

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| QUOTES AND NOTES by Ted Pauls..... | 3 |
| Huac A Knockin' At My Door?..... | 3 |
| The Humor Of J. Fester Gavelnoggin..... | 6 |
| A Few Thoughts On Democracy..... | 7 |
| The Top Shelf: A Fan's Library..... | 8 |
| May This House Be Safe From Alice McCluskey..... | 11 |
| Short Notes On Long Subjects..... | 12 |
| ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT by Harrison Brown & James Real..... | 14 |
| A SONG OF SIXPENCE by The Cheering Throngs..... | 18 |

Kipple is edited and published by Ted Pauls, 1448 Meridene Drive, Baltimore 12, Maryland, on the tenth day of every month. Copies of this august publication are available for letters of comment, contributions, trades, or 15¢ per issue, 2/25¢. Lifetime subscriptions may be obtained by any reader who presents me with a package containing the shrunken heads of Larry and Noreen Shaw. Trades: Kipple trades with other magazines on a one-for-one basis. --WOKLpress

GEORGE SOKOLSKY
APPRECIATION ISSUE

QUOTES AND NOTES

HUAC A KNOCKIN' AT MY DOOR?

Several issues ago in the pages of this column (Kipple #22, pages 8-10) I quoted and refuted an editorial in the Baltimore News-Post dealing with the House Un-American Activities Committee in general, and "Operation Abolition" in particular. In my naive innocence I mistakenly assumed that those comments were the epitome of conservative fuggheadism, but my unerring ability to make false predictions has once again been proven. My faith is restored in the utter incompetence of the Baltimore News-Post in particular and the Hearst newspapers in general. The culprit in this case was at least willing to sign his name to the inappropriate and misleading comments which he authored on the HUAC. Mr. George Sokolsky, in his column for March 1, 1962, headed "There Are No Valid Arguments For Abolishing House Committee," examines the allegations of an organization called the Ad Hoc Committee. Unfortunately, the act of signing his name to the piece evidently took the sum of Mr. Sokolsky's courage, for the text of the column shows a typically conservative lack of that quality. It violates all the laws of fair play and decency, and provides a veritable guidebook of John Birch Society tactics.

"Each session of Congress," reads the first paragraph, "faces a heavy barrage for the abolition of the House Unamerican Activities Committee. The names attached to such petitions usually are a collection of constant signers of pro-Communist petitions. The recurrence of names proves only that the Communist 'hard core' exists, is effective and that the organization has not withered on the vine in this country." The extraordinary genius inherent in the running conclusion jump between the second and third lines of this paragraph amazes me, for I must frankly admit that I had previously doubted that reactionaries were capable of such strokes of brilliance in their writings. In the first line, the unfortunate liberals who oppose the HUAC and all it stands for are merely a "collection of constant signers of pro-Communist petitions." That in itself is bad enough, but in the second line in question, they have been miraculously transformed into the 'hard core' of the Communist organization! There is a deep and dark chasm in between those two points, but Mr. Sokolsky has somehow succeeded in crossing it safely by riding on the puffs of his own hot air. Other travellers along this devious route would not be so fortunate: were I to transform the signers of an anti-Communist petition mysteriously into the 'hard core' of the John Birch Society, I doubt that Mr. Sokolsky, in his infinite wisdom, would allow me to get away

A COLUMN

BY TED FAULS

with it. He would probably be sneaky enough to claim that persons who sign anti-Communist petitions are not necessarily Robert Welch-stereotype extremists.

He would be right, too.

"At any rate," he continues, "when it comes to such matters, it is preferable to rely on J. Edgar Hoover rather than on Clarence E. Pickett, who signs himself as chairman, Ad Hoc Committee." I must agree on this particular point, but I must also find it extremely interesting and enlightening that while Mr. Sokolsky places so much faith in the opinions of J. Edgar Hoover, he does so only when those opinions support his case. It stands to reason that if J. Edgar Hoover deserves listening to when he defends the House Un-American Activities Committee, then he should also deserve a certain amount of attention when he asserts that "The danger of indiscriminately alleging that someone is a Communist merely because his views on a particular issue happen to parallel the official party position is obvious."

But Mr. Sokolsky's lack of attention to this point is more understandable when one realizes that he habitually ignores any point which may weaken his already teetering arguments. He continues his column by quoting from the Ad Hoc Committee various objections to the HUAC and commenting upon them in a way which he fondly hopes demolishes the position. The first and perhaps the cardinal objection offered by the Ad Hoc Committee is that the HUAC is "dividing the nation; setting neighbor against neighbor." Mr. Sokolsky refutes this in typical fashion: "Of course, it might be said that the existence of Republicans and Democrats divides the nation; or having Catholics, Protestants, and Jews divides the nation; or for that matter, having any sharp differences of opinion divides the nation. We are not a monolithic state. Differences of view do not divide the nation; they make for enlightenment. But no difference can make espionage tolerable--that is a different story.

"As for setting neighbor against neighbor, it seems that that is carrying toleration too far. For instance, if a neighbor of mine is engaged in pushing dope, should I tell or in a neighborly fashion be silent? Many issues arise which require that we set ourselves against our neighbors. Sometimes over a matter of principle, we quarrel with our best friends or with our brothers. It would seem that the Ad Hoc Committee's argument No. 1 is untenable."

Oddly enough, a great deal of Mr. Sokolsky's comment in these two paragraphs is quite true, but unfortunately has little relation to the still-undefended charges of the Ad Hoc Committee. I did not see the original comments made by that Committee, and have only the reprinted segments from Mr. Sokolsky's column by which to judge, but I would venture to say that the argument against the HUAC he quoted was only a lead-in line to a paragraph on the subject. It is logical to assume that the committee of liberals which drafted the arguments was at least reasonably intelligent, regardless of the numerous moral and intellectual failings which are attributed to them by Mr. Sokolsky and other conservatives. An intelligent body of men would have realized that the one-line argument quoted above is far too open to distortion, particularly when examined by those who disagree with it beforehand. But if that line was indeed only a portion of a more coherent argument, Mr. Sokolsky gave no indication of the fact.

Differences of opinion most certainly exist between neighbors, and in spite of Mr. Sokolsky's deliberate attempts to misunderstand, I don't think that was precisely what the Ad Hoc Committee had in mind. They were most likely criticizing the efforts of the HUAC to convince the public that, no matter what J. Edgar Hoover may have said, anyone who holds a Communist opinion is, de facto, a Communist. They were criticizing the unjust and, horrors!, un-American idea that a person is guilty until definitely proven innocent which is the very backbone of the HUAC.

The second point of objection noted by the Ad Hoc Committee was that the House Un-American Activities Committee was "depriving the nation of the benefits of free discussion." Mr. Sokolsky's answer to this is either stupidly naive or cleverly slanted, a fact which we shall decide after hearing his comments in full (a courtesy not granted by the HUAC which he defends).

"Quite the contrary! The existence of the House Committee on Unamerican Activities provides the opportunity for free discussion. If the witness chooses to plead the Fifth Amendment and be silent, that is his privilege and responsibility. Otherwise, he can state his case as he desires under oath, in the presence of his neighbors."

An organization which propounds the theory that any statement, attitude; or opinion which resembles (however remotely) a Communist statement, attitude, or opinion is, de facto, treasonous, is not very conducive to free discussion. On the contrary, an organization which looks upon any opposition to itself as treason is not conducive to discussion of any kind. Our country was built upon the principles of the freedom to criticize anything, including the government, with complete freedom from reprisal, while the Soviet government exists on the premise that the state is always right. There, essentially, is the difference between the two forms of government. But now that gap is being bridged by the HUAC, existing on the premise that it is always correct and that any dissenting opinion is necessarily part of a plot to destroy this country.

The HUAC exists because the people of this country are frightened of the Communist Menace, the Hidden Conspiracy, or any other name by which it may be known. The HUAC is a fear-reaction, just as the McCarthy hearings were a fear-reaction: things aren't going too well, and a scapegoat is needed. The Communist Party and--worse--the entire liberal movement is that scapegoat. The Salem witch trials were a product of the same atmosphere which produced Joe McCarthy and the HUAC. The inhabitants of Salem were in a new and strange land, already badly frightened, and when things went wrong, they needed a scapegoat on which to blame their own failings. If the crop failed, it wasn't because farmer Johnas was too stupid to make certain that the seeds were sown deeply enough; it was because that strange Wilson kid, who didn't respect her elders, was a witch; or old man Carter, the deaf old gent who lived alone in that dark house at the edge of town, was a warlock. And so thousands of innocent people were slaughtered out of sheer ignorance and the need to take vengeance on something tangible for events which were not understood.

A similar situation exists today, with one exception: we are too civilized to hang or burn liberals (although I am certain that there are

still a few hard-bitten conservatives who would gleefully "string up the bastid commies"). When the current-day Cotton Mather is through with his victims, they have simply lost their jobs, friends, and social standing; but they aren't dead...not completely.

As for the "choice" between speaking or taking the Fifth Amendment, that is laughable. The HUAC has made it very clear that anyone who refuses to answer is to be considered a Communist who is simply afraid to speak. Certainly, as Mr. Sokolsky said, one can refuse to answer the questions posed by the Committee; but you will then be branded a Communist by supposedly reputable political leaders, and even if, at some future date, the allegation should be disproved, the truth will never catch up to the rumor. Perhaps Mr. Sokolsky believes, like many radical conservatives, that those who have nothing to hide have nothing to fear. The premise that you cannot be hurt by a lie is always false, but particularly so when the charge is this serious and the questions as cleverly constructed as "Have you stopped beating your wife? Answer 'yes' or 'no'." The people, as I said, are badly frightened of Communism; they are apt to believe anything relating to Communist activities in this country. Joe Blow, who has been questioned by the HUAC, refused to answer, and has consequently been branded as a Communist or Communist dupe, decides to drive over to his favorite saloon one night for a few drinks. He leaves the house and gets his auto out of the garage very quietly, for although it isn't yet eleven o'clock, there is a very old woman living next door to him who retires rather early. As he pulls away, the newlywed couple across the street stop peaking through the window and turn to each other. "George," says the woman, "isn't that that Commie guy sneaking off across the street?" "Yeah, Helen," he replies. "The sneaky bastard's probably going to his cell meeting."

By the simple act of leaving his own house quietly as a courtesy to a neighbor, Joe has absolutely convinced two of his neighbors of his traitorous affiliations.

Mr. Sokolsky leaves us with another splendid comment, having learned that there are several religious leaders on the Ad Hoc Committee: "The most disgraceful section of the list is under the heading, 'religious leaders'. What kind of religious leaders are these who join with atheists to destroy the very religion which they claim to represent."

This is the first indication that the Ad Hoc Committee is composed of atheists, and if Mr. Sokolsky has such information in his possession I imagine we would all be very happy to see it. If he does not possess that information, then I believe we would all be very happy if he were to cease bolstering his arguments with falsehoods. It is neither honorable nor ethical to substantiate one's arguments with lies, though it is perhaps the expected tactic from a Hearst newspaper.

Now what are they gonna do for an encore...?

THE HUMOR OF J. FESTER GAVELNOGGIN

"What you need," Peter Graham told me, "is a Sense of Humor." Pete absently reached up and straightened his glasses, which had been knocked askew by the party-hat he continually wears. He chuckled lightly as he repeated the statement, watching my face for a reaction.

"What I need is a Sense of Humor," I repeated, rolling the words over

my tongue (including the capitalized phrase). "Yes, I think you're right, Pete. Why, if I had a Sense of Humor, I wouldn't be dull and stodgy any longer--I'd be gay, cheerful and fun-loving, just like all the New York fans."

"Not all New York fans," Pete hastily corrected. "Even in Mecca there are outcasts."

"Well, of course!" I exclaimed. "I wasn't really thinking of Sam and Christine. Still, most New York fans are gay, cheerful, fun-loving chaps, and I'd sure like to have a Sense of Humor so I could be like them. I can easily see the difference it would make in my actions and in Kipple. Serious Old Ted Pauls would probably write a letter to a fanzine he didn't care for, outlining his objections and giving the editor a fair chance to answer them. But if I had a Sense of Humor, I'd probably publish a parody of the fanzine instead."

"But I..." Pete began, but I interrupted, continuing: "And of course my sercon side wouldn't think of publishing an opinion of another fan in Kipple unless I had the courage to say it to all of my readers, but if I had a Sense of Humor I'd probably make each copy different, calling the addressees names in Quotes & Notes and giving them the impression that the comments appeared in all of the copies. Of course, that's unjust, but as long as it's Funny, who cares?"

Pete was sputtering and protesting vigorously by this time, but I quickly silenced him with a single shot of my portable howitzer. "If I had a Sense of Humor," I continued, raising my voice to be heard above the echoing roar of the cannon discharge, "I probably wouldn't bother to criticize a fan or fanzine in an ethical manner, but instead I'd do it in a gay, cheerful, fun-loving New York manner--such as Andy Reiss, who commented on a quotecard of mine recently that he didn't 'give two turds in a high wind for (me) or (my) fanzine.'"

Pete was slowly rising from the floor as my shot had, after all, only stunned him, and I endeavored to finish my line of thought before he revived sufficiently to interrupt. "Meyer, there are all manner of things I could do with a Sense of Humor: I could publish a newssheet that was instrumental in getting Ted White sued for \$75,000, I could praise my own fanzine in letters to Yandro...just all manner of incredible things. If only I had a Sense of Humor. Please, Pete, show me how to get a Sense of Humor, show me the road to salvation..."

But Pete never did reply. I woke up just then, and the dream ended.

I wish I had a Sense of Humor; it certainly is a wonderful thing...

A FEW THOUGHTS ON DEMOCRACY

"Democracy is wrong in many of its current aspects and under some current definitions, but democracy is the only political ideology which can be made to embrace an ethically good society by the standards of ethics here maintained. Laissez faire capitalism, or any other societal activity that promotes or permits selfish or unfair utilization of some individuals by others, is obviously wrong by these standards. Capitalism, not further restricted, is perfectly consistent with authoritarianism or totalitarianism and is of course wrong if involved in either of these morally wrong systems. In a socialized democracy, controlled

capitalism without improper exploitation may be ethically good. Majority rule is wrong if it involves suppression or oppression of any minority, but decision of problems by the majority of all those affected by them, accompanied by free expression of all opinions and full preservation of minority rights is, so far as has yet been demonstrated, the only possible ethically good means of reaching collective action. Attempts to assign personal responsibility to the government are ethically wrong (and biologically futile, to boot), but government by representatives or delegates for whose actions each one of their constituents remains personally responsible seems to be the only practicable method of ethical government for large groups of people.

"Governments called democracies are by no means all ethically right by our standards, and none is free of many ethically bad aspects. Yet an ethically good state, one based on the fact of personal responsibility by each of its members and organized to promote the acquisition, dissemination, and acceptance of truth in all fields, to maintain the integrity and dignity of every individual, and to enable maximum possible realization of personal capacities--such a government would necessarily be a democracy." --George Gaylord Simpson, in "The Meaning of Evolution," Mentor Book #MD66, 50¢.

THE TOP SHELF: A FAN'S LIBRARY

J. Edgar Hoover's "Masters of Deceit" (Cardinal Giant #GC:39, 50¢) is capable of being judged by two sets of criteria: its value as a literary work and its value as a political work. By neither set of criteria is it a spectacular success, although it is an entirely adequate volume in both classifications. Its value as a literary work may have been tempered somewhat by my own inability to appreciate all but the most obvious writing styles, since Mr. Hoover appears to me to have no discernable style at all. While reasonably well-written, it seems somewhat labored in the manner of many scientists who turn to the literary field and attempt to put into words their brilliant theories: dull, plodding, over-written. "Masters of Deceit" is somewhat more successful as a political work, and it is in this facet that it should be of most interest to us. The book is laden with facts about the history and objectives of the Communist movement, and though it is sometimes couched in alarmist terms, this is probably done more in an attempt to gain an attentive audience than for any other reason. I do not care for the occasional examples of reactionary tactics, however, particularly when they are authored by a man who asserts the danger of indiscriminately assuming that anyone who holds a Communist opinion is necessarily a Communist. Although Hoover speaks out against this sort of thinking, he is occasionally tempted to indulge in it as well: While discussing Lenin, he notes that "It is interesting and important to note here, as with Marx and Engels, that atheism was the first step toward communism." While "interesting," I don't believe it is "important" in at least one interpretation, and it is certainly a magnificent example of a "guilt-by-association" theory, leading as it does to the indiscriminate condemning of all atheists as potential Communists. This book is nevertheless recommended to anyone who may wish to know a little more about the principles and objectives of Communism, with the qualification that such statements as the one I quoted be taken cum grano salis.

Although it was reviewed many months ago in Kipple #4, a re-evaluation of George Gaylord Simpson's "The Meaning of Evolution" (Mentor Book #MD66, 50¢) is probably in order. I dismissed it with a shrug and two

sentences at that time on the premise that it was abridged from a larger volume and did not cover certain topics as fully as might be desired. This is true, but I cannot fathom at this time the mental lapse which led me to dismiss it so lightly in the distant past. My only excuse is that the review was written fully four months after I had actually read the book, and by that time all of the good qualities must have been forgotten. Recently, however, I found myself re-reading "The Meaning of Evolution" quite by accident: I retrieved it from the shelf for the purpose of checking a point, found the page on which it was covered, and found myself reading sixteen pages before I realized that I had long since ventured into another topic. This book would have a similar effect upon anyone even slightly interested in the subjects under discussion, for Simpson's writing does not suffer from the dullness common to scientists who write books. Indeed, one is not only educated but also entertained by "The Meaning of Evolution". Simpson's wit is nearly as great as his skill, particularly when the stiletto is turned toward the idiosyncrasies and less probable theories of his contemporaries. (While discussing image-forming eyes, it is noted that "Some students call these 'iconogenetic,' but the term is no shorter than 'image-forming' and means exactly the same thing to fewer people.") This may not seem the ultimate of high humor, but I assure you that it is when compared to the 1500 pages of Huntington, Darwin, and Greene I've recently read.

As for factual content, it is often difficult to judge such a book on that basis unless you are an expert in the field which it covers. From my own experience, however, I would say that in the areas "The Meaning of Evolution" does explore, it is unsurpassed in its field. Anyone interested in evolution will find this an invaluable text.

Murray Leinster's "War With the Gizmos" (Gold Medal Book #s751, 35¢) is difficult to review, for while it is an enjoyable novel, it is hardly an above-average one, even for science fiction. Leinster, as always, is an interesting story-teller but little more, a fact that has earned for him the reputation of science fiction's lovable purveyor of highly unspectacular stories. "War With the Gizmos" is worth reading as a competent, exciting story, but the reader who begins it with illusions of discovering anything more will be disappointed. It is similar in this respect to 95% of science fiction: you can read it, enjoy it, and forget it in the same day. This is not intended as an indictment of the genre, but simply a statement which could be equally applied to any of the other forms of "popular" fiction (mystery fiction, westerns, etc.). Science fiction as a whole is purely entertainment-oriented material, and its prime value is that of story-telling; this isn't necessarily a fault, but it is the difference between most science fiction and work which is termed "literature". Nor do I cite Leinster as a hack: few writers in this genre are able to create something more than so-called "escape literature" (Sturgeon and Heinlein are two notable examples of authors who have succeeded in doing so), and Leinster finds himself in the enviable company of Clarke, Leiber, Anderson, Asimov, Russell, Blish, and dozens of others.

I hesitate to praise "War With the Gizmos" in even these qualified terms, however, for once the initial enjoyment of the story-telling subsides, my opinion of the novel may be drastically altered. Most stories of this sort have a half-life as short as that of Iodine-131, and I may discover it turning to crud within a brief period. The character-

ization is particularly faulty, a characteristic of Leinster's work which he seems to have defeated only in "Combat Team" and a handful of others. Dick Lane, the hero of "War With the Gizmos," is a cardboard cutout who exists as tenuously as did Clark Kent, mild-mannered reporter, and the other characters are little better. The only real characterization is that of Burke, and he is merely a massive cliché.

"War With the Gizmos" is a novel to read in order to alleviate boredom, a novel to be read only when other pastimes have been thoroughly exhausted, and I recommend it as such.

As many of you may know, my peculiar weakness in regard to science fiction stories are those dealing with alien flora and fauna, particularly that neatly labelled category of stories known as "jungle-planet" stories. As a result of this entirely human weakness, a number of stories hold a warm spot in the cockles of my heart, although most are otherwise unexceptional tales: Leinster's "Combat Team," Harrison's "Deathworld," Simak's "The World That Couldn't Be," Williamson's "The Legion of Space," and many others. Of the four named, I consider only "Combat Team" to be a particularly worthwhile story aside from the subjective allure of the alien ecology: "Deathworld" had great possibilities, and I wish that some more talented author than Harrison had decided to write it; "The World That Couldn't Be" explores an interesting idea in a competent manner, but has little else to recommend it; and "The Legion of Space" is an interesting space-opera adventure, but science fiction is capable of so much more than simply "action" stories of this type. All, however, are remembered with great fondness in this quarter, as are most of the other stories I've read dealing with similar situations.

I am quite willing to make an exception in the case of "The Long Afternoon of Earth," however, Brian Aldiss' latest book. (Signet Book #D2018, 50¢.) This novel originally appeared as five separate stories in The Magazine of Fantasy & Science Fiction, the first of which ("Hot-house") was reviewed in Kipple #10. As I admitted then, despite minor faults such as a startling lack of plot and paper-thin characterization, I enjoyed the tale because of the myriad weird forms of life which Aldiss depicted as inhabiting his future earth. However, even my saintly patience with sloppiness of plot and absurdity of scientific basis eventually wears thin, and 192 pages of unbelievable, utterly impossible, and eventually dull story nicely accomplishes this feat. Although not a scientist, I like to think that my mind is scientifically oriented to some extent, and I cannot for very long console myself to: the earth and moon frozen immobile in space; mile-long, bladder-shaped vegetable creatures which spin webs between terra and its satellite, relishing the hard radiation of deep space as they travel between the two bodies; a sun-side overrun by plant life (which should instead be crisply roasted after a few years of constant daylight) in which there is no ecological order, where every life form seeks only to destroy other life forms; "human beings" which undergo metamorphosis after having sealed themselves in transparent coffins, emerging as totally different winged creatures after they are transported to the moon by the bladder-creatures; and much more, too incredible to mention.

From a literary as opposed to a scientific viewpoint, the book is somewhat more acceptable. Aldiss is an interesting author, with a gift for narrative surpassed only by his ignorance of characterization, the hane

of many science fiction writers. Poor characterization walks the pages of numerous science fiction novels, but in this one it runs rampant: only Gren, an entity I suppose one might call the "hero" of this tale, and the Tummy-Men as a whole, are characterized reasonably well. As for the other human characters, the plants have more individuality.

"The Long Afternoon of Earth" is recommended, perhaps, if you ever care to read a fantasy masquerading as science fiction, written in an interesting style hampered only by transparent characters, with an utter lack of regard for scientific premises. It is worth 50¢ if you take pleasure in such a story; not otherwise.

MAY THIS HOUSE BE SAFE FROM ALICE McCLUSKEY

Far-flung Kipple reporter Betty Kujawa appears to be aiming for the staff position of Editor in charge of Censorship Incidents, as she has kindly taken to mailing envelopes full of newspaper clippings on such matters to me. The latest batch contains one of particular interest to me, considering the recent wealth of comment on the House Un-American Activities Committee which has appeared in these pages. The clipping, from the March 12th Miami Herald, concerns the efforts of radio commentator Alice McCluskey of Perry, Florida, to ban from newsstands a book that dares criticize the HUAC. Although neither title nor author are mentioned within the clipping, Betty notes that the book under fire is "The UnAmericans," by Frank Donner.

According to the clipping, "Mrs. McCluskey said she had not read the book, but knew from literature she received from anti-Communist organizations that the author of the book had 'Communist connections'." Passing for the moment over the question of whether or not the statements of an anti-Communist organization are necessarily to be trusted without substantiation simply because it is anti-Communist, I would say that a person who would judge a book (or anything else) without benefit of reading it should not run a program of "political comment". In case Mrs. McCluskey doesn't realize it, someone should point out to her that it is her type of person that the Communists seek to recruit: those who let others do their thinking for them. I've never heard Mrs. McCluskey's program, but I'm against it because I know from literature of an anti-conservative organization that she is a person with rightwing connections. The same reasoning, you see...

Someone had the presence of mind to point out that Mrs. McCluskey should not criticize the book sight-unseen. In relation to a druggist who first refused to remove "The UnAmericans" from his shelves, she is quoted as saying, "He seemed to think I wasn't giving the book a fair trial. He told me I ought to read it. I told him why should I take poison when I know it is poison." Arguing by analogy generally puts one on weak ground, you see; the proper parable would have been: Why should I have this chemical analyzed when I have been told it is poison. Although the thought of Mrs. McCluskey taking poison is perhaps an attractive one, and one that I might have endorsed in a moment of anger at her abominable ignorance, that isn't properly analogous to reading a book. If "The UnAmericans" does indeed contain elements of Communist propaganda, Mrs. McCluskey must have a depressingly low opinion of her mentality if she is afraid that reading such a book would "poison" her mind.

The last paragraph of the clipping is a particularly splendid one: "The

committee (HUAC) established that he (Frank Donner) had associations with known Communists, she said, and 'therefore he must be a Communist.' That statement is foolish to the extreme in its own right, needing no cleverly devised comment from your beloved editor to make it appear even more foolish--but will you forgive me for nevertheless redundantly pointing out that it means no more than this statement: "He has associations with Negroes, therefore he must be a Negro..."?

At any rate, Mrs. McCluskey was successful in having the book banned from the newsstands of Perry, Florida (probably not a terrible financial blow to the publishers), and that minor success has inspired her to perhaps greater heights. Why, her influence may spread as far north as Point Olgawallaheela, a small moose-trapping settlement in southern Georgia. "Mrs. McCluskey's success in her first venture was heartening to her," reports the Herald. "She is continuing to watch Perry newsstands for other 'subversive' material." I would be most happy to assist this charming woman in her search for further 'subversive' material, and if someone will send me her address I will forward copies of my recent caustic commentary on the HUAC. If she experienced amazement at "The UnAmericans," a few copies of Kipple ought to send her into immediate shock, an eventuality for which the newsstand operators of Perry are avidly praying.

SHORT NOTES ON LONG SUBJECTS

Department of Material Department: The article in this issue by Harrison Brown and James Real is reprinted from "Community of Fear," a pamphlet published by the Fund for the Republic. (Single copies are available free of charge from the Fund at this address: Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Box 4068, Santa Barbara, Calif.) Another segment of the very same pamphlet was reprinted in the tenth issue of this journal, leading at least one local wit to note that there was no point in sending for a copy, since it would eventually appear in its entirety in Kipple. At this rate, however, the final segment will not appear until Kipple #121 (the Gala Tenth Anniversary Issue, which will contain over 100 pages--I've already cut several of the stencils). If you are at all interested in the future (if any) of the human race and don't care to wait until May 10, 1970 to read all of the publication, I strongly advise sending for a copy of "Community of Fear".

Speaking of anniversaries, it has just occurred to me that the next issue of this stalwart journal of rash opinion will commemorate its second anniversary (or "birthday," if you care to become sickeningly mundane). Having published 192 pages during the first four months of this year, I wonder what I'll do for an encore?

An Error A Day From All Over: Fanac #83 reports that Maggie Curtis and Don Franson are to be married June 23rd, and though I realize that the domestic affairs of fans are none of my business, I would like to plead that the parties concerned call off this rash move. The mortality rate of fan marriages is incredibly high under ordinary circumstances, and I see absolutely no chance for the success of this match. Miss Curtis is a pretty young thing, just out of her teens, and Donald Franson, fine man though he is, is a grizzled greybeard with 25 years experience as a letterhack. I appreciate the fact that Mr. Franson must have presented a charming fatherly image to innocent Miss Curtis, but I still hope and pray that this marriage, doomed to failure from the start, will be called off. Not only is the age factor an important one, but a good friend of mine will probably be irreparably traumatized by the event. Mr. Donald Thompson has been wooing Miss Cur-

tis for years, and the shock of having her charmed away by handsome, debonair (though senile) Mr. Franson may be too great to bear. Under these circumstances, I hope Mr. Franson will think of Miss Curtis' best interests and reconsider this brash move. Thank you...

Department of Newspapers: Ted White should be extremely elated to learn that not only is Baltimore's News-Post becoming more and more liberal, but also more and more dignified. A recent editorial in that amusingly foolish publication begins with these words: "On October 24, 1961, Fidel Castro, the well-known Cuban murderer, thief and pervert... stole the U.S. owned nickel plant in Oriente Province." I mean, gee, fellas, I'm not in favor of Castro either, but is it necessary to sound like a five-year-old who just had his capgun confiscated...

Why You Aren't Getting This Issue: Lack of foresight and an influx of interesting fillers combined to leave no space in this issue large enough to tell you of the myriad reasons you may be receiving it. Rather than to use this section of Quotes & Notes for a crowded rendition of the unaesthetic checkmark system, I have decided to use a system invented 37 years ago by Pinwheel J. Cadwalader (known appropriately as the Pinwheel J. Cadwalader System). A number or letter will appear in the extreme upper-right of the address box. This is part of a code intended not only to inform you, the reader, of your status on my mailing list, but also to inform my agents of the location of Baltimore's Nike bases. If a number appears in that space it is, of course, the number of the last issue you will receive. The letter "C" means that you are represented herein with a contribution, either an article or letter; "P" is not a suggestion for something to do during a coffee break, but refers to the fact that you are a permanent recipient of my publications; "T" means, of course, that we trade magazines; "S" means that this is a sample copy, either sent upon request or because I saw your name elsewhere; and "N" indicates that you are one of my far-flung news-gatherers and that your monthly check will be arriving shortly, replete with a letter of recommendation to William Randolph Hearst. Are there any questions?

Wanted--One Star Columnist: Kipple has evidently lost both of its Star Columnists in one fell swoop, as it were. "Cryin' In The Sink" has failed to arrive for the second consecutive month, and despite a desperate postcard and a note on Kipple #23, I have heard nothing from Marion Bradley in that time. She has evidently been buried by either a Texas sandstorm or an influx of fanzines. The other Star Columnist, Ted White (known as Bitching Old Theodore Edwin White to his friends), resigned his position after I had rejected his recent offering on the grounds that it was too ephemeral for Kipple. Ted answered by return mail that the column would probably turn up elsewhere, and that he was sorry he was unable to inject a little humor into Kipple. I didn't have the heart to remind him that I hadn't criticized the column on the basis of humor; humor I will print, but two pages with the substance and appeal of cold mashed potatoes I will not. Oh well, I suppose it is all for the best; Kipple will very shortly be returning to a more respectable size, and one of those columns was going to be dropped anyway in order to have enough room for a decent sized letter column and perhaps an occasional article.

Department of Problems: Despite my mention above of an influx of interesting fillers, I have none small enough to fill four lines, and so I am faced with a problem common to many editors. My solution is hardly original, but quite workable, as you must have noticed...

--Ted Pauls

HARRISON BROWN & JAMES REAL ON [] ARMS CONTROL

On the basis of the considerations thus far discussed, it is amply clear that the world is in great danger for as long as the arms race continues and the giant retaliatory systems remain in place, ready for use. It would appear to be obvious that major steps must be taken aimed at eliminating the retaliatory systems and bringing the arms race under control. In other words, the situation warrants agreements between the nuclear powers aimed at instituting a considerable measure of disarmament with inspections and controls, slowing the rate of spread of nuclear military technology, and breaking the vicious research and development circle that helps perpetuate the arms race. In spite of the overwhelming need for such agreements, however, there does not appear to be much chance that adequate steps will be taken in the near future.

There are few people in America today who care to be identified with a belligerent militaristic policy which is likely to lead to war. It is generally recognized that the time is past when talk of "preventive" war could be rationalized. Yet the war machine gathers strength, and serious consideration of its diminution or dismantling is rare and often timid. Aside from the difficulties involved in the Realpolitik of the international situation, there are domestic forces, largely unspoken, that commit us more absolutely each day to the path away from effective arms control--not to speak of actual disarmament.

There are many knowledgeable persons who believe that under no circumstances should research and development on new weapons systems be stopped. There would always be the fear that the potential enemy might develop a greatly superior system of offense or defense which would give him a considerable advantage. The only way of minimizing the danger of such a threat is to maintain a diversity of research and development covering all major aspects of military technology. Since individual nations cannot justify stopping development programs on weapons systems, it is clear that the tug-of-war in this area is likely to continue--that new offensive systems will continue to replace old ones and that these in turn will necessitate new defensive systems. As the research and development continue, there will be new breakthroughs which will make possible still newer systems and render older ones obsolete.

Persons who insist upon perpetuating the military research and development race have an impressive argument when they point to the development of the thermonuclear bomb. Following World War II, strong forces in our government, particularly in the scientific community, discouraged the establishment of a research and development program aimed at producing megaton weapons. Many factors were involved in this attitude--some of them practical, others emotional and moral. There were others, however, who believed just as strongly that our lack of effort in this direction could be suicidal. What if the Russians were to develop such weapons

AND

DISARMAMENT

first? Would they hesitate to make use of their new-found strategic advantage?

The pro-hydrogen bomb forces eventually won out, and a vigorous program was established, which was successful in a spectacularly short time. The Russians, of course, established their own program, which was also successful.

Today the proponents of maintaining extremely strong programs in the development of weapons systems can point to much more than the hydrogen bomb as justification for their views. The rapidly increasing deterrent gap has resulted in large measure from our not financing missile development adequately. The Polaris development, had it come earlier, would have done much to relieve the situation.

Thus, no matter what is possible it must be pursued. Can gigaton bombs be built? We must do the work and see. Can climate over the Soviet Union be altered? We must experiment. Can the earth be burned, broken, kept from rotating? Can the albedo be increased? Can all life be eliminated? Can we make the oceans boil? All of these questions must be considered. If we don't consider them, the Russians might, and if successful they would have us at a disadvantage.

Most persons who view the arms race with alarm and feel that something can be done about it believe that nuclear test suspension with inspection and controls represents a reasonable first step which can lead to a more widely-based system of arms control and disarmament. It would stop nuclear weapons development at the present stage; it would establish a precedent for other arms control arrangements; it would slow the spread of nuclear military technology to other areas of the world.

Opponents of nuclear test suspension do so in part on the grounds that research and development in this area would effectively be halted (it is difficult to design new products and systems without testing them). There are many new areas which the research and development-minded persons would like to explore: new tactical weapons, anti-missile defense, communications jamming, the effects of tremendous explosions outside the earth's atmosphere, improved efficiency of megaton weapons so that the very largest could be carried by ICBM's.

When it is pointed out that Russian research in these areas would be curtailed also, it is usually suggested that the Russians might carry out a clandestine testing program. It is also suggested that the Russians might already be ahead of us in some of these areas.

Opponents of nuclear test suspension correctly point out that no system of inspection and controls can be 100 per cent effective. No matter how elaborate the system might be, there would always be a chance (although perhaps very small) that a particular clan-

destine explosion might go undetected. This argument is used effectively with many persons who take the view that if there is any possibility of cheating we should not enter into an agreement. This same argument can be used effectively in test bans in any military area. For example, although missile tests could be monitored very effectively, it would always be possible in principle for a test to be undertaken secretly. Technical systems of monitoring and inspecting, like massive retaliatory systems, are fallible. In our modern technological world there can be no such thing as 100 per cent security--like infinity, it can be approached but never reached.

Although the probability of detecting clandestine tests can never be increased to 100 per cent, it can be increased substantially given adequate research and development in this area. Thus far, however, the responsibility for research and development in the nuclear test detection area has been placed in the hands of those groups that are most opposed to test cessation: The Air Force and the Atomic Energy Commission.

The foregoing illustrates the effectiveness of the alliance, which is still young, between the scientist-technician on the one hand and the military on the other. Tens of thousands of scientists and technicians have devoted all of their professional lives to the invention and construction of weapons. A majority of those who went to work after World War II are convinced that weaponry is a way of life for themselves and expect the U.S.-Soviet contest to continue forever. Many of them are articulate and highly valued consultants in every walk of American life, from the Congressional committee to the P.T.A.

Although these men are not generally openly political, they are in every sense the paramilitary--civilian soldiers. They have spent most of their adult lives in the direct or secondary employment of one or another of the services, and their sympathy for and concurrence with their uniformed colleagues are often marked and open. Should a showdown between the military and the civilian sectors occur, this group could be relied upon to staunchly back the handlers of the weapons they have so devotedly evolved.

The military leaders themselves are quite naturally not enthusiastic for disarmament or for any steps that might curtail the freedom of action of the armed forces. There is rather clearly a military elite emerging in the United States which is dedicated to a position of perpetual hostility toward the Soviet Union and which wields enormous political as well as military power.

A small but not negligible fraction of the \$40 billion defense budget is invested judiciously each year in a well-conceived program of public and Congressional relations. As a result, the military lobby is now the strongest lobby in Washington. Were the State Department to negotiate successfully an arms control agreement with the Soviet Union and were the armed services united in their opposition to the agreement, the agreement would almost certainly be defeated by the Senate. There is little doubt that the armed services exert more control over Congress than that body exerts over the Defense Department. Indeed, the military elite is clearly in a position to assume actual political command over the U.S. striking forces if there are serious signs of "weakness" in U.S. foreign relations.

Among the deadly myths that tend to support the argument for retention and expansion of the arms race, the least examined, but nonetheless powerful and inhibiting, are those revolving on

our dependence on the war economy. The primary apprehension about the reduction of the weapons budget is based on a single, simple statistic --the \$40-\$50 billion defense budget is a 10-12 per cent segment of the gross national product. But, as Gerard Piel points out, one must adjust to the "investment multiplier" to determine the real derivative economic activity generated and sustained by the weapons business. This arithmetical device suggests that between one-quarter and one-third of the economic activity of the nation as a whole is based upon the weapons race. The primary war equipage business supports a host of dependent enterprises which are nominally "civilian" in nature.

The first statistic, the 10-12 per cent, is the more widely used because it is the easier to accomodate. The argument for the relative unimportance of the war economy goes this way: The GNP is slated to accelerate at about 5 per cent per year. If we can hold war expenditures to their present dollar level, then obviously the proportion of the national income spent on "defense" would decrease each year. There are two assumptions here, and both of them are slippery. First, there is no assurance that the kind of economic faltering encountered in 1958, the year of the still largely unexplained "recession," cannot and will not be repeated with greater or lesser intensity and for unforeseeable periods. Second, the dollar demands of the arms race are flatly unpredictable from month to month.

If the expenditure on weapons systems increases during the next five years at the same rate as it has during the last five, even allowing the 5 per cent annual GNP increase, the use of the Keynesian multiplier would indicate that close to 50 per cent of the total of U.S. production and business in 1965 may be directly or indirectly war goods and services.

At what point will this kind of economic dependance become so crucial that it cannot be substantially reduced without grave harm to the basic economic structure? It may well be that the time has already come.

The elements and conditions reinforcing the war economy are many. Real, justified fear of the mysterious Soviet juggernaut is held by most of the people in one way or another. Substantial disarmament now, or at any foreseeable time ahead, seems emotionally (and, therefore, practically) impossible. On the contrary, the psychology of fear promises to increase to the point where substantial personal economic sacrifices could be asked of the people--and given willingly, if the alternative parades as military vulnerability. Even a full-scale depression would undoubtedly be largely blamed on Soviet actions and pressures. It is conceivable that the public reaction would be similar to that displayed after Pearl Harbor. The butter is more likely to disappear than the guns.

--Harrison Brown & James Real.

"Peaceful coexistence implies complete renunciation of war as the means of settling questions at issue, as well as noninterference in the internal affairs of other countries. The principle also suggests that political and economic relations among states should be built on the basis of full equality of the parties and mutual benefits." --Nikita S. Khrushchev, in a speech at Tatabanya, Hungary, delivered on April 8, 1958.

LETTERS-LETTERS-LETTERS-LETTER

LARRY WILLIAMS
74 MAPLE ROAD
LONGMEADOW 6, MASS.

Your school system is a fine one, but I have a few objections. First, you would be developing a caste system, as in "Brave New World". Before a child knows the facts of life he has been classified, and his schooling has been thoroughly planned with regard to intelligence. Ted White stated in Warhoon #11 "...my IQ jumped from 115 in grade school to 128 in high school to around 160 four years ago..." This is a fantastic thing, and a good one. The IQs of many people rise as they apply themselves more to their studies. In your system, there would be no room for developing a student beyond the intelligence of his hard-walled caste. (Tell me, how did you manage to so thoroughly misinterpret my comments? There might be a caste system of sorts, but it would certainly be no worse than the one which already exists, where each "grade" feels itself vastly superior to all those below it. As for a person whose intelligence increased beyond the bounds of his original classification, that point was adequately covered in Kipple #22. "After this point (of original categorization by "grade")," I said, "a student would advance as quickly or as slowly as his ability permitted." This appears to be a vast improvement over the current arbitrary system, in which there is little chance for advancement beyond a certain age-group.))

Secondly, "sex" is still considered by people of senior high school level as a dirty word and/or something to be laughed at when mentioned. Sex education should still be left to the parents, since I don't think the children would be mature enough to take such a class seriously, although they may "understand the proceedings". (The point of "sex education" classes, however, is to teach the children as much as the ordinary person would need to know before they begin to look upon sex as either "dirty" or "funny". Of course, the parents would better be able to accomplish this feat, but unfortunately too many of them don't understand the subject well enough themselves to teach it to their offspring. An aunt of mine, who has been married for more than twenty years and has a child, recently disclosed quite accidentally in the course of a conversation her belief that chickens laid eggs through the intestines and anus! I attempted to dissuade her in gentle terms, but I don't think she believed me...))

And finally, physical education, although not educating a child mentally, is still necessary. The USA is still inhabited by some very sad-looking human beings. If in your system, Phys Ed was dropped, our situation would become increasingly pitiful. You could urge extra-curricular activities in sports to your heart's content, but the people who didn't give two damns about it wouldn't join. It's got to be required in order to be effective. (The

a song of sixpence

S-LETTERS-LETTERS-LETTERS-LETT

idea of mandatory physical education classes has never been particularly successful, at least not in Baltimore. When I was in junior high school, the two periods per week of physical education luckily happened to be the last period of those days. At least half of the class assigned to that period simply left school an hour earlier, and to my knowledge there was never any complaint or disciplinary action.))

Then we go on to "Rock Around the Pickle Tree": You are arguing something that is up to the individual. There is no "truth" on the matter of rock & roll. You consider it to be trash, as do many others; probably an equal number like it--so who's right? What about the music that you like, Ted? Surely plenty of people despise it, but does this make it bad? "No," you say, "that's just their opinion." ((Please don't put words into my mouth; I am entirely capable of making foolish statements without assistance.)) Don't we who enjoy rock & roll have the right to say the same thing?

Who keeps the bands of the thirties still going? Not us, so it must be people of your generation. ((Fancy that, Matilda! War babies keep the bands of the thirties going!)) But are you attached to this music heavily? You'll deny this. ((Quite so, since I despise the "big band" sound of which Leman seemed so fond.)) So how do the bands keep alive? You buy the records, yet aren't attached to the music. Same with us, pal.

A person who despises rock & roll in a teenage society will not even be suspiciously watched. I know! I'm a teenager. You aren't! ((Having been born at 6:00 pm on December 6, 1942, mathematicians I have consulted inform me that I will be, for the next seven months, a teenager...))

LARRY McCOMBS Speaking of the radical right (as you were on page
147 BRADLEY ST. one) it is most interesting to note that even such
NEW HAVEN, CONN. staunch right-wing columnists as George Sokolsky have
felt it necessary to publicly denounce the Birchers,
Schwarz's Anti-Communist Crusade, and some of the other Ultra-Righters.
Even such a fanatic as Holmes Alexander hasn't had the temerity to
praise them, so far as I know, though he would never go so far as to
denounce anyone who was opposed to Communism and Kennedy. The local
newspaper prints Sokolsky and Alexander as their only regular news ana-
lysts, and I always look forward with great joy to Holmes' daily fugg-
headedness. Lately he has been devoting most of his time to attacking
the Administration's "No Win Policy" and censorship tactics. Every time
Kennedy makes a remark about the desirability of avoiding nuclear war,
Alexander is ready for another column about the "No Win" cowards in
high places who are ready to hand the country over to Russia on a sil-
ver platter. As nearly as I can tell, Alexander seems to favor an im-
mediate attack on the Godless Communists with nuclear weapons, flame
throwers, and any other gory and painful weapons we can devise to give
them their just deserts. As for Administration censorship...well, I re-
call one recent column berating the Kennedy Group for flagrant and out-
rageous censorship. When you read the column closely, you discovered
that a book company had refused to print an "I-Was-Jackie-Kennedy's-
Hairdresser" type of exposé without checking first with the Kennedys.

On this one tiny incident, which apparently had absolutely nothing to do with the Administration, he based his whole tirade. One wonders how many people are fooled by these tactics. Some must--he continues to be printed, and I'm fairly sure he's not intended as a humorous feature.

On the other hand, I am becoming more impressed with Sokolsky. He is guilty of occasional fuggheadisms, but on the whole maintains a fairly stable, if far right, track. Today, for instance ({March 19th}) he is defending Warren and the Supreme Court against the irrational attacks of the Birchers. One thing that I think has turned him against the Ultra-Righters is that he gets after each column a whole bushel of mail, accusing him of having sold out to the Communists and threatening dire happenings if he doesn't get back on the proper Ultra-Right track. I do wish that New Haven had some other paper, though, so that I could get a picture of the other side. I make do with the "News of the Week" section of the Sunday Times.

There is certainly no denying the narrow-mindedness of the conservative movement. A large part of the problem seems to be a blind faith in words, with a practically deliberate refusal to consider what the words mean. Skousen blathers on about the "Left Wing Group in the State Department," and finds it much more convenient to use this phrase (which usually draws a round of applause) than to consider exactly who he is referring to. In this light, I think it is no coincidence that the Ultra-Righters are strongest among the staunch fundamentalist church groups. Replace the Devil with Atheistic Communism, and the Gospel by Our American Principles, and you have the same religion on a much more immediate and emotional level.

However, I am always disturbed by the fact that opponents of the Birchers tend to take on their tactics when attacking them. For instance, look closely at the paragraph beginning at the very bottom of page two (Kipple #23) and continuing on page three. First you link the names of the Birchers and the "late, unlamented Joseph McCarthy." ({Not at all--I simply pointed out that the tactics of the JBS were those which McCarthy used and found so effective, and then proceeded to outline them. This could probably be construed as an attempt at "guilt-by-association," but only by someone willing to stretch the definition to its breaking point in order to make their point.}) Then you refer to the Birchers as "SOBs", hardly an objective nickname. You refer to "the principles of this country" several times. Now, I hasten to add that you show only the slightest glimmering of using these tactics. You then go on to explain just what "principles" you are talking about, and exactly how they are attacking them or opposing them. But the tendency which is just a shadow here becomes rampant in most liberal attacks on the Birchers. Guilt by association, vague charges, failure to name names--all of these tactics are being used against the Birchers too. For God's sake, these fuggheads (see how objective I am?) make themselves assinine enough without any need to call them names--can't we just sit back and let them play the fool by themselves? Unfortunately, anybody who is too stupid to see through the ultra-righters in the first place, will also be too narrow-minded to listen to rational argument.

The tactic of assuming that anyone who agrees with the Communist line on that point is thereby proven to be a Commie or Commie-dupe is not at all unusual these days--it's the whole basis for the HUAC charges that the San Francisco riots were Communist-inspired. But I have had the same tactic used against me! I would like to see a relaxing of government controls

on industries--therefore I must be an ultra-conservative, and all my other opinions become worthless!

This tactic was carried to its logical extreme, however, by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee when they tried to prove that Pauling's anti-bomb petition was Communist propaganda. Here was a simple plea to the world to use every possible means to end the testing and manufacture of nuclear weapons, signed by probably the most distinguished list of people ever to endorse one document, and the Committee felt that they could dismiss it by showing that a few Communists may have helped to gather signatures for it.

Actually, I imagine that the Communists are placed in rather a dilemma by these Ultra-Right groups. On the one hand, they're a damned nuisance and keep interfering with various projects of the Party, and they do oppose most of the things that the Party believes in (such as progress). But, on the other hand, they are doing such a fine job of stirring up the American people against each other, and beclouding the real issues, that the Party must be sorely tempted to do everything it can to keep them going.

Well, Ted, what can we do about these fuggheads on the Right? Would the liberals be willing to finance an Anti-Anti-Communism School to follow Schwarz around and depropagandize the local yokels? Let's face it, friend: if the American people are going to fall for this sort of pulpit-pounding, flag-waving, slogan-shouting appeal to their emotions, we haven't a chance in swinging them back with logical argument. I think we'd better concentrate our attention on finding some way to educate the children so that they won't fall for such approaches. This means that we teachers have got to have the guts to poke holes in any authoritarian tendencies we spot in our kiddies. But this is a sure way to lose a job! I may even get away with demolishing my students' anti-Communist stupidities, if I'm sure to use lots of pro-American jargon myself. But I could never dare poke holes in their equally fuggheaded unquestioning acceptance of religious inanities. And that's what the "Christian Anti-Communist Crusade" is making use of! (I don't share your evident faith in the notion that an adult who begins by falling for JBS emotionalism is irrevocably placed in their camp. Of course, this may be true in many cases, but I know of at least one man who was convinced of their fuggheadedness by logical argument. I began by granting that they were anti-Communist, but then went on to show why this was not necessarily a recommendation in itself.)

Look at it this way, Ted: it's about time for the American Empire to crumble anyhow and there's no sense in wasting time figuring out how to keep the barbarians at bay for another year or two. Let's figure out how to preserve our ideals within a small group that can survive the barbarian onslaught and perhaps later on find a way to expand without losing the ideals.

So, what are the ideals that we want to preserve? So far, I've gathered from your writings that you are in favor of complete independence--freedom for the individual to develop in his own way, so long as he does not actively harm others. Is this to be the basic principle for an ideal society? What others would you propose? How large a society do you think these ideals would work in? How would this society differ from our current one, other than in the elimination of (by our definition, I suppose) fuggheads who want to destroy the system? (Yes, I believe that complete individual freedom (within the reasonable bounds you mentioned) is a fine principle on which to base the ideal soci-

ety. This covers a broad range of situations, and no other "principles" would be necessary at the beginning. I would like to see the government returned to a position as a servant of the people, as opposed to master of the people. The position of the government in an ideal society has always been exemplified, to me, in these words: "...from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs"; i.e., the position of distributor of goods and services. A startling number of people agree with that quotation until they discover that it comes from Karl Marx, whereupon they immediately back away from me as if I had the Plague. As for the size of the society in which these ideas would be workable, I'm certain they would be workable in a city or even a small country, but probably not in a large country.))

I think that the most damning point against "Operation Abolition" is the quote from the soundtrack: "One student provides the spark that touches off the violence when he leaps over a barricade, grabs a police officer's night stick, and begins beating the officer over the head." This charge comes almost word-for-word from Hoover's report on the riots. Yet no pictures are shown of this stirring incident. The Life magazine photos show no such incident, and in the Life photo, the student who was supposed to have done all this, and sparked off the riot which led to the use of the hoses, can be seen leaning quietly against the wall, doing nothing as the hoses are turned on. He was acquitted in court when witnesses agreed that he was innocent. Court testimony affirmed that the students had been passive and had done nothing more than block the halls and make unnecessary noise. Yet, with its congressional immunity against any legal action, the Committee continues to claim that something happened which has been discredited legally. And the Committee allows its supporters to lay charges of Communism against any person who tries to present the facts as legally established.

Whatever the details of the film's inaccuracies, the blatant mis-use of congressional privileges seems inexcusable. Yet because of the Committee's political power (apparently largely maintained by playing footsie with the various anti-Semitic, segregationist, and anti-Communist movements), no one dares oppose the Committee in Congress. The only way that the Committee can really be stopped is by cutting its purse-strings (it even has a perpetual charter from Congress to go on investigating from now till Doomsday without renewal--something no other investigating committee has). But there are very few Congressmen who have the guts to oppose the Committee--after all, who hasn't committed some little indiscretion at some time in his past? And the Committee's file of useful little facts for blackmail is well-known. Oh, pardon me, it isn't for blackmail at all--it's merely exercising its congressional mandate to inform the American people about the traitors in our midst. I forgot. I'm going to be a teacher soon, and the Committee's dislike for teachers who question its authority is well-known. They got several teachers fired in California a few years back, and only failed in getting a good hundred bounced when half of the state rose up to defend its teachers.

June Bonifas is right in saying that a fallout shelter may turn out to be of some use after all. What I object to is the fact that the salesman deliberately implies that the shelter will be of great use, even if the bomb falls where it is supposed to. In other words, he greatly overestimates the potential value of the shelter, thus mis-leading the man who's trying to decide whether or not to spend \$2000 on it. But, really, what good is it going to do to survive the initial blast if you are left crammed

into a concrete wilderness with several million other people, with all food supplies and water and sanitation cut off for at least several weeks? Oh well, you're right--it might improve survival chances slightly--but is it worth doing without \$2000 worth of other things? I'm inclined to think not.

But then, I never plunk a quarter into an insurance machine before riding a plane, either. I prefer to live now and take my chances on later.

Well, well, I didn't realize that dinosaurs were your pet hobby. Perhaps I have gotten into your field, but then I have a little piece of paper which says that I am a Bachelor of Science in Geology, so I can claim it as my field too, even though I obviously know much less than you do about the subject.

First let's find out whether we're arguing about facts or about definitions. The dinosaurs began to die out before the end of the Cretaceous, but several species of the critters remained in existence until the very end of the period. Do we agree? (I certainly agree that all of the dinosaurs did not die out until "the very end" of the Cretaceous, but someone else believes that they existed beyond that time: a fellow named Larry McCombs said so on page 50 of Kipple #23. My disagreement was with this fellow (who is using your address as well as your name); now that you have admitted that the dinosaurs lasted only until "the very end" of the Cretaceous, we have no disagreement.) If we are not in agreement, I'll cite my evidence. Unfortunately, all my geology books are in California, and I'm too lazy to go over to the geology library and check other references or original papers. But according to Dunbar (my lone authority), "Ceretopsians and duck-billed dinosaurs lived until the very end of the Cretaceous Period, and are common in the Laramie group, especially in the Lance formation." Now the Lance formation seems to represent the very uppermost Cretaceous in the Montana-Dakota area. So either Dunbar is wrong on his facts, or possibly your authorities disagree with the correlation of the Lance as uppermost Cretaceous. If we're still in disagreement, I'll go look for the original papers on these discoveries in the Lance, and for the stratigraphic work on the formation. This is a most interesting point. God, I didn't realize how much I'd missed geology until I read Eney's paper on "Flora and Fauna of the Pleistocene Holarctic" and then got into this discussion with you.

As for the cause of the death of the dinosaurs, I like the way Dunbar puts it: "Whatever the cause, the latest Mesozoic was a time of trial when many of the hosts were 'tried in the balance and found wanting'--wanting in adaptiveness to the new environment. Walther has picturesquely called it 'The time of the great dying.'"

By the way, I notice that the Sauropods did die out before the end of the Cretaceous. Perhaps that is the source of our difficulty, since they (particularly Brontosaurus) are the creatures which usually come to mind when one thinks of dinosaurs. But the theropods and ornithipods, as well as the previously mentioned ceretopsians, all seem to have lasted until the end of the Cretaceous, and are all included in the broader definition of dinosaur.

And, for God's sake, Ted, don't be uncomfortable about arguing with a "scientist". We're the greatest bluffers in the world. When we don't know what the hell we're talking about we put it into big words and complex sentences to make it look good. When we're really in trouble we fall back on the old "Well, we're authorities, and we say so" routine. So if

you know what you're talking about, don't be afraid to wade in and do battle. Your exposition is twice as lucid as the average scientific paper.

TED WHITE
339 49th ST.
BROOKLYN 20, N.Y.

I'm convinced that when I lived in Baltimore it was in an alternate universe, and the very different Ted Pauls I knew in those days is only one small indication of the fact. I'm referring to your curious run-down on the Baltimore papers. When I lived there the lot of them were execrable and the only thing I could say against the News-Post was that, operating on a smaller budget and bucking the Hearst machine, it was lucky to be alive at all, so what if it was somewhat cruddier than the morning and evening Sun papers...? (Some of the older readers may recall that we had several arguments about this city while you were living here; you made a number of incorrect statements then, such as regarding the number of slum neighborhoods, the competence of the D'Alesandro administration, and the number of industrial buildings in the city. But whatever little you may have known about Baltimore has evidently been forgotten since your move to New York, particularly in regard to the press of the city. The picture of the News-Post bucking the Hearst machine is an interesting one, in view of the fact that the News-Post is the Hearst outlet in this city...))

I am astonished that in your universe the Morning Sun "is rated third or fourth best newspaper in the country," since the last survey I saw didn't even give it honorable mention (a survey in the Saturday Review). I mean, the Sun of your world must be something to compete with the New York Times, the Christian Science Monitor, the Washington Post, and a Louisville paper whose name I forget. In my own estimation it wasn't even in a class with the "second-bests" like the New York Herald Tribune or the DC Evening Star. (How could you possibly judge the Sun? You once mentioned in Gambit that you wouldn't know of an impending war until the bombs started to fall, because you owned no radio or tv and did not read any of Baltimore's newspapers.))

But then, the News-Post I remember did not "epitomize conservatism in its every feature and story," since it ran Herblock cartoons on what struck me as a rather liberal and nicely laid out editorial page. (There's one more thing the News-Post you remember did not do: it did not exist. The most liberal item on the editorial page of the News-Post is George Sokolsky's column (or occasionally Bishop Sheen's irregular feature), and Herblock would be lynched on sight in their offices.)) And most emphatically the News-Post did not sell "more copies than the Sun," which paper, being two-in-one and a product of the vast Hearst empire not only outsold the News-Post substantially (and had as a result much higher advertising rates), but had put most of the News-Post's predecessors out of business. (The Sun is not nor has it ever been a Hearst publication. Good Lord, Ted, where did you gather this amazing wealth of false information...?))

It was also my understanding that the Baltimore Sunday American was affiliated with the News-Post in the Baltimore I knew, and that indeed it was simply the Sunday edition. (Both papers are produced by the same company, but they are advertised and sold as separate newspapers, just as the Morning Sun and Evening Sun are sold as separate newspapers.))

I'm sorry, but Ed Wood is quite right. Until the recent raise of membership fees by a dollar, conventions stood or failed by the success of their

auctions, and despite what you may have heard or thought, 98% of the material auctioned consists of original prozine artwork (last year a pb publisher threw in a cover or two), obtained through the graciousness of present-day prozine editors. It is not usually very old, for the simple reason that the older stuff was donated and auctioned the year before, and the year before that. Indeed, the well is running perilously dry, which may be one reason more effort was made to raise funds in other fashions at the Seacon. (In addition to the increased membership fee--and that money is very important since it is needed for before-the-con expenses which include progress reports, Hugos, and the like--the Seacon received a cash donation of around \$300 from the Pittcon, and the committee members cut every conceivable expense to the bone.) If the prozines all folded, we'd not only not have their pages to publicize the cons, but we'd be out the artwork and occasional manuscripts they donate. The result of this would have a considerable impact upon conventions.

Regarding this strange feud between you and the Shaws, I did as they suggested, and checked the Axe in question for the comment you quoted. It is not there. Nor is it in any issue of Axe. (Come now, did you look at every copy...?) Not only does the quote sound quite unlike them, but your continued harping on it sounds suspiciously as though you fabricated it in order to have a new villain or straw man for attack. (My, aren't these New York fans clannish rascals, though? If you won't credit me with integrity, then at least grant me a certain degree of intelligence; it would have been incredibly stupid to credit such a quotation to Axe if I could not prove in some manner that it actually existed, if only in one copy. Shortly after learning of the lack of this comment in any other copy of Axe, I took the precaution of mailing my copy to a person of unquestionable integrity: Harry Warner. Says Harry, "The page from Axe has been properly impressed on my eyeballs and is returned herewith. I'm sorry that my earliest convenience wasn't any sooner, but these are busy times. It runs in my mind that I remember reading this in my copy of Axe, but I could be wrong and I can't locate that issue immediately...I don't know whether the Shaws were just trying to stir you up a little or were really provoked at the way you tried to cause trouble about Washington's convention bid.")

BOB LICHTMAN
6137 S. CROFT AVE.
LOS ANGELES 56, CALIF.

So Mike Deckinger has seen "Operation Correction." Good for him, though the merit of that film is something quite beyond me. I didn't see it, but it was shown to a crowded audience at

UCLA recently and the Daily Bruin gave quite a thorough rundown of what it was about. Frankly, I am disappointed. As much as I appreciate the ACLU, I don't think just dubbing in a new soundtrack to an old film--"Operation Abolition"--is going to prove anything. Besides, it's a waste of time. As Mike points out blithely, anyone who disagrees with the hooack is assumed to be a Communist, or at least an Unwitting Dupe thereof. Of course, as usual neither side is really right, and the truth of the whole situation lies somewhere in the middle.

The HUAC was in town last Monday and the local left-wing political groups were out in full force for an "orderly demonstration" in front of the Ambassador Hotel where the committee members were housed. There were perhaps 200 members of groups like Platform (UCLA's liberal political party), the Young Socialist Alliance (newly organized at UCLA, but old stuff up in Berkeley), and others picketing the hotel. In addition, there was a crowd of perhaps 100 fraternity-type people, right-wingers all, picket-

ing these pickets under the name of COUP, or Committee Opposing Uninformed Pickets, which title is rather laughable. The Bruin has been full of letters all week from these amusing right-wingers, which are printed in full probably for their humorous element.

These fraternity people who sponsored the COUP counter-demonstration have been putting out a mimeographed sheet, The Gargoyle Weekly, for about a month now. It's quite stereotypic of what one might expect from a bunch of right-wing students. There are poor jokes with political bases, quotations from people like Barry Goldwater, and general deploring of the "liberals" who "run" the campus newspaper, the Daily Bruin. I do my part for the whole bit by regularly chucking a handful of these things into the wastebasket. I mean, one thing you've got to say about left-wing propaganda: it may not make too much sense, but its humor is at least humorous, rather than pathetic.

MIKE DECKINGER Your views on the Radical Right are interesting, but
31 CARR PLACE not much different than the views of others who oppose
FORDS, N.J. them. The John Birch Society and its smaller idiot under-groups are definitely recognized, but unfortunately in most cases they appear as glory-surrounded benefactors designed to lead the U.S. to freedom and liberty by defeating godless Communism and all its duped college students. While mere recognition is one thing, recognition of content is entirely different.

As re censorship: We're having some fun in New Jersey over the showing of Roger Vadim's french film "Les Liasons Dangereuses," based on a noted french novel of the eighteenth century and now up-dated for motion pictures. A theatre in Montclair opened with the film, remained open for approximately three weeks, and then had the film confiscated by the local police chief after receiving a bevy of calls from irate parents protesting this showing of pornography. A sermon denouncing the film, delivered the past Sunday, helped in this campaign, I might add. After some deliberation and head-scratching, it was decided the film was acceptable and a two week release date was scheduled. Two hours before it was to commence again, a "citizen's arrest" was made, confiscating the film for a second time. Astor Pictures, distributors of the film, threatened to sue (but have since backed down), a court battle ensued, I was the first one of about a dozen to have a letter published in the local paper denouncing the seizure as censorship and condemning those responsible, and as it now stands the theatre has completely revamped its policy of showing foreign films, and most of the critics seem satisfied. To me, it seems like an echo from the witch-burnings of yore when a rapidly pointed finger at an individual set the destruction of said individual into motion. The fact that nearly all of those condemning the film had not seen it (including the police chief who seized it) and children under 21 were not admitted did nothing to deter the efforts of the do-gooders out to save humanity from this "pornography".

Harry Warner is right in that experimental films are not the newest of the new today, but what I was trying to point out is that those of a higher quality appear to be on an influx. Hedy Lamarr's "Ecstasy" is one of the most over-rated films of the decade. Her "shocking" nude bath scene is about as titillating as a tv commercial for bath soap. I can't attach any importance or significance to it. (You must bear in mind that while the "nude scene" is passé by current standards, it was probably quite shocking thirty-five years ago when the film was produced. I found it

an extremely interesting film, if only for the manner--lacking a great deal of dialogue--in which feelings, moods, etc. were expressed.?)

An- other way in which the disc jockey controls which records become "hits" is the way in which they are scheduled before newscasts. Logic indicates that more people will tune into the station a few moments before the news is broadcast, and at least one local station will play only one recording in that time-slot for long stretches of time. It makes one wonder what sort of compensation the disc kockey receives for this service.

In Millburn, where I went to school, the schools were relatively uncrowded, despite some extreme short-sightedness on the part of the builders of a high school, opened in 1956, which was declared inadequate for the population three years later. Homeroom classes average around 30 students, as did most others except for an English class where we crammed something like 45 students into one room. In Woodbridge, however, where my brothers attend school, things are different. The schools are incompetent, understaffed, and overcrowded. The high school operates on two shifts, from 7:30-12:00 and from 1:00-5:30. There simply is not enough space in the high school to get all the students together at one time.

JOE GIBSON
5380 SOBRANTE AVE.
EL SOBRANTE, CALIF. You confirmed a suspicion I'd had that you hadn't read my original article in Shaggy either before or after publishing Dick's rebuttal. Bergeron made a mistake regarding one of the chief points he raised against me and you didn't catch it. In fact, you and perhaps your readers still believe Dick's statements must be true. Unfortunately, if I used Dick's own methods against him, I should be saying that Dick "couldn't possibly have been that stupid" and that "the answer is therefore obvious: Dick Bergeron is a liar!"--which would spark a fine fan-feud, maybe, but I simply will not use such methods. (Please be so kind as to show how this is Bergeron's method instead of merely pinning that tag on it in an attempt to discredit his tactics. If Dick ever were to call anyone a liar, I'm certain it wouldn't be done as clumsily as that...))

Dick contended that the only "undesirable" I named was a dead fan who couldn't defend himself. Terry made Dick notice that perhaps I wasn't talking about "undesirables" in this instance, but rather the fans who have been wrongly and unnecessarily blacklisted as such. But that wasn't Bergeron's biggest mistake. Dick also failed to note that I named someone else besides E.E. Evans whom I thought that been unnecessarily blacklisted. This other fan doesn't happen to be dead. In fact, he's one of my paying subscribers. (There you go again, Joe: all of my readers now know that one of your paying subscribers (who doesn't happen to be dead) was blacklisted by unknown parties for an unspecified reason. Your eagerness to circumvent the naming of names is even now leading to further confusion, you see: you have left the way open for any suspicious minds to scrutinize all of your paying subscribers and decide to their satisfaction which one has committed the heinous sins which led to his blacklist status.))

Alva Rogers is clinging to a similar notion that I'd labeled ex-Commies as "undesirables" with a persistence which I feel must be more emotional than sensible. Personally, I believe there is nothing particularly disagreeable about ex-Commies or ex-Pinkos--so far as the Communists are concerned, there are only Communists and Enemies of Communism, and there is no such animal

as an ex-Communist. And personally, I can't see why anyone should get alarmed about the John Birch Society when we've had the D.A.R. preaching the same stupidity for years. Again, I find more real s-f in Terry Carr's comments on a telephone exchange than I can see in Ted White's review of a Heinlein novel. ((Perhaps I am at fault for being unable to follow your strange and complex thinking process, but tell me, just what does that last sentence have to do with the rest of the paragraph --or with anything else, for that matter? Granted that Terry's article was a good one, just what segment of it constitutes or contains any "s-f"?))

But in my article, I admonished fandom--and specifically stated that I meant most fans--not to associate with ex-Commies or homosexuals. I know perfectly well that people can be tolerant of something they understand. There are other things they simply don't want to be bothered with, and this is natural if sometimes unfortunate. Any fan who is an ex-Commie or a homosexual knows perfectly well, or has to learn, that he will find intolerance in fandom if he parades himself as an ex-Commie or homosexual. If he's simply another fan in his relations with fandom, I feel there is absolutely no reason to condemn him or dislike him. But how could I honestly say this of all the other people in fandom? I couldn't say it of you, Ted, even if you agreed with me. You have to say it yourself. ((Your attitude is that of every censor who ever walked the earth: I'm intelligent enough to know what I'm doing, but everyone else is stupid and I must protect them. If you came to the conclusion that "ex-Commies and homosexuals" weren't to be snubbed or castigated as long as they behaved themselves in fandom, didn't it ever occur to you that the rest of us might be intelligent enough to come to the same conclusion?))

The greatest misunderstanding of my article has come from those who apparently first read the fanzine review which claimed I was asking fandom to "name names" without mentioning my main point: that fans who get victimized today don't say anything! I think they're the ones who should--they ought to name the guy and raise hell about it! ((I think they should, too, but as long as they don't care to do this, I don't think you ought to make it your business to do it for them. If the victims had wanted to "name names," they would have; it's their choice, not yours.)) I think this is what we should have instead of DNQ letters or some fan "naming names" with regard to what he'd heard somebody had done to somebody else.

I had no love for the way George Willick handled that "fan awards" deal. He knows it, too--directly from me--and he must certainly have no liking for me. But I wonder about the DNQ stuff that's supposedly been floating around to discredit him. Suppose that stuff charged Willick with something he didn't do? ((Since you don't care for "some fan 'naming names' with regard to what he's heard somebody had done to somebody else," I'm a bit surprised to see you mentioning "DNQ stuff that's supposedly been floating around" (my underlining).))

TERRY CARR
56 JANE ST.
NEW YORK 14, N.Y.

I seem to have irritated Dick Bergeron with my comments on his article, don't I? Well, since Dick is one of the biggest of the current-day BNFs it seems to have been a political thing to do: I see that he mentions my name no less than twenty-nine times during the course of his letter, and such close attention is egoboo in any fan's language. Hee, hee, he does indeed seem perturbed: one of these days I shall have to write an article on What Makes TCarr Obnoxious...

I hope Dick and everybody else will recognize the foregoing paragraph as nothing more or less than a satire on a namesake of mine. Let's pass on to some more serious commentary on the matter. I suspect that I could write a ten-page article rebutting various points and argumentative techniques of Dick's, but such an article would only serve to obscure the fact that I'm really in substantial agreement with him. At any rate, I'm not interested in writing a ten-page article on a subject which I consider already over-exposed in the fan-press, so I'll confine myself to a few major and/or glaring points.

First, it should be understood that I have not received an issue of G2 since #4. I wasn't fully aware that Bergeron was arguing with Gibson instead of the major article which touched off the discussion, and in any case don't have the material on hand to go ahead with any such wider argument, so that lets out a lot of the discussion right there.

Second, I'll take Dick at his word when he says he doesn't know what nit-picking is; if he did, I'm sure he wouldn't engage in it to the extent that he does. There's an admirable example in this letter of his: he says, "(Terry) claims that since he can't recall anything I've written about sf...my answer to Gibson...falls through," and then goes on to point out that my memory was at fault and he has written at least four articles on sf in War-hocn. Well, fine...but I brought up that point specifically as an example of nit-picking, with no claim whatsoever that it would invalidate any of Dick's points. I could give several definitions of nit-picking, but one would be "missing the point, or making a point of something which is not at issue." ((Nit-picking is what your opponent is doing while you are pointing out errors in the fabric of his argument, or, as Eney says, "Nit-picking is what you accuse your opponent of when it's you that's doing it."))

Thirdly, I don't for a moment believe that fan feuding disproves the thesis that there is no more feeling among fans that A Fan Can Do No Wrong than there should be. Sure, individual fans get irritated by other individual fans...but one of the things which you'll see time after time in such cases is complete apathy on the part of people not directly involved. No matter what the charge (malicious lying, unprovoked attack, railroading of motions in fan-organizations), very few people will pay any attention to it unless they've been stung themselves; the overwhelming tendency is for the mass of fans to sit back and say, "You two are nice guys; why don't you quit bickering over something I'm sure is simply a misunderstanding?" It's a head-in-the-sand syndrome, and the rare cases of GMCarr and Chris Moskowitz are merely exceptions, I assure you. I maintain that the A Fan Can Do No Wrong mythos ("Fans are all swell guys, the best people in the world"--- look it up in Why Is A Fan?, Dick) is rather sickeningly widespread, and deserves a blast.

For that reason, I'm probably guilty of a bit of wishful-thinking regarding Gibson's article in Shaggy: I chose to regard it in terms of being such a blast, and interpreted the mishmash of vaguely-worded examples he gave as simply bad writing. Well, I'm still not convinced that Gibson actually managed to say what he meant, but I see no point in debating that issue further; until Joe does manage to say what he means I'm going to let that be his problem.

For the rest, I'm pretty much in agreement with Dick: I don't like Birchism, I think when you come right down to it Gibson should have named names (I was merely trying to suggest an alternate interpretation which would have

made it clear that whatever the faults of his position Joe was not necessarily trying to be Birchistic), and all the rest of that jazz. But despite the foofarah about that article I can't agree with what seems to be part of Dick's position: that any fans' reputations will be damaged by his article. Hell, there'll be (and has been) some gossip speculation for awhile and then everybody will decide, What The Hell, They're Faaans Even If It Is True And Even If It Is The Ones I'm Thinking Of, and that will be that. That's why I think this is all a tempest in a teapot, and why I don't feel like going into the subject more deeply.

About half of your comments to Ed Wood struck me as even more fuggheaded than his, Ted--I've yet to see anybody question Wood's figures on convention-attendance in Yandro. (Walter Breen, for one, questions them, though at this writing Yandro has not yet printed his comments. He calls them "a fast snow-job".) And I was vastly amused by all sorts of things in your editorial, such as your bright-eyed revelation that "the radical left-wing is normally progressive, while the radical right-wing is generally regressive" (did you just figure that out, or do you think any of your readership has missed hearing that old cliché?), the smug recommendation of the Morning Sun because its various editors "fill their fountain pens with the same acid I use," and other such examples of the editorial personality. (A minor conceit, surely, and for you to criticize anyone for that smacks of throwing torches while living in a paper house.) I did like very much the humorous piece about the former Baltimore fandom, but I'm loath to say it because it may make you think I like only fannish topics or humor, and that isn't true; this particular piece just struck me as the best on its own merits. (Goshwow, Boggs praises my serious articles and Terry Carr praises my humorous ones--can fame be far from my grasp?)

You gonna cut that last paragraph back because it criticizes you? I note you cut the last such paragraph I wrote, cut the reference to it from Pete Graham's letter in this issue, and rejected Ted White's column when he wrote about how we published the Kipple satire. If you really have as much self-confidence as you try to show, it seems you wouldn't have anything against criticism of you. (Your skill in spouting deadly barbs is surpassed only by your ability for inventing non-existent situations on which to use them. The "criticism" in a former letter that I cut was something to the effect that I never ventured off of my front porch, a cut inspired by the fact that I commented on but did not join the sit-in demonstrations in Baltimore. I am a firm believer in the notion that a silly question deserves a silly answer, and since I could not at the time think of a silly answer, I cut the paragraph. My decision not to join the demonstrations was based on my inability to hold my temper (and consequent inability to observe strict non-violent codes), discussed in Kipple #22. As for Ted White's column, I greatly enjoyed the segment dealing with the production of the fake Kipple (as I told Ted when I rejected it), but the sections prior to and following it were pointless rehashes of an inane telephone conversation. I refuse to print such chatter.)

KEVIN LANGDON
823 IDYLBERRY RD.
SAN RAFAEL, CALIF.

Morality is a system specifying the correct mode of behavior for any practical situation. Your approach to morality, like the Christians', is to define certain things as "moral" and others as "immoral". Frequently, you will be faced with a choice between two "immoral" alternatives and, though you are forced to choose one or the other, you

still consider your action to be "immoral". This is one of the ways that Christianity generates guilt-feelings. My approach to morality, on the other hand, the approach of the rational humanist, derives from an ethical judgment as to what constitutes "good". The moral course of behavior in a situation, then, is that which tends to maximize what one has taken as "good". (That code sounds fine on the surface, but let us examine it a little more closely: When you say that the moral course is that "which tends to maximize what one has taken as 'good'," you are actually saying that the moral course is that which minimizes what one has taken as "bad"; i.e., that "the lesser of two evils" automatically becomes the "moral" course. You may find that workable, but I do not. In my philosophy, morality is an absolute: given that an action or course is immoral, it remains immoral without regard to circumstances. The fault (in my opinion) of your system may be readily seen through this parable: you are in desperate need of money, and decide upon larceny as an equitable method of obtaining a sum. Having decided upon a handy grocery store to rob, you are faced with the choice of merely robbing the store, or of robbing the store and killing the clerk so you will stand a better chance of not being recognized. By an extension of your ethical system, larceny without murder would become the "moral" course, simply because it isn't as bad as larceny with murder. In my philosophy, both courses are immoral; the first is better than the second, but that mere fact does not render it "moral".)

You say, "No civilization can long exist without progress," yet Western civilization has endured for some twelve hundred years without making any but superficial progress. The average man today is richer, but no wiser or happier than he was a thousand years ago. (I suppose you must be referring to other than materialistic progress, since I doubt that anyone could seriously propose that no material progress had been made. (If I am in error, then just think of all the push-button gadgets, transportation methods, and communications devices which have been invented.) I don't believe you're that naive, so your thesis must be that man himself has not progressed, within the psychological frame of reference. I would dispute even that, however. It is probably true that man is no happier; he worries about different things, but of no less magnitude. But man is richer, better educated, works less, has more leisure time, has a better chance of living longer, with less possibility of permanent disablement through a minor injuries (doctors were rare twelve hundred years ago), and, in this country at least, he has more freedom. That, I believe, is substantial progress.)

Loftus Becker says, "...the Roman Catholic Church has as many original thinkers in it as, by and large, any organization." Maybe he's right. Lots of people get excommunicated.

KRIS CAREY
1016 SECOND ST.
WASCO, CALIF.

I must state my negative opinion on the question of religion in the schools. Let me begin by saying that not too many centuries ago, the schools were all and without exception run by the church. They were the only schools during that period, and if they hadn't existed, learning, along with the famous classics of the past, would have disappeared completely. In those days, that was the best and only way to run a school. Nowadays, where the main objective is not to glorify God but to learn, religion has no place in the schools. I for one am for the abolition of all religion in public schools. Yes, the parochial school does much to better the standards of learning, but what good does the religious as-

pect do? We certainly don't need to have religion to be good patriotic Americans (as stated by Helen Urban). We have on my campus a religious organization called "Youth for Christ" (formerly called "Christian Living on the Campus"). My friends try to convince me to attend their meetings, but, as I feel I get enough religion at my church, I refuse. For this I am regarded as a sinner; those who don't attend are considered un-Christian. Those who do attend go about trying to persuade all the "sinners" to come, and get "saved". Confound it, if there is one thing I can't stand, it is having someone try to shove religion onto me.

WALTER BREEN
2402 GROVE ST.
BERKELEY 4, CALIF.

Don't be silly, Dave Locke. There is a third type who talks of conformity--even if he doesn't use that word; it's the commonest of the three, and it consists of the people who ARE average joes and janets and who resent anyone who isn't. I've known too many of them to admit to the possibility that they are nonexistent as you seem to believe. And when you say that teenagers "don't give a damn what anybody believes in," you lead me to suspect that you must know a high atypical bunch, if indeed you aren't merely generalizing from yourself. The teenager with an atypical religious or ethical code, learned from parents or wherever, is going to be a misfit in many schools. "Atypical" can mean Catholic in certain bible-belt areas, Protestant in Eire or the Inwood section of Manhattan, orthodox or conservative Jewish in many different communities, and agnostic or atheist in many more if not most, not to mention Jehovah's Witness or Mormon or the like. Or it can mean a more relaxed (or more stringent) sexual code than the majority. Your other points have been answered in Kipple #23. After seeing this letter of yours, I am not really surprised that you got some votes for Fughead of the Year; you seem to have been impervious to logic in the all too familiar manner of GMCarr. Frankly, you disappoint me.

Gordis' presentation is sound and so thorough that there is very little comment that can be made on it. Part of the answer he suggests would have to be elementary-school-level textbooks in comparative religion, and the writing of these poses all over again the same problems he described as for personal instruction by the representatives of the various faiths. Where does description leave off and propaganda ("Jesus Saves! Won't you accept Him as your personal Savior" and all the obnoxious rest of it) begin? And even if descriptive nonpropagandistic material can be obtained from the various non-Catholic denominations, it will be just about impossible to get from the Catholics. Moreover, some will certainly insist that this teaching begin so early that the kids are unlikely to be critical of it. In short, they aren't interested in objective presentation, unless it can be used to make new converts.

Loftus
Becker: I think you've confused two similar Catholic positions. It's abortion that they label as "murder"; their objection to birth control by other means than abstinence is on entirely different and illogical grounds, namely "natural law," or the dubious proposition that sex is for the sole purpose of procreation. Sperm cells have no souls. Some cite Genesis 38 in support of this position, but they are misinterpreting the text.

Pete Graham: You haven't proved your point that those who aren't down in Mississippi on freedom ride buses are helping the segregationists. My own attitude is each to his own cause. I have mine, you have yours, and I dislike the imputation you append to yours. There are

so many worthy causes now that it's unwise to try to rank-order most of them, let alone to claim that those who aren't working for yours are automatically helping the opponents.

Larry McCombs: There is a difference between simply telling your students that works such as those of Lamarck, Lysenko, et al. are crap, and telling them just what these people said and why it is unacceptable to modern science. The former could conceivably lean towards censorship, the latter not. Any student who doubts you, in the latter course of action, is perfectly entitled (and should be encouraged) to look up the books in question and check your statements. I doubt whether censors will adopt any such course; my own article on censorship (Bane #6) pointed out on the very first couple of pages that censorship was a fear tactic, whereas scientists confronted with crackpots have nothing to fear by people checking their respective claims. And here is where the line you believed nonexistent can be drawn.

Thoreau didn't invent the nonviolence philosophy. It's integral to all three systems of Buddhism as part of the Noble Eightfold Path. What Thoreau did was to apply it to politics, but even there he seems to have been anticipated by early Christians (who were well aware of the terrific propaganda value of martyrdom) and Quakers.

There is one simple theory that will account for the Great Extinctions as well as all of the other (biological and geological and climatic) changes indicated by the fossil record. It is Hapgood's theory of crustal shifts, detailed in his "Earth's Shifting Crust" and several popularizations. Briefly, what he assumes is that the earth's crust (lithosphere) floats on a viscous, semiliquid layer (asthenosphere)--a common enough assumption--and that the crust does not bend very rapidly under accumulating weight of icecaps. An immediate conclusion from this and from numerous core studies is that the rapidly advancing asymmetric polar icecap exerts a centrifugal thrust which eventually causes displacements in most regions of the earth's crust. The continents are pushed or pulled, creating mountains and chasms, and where they pass over the equatorial bulge they crack and split, resulting in a vast increase in volcanic activity. The land mass to which the icecap is affected moves northward in the direction of the greatest asymmetry. (In the case of the present Antarctic icecap this is near 96° E., accounting for the stupendous earthquakes which have already buckled the crust in East Asia enough to raise Mount Everest and some other Himalayan peaks over a hundred feet since 1950.) Eventually the land mass bearing the icecap is far enough north that the ice melts; the rise in sea level has altered continental boundaries, while the other crustal movements have submerged some areas and raised others above sea level. In the meantime whatever land mass has approached the other pole has begun to develop an icecap. The process takes, apparently, twenty to forty thousand years. All the data now on record are consistent with the hypothesis that the north pole was formerly in the neighborhood of Hudson's Bay, that it reached its present location between 17,000 and 20,000 years ago, and that the history of the earth's crust (including extinctions and the rest) can be understood without difficulty in terms of successive crustal displacements. We're not far from another one even now, by the way. Hapgood's book is readable and usually available; it answers all the common objections, and I can probably answer any of the uncommon ones (I worked with Hapgood on it).

Ted Pauls: Where do you get this theory that a species "ages"? This is nothing but the us-

ual medieval analogy between a species and an individual life-span. This notion has been caustically attacked by such authorities as George Gaylord Simpson (in "The Major Features of Evolution" and "The Meaning of Evolution"); there is no evidence whatever for it and much evidence against it, the latter consisting of innumerable species showing no such phenomenon as overspecialization, let alone degenerative features, during tens or hundreds of millions of years. (My use of "age" in regard to the species was only as a metaphor (albeit a poor one); it was enclosed in parenthesis for that reason. At least one scientist believes that species age: George Gamow. In one of the most amusing articles on the subject I've ever read, Gamow claimed that the reason behind the extinction of the dinosaurs was that their genes became "tired of division". My respect for Gamow has rapidly dwindled since reading of that theory. He also makes the comparison between the individual and the race, though by no means as metaphorically as I did. In "Biography of the Earth" (page 174) he claims "If the development of an individual parallels the development of the entire race (he is speaking here of the embryonic stages), it would be logical to expect, conversely, that the race itself should die sooner or later in the same way as each of its separate members does.")

PETE GRAHAM
APT. #8, 635 E. 5th ST.
NEW YORK 9, N.Y.

My feelings as re the Right are a little less pessimistic than yours. In the first place I don't find the ultra-right as it presently exists to be much of a danger; and in the second place I see it as a phenomenon paralleled by an increase in liberal thinking and sentiment in the past couple of years. One reason why such as Welch and Goldwater will not become the fascist menace is because they completely underestimate the value of the working class, which is one thing every fascist leader so far has understood to be essential. The fact that none of these guys are making any kind of play at all toward the millions of unemployed is one reason why they will not have any major influence in the future. This may change, of course, given a deepening of the crises of U.S. foreign policy, but as I say I see on the other hand the increasing development of the liberal side of America, particularly in the Southern Negro movement.

Past fascist movements have developed out of severe economical conditions which do not seem presaged in the United States. Any indigenous fascist movement here would probably rise out of the frustration felt due to the continual losing position of the United States in the cold war. The answer to that, of course, I see as being a correct approach toward the defeat of Communist totalitarianism; but that means the growth and strengthening of an effective democratic left-wing in the United States, something the Right would not care for either. So the Right will probably become stronger no matter what happens; to defeat it is needed a left-oriented movement whose commitment to democracy is so strong that it can attract to it sufficient people to enable it to defeat both the right-wing and the Communist dangers.

DAVE LOCKE
PO BOX 335
INDIAN LAKE, N.Y.

I haven't read Gibson's original article either, but from what I've heard of it so far, he appears to be more correct than his rebutters. As for Joe being a fugghead, I would imagine that he is more mature than anyone whom I have so far heard make such a statement or insinuation. As I've been told time and again, a lot of fans who write fairly intelligently turn out to be less than mature when you meet them in

person. I've never met Gibson, but from what I've heard in an offhand, whispering-in-alleys sort of way, he's got a lot of experience behind him and knows just what the hell he's talking about (whether some others do or not).

I'm not going to bother quoting authorities yet, Larry McCombs, until you understand what I'm talking about. When I said that radiation was not cumulative over a long period of time, I wasn't talking in terms of a dose today and a dose tomorrow. I was talking in terms of months. You say in one paragraph that whether or not radiation is cumulative is largely a mystery as yet, and then in your next paragraph you say that radiation really is more or less cumulative. I just may not be tuned in with you, but it seems to me that you've contradicted yourself.

Alva Rogers disagrees with me and says that character and personality are not the keys to acceptance in the teenage group today, and then shows us his own son as a prime example of this. Well, I won't argue about your son's character, Alva, but by your own admission he is too serious and talks rather pedantically; this is an interesting personality? It's also doubtful that many parents would not say that their child has a "reasonably pleasant personality."

I see that Walter Breen is hiding behind his "Community of Fear" pamphlet again. I can't say a thing to him but what he leaps in back of it and screams that I must rebut it to rebut him. I wish he'd do his own damn arguing (freely quoting from this pamphlet if he feels like it), as it's too easy to say "I believe what he believes; rebut him." It certainly is a lazy thing.

But whether or not Walter says now that "it isn't that I'm asking people to agree with me or be labeled fuggheads" doesn't change the fact that that is indeed just what he did say. He's sorry that he made such a statement, but nothing that he can say or do will erase everyone's knowledge that he will think them a fugghead if they hold any opinions, on fallout shelters, that are contrary to his own. You can admit a mistake, but you can't convince people that you have changed your methods of thinking. ((It appears to me that this nit-picking is totally obscuring the issue at hand--i.e., the value of fallout shelters. Walter challenged you to refute Brown and Real, who happen to hold opinions similar to his and my own. Instead of doing this (either through disinterest or inability to do so), you have chosen to demand that Walter stop hiding behind that pamphlet. Now the fact is, we could each write an article detailing our opinions and the facts to back them up; but why bother, since "Community of Fear" is a lengthy and lucid article utilizing these same opinions?))

SETH JOHNSON
339 STILES ST.
VAUX HALL, N.J. I wonder if political extremists aren't a necessity to a truly functioning democracy? After all, it's the extremists who will point out every fault and shortcoming in the system. The Communists are extremists in every meaning of the word, yet without their agitation there would never have been social security and unemployment insurance. And the present drive for minority rights would never have gotten beyond the lecture rooms. Without the John Birch Society types we would still be in the dark about shortcomings of one sort or another, and by their very demand for the immediate bombing of the USSR they point up the need for a vigorous fight for peace.

I liked Gordis' article on religious and secular education. Personally I feel that kids should learn their reli-

gion from their parents and their church or temple officials, and stick to learning the Three Rs and kindred topics in the classroom. And when other schools are opened specifically to teach religion of one sect or another, they should receive no public support of any kind through taxes.

Harry Warner: Just six 100 kiloton bombs would wipe out all life from the Atlantic to the Appalachian mountains and from Boston right down to Washington. And furthermore the USSR now has the rocket-power to launch a 1000 kiloton bomb which would wipe out all life in North America in exploded in space. There simply is no hope for survival on either side of the Iron Curtain once someone hits the panic button. The massive retaliation on both sides would wipe the northern hemisphere clean of life. (I assume that you are confused between two terms, "kiloton" and "megaton". Six 100 kiloton bombs would hardly suffice to destroy Baltimore and it's surrounding suburbs, much less the entire coastal area from Boston south to Washington. As for the explosion in "space" which would wipe out all life in the country, that is patently impossible. It is true that high-altitude explosions are potentially more destructive than surface explosions, but by no means as much so as you seem to believe. Brown and Real, once again my authorities, admit that our country could be completely scorched by exploding "about 600 ten-megaton bombs, evenly spaced, at an altitude of about thirty miles" above the ground. Aside from the fact that this requires 6000 times more power than you imply, it is also impracticable for the simple reason that a substantial portion of our country is at all times hidden beneath a cloud cover.))

HARRY WARNER

423 SUMMIT AVE.
HAGERSTOWN, MD.

Your Quotes & Notes column has convinced me of something. You are spending too much time reading newspapers, particularly bad ones. I wonder why you continue to annoy yourself with the Baltimore News-Post? Maybe you get some sort of sadistic joy out of beholding the spectacle of human idiocy, but I can think of even stronger examples of this that would not be as hard on the eyes. Or do you just feel much better when you've finished plowing your way through the day's copy and know that you won't have to encounter such stupid thinking and writing for another 23 hours or so? (Actually, Harry, I read the News-Post because if I didn't Quotes & Notes would only run three or four pages every issue. I can't fill all of that space without something to inspire me: Burbee had Ashley, Berry had Willis, and I have the News-Post.) Years ago I gave up the habit of reading newspapers, and I didn't substitute the news weekly publications or the radio broadcasts for the daily papers, either. I get just enough information on current events through an occasional glance at headlines or an accidental listening to a radio or television news summary to avoid total ignorance of what's going on in the world. (But don't you have to read competing newspapers to find out whether or not they've already printed the story you're going after?) I think I'd be happy in such total ignorance, but for the sake of my job I must be able to carry on some sort of primitive conversation about happenings of the day. Maybe I'd resume newspaper reading if I stopped working for one of the breed, but I'm not altogether sure of that. I don't put much faith in the accuracy of anything published in even the best newspapers, and prefer to wait a year or two and learn from books what really has been occurring. I'd like to see newspapers reserve just one column each day for news that really affects the readers, such as the presence of a mad dog in the neighborhood or plans for a fireworks display or the fact that you'll die of leukemia if you

drink more than three quarts of milk per week. If I could find that kind of reader service, I might become a newspaper reader again.

I've never understood the controversy over teaching religion in public schools. I should think that the entire topic could be covered in two or three hours in the student's junior or senior year in high school. That would be long enough for him to learn all the essential facts about the location and nature of the world's major religions, and he would already be acquainted through history classes with what religion had done in the way of starting wars and spreading venereal disease. It's absurd to think that course of instruction in religion would need to go on for months or years for each pupil. Nor do I think it's worth getting excited over, if an individual school system makes a practice of morning prayers. I sat a few feet from the men who were taking their oath of membership in the Army of the United States after a draft examination, and neither I nor any of the other men who had been rejected for physical reasons were inducted by contagion. The parents who don't want their children participating in religious exercises in classes should be able to trust them not to pray along with the others.

Similarly, I think too much concern is felt about how down-trodden or superior students might feel if they are kept with less brilliant classmates or shoved ahead of their normal rate of progress. It hasn't been too many years since practically all students were jumbled into a big room that contained kids of all sizes and degrees of advancement. Our grandparents seemed to learn and to avoid psychoses fairly well even though their learning wasn't confined to their own ages until they got into the upper grades and college. (Maybe in the largest cities the students were separated by grade from the first grade on, but before the turn of the century, the bulk of the population lived on farms, anyway.) I think that a healthy personality coupled with a brilliant mind can learn to survive when surrounded by less intelligent classmates in school, and the superior individual might as well get the practice, because he'll face at least fifty years of the same situation at his work and in his social relations after he finishes his studies, unless he gets run over by a truck before he becomes senile. A good compromise might be the newest thing in teaching machines. I thought someone mentioned it in the letter section this time but can't find the reference. It's a movie machine that projects the image on a small screen, one to each desk. The teachers face, voice and demonstrations are on the film. At intervals the film stops for the student to answer questions, which he does by pushing buttons, and his accuracy is immediately translated by a punched tape system, after which the film can start again. It permits each student to learn at his best speed, permits rerunning as educational television does not, retains some semblance of pupil-teacher contact, yet allows the best teachers to reach all students. The Ford Foundation has been shoveling out money for development.

Pete Graham's article is a splendid summary of a type that I haven't encountered in any professional publication. It's nice to know that someone is keeping alive a title whose history now goes back about 25 years, too.

On insurance companies: There's a way to get part of these profits they're making on the law of probability, you know. All you do is buy stock in them. This is a system of playing the market that quite a few timid-type investors are using now. You get almost the same results as mutual funds provide, because the insurance corporations invest in a carefully

screened group of securities, and you don't pay the fantastic commissions that are hidden away in the mutual fund plans.

AND I ALSO HEARD FROM

Dick Schultz wrote a six-page letter of comment on #22, commenting mostly on conformism, the bomb, and censorship. Dick asks that I mention that he needs a copy of Kipple #21 (the real one) and will pay 20¢ for it, or trade "a few Hyphens and an apazine or two". +++ Betty Kujawa writes that she misses fandom; she has recently been vacationing in Florida and the Bahamas. +++ Frank Wilimczyk subscribes again after finding his recent two-issue subscription wiped out in one fell swoop--his quarter arrived well after #21 had been mailed, but I managed to find an extra copy and sent it to him only slightly before #22 was published. At any rate, Frank says that Kipple is the type of fanzine he likes most. +++ Ed Meskys also subscribes, and comments that "that was a beautiful putdown of Joe Gibson by Bergeron! Whenever I read G2 or Parsection I get the feeling the editor's purposely trying to be obnoxious; sort of amateur GMCarrism." +++ Fred Galvin, fergawdsake, wrote a six-page letter on Kipple #10. I hope he doesn't expect a free issue for that letter... +++ Len Moffatt offers a correction: "I'm not a paper box salesman, but rather a sales correspondent working in the sales office of a paper box manufacturer. True, I do some selling by phone and by mail, but my primary duties are translating the customer purchase orders into factory orders (or 'job papers'). A kind of technical writer for paper boxes..." +++ Charles Wells found several issues of Kipple when he returned to Atlanta, due to my faulty mailing list and to the Post Office's refusal to forward third class mail. His letter of comment was interesting, but I didn't even have enough space to print all of the comments on #23, much less belated ones on #22. +++ Gary Deindorfer didn't write a letter of comment once again, but once again promises one on the next issue. From the tone of his brief note, I would hazard a guess that Gary's second incarnation in this microcosm is coming to an end even faster than did his first. +++ Steve Stiles says that the term "New York fandom" as in "New York fandom vs Pauls" is invalid. "The Shaws do not make up New York fandom. There are a few other fans in this area, including me, who are, as you no doubt know, loyal and trueblue." I had planned to discuss the Shaws more thoroughly this issue, but I've given them up for Lent--it's a refreshing experience... +++ Thanks also to: Tom Armistead, Cal Demmon, Ruth Berman, Ralph Kristiansen, Buck Coulson, Ringworm Fuzzwort, Pete Gramham, and Bill Berger.

FROM

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

SEND TO

Printed Matter Only
Return Postage Guaranteed
May Be Opened For Postal Inspection

Len Moffatt
10202 Belcher
Downy, Calif.

N26