

Kipple is edited and published at irregular, frequent intervals by Ted Pauls, 1448 Meridene Drive, Baltimore 12, Maryland. Copies are available for letters of comment, contributions, exchange with your own magazine, or the exorbitant cash sum of 20¢ per issue. This is a journal of commentary and opinion, the black sheep of the otherwise monolithic Liberal Press. Circulation Director: Ben Orlove. --WOKL.

THE SHELTER CRAZE

My faith in the electorate is generally solidly entrenched if not overly optimistic, but every once in a while the American people indulge in such gross lunacy that even my good opinion of their intelligence wavers. One example of this is in the matter of fallout/blast shelters, where a vast number of people insanely place their trust in a few feet of concrete against bombs equivalent to millions of tons of TNT. The matter was sufficiently dealt with in all its general ramifications in Kipple #33, but a newspaper clipping in the January 21st Baltimore Sun inspires me to write an additional few lines. It seems that a group in Livermore, California undertook to test the effects of shelter life upon some normal Americans. Ninety-two members of twenty-four families spent thirty-six hours in a privately constructed underground shelter, and at the end of this time reported a spectacular success.

The entire experiment was a ludicrous sham, and the success was as hollow as the head of anyone who would draw from it favorable conclusions. During most of the 36 hours, air was received from the outside, but for nine hours the shelter was sealed off and the oxygen supply inside was utilized. This proved that calm, cheerful people can survive in a closed shelter for nine hours, a revelation which is interesting but hardly comparable to any realistic situation which might occur in time of emergency. Dr. Arthur Hudgins noted that this experiment proved that "the shelter could be closed off from the outside in case an attack created a fire-storm in the surrounding area," completely overlooking the fact that the major reason for the internal air supply is because radiation may contaminate the outside air; and that this effect would last from two to six weeks, not nine hours.

On the basis of the dubious results obtained from this test, Dr. Duane Sewell was "convinced that we could live here a month without serious problem." I am vastly amused at these pronouncements coming from scientists (both doctors referred to are nuclear physicists), who, more than anyone else, should realize that for any experiment to provide valid data, the conditions under which it is carried out must be close to the realistic situation or situations the experiment is intended to duplicate. What 92 people who know they're in a test will do in 36 hours isn't even remotely comparable to shoving 92 people into a shelter for two, three, or four weeks with the knowledge that every major city in the country lies in utter destruction, that tens of millions are dead, and that our entire civilization is crushed. The experiment didn't even attempt to reproduce reality:

"One family left Friday night and another yesterday because of illness among children. Six adults went out yesterday because of previous working commitments."

I submit that this experiment is utterly worthless, that it proves precisely nothing, and that it is likely to dangerously mislead thousands of straw-grasping readers of the national press. I submit further that it was either monumental stupidity or flagrant deceit which led two nuclear physicists to lend their names and reputations to this "successful" test which they must have known to be utterly invalid. The most misleading conclusions of all are those pertaining to the psychological state of the people involved in the experiment; any competent psychologist--in fact, any reasonably intelligent layman--would realize that so long as the people involved are aware that they are taking part in a meaningless and safe experiment, no accurate psychological conclusions may be drawn. I can plonk a two-inch board on the sidewalk and walk back and forth on it fifty times without stepping off; but suspend that same board from the roof of a fifteen-story building, and I'll likely fall and break my neck on the first attempt. As soon as the element of danger becomes involved, my former physical ability is grievously impaired. This is admittedly a strained analogy, but the conclusion is obvious: under pressure, tension creates difficulties not inherent in the situation.

So far, none of my acquaintances has come up to me on the street brandishing this article and sneering, "See, I told you people could live in shelters..." But I'm expecting it, by heaven, I'm expecting it.

ENID JACOBS COMMENTS ON #33

"So Jeffrey Lynn, like Chay Borsella's god, is non-existent. That's one on me! I realized that his letter was far below the literacy level of the average Kippler, but I thought that perhaps you had received his opus from a lunatic-fringe tupe, and had printed it purely for comment's sake. It seems that you--Lynn, that is--rippled the waters here at Towson State, but barely disturbed them elsewhere. Chay Borsella's letter was interesting, but with my mania for detail I noted one inaccuracy. Wesley's God was not masochistic; Wesley himself was. He was the sort of man who would abase himself--physically, as well as mentally--for the pleasure of his God. His God, incidentally, was surprisingly like his mother, Susannah Wesley, a dominating, strong-minded woman who expected complete obedience from her children and absolute submission to the parental will. Her system for raising children included overdoses of both religion and discipline. (Of course, having 19 children perhaps she needed such a system.) Anyway, John Wesley looked for an authority-figure in his God, who, like Susannah, was an all-powerful, overly strict being, who demanded conformity to rigorous standards, and meted out rewards and punishments with terrible judiciousness.

"Derek Nelson is right about capital punishment being revenge--but, like most revenge, it serves only the purpose of partially relieving the tensions provoked in the injured party--in this case, society. Aside from punishing for the sake of punishment, acting because we feel we have to do something about the terrible menace, revenge is useless. Capital punishment may 'remove from society a danger'--but that is all it does. It is neither curative nor preventative. A society which uses it is acting on the theory that the act of murdering a fellow human being turns a person into a monster, an unfit person, who has relinquished his right to live among human beings--or even to live at all. Yet most people have had the impulse to murder. Why, then, didn't we? Primarily because the conditioning of society that it is 'wrong' to murder, as reinforced by our immediate environment, is stronger than our wish to kill. In the murderer, for a variety of reasons, something goes wrong with the conditioning process and the impulse to kill, momentarily at least, becomes stronger than the environmental taboos. But is

this person less potentially productive to society because he has killed? No. Then should society condone his behavior? Of course not. He is accountable, though not responsible, for his actions; it is the society's duty not to punish him--or exterminate him--but to help reclaim him as a useful, productive member. Since his old environment was somehow inadequate--it led him to the brink of murder, and then was not strong enough to keep him from murdering--he must be given a 'new' environment through psychotherapy, rehabilitation, etc. Of course, if he is so mentally disturbed that he can be of no potential use to society, he should be immediately institutionalized.

"Dorothy Braunstein: Of course the poor white students should have a chance to go to better schools, but this is no argument against the Negro students attending these schools. Nor is the fact that 'everyone hates them'. Even if true, which is hard to believe, it is no argument. Should these students (who, I gathered, were especially chosen, thus probably more intelligent than the average student) have to waste their potential and their lives by going to inadequate, poorly-equipped schools, schools that would not give them the encouragement and outlet for their imaginations that they need, because 'everybody' in a better school would 'hate' them? Also 'everybody' in the 'bad' schools would 'hate' them. People often resent those whom they consider to be no 'better' than they, who are moving 'up in the world' at a faster rate--but it would take an extremely insecure person to not try to improve his condition because his friends would 'hate'--that is, envy--him. As for the white students in the 'good' schools--I doubt if their 'hatred', based as it probably is on a vague, stereotyped scapegoat-figure as described and deplored by their parents and contemporaries, would last long in the light of day-to-day contact with Negroes. (I wouldn't be surprised if many of the white students had never had much contact with these people before.) A sociological test proves the value of day-to-day relationships in smashing stereotypes: a group of soldiers, all Southerners, and all with the so-called expected attitude toward Negroes were placed in a company that was half-Negro. All grumbled and growled at the prospect--but all came out of the experiment with radically different attitudes. All now accepted the Negroes as equals, many men of both races had become close friends. I think the same sort of reaction will take place in New York--especially if the parents of these white junior-high kids will withhold all comment for about four months. But this, I suppose, is too much to hope for." (Box 257, Towson State College, Towson 4, Maryland.)

DAVE HULAN DISAGREES (A REGULAR FEATURE)

"You're wrong about myriad strings being attached to any favor from me--quite the reverse; if I feel like doing someone a favor, I do it, and if I don't, I don't, and no strings are attached in either case. You might do well to avoid counting on my help in any particular before asking me, since whether I agree to help will depend on my mood of the moment, but if I do agree to help then you can count on me to help to the maximum of my ability with no 'strings'. I can't think of anything more unlike my actual happy-go-lucky self than the calculating, cold individual that you seem to think me. Either my projection of my personality in print is far from the truth or else you're reading into it something that isn't there, or a combination. Out of curiosity, just what in my writings leads you to this conclusion? Or is it just an overall impression that you can't put your finger on? (The fault is no doubt my own, and I would not have made the original comment (I don't make a practice of dealing in baseless pre-judgements) if you hadn't specifically asked me for an appraisal. My impression of you, for which I again apologize, is not based on any specific comments in your letters

or magazines, although your rather casual attitude toward the fate of people who can't protect themselves from false advertising may have contributed to it.)

"It is, regrettably, true that juries in certain parts of the South (not all--the South covers a lot of territory, including a wide spectrum of attitudes) are reluctant to convict white men for the murder of Negroes, though in many cases this depends on the circumstances. Outside of the Mississippi Delta country, most juries would convict a white man who killed a Negro for motives of gain, or anything like that. The only cases they're likely to acquit are those arising from reaction to a Negro doing something which they consider threatens their 'Way of Life', such as alleged rape of white women, attempting to integrate, etc. Even this is mostly confined to the 'Black Belt'--a strip running from South Carolina through central and southern Georgia, central and southern Alabama, most of Mississippi except the Gulf Coast, West Tennessee, and the Delta areas of Arkansas and Louisiana. Outside of that strip the Negro, if he doesn't get a really impartial jury, will at least not run into many cases of flagrant violations of his rights (as interpreted by the state, not the nation--they aren't conceded the right to do everything whites can do, but are guaranteed freedom of life, limb, and property). If there's reasonable doubt as to the facts, there may be prejudice, but if the facts are clear, they'll get their conviction. Remember, it was a Tennessee jury that jugged John Kasper, among others.

"While it is true that sometimes there are obvious miscarriages of justice in the case of jury trials, both in the South and elsewhere, I still cannot think of a reasonable alternative. Your all-wise computer which you mention elsewhere in this issue might be one, if such a computer existed, but at present it doesn't. So what would you do? What would John Boardman do? It's all very well to get worked up about the evils of the status quo, but unless you can think of a reasonable alternative then I'll have to oppose you. And in all history no better system than the jury trial has been devised to give maximum protection to the innocent, though admittedly other systems give better odds on convicting the guilty. But I'm old fashioned enough, liberal enough if you will, to feel that it's better that a guilty man go free than that an innocent one should suffer. Do you? (Certainly.) John doesn't seem to, but then I don't expect it of him... (I didn't notice anyone getting "worked up" in #33, although admittedly I lack your detached viewpoint toward my own comments. I commented, reasonably calmly and, in fact, rather irrelevantly, to Bernie Morris that trial-by-computer would probably eliminate bias (assuming, of course, a computer capable of the task). I also noted that the surprising thing about our jury-trial system, to me, was that it was so often just. All of this seems rather theoretical and equivocal--and, I assure you, when I get worked up about the status quo, my attack is not often equivocal.)

"Your reasoning on religion is interesting enough, if hardly original. I don't really see what it has to do with the subject at hand, though; the reasoning is strictly by analogy, and analogies have a way of falling down when relied on too heavily. Granting that primitive religions are religions, and that the more developed a society is the more developed a religion it has, says nothing about the validity of, say, Christianity, to choose the best-known religion to the Kipple readership as an example. A Christian would say that the religions of more primitive societies represent gropings for the truth which they missed because at the time God's will had not been revealed in its fullness; beginning with the early Hebrew patriarchs, and coming on through Moses and the Prophets, more and more was revealed until at last it was revealed completely in Christ. The movements of other reli-

gions are evolutionary developments of the blind gropings of the primitives, but Christianity is the result of the revelation of God at a point in history, or rather throughout history culminating at a point. As I say, your argument is reasonable enough, but there's no real difficulty in getting around it. This is directed against your point (b), since you devoted the most time to it. Two others, (a) and (d) seem irrelevant to me, and you yourself admit that they show nothing but room for doubt, which is so obvious as to need no pointing out--if there weren't room for doubt, there would be no such thing as an intelligent agnostic. Point (c) is also irrelevant, though this may take a sentence or two to show. Saying that a person believes in an absurdity, and he also believes in Proposition X, says nothing at all about the truth of Proposition X. (My clumsiness of expression is at fault here, not my argument. My original argument that many religions encompass demonstrable absurdities would better be phrased, using your analogy, "This person believes in an absurdity which is an integral part of Proposition X, therefore Proposition X is highly questionable." My unfortunate phrasing caused this argument to take on the form of guilt-by-association in #33.) I might as well say that Ross Barnett believes that the Negro is constitutionally inferior to the white man, and that he also believes that Ole Miss has the best football team in the country. The second proposition is unproved, but it has a pretty good chance of being true, and certainly Ross Barnett's opinions about the Negro have nothing to do with it. I'll admit that it's no evidence the other way, either--but there are a great many people who don't believe in demonstrable absurdities who still believe in God, so I consider this paragraph also irrelevant.

"In short, I can see why the things you mention could, taken as a lump, sway you emotionally toward the atheistic side of agnosticism, but logically they say nothing except that there is no objective proof either way--which no intelligent and knowledgeable theist would deny anyhow.

"Let's look again at the just society. You chose one example; let me choose another, so that you can apply your criterion if you can. Let's say that you and I are ensconced in that same cell whereof you speak, etc., but that the book in question is not 'The Chapman Report' but rather some book that we both like. I don't know your tastes well enough to pick a specific book, but think I know them well enough to know that there wouldn't be any great difficulty in choosing one. Shall we say 'The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire'? If you're not interested in that one, we can pick another easily enough. Let's say that we each were allowed one book, and that this one was mine--you brought 'Finnegan's Wake' or something else I find equally dull and uninteresting. You finish yours, which is much shorter, and want to read mine. I haven't finished it yet. At this point the representative choices are: (1) I continue reading my book while you either twiddle your thumbs or re-read yours; (2) you take my book and read it while I have the choice of either twiddling my thumbs or reading yours, which I dislike; (3) we burn both books so that neither of us has anything interesting to do. (Let's add the premise that both of us have sore throats so that the obvious solution of one reading aloud to the other is eliminated.) What's your answer? (Your hypothetical situation seems a particularly poor one. The original situation of two men in a cell which I proposed in #33 was a simple little parable reducing censorship to its basic nature. If the analogy was strained, it was at least not absurd, but the hypothetical situation you have created appears to have no reason for existing other than to support your argument. (I am, incidentally, capable of "twiddling" my intellectual thumbs for hours, so I would not likely become bored.) But in any event, if my premise is not applicable

to your situation, it is no defense to claim that your situation is improbable. Actually, I suspect that I could make a pretty good case for applying my standards to the situation, but you'd simply spend more time in your next letter inventing a situation which I couldn't handle, so I won't beg the question by making the attempt. As I admitted in the body of the original article, "the only claim I can reasonably make" for my standard for the just society "is that it leaves me better off in formulating my own opinions than I was before..."

"I may have overlooked it, but I don't recall anyone trying to identify liberalism with Communism in Kipple. What several people did say, and what John Boardman with his customary blindness refuses to answer, is that it makes about as much sense to identify liberalism with Communism as it does to identify conservatism with Naziism. Most of his other comments are either quite irrelevant to anything anyone actually said or serve further to confirm my opinion of him as a junior-grade Robespierre." (228-D Niblo Drive, Redstone Arsenal, Alabama.)

KEVIN LANGDON COMMENTS ON SEVERAL RECENT ISSUES

"I think you're all missing something on this abortion discussion: Abortions will take place whether they're legal or not, and they will be a lot less likely to lead to the death or injury of the mother if they are legalized and, therefore, placed into the hands of reputable physicians.

"Ted, you're right about the mechanism by which man-fear is passed on among birds--the adults teach it to their offspring. The phenomenon Harry Warner is mistaking for the inheritance of acquired characteristics is simply natural selection; the cautious birds survive to breed and to teach their offspring to be cautious also.

"If I found my wife lying dead with her murderer standing over her, I'd run like hell, having no desire to be murdered also.

"Hulan: I am inclined to think that seeking pleasure, seeking love, and seeking knowledge all boil down to the same thing in the long run. I seek pleasure (love/knowledge), but my feeling of duty to humanity springs from the fact that I can see no logical difference between my pleasure and others'. And what's wrong with sensualism?

"Derek Nelson: Lord Russell is not blaming all cold war troubles on the United States; he is merely pointing out that the U.S. doesn't have to play this insane game. Your criticisms of Russell would carry more weight if you understood what he is saying.

"I don't think that contraceptives should be made mandatory, but it is certainly apparent that one does not have a 'right' to bring a brood of squalling brats into a world which has no room for them.

"Enid Jacobs: All decisions do not necessarily depend solely on heredity and past environment. There may be a large chance factor involved. In the present state of our knowledge, we can say no more than this. Incidentally, you have the major and minor premises of your syllogism reversed.

"Dorothy Braunstein: Your biology teacher is stating a half-truth. Natural selection isn't necessary to the improvement of the race when eugenics is practiced. Either will assure that only superior individuals will breed.

"Ben Orlove: I am horrified that you suggest the murder of carriers of inheritable diseases when sterilization would produce the same results.

"Dick Schultz: You raise some interesting points. I am inclined to think that even if a 'one-class community', where everyone agreed on everything, could be completely isolated from the rest of the world, sooner or later (probably sooner) non-conformity would appear spontaneously. There are numerous historical examples. Take any of the reli-

gious colonies of the New World. Yes, intellectualism is a normal reaction to rejection, but this is not the only cause of intellectualism. It will be interesting, if we ever encounter non-human intelligence, to see just how much we all have been conforming to each other. I am tempted to snicker at Ted for being so hung-up about public sexual relations, but there are still a few things that disgust me for no good reason--french kissing while eating, for example. Still, I would never try to force my ideas on others and once I realize that an attitude is irrational, it is not long before I change it. Children reading pornography with no literary value is no more a problem than their reading anything else (like comic books) with no literary value.

"Hulan: It is a common misconception that Russell said nothing against Russia. Actually, his telegrams to Kennedy and Khrushchev were practically identical. His criticisms of the U.S. are just better publicized in this country." (1824 Hearst St., Berkeley 3, California.)

CARL LAZARUS HAS A FEW WORDS TO SAY ABOUT #33

"In 'The Just Society Revisited', you said that surrender would allow the most individual freedom of choice because 'those who prefer death can attend to it themselves'. I want freedom rather than surrender or death, so surrender will not satisfy me or many others. (I respect your choice--obviously, we would all prefer freedom to either Communist domination or racial suicide--but in the problem as originally proposed, only two choices were offered. My point was that of the two choices, surrender was preferable. The introduction of a third choice, while interesting, is not relevant.) When you have an enemy who has declared that he will bury you, there are only two ways to avoid the war which you want so desperately to avoid--either you surrender immediately (waiting for a crisis carries the added risk that you might not be able to surrender in time) or you stay so strong and convince him so well that you will not give in that he will be afraid to start anything; there is no third way. Remember, a bully only bothers you when he knows that you are scared or that he can easily beat you. A policy of weakness will merely bring on a situation in which we will have to make a choice, and if we continue to lose ground we may reach a point where we will have no choice at all. Considering that the Soviet leaders want to avoid the destruction of their homeland, the wisest choice in such a crisis would be to call their bluff, assuming that we would not be far behind in military power (certainly there is some risk, but there is always some danger and there would be much to gain).

"I don't see why you ever claimed to see things eye to eye with Boardman. He's a fanatic with little right to call himself a liberal, while you are a reasonable person. (It must be remembered that in Kipple, only our disagreements are discussed. I have seen nothing to indicate, on the other hand, that John and I are in anything less than complete agreement on other matters: integration, that tremendous category known collectively as "censorship", church and state, foreign policy, ad infinitum.) In fact, you have even unbent far enough to want an end to compulsory social security, surely a heresy in liberalism. Doesn't Big Daddy know what is best for the whole country? Doesn't the government have the right to take care of everybody from the cradle to the grave, dishing out welfare 'benefits' when it feels like it? Why, don't you even understand the twentieth century?!

"Your definition of the just society is one of the best ones I've seen so far, but it is still incomplete. I suggest: 'In the just society each individual should be allowed to do whatever he wants as long as he doesn't harm anyone else.' Even this needs some polishing, though. I am not advocating anarchy; government is necessary to see that no person is harmed or has his freedom restricted by others. Inci-

dentally, most compulsory welfare measures would be excluded from the just society as defined by either of us.

"John Boardman: Calling a pig a cow doesn't make it one, and a pig still isn't a cow if it calls itself one (which would be quite a feat). By your reasoning, had a liberal harmed me or someone close to me, I would have the right to harm you--but you would change your mind pretty quickly if I came after you with a gun (something I don't usually do). Or maybe I would have the right to kill everyone in the A.D.A.--obviously a subversive organization of liberals.

"Capital punishment, infanticide, and euthanasia are three sides of the same coin--they're all cases of the 'sanctity of human life' versus expediency and the idea of the 'greatest possible happiness for the greatest number of people' or the least possible suffering. I have not included abortion, because it is a different coin for reasons which I mentioned in the past two or three issues of Kipple. My views on all three are not very clear; there's quite a bit of confusion surrounding these topics. For example, nobody knows if capital punishment is or is not a good deterrent to crime because it is not used very often, thus making criminals think that they will be lucky enough to escape the death penalty. If it deters crime, I am for it, but I am against capital punishment for the purpose of revenge. I'm in favor of euthanasia if the patient wants it because I believe that each person has the right to do whatever he wants with his life and because I am generally against useless suffering. On this basis, infanticide is wrong because an infant, though it is an independent, conscious human life, is not able to decide if it wants to terminate its life. Finally, you can't give 'the sanctity of human life' as a final, unarguable reason. Like all moral codes which people fall back on, no moral is unquestionable, but I do think it is a good idea to go along with in most instances, as long as one remembers that it is only an idea." (c/o Ben Orlove, 845 E. 14th St., Brooklyn 30, New York.)

OUR AMERICAN HERITAGE (A Story of the Near Future)

"What I have chosen to call the modern dark age began technically with the inauguration of Wyatt Paige as the thirty-ninth President of the United States in January of 1985, although its basis may be traced back as far as the end of World War Two. It was made known during the campaign that Paige, a brilliant speaker with a hypnotic personality, was a member of a certain organization called the Fighting American Nationalists and had been since its inception, but Paige's talent as a public speaker and the newly increased fear of Communism brought about by the internal subversion of Germany, France and Belgium overshadowed this point." (Nickolas Crakow, in the introduction to "The Modern Dark Age", Gormon, Leland & Co., 2036.)

"In discussing the Organizations (see above, pages 16-34), it is important to note that whatever activities they may have engaged in, none had any real political power until the infamous Sedition Act of 1986, which not only made illegal non-membership in one of the Organizations, but also imposed a mandatory death sentence for failure to comply. Prior to this, militiamen of each Organization carried on raids and roamed the streets in search of traitors, but these activities were carried on outside the law. These raids were very

often aided, either positively or (more likely) negatively, by the government police, but there was no official directive to this end until August 14, 1986. It is likely that the government police, not always reputable men, were carried away by the same fanaticism which gripped the public." (Ronald Whitehead, in "The Organizations", Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 2052.)

+ + +
+ + +

Mahler crouched behind the trashcans, gulping air into overworked lungs, as he tried to stay the trembling of his hands. Footsteps and incoherent shouts echoed through the lonely streets, drawing closer to the alley. Suddenly, the crowd of two dozen appeared at the entrance to the grimy alley, pausing under the dim street lamp. Mahler shrank back against the wall, desperately trying to slow his breathing. It sounded to him like a bellows, and he thought surely the crowd would hear him. But some of them were speaking in loud voices, apparently satisfied that he was not in the immediate area and oblivious to any sounds but their own. One of them finally croaked something which must have been an order, and the mob split into smaller groups, trotting slowly off in all directions. Gradually, the sounds of the search faded into the distance, leaving only the sound of Mahler's own breathing and the beating of the rain on the metal trash containers and the pavement.

For a long time after the last sounds of the mob had disappeared, Mahler did not move. His body relaxed against the damp brick wall with a sigh, and he let his eyes drift closed as he tried to marshal his thoughts. His first impulse was to laugh, but he managed to stifle it. Laugh! He must be insane. But why not, everybody else seemed to be. Then the full impact of his predicament hit him, and a wave of nausea swept over him. "I'm being hunted," he told himself silently, moving his lips in accord with the thoughts. "I'm being hunted like a dog by a maddened mob of people who don't even know my name." Again the impulse to laugh was there, less pressing this time. This is America, he thought, and things like this don't happen here. But it was foolish to lie to himself; this was America, and this whole nightmare was happening.

It was his own fault, he knew. It was insane to be on the street after dark, unless of course you held membership in one of the Organizations. He was one who had refused to join, and now he was going to die for that refusal. Many people joined one of the Organizations just to save their lives or the lives of their families, but he refused to become a party to any of the activities of the Organizations just to save his life. Even when the new law was passed outlawing non-members--and he had no doubt that it would be passed--he would not join. It would mean his life, but life wasn't worth much these days. Mahler was no hero, far from it, but there were certain things a man wouldn't do even to save his own life. This was one of them, for him.

Then the reality of his situation hit him again. He wouldn't have to worry about dying next week or next month; he was as good as dead right now. He'd run blindly from the pursuing mob, into a section of town he didn't know, and now he had no idea how to find his way back home or to the hospital. If he only hadn't come out at night! So far, the government was still giving lip service to the proposition of protecting non-members of the Organizations, and in a daylight crowd he might have been safe. There were always a couple groups of government police at every intersection, and he at least stood a chance of being protected if attacked in their view. Many of them looked the other way

while uniformed Organization militiamen ran down non-members, but some police still stepped in before the group had done much damage. The police who looked the other way, he realized, were probably the smart ones. The Sedition Act was bound to be passed, and then the police who had protected non-members in the past would be suspects. It was the way the System worked.

Mahler realized that he was falling asleep and pulled himself awake with a start. He knew he had to get home if possible; the hospital wouldn't help him when they found out he was being hunted. But he had to go somewhere or he'd collapse. He hadn't slept in two days while his wife struggled to give birth to their baby, and the chase had taken from him what little remained of his strength and energy. Standing up was painful. Mahler was still a young man, but he had never been athletic and his legs had become cramped from crouching in the garbage pile. Now he also began to feel the pain in his left arm. He had broken it, he knew, when he stumbled down a flight of steps during the chase, but until now the pain had been pushed into the back of his mind by other problems. Mahler hooked his thumb into his belt in an attempt to hold the arm still as he slowly, cautiously walked out of the alley, but the pain was still excruciating. The street was fortunately deserted, but he didn't recognize any of the buildings, so he warily made his way to the next intersection in order to read the street sign.

Although walking slowly and softly, Mahler didn't hear the men until it was too late. He was deep in thought, wondering what his wife would think if she awoke to find him missing. Two hours ago, he'd left the hospital to buy a sandwich, but the mob had come upon him a block from the restaurant and he hadn't stopped to think about his wife since. He knew he ought to phone the hospital, but... In this state of concentration, Mahler nearly bumped into the men as they turned the corner, and he was only partially aware of one of them saying, "That's him, Steve." He couldn't speak as the four men silently formed a semi-circle around him and forced him back against the wall. Somewhere in a less troubled recess of his mind, he took note of the fact that their armbands proclaimed them to be members of the New York Fascist Party, one of the smaller of the Organizations. The one called Steve grinned at him. "You gave us a tough time, buddy. We thought you got away." The others didn't speak as they began closing in on him.

The squeal of brakes at the curb announced the arrival of a car, and Mahler just had time to notice that it was a police car before a uniformed officer pushed through the semi-circle of men and confronted him. Mahler could see by the insignia of his standard red, white and blue crash helmet that he was a captain. "Your name?" he commanded. "G-Gordon Mahler," he finally managed to force out between parched and trembling lips. "Membership cards?" the officer demanded in the same tone. Mahler couldn't manage a reply to that. He simply inhaled several times and shook his head. "Commie! I knew it!" one of the crowd hissed, almost joyfully, and Mahler objected, "I'm not, I..." "Shut up!" the captain commanded. A smile settled uncomfortably onto his pockmarked face, and the tone of his voice was mockingly gentle when he asked, "Can you prove you're not a Commie? Do you belong to any of the Organizations?" Mahler shook his head at the last question, and the officer repeated, "Can you prove you're not a Commie? Answer me, you Red bastard!" Mahler was still trembling, but his voice was calm as he replied, "No. No one can prove..." "I tol' you to shut up!" roared the officer, emphasizing the command with a blow to Mahler's abdomen.

"Well," he said, his voice softening again, "you didn't break any laws yet, so there's nothing I can do." He looked at the four men, all large, rough-looking laborers. "You fellows won't hurt this pinko, will you?" "Naw, of course not," answered Steve, but the grin he and

the captain exchanged belied that reply. Almost before the police car pulled away from the curb, the four men closed in again. The last thing Gordon Mahler saw, before he closed his eyes for the last time, was the police car parked half a block down the street, both its occupants observing his murder with casual disinterest.

His body was carted away the next morning, and the low-class Organizations workers whose task was removing it probably didn't notice the tattered shred of paper which had blown against Mahler's dead and expressionless face during the night. It was a page from an ancient magazine, Reader's Digest, a page yellowed by age and smeared by the rain. It was a page headed in large, bold letters, LIFE IN THESE UNITED STATES.

+ + +
+ + +

"Throughout his tenure as President of the United States, Wyatt Paige had as his slogan the question, 'Can you prove you're not a Communist?' Although Paige certainly used the question many times (and instructed his cabinet to adopt it for their personal use), and although it is a slogan closely associated with his name and political party, Paige almost certainly did not originate the comment. His forerunner as inquisitor, Senator Joseph McCarthy, utilized much the same philosophy, although he probably did not use this particular question to explain it. Exhaustive research has uncovered what is probably the earliest usage of this criterion for determining seditious behavior. On or about December 16, 1962, Representative Clyde Doyle of California (a 'state'--for definition of 'state' in this context, see Appendix XIV) commented that a woman whom his committee was currently questioning 'is a Communist because there's no evidence that she's not.' Thus began an idea which resulted in the execution of fifteen million Americans between 1985-1993." (Wallace Clay, in "Wyatt Wayne Paige: Biography of a Dictator", Mentor Books, 2041.)

ROY FRANK COMMENTS ON SEVERAL SUBJECTS OF CURRENT INTEREST

"Hulan's comments in 'Musings of a Philosophical Hedonist' do not particularly impress me. K.R. Popper makes a distinction between societies: he calls a society in which individuals are faced with moral decisions, an open society; and calls one in which this opportunity is absent, as in a primitive tribe or Plato's 'Republic', a closed society. Hulan is certainly well-suited for a closed society. By some magical stroke, what is forbidden by the laws of this country just happens to be what he does not want to do. I suppose that if, say, he were a fruit picker during the Depression and the local citizenry and Grower's Association passed ordinances against striking and assemblage, he would want to work for fifteen cents an hour. Confound his spinelessness!

"And this bit about everyone being a hedonist is patent nonsense. I have seen more than one person repeatedly goad himself into a state of extreme unhappiness and the Funny Farm is loaded with people who will starve or torture themselves if they are not prevented from doing so. These people are not happy, I assure you; they are about as miserable as it is possible to be. The usual argument for universal hedonism is a circular one: if a person does something of his own free will, he must be happy in doing it; therefore, a person tends to do

that which is most pleasurable. I do not think, therefore, that the 'pleasure-pain' principle is a universal motivation for human behavior. (I agree with you that the philosophy of psychological hedonism (that everyone seeks merely to satisfy their desire for pleasure) is erroneous, but there are some rather better arguments against it than those you put forth. The psychological hedonist supposes that the desire of a man to do something which will have pleasurable effects is influenced by the resultant pleasure, whereas more often it is the desire which is the cause of the pleasure when the desire is achieved. In other words, while it is true that sane men rarely do of their own choosing that which they have no desire to do, this desire is not inspired by the pleasure of satisfaction; rather, the pleasure is generated by the satisfaction of the desire. An illustration: A hungry man desires food, and the satisfaction of this desire will undoubtedly give him pleasure; but the pleasure-to-be-derived was not the reason for the desire--instead, the desire was the cause of the pleasure. C.E.M. Joad states the argument much better than I am able to, and I defer to him: "Because pleasure P occurs when I obtain something X which I want, therefore, the hedonist maintains, I only want X because of P. But if I had not wanted X for its own sake, I should not have experienced P on obtaining it; P, in short, only occurs because I wanted X independently of P; hence, that we should desire things other than pleasure is a necessary condition of our experiencing pleasure when we obtain them.")

"I do think, though, that for the most part a person finds it necessary to believe that the world would be worse off if he weren't around and that he is somehow intrinsically valuable. Without this feeling, people seem to retreat and give up or, which is more obvious, to come out fighting (in a destructive manner). A number of people who believe that high-IQ is the thing don't really seem to believe that, with or without it, they are worth anything, for when they suffer some sort of setback, they drag out this high-IQ business to prove to themselves that the fight is really worth it. This sort of compensation is, I suppose, necessary in order that they don't give up altogether; however, I wish that their compensation would take a more generally applicable form, for it implies that lesser types have no point in being around at all. This feeling certainly cannot be a definition of sanity or happiness, but it must be a necessary component of both.

"However, it is a poor commentary on a society to be able to observe that a good many people are prevented from feeling that their existence is important. A person can be told that he is worthless and interchangeable with someone else by countless groups: fundamentalists, capitalists, domineering parents, the armed forces, etc. I might amplify this point: these groups will try to convince you that your present way of thinking about yourself is inadequate and that you are failing to justify yourself and your own existence, and as soon as they have convinced you of that, they will substitute their own system of values in the hope that you will act in such a way as to justify yourself under the new rules and so advance their cause. With diligent application of this procedure, a closed society and homogeneity will result.

"I think I prefer heterogeneity (it's a little more interesting), making my own moral decisions (mind your own business), and feeling that my own existence is worthwhile on bases which I choose (whether I actually do all the time or not).

"Where in the hell does Boardman get the idea that the Nazi Party can (legally) be considered a band of guerrillas? And a point that no one seems to have picked up is that Hitler was 'pitched into the gutter' more than once and each time he arose as virulent as before. Also, it is sadly true that the people who get the ax in the end are not the ones who started things (take Africa, for example) so Boardman

will be applying little deterrent to Southern violence by acting against Northern 'conservatives' (whatever he means by the term).

"About the just society: why don't you guys just define justice instead of applying it to societies as an abstractly good quality. Let it mean, say, unbiased application of the rules to everyone who falls under their jurisdiction. Now justice, like validity, may be a good thing to have a system operate under, but, as Kevin points out, the fruits of this justice (e.g., genocide) may not be a very good thing. As for your criterion for a 'just society' (maximum opportunity for the development of the individual concomitant with social consideration), you can see from the above that I agree that this is an excellent quality for a society to possess, even though I fail to see how you can call this 'just' without stretching things a little.

"I understand that the Air Farce has contracted for the design of an ingenious space vehicle. The interesting thing about it is its propulsion mechanism: it is to have a cup-like rear surface near which will be detonated a succession of 10-20 megaton bombs, which will propel the vehicle, equipped with 'shock absorbers', forward at astonishing velocities. (←Yeah, and in lotsa different directions, too. With this new scientific breakthrough, the boys in blue can put a man on the Moon, Mars, and Venus simultaneously. The same man...→) I get this tidbit from one of the better known bomb-makers in the Cal Radiation Lab.

"Before I got out of the Air Farce ROTC program as a conscientious objector, I was told by one of their majors that the Air Farce is now working on a missile which will travel three times the speed of light." (1824 Hearst St., Berkeley 3, California.)

MIKE DECKINGER COMMENTS ON #33

"A devout theist must, of necessity, be a member of one sect, dedicated and devoted to the teachings of that particular sub-category, rather than an outside observer, as you point out. Once you enter the latter category, the contradictions and absurdities of the various religions, when viewed in comparison with each other, are all the more apparent. The most unlikely and hard to accept declaration is probably the one in which every religion asserts its domination over the others, as the proper and 'right' one. Admittedly, the Catholics go overboard in stating their prominence, but to some degree this is found in every religious order. Logic negates the worth of the proposition, because of the sheer impossibility of each of the numerous religions containing the importance they claim to contain.

"Belief is a fine thing, as long as the belief exists of justifiable and provable grounds. I may believe a child is born deformed and sickly because of a birth defect, or a recurrence of the thalidomide scare, but only in my most cynical moments could I possibly accept the unbelievably cruel proposition that God has deliberately punished the child because of a sin by the mother. This is belief in something so monstrous and terrifying that its followers are apt to prostrate themselves in fear before the imagined wrath of this diety, rather than transmit understanding and love. Faith and ignorance tend to go hand in hand. The first caveman who saw fire was understandably frightened by this phenomenon, and through his fear and his overpowering desire to in some way understand a portion of what created the fire, he chose the most logical (to him) assumption: that a supernatural being controlled the fire in some way. Certainly it's a basically unsound and unscientific explanation, but to a superstitious, gullible caveman, it's by far the most sensible explanation he can establish. Today this concept has just been magnified. The fear of god exists due to the unwillingness to explore deeper, to uncover just what the truth may be, divorced from a coating of lies, superstitions and half-truths.

"One aspect of fallout shelters has always puzzled me. It's a proven fact that no fallout shelter can survive at the exact point of impact, like a large city such as New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, etc. Yet in all these cities, makeshift shelters have been constructed, usually in sub-basements and underground chambers, which, at best, would keep the occupants alive if the bombs were to fall some distance away from the city. However, I doubt if our enemy's desires are so humane that they would seek to bomb sparsely populated sectors. It is undeniably the large cities that would bear the brunt of the attack, and in this instance, the fallout shelters would be converted into self-contained crypts, whereby the bodies would all be in one place, so as not to clutter up the surface. On second thought, that may not be such a bad idea after all.

"If turning to various herds that offer a glimmer of non-conformity is indeed, as Dick Schultz asserts, conformity, then by that very definition, true and lasting non-conformity is impossible. The desire to be part of something is just as strong and pronounced as any other basic societal drive, and the individual may choose a herd or group to satisfy that desire, rather than placate the overriding urge to be different. If more than one person selects a clique that has some earmark of difference, they are conforming through their very non-conformity, since they are merely performing an action which someone else has already done. If they remain in their environment-imposed niche, then they are undoubtedly conforming--by letting themselves be swallowed up by what they despise yet are rendered powerless to resist.

"In other words, conformity can only be practiced by degree. True non-conformity must embody a conscious and active desire to be part of something else. Most of the contrived beatniks are only non-conformists in the most superficial terms. I personally deplore the band that society has tightened around the individual, driving him deeper and deeper into his own little rut where he responds like clockwork to every outside action. This is evident all too prominently today and reveals a decline in the individual intelligence and the will to be self-sufficient, and an increase in the relentless influence of the material values that society will grant one; if he will just walk the straight and narrow--work from nine to five, be good to the wife and kiddies, and forever pay tribute to his overseers through taxes and luxuries which he has no need for but which will drop him from the race with the Joneses if he does not purchase them. Even religion has become one enormous facet of the conformist, in which socializing can be conducted, new clothing can be displayed, and each church-goer sells away a portion of his intelligence with every coin he drops into the plate.

"For shame, Dave Hulan; I never expected that you'd fall for my ridiculous demand that prostitution be made compulsory. Even legalizing it, which I favor, would run into many difficulties. Until then, let's leave it as it is now: clandestine, quiet, and profitable. I'm sure everyone concerned would be much happier." (31 Carr Place, Fords, N.J.)

ON THE RELATION BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE

An area of controversy which is of considerable interest to the liberal is that of the separation of church and state, guaranteed by our Constitution. This precept of the Constitution, found in the First Amendment and known as the "establishment clause", serves a double purpose: to protect the state from the church, while at the same time protecting the church from the state. It states, specifically, that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Interpreted widely, of course, it would prohibit, by the first clause, the prayer which opens each session of the Congress, and by the second clause, any legal interfer-

ence with Mormon polygamy. However, it is not seriously suggested that this wide interpretation be placed on the precept; while it might be desirable, it is not practical within this present society. The major concern of liberals is with the interpretation of the second clause which dictates that no federal or local government may dictate through its laws or actions any religion, specific or general. This interpretation was recently honored by the Supreme Court, when it outlawed a brief prayer which had been written by the Board of Regents of a New York school system for inclusion in the opening exercises of classes. The prayer was extremely general, mentioning no specific religion, and its recitation was nominally voluntary--that is to say, any student who objected to its recitation, or whose parents objected to it, could leave the room. The prayer itself was an innocuous one; in fact, the greatest objection to the prayer, per se, is probably the rather odd order of importance it establishes for blessings:

"Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers and our country."

However insignificant the prayer itself may have been, it was ruled unconstitutional in principle. A great deal of controversy was raised on account of the fact that the prayer was nominally voluntary. This, I suppose, depends upon the definition of "voluntary". My use of the qualification "nominally" has been intentional. Although there was no injunction to the effect that a student must recite the prayer, it must be realized that the social pressure had nearly the same effect. For a child to walk out of the room during such an occasion is to risk the displeasure of his classmates, in his mind a very important group, and that of his teacher, even more important in elementary school as a Mother-image. Few adults have the courage to risk social ostracization by standing against the majority on a point of so little practical significance, and even fewer children would be capable of that action. As Mr. Justice Douglas pointed out in his concurring opinion,

"It is said that the element of coercion is inherent in the giving of this prayer. If that is true here, it is also true of the prayer with which this court is convened, and with those that open the Congress. Few adults, let alone children, would leave our courtroom or the Senate or the House while those prayers are being given. Every such audience is in a sense a 'captive' audience."

That the Regents Prayer did indeed constitute an establishment of religion is not debatable. The point usually brought up is that this "establishment", while it may be said to exist in a sense, was of so little significance that the foofaraw of the court decision and resultant controversy was a ludicrous, "mountain-out-of-molehill" situation. This is true, of course, only insofar as any matter of principle can be insignificant. While most liberals will grant that the practical matter of the Prayer Decision was hardly worth the controversy, they staunchly submit that principles cannot be compromised. It is the principle of establishing the prayer and the precedent involved, rather than the prayer itself, which is objectionable. James Madison, the author of the First Amendment, commented on that distinction in this manner:

"It is proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties. (...) Who does not see that the same

authority which can establish Christianity, in exclusion of all other religions, may establish with the same ease any particular sect of Christianity, in exclusion of all other sects? That the same authority which can force a citizen to contribute 3 pence only of his property for the support of any one establishment, may force him to conform to any other establishment in all cases whatsoever?"

A second case, not precisely of the same order, may serve to illustrate even better the liberal position on this extremely important issue. Namely, the proposed federal assistance to parochial schools. This is claimed by many to be only fair if extensive federal aid is granted to public schools, since at least some of this aid must come from the tax dollar of Catholics whose children would consequently receive benefit from the expenditure only if equal aid were given to parochial schools. This argument, of course, is specious; does anyone really believe that they receive benefits in an equal ratio to their output on every item of the budget? It might as sensibly be argued that federal aid to any education is unfair, inasmuch as a portion of it is paid by persons having no children at all. Or that state taxes to build highways are unfair because some of the citizens who are taxed do not own automobiles. Such arguments are unacceptable. The only relevant argument is whether or not the federal government may legally aid parochial schools without over-stepping the bounds of the Constitution. I think not.

The establishment clause forbids government promotion of religion, per se. Obviously inherent in this is an injunction against the specific promotion of a single religious sect. And yet this is precisely what will result if the federal government gives aid to parochial schools. That this is not the intent of the aid is immaterial. Parochial schools teach a great many subjects, most of them academic, but they also teach Catholicism. This is an important and inseparable part of the curriculum. If the government grants assistance to these schools, it will in effect be subsidizing the teaching of a specific religion. The power, prestige, and wealth of the United States of America will be placed behind a specific religious doctrine, thus in effect creating a state religion (i.e., a religion formally supported by the state above all others). This is intolerable in a free society.

Another example of the relation between church and state, which has nothing to do with the Constitution but a great deal to do with justice, is the matter of the Roman Catholic Church's position on artificial contraceptives. The official position of the Church is that any contraceptive measure (except the undependable rhythm method, and total abstinence) is immoral, that it is in opposition to the will of God. Believing this, the Church opposes contraceptive devices. Now, it is obviously their right--indeed, their duty--to oppose that which they consider immoral, but unfortunately the means they have chosen to enact their opposition is such that non-Catholics whose position is more lenient are affected. The Church has worked to make illegal all contraceptive devices; and to otherwise prevent them from being distributed where they are sorely needed. This affects not only the millions of Catholics in this country, but also the greater millions of non-Catholics. The Church realizes this, but they feel that it is their duty to protect from immorality even those who do not recognize it as such. This is a valid point, but it still does not serve to justify the institution of laws respecting this belief. The civil community cannot recognize above all others the belief of any one sect as to what is immoral and what is not. The Catholic Church may or may not be correct in

stating that artificial contraceptive devices are immoral, but regardless of the virtue of the viewpoint it cannot be respected by the civil society as a valid one, so long as its implementation would adversely affect the lives of many persons whose moral code is divergent and whose religion or philosophy, while different, is not necessarily less valid.

Allowing laws which affect unduly the freedom of dissenting individuals to be implemented by any pressure group or religious sect is obviously at variance with the basic premises of this democratic republic.

In advocating the separation of church and state, however, many desire to impose undue restrictions. In the eyes of some, for example, no church, no clergyman, no religious council should have the right to put forth an opinion of any controversy. Nor should any clergyman attempt to convince his congregation of the truth of any value-judgement, any opinion. The basis for this restriction is that any opinion offered by a clergyman is often considered, not always accurately, as the official position of the church; and the official position of the church, not always intentionally, has ascribed to it divine origins. Actually, this situation does occur at times, but it is not usually of extreme importance, since relatively few individuals are sufficiently avid sectarians to allow the policy of their religious sects to influence them greatly in the final analysis. It is my belief that it is not only the right of the clergyman, but his duty, to voice opinions on current topics of controversy. One of the major tasks of the clergyman, after all, is to grant counsel on moral, social, and ethical issues.

To reiterate, then, the church should have the right to hold and voice opinions on subjects of a controversial nature; indeed, it is the duty of the church to attempt to influence humanity in accord with its moral precepts. But no church has the right to create a situation in which its moral precepts are recognized and enforced by law or social pressure on those persons who do not hold them. This is, basically, a liberal's position on the issue, although it may not be the only liberal position.

JOHN BOARDMAN COMMENTS BRIEFLY ON #34

"The appearance of such racist nuts as Bill Mallardi makes me realize that liberals are wasting time in sniping at each other over tactics when there are attacks like this to be met. (The House Un-American Activities Committee offers substantially the same defense--viz., that it is silly for Americans to criticize the Committee for tactics when the Commie Menace is growing larger every day and threatening to engulf us all...) Our energies are better employed in refuting conservative, segregationist, and racist attacks as soon as they're made. (I had been thinking of blasting Mallardi in the next Knowable, but see no reason to duplicate your work. Instead, I'll refer readers to Kipple #34.)

"As for the possibility of violent counter-attack against conservatives, these are facts: (1) segregationists, calling themselves conservatives, are murdering or maiming their opponents, burning their homes and churches, and jailing them on groundless charges; (2) law enforcement agencies in states dominated politically by conservatives are doing nothing to prevent these crimes or to punish their perpetrators; (3) the Federal Bureau of Investigation, also dominated politically by conservatives, is also doing nothing. How long are liberals to be defenseless under these circumstances? I am still waiting to hear my opponents in this debate propose non-violent means for terminating this campaign of terrorism. (Laws make mistakes, John, and they operate exceedingly slow, but by and large they are infinitely superior to the

chaotic state of civil war which you advocate.))

"The adoption of the label 'conservative' by Southern master race nuts is nothing new. The counter-reconstructionists who seized control of Southern state governments in the 1870's and instituted segregation called themselves 'conservatives'. More recently, William Simmons of the White Citizens Councils of Mississippi said in November, 1956: 'Working side by side with other patriotic groups in the North, we are fundamentally the first stirrings of a conservative revolt in this country.' General Walker used the same terminology, 'conservative revolt', at the Battle of Oxford. If anyone else chooses to identify himself with these men by applying the label 'conservative' to himself, he is perfectly free to do so. (I don't have the precise reference for the Simmons quote at hand, but in case Derek Nelson is interested I can run it down. Walker's words were reported at the time of the Battle of Oxford in the New York Times, a daily newspaper that used to be published in this city.)" (Box 22, New York 33, New York.)

LOFTUS BECKER JR. COMMENTS ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

"I seem to agree with much of your position on capital punishment, but, I think, for different reasons. In the first place, I think that your contention that only an 'insane' criminal would kill more than once is a rather weak statement. If one takes the standard (i.e., accepted by the courts) definition of 'insane', the statement breaks down immediately: just look at the list of multiple murderers who have not been adjudged insane. If, on the other hand, one takes the perhaps more logical position that a person (except under special circumstances, which I'll come to later) who commits murder has to be insane, your statement is nothing but a tautology. The special circumstances I would except, by the way, are accidents (I didn't know the gun was loaded), crimes of sudden anger--i.e., temporary insanity--and, finally, the very rare case when a perfectly sane person comes to the conclusion that some one person (or group) is so dangerous that he must be assassinated, and does the deed. ((The statement that only an insane criminal would commit multiple murder is weak only if you define "insane" by either of the arbitrary definitions you hopefully put forth above. The statement is not false, because I do not honor the legal definition of insanity; and it is not a tautology, because I do not believe that all--or most--persons who commit homicide are insane. You err in assuming that because the legal definition of "insanity" is rejected, I must necessarily swing to the other extreme and believe that all murderers are insane. This is not, as it happens, my opinion. I believe that many of those persons who commit homicide are sane, and that of this group, it is highly unlikely that any of them would commit a second murder.))

"Second, saying that 'capital punishment is discriminatory' because 'it is the poor, the minority-group members who are executed' is a bit of idiocy the like of which I haven't seen from you in years. If capital punishment is discriminatory, so is imprisonment for robbers (which catches mostly people with low incomes) or income tax evasion (which centers on people with above average incomes). Like it or not, most murders are committed by the poor; if one can be said to have a reason to murder, they have it. Few people with an income of twenty thousand a year will kill for a thousand dollars; but there are people with no income who will--sometimes simply because they need the money. ((Granted, most murders are committed by the lower classes; but nearly all executions are done on the lower classes. There is a subtle distinction there. This is a point made by both the chaplain and warden of San Quentin prison during a television broadcast mentioned several months ago: neither of these gentlemen, whose acquaintance with capital punishment must be assumed broad, could recall even one case in which a

wealthy man had been executed.)

"And finally, the fact that crime rates in areas abolishing capital punishment have usually 'remained static or dropped slightly' is unfortunately a meaningless statistic, since it has also, in most such areas, remained static or risen slightly--i.e., in the overwhelming majority of cases, the rate has remained roughly static. The fluctuations in either direction are small enough that interpretation of the statistics is completely open--random fluctuations or a rise (or fall) in the general crime rate could account for the observed changes. ((But has the crime rate risen under such circumstances? You have surreptitiously introduced this conclusion without bothering to substantiate it.))

"Nevertheless, capital punishment is, I think, a bad thing. In the first place, it is too obviously irrevocable, and juries do make mistakes. If the object were revenge...well, a week or do of Chinese water torture would be a far batter revenge, if such were desired (and I wouldn't desire it), and a quick death is in such a case nothing but a humane revenge--an obvious absurdity. ((The absurdity is obvious, perhaps, to you (and to me), but it is by no means so obvious to the hypothetical Average Joe who (probably passively) supports capital punishment. Any articulate opposition to capital punishment in such a group is likely to run into this sort of comment: "Well, you just can't let somebody get off scot free after killing a man. He oughta suffer." So revenge is indeed the motive, no matter how absurd we may think it.))

"But a killer needs more than a reprimand. A short prison sentence is not the answer: killers simply sentenced to short terms and then released are liable to kill again--because, damnit, they are sick. There is no reason they should suffer for their sickness more than necessary, but if they are liable to kill, there is less reason that the members of society should be exposed to them. The only solution I can see is treatment--imprisonment with treatment until it is a pretty sure thing that they will not kill again. This is precisely something we are not able, today, to do--we don't know enough about psychiatry to cure many cases and worse, we don't even know enough to be certain when we have effected a cure. But a cure of some sort is the only solution--the only one with any hope of long-term success.

"Off onto Eichmann: I do shed tears (theoretically) at his death. He was, of course, a louse of the worst type. Unhappily, the way to fight fire is not with fire; the way to punish a man like Eichmann is not to kidnap him and then try him under a law which, however logical it may seem, is in fact an ex post facto law. The fact that Israel claimed to be following the precedent set by the Nuremberg court is irrelevant: the precedent was in this way a bad one. Trying people like the late Nazi leaders for murder, for violation of the Geneva convention is one thing, but trying them under laws which never existed when they did their dirty work--or laws as vague as that on 'crimes against humanity'--does in the long run more harm than good. It is a return to the old, barbaric custom of murdering the generals of your enemy's armies after you had beaten him, and a return which we most definitely do not need." (Winthrop F-24, Harvard, Cambridge 38, Mass.)

MIDGE WEST COMMENTS ON THE WORLD YOUTH FESTIVAL

"The letter from Derek Nelson in #32 regarding whether the World Youth Festival is a Communist front organization deserves some comment. Actually, no one but an ignorant twit would claim otherwise with its present set-up. However, let us place the blame for this where it really belongs, on the non-Communists. The organizing body of the W.Y.F. is the Internation Preparatory Committee, who invite anyone to join the Festival Committee in their own country and through that committee participate in the work of the I.P.C. This non-Communist bodies have re-

fused to do, apart from a few religious groups in my own country, and I have at last won a battle with the Labour Party, which started in 1959 when I attended the Vienna Festival, to be allowed to participate in Festivals without giving up my L.P. membership. Perhaps this is a hopeful sign that the wind of change has at last hit the Labour Party.

"I agree with Mr. Nelson's friend's remarks on Seminars, but I would like to correct the biased stories regarding the departure of the Ceylonese delegation. For a kick off only about thirty of the delegation left, and these mostly comprised of the Cultural section, who the day before had been involved in a disagreement with the Festival organizers about the transportation of their musical instruments. Also, they were given a free trip around Scandanavia by the anti-Festival group called 'Young America'. Perhaps this played as much a part in their decision to leave as did the 'propaganda show'. The British delegation also went to Schwerin and I did not witness any Nazi-type rally or get involved in orgies of embracing, etc.

"The Helsinki headquarters of 'Young America' displayed a banner proclaiming 'WE DO NOT PARTICIPATE' outside and an excuse for an Art Exhibition inside; they also held Jazz Concerts in opposition to the Festival programme, and distributed pamphlets and books condemning Communism. America, I am sorry to say, seems particularly childish in its attempts to break up these Festivals for a country which--I think--originated the expression, 'If you can't lick 'em, join 'em.' The money they waste in this practice could be better used in other pursuits.

"In conclusion, I feel that these Festivals can be very worthwhile, educational and great fun, if you approach them with the right spirit. The propaganda is not as obvious as one is led to believe, and in any case anyone with a grain of common sense will know what is genuine and what is to be disregarded--i.e., the overwhelming welcome given to the Cuban delegation. Perhaps one day when less lies are told about the Festival, and more non-Communists recognize its tremendous possibilities for inspiring world peace, we will have a true WORLD Youth Festival." (12, Parkhurst Rd., Wood Green, London, N.22, England.)

VIC RYAN HAS A FEW WORDS ABOUT #34

"Recently I was damn enthused about getting to see George Lincoln Rockwell in a small, informal gathering. He'd been invited to speak at a 'fireside' in a freshman dormitory on the Northwestern campus, had accepted, and had carried through with all the arrangements. The FBI at first looked askance on the idea, but when they saw the extensive preparations that'd been made by the dormitory residents for security measures (?!?) and such, they acquiesced wholeheartedly. To the surprise of practically no one, the University fathers threw in a monkey wrench, banning Rockwell as someone who'd likely poison the minds of the university's charges--and this in the face of permission granted for speeches by avowed communists, socialists and even a Black Muslim.

"The banning raised the usual furor on campus, with the usual results: none. An organization which almost certainly would have picketed Rockwell's appearance came out with a condemnation of this abridgement of free speech. Letters were written to the student newspaper. The American Nazi Party promised that the campus would get some sort of Nazi action, but hardly as peaceful as that originally planned. No one could understand how this banning could be justified; hell, more people ought to see George Lincoln Rockwell, to hear his philosophy of hate preached and to come to their own conclusions about the man. The fireside was to be small, limited to the hall's residents--but I know other students, myself included, would have used connections to get in and, at least, there would have been some representative of the student

newspaper to report what the man had to say. I think it would have been profitable, but, as is, the man is now damn near martyred among those that aren't too familiar with his philosophies.

"Maybe someone such as you or I wouldn't give much of a faint damn what happens to our bodies after we've died, but you can hardly extend your own philosophy to the bulk of Christian-thinking people, who happen to think burial a pretty damned important thing. As for the allied manner of this vicarious interest in Negroes' sexual encounters, this matter of the Negro's alleged potency has apparently been a sore spot among southern whites for at least a hundred years. If one's to believe Kenneth Stampp, one of the chief causes of the Civil War was the South's insistence on the mechanisms for preventing a slave rebellion led by the northern Black Republicans; and it seems they pretty well had a right to be afraid, because the Negro population was growing all out of proportion to the white, and there simply weren't enough huge cotton plantations where the nabobs could oversee vast flocks of enslaved labor. (Incidentally, if the Negro's more potent, it's simply because he's less inhibited.)

"I hope you don't mind if I cast some very grave doubts on your avowal that in the event of nuclear war you'd assume your life to be limited to several weeks at best, and that you'd be perfectly willing to admit a neighbor to your shelter. It sounds properly fatalistic, but I'm not at all convinced that in the face of the catastrophe of nuclear war you'd deviate from the 'normal' behavior: that is, straw-clutching. Not only would that neighbor lessen your chances of holding out for those highly unlikely 'more favorable conditions'--there's the very real consideration that he might object to your being in the shelter, and try to evict you a week early. ((I live within a few miles of the center of Baltimore; in the event of an attack, it really makes little difference whether I'm cowering in a hole or standing on the roof, since I will in either case be disintegrated. If someone else covets my hole, and if it will make their last few moments happier, why shouldn't I let them have it?))

"It appears all I have left to say, then, concerns this matter of 'potential'. Your examples--'potential criminals', 'potential lunatics', and so on--are a good deal more far-fetched than an instance in which a crowd has gathered with the expressed desire to act violently. ((As I recall the original situation, the "expressed desire" of the group was to demonstrate in sympathy for the students at the University of Mississippi. Bill Plott, who introduced the question, made no mention of an expressed desire to commit violence--where did you acquire this bit of information?)) Of course a gathering of the WCTU is a 'potential mob', but I'm sure you'll admit that the likelihood of its doing harm is a lot less than that for a group that meets behind the general store to 'talk' over the situation where a Negro's being admitted to a local school. There may be all sorts of authoritarianism involved in dispersing a group that's bent on trouble (and George Lincoln Rockwell's entourage hardly fits that description), but I think it's authoritarianism that's pretty damned necessary. ((Yeah, but who decides when a group is "bent on trouble"??))

"There are hinderances on 'potential criminals', remember? Although the law makes 'attempted murder' a crime in itself, the understanding certainly must be that the person must be discouraged from actually doing the lawbreaking. And some tests make pretty thorough strides toward identifying 'potential lunatics', assuming you mean psychopaths and such. ((This is true, I suppose, but to argue thus is to miss the point. Laws which punish for intending/attempting murder or mayhem are equivalent to a mob which is halted at the threshold of looping the rope around its victim's neck; groups which are prevented

from gathering on the off-chance that they might become a mob present a different situation altogether. The proper analogy in criminal matters is a situation in which you are arrested for walking past a bank, on the off-chance that it might have occurred to you to rob it. This is what is meant by "potential criminal", not the criminal who actually attempts murder or rape.)

"A 'potential rapist' is an entirely different thing than a 'potential mob', and I'm sure you realize this. In the second instance, all one is doing is dispersing and perhaps detaining the ringleaders; in the first, the penalty suggested was castration, and I imagine more people would be inclined to view that as the greater evil. (We are attempting to resolve an ethical problem; the harshness or gentleness of the punishments are immaterial in this context, as I'm certain you are well aware.) Secondly, the environment varies completely; a mob rarely calms down; it grows from the individual excitements of its members and produces something that's probably not the product of any one. Have you ever seen a bunch of fired-up people, meeting in a mob, only to calm down? (No, but--again--who is going to decide when individuals are sufficiently angry to justify preventive measures? Do you believe yourself capable of assuming this responsibility? Would you trust me to do it properly?) On the other hand, outside factors very well could deter a potential rapist: the removal of some stress, finding some creative outlet, a woman to love, or some such thing." (Box 308, 2309 Sheridan Rd., Evanston, Illinois.)

GARY LABOWITZ COMMENTS ON DEATH AND CENSORSHIP

"The comments quoted from Double Bill bring to mind a parable I recall from Sunday school days. It seems that a rather nasty old man finally died in a small village where he was hated. Jewish law prescribes that before a person may be buried, someone must say a good word for him. In this case no one would come forward to speak in the old man's behalf. After some days, the community gathered to deal with the problem of his decaying carcass. At last, another old man rose and spoke.

"His father was worse than he was," he said. And so the relieved congregation buried the body. It wasn't long, however, until the community was abuzz with questioning voices. The speculation was about how the old man's father ever managed to get buried.

"The village finally gathered at the old man's house who had spoken at the deceased's funeral. He simply explained, when the question was put to him, that his father had been worse than he was.

"Moral: We're getting better all the time.

"Frankly, I sometimes doubt that.

"The problem of censorship of great books is a vexing one. It seems to crop up in the most unexpected places. While I was at Rockhurst College (a Jesuit school in Kansas City), I had occasion to attempt to remove various books from the school library. Some of these were classics of literature, some of these were classics in the field of philosophy (my minor). On more occasions than I care to admit, the sweet librarian refused to let me check out books which were on the restricted circulation list. This list, of course, is nothing more than all the volumes which appear both on the Index and in English. The fact that all of them are readily available at public libraries or at nominal cost in paperback didn't seem to impress her. Neither did the fact that I am not Catholic and had permission from various professors to use the books. The fact is that when questioned point blank as to her motives, she told me that she was saving me from myself.

"The real tragedy of this sort of thing is that it is perpetrated in the name of religion and education. These reasons are no more

valid than that of 'decency'. Those persons who take it upon themselves to judge such things usually don't really know what they are talking about. In this case I doubt very much if the librarian was qualified for much more than cataloging books and putting them away.

"This sort of thing goes on more than we think. At the time the Kinsey, Pomeroy, and Martin volumes came out there was such a furor in the papers that although the library had purchased them (I still don't know why--they have an otherwise very poor sociological section) the librarians were loathe to hand them out. They were placed off stacks and you had to boldly ask for them, a factor which did reduce their circulation. Even at that, I recall noting at the time her reluctance to check them out to me. I have read much more in the field but the lack of publicity caused people to have no interest at all in what I read--as long as it wasn't the 'Kinsey Reports'.

"The same thing goes on in the motion picture industry--not in the self-policing action of the Code Board, but in local censorship groups. These groups (in Kansas City it is several appointed citizens--the only qualification one needs is to be a friend of the mayor's and perhaps a sense of what is 'right') screen every movie which has been proposed for showing by the local movie houses and distributors. On their judgement a movie is shown or not shown; the only compromise is in the form of a 'cut' version of the film which omits the 'bad' parts. Having on some occasions seen both the 'cut' and 'uncut' version of the same film, I can only say that I personally didn't notice the difference. Apparently, neither did the committee when they released a film on its second time around. Politics being what it is, however, I suspect the committee didn't notice because the members were busily counting the bribe money they received from the movie house that showed the film 'uncut'. ('Now the UNCUT VERSION comes to the screen of Kansas City--the whole picture--UNCUT.')

"Anyone could continue with a catalogue of subtle censorship influences that plague society today. There are admittedly less than before, a fact which leads me to believe we are indeed getting better all the time. But as long as incidents like the Edgerton, Wisconsin grass roots censorship and the Philadelphia, Pennsylvania official censorship movements arise, I have that gnawing doubt." (8233 President Court, Kansas City 31, Missouri.)

AND I ALSO HEARD FROM

Mark Owings notes the birth of a science fiction fan club in Baltimore and sends along repeated invitations to meetings, which I have heretofore managed to ignore. However, the club's recent merger with Local 109 of the Exotic Dancers' Union promises enlivened gatherings in the future. Carol Anonymous, whose surname is illegible but who appears to live at 2721 Haste (?) Street in Berkeley, is entitled to a copy of Kipple as soon as I acquire enough information about her to type a coherent mailing label. Calvin Demmon notes that his letter of last month was sincere. Harry Warner has gone out and cracked a few more bones, and is presently convalescing. His letter on #33 may appear next issue. Likewise, Dorothy Braunstein's letter on #34 may appear in the next issue. Fred Galvin, Steve Schultheis, Bob Brown, James Hamilton, Martin Helgesen, Gordon Eklund, Phil Bernard, and John Stopa sent filthy lucre. Thanks to one and all.

SHORT NOTES ON LONG SUBJECTS

Hieronymous Fabricius was a Sixteenth Century anatomist whose work dealt with, among other things, the circulation of the blood. About the valves of the veins, Fabricius said this (in a book published in 1603): "My theory is that Nature has formed them to delay the blood to

some extent, and to prevent the whole mass of it flooding into the feet or hands, and collecting there. Two evils are thus avoided, namely, undernutrition of the upper parts of the limbs, and a permanently swollen condition of the hands and feet. Valves were made, therefore, to ensure a really fair all-round distribution of blood for the nutrition of the various parts."

If anyone believes that it is no longer possible to encounter such astonishing statements, let me only point to the recent announcement by the Roman Catholic Church to the effect that it was seriously studying the question of whether life existed elsewhere in the universe and, if so, what the local religion was likely to be. It was considered "unlikely" that Jesus Christ would be known outside the solar system, although mention was made of the possibility that news of Him might have been spread to other planets by divine revelation. The major question, however, was of how to go about the task of Salvation, if the inhabitants of other planets were not proper Christians. It is to be expected that avid theists would be matter-of-fact about such matters, but, expected or not, it is startlingly horrible to actually read such statements.

From all accounts, the lead in police brutality in this country must be held by the officers of San Francisco. Their superiority in this field may soon be challenged, however. I was rather shocked to recently come across a brief squib in the Baltimore Evening Sun which told of an attempted robbery which was thwarted in Davenport, Iowa. The criminal was mortally wounded in a subsequent gunfight with police, and instead of being taken to a hospital he was removed to the police station where he collapsed and died under questioning. This callous treatment of a wounded prisoner is appalling.

To end on a boring note, let me outline for the benefit of new readers the significance of the esoteric symbols in the upper-right of the address box. A number in that area will be the number of the last issue currently due you; the letter "T" indicates that we exchange magazines; "C" means that you have a letter published herein; "P" refers to your exalted place on my permanent mailing list; and "S" indicates that this is a sample copy.

FROM
Ted Pauls
1448 Meridene Drive
Baltimore 12, Maryland
U.S.A.



SEND TO:

Len Moffatt
10202 Belcher
Downy, Calif.

printed matter only
may be opened for inspection
return requested

Ban the Bomb Before the Bomb Bans Us!
--Bill Yardley