

QUOTES AND NOTES by Ted Pauls.....	1
A SONG OF SIXPENCE by the Readers.....	8
THE TOP SHELF: ADDITIONS TO A FAN'S LIBRARY by Ted Pauls.....	26

Kipple, published and edited monthly by Ted Pauls, 1448 Meridene Dr., Baltimore 12, Maryland, is available for letters of comment, trades, contributions, or 15¢ per issue, 2/25¢. This issue is dedicated to Julie Harris who won, I am extremely happy to note, an Emmy award for her superlative performance in the title role of "Victoria Regina". This is a WOKLpress publication.

quotes and

notes

BY TED PAULS

The previous installment of this column was unusual not only for its change in format, but for an exclusion in content: it was the first installment in many months which failed to mention, in some context, the newspapers of this fair city. It gladdened my tired old heart to note that nothing had appeared in any of our major newspapers for nearly a month which was fuggheaded enough to deserve a chunk of this column's valuable space. After this momentary lull, however, the press of this city, particularly the News-Post, struck back with a vengeance. The first in a series of noteworthy articles appeared in a sometimes-column entitled "Washington Parade," and is titled "'Confrontation' Use Threatens U.S. Security". The opening paragraphs are of especial interest:

"Something is going on which may pull the rug out from under the Internal Security Act aimed at protecting the nation from the Moscow-directed operations of the Communist Party.

"The 'something' also virtually sabotages the counter-espionage system.

"It stems from the Atomic Energy Commission becoming the first government agency to establish the principle that its employees and job applicants have the right to confront accusers in security cases.

"The matter of confrontation of witnesses has been an issue recently in the granting



of passports by the State Department.

"Prior to June 16, 1958, the secretary of state automatically denied a passport where an applicant indicated he was a member of the Communist party or where he refused to answer a question as to whether he was.

"However, interpreting subsequent Supreme Court decisions, the State Department, while ordering that a passport could be denied on the grounds of Communist party membership, provided that the applicant must be afforded a hearing if requested.

"The State Department further took the stance that the applicant for a passport must be informed of the charges against him and must be advised of the source of evidence and have the opportunity to confront and cross-examine those who made allegations."

While I admire both the State Department and the AEC for their stand on this matter, I'm afraid I can neither admire nor respect David Sentner, the writer of this article, or any like-thinking persons. The right to be informed of evidence against you, and the right to confront accusers, are as old as the democratic system in this country. When and if these rights actually threaten the security of this nation, then I think it is time to quietly pack our collective bags and sneak away. The basic human rights guaranteed by our Constitution and related documents could only become a threat to a government which has drifted radically from the democratic principles: when the freedom of the people threatens the government, it is time for the people to install a new government. Our forefathers recognized this situation well, as this excerpt from the Declaration of Independence shows: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,--That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundations on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness."

+  
+

+  
+

+  
+

Three days in bed and several bottles of nerve medicine helped me to recover from the attack of Creeping Revolutionism brought on by that article, but a few days later I suffered a relapse. The culprit was again the News-Post, although in this instance it was not editorializing on the part of columnists, but honest reporting. (The extent of my subsequent recovery from a state of shock is marked well by that admission...) Dr. R. Walter Graham, City Comptroller of Baltimore, has expressed his desire for a state law permitting sterilization of women bearing illegitimate children. It is a not-atypical product of an administration which has striven for several years to make Baltimore the bleeding stock of the country. (The "Three G's" administration--Mayor



J. Harold Grady, Comptroller Graham, and Council President Phillip Goodman--ran on a platform of replacing the allegedly "corrupt" D'Alesandro administration, and replace it they have: with ineptness, incompetency, and inexcusable intra-administration nit-picking.) Said Dr. Graham:

"I sincerely believe we need a state-wide law to combat chronic offenders in this area. How much further can we go at the public expense?

"We send offenders to jail, which is merely an unfair expense to the taxpayer.

"If it can be absolutely and unquestionably established that a woman has had three illegitimate children we would draw the line there under my plan. Any more children would mean sterilization."

It is interesting to note that Dr. Graham has never supported the introduction and distribution of contraceptive devices into the area, yet he goes beyond this to compulsory sterilization! More interesting, perhaps, is the exclusive concern with women. From what little I remember of biology, the male organism was ever so slightly involved in the process of conception. Of course, Dr. Graham must know this, but it seems to be typical of the male vanity to regard illegitimate offspring as a strictly female responsibility. (Most men, in fact, seem startlingly oblivious to their responsibility and to the plight of the bastard children. Ray Nelson once mentioned during the course of an article on the disadvantages of beatnik life that the children--usually illegitimate--experienced considerable emotional disturbances as a result of promiscuous mothers who lived with six or seven different men during the course of their childhood. Nelson's concern was touching, but unfortunately hollow, for in the very next sentence he mentioned noticing this problem with the child of a girl he "lived with for a short time." This would have been quite amusing, had it not disgusted me.)

Fortunately, I need not worry about such a law being passed: my staunch enemy on the matter of contraceptive devices, the Catholic Church, here becomes my ally. (Admittedly, we are strange bed-fellows...) But I find it fantastic that the obvious measures of inexpensive, easy-to-get contraceptives could be overlooked while this extreme "solution" is heralded as the answer to the problem. The former would solve the problem as easily, and certainly more humanely.

+ + +  
+ + +

Pete Graham wonders why I always write serious material. If he asked me to my face why I didn't write any humorous material, I could tell him--as soon as I'd calmed down sufficiently. I'd tell him that there was really no point in writing any material that wasn't of a strictly serious nature, since everything I write is assumed to be serious by the readers. I'd even tell him that I have been writing humorous material for at least the last ten issues of Kipple, but no one has noticed. At least once in every article in this column, I say something in a facetious manner--and it is invariably commented on by twenty or thirty readers as a serious statement. My readers are so determined to keep me in the mold of Ted Pauls, Stodgy Fogey, that most of them believed the



line in Kipple #16 to the effect that I owned an orange-red satin sportcoat with purple velvet lapels. When I mentioned in Kipple #17 that I was an admirer of classical music and that I could prove it because "one of the most listened-to records in my collection is a recording of the entire New York Philharmonic Orchestra (with Leonard Bernstein) tuning their instruments," three readers asked where I had acquired such a record.

Why don't I write humor, fergawdsake?

A few weeks ago Don Dohler dropped by to give me the latest issue of Wild, and mentioned in passing that Kipple #24 had arrived on a Friday. Since it wasn't mailed until a Wednesday, I was quite thrilled with this evident proof that at long last the Post Office had decided to take its task seriously. But Don shattered my momentary elation.

"Why are you against this marriage of Don Franson and Maggie Curtis?" he asked.

I opened my mouth two or three times before any words would come out, then I chuckled, realizing that Don probably didn't know any of the parties involved. "The announcement was an error," I explained. "Breen typed the wrong name in that paragraph. Don Thompson is really going to marry Maggie Curtis, not Don Franson. I was being facetious."

Don assimilated this information which I thought was sufficient to allay his confusion, but I evidently overestimated my powers of explanation. "But why are you against this marriage between Don Thompson and Maggie Curtis?" he asked.

I hastily grabbed my bottle of nerve medicine and downed three potent swallows. "No...no. You don't understand. I'm not against that marriage; it's just that I was being facetious about an error Walter had made. Don Franson's about three times the age of Maggie Curtis, so I was just joking. You know, funny. Haha..."

Don finally understood, and we talked about other matters until he left. But one thing bothers me: three readers patiently explained to me in their letters that Don Franson is not really marrying Maggie Curtis and that it was an error.

Humor! Bah, humbug!

+ + +  
+ + +

All that we really needed here in Baltimore to make our lives complete was a religious controversy of some sort in one of the daily newspapers, and thanks to a man named Robert Lohr, we now have one. Mr. Lohr wrote a letter to the Baltimore News-Post rebutting a quack of some sort who issued dire warnings against trespassing into God's kingdom with our missiles and satellites. This argument had more than passing personal appeal to me, since it is one I have frequently encountered from various relatives. (These are the same people who claim that Scott Carpenter's recent successful flight was directly responsible for the series of thunder-showers which have recently drenched Baltimore...) Mr. Lohr countered with abnormal logic and patience, then went on to say that he



would rather place his faith in our science and technology than in an invisible, intangible, improbable god. The replies to his comments have been hilarious:

"Mr. Lohr stated in his letter that 'Good is science,' not religion. Also he states that recent discoveries enlighten the theory of evolution. In answer to this latter statement, I have always wanted to ask an evolutionist why monkeys keep begetting monkeys, snails begetting snails, and so on. In all the years that man has been keeping records he should have a lot of case histories on evolution by now."

As Mr. Lohr discovered, it is impossible to argue with a person of this sort. It is useless to explain that the paltry few thousand years man has been keeping records is hardly a particle of sand through the neck of the hourglass compared to the scale on which evolutionary processes operate. They will dismiss this as a weak excuse, if they believe it at all. (Many of these people believe that the earth itself is only a few thousand years old, having been created, with all its varied life-forms, in six days, for the express enjoyment of Homo sapien.) It is less useful still to say that mutation is an integral part of evolution and to point out that we have not only observed, but caused, mutation--for they will say that this is artificial (which it is) and therefore doesn't count. It is useless to chew on the age of your carpet, too, but arguments with such religionists usually end up in this fashion.

"I can't sit idly by and let Robert Lohr speak of God as he did in your paper. Evidently, this man doesn't read or believe God's word; for God speaks of earth as the habitation of man. There is no mention of Mars or any other planet where man exists! I challenge Robert Lohr to read the 33rd Psalm."

The faith of this writer is indeed touching, that she would expect the reading of a few pages from the bible to completely change the attitudes and opinions of anyone. I suppose someone's opinions might change after reading Darwin or Huxley, but I cannot conceive of any attitudes or opinions changing by reading a book which not only fails to present logical arguments to support wild statements, but is even self-contradictory in spots. However, summoning all my meager courage, I decided to accept the challenge. I must admit to some qualms at the beginning. "Good grief," I thought to myself, "d'you suppose I'll be a different person as a result of this reading?" I am happy to report, however, that I still feel much the same way--more strongly...

"Khrushchev vows 'your grandchildren will live under Communism.' If this nation would fall on its knees and pray, Khrushchev would be a mighty disappointed man. If God be for us who can be against us?"

"Daily prayer meetings inspired the salvation or deliverance of our nation in World War II. How can one man forget so soon?"

This notion that God will mysteriously intercede at the very moment of our destruction and miraculously Beat The Commies is an odd one. He



never has in the past. Do you think if there had been a God that he would allowed eight million civilians to be brutally murdered by the Nazis during World War II? This answer to this, from a religionist, is simply this: "God works in strange and mysterious ways, my son..." You cannot argue with people who have a ready (if not sensible) answer to every objection and who are completely impervious to any form of logic or rational argument. You may as well attempt to convince Barry Goldwater by logical argument that the ACLU is a worthwhile organization...

+  
+

+  
+

+  
+

The following is a passage from "An Essay on Morals," by Philip Wylie, which I have marked for reprinting in this column. Since I first intended to use the paragraph, late in 1961, the religious discussion in these pages has ceased. However, the passage is still worth quoting, especially since it so closely mirrors my own opinion:

"It will be said that, for a man so intent on morals, I have been hard on the church. I would be harder; I would do away with it. This institution, this school for hypocrites and university of ignorance, has resisted attacks from myriad sane and decent quarters since the time it was divinely guided by a witchman with a drum and until the reign of the current Pope. Men of enormous good will, and hope, too--even men within the church, like Emerson--have shaken every timber of its moribund architecture. Yet it does not not fall. It has a sinister viability. The church is like the Hydra that guards Hell's Gate: whenever a successful cut is made at it, a head falls, whereupon two replace it. Let a dissenter penetrate some ignominious churchly superstition and so deprive the parent body of members and behold, one--two--ten denominations are founded on the objection."

+  
+

+  
+

+  
+

Fandom's stormy petrel, Joe Gibson, is up to his old tricks again, it seems. It is no secret, of course, that Joe dislikes fans and fanzines which discuss politics more than he (Joe) thinks necessary. This falls within the realm of personal opinion, to which Joe is entitled; unfortunately, he seems overly fond of making unsubstantiated statements casting suspicion on the mental stability of these persons and their right to bear the proud title, Fan. In G2 #6, for example, Joe comments that his previous remark, "These fake-fans get very emotional about their Great Discussions, too; neuroses provide a considerable emotional drive to their writing and publishing activities," referred to "the individuals in fanac who apparently can't discuss anything else but politics." Typically, Joe has no wish to identify these neurotic individuals.

While not a leading fan of this early-sixties era, I am certainly one of its most active, and I think this places me in a position to know what is going on within our little microcosm. There are quite a few fans discussing politics currently, but if there is anyone "who appar-



ently can't discuss anything else," I certainly don't know who it might be. Having been accused of that particular crime on occasion in my own right, I know full well how little discussion of politics can be construed as "nothing but politics" by someone who sets out with that in mind. Kipple has featured a major chunk of the political discussion in fandom over the last few years, but it has also featured subjects ranging from amoebae reproduction to comic books to folk-singing. Many others have been accused of such single-mindedness: Walt Breen, Dick Bergeron, Pete Graham, etc. But it simply isn't true. There isn't anyone in fandom who discusses politics to the exclusion of all other subjects.

Then Joe Gibson's odd and rather intriguing attitudes take over: having decided that he dislikes these hypothetical fellows who discuss naught but politics, Joe decides that they do not deserve the appellation "fan". In G2 #8, Betty Kujawa, sweet Tory that she is, comments: "Y'know, speaking of how we fen supposedly believe in the brotherhood of man (a moot point, Joe--do these far out fannish Liberals REALLY look upon me as their brother?? Or wouldn't many of them like to see me and other Conservatives mercifully eradicated forthwith?)" Gibson interjects: "Betty, why do you call these persons fans?" This comment has a slight personal interest to me, since I am fairly sure that I was one of the "far out fannish Liberals" cited by Betty. As it happens, I am more than happy to accept Betty as a brother (or, more appropriately, sister) in spite of my liberal or even radical leanings, although if she asked me to accept Richard Nixon as a brother, I would probably demur. But I dislike Joe's implication that as a result of being a liberal, I have no right to be called a fan. Why should the two be incompatible?

In spite of his earlier comment, Joe Gibson's ire is not restricted merely to those of us who discuss politics; he appears to dislike anyone who discusses anything which Joe Gibson does not consider a subject fit for "fannish" discussion. In G2 #6, he becomes more specific about the type of person he dislikes: "Lads who discuss student 'riots' and the HUAC, capitalism...and Communism (capital C, of course) as opposing ideologies, the known medicinal affects of peyote and marijuana, or maybe just the terrible, Fascistic inquisition of blue-nosed postal regulations on poor, downtrodden fellows who simply want to mention their genitals in public. The only real fault with such neurotics is that some of 'em are, or become, somewhat untrustworthy. Neurotics occasionally are trashy types. They'll cheat. Some are thieves." At this point, Joe Gibson's refusal to "name names," in spite of the fact that he advocates doing so, becomes more understandable. Mr. Gibson has no intention of risking a law suit, although he is not at all above attempting to convince others to do so. He will simply continue to make these broad statements about the "neurotics" in fandom who discuss the outlined subjects, and his readers will be allowed to draw any conclusions they care to from the insinuations. Since there are so very many people discussing such subjects in fandom today, we have a broad choice as to which of them are the untrustworthy neurotics who cheat and steal.

And of course, any person innocent of these charges is still considered a fake-fan; that's the least he can be accused of by Joe Gibson's standards.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 32



a song of sixpence

HARRY WARNER  
423 SUMMIT AVE.  
HAGERSTOWN, MD.

About that Karl Marx quotation: I wonder if he would have created it if he'd conceived communism in the 20th instead of the 19th century?

It seems to me that the sentence which you threw out for discussion is the child of a civilization in which want rather than plenty was the rule in all parts of the world, which the exception of a trifling few upper class members in scattered localities. Today the want has been almost banished from one continent in the extreme form that prevailed a century ago, it's disappearing from another, and another century should see it greatly alleviated in Asia, Africa, and South America. It might also be well to remember that Marx wrote the sentence in an age which had seen democracy spring into life in comparatively recent times and fail to keep the promise that it had once shown of solving all problems in the nations where it existed. A strangely similar situation exists today in the opposite direction: we can now look back on some decades of communist rule in certain lands, and have learned that communism doesn't work out as beautifully for the people as its theorists once believed it would. Right now, I imagine, someone is writing a sentence that will serve as the basis for yet another political panacea that will be advocated and hated just as fiercely a century from now as is the case with communism today, simply because neither democracy nor communism brought utopia.

But to me, the sentence is something as meaningless as "All men are born equal." It is useless as it stands and it is open to every type of interpretation, depending on the individual's beliefs. Today, the major problem would be that in many nations, application of the idea would result in a dreadful surplus of many items and services, which nobody really needs. I can't conceive of it operating without the most stupendous bureaucracy and impersonal authority in all recorded history. I suppose that I'd spend all my time typing except when eating my three meals and getting the five hours of sleep that are all I really need, plus listening to one symphony every three months--my hospital stay proved that I can survive with only that small supply of music.

You were so upset about the vaguenesses of "Man, the Unknown" that you forgot to give any hints in your review about its topic. A couple passages that puzzle you made fairly good sense to me. I think that he meant in the first simply that primitive man didn't know what caused babies to be conceived, with the implication that today mankind consciously chooses to perpetuate the race instead of doing it unwittingly. The last words of the second quoted sentence sound like the explanatory ones: that big



city kids may suffer from production line methods in schools in lieu of other incentives to learn things. I don't think intelligence is needed for insanity. Somewhere I read that flea circuses acquire talent by putting fleas into glass tubes. The fleas bump themselves on the head as they hop and after a while stop hopping to avoid the pain and they don't resume hopping when removed from the tube, because they are driven to the point at which they are too nutty to hop after the barrier is gone. (If the fleas don't hop after being removed from the tube, it is simply because they are not intelligent enough to realize that the barrier has been removed. Such an abnormal reaction in a flea is a conditioned reflex, just as salivating was a conditioned reflex in Pavlov's dog. Insanity has nothing to do with it.) I imagine that the facial coloring under emotion depends on the strength of the emotion. The last time I really got angry, someone who was with me got scared to death, believing that I was suffering a heart attack or stroke because my face became a livid white.

I'm somewhat skeptical about this particular Vicary study. Where were the controls that are supposed to be maintained for any scientific investigation? Did he run similar experiments in other circumstances to make certain that some entirely different cause didn't slow the eye-blinking, such as the quite high level of illumination in most supermarkets? (I should think, on the contrary, that an extremely bright lighting arrangement would cause the eyes to blink more rapidly.) I have never encountered inability of a customer to pay a bill while waiting in line at a checkout counter and I have never failed to be greeted by an acquaintance. On the General Mills matter: isn't it quite possible that the housewife prefers cake mixes to which she must add something because the fresh ingredient makes the finished product taste much better?

I wish I could share your enthusiasm for television news coverage; maybe possession of it would even persuade me to try to switch from newspaper to airwave work. But I don't think that enough news events are available to television and perceptibly more comprehensible when under the camera's eye to justify the millions that are spent on special television coverage. I didn't enjoy the telecasts more than the broadcasts of the Glenn orbital flight, and I managed to get about 90 minutes of the event in each form: Direct telecasts from the spacecraft would be something else again, of course. But there wasn't anything on the telecasts that proved that the thing was actually in progress; it could all have been an elaborate hoax for all we could see. (I wonder...?)

GARY DEINDORFER A lot of good ideas have been lost on a lot of people  
121 BOUDINOT ST. because of their being associated with unpopular peo-  
TRENTON 8, N.J. ple or groups. "From each according to his ability,  
to each according to his needs" is doubtless one of  
these. Too many people tend to ascribe to ideas the value judgements of  
the person or group associated with them. This is unfortunate for many  
reasons. For one thing, it means that these people are quite likely to  
misunderstand a rational man, since he regards as morally neutral the  
same idea they regard as having an inherent morality tending in any of  
many possible directions. This is one of the things that leads to dif-  
ficulty in communication. For another thing, it means that the sum to-  
tal of attitudes of these people is colored with biases, views, etc.,  
grounded not in rationality, but in ideas can moral associations not  
germane to the idea per se. Thus, it is hard to communicate with them,  
and it is hard for them to communicate with each other. The trouble



with most fuggheads seems to be this; they fail to be able to dissociate an idea from its moral context.

I suppose the ideal presentation of goods in a food store would be for all goods to be wrapped in paper (or canned in painted metal) of a uniform neutral grey, with nothing indicated but the type of goods and its brand name; the ideal presentation in the view of everyone, that is, except for store keepers and manufacturers. (What difference does it make to the store keeper what brand is sold, so long as it is purchased from his store?) However, as long as we have free enterprise, manufacturers will want their particular product to be presented in a way most amenable to its selling well (ideally, in their eyes, selling better than any competing brand). Since I feel motivational research to be nothing more, essentially, than one of the tools of the manufacturer towards this end, I cannot condemn it, or even approve any efforts to curtail its effectiveness. (I trust you would feel less kindly toward a government edict instructing us to buy a certain brand of detergent or deodorant...? The free choice of the individual is limited to about the same extent by both methods of persuasion.) And it should be brought out that MR does not coerce anyone to buy a particular product; at its most effective, it persuades them. (A political prisoner can be coerced into signing a "confession" of his horrible crimes against the state by torture, or he can be persuaded to do so by a gradual breakdown of his mental faculties or by hypnosis. In both cases, the end result is the same.) And even then a shopper is able to choose to the extent that the various brands of the same product have all been most likely designed to appeal to him or her on a level higher than that of the product being presented on its own merits. (You mean I have a choice between buying a cake mix which has a layout calculated to make me think of a beautiful girl with a 'come hither' look, or one whose coloring is designed to remind me of the safety and comfort of the womb? No, thank you, I think I'd prefer to choose the one which makes the superior cake...)

Too, I feel that Packard considerably exaggerated his case in "The Hidden Persuaders," deliberately choosing extreme examples to back it up. I felt the Vicary experiment to be extreme when I first read Packard's book, for example, and, reading it over now, I still feel thusly. For the past five months I have worked in a supermarket, and I have not noticed the female customers pushing their carts down the aisles in hypnoidal trances. Most of them appear eminently normal; those few who appear hypnotized are also the ones I note look that way before they enter the store, and after they leave. To sum up my view, I feel that the case against motivational research has been considerably exaggerated, probably in reaction to a lack before Packard's book of any important criticisms of the advertising field or any of its methods. I also think that much of the criticism of motivational research is a deliberate play for the many people who resent advertising. Please let it be noted that I am not defending the advertising field, or even MR, but merely saying that I think the case against MR has been muchly overstated.

Incidentally, let it be noted that the potentially most harmful area of MR, subliminal persuasion, the theory and method of which is no doubt known to most readers, seems, by the tacit agreement of practically all manufacturers and their respective agencies, not to be in use. You can rest assured that if it were being used today anywhere, to any degree, and I was made aware of the fact, my outraged screams would be audible from Trenton all the way to Baltimore, and possibly beyond. If you wonder why I



should object to subliminal persuasion so strongly, let me say that I consider it indefensible for the reason that it can be used and can act upon a party without his being aware of it, while the other areas of MR are overt to the extent that a party knows that an appeal to him is being presented, at least to the extent that he realizes that a product is before him, if not being aware of any possible subconscious reactions on his part toward it.

As things stand now, most MR is applied to a product to the extent that the product is designed to be as appealing as possible to a prospective buyer, nothing more. MR is essentially an application of psychological and sociological facts to product presentation; it is not inherently Evil or Immoral.

DAVE LOCKE  
P.O. BOX 335  
INDIAN LAKE, N.Y.

There was a time when I had but little doubt in my mind as to the honesty and fairness with which you edited your letter. There is now no doubt, because after reading issue 25 I realized that you were as full of honesty and fairness as a pair of loaded dice. What am I talking about? Mr. Pauls, I am pleased to tell you. I complained that you were refusing to print most of my comments on conformity, rock 'n' roll, and fallout shelters. You said that you did not print my LoC on the Feb. issue because there wasn't enuf room. You say that you printed most of my LoC on the March issue. Well, sir, it was the LoC on the Feb. issue that contained 95% of my comments on conformism, 60% of my comments on rock 'n' roll, and most of my comments on fallout shelters. The March letter contained, I think, nothing but ramblings and I'm surprised that you printed as much as you did. But the Feb. letter contained the bulk of my comments and opinions on the three above mentioned subjects and not one damn word of it was printed. ((F.M. Busby, Dick Schultz, Lenny Kaye, Loftus Becker, Don Thompson, and others were consigned to the end of the letter column in that issue as well; there was, as I said, simply not enough space. None of them have burst into angry tears because of this, however.)) Ted White says he has the impression that you cut the criticism you can't argue with and print only that which you can cast aspersions upon. I have heard a number of people say the same exact thing and I have also personally found this to be true. It's an advantage to your own positions to print only that which you can easily handle, and this of course is why you do so. ((It would be courteous of you to name the "number of people" who have said "the exact same thing," if you can. And please don't flatter yourself: you have written nothing which I could not handle easily, including this current outburst. Since you appear to be interested in points which are ignored, perhaps you can tell us why you chose to ignore the error or falsehood I caught you in last issue: you claimed I'd printed only one paragraph from your March letter on the three subjects under discussion, and I pointed out four such paragraphs. Why did you neither contest nor concede the point? Could it be that you ignore comments which you cannot argue with?))

Yes, I call it "unfair" when you refuse to print my side of the argument. I have "evaded" nothing--I stuck strictly to the main point of the discussion until personalities were brought into it, and, as you must have noticed, I do not evade personal attacks either. I'll meet anyone head-on in a discussion on any of these topics and I'll cling to the main points, and if anyone wants to battle personalities I'll do that too. Don't accuse me of evading anything, especially when you don't print my side of the discussions. But what's the use, even if this sees print you'll alter hell out of it.



(This letter is being printed in all its pristine, unedited glory, including such things as "LoC," "enuf," and "Feb." which I would ordinarily have removed. In view of your belligerence and lack of tact, I am sorely tempted to point out that if you meet anyone head-on, your neck will be seriously injured...)

You say that you edit little humor from your LoCs. I also mentioned 'lightness,' and you said nothing about that. When someone writes lightly on an idea or personal opinion you often will edit out the lightness and make everything deadly serious. This may not completely change the meaning, but it does at least change the emphasis. (If you look upon the editing of "enuf" and "wot" from your letters as editing lightness, then I suppose I must plead guilty. But I think of it as correcting pointlessly juvenile "cuteness," not changing emphasis.)

Kevin Langdon must not have a friend in the world. "A fugghead is a person who holds certain opinions contrary to one's own." The word "certain" may be the loophole thru (I) which he may try to avoid being stomped on, but the fact remains that a lot of people probably don't agree with all or even most of Kevin Langdon's opinions and this does not make them fuggheads. Langdon must have little tolerance if he runs around calling people who don't agree with him fuggheads. I don't agree with a lot of opinions, either, but I respect most of them and do not often call the people who believe in them names.

Pauls, I wrote you two personal letters in an attempt to get you to correspond. Despite the fact that you may have been too busy or that you had no desire to write to me, I did not receive the slightest explanation as to why you didn't write. You often do not send your fanzine to people who have sent you their zine in trade and who have asked you to put them on your ml, to people whose zines as reviewed in MZB's column, and to people whom you talk about in your editorial column. This is all petty stuff, but tho your writing may be better, your attitude has not really changed since the days you were doing Disjecta Membra. No amount of writing skill can hide your belligerent personality. (I am, as Larry McCombs and others will tell you, a lousy correspondent, and since you said nothing in your letters which deserved an answer other than one I could give in Kipple, I did not write to you. I send Kipple to everyone Marion mentions in her column, as well as to everyone I mention in Quotes & Notes. On two occasions, several people whose fanzines were reviewed did not receive copies because of last minute subscription renewals, which of course deserved priority. (I printed no extra copies of any issue before #24.) I do not send Kipple to everyone who sends a fanzine in trade; when I receive trash, I generally place it in the receptacle designed for that purpose. I do not often send a copy to someone who asks me "to put them on the ml," since, as noted in the colophon, Kipple is available for 15¢ per copy. None of these practices are at all unusual, and the majority of editors probably follow them.)

WALT BREEN  
C/O BASHLOW  
241 6th AVE.  
NEW YORK 14, N.Y.

Larry McCombs: If the Common Man is going to fall for this, as you say, "pulpit pounding, flag-waving, slogan-shouting appeal", then I strongly suspect that the only answer will be for some libertarians to get together and start something like a Fosterite cult which will inculcate more sensible notions underneath a fine facade of claptrap, carnival and carnality. I dislike the idea probably as much as you do, but there may be no other alternative, and you might



remember that it isn't the first time Heinlein has suggested something of the sort.

Seth Johnson: This notion that it was only the communists who stung capitalists into instituting social security and unemployment insurance is nonsense based on ignorance of history. I'll let Pete Graham fill in the details, but you'll find that pressure for reforms in a laissez-faire system came from many different sources, not all paying homage to Marx by any means. Political extremists can be sometimes useful, but they aren't a necessary ingredient.

Harry Warner: The people involved in trying to get religion taught in public schools are not interested in factual instruction, they are interested in trying to make converts to their own sects. It isn't a matter of morning prayer, but of exposure to propaganda; and the churchmen want any opening wedge no matter how small. As for your scoff at the problem of the gifted in classrooms with the less favored, the answer is precisely that in the old days kids progressed at their own rates; but now they are required to do the same things (long ago outgrown and boring for some, challengingly difficult for others) at the same time. And I am reasonably sure you underestimate the effects of continued boredom on a highly intelligent youngster. It can make school one day after another of agonizing frustration; nobody understanding him or his needs, nothing new being learned, no meaning to his life, no discernable benefit from continuation of the same, and all too often an interpretation of school as an outlet sadistic adults have for kids, or a way of keeping them safely penned up. The argument that the gifted "ought to get practice" in living such a grind is unnecessarily harsh and unrealistic. You might as well take it all the way and advocate rigid spartan military discipline from age five on up because most kids will eventually get into the army anyway; and advocate rigid schedules and avoidance of affectionate contact (a la J.B. Watson) as this will prepare the kids for what they'll get in adult life. But these reductions ad absurdum fail to take into account that learning doesn't proceed in that way and that kids have emotional needs which change in character and intensity as time goes on. Frustration over and above that inherent in living in an indifferent world, frustration deliberately imposed by no discernable reason by adults whose sole discernable advantage is their capacity to use force majeure, is in large measure contributory to the increase in neurosis among youngsters today.

BUCK COULSON I won't object to your "from each according to his ability,  
ROUTE 3 ty, to each according to his needs" as long as you stipu-  
WABASH, IND. late that this is merely the basis for the society. Too many people who quote that line think it's all that's necessary for an ideal society, and in that context I disapprove. That is, each should work according to his ability and each should receive basic needs. But, those who have more ability than their neighbors--ability in any function which is valued by the community--should receive extra benefits according to their wants. (As soon as you begin to do that, though, you create classes and castes, which have been the cause of much of the bigotry and prejudice in our own society.) Filling the basic needs of everybody is fine, but luxuries should go to those who can earn them by performing especially valued service.

Which services are valued will depend on the particular community being served. The amount of luxuries should be varied according to the value of the service--there's no point in making anyone revoltingly rich, but I object



to the idea that everyone should get the same treatment regardless of the value of the work he performs. In my society, an inventor or a college professor would live in somewhat more luxury than a janitor or a ditch-digger, even if all of them fulfilled their capabilities equally well.

Of course, in practice I defy you to find a system which will assure that everyone is working to the best of his ability and that what he receives is actually filling his needs instead of his wants, which is why I'm opposed to most socialism in practice. But as an ideal it's fine. (All that is necessary is for every member of the society to be completely honest. Of course, Diogenes was unable to find even one honest man, so I don't expect to find an entire society of honest individuals.)

I object to this "all women are impulse buyers" line. You can say "most women," or you can give a percentage, and I won't object (even if it's the wrong percentage I probably won't try to check up), but when you go making statements about "all" women, you're stating an obvious falsehood. Even biologically there are damned few statements that would apply to all women, without exception; when you get into mental traits, the number of exceptions to any statement goes up sharply. (Is "79.013% of all women are impulse buyers" acceptable?)

I'm afraid I can't get very worked up over the plight of anyone who goes into a light trance in a supermarket; if they're that fatheaded, they shouldn't be running around loose in the first place.

When Tom Armistead has more experience with politics, he'll find out that everybody gets foggy when they try to understand what the Democrats or Republicans believe.

MARK OWINGS  
319 E. NORTH AVE.  
BALTIMORE 2, MD. After reading your review of "Man, the Unknown," I begin to wonder about you: Do you search through the newsstands for the most idiotic volumes you can find or what? I can see most anyone starting a book like that, but who, outside of you, would ever think of finishing it? (When I first discovered that I didn't care for Carrel's book, I decided to review it in Kipple. Obviously, I had to complete it in order to review it.)

Dave Locke (or anyone else, for that matter) might well dislike Eisenhower for appointing Warren. I myself don't know of any whispering campaign against the Chief Justice, but I've heard it stated, quoted, and shouted that he has had about as much experience in court as Lenny Kaye. Prior to becoming Chief Justice, he was a professional politician... (But the only proper criticism of Mr. Warren would be based on his record since assuming the position, and on that basis I have heard no valid complaints.)

LOFTUS BECKER  
STRAUS A 12, HARVARD  
CAMBRIDGE 38, MASS. It seems that all the communistic ideal societies postulate a fixed and for the modern world not very high productivity; that is, nobody really thinks there will be much of a surplus. This isn't terribly illogical; a society based strictly on the "from each" etc. philosophy will not, I propose, have much of a surplus. Men being what they are, some sort of incentive is necessary to make them work; and if there is nothing to be gained from more work, few men will keep laboring. You might notice here that even the most communistic societies in the world (mostly primitive ones) provide incentive of a sort for extra work. Man is at heart a selfish animal, not a philanthropic



one.

In other words, I don't think a society purely of the kind you postulate has much chance of working well; i.e., the best it could hope for would be a sort of continued mediocrity. The only real way I can see of getting over the twin problems of providing some sort of incentive for work (and, for that matter, for ability, luck, etc.) and at the same time assuring everyone of a living is a sort of benevolent capitalism. In times of scarcity, clearly, the incentive system has to be to a certain extent relied upon: there is no point in making sure that everyone starves equally quickly: far better that some survive than that all die. But when there is a sufficiency of goods, it is one of the first responsibilities of a government to assure that all its citizens get a decent living. There are probably limitations to this--I for one think that just as there should be no question in a society as affluent as ours as to whether someone without food should be given some, I am equally convinced that someone receiving public aid should (if able, of course) be willing to work for the government in whatever capacity the government needs him. The question of course arises, what do you do with the lazy man who refuses to work? Here there is no really simple answer; probably the best thing to do would be to offer the people concerned the choice between not receiving the free food and being treated as mentally ill, with a consequent attempt at a cure. But all these schemes would doubtless lead to all sorts of unguessed side effects, I'll admit; like you, I can't claim my dream world would work perfectly here.

But back anyway to the question of distribution: beyond providing everyone with a decent living, I can't see why the government should step in. Free enterprise capitalism is an uncommonly effective economic system, and despite the obvious difficulties in trying to mix it with a welfare state, I think that the only practical and effective system we will ever find will turn out to be some sort of mixture along these lines, with the government guaranteeing everyone the necessities of life, but without otherwise interfering with a capitalistic system.

I think you're making some might wild assumptions when you claim that Vance Packard's woman in the supermarket has been rendered "incompetent for all legal purposes." Contrary to what you seem to think, it is exceedingly difficult to void contracts (or to excuse criminal acts) on the grounds of temporary incompetence. There are, of course, exceptions; as it happens, the exceptions are generally the cases one finds in the newspapers. But by and large, an individual has to show he was really quite insane at the time of signing to void a contract, and to show himself only slightly less competent to escape criminal prosecution. (But aren't there points of law covering the signing of a contract under the influence of drugs or alcohol?)

All right, Harry Warner, I'll bite. I think there is a serious possibility of communist tendencies in this country, which is being very well handled by the FBI and hideously by the HUAC. So now I'm a statistic.

I would be inclined to take any figures on I.Q.'s with several pounds of salt, and particularly figures indicating someone's I.Q. has risen or fallen. As a rule, higher or lower scores on an I.Q. test indicate nothing more or less than (a) pure accident, or (b) an increase in the subject's test-taking ability; this may come from all sorts of things, including an extra cup of coffee that morning, a raise, a grandson (now don't think I'm suggesting these all as causes for Ted White's jump), and so forth.



I.Q. tests, remember, are highly artificial attempts to measure intelligence, and in fact are valid if at all only for a moderately large group of subjects with similar backgrounds and for whom the test(s) were designed. That is, any attempt to measure the I.Q. of an Australian Bushman by a test similar to that given a New York child, even disregarding language differences, would be bound to give ridiculous results. It is in fact as a result of this that all the contradicting figures on the "Average I.Q." of Negroes as opposed to whites have come forth. In general, Negroes given an I.Q. test set up for whites (i.e., the average (say) New York city white is expected to score 100) will score below average; contrariwise, if the test is one made for Negro children, the average NYC white child will score below average. The reason for this is that, apparently, different factors have some apparent correlation with intelligence in the two groups; whether these factors are racial or environmental (probably both) is not known. So what is generally done now is to cook up a test combining both sets of questions and score it in such a manner that the average white and the average Negro will score 100. And so the debate goes on: you can't test intelligence before you can define it.

Sex education in schools is a touchy thing; still, I can't help wishing more schools offered something similar to the program mine did. Aside from rather good instruction for those students taking biology, the school each year brought in two doctors, one to talk to the girls, another to the boys: talk a few minutes and then answer questions. (I don't think such division is an ideal situation, since it probably gives both groups the idea that there is something the other group shouldn't know. Sex education should be introduced, I think, to mixed classes.) The last girls' doctor evidently was pretty much of a loss: she spent most of her time explaining, according to reports, that "all men are like greyhounds--they only want one thing". The rest of the time she tried to explain to the girls why they shouldn't burst out in gales of laughter when they were told "nothing at all below the neck"--this phrase of hers was not too well received. The boys' doctor, though, concentrated on conveying information without giving moral opinions either way, and (amazingly) without being either too serious or too light. I suppose parents should have the right to decide what their children should know about sex, and when; but I would suspect that enough parents would be happy to have their children listen to such people that even public schools could invite them in.

BETTY KUJAWA  
2819 CAROLINE  
SOUTH BEND 14, IND.

How do you feel about the NAACP chapter out in San Francisco that is kicking up a ruckus over a school production of "Huckleberry Finn"? Does this not strike you as more than a bit too thin-skinned? What would they have us do, pretend that slavery had never existed in America? This I would put on a level with the Jewish groups who kept J. Arthur Rank's film version of "Oliver Twist" from being released in this country. I understand that Alec Guinness did a masterful job as Fagin, but to deem that Dickens classic as anti-semitic (to the Jews of today) is pretty fuggheaded. Of course, when the villian is a white, Anglo-Saxon Protestant (with no discernable occupation or profession), then none of the minorities care if the villiany, nastiness or stupidity is shown. Oh well... (Such sensitive reactions are, of course, stupid, but Hollywood escapes such censorship to some extent. Television is even less free in that area. It seems inevitable that a television program will offend some group or other, no matter how innocuous it may



have been. Teetotalers protest when social drinking is shown on television, and wine bottlers protest when it is not shown. One television show received several protesting telegrams from various manufacturers of men's undershirts because some of the actors were not wearing undershirts!))

On the Marx quotation: Since this is all sort of wishful dreaming on your part, I won't complain--it isn't my personal cup of tea, but since I think it will never come to pass, you won't find me grotching or objecting to your right to advocate such a situation. But I feel that human nature makes the scheme an impossibility. No matter who first created the slogan (Marx, or Jesus, or Wally Cox), the loafers, freeloaders and goof-offs will queer it--and I'm paying too much now via taxes for those who feel that the world/state/county/town owes them a living. In Chicago, there are families composed of three generations that have been on relief. Don't tell me that from 1931 until 1962 some of that family couldn't have found employment--like in war work in World War II. I read an article on a family which started out on relief in 1931, had children, the children had children, and come 1962 the whole brood is still living off the tax-payers. And alas, as in so many cases, the children are illegitimate. Take a rather backward, stupid, slovenly, trashy girl. She has three to ten bastards (I know of quite a few here who have had twelve so far and they are far from stopping). Each of the kids what with the home influence and mom's example grow up to mother or sire three to ten bastards each--and so on and so on. See what we have? And see who's paying for it? And some of those tax-payers have seriously and conscientiously limited their own brood because they felt they couldn't afford more babies. Now would that irk you? (Of course. These "regulars" on the relief lists are the result of governments, and since my system practically abolishes governments, it would at the same time abolish such freeloaders. A few thousand years ago, when man was living in small agricultural settlements or roaming in small hunting bands, I doubt if there were any freeloaders such as you describe. Anyone strong enough to work had to work, or starve, with the possible exception of a village wise man or shaman, who was fed in return for services other than physical labors. All food was turned over a community storehouse (just as it was in most of the American Indian societies), each family taking what they needed and contributing whatever they could from their own little vegetable garden or from their hunting forays. This is, essentially, the system I (and, I believe, Marx) proposed. Unfortunately, it appears to be unworkable in any society larger than that of a village. Modern civilization vastly complicates the system as well: there are now many goods and services which can only be supplied by a few men or companies. In those ancient societies, most of a villager's needs could be grown or hunted by himself or by any other individual (with the exception of, perhaps, arrows or axe-heads, which could be supplied by one or more talented craftsmen within the society). But I can dream...))

We pay not only in support money but in other ways. The crime and sickness and even danger to ourselves and our families during robbery and mugging and theft comes in the main from this level of our society. The 'ability-needs' theory would be duck soup for such as these, I feel. I favor oral contraceptives given gratis to the lower classes--and in some cases given forcibly to the gals who breed and breed bastards. I hope you say the CBS Report lately on birth control in America. It was a damn fine show.

I must voice a complaint--and if this sounds bitchy or angry, I am sorry, but I feel



this is a valid gripe, and would very much like to know your personal feelings on the matter. Isn't it just a bit unethical for Breen to tell Locke in print that Locke got votes for Fugghead of the Year in the Fanac Poll? Breen has access to this information, but barring a few of his friends, the rest of us do not. This isn't fair tactics; no real report has ever been given to the rest of we voters, for one thing. Either Walt shouldn't have brought it into his argument with Dave or he should have listed all of we fans who got votes. This idea of tossing out the information that Locke was voted for makes each and every reader of Kipple cringe a wee bit and wonder if he/she also was mentioned, and we might also wonder if when Breen is arguing later on with one of us he will put us down by publicly mentioning that we, too, were candidates. ((Why should anyone worry about that? It isn't a very effective put-down, since anyone with opinions is likely to be considered a fugghead by some voters. I personally will be disappointed if I do not get some votes in that category... Segregationists have called me, among other things, a "n-----lovin' bastard," but I don't "cringe" at the thought of that comment being made public. To be hated by fools is not a burden, but an honor... As for the ethical consideration, it is something to which I have given little thought. I suppose it would have been polite of Walt to wait until the results had been printed before using them in an argument, but I don't consider it important enough to argue.))

I'd like to make the obvious comment to Larry McCombs: that very few folk today can really get to know each and every person they come into contact with, hence we have to judge by some standards. When one sees a person unshaven, sloppy, unshorn, one usually judges by his apparent unconcern for the sensibilities of those who have to be in his presence. A really sloppy cruddy sight we'll pass by for someone who shows by garb or behavior a concern and a consideration of those about him, which is only fair. What with our Freudian-soaked civilization we, and often correctly, conjecture that this person is in this way being deliberately offensive--so as to be rejected for that instead of for his personality defects or as a slap in the face of all those he feels are his superiors. Since we just don't have the time to know and understand all people, we usually choose from those who do conform enough not to offend the eye, the ear, or the nose--which is our right, too, even as it may be the right of others to be sloppy or boorish.

There was an article in Time a week or so ago about Nagasaki as opposed to Hiroshima, and how Nagasaki did not end up being a professional place of woe but instead kept on going and has progressed and thrived. The ban-the-bomb segment should read every word of it. Its people, equally bombed if not more than those of Hiroshima, are not playing the martyr role or showing hatred towards America and Americans--or, by gawd, doing a thriving lucrative tourist business on tourists who came to see. No, they are up and going and have no time for professional martyrdom, thank you. According to the article, which reported on the radiation effects on the survivors of the bomb, the actual facts are not the things we hear from the ban-the-bomb, unilateral disarmament group at all. One big fat snow-job has been pulled on us on this subject. ((But are you sure the "snow-job" wasn't the article in Time? I have never heard any particularly astonishing accounts of radiation effects on the survivors of our bombs; that is, none of them are surprising in view of the power and odd effects of over-doses of radiation which are known to us.))

One cannot help but feel admiration for Nagasaki and its



citizens for not taking the road of Hiroshima, for not turning that war-time horror into a business to be milked in every way possible. There is none of that in Nagasaki; instead, there are active, vital citizens getting back to this world and to their own lives in it, thriving industries, factories humming and buzzing, and only a small park commemorating the event. No souvenir stands and guides with speeches and photographs and postcards for sale showing the horror--no great park and mall and all the rest. The destruction is covered now by the business of today. This I prefer.

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

There is one big difficulty with Marx's "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs," and apparently neither you nor Larry has thought of it. It is this: if you are going to dole out the national wealth to all persons according to their needs, you are slowly going to create a situation in which very few people both to exercise their full abilities, because they know they will receive recompense according to whatever their needs happen to be, anyway.

This has been the problem in the Swedish welfare state, from all I've heard; it has lessened the incentive of Swedish talent to exercise its talent in a constructive way, on the job, because once a top salary is reached, there is no need to continue to be inventive and original in one's work, so long as one doesn't slip. If you're going to receive a set salary, why bother? (Anyone who thinks like this would probably be incapable of either originality or inventiveness. If the "set salary" is sufficient to allow the person to live in reasonable comfort, I doubt that the fact that it couldn't increase would cause any lack of creative work in those capable of it to begin with.)

But Sweden is a long way from here, and I am not in possession of all the facts, so let us get a little closer to home. I have two college professors in two different classes I attend. Both are not full professors, they are associate professors, and one teaches English and the other geology. Presumably, they receive about the same salary, since they are equally ranked within the framework of the University, though they may get slightly different pay due to seniority or something. However, one of them is an excellent teacher. His speeches are clear and resonant, he never fails to make his point, and he puts a great deal of time, effort, and sheer love into his course. The other one also tries a great deal, it is obvious, and both have an equal love of the subject they are paid to instruct in, but the other professor does not at all succeed in getting much of his point across to the studentry.

In short, one of them is a very good teacher, and the other is a very bad teacher, but they both receive the same pay. This strikes me as unfortunate and somewhat unfair. How does it strike you, Ted? (I agree, although probably in a slightly different sense, that it is both unfair and unfortunate: a "very bad teacher" has no business being a teacher, and he would not be were I in a position to impose standards. However, aside from this unfortunate analogy, I agree with you in a general sense. This would be a very grave problem, although a person of such creative fibre (one who would put a great deal of "sheer love" into his task) would not be petty enough to become jealous because a competent, though slightly less gifted, man received the same salary.)

I agree with the first part of Marx's dictum, "From each according to his ability." I



believe that every man should give of himself to the utmost of his abilities, in whatever field he is best capable of working. I believe that man should give the best of himself not only on the job, but in all phases of life, because giving is a way of fulfilling oneself. But I do not believe that "society" as a whole has a duty to supply each man according to his needs. Man should work for his return in bread, and if he doesn't work, then he shouldn't be entitled to any more return than he puts in. (That attitude is obvious in both Marx's comments and in my interpretation of them, but several readers seem to believe that I was advocating giving everyone "something for nothing". In my comments in Kipple #25, I said that "this Marx's dictum" 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...fashion." There was no provision in my comments for supplying those who refused to work (although some provision would obviously have to be made for those who couldn't work).)

There is a difficulty here, and that is that what some people may excell in, society has no particular need for, and the person cannot possibly get a living wage in return for his excellence in this field. This is unfortunate, and I wish something could be done about it, but I'm not sure how it can be done. Perhaps you can suggest a feasible solution? (No, I join you in being unable to think of any workable solution.)

But, again, I do not believe that society as a whole has a duty to supply each man according to his needs. If there is going to be anything like this, I believe it should be done on a limited, individual basis, something like the pledge system of the Church of the Brotherhood of the Way (see Fanac #85). I am willing to help out my close friends freely and to the best of my ability, and I feel that they would do the same for me, if I were in need. But I cannot feel it my duty to pay outrageously high taxes to support a government project to support thousands of people whom I don't know, who do not work and have no intention of working if they can collect a check from the government, and who have no particular ability. It is an old hackneyed saying, but I believe that charity (so to speak) begins at home, and if I am going to be charitable at all, I would rather it be on an interpersonal basis, rather than through a highly impersonal central dole agency.

I hope this doesn't lower your impression of overall fan intelligence too much, but this does happen to be the way I feel about the whole situation. I welcome your arguments in return. (Arguing over, around, and behind the fact--ringing in emotional accusations of "Pinko!"--dogmatic refusal to argue logically; that is what would have lowered my opinion of overall fan intelligence, as I implied last issue. I have been gratified by the nature of the response so far, and it raises, if anything, my opinion of the intelligence of my readers.)

While I would be the last person to deny that MR methods do no harm, I question the notion that their effect is as widespread as people seem to claim. Remember, Vance Packard is no less guilty than the MR people of one particular crime--he wants to sell books, you know--and he is inclined to be rather sensationalistic. Frankly, I think the extent to which motivational methods have been successful is a sad commentary on the people who come into their sphere of influence. I think that if people in this country, and elsewhere, were raised to be individuals, had more originality in their thinking than most of them do have, and were more re-



sistant to the tides of advertising that wash over them, then motivational methods would have a more negligible effect.

But as it is, people go about acting like so many passive cows, buying things because of utterly silly reasons, like the color of the package or the single jingle on TV advertising it, then there is not too much one can say one way or the other. Surely people would be better off without MR influencing them, but who's to say they want to be.

However, there is a ray of hope shining through all of this. I was talking with an advertising man, a friend of mine, and he brought out the fact that though people may be duped into buying something because of the package or the clever advertising, when they try it and find that it's inferior to what they'd been buying in its place, they'll revert to the older product. Of course, this is hard to apply to things like toothpaste, which is a Silly, Pointless Product no matter how you look at it (its only real use is as a breath freshener), but in the case of various foodstuffs, many of the companies that play up their MR campaigns to a great degree manufacture inferior stuff--and even advertising can't cover up cruddy tasting food.

Ideally, everyone should be intelligent and rational enough to pick and choose amongst various brands until they find one that suits them, and then stick to it so long as it continues to suit them. I am always on the search for bargains, but I never read advertising willingly, nor do I place much stock in manufacturers' claims for their products. I buy the best available, consistent with what I can afford to put out to pay for it, and I'm generally happy with what I get for my money.

Alva's comments about Joe Gibson are well-taken, particularly the ones regarding Joe's writing his articles for Shaggy and Vorpall Glass to "insure a permanent place for the name of Joe Gibson in the annals of fandom." As a matter of fact, that's sort of what Joe's doing, or so he told me. I used to work for Joe Gibson, back in them halcyon days in Berkeley, and after his article in Shaggy came out (I hadn't paid much attention to the one in Vorpall Glass), I asked him about it. He said he was just trying to make fans sit up and take notice of certain trends he had noticed himself. He didn't say he was trying to make them pay attention to Joe Gibson, but that happened, too.

Joe's article in Vorpall Glass is accurate, so far as it goes, but it doesn't go very far. It's true that on those "noisy nights" at Donaho's you might find a situation somewhat analogous to the one he draws, and which Nelson draws more hilariously in his concluding cartoon to that article. But those noisy nights are not really that frequent, and what of them, anyway? Bill and Danny have a perfect right to invite anyone over they please, and to play any sort of music they want to play. If Joe Gibson doesn't like Frances Fay's squalling or Bill Donaho's friends, he's perfectly free to ignore them. Why don't you ignore them, Joe?

As for Terry Carr, it's true that he had a green desk when he was living in Berkeley--it's being stored at Ray Nelson's these days, and is truly incredible, what with its many little nooks and crannies, etc.--and that he was an active fanzine fan much of the time, but again, but of it? Ditto for Dick Ellington and his family. If Dick likes working on his used cars, and if Marie-Louise is perhaps not the most well-trained little girl in Berkeley (though actually she's not much different than any cute blonde 4-year-old girl), what of it? I



will admit that the Little Men are rather boring, as a whole, but some of them are interesting people removed from the stultifying atmosphere of the formal meeting. And the GGFS may not have any real reason to exist, but it has fun and provides a lighter side to club fandom in the area, since the Little Men are rather stodgy and science-oriented.

The rightfully unavilable pros probably got a kick out of that line, if they read Joe's article. They didn't seem too very unavailable to me, but then I was closer to most Bay Area fan activity than Joe ever bothered to get during the time I was there. Joe hardly ever showed up at fan meetings, while I went to most of them. I know the Andersons best of the pro couples in the area, and I think they're very wonderful people indeed. I've met Rog Phillips, Tony Boucher and like that; nice guys. If Joe would come down out of the wilds of the hills of El Sobrante, and mix in with Bay Area fandom a bit more, maybe he'd even start liking it. But if he doesn't want to do that, he can blow off steam for as long as he wishes, because I just won't put any stock to what he says.

LARRY WILLIAMS  
74 MAPLE RD.  
LONGMEADOW 6, MASS.

Before I dive into the current issue, I feel that I should answer your comments on my arguments on rock & roll. You stated earlier in answer to my letter that I had thoroughly misinterpreted your comments on schools. I must say that you've done exactly that with my comments on rock & roll, or perhaps your seeming misunderstanding is intentional. Certainly the fact that I've overestimated your age is as irrelevant to the subject as any GMCarr argument I've read. (Not at all, since it was connected with your rather odd notion that people of my age-group were those supporting the big bands of the forties, and that I therefore had no right to criticize anyone else for their enthusiasm for rock & roll.) I've inferred from your previous articles about rock & roll that you think it's trash, and that anyone who likes it is a plain ass. I've also felt that you don't think that people have the right to call the music you appreciate trash. (I'm afraid those opinions of "mine" are invented (by you), not inferred. It's true that I think rock & roll is trash, but I have never denied anyone the right to call my favorite music trash, and I do not think of the people who enjoy/listen to rock & roll as "asses".) The fact that I didn't know how old you are, or what kind of music you like makes no difference whatsoever in this argument. I claimed--and still claim--that the fact that we buy rock & roll doesn't mean we thrive on it, nor does it mean that we couldn't do without it. Certainly it's primarily teenagers who buy rock & roll, but then it's primarily adults who buy swing music. I'm sure that the vast majority of these adults do not thrive on swing, and could do without it quite nicely. So the cases jibe.

I don't think that teenage society is any different from adult society within its own bounds. Certainly, there are many things adults enjoy that teenagers stay away from, but this is beside the point. Incidentally, I was perhaps not clear in my definition of "teenager". Technically, a teenager is a person whose age ranges from 13 through 19, but I was thinking more of a member of teenage society, which practically everyone thinks of as the group in high school. You're not a member of this group--and this is the rock & roll group, and the one Dave Locke was arguing about in "Rock 'n' Roll Rebuttal" in Kipple #22.

Your comments on communism/Communism are quite interesting and the fact that you are quite right



in most cases leaves little for me to comment on. You mention that there are distinct differences between USSR communism and pure communism. There certainly are, since Communism is actually socialism. I had to do an oral report on the subject of Karl Marx and "Das Kapital," and one thing I discovered was this: socialism is the control of all lands and businesses by the government, whereas communism is the control by the people. Since, in reality, the government controls the USSR, it is socialistic. Certainly Marx would not recognize the USSR as communistic, since it doesn't conform in the least to his theory. The government is not on an equal basis with the people, for one thing, and for another, in pure communism there is anarchy. Marx's theory has not just recently been twisted. It was twisted when first published. While Marx was still alive, he was reported to have said "I am not a Marxist." He was too much an idealist for communism to be a workable theory. He felt that by sweeping away all existing government, and putting all people on an equal basis, everybody would be satisfied with their status. Somebody always get greedy, so communism is unworkable. Socialism is equally unworkable.

I suppose that without government, there would be no classes; this seems reciprocal also. A class society is based on the belief that some people are better than others. A governmental society believes that some people are fit to do other people's thinking. They round out to about the same thing.

Certainly, individuals have rights (in answer to your arguments against MR), and one is that they don't have to buy if they don't want to. Even with MR, these housewives do not have to buy the item involved. If the housewife is ignorant enough to make herself susceptible to MR methods, then she deserves to be admonished by the cashier for not having enough money. ((I dislike the idea that a stupid or ignorant person "deserves" any consequences of actions simply because he is stupid or ignorant. A small child is too ignorant to leave a can of rat poison alone, but does he "deserve" to be poisoned...?)) MR methods are just advanced advertising methods. They attempt to make people want to buy. Evidently you are against the whole system of advertising, or you wouldn't attack this. ((I am against dishonesty in any form, which places me squarely against advertising, since advertising is largely dishonest in all its forms.)) MR does not, by any stretch of the imagination, take away the rights of the individual. You are a dreamer.

Other people also believe that individuals have rights. For this reason, flashing ads on the movie and TV screens at such a rate that only the unconscious picks them up has been outlawed. But that is entirely different. In this case the individual is defenseless. ((Just where do you draw that thin, fine line?))

ALVA ROGERS  
5243 RAHLVES DR.

CASTRO VALLEY, CALIF.

Your comments on Marx were quite interesting. It's a sad commentary on our times, though, that you feel compelled to qualify or justify your interest in Marxist philosophy...an interest

more people in America should have if they want to understand one of the driving forces underlying Khrushchev's every statement and action. It seems absurd to me that so many colleges and universities today have the problem they do have in presenting any halfway decent courses in Marxism. It seems to too many fearful souls who are in a position of authority that to expose college students to the philosophical core of communism is tantamount to infecting them with the disease of communism itself. This is probably very flattering to the dedicated communist who



fervently believes that the logic of Marxism is irresistible, but it just isn't so.

The quote, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs," was an ideal condition that would only be achieved in the higher phase of communist society. It had particular reference to Marx's concept of the "withering away of the state," and was rather succinctly expressed in the following quote from Marx's "Critique of the Gotha Program," written in 1875:

"In a higher phase of communist society after the enslaving subordination of individuals under division of labor, and therewith also the antithesis between mental and physical labor, has vanished; after labor has become not merely a means to live but has become itself the primary necessity of life; after the productive forces have also increased with the all-round development of the individual, and all the springs of co-operative wealth flow more abundantly--only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois right be fully left behind and society inscribe on its banners: from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs!"

You say that "Russia is not, in fact, a communist country; it is striving for that position, but it has not yet reached it." I agree with the first half of that statement, but I tend to question the other half. I doubt if Russia, as it's constituted today, could advance to the ideal state of communism as Marx envisioned such a state to be. Contemporary Russia doesn't quite conform to the picture of a transitionally socialist state that Marx forecasted would develop after a proletarian revolution. The state, instead of withering away, seems stronger and more entrenched than ever before. And, certainly, capitalism failed totally and abysmally to follow Marx's predictions for its future. Marx took the brutalizing capitalism of the early and middle nineteenth century with its long, backbreaking working day, low pay, exploitation of woman and child labor, the dismal factory towns of England with their filth, disease, and degradation of the human spirit, and over it all the capitalist and wholly bourgeois class fattening on the exploited masses, and projected it into the future, unchanged except as it became worse. With its back ultimately to the wall, the desperate proletariat in all the advanced capitalist nations would inevitably rise and seize power, establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat, and initiating socialism. This was to be the fate of western capitalism, said Marx.

Modern communism bears about as much resemblance to the letter of Marxian philosophy as does modern Christianity to the teachings of Christ. Even so, the works of Marx, Engels, and Lenin still wield a profound influence on the leaders of the Russian and Chinese states and for this reason should be required reading...even if it is heavy and soporific.

Getting back to the original quote, there is an example of its application right here in the United States--or, rather, on the North American continent. (Uh...The last time I looked, Utah was in the United States, as well as on the North American continent.) When the Mormons, led by Brigham Young, fled from the intolerable persecutions of their Christian bretheren in Illinois and Missouri and turned their faces to the uncivilized west, finally settling in the wastelands surrounding the Great Salt Lake, they were confronted with the basic problem of survival. After surviving the severe winters, invasion and occupation by the United States Army, the Gold Rush in California, and hostile Indians, and were well on their way to establishing an oasis in the desert, they



were almost brought to their knees by the depression of 1870 in the East and drought in the West. Brigham established the Zion's Cooperative Mercantile Institution in Salt Lake as an answer to the businessmen's problems; and in the outlying settlements which were hardest hit by the drought he established what was known as the United Order, which was based on Joseph Smith's Order of Enoch. In the communities where the United Order was set up the Saints would pool their equipment, their property, and their labor, and work in complete cooperation in everything necessary for their survival. Thus, reasoned Brigham, they would not only increase their own comforts but would be working towards Joseph Smith's completely selfless society which he had envisioned as the Kingdom of God. The United Order prospered for a time, particularly in a town named appropriately enough, Orderville, but eventually fell into a period of decline and ultimate abandonment. Remnants of it exist to this day, however, in the Church's welfare program which maintains vast warehouses and graneries, cooperative farms and what-not for the sustenance of needy members of the Church.

Going from the sublime to the ridiculous, I wonder if a little drama enacted in one of our more enlightened communities here in the Bay Area reached the papers in the East? ((No.)) This concerned a high school girl in the town of, I believe, Burlingame, and an eagle-eyed John Birch type female. It seems this girl, blessed with singular intelligence and courage, wrote a paper as part of a class project in government, or some such thing. In this paper this girl expressed her profound faith in democracy and the intelligence of her fellow men by stating that she didn't believe the government had the right to refuse recognition to the Communist Party as a political party and that communists should be treated no different than anyone else; that in the free competition of ideas communism would inevitably come off second best. Almost immediately the forces of righteous anti-communism went into action when this female archangel of Robert Welch publicized this girl's paper by telling the newspapers that she had turned over all the facts concerning this un-American child to the FBI and other interested agencies, and tried to put pressure on the school principal to have him discipline the errant pupil. This he stoutly refused to do, declaring that he believed a student had the right to come to his own conclusions on subjects of this nature.

Have you heard of the situation in San Francisco involving Negroes and a high school production of a musical based on "The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn"? George Washington High School, which has a mixed student body of whites, Orientals, and Negroes, has planned for their final dramatic presentation of the school year an original musical written by one of its students, based on Huckleberry Finn. The NAACP has voiced vigorous objections to this, at first insisting that it be stopped, but later amending that stand to one of a boycott against the play by Negro students and their parents. Their position is that the character of the escaped slave, Jim, who accompanies Huck on his adventures down the river, is a degrading one to the Negro race by reminding them of the days of slavery; that it were better the school give dramatic recognition to the more positive elements of early Negro history in the United States. The whole thing has become quite emotional with the Negro community led by the NAACP and the Negro ministry lined up on one side and the school authorities on the other...and the pupils right smack dab in the middle. It is further complicated by recent publications to the effect that racial segregation is being subtly practiced in the San Francisco school system--a charge that is hotly denied by



# ADDITIONS TO A FAN'S LIBRARY

The most noticeable quality of the new Pyramid Books science fiction line is their evident intention to sell the books rather than to hide them within the vast bulk of newsstand trash. Those I've seen have an attractive and striking cover design which makes them virtually leap off the rack and into the face of the prospective buyer. The second noticeable quality is that of content: both of the Pyramid paperbacks I have recently purchased have been of exceptional quality. One, in fact, must be one of the five or six finest science fiction novels in existence: "Venus Plus X," by Theodore Sturgeon. It is not only a fine novel, but, more important, a successful one. Many science fiction writers feel it their duty to take pot-shots at the mores and idiosyncrasies of Society, but in most cases such attempts obscure the story itself with shavings from the author's axe-grinding. In "Venus Plus X," Sturgeon succeeds admirably in placing his jabs at mankind where they will do the most good, but the prime purpose of the novel--that of telling a story--is never lost sight of during these sessions. This book is actually composed of two novels, existing simultaneously, and quite apart from each other even at the end. The first story is that of Charlie Johns, who wakes up and finds himself inexplicably in a new and different world, which he is asked to judge for the benefit of his hosts. The second story is the story of some normal American neighbors, in the not-too-distant future. In its early stages, the continual jumping from what I came to think of as the "major story" to this sub-story was distracting and annoying, but it is within the framework of this shorter tale that Sturgeon punctures the fads and foibles of his current-day society, strikingly similar in its more repulsive details to our own.

"Venus Plus X" does not deserve the stock recommendation, "A superb science fiction novel." It is a superb novel with no qualifications. (Pyramid Books #F-732, 40¢)

"Worlds of When," the second Pyramid edition (Pyramid Book #F-733, 40¢), is another in a long string of Groff Conklin anthologies. It contains five short novels: two good ones, two superlative ones, and a single clinker. The latter, to reverse chronological order, is committed by Arthur Clarke, a Sunday supplement story with science fiction trimmings entitled "Death and the Senator". Clarke's talent, which is by no means extraordinary under normal circumstances, deserts him completely in this case. My initial reaction to this story was to leave it unfinished, but in the interests of fair reviewing I regret to say that I read "Death and the Senator" in its boring entirety. However, Clarke's embarrassment consumes only a small portion of the anthology, and the



remainder is unequivocally recommended to all inveterate science fiction fans. Mack Reynolds and Fritz Leiber contribute worthwhile stories concerning, respectively, the political problems of desert-farming, and a test given to an average inhabitant of this planet in order to determine Terra's future position with regard to being citizens of the galaxy. In spite of these uninspiring blurbs of mine, I enjoyed both stories heartily. The true worth of "Worlds of When" lies, however, in the superlative tales indicated above. The remaining novels, Chad Oliver's "Transfusion" and Margaret St. Clair's "The Rations of Tantalus" are indeed superlative. Miss St. Clair's little gem could probably be called, by a less friendly critic, a minor-league "1984". In plot it is not exceptional, but this writer manages to do more with the characters and events than would many authors in three or four times the space. Oliver's is the best novel in the book. Chad Oliver is always at his best when writing about anthropology (no surprise, since he is an anthropologist), and this novel is probably his best. It concerns the events, in the world of anthropology, following the discovery of a method of travelling through time. This is, of course, a great blessing to any anthropologist or paleontologist, but when several scientists conduct experiments with the time-bridging device to observe early man rather than just a few of his bones, they can't find him. The idea, I'm certain, is original, and the treatment is superb.

"Man's Emerging Mind," by W.J. Berrill (Premier Book #d159, 50¢) is what Alexis Carrel's "Man, the Unknown" should have been but was not. (See Kipple #25, pages 3-5.) It is a comprehensive analysis of mankind, his origins, accomplishments, and goals. It is of ample interest to the student of biology, anthropology, or philosophy, containing elements of all three in equal amounts. Although scientifically precise in nearly all its statements and theories, there is one glaring error which I am certain must be a typographical one: "In any case it is somewhat chastening to find that the Sumerians of Mesopotamia, star watchers though they were, had put the age of mankind at 473,000 years, which is about the figure now accepted. Even their estimation of the age of the earth at two million years is of an entirely different order from the biblical calendar of later times, although it is about one-twentieth of what we at present believe it to be." There is some doubt as to Berrill's estimate of the age of mankind, but in 1955, when the book was written, these were the accepted figures. However, his estimate of the age of earth is preposterous, and I would hazard a guess that the printer misprinted "billion" into "million" at one point. Two million years is one-twentieth of forty million, but forty million years is not even close to the age of the earth.

Aside from this doubtless unintentional flaw, "Man's Emerging Mind" is a fine and valuable book, certainly worthwhile to anyone who wishes to learn more about mankind, physically, mentally or emotionally.

Just as I was about to congratulate the general high level of quality rewarded in the recent "Emmy" awards presentation for the best television programs of 1961, I happened to read "Bertrand Russell Speaks His Mind" (Avon Bard Book #G13, 50¢). The book consists of thirteen chapters, transcripts of thirteen interviews presented on BBC, the government-operated, non-commercial television station in England. They are programs which could not have been presented on any United States television station without, at best, extensive editing. The "controversy" of "The Defenders," an extremely fine weekly series on American televi-



sion, appears sick by comparison. Lord Russell, surely one of the greatest minds of our century, gives his frank, unrehearsed opinions on such unrelated subjects as religion, fanaticism, the nature of happiness, the H-bomb, birth control, the future of mankind, morality, nationalism, pacifism, the role of the individual, communism versus capitalism, and others.

I have no doubt that this book will be banned shortly, and I am extremely happy that I purchased a copy as soon as it hit the local stands. As I casually loitered in front of the drugstore magazine rack, two fat, pompous middle-aged women began reading the blurbs on the back cover, containing quotes from Lord Russell such as "A great many people enjoy a war provided it is not in their neighborhood and not too bad." They began making comments about that "nasty man," and I turned to them, smiled cheerfully, and made an obscene sucking noise with my mouth, whereupon I turned and stalked out much to their horror. On reflection, I regret this act--not because of its effect on the pair of shrews, but because Lord Russell should not be identified, however briefly, with an obscene sucking noise.

Anyone alive from the neck up should be interested in "Bertrand Russell Speaks His Mind."

"The Truth About the New Birth Control Pills," by John Devaney and Philip Reaves (Popular Library Edition #SP121, 50¢) is a slim book for the price (126 pages in large type), but it is a valuable reference volume to one of the major controversies of our time. It gives the history, effects, and reasons for birth control in startlingly objective terms--neither author has any axe to grind--and furthermore presents a guidebook to the morass of stupidities and contradictions which comprise the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church toward any form of contraceptive device. (The most notable of the contradictions is that the RC church opposes contraceptive devices on the grounds that they interfere with "natural laws," yet it favors abstinence as an acceptable birth control measure--and what could be more "unnatural" than abstinence?) It describes fully the effects of such new devices as Enovid, Norlutin, and other progestins, as well as the manner in which they prevent conception. It also outlines adequately possible dangers over long periods, which have not been adequately researched as yet. It would be interesting and instructive to give a brief resumé at this point, but thanks to the control exerted by Anthony Comstock even from the grave, this publication would be unmailable if I were to do so. Suffice it to say that everything one could want to know about this delicate subject is contained within this volume.

It is inevitable that the Kennedy administration will be severely criticized from many quarters for some of its actions (or lack of action). I have done so myself, although in general I find it indistinguishable from the previous Republican administration. It is certainly no worse; it is probably little better. However, Frank L. Kluckhohn, author of "America: Listen!" (Monarch Giant #MS3, 50¢), finds absolutely no virtue in Kennedy or his administration. Although the author is obviously sincere in his beliefs, I find it difficult to believe that a man could act as President of the United States for so long without doing even one thing right, but that is precisely what Kluckhohn suggests. There are legitimate complaints to be directed to the administration, but Mr. Kluckhohn, in his rabid Republicanism, doesn't mention many of them.



His attention is given instead to insinuations of vote rigging and to finding Hidden Communists within the group of high government officials he happens to dislike. He also manages to bring the President's relatives into the picture, ridiculing them for anything from playing touch football while pregnant to eating peanut butter sandwiches to dishonest stock manipulation. This book has all of the distasteful characteristics of sour grapes, and Mr. Kluckhohn is not adverse to the use of such unjust tactics as guilt-by-association. He indulges in this disgusting practice while summarily dismissing all of Kennedy's aids as being un-American: "ADA, in its 1961 platform, for instance, believes too much accent is placed upon 'military' rather than economic and political considerations in the Far East, and questions the need for continued maintenance of American bases there. It is an interesting coincidence that Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev has long called for the elimination of such bases." More blatantly: "Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., whose father belonged to eighteen Communist fronts..."

If anyone wants an interesting guidebook on how not to fairly criticize the government, I recommend this book. Being garishly colored in red, white and blue, it won't be difficult to find on the book rack...

"America--Too Young To Die!" by Major Alexander P. de Seversky (Macfadden Book #50-122, 50¢), is also a criticism of governmental policy, though of a more precise nature. Seversky is critical of the military policy of the United States, particularly since the end of World War II. There are two other major differences between this book and "America: Listen!": first, Major de Seversky does not attempt to win arguments through the simple expedient of calling his enemies names, but instead presents cold, hard facts in support of his statements; and second, Major de Seversky actually has several extremely important points, rather than meaningless quibbles about pregnant peanut butter sandwiches. He points out that in spite of the government's lack of desire to spend money on the project, it is imperative to perfect an anti-missile missile. He also attacks the stupidity of spending tremendous sums of money to maintain a "conventional" army when the next war will be almost entirely an air force venture.

Unfortunately, the book seems to have been written primarily as civil defense propaganda. After many pages of facts and figures on how incomplete our defenses and retaliatory powers really are, he then goes into a spiel designed to convince the reader of the advisability of a blast/fallout shelter in his back yard. His approach is an interesting one, playing as it does on patriotism: "At the beginning of this book I mentioned that in the next war the major casualties will not be among the military, but among our civilian population. The men, women, and children at home will be at the front line. It is very important for everyone to understand that being a target makes everyone also a powerful deterrent, giving each individual an opportunity to strike back at the enemy just as decisively as any member of the Strategic Air Command or the North American Defense Command. The citizen who takes the necessary precautions to survive a nuclear attack is a true American, a patriot, and a true defender of freedom. The defeatist, the person who wails 'I might as well be dead as alive after an atomic attack'--the man who makes no effort to protect himself and his family--is hardly fulfilling his patriotic duty. He is encouraging an attack on his country."

To anyone burdened by this depressing thought, I recommend massive do-



ses of "Man the Beast and Wild, Wild Women," by Virgil Parton (Dell Book #R129, 40¢), or "Pardon My Blooper," by Kermit Schafer (Crest Book #s527, 35¢). The former is a collection of hilarious cartoons by VIP, probably one of the funniest cartoonists alive today. "Pardon My Blooper" is an anthology of boners from radio and television, most of them extremely good. (Of course, as is normal in such situations, they are always more humorous when heard than when read.) Most of us know of several such bloopers, probably second- or third-hand, but here are 140 pages of broadcasting mistakes. Both of these books are just the thing for a long bus or subway ride, as long as you don't mind rolling on the floor with laughter while riding such a conveyance.

Although my reading tastes are rather wide, the biography or auto-biography is the one type of book for which I have never been able to raise a great deal of enthusiasm. Aside from my personal tastes, a very good reason for this may be the nature of the books themselves: they strike me as rather dull and colorless, in spite of the fact that the central character may have led an impressively colorful life. If the work is a biography, the writer is probably working largely from taped interviews, newspaper clippings, and other second-hand sources, and thus create an impression of rehashed nothings. In an auto-biography, the writer generally has an annoying habit of trying not to sound conceited, and such a work further lacks the unique perspective of an outsider looking in. "Assignment: Churchill," by Inspector Walter H. Thompson (Popular Library Book #SP127, 50¢), is an exception. Inspector Thompson was assigned to a special squad of Scotland Yard officers whose duty it was to act as bodyguards for various public officials, and in this capacity he was Winston Churchill's "shadow" for nearly twenty years. His knowledge of the situations about which he writes, both important international problems and personal crises in the life of Mr. Churchill, is extensive, and he compliments the factual content with a brisk, pleasant writing style. Herein are to be found intimate personal glimpses of one of the greatest statesmen of our century, written by a man who was as close to him, day and night, as his own wife.

"The Strange Story of Our Earth," by A. Hyatt Verrill (Premier Book #d163, 50¢), is the story of our earth from its birth to the advent of man upon its surface. It is an extremely fine work of the "popularized science" sort, although the tremendous scope of the book creates understandably sketchy sections. There have been many thousands of pages written on the subject of evolution, and when any book attempts to tell this entire story in 149 pages of large type, allowances must be made for omissions. In this case, while dinosaurs and mammals are handled in a competent, reasonably comprehensive fashion, other equally important forms--such as the Paleozoic sea-life--are virtually ignored. Within the bounds of these limitations, Verrill has done a fine job of introducing to the reader the history of this planet. He has what I suppose would be called some rather strange theories about such matters as early New World man and sizes of prehistoric insects, but this is not unusual--there are as many theories in this field as there are scientists to advocate them. (Verrill, for example, postulates Devonian roaches twelve inches long, ten-inch crickets, foot-long grasshoppers, etc. Many other paleontologists scoff at this, and I am inclined to agree with them.)

Above all, this book should not be read as anything but what it is--an



introduction. If anyone should buy this book on my recommendation, read it; and find themselves interested in the history of life on this planet, then by all means go on to some more substantial work, such as Darwin, Huxley, Carson, Simpson, or others. But as an introduction, it is superb.

"Abortion: Murder or Mercy?" (Gold Medal Book #s1215, 35¢) is not the normal sort of "confession" novel, although I suppose it would fit nicely into that category by most criteria. The authors are Margaret Witte Moore and an anonymous doctor who performed illegal abortions for a number of years and served a prison term as a result. It is not a normal confession for several reasons: first, because it has none of the gummy, maudlin cliches of a typical confession novel; and second, because the doctor does not sound particularly repentant. It describes fully the reasons of both doctors and patients for allowing and performing abortions, criticizes the incompetent quacks getting rich in the field, gives a clinical account of the process of abortion, and presents several case histories of types of patients. Dr. X has some opinions on the laws governing abortion which are somewhat less than meek, and he makes his position very clear. Birth control and the need for sex education are also touched on, insofar as they relate to abortion. It is a highly interesting account.

#### AND THEN I READ:

"New Stories from the Twilight Zone," by Rod Serling (Bantam Book #A2412, 35¢), wherein Mr. Serling proves his ability to turn first-rate plays into second-rate stories. Not recommended.

"Atlas Shrugged," by Ayn Rand (Signet Book #Q1702, 95¢), a monumental tale running to 1084 pages. It is a fine novel, but one thing bothers me: having read this, plus "The Fountainhead" (687 pages), I am still not sure that I understand Objectivism completely. Highly recommended.

"New Handbook of the Heavens," by Hubert J. Bernhard, Dorothy A. Bennett, and Hugh S. Rice (Signet Science Library Book #P2123, 60¢), was, for me, sort of a refresher course. It has been ten years since I seriously studied astronomy, and I was amazed at how much it is possible to forget in that period. Highly recommended.

"The Marxists," by C. Wright Mills (Dell Book #LX141, 75¢), appears to be a very objective presentation of the history, theory, and practice of Marxism, plus the story of the changes and distortions of that theory made by current-day Marxists/Communists. Highly Recommended.

"Nine Planets," by Alan E. Nourse (Pyramid Book (Worlds of Science) #3, 75¢), is perhaps the best of this month's additions to my library. It is equal parts fact and speculation, the former presented in an enjoyable, non-textbook manner, and the latter solidly supported by information and deduction. Dr. Nourse's knowledge of this solar system is immense, and as an accomplished writer, he is able to present this information in an eminently readable fashion. The only discernable fault of "Nine Planets" is that the good doctor's extensive knowledge is contradicted in the Mel Hunter illustrations, which show, for example, the sun as seen from Pluto many times larger than it could possibly be. But by and large, this is the most interesting, informative book of its



type that I have ever read. Very highly recommended.

"The Day the Earth Caught Fire," by Barry Wells (Ballantine Book #E602, 50¢), appears to be the effort of a minor author to write a major novel, and, predictably, he fails. The central character, so help me, is a one-time hotshot newspaper reporter who began drinking when his wife left him. He is constantly in danger of losing his job, but a fatherly, veteran reporter covers up for him, occasionally writing material for him. If that sounds familiar, it's only because it should. Of course, the entire story has a science-fiction setting: the earth has been knocked out of its orbit by nuclear explosions, and is falling toward the sun. At the end of the novel, the planet is returned to its orbit in the same manner. The author unfortunately forgets (to put it as charitably as possible) that any explosion capable of affecting the planetary orbit would also destroy a sizable chunk of the planet in the process. Not recommended.

"The Origins of Scientific Thought," by Giorgio de Santillana (Mentor Book #MQ336, 95¢), though a small book for that price, is an extremely interesting one. It chronicles the opinions, attitudes, and theories in all branches of science from approximately 600 B.C. until 500 A.D., an era of interesting, if not particularly correct, theory. Highly recommended.

--Ted Pauls

## QUOTES & NOTES CONCLUDED

A fan, according to Eney's Fancyclopedia, is "a follower, devotee, or admirer of...fantasy in book and magazine form, on film, and on the airwaves." Specifically, a (true) fan "maintains a correspondence with other fans, and visits them when located in the same area. He may publish or write for a fanzine--or several of them. He often attends local club meetings, and, finances permitting, conferences or national conventions." There is no qualification in this definition to exclude those people Joe Gibson doesn't happen to like. It would be nice, I admit, if we could relieve certain people of the term fan. It would be extremely easy to say "Wetzel is not a fan" or "Degler is not a fan," thus exorcising all evil-doers from our ranks. Unfortunately, this is merely convenient; it is not realistic.

I am a liberal. I am also a fan, by virtue of publishing and contributing to fanzines, attending conferences, corresponding with other fans, and visiting local fans. I am an admirer of fantasy. While it may hurt Joe Gibson to admit it, I am as deserving of the term "fan" as many people who are not liberals. So are other liberals.

Justitia omnibus, Joe?

--Ted Pauls

The number in this space 28C is the number of your last issue; the letter "T" indicates that we trade, "C" that you contributed, "S" that this is a sample copy, and "P" that you are on my permanent list.



# LETTERS... CONTINUED FROM PAGE 25

the city.

As deeply as I sympathize with the problems of the Negro in this country, as much as I admire the work of the NAACP, CORE, and other Negro organizations, I can't help feeling that they are creating an issue where one doesn't exist, in this particular case. The character of Jim in Twain's novel is far from a degrading one to the Negro race; instead, Jim epitomizes the humanity of Negroes, and in his relationship with Huck, who represents the lower strata of the Border states white of the day, the essential brotherhood of man underlying white and black skins is forcefully affirmed.

The days of slavery in this country, as much as we would all like to forget it and deny it, is still a fact of history and as such deserves to be examined and discussed. For the Negro to deny his history of slavery is as unrealistic as for the Jew to deny his history of slavery. If there is any degradation connected with Negro slavery in this country, it is not to the degradation of the Negro, but rather to the eternal degradation and shame of the white race.

But even more serious, I believe, is the position that the NAACP has placed itself in, in this instance. It is trying to suppress the free expression of ideas by students, to censor a work of art. It might be argued that a musical written by a high school student is probably far from being a work of art, but this really is not germane. It's interesting to note that the Negro students enlisted to enact the roles of Jim, and other slaves, saw nothing objectionable to their parts until the NAACP took an interest in the affair. This type of pressure by the NAACP is just as objectionable to me as the pressure exerted against the showing of the film "Oliver Twist" by Jewish organizations, or the attempted pressure by the Catholic Church against the film "Martin Luther". I just plain hate like hell to have any group, no matter who or what, attempt to proscribe my right to be exposed to anyone's ideas or works of art, no matter how awful they might be.

KRIS CAREY  
1015 SECOND ST.  
WASCO, CALIF.

I say the John Birch Society is off its rocker. Even if there are dangers from a subversive element in the United States, the publicity alone of the various anti-communist activities has scared them off. All of the numerous organizations to fight communism are just adding to the confusion. Also the feuding and fighting between neighbors caused by the communist controversy is doing just what our friends in Russia want it to do. They know that a split in the enemy ranks can aid them no end. Oh, I admit that we should keep the FBI on the alert for communist "conspiracies," but to let the narrow-minded people take the problem into their hands would actually hinder. (I hope that "I say the John Birch Society is off its rocker" was a product of nervous typing fingers, not serious thought. It is precisely this sort of comment to which I object, since it is a favorite type of argument from the far-right elements. It wouldn't do for we broad-minded individuals to stoop to those tactics.)

As to the Minute Men here in California, several of their leaders have been publicly proven as perverts. (This is not germane to a discussion of their political affiliations; I refuse to lower myself to such HUAC tactics, and I don't enjoy seeing others do so, e-



ven if they are on my side.)) Their organization has been shaping up more like a private army than anything else, and if there is anything that we don't need in the U.S., it is a privately owned army. And then who's going to trust a pervert in charge of several hundred armed men? And then again, who's going to need an army that can't leave the continent, when the next war would be atomic anyway? More likely, after an atomic strike they would be organized, but organized to rob and loot stores and markets. ((Their major purpose seems to be to provide the core of a valiant army of guerrillas which would defend the country against the Soviet army of occupation. This assumes that (1) we would lose the war, (2) there would be something worth fighting for afterwards, and (3) anyone left to fight.)) The Minutemen have stayed more out of sight now, and are less in the public eye, but they too count as a radical-right function.

"From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" seems like a sure-fire policy, but even Stalin found that it was easier said than done; so much so that he even reverted to basic capitalistic methods. Under the concepts of "pure communism," an unskilled worker with four children would receive twice as much pay as a trained factory worker with two children. ((Under our capitalistic society, the unskilled worker is merely able to deduct twice as much from his income tax...)) This system quickly crumbled as initiative was lost and enthusiasm died down, so Stalin paid the manager more, because he was worth more. From then on, Stalin found out, as had Lenin, that certain capitalistic methods of capital and gain brought more prosperous results than the "pure communism" as set down by Marx. This idea has never before successfully worked out, and as far as I can see it will never work successfully.

Just recently there was quite a bit of stinko in Wasco about the showing of certain "pornographic" films that was put up by the local town fathers. The Fathers accused the show of providing base and vulgar material to help decay the minds of decent children. In reply, the movie protested that if they didn't provide such material on the level of interest of the majority, they would go out of business. You know, they show a movie like Disney's "Swiss Family Robinson" and there are an average of three people in the whole theatre (and these three are invariably adults); but during the showing of a film like "La Dolce Vita," the show is packed to capacity.

The activities perpetrated by the denizens of Montclair, New Jersey that are described by Mike Deckinger in his letter in Kipple #24, sound typical of the fuggheadedness that seems to be sweeping the country. Last year I encountered this example: I was vacationing in a town in southern Nevada, and staying at a friend's house at the time. My friend and I were going to see "La Dolce Vita" and arrived at the theatre to find that the program had been changed because of the many complaints of the "scandalous indecency" of the film. As it turned out at the end of the year, the film was voted one of the best foreign films of the year.

Pete Graham is absolutely right about the fascist movements developing out of severe economic conditions. The Third Reich of Germany rose out of the severe depression and recession of the late 20's that covered the country. Likewise, I feel that unless we, here in the United States, were to experience similar conditions, that subversive elements will have a tough time gaining any hold on the government. It would only be on the fall of our effective form and state of government that people would look to new elements that offered a way



out, and better conditions.

Ted Pauls: In Seth Johnson's letter (in Kipple #24), you offer a rebuttal to his statement about the kiloton bombs to the effect that "Our country could be completely scorched by exploding about 600 ten-megaton bombs evenly spaced from about a height of thirty miles," but that "this is highly impractical for the simple reason that a substantial portion of our country is at all times hidden by a cloud cover." This reason alone does not make the above statement "impractical," considering the fact that not only are modern hypersonic bombers equipped with the finest infrared precision bombing devices that can accurately bomb through any thick cloud cover on Earth, but that these modern bombers are also programmed to perform such low-level maneuvers as "loft-bombing," in which the plane flies over the country hugging the ground (thus avoiding radar detection) until it reaches its target and executes a high-gee pull-out, lofts the bomb, and is a substantial distance away before it explodes. So you see this idea as stated by Brown and Real could be planned and effectively carried out in the case of a nuclear war. (I suggest you read my comments to Seth again. If you do, you will find that I did not say "Our country could be completely scorched by exploding about 600 ten-megaton bombs evenly spaced from about a height of thirty miles," but rather that "...our country could be completely scorched by exploding about 600 ten-megaton bombs, evenly spaced, at an altitude of about thirty miles." (Underlining mine, not originally included.) There is a significant difference, you see. The range of the heat-effects of a bomb increases as it is exploded at higher and higher altitudes (although the power of the bomb must at the same time be increased if those effects are to be noticeably damaging), and at an altitude of thirty miles, 600 ten-megaton bombs, evenly spaced, would simultaneously ignite every combustible element not adequately protected--grass, trees, wooden houses, the clothes on your back, lumber yards, etc. This would obviously effectively destroy the United States as an economic power, and the resultant fire-storms would stand an excellent chance of wiping out all life in the country as well. Fortunately, because of the extensive cloud-layers (situated below the thirty-mile mark, and therefore effectively shielding a large part of the country from light and heat effects), this is not practical.)

As to the part of "Quotes and Notes" (Kipple #25) on "impulse-buying," let me say that I have noticed a growing group of people that have grown so sick of the many repulsive and psychological commercials of the modern world, they reject them completely, and when in need of an item, just grab the nearest name-brand and use it. Perhaps you heard of the group of people who became so enraptured with commercials, on the other hand, that they gathered in New York to watch from beginning to end 100 commercials, all the while sighing and expressing their enrapturement and enjoyment. This actually happened and was considered a fashionable event.

There is no doubt that many products that are pushed every day are vastly over-rated, but the unsporting thing about these products is the many psychological studies and devices that are used to sell them. A poor dolt of about 89 IQ doesn't have a chance when faced by the clever approaches and selling devices. He might submit to a certain toothpaste just because of the brightly advertised wrapper. Or he might buy a certain kind of cigarette because of "the most important quarter-inch in smoking today." Then there is the old premium line that is made to appeal to the materialistic shopper: the "you get this brand new Clugg abso-



lutely free when you buy or regular-sized box of Fleegs" bit.

On conformity: I say that there is no such thing as non-conformity, but there are many stages of conformity. The Beatnik is conforming to his mode of life, and is not to be subjected to someone else's idea of conformity. Therefore he is not a non-conformist when he does what he wants, simply because he is at a different stage of conformity than his neighbor, who might be a "tie and tails" man. Other people would have no right to subject the beat to their mode of conformity unless he was directly hazardous to them. An individual is not to be subject to the demands of others on the grounds of conformity, and cannot be called non-conformist simply because he conforms to his own standards.

MIKE DECKINGER  
21 CARR PLACE  
FORDS, NEW JERSEY

The trouble with the statement "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" is that it sounds good, even though it's totally unworkable in our present society. The reason for its stress in the communistic world today is merely as an excuse to justify their own system of tyranny. They are not arguing the basic advantages or disadvantages to this theory, but rather pointing it out when their unjust domination is brought up, and using it as goal for their plans. If communism actually embraced as many of Marx's theories as they claim, than it would be a completely different force today.

Just think of that idea, as being allied with the Russian's and Red Chinese' defense of "liberating the people" whenever they move into a red country to destroy a revolt staged by the persons desiring freedom. They are not murdering innocent people whose only desire is to be treated as free individuals, but they are supressing a bloody revolt, staged by the capitalist war-mongers and using the workers as dupes. The true meaning loses something in the translation, you see.

Naturally, I won't argue your stand against MR and the blatant misuse of it by the advertising world. It just goes to prove that we've reached a day and age where customers are hawked at to buy merchandise at both levels--the conscious and the subconscious.

If, as Alva Rogers pointed out, Joe Gibson's only purpose in penning the Shaggy article was to insure a permanent place for him in the annals of fandom, than there can be no doubt that he has succeeded, in much the same manner that Christine Moskowitz has succeeded in making her name almost a complete synonym for "fugghhead" in fandom today.

And a biological quibble, Ted old man. As a matter of fact, in addition to the reproductive purpose, the female's vagina does serve a substantial role in the elimination of waste products, serving as a channel for periodic menstrual flows. Don't tell me they're now teaching little girls this dandy bit of misinformation. ((I didn't say that; John Langdon-Davies did. But the misunderstanding here is in his poor choice of words and in my quoting out of context. Langdon-Davies was referring to feces, which was explained in a portion of his comments which I failed to quote.))

It seems incredible that a state would actually pass a law banning anything that was "morally offensive" without going into more detail. There are so many items that could be construed as "morally offensive" that the mind boggles at the problems faced by a judge who handles cases from eager young individuals, demanding the banning of such "morally offensive"



items as: toilet seats, toothpaste, comic books, foundation garments, and just about anything you could possibly name. Who knows, maybe some joker will get the idea that the very court system trying these cases is morally offensive, and then where will they be?

I feel pretty much the same as Larry McCombs in regard to dressing codes, and as long as I can remember, my attitude has always been that I'll dress as I damn well please, not as other people do. I've long had an aversion for appearing in public in suit and tie, which I've always found to be thoroughly uncomfortable, and the fact that I must wear this type of outfit five days a week does little to alleviate the annoyance I derive from it. In warm weather, especially, I dress strictly for comfort (within limits, of course) and refuse to do it for any other reason but that. (I am probably one of those people whom Betty Kujawa would "pass by" for someone "who shows by garb or behavior a concern and consideration of those about him." I always dress comfortably, which for this season entails old, though presentable trousers, a sport-shirt open at the neck and not tucked into the trousers, and badly-worn, comfortable loafers. My hair is not always combed, and my unshaven face is masticating a cigar at most times. In the colder months, this garb is supplemented by the hat I once described in Habakkuk. If Betty were to pass me on the street, she would either continue on--thereby depriving herself of my thoroughly dreary personality--or offer me a dime for a cup of coffee. (I'm being facetious, Pete Graham.))

I, frankly, find sexy scenes in books and magazines on the boring side and am continually amazed by the scores of those in their late teens and early twenties who flock to the newsstands whenever a "hot" novel like "Lady Chatterly's Lover" or "Peyton Place" or "Tropic of Cancer" make the scene. I don't think I'm abnormal, but at the same time, I'm not overly moved by page after page of bedroom scenes, almost completely identical with one another. My girlfriend, who goes to nursing school in a large hospital in Newark, was telling me that the latest rage there is the paperbeck, "The Carpetbaggers," which practically every girl in the school has bought (and at 95¢ a copy there won't be any complaining from the publisher, either). I leafed through a copy on the stands and found it to be little more than a rehash of the current theme in sex novels, perhaps delved into a little more deeply with a little more interesting words.

JEFF WANSHEL  
6 BEVERLY PL.  
LARCHMONT, N.Y.

I would say that no one single fact separates man from the lower animals; for instance, is reason so superior to instinct as more highly developed in animal life? Of course, the answer to this is that reason and the use of logic is an outgrowth of instinct; and since the basic purpose of the human race seems to be as yet to survive, I would say that reason is more desirable, if barely more efficient. Of course, then one has to take the animal and insect societies into the argument, and there I leave. The use of language is not necessarily uplifting; animals and insects manage to communicate their ideas, one way or the other. The use of symbols would seem to be to be the main feature; however, the use of symbols has its firmest roots in the use of reasoning and language, and from there on the discussion dissolves into a game of philosophical musical chairs. I don't think there is any definite answer to the question: What, above all, distinguishes man from the lower animals? (There are a great number of answers to this question (only a few of which you have noted), some rather foolish and others quite in-



telligent. I believe that man's uniqueness lies in his superior brain--not only in the ability to reason, but in other areas as well, such as superior memory. I find your belief that reason is only "barely more efficient" in the contest for survival than instinct. Instinct is singularly limited in scope. Animals have instinctual reactions for various situations (e.g., the "playing dead" of the opossum, the broken-wing act of the kildeer, etc.), but these instinctual reactions vary only to a small degree in similar situations. An animal facing a situation for which it has no instinctual response will be at a loss for a solution, and will probably go into panic. (So, too, will a man faced with an unfamiliar situation, but he has less chance of coming face to face with one.) More important, instinct cannot be improved. An animal dies just as fit to survive as it was born; it cannot learn and thus add to its chances, whereas a man, having chosen the wrong alternative in a situation, will learn not to make the same mistake again. In many cases, it may not even be necessary for a man to make a mistake before realizing his error; he can foresee the outcome of his actions (as no animal ever can), and therefore deduce the probable chance of an action being successful. This is not to say that an animal is incapable of learning by error--but it usually takes him many attempts before the proper course is reached, and in a truly dangerous situation, one does not get that many chances. A praying mantid, for example, when placed into a cage separated by wire screening from a number of beetles will freeze into his statue-like position every time a beetle attempts to approach too closely, and the mantid will strike in its customary fashion, banging its claws against the screening. The creature will continue to perform this instinctual act, even though he does not catch a beetle but simply smacks into the screen. A man, after one or two unsuccessful attempts to grab something through an invisible shield, would learn that it was useless. There you see the principal difference between instinct and reason, a not insignificant one. +++ Some of the other suggested differences between mankind and the lower animals have been: the highly developed nature of our hands, the existence of a soul, and, nearly the same, the possession of humanity and conscience. The first reason is merely silly (any chimp can, given the intelligence to direct the action, perform the intricate finger movements of a concert pianist or a surgeon), and the latter two are unarguable in the space I have in this magazine. I don't happen to believe in the existence of a soul, and I have heard some substantial arguments in favor of the theory of some animals exhibiting charity.))

KEVIN LANGDON  
823 IDYLBERRY RD.  
SAN RAFAEL, CALIF.

I'm sorry I didn't make my remarks clearer, but I thought you'd realize that I disconnected the button from the thermonuclear missile before connecting it to the fire alarm. The invariant action is pushing the button; all the rest is circumstances. Maybe you should reprint the first paragraph from my last letter and take a shot at it. ((Very well. In Kipple #25, Kevin commented: "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." From the tone of your comments, I had assumed that the button would still release the missile. But what you are doing now is merely semantic quibbling, as is proved by your own comment last issue: "...a button which you know will launch a thermonuclear missile..." Going around pushing buttons isn't an immoral action (though walking down the street pushing belly-buttons may be branded as such...), but launching thermonuclear devices assuredly is immoral. The immoral ("invariant") action is the launching of the missile, not the pushing of the button; that should be obvious.))

The standard objection to a society organized around the Marx quote is "People won't work without an incentive." It is a sad commentary on modern civilization that no one I've discussed this with considers the possibility of a non-economic incentive. Some people really do work for other reasons than to make money.

A good shelter program might make a difference of one or two percent in the number of people who survive the actual nuclear attack, but, unless crops and livestock are also sheltered (a practical impossibility), it will make no difference in the number of people who survive the first year after the attack.

Larry McCombs: It doesn't take much time to encourage your students to read Lysenko and Lamarck (or any other authors). It's just necessary to mention at the beginning of the course that you encourage them to read the authors you mention in your lecture. ((Any student who would bother to do any such academic reading on his own time would not need encouragement or permission from the teacher.)) Most of them won't pay any attention, but then most of them wouldn't bother to read anything more than they had to anyway. ((That, unfortunately, is quite true. The average person--student or adult--reads very little more than is required of him by his job or school. The workers use for an excuse the dubious claim that they haven't time to read (although they have in most cases an abundance of time for television), and the students use the even weaker excuse that they have no appetite for reading since they are forced to read uninteresting material in school. This is an interesting justification, but one that I have never quite understood. I was forced to read uninteresting material in school--American history, for example--but because of this I welcomed the opportunity to read interesting, non-required books on my own time.))

Tom Armistead:  
You are assuming that it is necessary for a child to know about sex before reading or hearing about it. How in the hell is one supposed to find out about it then? ((There is no substitute for experience; the children in Huxley's "Brave New World" discovered sex in just that manner, while not yet in their teens.)) If this attitude were applied to, say, mathematics, we'd all be counting on our fingers.

Mike Deckinger:  
Sex education shouldn't be handled by parents for the same reason that other kinds of education aren't: most parents are ignorant of all but the most rudimentary facts about the subject.

LEN MOFFATT There is an interesting theory that our society would  
10202 BELCHER perhaps be improved by the introduction of nudism, no  
DOWNY, CALIF. doubt based on the fact that a semi-nude woman is more  
"provocative" to the male eye than is a completely naked woman. And of course it is the Unsatisfied Curiosity in the young that leads them to feelings of guilt and fear regarding sex. Children



whose questions on any and all subjects are answered honestly and frankly by their parents are less likely to grow up with these guilt complexes. But if everyone went around naked without these questions being answered correctly, it still wouldn't guarantee that some kids would grow into guilt-free adults. Knowing what the opposite sex looks like sans clothing doesn't tell the kids what sex is all about. They still have to learn maturity (or rather, a mature mental outlook) from adults who are mentally mature. Lack of shame brought about by the gradual introduction of public nudity (and it would have to be quite gradual--the human race just isn't mature enough as a whole to accept such a change in a matter of a few generations) would help; but there still could be guilt-feelings and shame.

Personally, having seen movies on nudist camps and nudist magazines, I think the "average nudist" is a pretty silly looking individual. The ones--and they seem to be in the minority--who keep themselves physically fit by proper diets and healthy exercise look okay without clothes, but so many of them look pretty slobbish--pot bellies, sagging breasts, flabby limbs, etc. They may be well tanned and feel free of shame, but running around naked part of the time hasn't automatically turned them into fine physical specimens.

Thanks Also To: John Boardman, Marion Bradley, D. A. Latimer, Mike Domina, Bob Underwood, B. Joseph Fekete, Richard Pinuski, and Lenny Kaye.

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



SEND TO

Len Moffatt  
10202 Belcher  
Downy, Calif.

Printed Matter Only

Return Requested

May Be Opened For Inspection

HELP STAMP OUT MENTAL HEALTH!