessity spend almost all their incomes on food, clothing, and shelter, whereas rich

people invest a lot of it and spend a lot of it on luxuries. Thus charging 15% of a poor man's income may deny his children milk or shoes while all it means to the rich man maybe is that he has to drive a Cadillac instead of a Rolls.

You may say, so the poor man is lazy and does not deserve any better. But perhaps he is poor by choice: perhaps he is a grammar school teacher. Should we penalize the man who sacrifices luxuries in order better to serve society?

Well, then, what about a progressive income tax? Charge poor people 5%, middle income people 20%, and rich people 80%. Or something. Now this seems to be all right when you look at it from the viewpoint that the other two forms of taxation were just looked at from, but what if you are an economist? You say that that system of taxation destroys the incentive that people may have to get rich and therefore stultifies the economy. The same argument about how much emphasis on material wealth we should have also applies here, of course, but it is possible for a progressive income tax to destroy incentives and we may decide we do not like being poor but happy philosophers.

The answer? Compromise! And the compromise will have to be adjusted again and again over the years as conditions change and as people's ideals change. There is no one clear way to tax people equally.

This argument gives much the same result when applied to other areas of government besides taxation and murderers. The result of it all is the "equality under the law", when examined closely, is a very complicated and difficult notion which is totally incapable of simplification. It appears to include our second interpretation, that of equality of opportunity, so that we now have two different explications of the phrase, "All men are created equal". One is moralistic and is in final judgment not subject to rational analysis. The other is what I will call political equality (since "equality under the law" is too narrowly restricted to the courtroom) and the attempts to achieve political equality may in the last analysis be motivated by the moralistic notion that all men are equal in the sight of God or should be in the sight of man or what have you.

The moralistic notion is also at the root of the concept of social equality and tolerance. A lot of the notion of social equality is tied up with political equality, but it is also concerned with relations between individuals. There are a number of ideals expressed in this area. Ideally, you should give every man a fair hearing on his opinions: you are being intolerant if you knock him in the face when he says he is a Conservative. You should be just as nice to Negroes as to whites. You should not throw stones at him when you find out he's to be your next-door-neighbor.

This sort of thing is recognized in various ways and in various degrees by nearly everyone. Just how much these notions are concerned with justice is hard to say. Most people consider it unjust for a mob to lynch some unpopular person, many people consider it unjust to pressure a Negro out of a white neighborhood, some people consider it unjust to have servants, and a few people consider it unjust to sneer at an atheist (but most people merely consider it impolite). It is hard to say where justice ends and practices which keep social friction to a minimum begin. It is clear that the notion of equality is an integral part of justice, but it is also clear that in some ways it is separate from it. The viewpoint of this series of articles is that justice is a characteristic of the relationship between society and individual, and in particular between government (which is an arm of society) and the individual. The fact that the articles will be concerned mostly with the government is partly the result of my own interests and partly because the notion that the non-governmental part of society should be just is difficult to explicate with any coherence. Caveat Lector.

Finally, a word about the method of this article. I think it should be clear to the brave reader by now that it places excessive dependence on the actual state of

current notions; it is to a very large degree an attempt at organizing current opinions about equality and putting them on a rational basis. There is not much in the way of bold new ideas and programs, of airy Utopias constructed in the manner of ANALOG. This is in some ways a fault of the method. But the proper concern of philosophy (and this is philosophy, not polemic) is to organize belief, and this is proper because new beliefs or systems proposed by those who would reform society radically overnight asquire a heady attraction which can be fatal to those who are unaware of what they themselves actually believe, and who are unaware of the complexity behind apparently simple notions such as equality. And on the other hand the kind of proposals for change which have merit are those which are designed in the knowledge of the current state of things and which make provision for the host of problems they will invariably raise. Not only that, but those are the only kind of proposals which get adopted and stay adopted, and of what use are any other kind?

--Charles Wells

That philosophers should be professors is an accident and almost an anomaly. -Santayana

REMARKS ADDRESSED TO A FELINE PARENT

O devout septuple mother, Chamois,
Orange orb with stripes, thy satellites
Interminably commingled in desire
For thy sustaining feline dairy product --
O beleaguered parent, automatic
Milk machine, ill-supplied with spigots
Six and feasters seven, suff'rest thou
Beneath the mewling recipient feline clutter?

Thine eyes half-closed, thy rotatory ear
Stand sentry 'gainst encroaching human feet;
Thy tail iambic thumps in measured protest
While multicolored gluttons brace their feet
Against thy jaw for more efficient purchase.

O whiskered lady, what scandal would ensue
Were thou the kind of beast that talks instead
Of mewling! Seven-at-once would surely earn
Thee fame -- and more than that, a Borden contract.
And their variety would cause thee outraged
Whisper, hardened glance behind thy back --
In horrified tally: three orange, three grey, and one --
Black!

--CW

the Quatt Wunkery

DAY*STAR (Marion Bradley) You could have become Marion Bradley-Breen, or Zimmer-Breen, as some have done including fandom's own Judy Beatty-Sephton. If you had been born in the Southeast, you probably would have been named Leslie Raymond Zimmer. There are many Southron Belles with masculine names. Among my relatives and acquaintances are Virgil, Dean, Cliff, Taylor and George. George, however, is a cat. / The requirement that all public school teachers have a B.A. is necessary because our nation has two hundred million people instead of two hundred. The hirer cannot know every hiree personally, so some sort of easily-checked shibboleth

becomes necessary. Of course, you may wish to propose some other standard than the one used, but some such standard is necessary. As far as I know there is no objective, easily-applied test which can be applied when the would-be teacher asks for a job which distinguishes good teachers from bad. / Hurrah for your defense of the superhighways.

mailing 108
COMMENTS

WARHOON (Richard Bergeron) A recent, in fact the Summer, issue of American Scholar has a fascinating article on the origin of the dragon myth by Mary Barnard. It is a truly refreshing sort of theory. No ancestral memory of dinosaurs. No Jungianism. No Freudianism. No indeed; her idea is that the dragon myth originated (to oversimplify her theory) when someone high on a hill looked down at a bunch of dancers dancing each with his hands on the shoulders of the one in front, all in a line, and notices the resemblance to a big snake. Since heretofore people have supposed that the dances were an attempt to represent the dragon, rather than the other way around, this theory is a refreshing sort of inversion of outlook. (Apes have been observed to do this sort of dance. As Miss Barnard points out, it is unlikely that we shall ever know whether apes carry an archetypical notion of Dragon around in their heads). / "Roma amor" is a palindrome, of course. Next question, please.

GODOT (Mike Deckinger) I recently mentioned to a friend of mine that a local theater was presenting a film of the Burton Hamlet production. He said he probably wouldn't go because he'd already seen Hamlet... / That was an excellent put-down of Janke.

CELEPHAIS (Bill Evans) To say that perpetual motion and squaring the circle are impossible requires some care with words. In the first place, "squaring the circle" has to be defined very precisely, with lots of talk about rulers & compasses and the like. Then you can show that it is mathematically impossible, i.e., ultimately self-contradictory. Perpetual motion is not ultimately self-contradictory; it does violate an extremely basic Law of Nature. (Extremely basic!?) I wonder if matter transmission--moving matter from one place to another at the speed of light or instantaneously--doesn't violate just as basic a law. Boardman, come and make like a physics Authority.

THE PERSIAN SLIPPER (Ted Johnstone) How the hell do you know what Dick Ellington's inner motivations were for his remarks on the assassination? Are you a telepath or something? / I must agree with your wife that Margaret Rutherford is highly unlike the Miss Marple of Agatha Christie's books. The movies are wonderful, but they are not in the spirit of the books. This is not a criticism of them. If a director can change a wonderful book all around and merge characters and change the ending and make a wonderful movie, why, more power to him.

JESUS BUG (Main) Everybody who goes into the Army misses something. Farm boys miss the field or the haystacks or something. Southerners miss the warmth. New Yorkers miss the civilization. And semi-beatniks like Andy Main miss beards and the Evergreen Review. / Yours is one of the current FAPazines people will remember 20 years hence.

SERCON'S BANE (F. M. Busby) I would not vote to oust George Lincoln Rockwell from FAPA; were he to become a member.

KTEIC MAGAZINE (William Rotsler) Admirable are artists who are unstuffy enough about their occupations to talk about painting walls an "arty" color.

A PROPOS DU RIEN (Jim Caughran) It is certainly not your fault that Russian seems harder than German or French. I can read all three about equally well, or badly, and I have had two and a half years of Russian in Oberlin, a college noted for its fast pace (we were struggling through Gogol' in the fifth semester), one year of German in a Georgia junior college, and no formal training in French at all. Russian is tough. That is, tough for any English-speaker; it would be easy for a Pole.

CADENZA (me) That issue is the sloppiest, in several ways, that I've done in a long time and a poor introduction of me into FAPA. Rest assured that all sorts of vows and Good Intentions have been registered about everything but reproduction, over which I have little control.

MOONSHINE (Len Moffatt) Sneary: There have been Americans who believed that it was unfair to earn money from land speculation, but that is a rare doctrine on the American political scene and has never exercised much influence. However, there is a movement afoot amongst county governments to raise taxes on unimproved land and lower them on improved land, to cut back on the deleterious effects of land speculation, which is one of the least commented-on scandals in this country. / Your videotical confusion arises from the fact that in Britain, a "channel" is what we call a network, whereas for us a "channel" is merely a frequency-band which is assigned to a TV station. Over there, things typically go like this: there are, say, n channels, or networks, at a given time, and the government decides that the time has come for a n+1st. They then proceed to build transmitters all over the country to carry the new set of programs on; the idea is that everyone in England, or practically everyone, should have the same number of choices of programs. Over here, of course, each community is assigned a certain number of channels depending on size (population) and the channels are used up by private enterprise as business warrants. Networks are private and formed more or less independently of the government. My information about Britain comes from reading electronics magazines. Maybe Bennett can provide corrections and more details. / Calling servants by their first name used to be common in the USA, too. This country has made great strides in eliminating class prejudice in the past fifty years. Waitresses are not browbeaten; waiters are not insufferable; it is expected that one will act friendly towards any other person no matter what his relation to you; people don't always, of course, but they are felt to be violating the Code when they are surly or unfriendly in attitude (the northeast seems to be a partial exception to this, and of course race makes a difference in too many places). Moffatt: I recommend "On Stage" -- the best serious comic strip running. (Intro to me by Don & Maggie Thompson).

LIGHTHOUSE (Terry Carr) Carol's article reminds me of the woman at the tourist desk I once worked at who, when I told her how far it was to Chicago, wanted to know if it was the same distance back. Graham: Write more about your experiences in radical politics; they're marvelous. Carr: All the people in this mailing who were mildly critical of Rotsler's Strange Mind (namely you and me) published their criticisms on that kind of mimeo paper with little hairs in it. All the ones who liked it (practically everyone else who commented on it, as I recall) published on smoother paper. H'm. ...There were so many highly complimentary remarks about it that I'm wondering

if I'm not Artistically Blind or something. I must remember to look at a traffic light against the sky the next time it's twilight... Breen: Marvelous article on Bach. "Bach's Greatest Hits" is one of my favorite records. I love to listen to it. I've never cared whether "Bach would have liked it if he had lived today" (as people keep saying) or not; there would seem to be no obvious reason why music can't be performed in a very different way from what the composer intended and still be wonderful, but it is nevertheless interesting to hear a real live musicologist say in effect that this record is closer to the way Bach expected his stuff to be played than the way it is usually played in concerts. Carr: ...it turned out to be a clumsy but sickeningly sweet little tale..." (emph. mine). Every once in a while someone uses a different connective in writing than I would have expected him to. Since "clumsy" and "sickeningly sweet" are both obviously criticisms, why did you contrast them with "but" instead of coordinating them with "and"?

TARGET: FAPA (Bney) It's all very well for you to say that Cheerios are used as p***king material in h*-f* s*ts, but Cheerios are a breakfast cereal, and as such have a Reputation and a Good Name, and I'm not going to accept the word of someone I have met only three times in person about something as important as a breakfast cereal's reputation. I mean, after all, Dick, there are limits to what I will tolerate in the area of slandering breakfast cereal. As to the question of whether Cheerios should be banned from the con hotel dining room, well, the con committee has the right to ban breakfast cereals but I'm dubious about the way they handled this one; Cheerios shouldn't be mixed with Wheaties anyway.

KIM CHI (Pat and Dick Ellington) Your adventures with Rattler are so horrendous that I can no longer complain about the minor inconveniences Chamois' seven kittens have caused us. By the way, does anyone know if cat litters ever contain identical twins? Two of our grey ones are so much alike as to be indistinguishable, and two of our orange ones (who were, like Chamois, chamois-colored when they were born) ditto. One of our grey ones (the third one) is turning into a tabby, by the way. / The things that go on in Franco Spain are as horrendous as anything I have heard out of Cuba. And this is in spite of the fact that Franco has been in power 25 years and so ought to have no necessity for behaving like a young Cubanstyle Jacobin government (in repressive measures, not in policies!).

APERCU (Curtis D. Janke) But one key can be more brilliant than another on many instruments, even keys a half-tone apart. On the clarinet, for example. Furthermore on the piano there is a distinct and very real difference in brilliance between close-together keys. The difference may be subjective, but it is there and needs explaining. I'm tired of people who think that effects which originate in the brain (often quite dependable and regular in their appearance) are less "real" than those which originate in the eardrum or the retina.

WRAITH (Wrai Ballard) Not only did Burbee quit the mailing I centered but you left North Dakota. What is FAPA coming to? / Jane and I were in the North woods of Minnesota for three weeks this August; first time I have been anywhere remotely near your neck of the woods, or former neck. Beautiful area, and hayfeverproof I discovered.

RPM (Norm Metcalf) Some of the stuff in this magazine is so terrible that I have decided to break up the mailing and throw this away. This is the first time in my life I have ever acted the book-burner bit. If the anti-Breen faction has friends like this, they need no enemies.

THE VINEGAR WORM (Bob Leman) There has indeed been confusion about civil liberties in the current dispute. But, while it is correct to state that a private organization not open to the public has every right to expel anyone they wish, it is also possible to hold that a particular organization, because of its purpose or for some other

reason, has the obligation (the moral obligation) to accept everyone into membership except those who by their actions demonstrate a desire to destroy the club. I happen to believe that FAPA is such an organization; its purpose involves a meeting of different points of view and to restrict the points of view is to harm the organization. / There is a related point: It is, I believe, immoral for a private club to restrict its membership arbitrarily on an irrelevant basis. For me, race is an irrelevant basis for any club I can think of. Religion is irrelevant for any club except one concerned with religion (and I have my doubts there). And I happen to believe that a person's morals are irrelevant to FAPA. I have reasons for this, but I suppose it would take a major Wells-type Philosophical Article to explain them. The point is, however, that there is a definite moral question here, that it is not improper, not always improper that is, to call a private club's discriminatory practices immoral. / Finally I emphasize that I am not in any way advocating that these activities that I consider immoral be made illegal. Except in the case of clubs which serve the public, which case has already been covered by the CR Bill.

SELF-PRESERVATION (Lee Hoffman) I simply do not agree that the anti-existence-as-an-individual faction has increased tremendously in recent years. A hundred years ago in any country in the world people were a lot less free in a lot of dimensions than they are now in the United States. They were more free to some extent in a few ways (especially in business) but I believe we have had a net gain. / If you had filled the mandolin cases up with concrete you would have had a real strong kitchen floor. (How's that for a comment untelligible to those who haven't read the magazine?) / Your remarks on old planes confirms a long-held suspicion of mine: you are FAPA's Ray Bradbury.

SOME COMMENTS ON FAPA'S CONSTITUTION The recent discussion on whether to repeal the blackball provision provides an excuse for me to declaim, I mean declame (disclamer) on a peculiarity of the FAPA constitution that has bothered me for a long time. It is harder to pass a special rule than to pass an amendment to the constitution. For a special rule must be signed by an absolute majority of the membership, whereas a constitutional amendment is voted on ballots in an election (which makes it easier) and requires only a majority of those voting provided it is a quarter of the membership. I know no justification for making a special rule more difficult than a constitutional amendment. On the other hand, special rules may suspend sections of the constitution, so they should not be less difficult either. It seems to me that the answer is to require that amendments be adopted in the same manner as special rules. Another possibility would be to make two classes of special rules; class A, operating within the constitution, adopted in an election by majority vote (a by-law, as it were), and class B, temporarily changing the constitution as it applies to FAPA or as it applies to individual members (evicting members, removing officers, overruling officers, etc.) adopted as they are now. But this seems unduly fraught with interpretational difficulties. Comments, please?

ANOTHER DIFFICULTY The constitution provides no limitations on the type of amendment that may be made to the constitution. The ruling that Breen must be readmitted by a special rule rather than by a constitutional amendment was clearly erroneous. I realize that doing something like that by amendment seems awkward and that a special rule was more in the spirit of things but awkwardness cannot be a guide in a case like this; an amendment to the constitution can do anything within the realm of FAPA's control in the absense of any constitutional provisions to the contrary.

Since the point is moot I will not bring the matter up formally to the VP. If the ruling is ever made again, however, I intend to protest it.

--CW

Raillery is the finest part of conversation.

--Swift

COUNTER- POINT (letters)

JOHN BOARDMAN (592 16th St, Brooklyn 18, NY) I'm sorry to hear that George Scithers has decided to quit FAPA because it rejected the accusations against Walter Breen, or the arguments of the people who supported the Exclusion Act. George's long labors in fandom, including the masterful job of chairing the DisCon, and the perennial excellence of Amra, shouldn't wind up this way. George and I have been waitinglisters and, subsequently, actives, in another apa for two years, and he has been one of the better contributors to the mailings. I hate to see him abandon a long tenure on the FAPA WL in a fit of pique over a controversy that, a year from now, will be one with the Knaves or the trip through Hell.

Some Exclusionists hark back to the time when a FAPA vote excluded a pathological racist named Wetzel from their company. From what I've read, excerpts from Wetzel's 'zines, they could have nailed him on civil or criminal libel. This is probably what they should have done, rather than a blackballing. As Earl Kemp showed in his troubles with D. Bruce Berry, you should go through the usual processes of civil and/or criminal law in such matters.

Then why didn't the Exclusionists so deal with Breen? Because they couldn't make a case, and knew it. This fact alone has caused many fans, who have no use for Breen personally, to oppose the Exclusion Act. The PacifiCon II has broken precedent in another manner by having for the first time a Fan Guest of Honor. Unlike the Exclusion Act, this precedent will probably be taken up in future Cons -- and I'll bet Walter will be one of the first Fan Guests of Honor, come '66 or '67.

(...) The various comments on the Civil Rights Act, pro and con, is largely wasted wind. For ten years, we integrationists have tried persuading racists that segregation is unethical, un-Constitutional, un-wise, un-economic, and not in keeping with American tradition. Liberal newspapers have run prize-winning editorials, hundreds of attorneys have pleaded the case for equal rights, men, women and children of both races have died victims to racists, Presidents and judges have pleaded for decency. A few of the less troublesome regions in the upper South have been brought around by these means. But the hard core of the problem remains, and grows more vicious.

Now we're through with all that. After ten years of trying, we now have on our side the Supreme Court, the President, most of the press, and, at last, Congress and the new law it has passed. From now on, we don't argue any more. We tell. And if we are not heeded, we move in with all the force that the federal government has now placed at the disposal of the equal rights movement.

The people who have proven impervious to appeals to right and law will now bend to the only rule they respect -- force. The segregationist who does nothing will see integration come peacefully. The segregationist who resists will go to jail, and integration will come. The segregationist who rises in revolt will be shot dead, and integration will come.

I hear a few complaints. "The change must not come at law, but in the hearts of men." I don't give a damn for "the hearts of men". Let them hate if they want; it's

a cheap luxury for those who like such things. It is not their "hearts" but their actions which the civil rights movement is concerned with. Regulate the actions, and give us a generation to train children away from their parents' hatreds, and the change in the hearts of men will come 'round.

//I'm not so sure it'll be as easy as all that. It is not yet clear that the fact that the CR Bill must ultimately be enforced by Southern juries will be an impediment or an additional point of persuasion towards acceptance. On the one hand Southern white juries in Mississippi and rural Georgia make one wonder if the CR Bill will ever be enforced; on the other hand, if I understand the court system, a federal jury (which it will be in this case) is usually chosen in the city in which the trial takes place, and that is usually a large city whether the crime occurred there or in the country -- look at the Hoffa trial. In the latter case, there is considerable hope. --cw//

ERIC BLAKE (P.O. Box 26, Jamaica, N.Y. 11431) On the question of race, it is incorrect to set up a contrast between "human rights" and "property rights" as if they were different things. Property right is a human right -- one of the most fundamental and important. And we have in this country today a government which seems determined to wipe out this right. Already the President has encouraged the passage into law of proposals which negate the property rights of shopkeepers, employers, and landlords. The government that can tell a man he must let unacceptable people into his store can take that store away from him. Many hotels and restaurants in the South have already been forced to close by this law.

It seems to me that many of the people who are trying to defend themselves against integrationism are using the wrong argument. To rely on states' rights is as much to say that states are justified in passing laws abridging rights of property and of free choice of association. The argument ought to be made on biological grounds, as Carlton Putnam does in his excellent book "Race and Reason." The Supreme Court seems capable of twisting our Constitution backwards to accomodate Communists and black revolutionaries, but it cannot change the scientific facts of race.

//Mr. Blake, meet Mr. Boardman. / Even if the average Negro is inferior to the average white, that doesn't mean that all Negroes are inferior to all whites. I know this for a fact; I have known two Negroes, for example, who were better mathematicians than I'll ever be. Not only that, but Wilma Rudolph can run faster than I can, James Baldwin can write better than I can, and Sidney Poitier can act better than I can. / Most anthropologists do not agree with Putnam. In a fight between experts, the layman must abstain. / Finally, most integrationists have some sort of belief, stated in varying ways, in the dignity of a human being; they believe that being a human being entitles a person to certain basic respect, to certain basic rights. Most integrationists would remain integrationists even if Negroes were prove to be statistically inferior to whites biologically. Such a discovery might spur research in eugenics, but that would be an irrational reaction, since no one worries about superior whites marrying inferior whites. --cw//

AL SCOTT (209 Aycock, UNC, Chapel Hill, N.C.) "Why Danny Pulaski Went FAFIA" is a great story. Maybe it is melodramatic, but (maybe I'm melodramatic) I found it very moving and well written. After all, reality is sometimes melodramatic, and if by the use of good writing techniques you can (as you did) make it seem realistic, you can often make us take a second deeper and more feeling look at what we might lightly brush off as melodramatic. There is one complaint, though (...) I feel the last phrase "and entered his own hell" was somehow out of place. No, that's not right. It just didn't seem to quite belong there, and to me was a little jarring -- as though a trumpet player in the last chord of a symphony all of a sudden got too emotional and added a little vibrato to his tone. Maybe it's just me.

(...) I was once after a definition //of good and evil//like Dick Schultz describes myself. After about a year of fruitless (technically) mental labor I allowed Walter Kaufmann in Faith of a Heretic. I've found I'm not any better off now though. I seem to draw a blank even trying to set up an ethical goal or value-criterion which will always result in the most subjectively desirable action or value judgment. (...) I have rejected two approaches. One, that the greatest good is the furtherance of the special evolution of Man, is too gross to give judgments of individual acts and also has the obvious difficulty of what specifically is an evolution-stimulating act. This was Julian Huxley's suggestion.

The other is that the greatest good is the attainment of control of all universal functions by self-conscious functions (in other words if God does not exist it sure would be a nice thing if he did).

On Roy Tackett's letter in #9 -- muddling along the middle way does not mean acceptance of every law as right. It can mean realizing when one side or the other is right and when it is wrong. There may be times individualism is "right" (on a specific point, that is) and other times when it is wrong. The middle way is not necessarily just an unacceptance of both extreme points of view and a dogmatizing of compromise.

An autoharp is a small instrument shaped sort of like a grand piano with the top and legs sawed off (pleasant thought). It is about the size of a large guitar, though it is less deep. It automatically plays chords when certain buttons are pushed. It sounds something like a harp.

(...) I like pretty sounds. And ugly sounds in music (I mean really unpleasant of course, not just dissonant or grating) seem to me about as justifiable as bad tuning in an orchestra for variety's sake, though maybe under unusual circumstances a few may be defensible. Pretty sounds seem to me to generally contain enough variety in themselves, to a really close listener, not to be boring. But it is true that one needs variety in content too to keep the listener entertained. My suggestion is to add more diversity in what one is singing than to sing badly. That is why I agree with you that it helps if one is a good actor. But I fear very much having to hear the "authenticity" bugs' recordings of original backwoods folk music more often. I kid you not, it hurts to hear some of those noble savages sing.

//I suspect that "the furtherance of the special evolution of Man" is circular, since it is not stated on what basis one is to choose the direction of evolution. / I think you are right about "Danny Pulaski". There are other places in the story where my goal of under-writing were not reached. --cw//

CLYDE KUHN (615 Pacheco Blvd., Los Banos, Calif., 93635) As much as I hate to say it, the more I read of Roy Tackett the more I end up agreeing with him. I advocate government control (which is an American way to say "Socialism") and anti-Individualism (so-called). The trouble with Tackett and myself seems to be that individually our opinions are so assimilative that I clash because I'd rather have them alone //That's the trouble with Tackett??--cw//

(...) Ah, but as Tackett put governmental control he also threw in "civil rights". Right there he made a horrible opening for the toppling of his point. I completely disassociate myself with "equal liberties" because of the actions of the Negro. Everyone must admit that the Negro goes OUT OF HIS WAY to create difficulties between the races. Whenever HE sees a way to "challenge" the civil rights legislation the friction that results is the "problem" that "Civil Rightists" blurbs all over the front pages of the newspapers. I also feel that as long as the government stays in economy and national life (in the sense of schools, state, country & city government) we have true Democratic Socialism. As Tackett left himself open, so would a government be open to fall if it made the mistake of the Pope (my apologies to any Romans reading this) and imposed his laws (as does the Pope) over a strictly social area such as civil rights instead of staying in the temporal area that its governance should cover.

If the United States had not been rushed into this "role in the civil rights" we could be in the peacefull revolution of thought, re-educationing both the White and Negro for their place in Western Civilization. The negro learning how to use the civilization, the White, how to help the Black build his own place.

NORM CLARKE (9 Bancroft Street, Aylmer E., Quebec, Canada) Jerry Page's article told me a lot about Dr. Keller, mainly because I didn't previously know one damn thing about him; his name was a vaguely familiar one, and I may even have read one or two things by him, but I had not the smallest conception of D. H. Keller, the person (fan). "Chances are, you don't think of Dr. Keller as a fan." Well, I suppose that, in order to be thought of as a fan, one must be involved in fandom; no matter the quantity of articles and "well-done fiction" Keller has contributed to fanzines, the very facts that (as Page says) "none of it is fannish" and "he does not write familiarly of fandom" are reasons for not thinking of him as a fan; in other words, he is a "pro" who has sold stories (if admittedly not many) and who contributed pro-type material to fan magazines.

There is a differentiation between fans who have sold professionally and pros who sometimes write for fanzines; perhaps the best example is Bob Tucker, who sometimes disguises himself as "Wilson Tucker" and writes Pro stuff, but, man, when he writes for fanzines he is Fan Clear Through. On the other hand, James Blish and Bob Lowndes have written regularly for Warhoon, but surely no-one thinks of them as fans because of that. I'm not putting down Dr. Keller, though, or jeering at him for not being faaanish; in fact, if he's still around, in fanzines, when Boggs and Warner are just half-remembered names in some 9th Fandomer's dimming memory, why, good on him.

I must call Gina's attention to your remarks about Unhealthful Substances in raw cabbage; I like most vegetables fairly crisp and undercooked, but I like cabbage ushy; Gina insists on having her cabbage "cooked" for about two minutes. As a matter of fact, we don't eat cabbage often, but it so happens that's what we had for supper last night. Yes, with corned beef.

I think there is "some sort of conspiracy to feed Americans bad food" but I don't think it's on the part of the doctors. By degrading everyone's taste so that they will eat nothing but bland pap, food manufacturers are able to make lots more money by mass-producing tons of cheap muck rather than use slower methods under Expert supervision, and expensive ingredients rather than cheap synthetics. And most people's taste has been degraded so that they actually prefer tastelessness; it knocks me out, for example, that a nearby supermarket takes steaks that have begun to turn a little dark, but the price in half and flings 'em in the freezer along with the fish and fowl; I think I'm the only one who buys them, and I chortle while stocking up on sirloins and T-bones at 60 cents a pound while Bright Red meat, Fresh-Killed This Morning, goes for twice that price to people who will smother it with Tenderizer and monosodium glutamate. (They'll cook it Well-Done, too).

"Report from We-berlin" was pretty funny, but I have a quibble, sir: you have Hubert's shortwave radio picking up "instructions from Peking" and then you say it "squeaked minutely in Cantonese"; surely you mean Pekinese? Anyway, it's "Bayping" as Boyd Raeburn will tell you. (And are you being subtly Funny with your spelling of "sneer"? Like, are you trying to be another Sneary?)

(...) Boggs' letter calls for a lengthier reply, I think, than I am prepared to make here; but, briefly, it would be something like this: mailing comments by such as Warner, Breen, the Busbys, Bergeron can be every bit as thoughtful and well-written as any more formal material they might publish. There is no inherent virtue in polished work, per se: Fan A may polish and revise a piece half a dozen times and the result may still be dull and inept, while Fan B may compose his mc's on stencil and produce any number of remarkable ideas and clever turns of phrase. An analogy to Redd's idea: it is fragmentary, disorganized, unsustained, casual, etc., to engage in conversation; how much better to work over a Little Talk you intend to

give at the next social gathering you attend. On the other hand, I agree that, outside of mailing comments, it would do fans no harm at all to "improve every opportunity to express themselves in writing, as if it were their last." (And it's even possible to do that while writing mc's, though not nearly so important.)

(...)/I/ wonder why Walter Taylor assumes that the "filthy hovel" you spoke of as being the sort of place where a Negro might be forced to eat is necessarily owned by Negroes? It's quite likely it would be a white-owned restaurant in a colored section, and it's filthy because the white owners don't bother keeping it clean because they're "only serving niggers anyway" knowing that the Negroes don't have any other restaurant to go to.

//Are there restaurants in Canada that won't serve French-speaking Canadians?
--ed.//

CLAYTON HAMLIN (Southwest Harbor, Maine) "Legal usury" of course is a contradiction in terms. //These comments are on Roy Tackett's letter--ed.// The effect may be the same, but there is good and adequate reason for these charges, which Roy doesn't seem to have considered. So let me take the side of the business man, and the money lender, and see if it can't be explained to his satisfaction.

Now, first, let's make it clear that interest rates are enacted by the state and they vary. The American Institute of Accountants have tried for years to have the states adopt a uniform law for this, but so far something less than 30 states have done so. New Mexico may be tougher on the borrower, but from the examples Roy gives I think not.

Second, service charges, carrying charges, or whatever else they may be called combine two separate and distinct things. They cover interest, the maximum of which is set legally, and they also cover additional bookkeeping costs. The interest, incidentally, is an allowable deduction on your income tax return, the other is not, being basically an additional expense passed on from the retailer to the consumer.

Interest, in essence, is the penalty exacted on the buyer for asking some else to assume the risk of payment. The risk on a bank loan, covered by a mortgage or similar collateral is low, so the interest is low. A mortgage, a paid-up cash value on insurance, or other security, is immune to loss in case of bankruptcy. Not so for the usual installment contract, technically the conditional sales agreement. They hold the right to reclaim the merchandise, of course, but the current procedure is that such sales agreements are deposited in a bank, as an immediate deposit, and by so doing, the seller also assumes the interest and carrying charges. In a word, they become a cosigner of this note. Since there is an element of depreciated value of use merchandise, plus the additional expense of interest, plus the possible loss of this in the event of bankruptcy, it simply is not possible to do this kind of business on the usual percentage of interest a mortgage contract gives you. So the states rightly allow a higher percent of finance charge on this.

It is even worse on the finance companies, which I assume everyone knows are a final last resort //you mean they're not a terminal final last resort?--ed.// for a borrower. Oh, they make it SOUND reasonable, because not many people around know how to figure true interest as distinct from the percent per month on the unpaid balance these companies use to express it. How many companies like this would dare come right out and advertise that their interest rates are 18% to 36% a year? They have to compete, too, you know. Yet, because of the rather enormous risk in this type of loan, usually made on the basis of anticipated income with little or not collateral, the states recognize that they would go broke under the normal interest rates. Loss on bad debts for a usual business run something like one half of one percent per year; for these companies it is more nearly 5% a year. If the sum is less than \$100, they can fall back on the small claims court to collect; if it is over \$100 then only legal action can save them, and the expense of this is one fourth to one

third of the amount due. Even then, bankruptcy licks them.

Roy makes a special complaint about the case of a person borrowing a sum of \$9,000 who paid a handling charge of \$800 plus interest of 8%. He calls it robbery. And I'll admit, at first glance it would seem to be just that.

But consider, the normal period of payment on a building loan is a minimum of twenty years, more likely twenty-five. The way he describes it, this is not a mortgage loan at all, but instead one that the bank assumes the risk of the difference between a mortgage and what is called the builders' lien. Much the same except for the possibility of bankruptcy. Even so, there is more than likely an insurance policy included here, which will pay up the balance in case of the death of the person.

But that is immaterial, except to show that 8% interest is not totally unreasonable. Take careful note: this 8% interest is not likely to be the real interest rate at all; it may well be 8% on the unpaid balance, which could be considerably less over the length of the contract. I have seen several cases where payment faster than the contract calls for entitles the person to a refund of a considerable portion of the interest. There are laws about this, you see; any contract will do the same, if paid in less than the period called for. You pay more because you take longer and tie up the bank's money for a longer time.

And about the finance charge, figure it out for yourself. Taking the minimum for this kind of loan, twenty years, that comes to \$1.00 a year. Still high, maybe, but also considerably less than a dollar a week. Now it takes at least one bookkeeper and one clerk to handle this. Statements every month, including postage. Notices in duplicate, maybe even triplicate, in case of a delay in payment. Depreciation of the various machines used, spread out over lots of others of course but they generally are fully depreciated in ten years or so. Forms required by the Federal Reserve Bank and various other places, so many forms I couldn't even attempt to try naming them all.

Really, less than a buck a week doesn't seem to terribly high when you stop to figure it out, now does it? Not that it is so easy to pay, of course, but the added convenience of doing it on this long-term basis should make it seem fairly reasonable.

Believe me, Roy, there is a good reason for this kind of thing. Between the additional expense forced on us by having to do most of the bookkeeping for the borrower, plus the risk of losing your shirt on the deal if they happen to be a deadbeat, or even if they happen to run into bad luck with no income, the banks and the retailers too simply HAVE to have these charges. Would YOU attempt to lend money for less? I think not.

//Talking about forms, my barber tells me he has stopped selling hair tonic because the two or three bottles a month were not worth filling out all the sales tax forms. While all his talk about the government hating the little businessman and creeping socialism and whatnot is a lot of bosh, still, filling out forms can be an expensive proposition for some small businessmen. I don't know what the best solution would be -- a government rebate calculated so that most of it went to those who paid the least taxes, I suppose. --ed.//

ENID JACOBS OSTEN (2712 Calvert Street, Baltimore, Md. 21218) I disagree with Vic Ryan about the assertion that the Southerner's hate for the Negro being, as he implies, indelible. Deep-rooted, certainly, I think it's partly the fact that the spotlight of public opinion is turned on the Deep South right now that is actually increasing (or rather bringing to the surface) this racial hatred. The Southerner feels he is being told what to do and doesn't like it one bit. Don't get the idea that I approve of his attitude -- I don't. I was reading an article about this deep-rooted hatred recently which quoted a Southern co-ed in a Northern university, who had been seated next to a Negro, as going to the professor and explaining, "I simply can't sit next to a Negro. I guess I'm bigoted, but there it is." She went on to say, rather

smugly, that the professor was angry at first, but finally moved her seat. I find this smugly self-satisfied, "just can't help myself" attitude disgusting, and, if I had been the professor, would not have changed her seat. I realize my attitude is simply one of my deeply-ingrained prejudices, a relic from my childhood, but I would identify with the Negro student and the way she would feel if the person who sat next to her was the only one in the room who changed her seat. I guess I'm bigoted, but there it is...

C. W. BROOKS, JR. (911 Briarfield Road, Newport News, Virginia 23005) Although my parents are southerners by birth, I was born in Montana and grew up mostly in Brooklyn and Concepción, Chile. I have never been able to grasp the southern objections to integration. I find it hard enough to find a decent eating place around here without worrying about that. I am tired of hearing people here say that you can't legislate morality, with reference to the civil rights bill, when Virginia, and most other southern states too, have these idiotic "blue laws" and movie censorship. There is a newsstand here with about half the paperback books of the most wretched perverted-sex type. Without touching those books, the city had the gall to ban Miller's TROPIC OF CANCER. I am against any form of censorship at all, but this sort of inconsistency makes me wonder if the people running the city are even marginally capable of logical thought. If this sort of thinking were applied to all of the everyday problems of running a city, it would seem that the whole thing would collapse in chaos in a week.

This question of whether an act which, if everyone performed it, would be harmful to all, is immoral is called Kant's Categorical Imperative isn't it? Or somebody's categorical imperative. I think it can only be applied to an act that is in itself at least slightly harmful, such as littering, picking the park flowers, etc. Obviously, it would be distinctly harmful to the community if even 10% of the population decided it wanted to go to the World's Fair this week, but still this is clearly not immoral because the act of my deciding to go is not harmful even slightly in itself. With this restriction, I would say that actions violating the Categorical Imperative are immoral. This would then include littering.

//Somehow I didn't think Kant concerned himself with things like littering. But the point I was trying to make is that one's act of littering is not in the slightest harmful; that it's only when many people do it that it becomes harmful. --ed//

R. BRZUSTOWICZ, JR. (366 Oakdale Dr., Rochester, NY 14618) I suppose that "art" could be called "the process of communicating meaningful experience" if you enjoy slogans. This is a Slogan because it has to be explained. First, communication: this can be done by using universally-understood terms or by using arbitrary terms without inherent meanings (i.e., using symbols or semiotes or both). "Meaningful experience" -- grr. I refuse to recap Das Heilige -- even in translation -- in one paragraph.

Anyway, I like Joan Baez, in the same way I like everything -- the way people like olives. I learned. She seems to sing ballads as though they were myths or fairy-tales rather than things which happened to people. If you compare this with the interpretation of ballads Stanley Hyman (who is doomed to go through life known as Shirley Jackson's Husband) uses in The Promised End (a volume of largely literary criticism) you will find that Joan Baez' rendition has certain definite merits. If you go in for myths -- which I do, among other things.

Does anyone know any reference to "the ancient, archaic, and very sinister image of the black sun"? Especially in myths, ballads, and folklore, where ancient, archaic, and very sinister images usually turn up.

//The best parts of Richard's letter was DNQ, I regret to say. --ed.//

WAHF: James Ashe and Vic Ryan, the latter of which thinks fandom needs an article on Vladimir Nabokov.

