

Kipple 25

S

MAY

QUOTES AND NOTES by Ted Pauls.....1
A SONG OF SIXPENCE by the Readers.....9

This is the humble, unassuming second anniversary issue of Kipple, published and edited by Ted Pauls, 1448 Meridene Drive, Baltimore 12, Maryland. It is available for letters of comment, trades on a one-for-one basis, contributions, or 15¢ per issue, 2/25¢. This issue is dedicated to Harry Warner, who likes small fanzines. -WOKL

QUOTES AND NOTES

BY TED
PAULS

At this writing, I have no idea what effect--if any--my admiration of the Karl Marx quotation in the last issue of this rash journal will have. Presumably, the effect will be less than that usually obtained by asserting my agreement with his ideal for a perfect society in mundane quarters, if only because Bill Conners, Bob Leman, G.M. Carr, and other of fandom's hard-bitten conservatives are not on my mailing list. I do not suppose I can entirely escape the "obvious" (to conservative minds) implications of such a move, however, but perhaps I can succeed in softening future blows by explaining my position somewhat more thoroughly. Of course, if my opinion of overall fan intelligence is as inflated as Pete Graham seems to think, then the following commentary will serve only to worsen the situation, and great numbers of readers will write in vigorous protest, some of them cancelling their subscriptions.

Larry McCombs and I were discussing the ideal society, and I pointed out that in my opinion, the ideal society should conform to the principle, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." As I mentioned at that time, whenever I have advocated such an idea, and fully explained its meaning, in reasonably intelligent mundane company, the reaction has almost invariably been agreement--until I mention that the author was Karl Marx. Here all rational process falls apart, and my acquaintance either stalks off or begins a loud and heated diatribe directed against the "goddamn commies". It is true that this is a communist idea, lifted straight from the pages of "Das Kapital," but I hope to be able to show why this is not necessarily a reason to condemn it without rational argument. First, however, I would like to examine the statement itself, and my personal interpretation of it, a little more thoroughly.

"From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." To me, this means simply that in the ideal society, a person would do as much work as he was able to do, and receive in return all that he needed to live in a fairly comfortable, if hardly extravagant, fashion. It would eliminate the very rich, of course, but it would also elimi-

nate the very poor: no person would starve while another enjoyed a twelve-course dinner. This should not occur under any circumstances, if charity has as much value as we place upon it in our conversations (if not our deeds), but unfortunately most of the very rich simply aren't that noble. Charity cannot, of course, be legislated, but in the ideal society, as, I think, both Larry and I picture it, all of the reforms we have considered would have the unanimous approval of the populace. I mean, if you're going to dream, why not go at it in a big way?

Marx, unfortunately, attached a few other premises to this one, premises with which I do not find myself in agreement, either in theory, in practice, or both. His perfect society would also be stateless, godless, and classless. The first and third of these premises are ideas with which we would all be in vigorous agreement but ideas that we must admit to be impossible. Societies need governments; man is simply not ready for anarchy. Even a minor society such as a family unit has a nominal leader. A classless society is even more desirable, and even less possible. There has never been a society without class distinctions of some sort, from the least civilized to the most civilized. As for the godless aspect of Marx's ideal society, I disagree with this inasmuch as he probably intended that such a society would be godless by enforcement, not consent. If, in my ideal society, the inhabitants unanimously agreed to embrace the agnostic or atheist point of view, there would be no problem. But if non-religion was legislated or propagandized against as it currently is within the Soviet Union, I would then disagree heartily with it, for while I would probably be perfectly content under a non-religious system, I have no right to force my ideas onto others.

But perhaps it would be wise to return to the stated point of this treatise while there is still someone who remembers that it is the point. Although I may be wrong, I do not expect very many fans to condemn this idea on the grounds that it was written by the founder of the communist doctrine. However, this is the reaction I have inevitably encountered among non-fan acquaintances, and it is caused by the simple fact that they know practically nothing about either communism-with-a-small-"c" or Communism-with-a-large-"C". The latter is a misnomer applied to the totalitarian form of government now in effect in Soviet Russia and other countries, and the former is simply a political philosophy. A terribly large number of people are seemingly unaware that a difference exists between the two, and it is for this reason that in the minds of the majority of Americans, any "communist" idea automatically becomes a "Communist" one--and hence an evil, totalitarian premise. Actually, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, co-founders of the communist political philosophy, would not recognize the Soviet Union of today as a communist-governed system. Russia is not, in fact, a communist country; it is striving toward that position, but it has not yet reached it.

A few paragraphs ago, I mentioned Marx's premise that the ideal society would be stateless. While this is fully in accord with the communist system of political thought, it is obviously incompatible with the current Soviet totalitarian government, wherein the State, far from being non-existent, is considered of cardinal importance in all actions. Marx would have described the current system of government in Russia as a "dictatorship of the proletariat," a supposedly temporary situation which exists shortly after a revolution for the purpose of consolidat-

ing the position of the new government. This "consolidation" consists of the utterly ruthless destruction of all opposing viewpoints within the confines of the country, after which the dictatorship is dissolved, the state is reduced to impotency, and a "perfect state of communism" results. Lenin, who led the Bolshevik Revolution, undoubtedly had such plans, but he found his enemies so numerous that it was impossible to disband the "dictatorship of the proletariat" as swiftly as might have been desired. Lenin died shortly thereafter, and his successor, Stalin, didn't even attempt any progress of this sort, since he found the interregnum state a perfect pedestal for personal power. It is highly questionable at this time whether Nikita Khrushchev is really making an attempt in this direction, either.

The point of all this, however, is not the integrity of the Soviet leaders, but rather that thoughts which are associated with communist political philosophy ought not to be associated too closely with the so-called "Communist world" that we know today. Such thoughts are of the nature of ideas, and they ought to be argued as such. I think that Marx's "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" is an extraordinarily fine principle for an ideal society, and if you wish to argue the point, I only hope that you will do so on its inherent merits or faults as an idea, not on the basis that Joe Stalin was neurotic or that Khrushchev bangs a table with his shoe. The latter form of argument is unworthy of intelligent people of the calibre I'm told inhabit fandom...

+ + +
+ + +

Reviewing books is an interesting form of literary exercise, and I find that in most cases a book review is easier to write than any other form of article. I am somewhat at a loss to review Alexis Carrel's "Man, the Unknown" (Macfadden Books, #60-102, 60¢), however. While I subscribe to Larry McCombs' view (outlined in Kipple #24) that if you think you know what you're talking about, you should not hesitate to "wade in and do battle" with authorities in any field, I am nevertheless hesitant to criticize a book and a man of such obvious high repute. Alexis Carrel is a Nobel Prize winner, and "Man, the Unknown," which Will Durant calls "The wisest, profoundest, most valuable book that I have come upon in the American literature of our century," has been translated into eighteen languages and has seen 55 printings in the hardcover edition. The volumes of praise from such unimpeachable sources as the Saturday Review and the Christian Science Monitor which are printed on the covers further serve to intimidate such minor thinkers as your beloved editor.

Indeed, everything from the quotations on the back cover and the words "Nobel Prize Winner" prominently displayed on the front cover, to the writing style itself, seems to have been designed not to educate, but to impress. The writing style is not spectacular, but the vocabulary is extensive, and this, accompanied by the stodgy, textbook-like progression from point to point, creates a vaguely unpleasant effect. In this particular case, I don't believe that my own inability to perceive subtle stylistic variations is at fault. Usually, even when I cannot appreciate a subtle style, I can at least appreciate the fact that there is supposed to be one. For example, while I cannot discern the style of Robert Bloch, I can at least realize that he has one--even

though I could not, under any circumstances, perceive it well enough to describe it. In the case of "Man, the Unknown," however, the impression I receive is quite distinctly one of drabness. The book is written entirely without benefit of any expression, any feeling whatever. I have a feeling that Mr. Carrel would speak in exactly the same manner, reciting a string of words without the slightest trace of any emotion, without pause, without any human quality. Since, obviously, none of us is completely emotionless, I fear that this quality must be simply an affectation, a pose to impress the readers with the inhuman scientific objectivity of Alexis Carrel.

But my major thesis in this critique is not the incompetency of the writing in "Man, the Unknown," for, after all, how many eminent scientists are also gifted writers? Rather, I would question the factual background. Because of the unique and unpleasant quality of the writing it is always possible to assume that any disagreements on this basis stem simply from my inability to understand the author. That premise falls through, unfortunately, because there are a number of simple, clear-cut fallacies in "Man, the Unknown" which are clear even beneath the misleading veil of excess verbiage. For example, this rather naive passage from an early chapter: "The sexual glands have other functions than that of impelling man to the gesture which, in primitive life, perpetuated the race." I agree that the gesture perpetuated the race in primitive life, but I would be very interested in knowing just what has usurped that function in our current state. The last time I read a biology textbook, that "gesture" was still doing a very efficient job of perpetuating the race.

The next chapter discusses psychological rather than physiological processes, and Carrel asserts that "We know how unintelligent the children are who live in a crowded city, among multitudes of people and events, in trains and automobiles, among the absurdities of the cinemas, in schools where intellectual concentration is not required." This revelation is interesting to me from both a general and a personal viewpoint. From a general viewpoint, I would wonder whether or not any statistics have been collected to prove that children who live in crowded cities are less intelligent as a class than children who live on farms or in small villages. And from a personal viewpoint, I would very much like to know how Mr. Carrel, without having met me, can state that I am unintelligent merely on the basis that I was born and raised in a large and crowded city.

Six pages later my eyes fell upon a passage that momentarily convinced me that Alexis Carrel was nothing more than a pseudonym for George C. Willick. "Esthetic sense," he claims, "exists in the most primitive human beings as in the most civilized. It even survives the disappearance of intelligence. For the idiot and the insane are capable of artistic productions." Now, as any competent psychiatrist would be extremely happy to tell Mr. Carrel, insanity by no means has anything to do with "the disappearance of intelligence". Insane persons are not necessarily stupid ones, and in fact the actual moron is incapable of insanity, since you need a certain degree of intelligence in order to become troubled enough to go insane. George Willick can perhaps be forgiven for being unaware of this, but a Nobel Prize winner, an eminent scientist, certainly should realize it.

Common sense and logic are restored to "Man, the Unknown" for precisely

4

eight pages. At the end of that time, the following splendid observation is made: "Pleasure causes the skin of the face to flush. Anger and fear turn it white." I have argued civil rights with enough ardent segregationists to realize that when one is angered, the face becomes red, not white.

Surely, these are minor points, and even though there are many other examples of such ignorance of points of common knowledge, they aren't really important enough to quibble over. But when a scientist can make mistakes on minor points that a grammar school student would recognize, one begins to wonder about his major points. These are less easy to rebut (particularly as they are obscured by the vocabulary), even when they are as questionable as the inherent superiority of the white race over Orientals and Negroes, which he propounds with gusto. But if he can't keep his sixth-grade facts in order, can we expect him to do any better on higher levels?

If you find 207 pages of highly questionable speculation to be worth 65¢, then I recommend "Man, the Unknown"; for my money, it isn't worth the price, not even as a curiosity to be read cum grano salis.

+ + +
+ + +

Surprisingly little discussion has taken place in fandom over the moral and legal implications of motivational research and its effects in advertising, except for a few articles and letters in Daphne Buckmaster's Esprit. Since no issue of that publication has appeared in over a year, most of us have all but forgotten the discussion. My opinion of the methods of subconscious persuasion utilized to sell various products is an unfavorable one, for obvious reasons. No one who believes in the freedom of the individual could condone these methods, and its defenders are primarily those who stand to profit in some respect from its use. These defenders are quick to point out that motivational research methods simply convince people to buy what they want to begin with, but this premise doesn't hold up very well to concentrated attack. MR methods convince people to buy an image that they want, but not necessarily a product that they want.

For example, General Mills discovered that its cake mixes would be more likely to sell if it left something for the housewife to do, such as adding eggs or milk. The cake-baker wants to feel as if she were contributing something toward the end product, rather than feel that the mix was entirely responsible for the finished cake. Most cake mixes at the time needed only water. Since General Mills discovered this attitude first, their sales for a time expanded beyond those of competitors; but not because the housewife would rather buy General Mills products, but because she would rather buy the impression of creating rather than simply preparing a cake. That is important. It was not a product which was selling so well on its inherent merits, but rather an image cleverly exploited for the purpose of increasing sales.

Another reason that I am horrified by MR methods is their potential usefulness in other than commercial fields. If a person can be made to buy a cake mix not because it is better than competing brands, but because it makes the consumer feel better, then this same principle can be applied to other fields. It shouldn't be difficult to adapt such

psychological arm-twisting to the field of politics, for example: the next governor of your state may be elected not on the merits of his platform, but because he wears a red tie. As silly as that sounds, much less believable gimmicks have turned products into "best-sellers" overnight.

But the important question, of course, is whether or not the consumers are actually buying what they want, or what they are forced to buy by methods which exploit their subconscious desires. In answering this question, it is important to know just what condition the typical housewife is in when purchases are made. "Impulse-buying" is an area in which MR is particularly useful; although strong desires may be generated by magazine advertisements, billboards, television commercials, and other means, the most vulnerable buyer is the impulse-buyer. All women are impulse-buyers when confronted by a self-service food store; although they may enter the store with a list of items to buy, they almost invariably purchase three or four times the amount listed. James Vicary decided to find out just what state of mind the average shopper in a supermarket was in, and he went about this task in a very simple manner. The frequency with which a person blinks his eyes is generally a good index to his state of inner tension, so Vicary set up hidden cameras to record the eye-blink rate of shoppers in an average supermarket. A normal person in a normal state will blink his eyes approximately 32 times per minute, while a very tense person may blink as often as 50 or 60 times per minute, and a person in a very relaxed state will blink only 20 times per minute. Here, quoted from Vance Packard's "The Hidden Persuaders," are the results Vicary obtained:

"Mr. Vicary set up his cameras and started following the ladies as they entered the store. The results were startling, even to him. Their eye-blink rate, instead of going up to indicate mounting tension, went down and down, to a very subnormal fourteen blinks a minute. The ladies fell into what Mr. Vicary calls a hypnoidal trance, a light kind of trance that, he explains, is the first stage of hypnosis. (...)

"Interestingly many of these women were in such a trance that they passed by neighbors and old friends without noticing or greeting them. Some had a sort of glassy stare. They were so entranced as they wandered about the store plucking things off shelves at random that they would bump into boxes without seeing them and did not even notice the camera although in some cases their face would pass within a foot and a half of the spot where the hidden camera was clicking away. When the wives had filled their carts (or satisfied themselves) and started toward the checkout counter their eye-blink rate would start rising up to a slightly subnormal twenty-five blinks per minute. Then, at the sound of the cash-register bell and the voice of the clerk asking for money, the eye-blink rate would race up past normal to a high abnormal of forty-five blinks per minute. In many cases it turned out that the women did not have enough money to pay for all the nice things they had put in the cart."

What you have read is a description of women in a state which renders them incompetent for all legal purposes. A murder committed under such conditions would probably be excused on grounds of temporary insanity,

a document signed under such conditions could be voided on the grounds that the woman was not competent at the time of the signing--and yet some people continue to insist that MR methods do no harm! The women described above are buying things they cannot afford, do not need, and probably do not even consciously want, under the influence of a semi-hypnotic trance. In my philosophy, Horatio, that is unfair exploitation of the people by the manufacturers.

But then, I'm just a dreamer who believes that individuals have rights.

+ + +
+ + +

Vast quantities of midnight oil have been consumed recently in what an outsider would mistake for an experiment to learn how quickly a human being can ruin his eyesight through studious application to the task. I haven't read the labels of any tomato cans, but I have read practically everything else I could lay my hands on. It would conceivably be possible to fill the remainder of this issue with book reviews, but discarding that rash notion, I would at least like to mention a portion of my recent reading matter: "Seeing the Earth from Space" and "The Sun and its Family," both by Irving Adler, are elementary, popularized guides to our progress in the field of artificial satellites and our solar system, respectively. At best, they are useful as guides to specific bits of information (such as the fact that the sidereal period of Saturn is the equivalent to 29 earth-years), or to practice and improve your speed-reading talents. I was enthusiastically studying astronomy when I was nine years old, so these simplified texts are fairly dull to me. +++ "A Primer of Freudian Psychology," by Calvin S. Hall, is probably also elementary, but since my knowledge in this field is considerably less, I found it interesting and instructive. Anyone interested in the human mind should certainly find something of interest herein. (Mentor Book #MD271, 50¢) +++ Lewis Spence's "The Outlines of Mythology" (Premier Book #d143, 50¢) would probably be of interest to much the same group as the Freudian volume mentioned above. Unlike the other books on mythology in my library, this volume does not concern itself to a great extent with individual myths or sets of myths, but rather with a general commentary on the origins of legends and beliefs in gods in various societies. +++ "Who Speaks of Conquest" is a science fiction novel about three times longer than its plot, and by either the author's intent or by error, I find myself cheering the aliens almost on the first page. The attitude of the alleged "heroes" of this book is the most overpoweringly egotistical I've ever seen in a science fiction story. Ian Wright, a fairly competent writer, must have been amplifying the superiority complex of the human race for satirical purposes, but unfortunately it doesn't come across in quite the way he intended. There are still people, I imagine, who delude themselves into believing that the universe was created for the amusement of the human race, but if minds holding such attitudes are in command of space exploration, when it comes, we had better say our prayers. The first lifeform we meet who doesn't favor the idea of riding in the backs of our buses will blast this little planet to kingdom come. Wright's hero, Stephen Brady, becomes very maudlin and introspective at the end of the book, although that is hardly a believable transformation from his earlier cold, unsympathetic, egocentric, loud-mouthed image. But throughout the book one thought is kept in mind: Terra's "right" to carve an empire in the galaxy. It nauseates me. +++ Will Cuppy's "How to get from January

to December" is vaguely reminiscent of E.B. White. If you desire some light reading, I recommend it--you can't hardly get much more lighter (Dell Book #F183, 50¢) +++ "Conquest Without War" is blurbed as the "Mein Kampf" of Khrushchev. It is an extremely interesting and extremely thick (550 pages) book, consisting of quotations from the speeches of Nikita Khrushchev assembled under appropriate headings such as "Peaceful Coexistence," "Military Capacity," "Education," etc. Tables of various sorts and a brief biography of Niki, the man, are also included. One of the most interesting segments is that devoted to Khrushchev's comments on education, and here, as elsewhere, the comments interspersed by Jacques Katel and N.H. Mager, the editors of this volume, are surprisingly objective. "Conquest Without War" is extremely helpful in understanding the objectives of Soviet Russia. (Cardinal Book #GC-137, 50¢) +++ "The World of Man," by Dr. Lyons Stapledon (Duncan Book #dd248, 60¢) is an extremely interesting collection of essays, although deceptively blurbed. According to the cover, "The World of Man" consists of "essays on every facet of man's existence". Actually, of 32 essays (totaling 281 pages), 29 are devoted either to religion or to sex. This is a meaningless quibble, however, for these subjects are so broad that they probably do constitute every facet of man's existence in some respects, and the treatment of the subjects is more than adequate. Dr. Stapledon, apart from being a thinker of imposing proportions, also has a pleasantly brisk writing style, atypical of a great number of scientists. +++ "The Menace from Earth" (Signet Book #D2105, 50¢) is Robert Heinlein's latest paperback collection, consisting of eight stories which appeared in various magazines between 1941 and 1957. This is a most astonishing collection: it appears as if someone at Signet had asked Heinlein to dig up his most mediocre yarns for a paperback edition. Two good stories accidentally slipped in--"By His Bootstraps" and "Project Nightmare"--but the other six are the mistakes of twenty years thrown into the spotlight. It is difficult to believe that Heinlein, one of the truly great writers in our field, could turn out stories like "Menace from Earth," which is like nothing so much as the plot of a typical television situation-comedy transferred to a lunar setting, or "Sky Lift," which reads like a chapter from the sort of novel which used to appear in Planet Stories or Thrilling Wonder Stories. +++ As an antidote to "Menace from Earth," I immediately read my tattered copy of "The Green Hills of Earth" (Signet Book #943, 25¢, but undoubtedly out of print). With the exception of "Delilah and the Space-Rigger," a rather annoying bit of fluff, this is a collection of top level Heinlein. Two of these stories are copyrighted by such unbelievable publishers as Hearst Magazines, Inc., and the American Legion Magazine, but I certainly don't want to indulge in the practice of guilt-by-association to discredit these stories. "The Long Watch" and "Logic of Empire" are perhaps the best stories in the collection, and they appear to foreshadow the emergence of the Robert Heinlein who currently looms large on the science fiction horizon: Heinlein the philosopher. "The Green Hills of Earth" can probably only be found in the dark and dusty recesses of a second-hand magazine store, but it's worth searching for.

--Ted Pauls

26
The number or letter to the left indicates your status on the mailing list: a number is the number of your last issue; the letter "C" indicates a contribution of yours in this issue; the letter "T" means that we trade; the letter "F" indicates your place on my permanent list; and "S" means this is a sample copy.

LETTERS

a
song
of
sixpence

OF COMMENT

ALVA ROGERS
5243 RAHLVES DRIVE
CASTRO VALLEY, CALIF.

I said that I didn't think Joe Gibson had a "John Birch" attitude towards political radicalism or a puritan mind regarding homosexuals, which I believe to be true. But Joe, in his fervor to make a point, has placed himself at the very least in the role of a John Birch fellow traveller. At the very beginning of his article, Joe, for some inexplicable reason, raised the spectre of ex-communists and homosexuals in fandom in such a manner so hysterically inappropriate to his central thesis that I found it necessary to answer it at length, considering the raising of such issues to be far more dangerous to the wellbeing of fandom than the problem of petty transgressors against the social mores. As to the political activities of Bill Donaho and Danny Curran, Joe dragged them in to provide an example of how their political indiscretions--or even naivete, one might infer from the tenor of Joe's remarks--could make them unfortunate victims of a purge of fandom as a result of an expose by some John Birch type. Joe doesn't even have the courtesy to concede that Bill and Danny might be sincere in their beliefs, but says, condescendingly, "They've both got this collegiate-type kick about either having to Conform To Society Or Fight It, and they're real George on the Socialist bit and the latest thing in progressive thought...these goddam fool kids are sitting ducks." Joe apparently sees no anomaly in singling out Bill and Danny as "radicals" who "might be just the thing to brighten up a lurid expose," and his refusal to name other equally prominent fans who, Joe insists, should be drummed out of the corps for antisocial behavior.

Dick Bergeron's letter was a masterpiece. Not only does he quite handily dispatch Joe, but he also takes on Terry Carr (no mean combattant) and deals him a few telling blows. I may be wrong, but I have the feeling Terry's letter in Kipple #22 was written out of a sense of friendship for Joe,

rather than because he went down the line with Joe on his stand. As the former Number One Berkeley Fan, Terry knows that many of Joe's allusions and innuendoes were aimed directly at Bay Area fandom, and he also knows that they were on the whole grossly misleading.

Let's face it everybody. Joe's gaffing--but before he finally departs the verdant pastures of fandom, he's determined to make a bang that's even noisier than T. Bruce Yerke's or Francis T. Laney's were. Some evidence of this can be obtained by reading his article, "O, Blast this Bay Area Fandom" in Vorpall Glass #3. In a knife-in-the-back kidding vein he ridicules the fannish (and otherwise) characters of a number of leading fans (including Terry Carr), and arrogantly dismisses the Little Men and the Golden Gate Futurians as worthless organizations empty of any fanac. (There's a rather wistful note to his reference to these groups. He says, "I honestly wish I could be more than vaguely known to these meetings. If I'm known at all.") At the end of his article Joe lets the cat out of the bag and reveals what he is really faunching for. The clue is there, for all to see, in one sentence: "There remains a rightfully unavailable group--the dirty pros" (underlining mine). And so we see from this article (which preceded his Shargy blast by some months) that Joe doesn't give two damns for fandom, but yearns to be numbered among the pros, aloof and disdainful of the eager fannish faces groveling at his feet. And from this we can also assume that his concern for the presence of "Cheats, Frauds, Thieves, Whores, and Moochers" in fandom is less than genuine--that the article was in fact written in an effort to insure a permanent place for the name of Joe Gibson in the annals of fandom. But of course, it might take Joe several years before he finally cuts the cord binding him to fandom--as it did Laney.

HARRY WARNER
423 SUMMIT AVE.
HAGERSTOWN, MD.

I'm tired of reading about the HUAC in fanzines and I refuse to read about it in any other periodicals, so you won't get direct comments on the material concerning it in this latest Kipple. However, I would be interested in reading statements of basic beliefs by the fans who have been writing most about the HUAC. I'm curious to know how many of them believe that there is not any possibility of serious communist tendencies in this country and no threat of infiltration by communists; how many believe that such a possibility exists but should be handled in other ways than through the FBI and the HUAC; and what the latter group would recommend. This is not intended as a request that you should put up or shut up, but rather a simple curiosity to know how you feel about the whole question, not just your opinions on the HUAC (or rather, your opinions on the opinions of others on that fraternity). (The FBI and the HUAC are two entirely different matters: the FBI is the organization which gathers information on possible communist activities, a surely useful function. The Communist party is dedicated to the overthrow of our government, and certainly close tabs ought to be kept on the organization. The HUAC, on the other hand, utilizes the information gathered by the FBI--a small amount of conclusive information, and a great bulk of meaningless suspicion--and in doing so discredits innocent individuals. The great fault of the HUAC is its placement of the burden of proof: in our society, the burden of proof lies always with the accuser, not the accused. If someone calls you a thief, then he or she must prove that you are a thief; you do not need to prove that you are not a thief, since a person is always assumed innocent until proven guilty. The HUAC reverses that process, however; it makes the accusation, and then by clever manipulation places the burden of proof on the

accused. By also refusing to divulge either the source or exact nature of the information used to make the accusation, they make it practically impossible for anyone--innocent or guilty--to defend himself. In other words, I believe that the Communist menace can be handled quite adequately by the FBI without any public witch trials.))

What does the physiology of a hen have to do with the kind of sex education that school children need? It's hard to believe that any parents are ignorant enough to be unable to tell their kids the facts that are really important: what causes pregnancy, what procedures are most likely to bring about intercourse, what venereal disease can do to the body, and the existence of homosexuality. If the schools are willing to give technical information on comparative gestation periods of various mammals, the successive changes in appearance possessed by the human embryo at various stages in its development, and suchlike, it'll do no harm, but these matters aren't the ones that may mean the difference between a ruined and a happy life. The problem isn't ignorant adults; it's the unwillingness of adults to give the important facts to children at a sufficiently early age, and even the image that has been built up by comedians and situation comedies on television, making this embarrassment something of a national institution. (The hen is not in itself important, but if my mundane relative knew so little about the relatively freely-discussed sexual mechanism of the hen, how can we presume her to have known more about human practices and mechanism? The fact that she had a child is meaningless; many parents are considerably more ignorant of these matters than you seem to think. While a portion of the stork/cabbage leaf claptrap fed to children is caused by embarrassment, a substantial portion is also caused by ignorance. John Langdon-Davies, in "Seeds of Life," notes that "It is a most unfortunate fact that owing to the ignorance of many parents, who were probably the victims of ignorance in their parents, girls grow up without any clear understanding of their own anatomy. Thus it is frequently found that young girls are ignorant of the fact that their vagina has no connection whatever with the function of eliminating waste products from the body."))

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

Walter Breen says: "After seeing this letter of yours, I am not really surprised that you got some votes for Fugghead of the Year; you seem to have been impervious to logic in the all too familiar manner of GMCarr. Frankly, you disappoint me." It's GMCarr who avoids discussion and attacks personalities, and this is just what Walter has done. (Gertie never avoided a discussion in her life. Her major fault was always that of arguing points which were not brought up, and cleverly twisting such trips around Robin Hood's barn into a victory. And it is you, not Walter, who has evaded the discussion, at least insofar as fallout shelters. I explained our position last issue in terms which anyone could understand, so I can only assume that your continued incomprehension is an intentional device. If you really wish to convince anyone of your opinion on the worth of fallout shelters, then please stop shouting "Unfair!" because Walter and I have asked you to refute Harrison Brown and James Real, whose opinions mirror ours. Your continued refusal to comment upon that mutual position leads only to the assumption that you are incapable of doing so.)) I talked to Walt when I went down to New York, and he told me that I had received two votes for Fugghead of the Year. Since I have at least four enemies in tandem, since I haven't appeared in print more than two or three times in 1961,

and since Walter himself received more votes for Fugghead of the Year than I did, I think we can dismiss the above quote as irrelevant to the discussion on conformity.

I've been asked by five people why I haven't defended my views on conformity, and by almost as many as to why I haven't said anything more on rock 'n' roll and fallout shelters. The truth is, I went over conformity as thoroughly as possible in the last two letters of comment, and also made a few defenses on rock 'n' roll and fallout shelters. With the exception of one paragraph, nothing of what I had written has seen print. I don't know why Pauls is, with an exception or two, printing only one side of an argument, but it's obvious that he doesn't want to hear anything more from me about either conformity, rock 'n' roll, or fallout shelters. (This is the first time since the summer of 1959 that anyone has accused me of printing only one side of an argument. It was true at that time; it is not true now. Your letter of comment on the February issue was not printed because there simply wasn't room for all of the interesting letters which were written on that issue, but your letter of comment on the March issue was quoted from extensively. You claim that I printed only one paragraph on "conformity, rock 'n' roll, and fallout shelters"; on the contrary, there were four paragraphs on those subjects quoted from your letter of comment last issue. The letter in question contained only five paragraphs on those subjects, so I seem to have quoted a reasonably fair percentage of your comments.)

You're sarcastic about what is called a "sense of humor". I don't mind a lack of humor in your own writings, but it grotches me that you edit most all humor and lightness from the letters that you publish. I know that you make my material read more serious than it actually is, and so I keep that fact in mind when I read your letter column. It's true that you seldom change the meaning of anything you publish, but you continually change the 'attitude' in which the material was written (by changing sentence structure, by changing the wording, by eliminating most all traces of tact, etc.), and so it's not unusual that feelings are often hurt because of some of the things which are said in your fanzine. (I receive the impression from your comments that this fellow Pauls must really be a devious bastard. I change sentence structure, particularly when the original structure is faulty; I change wording, too, but only to clear up obscure references or to correct grammatical errors. I do not remove tact from letters (particularly not from your letters, where I do not often find any), and I do not edit humor from letters unless, in my opinion, it is at the same time uninteresting. Redd Boggs and Harry Warner manage to inject a little humor into their letters, and I don't remove it; but then, their humor is well-done and it usually has a point of some sort. I edit out fluffy, inane comments of no consequence which I suppose might be called "humor", because printing such comments would cause me to have less space in which to print the discussions which make this letter column interesting. If I printed a half-page by Joe Bleau on how he fell out of his chair while reading Warhoon and consequently had to cut a half-page by Larry McCombs on civil rights, would that make you happy? Perhaps, but so long as my money supplies the stencils, paper and postage for this publication, I'll continue to print the interesting commentary and cut the fluff. If you want a letter column which concerns itself with the insignificant to the exclusion of the significant, you are free to run your own in that manner; or, still easier, subscribe to Cry. In spite of excellent material and editorials which are eagerly awaited every month, Cry still has a let-

ter column with the general atmosphere of a kindergarten recess period.))

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

It saddens me that you've found it necessary to resort to Sam Moskowitzian tactics in replying to my letter. My major points--the relative crudeness of the Baltimore newspapers and their sales relationships--are overlooked while you concentrate on disproving me not by refuting facts but by using innuendo. ((I think it would be a matter of courtesy to criticize my tactics with specific facts rather than simply to label them "Moskowitzian" and leave the matter at that.))

To take your immaterial points in order: my arguments with you about Baltimore concerned the rather large proportion of its residential slums, particularly in comparison with those in DC. You chose to speak from the point of view of suburban Baltimore and I of urban Baltimore--we spoke at cross purposes. ((Since your original comment was that Baltimore was "largely composed of slums," I simply thought you ought to be able to prove it irregardless of the fact that you may have been speaking at the time only of the central section of the city. The neighborhoods I pointed out were all within the city limits, so you had no reason to scream "Unfair!")) But inasmuch as I lived in and had a close acquaintance with these slums for a time (and no, the North Charles Street addresses I did not consider slummy, although in DC they would've been), and even did maintenance work in several genuine falling-down-sium houses, I knew whereof I spoke. Likewise, D'Alesandro's corruption (including nepotism) was not exactly unknown to those of us who read anything of Baltimore's politics at the time, and I don't recall your challenging them, although it is quite possible you can dredge up and quote some immaterial paragraph back at me. ((If these devious goings-on were obvious to "those of (you) who read anything of Baltimore's politics," then one wonders how they escaped notice by a family of five who have lived in Baltimore all of their lives. But then, the poor Pauls clan probably just isn't as perceptive as Ted White.))

But what

this has to do with Baltimore's newspapers I don't know.

Then you bring up a statement I made in Gambit about not reading Baltimore's papers. But surely you realized that I didn't read them because I'd been exposed to them sufficiently to dislike them--even if you'd forgotten that the Gambit you quote wasn't (it was a Gafia), and was published in Falls Church, Va., before I'd spent more than a week or two in Baltimore.

Okay, to more specific points: I assisted Fred von Bernewitz with the ads for the New Cameo Art Theatre in Baltimore for several months, during which time I was often exposed to the Baltimore papers, in which we advertised. I may have confused the Hearst outlet, but as near as I can tell you haven't refuted anything else I said. For your information, I saw Herblock in the News-Post when I was visiting Dick Wingate in the fall of 1960. At the time the News-Post editorial page struck me as a poor imitation of the DC Washington Post's, replete with Herblock. It impressed itself on my memory. ((Judging from your ardor in asserting it last issue, so did the "fact" that the Sun was a Hearst publication... But I can't really argue this, except to say that I do not recall ever seeing Herblock in that sheet and that its conservative attitude isn't very conducive to such a cartoonist.))

I know this will

shock you even further, but on my Easter visit to Falls Church I ascertained that the DC Post also prints George Sokolsky's column. Now, the DC Post may not be as liberal as the NYC Post (few papers could be), but it is the Democratic/liberal DC paper, and it originates Herblock. Presumably Sokolsky is not too stodgy for one liberal paper, and by circuitous analogy it may be possible that the News-Post found Herblock acceptable at least for a time. ((I'm surprised you didn't point out the fact that both papers contain the word "post" in their names, since that is at least as logical as your analogy.))

To top this strange me-
lange off, I see you cut the entire first topic of that letter, in which I took you to task for type-casting liberals and conservatives. ((I printed essentially the same criticism in the quoted sections of Terry Carr's letter. I simply cannot print every portion of every letter I receive, especially when more than one person makes the same comment.))

I don't know why you did this, but the effect, combined with your evasive and somewhat less-than-honest handling of the first page of the letter you printed, is not endearing to me. It gives me the impression that you cut the criticism you couldn't argue with, and printed only that which you could cast aspersions upon. ((Don't you ever stop tossing bricks long enough to realize that the walls of your house are extremely fragile glass? Last issue you called me a liar with regard to the childish comments in Axe which I quoted, and I answered with a section of a letter from Harry Warner, who saw the comments and satisfied himself that I didn't invent them. I didn't notice an apology in this current letter of yours--although one was obviously called for--nor indeed any mention of the accusation you made. It gives me the impression that you ignored the criticism you couldn't argue with, and gave your attention only to that which you could cast aspersions upon.))

Joe Gibson makes no sense to me. "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." Now there's a non-sequitur for you, boy. (Terry's item was in Cry and hadn't the slightest stf association; my review of Heinlein was in a Void we didn't send Gibson--but it certainly had something to do with stf, or "s-f".) Foosh.

KEVIN LANGDON
823 IDYLBERRY RD.
SAN RAFAEL, CALIF.

In some cases, larceny is the moral course. Don't you approve of Robin Hood? Now let's examine your moral system more closely. You say, "...given that an action or course is immoral, it remains immoral without regard to circumstances." I think you'll agree that it is immoral to push a button which you know will launch a thermonuclear missile at New York (whatever you think of New York fandom), but let's change the circumstances. Let's connect the button to a fire alarm and imagine that your grandmother is trapped in a house across the street by a fire. There are no other fire alarms in the vicinity, and you are fully aware of the whole situation. By your reasoning, since pushing the button is immoral regardless of circumstances, it is immoral to summon aid to save your grandmother's life. Spare me from this kind of morality. ((I can't quite believe that you really want to be spared from this kind of morality, since the only alternative you offer is to cause the death of several million people in order to save the life of one. I suppose I would have certain qualms about my lack of action under such circumstances, wondering (illogically) if there weren't some way in which I could have saved all of the lives concerned, but I would

never consider the possibility of launching the thermonuclear device to save any single life, including my own.))

Ted White's IQ may have jumped (mine did, too) simply because he came into contact with more intelligent people. People tend to adjust downward to the intellectual level of those around them. Read "The First Men" by Howard Fast for a good fictional treatment of the subject, Larry Williams. Harry Warner could profitably take a look at that, too.

Dave Locke doesn't seem to realize that a fugghead is a person who holds certain opinions contrary to one's own. Anyone who doesn't agree with me that blowing up the world is unwise is, in my opinion, a fugghead. I go along with Walter Breen in considering Dave Locke a fugghead, and will continue to do so until he changes his opinions.

JUNE BONIFAS
1913 HOPI RD.
SANTA FE, N.M.

Do you not miss the point, when you argue with Mr. Sokolsky about whether there are atheists on the Ad Hoc Committee? The wild jump in his reasoning would seem to lie in the assertion that the Ad Hoc Committee was seeking to destroy religion; from what you say, I gather that this is unrelated to its purpose. Perhaps Sokolsky thinks, as Mr. Hoover seems to think, that atheism leads to Communism, but this is something you should challenge him on, at least in these Kipple apostrophes. (I have in the past challenged the statement that atheism leads to Communism, but in this particular case I didn't feel the need. My point was that only Mr. Sokolsky's word would appear to indicate that the members of the Ad Hoc Committee are atheists (regardless of whether or not this is a good or bad thing). This is not readily obvious from reading the sections of their comments that Mr. Sokolsky printed. They are against the HUAC, to be sure, but that is the only definite conclusion one can draw from their comments. Mr. Sokolsky managed to make them not only atheists, but atheists who were out to "destroy religion," and I was interested in whether or not this charge could be substantiated. So if I missed the point, it was only because I wanted to be sure of the general attitude before arguing specifics.))

The Ford Foundation authors' assertion that scientist-technicians are allied with the no-disarmament military elite is questionable. Los Alamos is a citadel of the United World Federalists. And I should be very reluctant to believe the statements, "the armed services exert more control over Congress than that body exerts over the Defense Department," and "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." If this were true, we should be no better politically than the republics south of us.

The argument about "progress" brings to mind a discussion between an employer of mine and Count de Ghize of this city, in which I played a small part. My small part was after they had argued for an hour or so about whether man had progressed since the age of Pericles, when I said, in effect, "You didn't define 'progress.' I think all you've been arguing about is a definition."

On behalf of that employer, let me take issue with Harry Warner on insurance companies and mutual funds. The market price of insurance stocks is not invariably related to the value of their investment portfolios. After their income began to be taxed a few years ago, the shares were depressed for some time; then last year investors discovered them again

and they went straight up. I take strongest exception to "the fantastic commissions that are hidden away in the mutual fund plans." You may or may not think that 8% is too much for a selling commission, and 1% annually too much for the investment advisor, but you cannot say that they are hidden away. In accordance with SEC rules, they are stated prominently in the literature required to be given to the customer; if similar frankness were demanded of insurance salesmen, the growth of insurance companies would come to a screeching halt.

LARRY McCOMBS
147 BRADLEY ST.
NEW HAVEN, CONN.

Last summer the California legislature was about to pass a new censorship law which gave incredible power to local authorities to ban the sale of anything which was morally offensive. The definition of "morally offensive" was simply that someone was offended by it enough to bring the case to court. Well, obviously no sensible judge would uphold the banning of anything just because some little old lady found it embarrassing, but I objected on principle to giving the judges that power to ban anything that embarrassed anyone. However, the newspapers were supporting the law and I think it was probably passed, although I lost track of what happened to it. (Since the newspapers supported the law, it would have been ironic justice if the first case brought to court had been against those same newspapers. There must be a little old lady driving an MG somewhere in Pasadena who'd find the newspapers morally offensive...)

But I think that all this red-tape and censorship is an inevitable result of our attitude towards life. We expect people to live by proper outward appearances and the adherence to certain specific rules and laws. Thus, we judge cases not on their moral merits, but on the trivial technicalities of the particular law involved. Since practically no two people can agree on a set of rules to live by, we have a continual hassle as people get into power and try to force others to live by their own codes. Now, if we could just become sensible enough to teach men to live by their own consciences, and realize that details of moral codes are bound to vary from man to man, we could do away with 99% of this sort of restriction. But it is certainly nothing simple--and probably nothing that will be done within our lifetimes, or the lifetime of mankind, which now looks as if it may be exceedingly short.

Dave Locke: Yes, some beatniks are just people who have personality problems, or who couldn't adjust to life. But many of them are simply non-conformists who are rejected by a society which insists that people fit neatly into one pigeonhole or another. "Beatnik" is now a recognized pigeonhole, so non-conformists are allowed to survive if they conform somewhat to that role.

Let me give you an example of what I mean by a pressure toward conformity. Here at Yale, nearly all of the students wear Ivy League suits and such to classes. I find this costume uncomfortable and inconvenient. I also don't happen to have more than one suit, and can't afford to buy the clothes to match the usual Yale image. For this reason I frequently attend classes in blue jeans and sweaters. Because of time and money limitations, I often go for months between haircuts, and I often neglect to shave for the better part of a week. I am regarded as somewhat of an oddball, and most people prefer not to associate too openly with me. They note that I do not conform to the accepted mode of dress for the Yale student. They therefore assume that I am either somewhat insane, boorish, stupid, queer, or otherwise undesirable. It is this judgement of person-

ality upon the basis of outward actions and appearance that I am objecting to.

There are people who put on an appearance of non-conformity for the reasons Dave suggests. In California I might have (and did) worn the above-described outfit in a deliberate attempt to create a "beatnik" image. In that case I have no right to complain about society's rejection of me--I have deliberately courted it.

There must obviously be some compromise. If I ran around stark naked, with hair to my shoulders, unbathed and stinking, babbling in some strange tongue, people would be quite justified in not making the effort to communicate with me. I must conform to some extent to the standard patterns in order to make communication possible, but our society overemphasizes the degree of conformity needed. For instance, do you ever think of your mailman as a person, with needs, ideas, problems and family? To most Americans the postman is simply a mechanism which delivers their mail--they would be seriously annoyed if he expressed himself in a fashion not allowed by the "postman" role. It is this tendency to force people into molds and regard them as machines that I find so objectionable.

Please keep giving us information on the progress of the CORE demonstrations along Route 40. The local newspaper has been singularly devoid of any details of what is happening. (The out-of-state group that conducted the demonstrations left after beginning a number of local organizations, but these appear to have fallen apart immediately after this outside influence was removed. Only the Rev. Logan Kearsse's group remains fairly active, and it isn't powerful enough to conduct the large, really effective demonstrations.) New Haven has been going through some rather meaningless demonstrations lately. The NAACP and CORE were backing a law which would have forced landlords to rent to anyone, regardless of color, creed, etc. It was defeated by the city council, and several marches, demonstrations, etc. have been held to protest the defeat. My sympathies here are with the landlords. If I were renting a room or apartment, I would like to have the right to refuse to rent it to anyone whom I felt would be sloppy, destructive, noisy, or otherwise a poor tenant. But under this law, if the person were a Negro, he could bring legal action against me, forcing me to prove that I had turned him down for reasons other than his race. I don't see that the law would really do any good--those who wanted to rent only to whites would do so, finding some other excuse for turning down each Negro renter. Those who were merely trying to keep up the standards of their building would be subject to harassment and legal action everytime some Negro felt slighted.

Don't misunderstand me. The problem is real. White Yale students are able to find a room or apartment with two or three tries. Negro students often have to try dozens or even literally hundreds of places before they can find a room--unless, of course, they are willing to live in the slum district where Negroes "are supposed to live, among their own kind." But I don't think that laws will ever solve this sort of problem. The harder you push the segregationists with laws and restrictions, the more vicious they become in finding ways to express their hatred within the laws.

But then, I feel the same way about most of our current problems. They can at best be temporarily solved or postponed by changing the laws. But trying to solve the problems in these ways is like standing on a crumbling dike, throwing shovelfuls of dirt into each crack as it opens, and be-

ing so busy with each little crack that you never realize the inevitably approaching collapse of the whole dike. Thus, instead of picketing the White House to oppose nuclear testing, or Freedom Riding into Birmingham, I am trying to concentrate my thinking and living upon the basic problem of how to allow a group of human beings to live together peacefully. The fact that people have been trying to solve the problem for all of recorded history makes it no less vital to find a solution. If humans are really by nature greedy, rapacious and vicious, then sooner or later we're going to blow each other up. But if there is a way to make humans good, peaceful and generous, then we might be able to solve our problems eventually. It seems to me that the place to begin looking for such a solution is in the teachings of men like Christ, Buddha and Confucius. So, I fear that you will find me wasting my time on the selfish problems of philosophical insight, and leaving the vital problems of our times to solve themselves or muddle along. But I would like nothing better than to be proved wrong and see someone come up with a valid governmental solution to the arms race or to segregation. I'll believe it when I see it, however.

The Larry McCombs on page 50 of Kipple #23 was indeed me, and I said there that the dinosaurs died out in the interval between the Mesozoic and Cenozoic eras. This means (to me, at least) that there are dinosaur remains in the uppermost Cretaceous sediments and none in the lowermost Paleocene. So what are we arguing about? (This argument is a good example of either my personal lack of perceptivity or the limitations of the English language. We argued for four issues without disagreeing on anything!)

I was interested to see my old geobiology professor, Harrison Brown, appearing in the pages of Kipple. I think that the course I took from him and Heinz Lowenstam was one of the most interesting I have experienced in five years of college. Though officially titled "geobiology," it could well have been called "The History of Carbon in the Universe," for we began with Brown's theories on the origins of the universe and solar system, and went all the way through Lowenstam's paleoecology to finish up again with Brown talking about problems of disarmament, food and population explosion.

Incidentally, I saw a report from some committee of scientists opposing the shelter program the other day (unfortunately I neglected to note down the name) which made a logical-sounding statement. They said that the Kennedy Administration's fallout-shelter program would be sound if the Russians made a missile attack aimed exclusively at the missile and aircraft bases of this country. In such a case, only about 10% of the population of the country would be killed if we had a good shelter program, as compared to perhaps 20 to 40 percent without shelters. But in the much more likely case of an attack aimed both at military bases and population centers, the shelter program could at best make a difference of only one or two percent in the estimated 50% casualty rate. (Perhaps percentage-wise the gain is not significant, but it ought to be remembered that 2% of the population is 3,700,000 people. Stated in those terms, the margin gained by a shelter program appears to be a bit more worth considering, doesn't it?)

On page 22 of Kipple #24 you attribute the "...from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs" quote to Karl Marx. But it can be traced back farther than that! I quote from the fourth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles (J.B. Phillips' translation): "Among the large number who had become believers there was com-

plete agreement of heart and soul. Not one of them claimed any of his possessions as his own but everything was common property to all...a wonderful spirit of generosity pervaded the whole fellowship. Indeed, there was not a single person in need among them, for those who owned land or property would sell it and bring the proceeds of the sales and place it at the apostles' feet. They distributed to each one according to his need."

If your ideal government is going to serve as "distributor of goods and services," how will you manage to keep it in the position of servant rather than master? (If I answer that question, do I get \$64,000? In my little dream world, it works out very well, but I wouldn't care to face the possibility in actually setting up a society. Here again is a limiting factor in the size of this perfect society: in a small society, the president, mayor, or whatever, plus any other person to whom a certain degree of power is delegated, knows that he or she can be removed whenever a majority of people become disgusted enough to act. He or she is then quite likely to give a bit more thought to any action, in terms of "Is this what the people want?" When the society becomes larger, police forces and armies are created, which fall under the control of the governing officials. As long as these groups remain on the side of the government, it can get away with practically anything.) I'm afraid I must agree with you that I can see no solution for more than a very few people. Large groups involve the necessary establishment of authority and the loss of freedom.

In reply to Walter Breen (page 33): Yes, Walt, it would be nice if I had time to encourage my students to actually read Lysenko and Lamarck and think for themselves. But, working within the limits of a schedule, I will probably only have time to mention them briefly, and few students will follow up such a brief mention by reading the original works involved. At your recommendation, I've been reading the works of A.S. Neill ("The Free Child," "The Problem Family," "Summerhill," etc.) and wishing that I would have the freedom to teach as he does. Neill refuses to segregate learning into separate courses or subjects, and does not restrict his students to any schedule. They are free to attend classes or not, or to pursue any line of inquiry that interests them. Likewise, teachers are free to ramble on about any subjects which arise and seem interesting. In such a setting, it might be possible for a conscientious teacher to avoid censorship.

Dave Locke: I didn't exactly contradict myself. I merely said that not much is known about the effects of radiation, but that it appears to be cumulative. I quote from an article in the May 1, 1962, New Haven Register, by Alton Blakeslee, AP Science Writer: "The fallout issue cannot be neatly resolved like a mathematical equation to everyone's satisfaction. :: For scientists aren't positive yet whether the radiation from fallout, admittedly small, really harms human heredity and health, or how little radiation it takes to do so...at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory...Dr. William L. Russell and associates have analyzed one million mice since 1950 for clues or principles concerning the effects low-level chronic radiation might have on human heredity...Human volunteers can't be used. Just one impracticality is that such experiments would take several 20-year generations or longer to detect any effects. Even then there could be doubts whether the effects truly came from fallout amounts of radiation, or from other causes."

So, I will state once again, and hope I make myself clear this time, that scientists do not know whether or not radiation is cumula-

tive, but they have considerable evidence which indicates that it might very well be. Several leading scientists are of the opinion that it is. So why take chances?

I must disagree strongly with Harry Warner. I don't believe that you could teach much of anything about religion in three or four hours to high school students. Why, it would take that much time just to begin to get them to understand that there are other religions which are not merely pagan ignorance. In order to help a modern American begin to understand the basic assumptions of Buddhism or Hinduism would take many hours of careful teaching and discussion, I'm sure.

As for social problems of advanced students placed with older children, there is a distinct difference between the social situation today and that in the one-room school you mention of the past. In those days, kids weren't put under such a steady pressure from Hollywood and Madison Avenue to conform to a social ideal. What about the pre-adolescent girl who has been advanced two or three years in her classes? Her female classmates are all developing busts and beginning to attract the boys. She is constantly told in magazines and movies that there is something wrong with her if the boys don't ask her out--she must have pimples, b.o., or something disastrous like that. In the old one-room school, children were expected to act their age, and people survived without too many psychoses. But in our day of conformity, the advanced student is forced to compete and bound to fail, for he is with his equals only in terms of intelligence, not in terms of emotional maturity, physical development or social interests.

SETH JOHNSON
339 STILES ST.
VAUX HALL, N.J.

I will once again enclose the same leaflet I enclosed the last time, as my comment on Harrison Brown and James Real's article on nuclear warfare. I will ask you to closely scan the little map of the Eastern seaboard and the range of the 100 megaton bomb. (According to the map, the fire-storm area of a 100 megaton device exploded over New York city would extend in a circle encompassing Camden, N.J., Bethlehem, Pa., Beacon, N.Y., and Danbury, Conn. This seems a bit large to me, but I'll let that pass for the moment. Two other facts are of more importance: first, neither side can currently deliver a 100 megaton device, and it isn't even certain that either side has been able to construct such a bomb; more important, fire-storms are not the inevitable result of a nuclear explosion. That is, sometimes the explosion creates a fire-storm, sometimes it does not. Without the accompanying fire-storm, your (hypothetical, undeliverable) superbomb is not nearly so fierce: Asbury Park escapes the blast, so does Patterson and part of Newark, on the little map you enclosed. So I would have to say that under the proper conditions, with a great deal of luck on the part of the aggressor, six 100 megaton bombs--if they exist and could be delivered--would more or less wipe out the coastal area from Boston to Washington DC. But there are a lot of "ifs" in that situation.)

Larry Williams and his discussion of schools reminds me of another discussion on this very subject in which I'm taking part. Several companies have developed machines which not only teach the student but permit each individual to progress at his own speed without interfering with the others. The system is a problem with a dozen alternative answers flashed on the screen, mounted on his desk. There are buttons corresponding to the alternative answers. If the pupil presses the correct button, then the next problem flashes on the screen. He cannot progress from one problem until he has

mastered it. This, together with motion picture lectures and instruction, would leave the teacher totally free to give individual attention to those who need it. And the pupils would progress just as fast as their mental capacity permitted.

Although there are cases such as Ted White, shooting up from IQ 115 to 140, it is not too common. He no doubt had the same innate capacity at first, even though not developed. The idea is to feed as much information and knowledge to the pupil as he is able to absorb. Thus, a bright high school pupil might get well into college work in some subjects while not progressing beyond his or her classmates in others. Certainly it would turn out more and better scholars with a minimum of teachers (which are in short supply right now, and will be until the boom in babies at the end of WWII has passed on through college).

It seems to be that sex could be taught scientifically in biology classes and classes in ethics or civics without the use of dirty. (The problem isn't "dirty words," but rather quite proper words which the students think of as dirty, and begin snickering and giggling. This sort of course would need a very serious, unsmiling teacher in order to convey some of that seriousness to the students. A smiling, friendly teacher could probably not teach such a course.) The average teenager is aware of new glands shooting their fiery fluids and impulses through his veins, and is just naturally curious as to what it's all about, and why. Parental teaching is not practical for a number of reasons, one of which, as you said, is the profound ignorance of the subject by the parents themselves.

Larry McCombs writes a fascinating letter, but the one thing he forgets is that the teachers are most vulnerable to HUAC and John Birch Society tactics. Their jobs depend on the caprice of school boards and even a rumor that they are not right of center is often enough to get them off the teaching staff for good, and possibly blacklisted at the other schools as well. (Teachers are in an uncomfortable position not only politically, but in nearly any other field. If I were an artist, I think I would paint a teacher symbolically walking a thin tight-rope over a pit of hungry lions. The task of the teacher is to attempt to instill knowledge to the student while simultaneously satisfying parents who have formed illogical and dogmatic attitudes and opinions on nearly every subject. Of course, if the teacher were responsible only to the majority of parents, the situation might not be as bad--not all parents are fuzzy-thinking, ardently religious censors. But in a situation where only a handful of parents can bring pressure to bear on the school board, the lot of the teacher is hardly tolerable. The satisfied parents remain quiet; only the dissatisfied ones verbalize their feelings.)

TOM ARMISTEAD
QUARTERS 3202
CARSWELL AFB
FORT WORTH, TEXAS

I am particularly susceptible to censorship as you note it, as I am in the 14-year-old age group which is usually classified with the 12-13 year olds as the group which one must protect from so-called 'lewd' books. My first experience with sex in a book, besides the 'lesser' love scenes such as kissing and minor petting, was at the age of 12 or thereabouts, when I read Fredric Brown's "Martians Go Home". There is one scene in which the hero and heroine are in bed. He wakes up and leans across and kisses her nipple. Well and good; they were married, and she was asleep. But that has never left me. Later experience with "1934" with its rather sexy fade-outs and a few other books has convinced me that sex as it is now in books

is not bad, but gives the young reader an idea of what is going on. I am not advocating the deliberate inclusion of sex, nor the stacking of sexy books in the children's shelves. I'm just saying that a 12 year old (and older) person should be able to roam at will through the library, picking out all but the most descriptive books (I mean literal pornography) and reading them. It did not warp my mind more than the average person's mind is warped, I suppose, and it gave me an introduction into the incidental sex material in later books. I now have a rather liberal set of standards about nudity (I don't think it would be bad if everyone did it, but it is not a philosophy to me, so I neither live nor plan to live in a nudist camp), race relations (I don't think it is bad for members of opposite colors to marry as long as the children are not hurt by this union), and other things. While all of this cannot, of course, be attributed to the reading of one slightly sexy passage in a Fredric Brown stf book, it can hardly be denied that it did have some effect on my present attitudes toward sex. Of course, not everyone would react this way, I know, but I cannot see censoring any but the youngest reader, and him only because he does not have a large enough wealth of knowledge of the differences between men and women to be able to adequately judge the merits of one experience or another. Of course, you could say that there are some adults who cannot judge the value of one experience, sexual or otherwise, over another. This may be, but after a person reaches the age of, say, 13, you must venture to say that he has at least the inkling that a man makes a woman have a child. That was all I knew at 11 or 12. That was all I needed to know to appreciate the sex in those books.

This can also be applied to political education in schools. My views on many things seem liberal, yet I am usually conservative when I think of politics. My head is foggy when I try to understand exactly what the Democrats or Republicans believe, and also the exact nature of Communism or Socialism. It is all very well to say "Communism is bad," but what about the kid who doesn't know why it is bad? I know that many schools are beginning the teaching of courses on Communism, and I think this is for the best. But there are many students who will leave school with just the idea that "Well, I think Communism is BAD" without knowing why. Thus, many of today's students are turning to Communism, not fully realizing its nature. Many people also confuse Communism with liberalism. I know I did. But then I read the book "Masters of Deceit," by J. Edgar Hoover. He said, "Communism is almost the exact opposite of liberalism as it is neither free nor has liberality for the individual." There was a fight recently as the Dallas schools put in a course about Communism in the 11th or 12th grade. This is good, but what of the student who does not complete the 12th grade? It seems to me that the younger student is the one who needs the course most, as he is in the process of forming his political ideas.

Pete Graham, in his article in #23, touched on many interesting points. I am sure you all must know that the battle for integration and against segregation (they are really not the same thing) must be won by small moves instead of one or two or three big ones. ((In which way are "for integration" and "against segregation" different?)) Only by slowly and surely convincing the white segregationist that the Negro is not going to Rape and Pillage Unmercifully when given the right to eat at a lunch counter with a white person is this movement going to go anywhere. All of these segregationists aren't in the South, either; the Northerner may not scream at having to ride a bus with a colored person, but have you ever seen a white man offer a colored woman his seat?

Not one hell of a lot of times! And often surface tension is better than deep emotionalism covered by sweetness and light. Many Northerners look down on the South, when actually they are just as biased and prejudiced and would react in the same way when faced with the same outside stimuli.

Many fights are won by the passive resistance method. Surely, it takes more courage to sit and let someone hit and beat you and make no defense, or to be jailed on obviously trumped-up charges, than to fight back. And surely to every thinking person the first way is best. Fighting accomplishes little, especially when you are fighting with fists: the only fighting that will win the intellectual truly to a side is the fighting that makes sense and does not "upset the checker-board," so to speak. If the Negro was seen fighting, every newspaper that was even slightly against integration would print NEGRO HITS WHITE IN SIT-IN DEMONSTRATION. None would print WHITE PROVOKES NEGRO TO RETALIATION IN SIT-IN DEMONSTRATION, and not just because the latter is longer, either. A white supremacist reading of a Negro being beaten might say, "Well, he got his," but at least he couldn't say, "The dogs, beating innocent white men!"

MIKE DECKINGER
31 CARR PLACE
FORDS, NEW JERSEY

The various comments you have scattered through this issue on the Baltimore News-Post make me feel disappointed that the New Jersey and New York papers apparently are not coming close to the high degree of misinformation that the News-Post disseminates (sort of an artificial dissemination, wouldn't you say?). As it stands now, my main source for the news is the radio, with papers coming in a close second. The late hour television broadcasts, usually ten or fifteen minutes in length, are almost totally worthless, since they provide little more than a re-hash of what has happened during the day, rather than what is happening or what may happen. Nothing is more detestable than old news being touted as first-hand information. (Television has the potentiality, I think, to be the ultimate news medium, and occasionally this potentiality is realized. Radio, with hourly news broadcasts on almost every station, is effective only insofar as local events are concerned: the national news is the same, every hour, endlessly repeated. Television is capable of on-the-spot coverage on a national level. Do you think radio did as good a job of covering the space shots as television (particularly NBC)? As for the newspapers being able to print "what is happening, or what is going to happen," I hope you realize that most morning newspapers go to press at approximately midnight, while the evening (subscribers') edition is printed at noon. My own conception of reliable news media includes only two sources, everything else being read or watched for amusement: The Morning Sun (don't wince, Ted White) and the Huntley-Brinkley Report, on NBC at 6:45 PM.)

Apparently Larry Williams is associated with a high school of extreme immaturity, if sex there is still considered a dirty word. You'll find some who will go snigger in a corner immediately when the subject is brought up, and others who will show a genuine and mature interest in learning more about it, totally devoid of any "dirty" inclinations, but rather an expression of honest curiosity. Granted, sex education should be left to the parents--the competent ones, that is--; all types of social education should. But what of the numerous cases where the parents are actually ashamed to discuss this matter intelligently with their son or daughter, and as a result the child is forced to enrich his education with a group of others of his own age bracket, where many of the mis-

conceptions and fallacies are bred? I feel an adequate sex education course for high school students is extremely beneficial, to either augment the parents' teaching, or to be a substitute for it. This is the age when sex is little more than a mystery, explored to some degree, but not with proper understanding and insight. Any school that deliberately does not carry this sort of course is just passing the buck and shirking one of the school's responsibilities towards the child.

The first paragraph of Dave Locke's letter is as beautiful an example of calculated illogicality as I've seen in a long time. His like for Gibson stems mainly from hearsay and unproven theory, and I imagine by this very foundation, he could easily dislike someone like Chief Justice Warren (because Robert Welch doesn't like him, and there's been a lot of offhand whispering against him among other John Birchers as well). Locke would be excellent writing propaganda for HUAC.

Kris Carey's views are very similar to mine and I applaud his individuality in not crossing paths with the junior religious groups. I've been in a similar position many times, from my family, friends, and even total strangers who seem convinced that I'm to burn in hades unless I offer my soul to Jesus, state my faith in good, and get back on the straight and narrow. Like Carey, I resent religion being tossed in my face, and having its theoretical consequences flounced at me if I don't sign up. The very basis of religion (or so it seems) is one's own personal beliefs; not another's, imposed on the individual. If a person feels he would like to join a church and dedicate himself to God, he is free to do so; it is his right. But when another person comes around and says you must join and save yourself, then I will gripe. Then religion is not a personal belief, but an imposed desire.

Thanks Also To: Don Fitch, Greg Benford, Gary Deindorfer, Rev. C.M. Moorhead, Lenny Kaye, Marion Bradley, Mark Owings, and Rosemary Hickey.

FROM
Ted Pauls
1448 Meridene Drive
Baltimore 12, Maryland



SEND TO:

PRINTED MATTER ONLY
RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED
MAY BE OPENED FOR INSPECTION

Len J. Moffatt
10202 Belcher
Downy, California

HELP STAMP OUT MENTAL HEALTH!!