

Kipple 27

JULY

QUOTES AND NOTES by Ted Pauls.....	1
EAST-WEST RELATIONS by Fred Warner Neal.....	10
A SONG OF SIXPENCE by The Screaming Multitude.....	17
THE TOP SHELF by Ted Pauls	26
THE PULP MILL by Marion Z. Bradley.....	31

Kipple is published and edited monthly by Ted Pauls and Simon Catchcraw, 1448 Meridene Drive, Baltimore 12, Md. Copies are available for letters of comment, trades, contributions, or 15¢ per copy, 2/25¢. GO TWINS!

QUOTES & NOTES BY TED PAULS

To anyone not acquainted with the Baltimore News-Post, it would be extremely difficult to imagine a periodical which is so thoroughly dedicated to incompetency. Nearly anyone could bring to mind an example of a stupid local newspaper, but the News-Post, through studious application to the task, has become ever so much more. Not only has it a healthy stable of its very own abysmally ignorant writers, but it somehow manages to pick and choose over the syndicated columns in such a way as to publish only the most flagrantly foolish. Such a column is "On Your Guard," by Jack Lotto, which appears every Saturday. According to the accompanying blurb, "To help its readers keep on guard against propaganda, the News-Post brings you this authoritative weekly round-up." It is, as you may have guessed, devoted to "subversive activities" (which would doubtless include the publication of Kipple, if Mr. Lotto were aware of its existence), and the author is accomplished in the field of illogic. It contains, as a rule, all of the tactics which have become associated with the doom-criers of the radical right, none of which belong to the traditions of fair play or decency.

"A mass 'Mission to Moscow' by young Americans is in the works.

"Two hundred of the boys and girls who are going to attend the Communist-sponsored 8th World Youth Festival in Helsinki, are being invited to be guests of the Soviet Union for at least two weeks.

"It is a little 'extra bonus' to entice greater U.S. youth participation in the big anti-American show, July 27-August 5."

Because of this "extra bonus" (which will undoubtedly be a memorable experience for two hundred youngsters), the June 9, 1962 installment of Mr. Lotto's column is entitled "Moscow Luring U.S. Youth." This is un-

doubtedly a more eye-catching heading than "Atlantic City Luring U.S. Youth" or "Pismo Beach Luring U.S. Youth," although it means no more and no less. As for whether or not the Youth Festival will be a "big anti-American show," I frankly do not know, but in any case I don't believe that we readers should be forced to accept Mr. Lotto's word alone for this. It is obvious that any Soviet-sponsored show is likely to be heavily pro-Soviet, but this is not quite the same as it being anti-American. There is a much more substantial reason for my refusal to accept Mr. Lotto's word, however, which begins to become noticeable in the next segment of the column:

"To ensure the fullest possible U.S. youth attendance at the Red-run and dominated propaganda affair, a U.S. Festival Committee has been hard at work throughout the country, especially on college campuses.

"The festival is under the control of two international Communist fronts. They are the World Federation for Democratic Youth, and the International Union of Students. (...) To round up young recruits, the committee runs entertainment programs.

"A star performer at a recent affair--Pete Seeger, folk singer and banjo-strummer. He has been identified as a member of the Communist Party."

There are several extremely interesting presumptions and conclusion-jumps inherent in those excerpts. One might immediately question the use of such a rabble-rousing term as "Red-run propaganda," which has no place in an objective article. This is not, unfortunately, an objective article; it is not even a vaguely consistent one. Mr. Lotto damns propaganda (as something one must be "on guard" against) when his entire article is, in fact, propaganda. Of course, the inevitable answer to this is that, my goodness, that Communist stuff is propaganda, but this American material is only honest reporting. Regrettably, I cannot attribute to an article the qualities of honest reporting when it bases its objections to two organizations on the premise that Pete Seeger entertained at one of their parties. Even if Seeger is a Communist, this comment has no meaning; but we have no way in which to be certain that even this is true--except, of course, Mr. Lotto's word that the singer "has been identified" as a Communist. But Mr. Lotto obtains his information from what might charitably be termed rather odd sources:

"One of the decision-makers [of the two committees] is Michael Myerson, chairman and executive secretary of the board of the festival committee. The House Un-American Activities Committee identified Myerson as one of the 'key promoters' of the student demonstrations against the congressional committee in San Francisco in May of 1960."

This is a non-sequitur: how can one be a "promoter" of demonstrations which were entirely spontaneous? But even if Mr. Lotto's comment did not develop holes in its fabric at this point, it could be discredited merely by induction--i.e., by simply realizing that nothing that the HUAC has claimed for the May, 1960 incident has turned out to be true, and so that if Mr. Myerson were actually a "promoter" of the demonstrations, such a revelation would mar the otherwise untarnished record of

the HUAC in the field of falsehoods, half-truths, and unsupported pre-
sumptions. (See Kipple #23, #24; Warhoon #12; Habakkuk #3; et al.)

A weekly or daily roundup of "propaganda" is probably not a very good idea, but even excusing the existence of such a propaganda device, the lack of fairness cannot be condoned. An absurd number of Americans seem to believe that any tactics are excusable in fighting allegedly "subversive" activities (whether communist, or, as more often, liberal). Even where the activities must be admitted to deserve "fighting," there is no justification for the premise that the ends justify the means. Richard Nixon once commented, in what is perhaps the only statement of his with which I concur, that when the ends are thought to justify the means, the means become the ends.

Nothing spoils a clean cause so much as a dirty fight...

+ + +
+ + +

From "America--Too Young To Die!" by Major Alexander P. de Seversky:

"Some scientists predict that a bomb could be designed to blow our planet to bits. If that can be done, I am sure someone will design one. If he designs it, he unquestionably will build it. And when it is built, he will not be able to resist the temptation to detonate it, just for the hell of it, to prove it can be done. In that case, of course, the problem of national defense will be greatly simplified. In fact, all our problems will be simplified."

+ + +
+ + +

This I believe to be self-evident:

That man differs only in his superior intelligence, his ability to reason, from the so-called "lower" animals. I place no faith in any blatherings about "soul". All of the qualities normally identified with the "soul" of a man--conscience, humanity, etc.--are directly attributable to his ability to reason. When one reaches the logical conclusion that it is foolish to harm others purely for personal gain, one is said to have a "conscience". Man is unique only in his superior intelligence. Given the intelligence, any normal chimpanzee could perform the delicate motions of a surgeon's hands with its own. Many animals are faster, stronger, and larger than man; many have superior senses of sight, touch, taste, smell and hearing. Only in mentality is man necessarily superior to even the most minor animal.

That we have nothing more valuable to leave to future generations of Homo sapien than knowledge. It is possible to build a large and wealthy corporation and to leave it to one's children, but this is only incidental. Knowledge is our most valuable gift to our children; one cannot truly claim to have accomplished anything until he has, in some manner, added to mankind's store of knowledge. Only then can he die with the thought, "I have contributed something."

That the most heinous crime existent is the failure to utilize intelligence for this purpose. The human being born with intelligence, capable of contributing, no matter how little, but who prefers to remain throughout his life an unlearned hedonist--that human being is being unfaithful not only to his own heritage, but to his present peers and future descendants.

That hypocrisy is the great sin of the common man. The dishonest person is harmful to the society in which he exists, but the hypocrite is not only this, but further dishonest to himself. Hypocrisy, compromise of opinions, passive indulgence through fear of consequences...all this is a crime against oneself. The betrayal of one's own attitudes and opinions is unforgivable, no matter what the justifications offered. It is better to be severely punished for something you do believe in than to be richly rewarded for something you do not believe in.

That only through the rigid adherence to one's own beliefs can one be an individual, can one truly claim to be a human being. Decide what you believe, then do it; there is no middle ground, no fence to straddle, if one is to truly be an individual.

+	+	+
+	+	+

This twenty-seventh installment of "Quotes & Notes" should be more than normally annoying to Pete Graham and other fun-loving chaps, who think I spend too much time reading and commenting on newspapers. Even Harry Warner, whose words are usually granted a respect generally reserved for the Oracle of Delphi, points out that I seem to be spending too much time reading bad newspapers. All of this has a purpose, however. Someday, an astute anthologist will compile a very thick tome dealing with the stupidities committed by persons in minor authority. Whoever decides to compile this Who's Who of idiots will find only one source open to him for reference: back files of all the major newspapers in the world. Only here is it possible to find such a magnificently complete record of the unique escapades of censors, bigots, flag-wavers, and other dunderheads. My aim is to anticipate this anthologist with my own minor listing of such incidents, and at the same time advertise his volume by acquainting my readers with the possible nature of such a collection. In this, my purpose is entirely unselfish; if that future best-selling author is reading this magazine, I will take this opportunity to inform him that I refuse to accept any compensation for my labor other than a purely nominal 5 or 10 percent.

Besides, as I pointed out to Harry, if I didn't read a great number of newspapers, this column wouldn't be nearly so lengthy.

In Carroll County, Maryland, for example, there has been a minor teapott tempest resulting from the introduction of a history book ("The Story of American Freedom") into the county schools. Historians are expected to make mistakes, and indeed such errors provide momentary relief from the normally boring progression of names and dates in most history books, but these errors traditionally increase in number in proportion to the antiquity of the period under discussion. It is decidedly unusual when one such text attributes the winning of World War II to the wrong nation or nations. "The Story of American Freedom" does not teach that the Axis powers were victorious, but it attributes the victory to

the United Nations, a then non-existent organization. I agree that the prestige of this organization sorely needs boosting, but this is absurd... According to the school board authorities of Carroll County, the book will not be withdrawn, requests requests from several principals. It is deemed cheaper to allow the students to read the book, but with the verbal corrections of the teacher.

In spite of an impressive record of conspicuous damnfoolishness, the schools of Maryland do not alone hold the line on stupidity. Recently, in the Evening Sun, twenty-three column-inches were devoted to the story and accompanying photograph of an incident which occurred in a Chicago school. Two high school students, both 15-year-old boys, were ordered by the principal of the Mark Twain school to pick up their diplomas at her office, rather than attend graduation exercises. The reason for this move was that the appearance of the students did not conform to the rules of the school. Such rules have been discussed in the pages of this magazine before, and at the time, Marion Bradley, among others, found certain justification for such rules. (See Kipple #20.) On reflection, I was forced to agree. Unfortunately, in this particular case I find no justification whatever. The boys, pictured looking at themselves in a mirror in the accompanying photograph, are well-dressed, clean-cut, typical American boys. They are obviously not given to unattractive extremes of dress or what many school officials term "unduly showy" hair styles. The sole crime of these teenagers is their failure to part their hair--that is, they comb it straight back. Perhaps I am simply unperceptive, but if there is a sensible reason for this restriction, I certainly wish someone would explain it to me. As far as I am concerned, it is merely a minor way in which the school officials assert the authority they seem to think they deserve; not for a valid reason, but simply to show that they can assert authority.

This seems to have been a splendid month for unintelligent proposals in and about the field of education. Mike Deckinger, one of Kipple's many roving reporters, forwards a clipping from the New York World Telegram and Sun for June 18, 1962. It is of particular interest, since it concerns the frustrated efforts of a few intelligent persons to expand the scope of sex education in New York's schools. This is a subject that has been discussed by a number of people in recent issues of Kipple. In this case, the concern with sex education is traced to an "alarming increase" in venereal disease among persons under 21. In order to accomplish anything of significance, the rules and regulations governing such delicate teachings must be torn down and rebuilt from the word go.

"The city schools permit discussion in the classroom of sex attributes of lower forms of biological life such as plants, but stops short of mammalian reproduction. However, health education teachers are permitted to answer privately questions asked by pupils.

"The schools have long banned sex education at the level of mammalian reproduction. The last effort to break the ban was unsuccessful in 1939."

In spite of their restrictions, the schools of New York are still obviously head and shoulders above those of Baltimore. In New York, one may learn about sex on a level below that of mammalian reproduction, but in this fair city, the teaching must cease on levels lower than that of

the mammals. (From recently recorded experiences with a relative of mine, it obviously doesn't extend so far as the physiology of a hen...) But the major problem with even the circumscribed form of sex education allowed by the now-existent rules is that the "private" (i.e., secret) information may, like sex education in segregated classes, foster the notion that there is something to hide. This should be prevented if at all possible. In my opinion, an entirely adequate sex education could be instilled in a biology class by using as a textbook John Langdon-Davies' "Seeds of Life" (Signet Key Book #Ks345, 35¢). This fascinating volume thoroughly examines sex from the most primitive vegetative reproduction, through the chaotic and many-faceted sex lives of Plasmodium and Phylloxera, and into human reproduction. Under current conditions, possession of this book in an American public school would probably constitute a near hanging offense, but it is perhaps the most valuable text of its kind in existence.

Calvin Demmon also deserves the brass ring for his discovery of Ray Gauer, head of the Southern California Citizens for Decent Literature. Mr. Gauer was in Inglewood a few months ago in order to assist in the forming of an Inglewood chapter, and Cal forwarded a clipping from an unnamed Inglewood newspaper regarding the initial meeting. Mr. Gauer seems to specialize in the endless spouting of cliches. Such fascinating examples as "This is not 'dirt for dirt's sake,' this is 'dirt for money's sake'" and "Every evil act is preceded by an evil thought" appear in the clipping. Like most short-pants Comstocks, Gauer is not overly concerned with "hard-core pornography," but rather with "girlie magazines, nudist magazines" and some "pocket books." His organization is not a censorship organization--"it simply wants to rid the nation of objectionable material." Since the Citizens for Decent Literature organization is just about the most objectionable material I can think of at the moment, I suggest he begin there and thus imitate the snake swallowing its own tail...

Oh hell, I've been reading too many newspapers.

+ + +
+ + +

Many of those who look askance at my continued quoting from newspapers have offered several alternatives: (1) that I write material other than serious commentary--satirical fiction, humor, and, in general, light material of all sorts--; and (2) that I draw from other fanzines the source material for the same sort of commentary which at present comprises this column. The first suggestion is impractical for the simple reason that I am not capable of writing such material very often. With a few notable exceptions, my attempts at writing light material are failures, as for example the admitted drivel about the contents of my desk which Pete Graham so astutely quoted in his parody. My lack of effort along these lines in many issues is caused only by my grudging admission that a lack of talent for such material exists. Though I would dearly love to be able to write the sort of material which consistently appears in "Cogito" (Discord), it simply isn't possible within the bounds of my limited talents.

The second proposition is more tenable. I have, in fact, drawn material from other fanzines in some cases, such as my recent commentary on Joe Gibson. However, fanzines do not provide the wide field of the

press, because even the most fuggheaded fanzine article cannot hope to approach the level of stupidity consistently encountered in the newspapers. Nevertheless, there are a few items from various fanzines to which I wish to give my attention, although I risk being accused by another faction of spending too much time reading fanzines.

Several months ago, I intended to comment on a section of F. M. Busby's column ("With Keen Blue Eyes and A Bicycle") in the April issue of Cry. Somehow, I never got around to it, being intensely occupied with people like Alice McCluskey and George Sokolsky. In order to please a heretofore neglected segment of my tremendously large readership, however, I shall make my comments here and now.

"The finest piece of fugghead-dissecting I've seen in years /quoth Buz/ turned up the other day, by Wm F Buckley, in National Review (there will be a short break while the liberals climb back down off the ceiling). (...) I've read 'An Evening With Jack Paar,' in which Buckley deftly cuts Paar too short to hang up; it was utterly delightful, and I was reminded sorrowfully that the fannish shoes of F Towner Laney are still standing empty. Buckley would be the perfect ally in a really slambang fan-feud; he did not leave one stone standing on another, in Paar's ~~head~~ case. Like wow."

Now, all of this leads to certain rather unpleasant conclusions. In the past, I have never known F. M. Busby to be less than fair-minded. Indeed, he seems to have tended, if anything, to the opposite extreme, for it was at one time my talent (and calling) to make annoying comments to Buz. One irresponsible comment, in particular, caused him a great deal of personal anxiety and distress, since it was in regard to his pet project, the Berry Fund. He was nevertheless thoroughly kind in dealing with this upstart neofan of tender years. However, this current applauding of Buckley's axe job is shocking, and can lead only to the conclusion that Buz, at least in this case, either has no need to see, or chooses to ignore, both sides of the argument. William F. Buckley's critique, although cleverly executed, was totally unfair and in many cases incorrect. It concerned an appearance by the notable conservative on Jack Paar's television show, during which he was allowed to present his opinions and was then soundly thrashed by Jack Paar. Although Downs is a wishy-washy conservative and Paar knows a great deal less than he believes himself to know, they nevertheless did a laudable job of shooting Buckley down in flames. The audience vigorously applauded his destruction, except for a small segment of his fans and admirers who stalked out at this point. Buckley, in retaliation for this humiliation, penned what Buz terms a fine piece of "fugghead-dissecting" in his National Review.

Unfortunately, "An Evening With Jack Paar" has little relation to reality. I am amazed that Buz didn't realize that such an account in Buckley's own magazine would obviously be slanted to a great extent; even if he hadn't seen the original interview, this much could have been ascertained by simply knowing the ordinary nature of Buckley's tactics. But Jack Paar also saw "An Evening With Jack Paar," and he handled it admirably on his show. This was done simply by quoting a paragraph or so of Mr. Buckley's account, then showing on tape the section of the

original show to which it referred. Need I bother to mention that this comparison proved Mr. Buckley's slanting to have reached horizontal proportions...?

Buckley was, in short, hoist by his own petard; cut to shreds by his very own words, without any comment by Paar or Downs being necessary. If this is what F. M. Busby calls "the finest piece of fugghead-dissecting (he's) seen in years," I can only assume that he saw neither of the Jack Paar shows in question. The dangers of asserting such opinions while possessing only one side of the story are well-known, and I don't believe that Buz would consciously want to become associated with that form of thinking.

I do agree with him on one point, however: Buckley would be a fine ally in a "slambang fan-feud." Since such tussles are uniformly devoid of fairness or ethics, just such a person is perfectly suited to participate in one. William F. Buckley qualifies nicely.

The second instance of saving four cents on a letter of comment is to no less venerable a publication than Discord. In the 17th issue of that journal, Kevin Langdon, most articulate of the recent crop of new fans, makes this observation: "The family is not the result of some natural human drive. It is absent even in many comparatively primitive societies. It is rather the result of the psychotic possessiveness of society." Kevin and I seldom agree on anything, but our arguments seem usually mere disagreements on points of definition. This may hold true in this case as well. Although many societies have family or clan units which differ--sometimes drastically--from our own, there is in all cases some sort of unit. Man is neither a social nor a solitary creature, but a combination of the two, and different primitive societies give evidence of different methods of reconciling the two driving emotions. But if Kevin can enumerate many primitive societies--or even a single one--in which no sort of family unit exists, it will shock not only your beloved editor, but also an impressive array of anthropologists. No less eminent anthropologist than Margaret Meade states, in her "Male and Female" (Mentor Book #MD150, 50¢; page 145), that "When we survey all known human societies, we find everywhere some form of the family, some set of permanent arrangements by which males assist females in caring for children while they are young."

As I say, our disagreement here may once again be a product of varying definitions. Kevin may have been referring specifically to our particular form of family unit (though why such a distinction should be made is not known to me), in which case he is, of course, correct in saying that "many" primitive societies lack such a unit. But in any event, it is clear that his comment is either wrong (if used in the broader sense) or useless (if used in the specific sense).

A society without a family unit of some sort would be one which fails to recognize these two basic proposals: that of responsibility for one's offspring, and that of safety-in-numbers. The Dobu society of New Guinea is one of the most fantastic primitive societies in existence. Treachery, deceit, and, in some cases, adultery are recognized as virtuous; practically nothing is considered "criminal," unless you are unfortunate enough to be caught. But even here there is a family unit, and the society recognizes the needs mentioned above. The parents, in spite of their promiscuity and probable lack of concern, are held ac-

countable for the safety and welfare of their children. Many other societies, although possessing mores which differ widely and wildly from those accepted by "civilized" people, are nevertheless alike in that a family unit of a sort exists.

Having exhausted several months' supply of fanzines in less than three pages, I am forced to conclude that fanzines, although occasionally irritating, will never replace newspapers for sheer idiocy. And for that, dear hearts, we may all be thankful...

+ + +
+ + +

SHORT NOTES ON LONG SUBJECTS:

The article in this issue by Prof. Fred Warner Neal is reprinted from his pamphlet, "U.S. Foreign Policy and the Soviet Union," published by the Fund for the Republic. Single copies of this pamphlet (many times longer than the article reprinted herein) may be obtained free of charge from the Fund at this address: Box 4068, Santa Barbara, Calif. This material also appears in "The Shelter Hoax and Foreign Policy," a pamphlet published by Marzani and Munsell, Inc., 100 West 23rd Street, New York 11, New York, and available for \$1.00 per copy. This latter pamphlet also contains material by Carl Marzani, Field-Marshal Sir Bernard Montgomery, and Prof. Leo Szilard. I have no doubt that by the time this magazine appears Prof. Neal's article will have been printed in a number of other publications, among them Void and Yandro.

The January issue of this august publication was slated to contain a poll, similar to that distributed by Fanac. I first considered the idea of intruding into the domain of Fanac in this manner in late 1959, but Ron Ellik convinced me that one poll was quite enough. Again in 1960 the idea was contemplated, but it was once again abandoned for the same reason. However, the results of the 1961 Fanac Poll failed to appear (except in highly condensed form), and this oversight bolstered my own plans for a fan poll, now postponed until the beginning of 1962. Once again I was thwarted by a combination of circumstances, not the least of which was the fact that the distribution of such a poll with that January issue would have placed the magazine into a higher postal bracket. I consoled myself with the thought that at least the Fanac Poll, being under new management, would appear on time and the results would be published quickly. Unfortunately, that February publication has not yet appeared, even though July is but a few days off. I shall therefore make the following announcement: the January 1963 issue of Kipple will include a poll, come the proverbial Hell or high water. I now have six months to thoroughly plan for all of the incidents which might confuse, delay, or otherwise injure those plans.

--Ted Pauls

28 The number in the space to the left of this paragraph is the number of the last issue you will receive unless I hear from you in some manner. If a letter appears in that space rather than a number, it could mean one of several things: the letter "C" means that you are represented in this issue with an article or letter; "T" indicates that we trade magazines; "P" refers to your envied position on my permanent mailing list; "S" means this is a sample copy; and "PZCKVMTR" indicates that you have been cut from the list and are not receiving this issue.

What are possible areas of negotiation with the Russians? First and foremost there are those concerning thermonuclear weapons, both in regard to a test ban agreement and in regard to disarmament. Negotiations on these matters, which have seemed interminable and have often been acrimonious, survived the U-2 atmosphere. Both sides have at times compromised, at times stiffened positions. In neither of the cases has the Soviet Union taken intransigent positions or indicated an unwillingness to negotiate seriously. If the United States has doubts that the U.S.S.R. really desires agreements, the same doubts exist in the U.S.S.R. about the United States.

The fate of the test ban negotiations is illustrative. In April, 1959, the Russians made a major concession when they withdrew their earlier demand for limited on-site inspections subject to a veto and proposed that a quota be set for the number of such inspections but that such inspections themselves be unrestricted and veto-free. While the number of inspections remained in dispute, leading American scientists privy to the negotiations felt there were no real barriers to agreement. At that time, however, the United States drew back, raising the question of difficulties in detecting underground explosions and asking that the ban not apply to certain types of underground and atmospheric tests. Although there was no evidence to support them, American officials began to voice suspicions that the Soviet Union was carrying on secret underground tests, and the Atomic Energy Commission called for resumption of tests by the United States. The new administration in Washington then seemed ready to compromise on the number of inspections. At this point, in the spring of 1961, it was the Soviet turn to pull back. Ambassador Tsarapkin now demanded a three-man secretariat comprised on representatives of the U.S. and Soviet blocks and the neutralists--the troika idea--and unanimity before inspection could be undertaken. This proposal was clearly unacceptable to the West.

Any doubts that Moscow had lost interest in a test ban were dispelled by Mr. Khrushchev's announcement that nuclear testing was to be resumed. The Soviet resumption of testing was a dangerous act, whether it was an irrational one or not. It subjected large areas of the earth to more fallout. It apparently blasted any hopes of a test ban agreement. And it increased international tensions. Doubtless it reflected the general stiffening of Soviet policy--probably in connection with the Berlin crisis--and it may have involved pressure from the

EAST - WEST

POSSIBLE AREAS

Chinese. But there were also military factors. Since the U.S.S.R. had conducted many fewer tests than the United States, presumably it was behind in weapon development. That the decision was taken--despite international political consequences--to try to catch up indicates its relation to the disarmament negotiations. Aside from the fallout question, the real significance of a test agreement would be as a step toward an agreement on control or elimination of thermonuclear weapons. The Soviet attitude on testing seems to indicate a belief that the United States is not prepared to make an agreement on disarmament.

The disarmament negotiations have revealed deeper and more serious difficulties than were apparent in the test ban talks. Here, despite frequent official and press comment, the major problem is more basic than inspection. As far as inspection goes, the Soviet Union has proposed detailed plans for virtually unrestricted, veto-free inspection. But they have tied it to an agreement that accepts the idea of complete or "total" disarmament, and on this point the Americans have repeatedly demurred. We have insisted on working out an inspection system before proceeding to discuss disarmament. There has not been agreement on the inspection mechanism either, but Khrushchev has repeatedly declared that if the West will accept the principle of total disarmament he, in turn, will accept "any kind of inspection." While there may be a valid reason for holding back on total, across-the-board disarmament at this time, we have not agreed either to the idea of "total" thermonuclear disarmament in advance of details on an inspection system. On the other hand, the Soviet system has never rejected partial disarmament. If the West would not adopt total disarmament, Khrushchev has declared, "the Soviet government is ready to come to agreement with other states on appropriate partial steps of disarmament and strengthening of security."

Perhaps Khrushchev does not really mean his sweeping pledge about accepting "any kind of inspection," but, of course, we shall never know if we do not take him up on it. That we have not, despite the advantages it would offer in terms of propaganda value if nothing else, casts doubt on how seriously the United States really desires an agreement. These doubts cannot be completely dispelled with ease because, given overall American policy, our position is ambiguous. We want agreements in principle but only if they can be had "without risk." Quite honestly fearing Soviet aggression, the major American policy-

RELATIONS OF NEGOTIATION

makers disagree with President Eisenhower's chief negotiator, James J. Wadsworth, who expressed his belief that "the Russian government has every intention of living up to any agreement they may make from the standpoint of nuclear tests or the larger area of disarmament." These officials also deny George Kennan's point that "the best security we can have against violation will not be the inspection provisions themselves...but the absence of incentive to violation." The logic of their position, given the fact that a really "foolproof" inspection system is technically impossible, is that any disarmament agreement would jeopardize our security. Instead of disarmament, the American preference is for "arms control". This would, hopefully, minimize the risk of war and at the same time constitute an "enlargement of the scope of our military strategy." Such a concept is unacceptable to Moscow and to many others who feel that anything short of complete elimination of at least all thermonuclear weapons would not deal with the main problem.

(This reluctance to accept disarmament as a goal may also reflect fear that without arms the United States cannot halt development of communism arising internally in backward countries. Such fear is both unnecessary and unbecoming to citizens of a country with the ideas and capabilities of the United States. The resulting rejection of disarmament as a goal is also irrational, because armament itself cannot halt development of communism. This is true not only of thermonuclear weapons but also of "conventional" armament. Development of communism can be halted only by providing a better alternative. The apparent American emphasis on "guerrilla" warfare is only another indication of our failure to grasp the reality of the social revolutionary impetus that grips the underdeveloped areas.)

Nothing said here should be construed as advocating that the United States give up its military strength while the Russians keep theirs. But one does not have to advocate unilateral disarmament, or anything like it, to see that there are any number of steps we could take without jeopardizing our security. Among them, for example, is a plan for cautious phased or graduated unilateral curtailment of our military posture, with very small steps taken in the beginning, with invitations to the Russians to follow suit, and with the understanding that the procedure can be halted at any point. Imagination and more imagination, in both word and deed, is what is needed to break the deadlock. Nothing can be done, however, until it is realized we are not in a chess game but in a deadly maze from which we must break our or perish.

Furthermore, agreement on nuclear weapons is inextricably tied up with political settlements, and political settlements are unlikely without an easing of tension. Here American policy, again based on the assumption of Soviet military aggression, has shown no indication of moves toward settlement of issues making for conflict. It is apparent not only that we are unwilling to discuss disengagement in any form but also that we are proceeding with a policy of arming our NATO allies with nuclear weapons. It is not at all clear that this policy does not apply also to Western Germany. There is good reason to fear that the results of such a policy, regardless of its aims, could make any real agreement on either disengagement or disarmament practically impossible. Furthermore, apparently, there seems to be no thinking about the future of our bases which more or less encircle the Soviet Union. There are, after all, only two ways to settle international conflicts--force and mutual compromise. While the United States does not want to use force, it is not always clear that it wants to consider mutual compro-

mise.

There is, indeed, grave reason to believe that the American position on these matters is unrealistic, inflexible, and unimaginative. Basically, our position throughout continues to be conditioned by our assumption of the constant danger of Soviet military aggression. Sometimes this is modified by defining Soviet policy as being committed to use "all possible means" for the expansion of communism and the extension of its power. As indicated above, this thinking is based on distorted evidence or no evidence at all and ignores the strong reasons for considering that the Soviet theory of coexistence is predicated not on making war but on avoiding it.

Furthermore, the concept of agreements totally without risk has no validity. As George Kennan puts it, "...cultivation of the ideal military posture will always be in conflict with any serious effort to ease international political tensions." And a policy "not prepared to make sacrifices and to accept risks in the military field should not lay claim to any serious desire to see world problems settled by any means short of war." The risks, in any case, are comparative, and the implication of American policy is that we are in greater danger from Soviet aggression than from a continuation of the thermonuclear arms race. Unfortunately, the evidence is to the contrary.

Berlin is a good example of the difficulties that arise both from past American policies and from our refusal to think in terms of possible compromise on points of dispute between us and the Russians. We are perfectly right in refusing to be "pushed out" of Berlin. Having made commitments--loudly and often--to the West Berliners, our concern to "save them from communism" is understandable. But it is no policy at all simply to reiterate that we will "stand firm," and it is only sophistry to assert that since the United States is demanding no change in the status of Berlin the issue arises only because of Soviet aggression and trouble-making. The situation in Berlin is abnormal and impermanent. It is nonsense to talk about the Berlin situation as part of a status quo that must be maintained. One does not have to agree with Soviet proposals to see that the Russian concern over the presence of foreign troops stationed far inside one of the satellite states which the West refuses to recognize is entirely natural. Furthermore, our position in Berlin is highly untenable militarily, diplomatically, and legally. Under these conditions the long-continued failure of the West even to discuss possible compromises on the Berlin issue was irresponsible.

To see the Berlin question in some perspective, it is necessary to consider several factors in connection with the whole question of Germany. First, the raison d'etre for our presence in Berlin has changed not only once but twice. Originally, Berlin, although more than a hundred miles inside the Soviet zone, was set apart on the grounds that it would be again the capital of a unified Germany. Then disputes over quadripartite administration led to a more formal and legal division of Germany. Certainly responsibility for this dispute must be shared by both the United States and the Soviet Union. If there was ever any agreement that was mutually violated, it was the Potsdam agreement on Germany. We felt we were reacting to Soviet policy, but it was, after all, the United States that took the initiative in formalizing the split when we presided over the combining of the Western zones and then established them as a West German state. The Soviet Union, in establishing an East German state, was merely following suit.

Subsequent American policy has emphasized what Secretary of State Rusk, in the summer of 1961, called the "many contradictions and historical fallacies in the present position of the Soviet leaders," but has ignored the contradictions and historical fallacies in our own position. The Western assumption that we had a right to create "our" German state but that the Soviet Union did not have a right to create "theirs" is so untenable that we do not even assert it in this manner, let alone try to justify it. Furthermore, this division of Germany completely altered if it did not destroy the practical as well as the legal basis for Berlin's separate status and for Western presence there.

With reunification no longer possible, the rationale of our presence in Berlin clearly could no longer be that it was a maneuver concerned with reunification. It was at this point that the Russians began to press their proposals for a change in the Berlin situation. This Soviet decision must also be considered in connection with other factors. The Western powers refused to recognize the East German republic as well as the Oder-Neisse frontier with Poland. The West German republic, its rearmament growing apace with its economic development, likewise refuses to accept the Oder-Neisse Line and has been ostentatiously asserting a claim to West Berlin.

In considering possibilities for settling the sorest point at issue between the United States and Soviet Union, the general international political climate must be considered. This climate is significantly affected by two highly important factors: the constantly recurring matter of Eastern Europe and the question of American bases around the Soviet Union.

Although American policy no longer is couched in wild and irresponsible terms like "liberation," it continues to emphasize the desirability of interfering in Eastern Europe one way or another, apparently oblivious of the impact this sort of challenge has on the Kremlin. This American attitude of non-acceptance of these Communist regimes has virtually no effect on the course of affairs in Eastern Europe. If there is any way at all that the Soviet hegemony can be weakened, it is through a lessening of international tension. There is no doubt, for instance, that American policy toward Germany and the Oder-Neisse Line is an important factor motivating many Poles and Czechs toward accepting strong Soviet influence.

It is entirely understandable that many if not most Americans view the satellite regimes with disapproval. It is understandable that so many Americans have been led to believe that constant official expressions of opposition, which in no way eases the plight of the Eastern European people and if anything makes life harder for them, serve any good purpose. Can there be justification for a course which accomplishes nothing but the opposite of its intention and, at the same time, interferes with efforts to lessen the dangers of a nuclear holocaust? Yet this is exactly the impact of American policy toward Eastern Europe. This policy may be largely hortatory, but it is still one of the most significant factors creating dissension between the Soviet Union and the United States. It must be reevaluated, not in terms of cheap and dishonest pandering for political support from Polish-American and similar groups but in terms of the realities of the situation and the interest of the United States.

The impact of American bases around the Soviet Union is seldom discussed in the United States. Convinced of our own devotion to peace, we have been unable, apparently, to see how provocative these bases are in Moscow's

eyes, even when they have been utilized for such activities as U-2 flights. Even if one assumes that the bases once served some purpose, it is necessary to ask whether they still do today in view of the capabilities of Soviet weaponry and rocketry. To what extent does their existence interfere with agreements that might reduce the dangers of the very war against which the bases are supposed to guard? Can the bases be maintained forever? And if not forever, how is eventual withdrawal envisaged, and when? Is it possible that a powerful nation like the Soviet Union, no longer second in military strength, will indefinitely permit itself to be encircled in this way? Is it realistic to assume that Soviet reactions to an American military posture in, say, Iran are any different from what ours would be to a Soviet base in Cuba?

Our idea, of course, has been to "contain" the Soviet Union. The bases were established in a period when the U.S.S.R. was in a markedly inferior position militarily. Today, is not the Soviet Union likely to be encouraged to do some "containing" of its own? Is there any reason why two cannot play at the game? The tides of international politics are never certain. Who knows who may end up "containing" whom? All these are questions to which American policy must address itself if it is to seek realistically to avoid war and serve the interest of the United States.

But what is the interest of the United States? Most of this discussion has implied some compromise in present American positions. The implication is, obviously, that the United States is too inflexible in some areas and over-committed in others. There is, of course, no thought of "giving in" to the Russians on any issue involving vital American security interests, American core interests. The point is, rather, whether American core interests should not be more carefully defined. Can the United States, any more than any other nation, have interests of equal significance to its security all over the globe? To suggest that certain interests are primary to us and that certain interests of less import to us are primary to other nations, and to negotiate compromises regarding these latter areas, in no sense constitutes "appeasement" (a word that has been so misused as to connote almost any compromise with Moscow). It is only common sense to see that an assertion of global core interests, regardless of the high ideals that may motivate it, can only bring conflict because of inevitable collision with core interests of other nations. At best, it will encourage globalization of other nations' core interests. The United States has military bases in many areas immediately bordering the Soviet Union. Our position has been that these are necessary for our security. But do not such attempts to achieve "total security" inevitably mean the "total insecurity" of other countries? Does the United States really have a greater security stake in areas immediately bordering the Soviet Union than does the Soviet Union itself?

It is true that for the United States to withdraw its military bases from some of these areas might result in exposing them over the long run to Soviet influence and even Soviet domination, although there is no basis for assuming that withdrawal of American forces in various areas near the Soviet Union would mean that the Russians would necessarily "move in" physically. On the other hand, our reliance on a military posture in many countries tends to interfere with the very domestic political and economic reforms--and our acceptance of them--that constitute the basic prerequisite for preventing Communist success.

It is often asked, "Suppose we

do restrict our global interests? Suppose, for example, we do give up some bases and stop heckling the Russians about Eastern Europe? What do we get in return?" We have become so used to the idea that we have a right to global interests, while the Russians don't, that this is, for many Americans, a natural question. It is important to realize that we cannot expect the Soviet Union to "give up" anything simply because we cease maintaining a position that threatens Soviet vital interests. In order to imagine how the Russians feel about this, we must think how we would feel if the Soviet Union had military bases in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Quebec, Ontario, and the West Indies, while we had no bases at all around the Soviet Union. Would this produce an atmosphere conducive to trust and to consideration of mutual compromises? Or, assume that we did not have military bases around the Soviet Union --which we do--and assume that the Soviet Union did have a military base in Cuba--which it does not. What would we give up as a quid pro quo for the Russians withdrawing their base from Cuba? Even under the existing base situation, the comparatively moderate interest the U.S.S.R. has expressed in the Castro regime has caused indignation and concern in the United States.

The suggestion that we might consider abandoning some bases is made, of course, in the interest of the United States, not the Soviet Union. But in achieving a more rational American foreign policy, better able to serve our own interest, we would also contribute to an international situation in which meaningful agreements would be more rather than less likely, because then the possibility for mutual compromises would present itself. It is not proposed, for example, that the United States unilaterally withdraw its forces from Central or Western Europe. But mutual disengagement, in a situation where American bases no longer ringed Soviet borders, would be a true subject for negotiation. Making it clear that we would recognize Soviet interests in areas around the Soviet periphery, also, would be an earnest policy for seeking assurances from the U.S.S.R. for hands off Cuba and all Latin America.

Of course, we cannot be certain that adequate compromises would be forthcoming from the Russians, although there is no reason to assume they would not be, since there is no reason to assume they are not serious about their fear of nuclear war and their desire to minimize the danger of it. But because the United States, by concentrating its efforts, would be in a stronger rather than a weaker position, we would be the gainer in any event.

--Fred Warner Neal

"Milton wrote of the fading of all the pagan gods; and Milton's God too is joining them in limbo. God has become more remote and more incomprehensible, and, most important of all, of less practical use of men and women who want guidance and consolation in living their lives. A faint trace of God, half metaphysical and half magic, still broods over our world, like the smile of a cosmic Cheshire Cat. But the growth of psychological knowledge will rub even that from the universe." --Julian Huxley, in "Man in the Modern World," Mentor Book #MD148, 50¢.

"Conservatism is a defensive gesture of businessmen and politicians who would defend the status quo but who are without ideas with which to do so." --C. Wright Mills, in "The Marxists," Dell Laurel Edition #LX141, 75¢.

DAVE HULAN
228-D NIBLO DRIVE
REDSTONE ARSENAL, ALA.

As an ideal, "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs" isn't bad, with the added proviso that once no one was in need the surplus should be divided in proportion to the individual's contribution to the whole group. As a pragmatic solution to anything, it stinks, because you are dealing with too many undefinables. For instance, what are "abilities"? I can dig ditches--not well, but I can do it. I can also work mathematical problems, and this I can do reasonably well. I am also pretty good at getting a group to work efficiently when I'm in charge of it. What are my abilities? Everyone has many unused abilities--unused sometimes because he doesn't want to use them, sometimes because no one wants him to use them. "From each according to his abilities" founders on this point--if the amount of useful work gotten out of me is measured by my ditch-digging ability, I'll produce very little; if a ditch-digger's useful work is measured by the number of new mathematical theorems he uncovers, his output will be low as well. There is no way for a human being to know whether another is working to the maximum of his ability. As for "To each according to his needs," how will that be defined? Some have a need for power, or for wealth, or what have you--will they get it? Or do you mean those things which are needed to maintain the body in reasonable health? But psychological lacks can cause physical disease! Where will you draw the line? Wherever it is, you'd be wrong. As a statement of principle, it's all right, but it's far too foggy to serve as the working basis of anything.

I can hardly believe your statement that reasonably intelligent mundane people got hot about it when they found out it was a Marxian principle. In the first place, I find it hard to believe that a reasonably intelligent person wouldn't already know it--I had it drummed into me very thoroughly in 10th grade World History, and I hardly went to one of the most Progressive and Enlightened high schools in the world (the public high school in a small Kentucky town). It was in the textbook, as well as having been discussed with great thoroughness by the teacher. I guess maybe it's Maryland--I was stationed at Aberdeen for about six months a couple of years ago, and I must confess I wasn't impressed with the populace. (Every area has its own little idiosyncrasies. Until recently, Maryland teachers were shocked at the prospect of mentioning communism in any context. In Kentucky, Darwinian evolution is the bogeyman.)

I doubt that the guiding hands of the Soviet Union even think they're moving towards Marxism--Marxism as it sits is a rather vapid and impractical philosophy which could certainly not be put into effect any time soon in any country and probably never can be, simply because it's marvellously ineffi-

letters

A Song Of Sixpence

cient and wasteful compared to so many other methods. The Soviet system, which is best described as state-owned capitalism and has little resemblance to communism with any size "c" except in name, is on the other hand remarkably efficient in most respects, the big failing being agriculture. This is reasonable enough viewing the system as capitalistic--because capitalism as an economic theory has never held any charm for farmers. The economy of the land has always been run on a peasant-feudal basis, simply because this is the most effective method of doing it, just as the capitalistic system, whether state or privately owned, is the most efficient method of creating industry and keeping it operating. If the U.S. tried to organize the farmers into a true capitalistic system they'd have the same difficulty the Russians do--for efficient agriculture there has to be love of the land, while the whole basis of capitalism is the regard of the means of production as being something to be manipulated, not loved and tended.

Motivational research is here to stay. Here, as in many other areas, the "liberal" view is rather fuzzy. How are you going to stop it? Individual freedom is important to me, too, but I happen to feel that the MR people are entitled to it the same as everyone else--and if everyone else doesn't like what the MR people are doing, then they can start to work on some means to counteract the effects of what the MR people are doing. (If "everyone else" doesn't like what the MR people are doing, the MR people can damn well stop--that is, be forced to stop. Our political system is based on majority rule, remember? It is true that the MR people are entitled to freedom as well, but their freedom ends when they harm someone else. I am only free to swing my hands through the air until I hit someone in the nose, whereupon my freedom to swing terminates and his freedom not to get punched begins.) It's not a matter of whether or not MR does harm--it works, and that's enough. (On the contrary, it is very much a matter of whether or not it is harmful. But let that pass for the moment.) It works because there's a flaw in human nature which MR has found and exploited, just as alcohol, gambling and prostitution have found and exploited human flaws. Legislation hasn't stopped any of those three and it won't stop MR, though it could possibly drive it underground. Personally I'd just as soon have it out where I can read about it and perhaps take measures to protect myself. (Then you obviously agree that it is something against which one might desire protection...)

Let me make a statement which I feel is true, though it will be attacked from all sides: No one has a "right" to do anything which he cannot protect. Means of protection can be varied--I don't mean that a man has to be able to talk or fight his way out of a loss of rights. He can band together in a group and the group can appoint police to enforce his rights if others try to abridge them. But things which are outside the ability of a person to defend himself against do not abridge his rights, because if he cannot defend himself in this area, he never had the "right" in the first place. (I find it incredible that intelligent people such as Larry Williams and yourself should have such odd ideas about the rights of others. We are agreed that (1) MR is harmful, and (2) that protection is warranted, but here we part company. You will protect yourself ("read about it...take measures"), but you deny the right of those less intelligent, those who can't read about it and protect themselves, to be protected, just as Larry feels that anyone stupid enough to fall for MR "deserves" it. This is a disgustingly self-centered attitude: Hulan, Williams, Pauls and friends are intelligent enough to protect themselves against MR, but the other

poor clods...well, who cares about them. As shocking as it may be to you, I happen to care about them, and I believe they are entitled to protection against MR even though they are not mentally capable of providing it for themselves as we can. Do you think pedestrians deserve to be struck by automobiles when they are too stupid to look both ways before crossing the street?))

"The first life-form we meet who doesn't favor the idea of riding in the backs of our busses will blast this little planet to kingdom come..." Yeah. Maybe. If they can. I admit that it would be better to go out into space with a friendly attitude and not attempt to push other races around, but I have vague doubts that this will happen--humanity has been a belligerent bunch from the word go and is unlikely to change much in the next few centuries, if it survives that long. And if it ever does come down to a war between humanity and aliens, I'd put my money on the nasty old human race--simply because we're so nasty.

Larry McCombs: Amen to your comments on civil rights. The touchiest question of all is where does one man's right begin and another's end? There's not much question that publicly-owned facilities (such as schools, parks, etc.) should be desegregated: there's a great deal of doubt in my mind as to whether privately-owned businesses which deal with the public (such as restaurants) should be legally compelled to serve anyone, though certainly it's the morally right thing to do. But I recall an instance when a racially-mixed group I was with tried to enter a restaurant in Tyler, Texas--we sat down and the manager came up to us and though he was very friendly and polite, he said that his was a neighborhood restaurant with a regular clientele and that we were transients, and that if he served us he would lose his regular clientele without any compensating gain. This seemed a reasonable thing to all of us, including the Negroes and Japanese in the group, and he was so nice about it that we all left and went to a restaurant in the Negro section, where we were served if stared at rather hard. If he'd been nasty about it we were going to sit in--though this was back in 1958 before the real wave of "sit-ins" started. I cite this to indicate that I'm not a segregationist--I'm just not so cock-sure of the rights in certain areas as some people are. And I feel rather strongly that renting of housing should not be regulated in this way, at least not in such a way as to place any of the burden of proof on the landlord. As Larry says, it's virtually impossible to prove that you weren't discriminating on the grounds of race if you refuse a Negro, even though you're pretty sure from other factors that he'd be an undesirable tenant.

Frankly, I think it would take even longer to get a modern American to understand the basic principles of Christianity than to teach them the same things about Buddhism or Hinduism. They'd have so much to unlearn before you could even start...

GREG BENFORD
APT. G, 6628 HILLCREST AVE.
DALLAS 5, TEXAS

Okay; you ask what is wrong with "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs"? Well, if you mentioned this little phrase in "reasonably intelligent company" and it wasn't recognized as Marx's, then I don't think much of the educational level of these people (and intelligence and education should go hand in hand in this society, if one wishes to do anything of importance). Aside from the huge problems which arise in forming a society of this sort, I still don't think it an especially good way to live. Why? Because I live for no one else, and I work for

no one else. Why should I be expected to support, economically, someone who disagrees with me, or whom I dislike, or vice versa? To me, the goods which I produce are the tangible evidence of my ability to create--to produce. If you tell me (by implication) that these goods are the property of everyone simply by reason of their membership in the human race (or my society), then it considerably lowers my estimation of the worth of the goods, and therefore the worth of myself. Perhaps you will say this feeling of mine (which seems to be pretty ingrained in our cultures; witness history) can be removed, but I will in turn say that this is a good way of reducing the survival-ability of our civilization, too. If ability is not rewarded fairly constantly, and a man is not impressed forcibly with his own worth fairly often (like, every morning when he wakes up in a shack, or in a mansion), I honestly don't think people will give a damn about their abilities. Part of the pleasure of work (a great deal of it, really) is the sense of accomplishment--and what have you accomplished if you are every day on the same footing as the slob down the street, who pushes a broom, or the mystic across town who doesn't even work more than one day a week? (To take your points in order, I find it interesting that you are so repulsed by the idea of your products (or services) being the property of everyone, since this in effect is what occurs. A person purchases your products or services with legal tender obtained by the sale of his own products or services. This is a highly advanced form of trade instituted in order to better regulate values. In a system of pure trade, values, as say between a cow and a sheep, become difficult to assign; some intermediate form--i.e., money--becomes necessary. My system dispenses with both money and the symbolic man-to-man trade: all products of every individual are distributed evenly to every individual, thus in effect being a less complicated trade system. The question of relative values is simplified--or rather, by common consent, it is bypassed. If everyone is doing all that he or she is capable of doing, no more is asked; while one individual may be producing ("trading") superior products in some cases for less valuable ones, he will doubtless also be receiving some better products for his less valuable ones. Thus, it evens out on a large scale. Now, none of this is particularly sound social theory, and it won't work; human nature is against it. But ideally, it should, and I think that some day in the dim future, when and if mankind reaches a stage where greed and egotism can be laid aside, this system will prove to be the beginning of a new--and higher--civilization. See Russell's "...And Then There Were None" (Astounding Science Fiction, June 1951) for a similar system, and for what qualities such a system requires of mankind in order to be workable.)

As I said above, perhaps you can eliminate this feeling with conditioning, but I see little opportunity to do so. For that matter, I see very little chance at all of setting up such a society as yours, even given a tranquil world scene. If you can't come up with a solution to these problems (and lots have tried) you are dealing with a fantasy and are really not of much help to the world.

STEVE STILES
1809 SECOND AVE.
NEW YORK 28, N.Y.

The whole question of illegitimacy is a touchy one for me; why should a child be any less "legitimate" (do they mean a child born out of wedlock is a fake?), or "honorable," and sometimes have to go through life with some sort of debt or black mark against them, simply because some uncaring stranger didn't pronounce a few words? Your put-down of Ray Nelson was not exactly necessary. After all, Nelson has

said he is no longer a beatnik, and from the tone of his article it is probable that his concern with the problem had something to do with his quitting that society. Your disgust over one of the paradoxes of a typical human being is touching. Nelson, I believe, not being God, is not infallible. (My concern was at this incredible double-standard which allows a person to damn an act and commit it simultaneously...)

I have a horror of sterilization. It's not physically damaging, but it still seems like one of the cruellest things one human being could do to another. One wonders why the good Doctor Graham ignores a much more humane solution: legalized abortion. But I suppose that wouldn't be as respectable--killing "human beings," you know. As a related point of interest, I might mention a recent play on television which came out in favor of abortion. Briefly, it was about a doctor whose daughter died under the hands of a quack, who practiced abortion on girls who might be seriously hurt by an illegitimate birth, and who might fall into the hands of "butchers". The lengthy speech of the protagonist was something surprising to see on television, as it seemed that the people responsible for the show were honestly trying to get across a message. I specifically remember the show because recently a girl in New York was killed by such an operation; denunciations of the television show immediately followed in the Daily News' reader's column. One letter particularly stands out in my mind; it seems that "anyone who was fooled into falling for the 'liberal' propaganda of that show will be brought to their senses by the tragic death of X, who was killed by those quacks." This reader failed to realize that legalized abortion would eliminate those deaths by placing the operation into competent hands.

I intend to go into a study of evolution. I am, against my will, associated with a group of teenage rah-rah-rah Baptists. It seems that once every six months they like to pull evolution out of its closet and laugh at it, and, by association, most other sciences. For a reason that I cannot fathom, they seem to believe that evolution is an invention of the atheists intended to destroy the notion of God. When I have pointed out that the Bible doesn't mention what happened between the time when man was supposedly a pile of dust and his present state, I am gently humored. When I happen to point out the existing bones which would substantiate the existence of several primitive types of men, I am usually dismissed as a screwball who should be watched lest he turn Communist. As I grew up with this group, this hurts, and I can't help mentioning that this has contributed to my resentment of organized Christianity. But--get this--from the most sickeningly pious of the group: "Which would you rather believe in--that you came from a messy glop of jelly, or was Created In The Living Image Of The Eternal God?" (Arguing with this sort of idiot can be quite enjoyable, but if, as in your case, they are friends, you cannot take a sufficiently detached view of their fascinating illogical blather. I prefer to argue this matter with someone I dislike intensely to begin with; I then feel no pangs of conscience when I argue by a Socratic-cum-HUAC method, liberally sprinkled with sarcasm.)

The religionists' reaction to the advent of the space age is interesting; individually, I have heard a few come out with the "if man were meant to go to the moon, God would have given him the means" argument, an argument which I suspect is as old as the hills, and which has been used in our age in the advent of the car, airplane, etc. However, in three articles in various Christian publications, among them a piece by Billy Graham in his Decision magazine, the

attitude has been taken that man was given the desire to explore, hence space exploration should not be condemned by Christianity. Graham went further in stating that since God was everywhere, He probably wouldn't consider man in space as an infringement of a private domain, and that space exploration might distract man from the need to war.

Isn't that comforting?

I find the statement "Daily prayer meetings inspired the salvation of our nation in World War II" as irritating as the myth that FDR dragged us into war. God didn't win WWII; several factors, perfectly natural, led to the collapse of the Third Reich, among them Hitler's incompetence as a war strategist, and the armed forces of the Allies. (You mean the United Nations, don't you...?)

Christianity has quite a few defenses for its own existence. For one thing, it deals with so many intangibles and unknowns that it is hard to pin it down with logic. I've always held that the book of Revelations is the church's last ditch ace-in-the-hole: if Wylie tried to do away with it, assuming he had the power to do so, he would find a revolt on his hands by people inflamed with fear about the AntiChrist.

Jeff Wanshel: Another factor which separates man from the lower animals is the ability to envision the future, whereas with animals, their awareness is limited to the now of time, not tomorrow or yesterday.

HARRY WARNER
423 SUMMIT AVE.
HAGERSTOWN, MD. You must have a big circulation for this 26th Kipple if you carry out your policy of sending a copy to everyone mentioned in Quotes & Notes. It would be nice if you got letters of comment from Leonard Bernstein, Khrushchev, and God. But I don't understand why you got so upset at the proposal to extend the compulsory sterilization only to women for illegitimacy. If the woman has a history of emitting bastards, isn't it probable that she will find other sires after the fathers of the first few have been put hors de combat? Isn't it even more likely that she would use the law as a fine means of revenge on any man against whom she harbored a grudge? And what of the rights of the wife of a man who was operated on for illegitimacy? It isn't "male vanity to regard illegitimate offspring as a strictly female responsibility." This is the law of the land: the kids stay with the mother, whether there's wedlock or not, instead of being tossed into the father's lap.

Some of us are condemned to be taken seriously when we write humor. It happens to me in FAPA all the time. I remember a brilliant phrase that I turned a few years ago about climate, speculating about how long it had taken South Americans and Australians to get used to having heat and Christmas time. In the next mailing, at least a half-dozen persons gravely pointed out that the climate has always been that way and residents of that part of the world grow up with it, and need not get used to it. Norm Clarke, another FAPA member, has had even worse experiences. Once he wrote an entire set of mailing comments designed as a burlesque on stupid mailing comments and most commenters took him literally. My current concern is with the Tolkien books that have raised such a storm in fandom. The excerpts I've read have convinced me that they were written as a burlesque and parody, but nobody else agrees, not even the author as far as I can determine.

Next Easter, I think I'll complain to the local authorities if any theatre attempts to screen "King of Kings".

I'll use as my complaint basis the fact that it displays anti-semitic propaganda by causing Judas, a Jew, to do such a nasty thing. Maybe this would be the best way to counter the censorship extremists: follow their own principles to such extremes with such persistency that everyone will be confused. I still think that the fuss over banning Tarzan books from a California school library was started with this very thought in mind.

Several of the letterwriters in this issue and even you seem to assume that the government supports indefinitely people who are too lazy to work. Maybe it can happen in some states, but I'll be blessed if it can be done in Maryland. Unemployment compensation is based on complicated considerations about previous employment and the nature of the lack of employment, but I don't think it can last more than 26 weeks in any circumstances. Welfare money goes to a half-dozen classes: dependent children who aren't supported by their parents, children who are kept in foster homes, the blind, the permanently and totally disabled, and those who are too old to work. Well, five classes, then. A few counties occasionally offer for limited periods of time relief for the employable, when there are special circumstances such as Washington County had two winters ago during the blizzards that followed the big Fairchild Aircraft layoffs. Washington County has given such help only three months in the past two decades. Once the unemployment pay is exhausted and the man is physically able to work, he either works or cadges off relatives or begs for money or starves. He doesn't get it free. I know that there are lots of no-good families and a survey here showed that something like half of the money spent by welfare and social agencies went to members of six percent of the city's families. But it isn't always the family's fault: a case of tuberculosis or a deserting husband can give a family a setback that it won't catch up from for a generation or longer.

You underestimate the tax relief that children provide. A worker with two children and presumably a wife, claiming four dependents including himself, would pay \$416 in federal tax on an annual income of \$5000, but the man with four children would pay only \$176. The saving is much greater in the lower income brackets. The married man with two children who earns \$4000 pays \$245 of it in federal tax, and his counterpart with four children pays \$5. I think the same general ratio would be found in most state income tax schedules. The American system of free education for children has gone to the other extreme: so much tax money now goes to support schools that the man with lots of kids pays less than his share. Reverse the method of figuring taxes, with the biggest exemptions for those with fewest dependents, and you won't need that oral contraceptive or a change in the Catholic church's ideas about sex.

DAVE HULAN
228-D NIBLO DR.
REDSTONE ARSENAL, ALA.

To pick a nit, the right to confront accusers in a court of law goes back considerably further than the beginnings of this country--specifically to the 17th century British Bill of Rights. (I don't recall if this came out of the Long Parliament, the Restoration, or the Glorious Revolution of 1688, and I'm too lazy to look it up, but it was 17th century.) However, up until quite recently there was no question that a person didn't have a right to such things as passports, government jobs, etc., and these could be denied not only without a hearing but simply on whim. Note that in the article you mention there is no mention of depriving someone of life, liberty or property without due process of law (whatever that is), which are the only

things that are constitutionally guaranteed. It is only the denial of employment and passports that come into question. In fact, if a person is a Civil Service employee with a certain tenure, he can't even be fired without the right to an open hearing, a right which is recognized by law.

While I, personally, approve of the action of the AEC and State in allowing these hearings, I thought it only fair to point out that this is something that's up to the agency involved and doesn't entail constitutional considerations at all.

Your statement: "Do you think that if there had been a God that he would (have) allowed eight million civilians to be brutally murdered by the Nazis during World War II?" is a fairly typical example of the attempt to mix atheist/agnostic philosophy of ethics with the existence of God, with the usual unhappy results. It is an unfortunate commentary on the religious beliefs of the average person that you got no better answer than "God works in strange and mysterious ways..." The fact of the matter is that this atheist/agnostic ethic has become pretty generally accepted, and that by arguing from its premises of good and evil it is hard to justify belief in God. But--if you believe in God, then "good" and "evil" alter in their meaning, or should if you are philosophically consistent. For instance, in the particular case you mention of the eight million murdered by the Nazis, this is very bad for the Nazis, but since a theist must assume that those who didn't deserve to die anyhow are now in Heaven (whatever it's like, it's supposed to be pleasant), the consequences to the "injured" parties are seen to be no great matter. (And the torture, I presume, is justified on the grounds that anyone who can endure without losing faith will be more likely to find an exalted office in Heaven? But if the premise is that dying is not unpleasant to the Pure In Heart, then it follows that no one ought to be sorry when a relative or friend passes away (unless he or she has been overly immoral), since he or she will obviously be better off. But this almost never actually occurs, and thus the only conclusion one can logically draw is that most people aren't completely convinced of the truth of their religion. This is a promising thought. But in my philosophy, death is obviously an unfortunate occurrence, no matter how noble a life one may have led, and thus if there is a God He would hardly ordain or condone the untimely death of any of His subjects. Since this theory is not compatible with reality, I do not find it possible to believe in a God. Now, this is all a logical progression based on the premise that death is undesirable; if this premise is wrong, my conclusions may likewise be in error. But so far, no one has disproved that premise to my satisfaction.)

The notion that God will intercede and keep the Bloody Commies from defeating us is another fallacy--why should He? Here again alleged theists are putting too much emphasis on things earthly, when it is plainly stated in the Bible that "My kingdom is not of this world," and it is generally implied in other religions than Christianity. About the only thing that one might feel that God would do in the way of interference would be to insure that the message of salvation would not be completely suppressed--but that He would save one political power over another is an asinine thing to think, and there is no reason why He should.

There is a considerable difference between brainwashing a political prisoner who is forced to submit to the operation of brainwashing and using MR methods which must be tacitly consented to by the buyer by his act in exposing himself to them. It is perfectly possible for a shopper

to decide while yet at home what he needs and wants and then go and get it without paying any attention to the various subconscious appeals of other items. That this is not often done is the fault of the buyer, not the seller--caveat emptor. (I think that as a general rule, women are constitutionally incapable of such a sensible practice of purchasing. One reason may be that buying items by a strictly prepared list is a practice traditionally confined to those of little means; freely purchasing whatever she happens to find appealing will give a woman the secure feeling that she has a great deal of money to spend. In actual cash outlay, the woman who purchases on impulse may not spend a great deal more than one who restricts herself to a predetermined list, but the psychological benefit is immeasurably greater. What I have never understood is how this attitude is reconciled with the bargain-hunting desire of most women.)

As long as you have people who differ in ability, you will have classes and castes, willy-nilly. Either the more able will come out on top, or, if this is denied them by law, then they are an oppressed class, denied the right to develop themselves to the maximum. In either case there will be classes, and the only way to avoid this would be to discover a way to make the whole human race identical in respect to ability. Pardon me if I think this is a highly remote possibility.

One important point to be made with regards to Betty Kujawa's statements about Nagasaki vs. Hiroshima is that while the whole city of Hiroshima was pretty well blasted by the bomb, the industrial area of Nagasaki on which the bomb was dropped was separated from the main population center of the city by a high ridge which deflected most of the blast away from it, so that even though the Nagasaki bomb was somewhat more powerful, it killed far fewer people and destroyed considerably less property. I don't want to take anything away from the achievements of the citizens of Nagasaki--I admire them, and indeed the whole Japanese nation, wholeheartedly--but it is nevertheless a fact that they weren't nearly as hard hit as Hiroshima in the way that counts.

Re your comment to Larry Williams about disliking the idea that a stupid or ignorant person deserves the consequences of his actions, and using the small-child-and-rat-poison analogy--it won't hold water, you know. A small child is considered irresponsible, legally, and deserves to be protected from the results of his ignorance and irresponsibility. If you will agree with me that a person who will succumb to MR methods should be considered legally irresponsible and not be permitted to sign contracts, vote, hold office, possess property, etc., then I will agree with you that in that case I would oppose MR. Only in that case there would be no need to suppress it, since the only individuals who could be deemed capable of purchasing and could legally do it would be those whom MR wouldn't effect anyhow. Meanwhile I'll stick to my opinion that MR is legitimate and it's up to the buyers to protect themselves--if they don't, tough. (I have already commented on this subject as re your first letter, but I would add one further thought here. We all do stupid things occasionally, I think you will admit. If one such stupid act--such as neglecting to shut off the gas completely in the oven--should lead to my death, would you engrave on my tombstone, "Well, he deserved it"?)

And it's not such a thin, fine line between conventional MR and subliminal advertising--the line is drawn when the prospective buyer is aware that there is a product being advertised consciously, or at least is physically capable of being thus

THE TOP SHELF:

ADDITIONS TO A

Bertrand Russell's "Human Society in Ethics and Politics" (Mentor Book #MP429, 60¢) is deceptively titled. Although politics are certainly discussed, this discussion is incidental to the true purpose of the book. "Human Society in Ethics and Politics" is Lord Russell's search for an ethic; that is, it is an attempt to explain logically his personal ethical code, and to dispense with any and all objections in an orderly, rational fashion. In this purpose it succeeds surprisingly well, at least in my eyes, despite the fact that I disagree with so many of his specific points. I found myself objecting to specific comments at frequent intervals while reading this dissertation, although nodding my head in agreement to the general application of Bertrand Russell's ethical code. For example, he comments that "Murder is punished, not because it is a sin and it is good that sinners should suffer, but because the community wishes to prevent it, and fear of punishment causes most people to abstain from it." The doctrine which states that people will abstain from a given act through fear of consequences is the keystone of our entire legal/penal system. There has been much discussion as to the truth of this presumption, and my personal view is negative. True, fear of consequences will successfully prevent me from going around shooting people out of hand (assuming I found pleasure in such an act and wished to do so), but as a general rule, those who are prevented from doing murder by the stringent laws governing such a crime are those who would not commit a murder in any event. If a person feels that he or she has sufficient and just cause to kill someone, and if he or she is the type of person who could commit a murder, no fear of punishment will suffice to prevent the act. One reason for this is, of course, that most of us are sufficiently egoistic to believe ourselves able to get away with the act. But in any event, if the murder is a crime of desperation or passion (as are most murders), as opposed to a coldly calculated crime for financial gain, the consequences will not be considered until after the act--by which time it is, of course, too late. The human ability to perceive the future consequences of acts is a rational one, but passion- or desperation-murder is wholly irrational.

Another example of a statement with which I cannot a-

FAN'S LIBRARY BY TED PAULS

gree would be this seemingly innocuous one from the middle of the book: "In theory, we might all be rich, but we cannot all be the richest man alive." The second part of this statement is a self-evident truth, simply by definition; so, too, is the fallacy of the first part self-evident, also by definition. Lord Russell's mind is that of a philosopher and cannot be bounded or limited by mere definition. But as a non-philosopher, a minor thinker, I shall exercise my prerogative to become lost in the highways and byways of definition. "Rich" is a relative term, which, on an absolute scale, is as meaningless as "free". In a dirty little South Carolina coal town, where the residents are slowly starving in spite of government aid, the man who suddenly finds himself the beneficiary of a forgotten relative to the tune of, say, \$10,000 is considered a "rich" man. This same fortunate individual, placed in the high echelons of New York or London society, would be considered little more than a pauper.

A man is said to be "rich," then, when he possesses a great deal of money or goods in comparison to the rest of his friends, neighbors or associates. If he were to move into another group, another social level, he might be considered less "rich". Or, of course, he might be considered even richer. But "rich" is in any event a subjective, relative term, and therefore we could not all be "rich"--theoretically or otherwise.

There are further points of disagreement, all offering tangents onto which the reader's mind may travel, and in general contributing to the worth of "Human Society in Ethics and Politics". It is, of course, very well-written and interesting throughout. Whereas some writers depend upon the setting up of straw-men which may then conveniently be knocked over in order to allegedly "refute" opposition viewpoints, Lord Russell delineates with tedious care every problem and opposing view, then proceeds with the logical process of demolition. This is an interesting manner in which to write such a treatise, for the reader may pause occasionally between the presentation of an objection and Lord Russell's criticism of it, in order to make a few mental comments of his own. The only disadvantage to this mental activity is that it may very well lower one's opinion of oneself: having cogitated for a time on a particular point, devising logical refutations of it, and thoroughly criticizing it at great length, one then reads on to the next paragraph only to find that Lord Russell has neatly cut through the surrounding cushion of presumption to the heart of the matter with only a few choice words. This happened to me several times. I devised what I fondly hoped to be concise, though thorough rebuttals to some of the noted objections, only to find that Lord Russell had said more, better, and in less words. Since I am more used to reading books by excellent writers who unfortunately have decided that since they are being paid by the word,

they'll damn well use plenty, my respect for Lord Russell at this point nearly reached veneration.

Here, as an example of both the content and writing style, is one of the problems Bertrand Russell sets for himself (and for the reader):

"If ethics is to have any objectivity, we want to find a meaning of 'ought' such that, when A says to B, 'You ought to do X,' this does not depend on who A is. This at once rules out a great many moral codes. If A is a theologically orthodox Aztec, the act X, which he ordains; may be that of killing and eating a human victim. If two nations, M and N, are at war with each other, and A is a member of nation M, the act X, which he commends, may be that of killing as many members of nation N as possible; while if A is a member of nation N, it will be citizens of nation M whose death he will prescribe. If you are a medieval Catholic, you will hold that it is wicked to kill by abortion a fetus in the womb of a heretic woman, but that it is virtuous to let the fetus be born and nourished until it becomes old enough to deserve death at the stake. If you are a modern Freethinker, you will not agree with this opinion. How, then, are we to arrive at objectivity in our definition of 'ought'?"

In the humble opinion of this writer, "Human Society in Ethics and Politics" is one of the finest books I have ever read.

"The Human Brain," by John Pfeiffer (Pyramid Book "The Worlds of Science" #1, 75¢), is another in a series of scientific paperbacks from Pyramid. Until recently, Mentor Books were the uncontested leaders in the field of scientific paperbacks, but this excellent Pyramid series is offering strong competition. Several other volumes in this series, which I have as yet been unable to find on the neighborhood bookracks, are reviewed in Yandro #111 by Buck and Juanita Coulson.

Pfeiffer's book is excellent in all respects. It is informative without being overly technical, but yet it is not watered-down in the manner of so many so-called "popular science" books. (There is actually no such thing as popular science: when a thing becomes popular, it is no longer science...) John Pfeiffer is an interesting and entertaining writer, and he discusses the evolution of the brain, the mechanics of memory, epilepsy, insanity, and the similarities and differences between mechanical computers and the human brain. His comments and theories on memory are of particular interest. It appears that, according to a currently acceptable--although not proven--theory, memories are stored in protein molecules within the nerve cells of our brain. Just how this is accomplished, and how it will be proven true (if, indeed, it is), is not known. One of the problems faced by specialists in this field is that the protein molecules in question have a "lifespan" of only about one day--that is, they appear to deteriorate in only about 24 hours. Since even poor human memories extend further into the past than a few hours, this seems an impassable stumbling block. It was solved, however, by another discovery: some of the molecules, particular ones known as "giant protein molecules," have the extraordinary power of being able to reproduce themselves in exact detail before breaking down,

thus presumably reproducing the knowledge stored in them as electrical impulses as well. Not all of the protein molecules in our brain cells are capable of this feat, which probably explains why we are prone to forget things--even important things. This is only a theory at the present time, but I find it more tenable than most of the others which have been advocated, if only because it explains why we do not recall everything we would wish. The advocates of other theories are vague on this point.

"The Human Brain" is a thoroughly interesting book and a valuable addition to anyone's factual library.

Richard Vahan, in attempting to follow the lead of Gene Grove and other newspaper reporters in writing a book about the John Birch Society, has made much the same discovery: that it is impossible to be objective about the JBS without condemning it, if only lightly. Vahan, in "The Truth About the John Birch Society" (Macfadden Book #MB50-133, 50¢), does everything in his power to present an entirely objective picture of the John Birch Society, but in spite of the polite comments and concern with presenting both sides of every story, his book is solidly against the Society. This is not surprising. When the members or leaders of the JBS request "fairness and objectivity" in judging the society, they usually mean it should be judged on the terms they comprehend, which are no closer to being objective than the terms which might be used by the Communist Party. To be truly objective, it is necessary to suppress bias of any kind and to examine each facet of the JBS as a single element. Mr. Vahan has done this, and he finds that while the aims of the Society are honorable (the abolition of the Communist movement), their means and methods are anything but honorable. I don't happen to agree with the first part of that statement (for the JBS aims not only at the abolition of a communist movement, but of the entire liberal school of thought), but I am willing to stipulate that it is an objective judgement. This, unfortunately, is the sole praiseworthy facet of the attitude of the John Birch Society.

Tactics--that is, means--which are as important as ends, are unfortunately not as noble within the framework of the Society. I do not feel that I need enumerate the tactics of the radical right-wing at this point, since they have been discussed previously and at length in these pages, but it is perhaps significant to note that Robert Welch, founder and head of the John Birch Society, has publicly applauded the use of admittedly "dirty" tactics against the Enemy. In the "Blue Book" of the Society, he describes some of the "means" of his organization:

"There is the head of one of the great educational institutions in the East (not Harvard, incidentally) whom at least some of us believe is a Communist. Even with a hundred thousand dollars to hire sleuths to keep him and his present contacts under constant surveillance for a while, and to retrace every detail of his past history, I doubt if we could prove it on him.

"But--
with just five thousand dollars to pay for the proper amount of careful research, which could be an entirely logical expenditure and undertaking of the magazine American Opinion, Welch's magazine, I believe we could get all the material needed for quite a shock.

(...) We would run in the magazine an article consisting entirely of questions to this man, which would be devastating in their implications. The question technique, when skillfully used in this way, is mean and dirty. But the Communists we are after are meaner and dirtier, and too slippery for you to put your fingers on them in the ordinary way--no matter how much they look and act like prosperous members of the local Rotary club."

Vahan, although not a spectacular writer, is a good reporter, and his material is well-organized and presented in an interesting fashion. The book is recommended to anyone wishing a comprehensive guide to the history, aims, and methods of the John Birch Society.

"Their Finest Hour," by Winston Churchill (Bantam Book #DQ2332, \$1.25), is the second volume in a series of six on World War II. It is a very fine book in most respects, but I'm afraid it isn't fine enough to inspire me to purchase the remaining five volumes at such an exorbitant price. I have always found the Second World War to be rather dull reading, and although this particular book is the least dull I have ever read on that subject, the thought of reading an additional 3000 pages or so of the same is highly unappealing. This is an entirely subjective impression--I loath all history more recent than the 15th century--and no one should be deterred from reading this series on my bias alone. The book is fantastically comprehensive as to details, and Sir Winston has a vivid, moving style. Recommended.

"The Age of Reason" (Mentor Book #MT367, 75¢) is blurbed as the "basic writings" of Bacon, Pascal, Hobbes, Galileo, Descartes, Spinoza, and Leibniz, and is edited by Stuart Hampshire. It is an excellent introductory volume, but it is too incomplete to have any real value as anything more than that. This book is particularly recommended to those who have the mistaken impression that my writing style consists of long, involved sentences; Descartes has a pompous, overbearing style which made me long to strangle him. (I'm being facetious, fun-loving New Yorkers...) This is quite an enjoyable book, although a very difficult one to review: the quality of the thinking is praiseworthy, but such praise from this quarter would be redundant, inasmuch as these men are already universally respected; and the styles of writing can hardly be praised--Hampshire's is rather drab, and the others are typical of the period. But I highly recommend the book.

--Ted Pauls

"The Greeks thought that the city-state was the natural and right unit for human society. They knew that it did not exist among other peoples, but that was just another sign of the inferiority of barbarians, and if any argument was needed for it in Greece, they had only to make comparisons with the past, where men lived precariously in villages and were able to satisfy little more than their barest needs. They felt that the city-state was a natural development first of the family and then of the village, and that it had the advantages of both without their limitations." --C.M. Bowra, in "The Greek Experience," Mentor Book #MD275, 50¢

MARION Z. BRADLEY: THE PULP MILL

Pause for portentuous announcement: "Cryin' In The Sink" is dead. Who killed Cock Robin...er, Cryin'? "I," said Terry, "with my little hoax and parody."

Now, lord only knows, fandom may gather round and congratulate Terry for a good day's work. The fact remains: although I laughed as hard as the next at Terry's parody of my review column, it had a delayed-action effect. When next I sat down to write a Cryin' column, there it wasn't. Every phrase I wrote seemed to revive some cutting memory of how adeptly Terry had knifed through my thoughts and my style. Sincere though my words were, I could no longer take them seriously, because as I wrote each one, I was conscious only of how it could be ridiculed or parodied. The column had crawled away, tail between its legs, curled up in my mind and died. So Terry, with ridicule, did what no vicious or brutal attacks had ever been able to do; he destroyed my ability to take the column seriously, and having lost the ability to take it seriously, I lost the ability to write it at all.

Now, all my dear enemies, you know how to destroy me. Make me laugh at myself. I can defend myself against brutal attacks because they mean something. I have no fences against being laughed out of existence.

It goes, I guess, with regarding a "Sense of Humor" as the most destructive weapon in existence. Who takes Bugs Bunny, or the clown in the circus, seriously enough to care what they are saying? If I consider someone dangerous, I will fight him seriously; once I can see that person, or that thing, as being funny, I dismiss it from my mind. When Terry, slicing through hidden weaknesses, made me see that there were elements of humor in my repetitive reviews, in the gravity with which I took them, Cryin' ceased to mean anything serious to be said about the fanzine world. I thought: "Who will ever listen to anything I have to say seriously?"

I wrote a few lines about Yandro. I thought, "All issues of Yandro are typical issues." I laughed. I re-read what I had written. I cried. I tore up the review. And so it went.

Thank you,
Terry.

The new format will probably not embody formal reviews, but will be a column about fanzines. To me, the job of reading, reviewing and commenting on fanzines is still the most interesting and meaningful in fandom.

Precisely why should fanzines take this kind of importance? I think, perhaps, because they represent fandom's mark or impress upon the world. Private letters are the social intercourse of fandom, the daily commerce, the personal relationships, the family life as it were of that small society which is "fandom". But fanzines are at once the public institutions, the social and tribal customs, the marketplace, the forum, and the Parliament of fandom. In a letter, fans can exchange ideas, rub noses as it were, do business, plot to overthrow their microcosmic "government," or even make love--figuratively or literally. The envelope of a letter represents the walls of the castle. "A fan's typewriter is his castle," in the peculiar sociological structure of Homo fan. But when he wishes to communicate with his fellow fan--to perform, as it were, his civic duty in the city-state of Fanopolis--he must do so in the fanzines. Here he may make a speech, perform for public entertainment, conduct a campaign, or repair the social brickwork of the microcosm.

The role of the fanzine reviewer or commentator, then, is that of the sociologist in the microcosm. He provides a street map and a guidebook so that Homo fan may know where he is going and where he has been; what his fellow homfanculus are doing, and what they may soon do.

Fanzines are the landmarks and public buildings of the society known as Fandom. The fanzine commentator--to carry our figure into absurdity--provides something like a highway map and tour guide. And if at times, in the now-departed days of Cryin' In The Sink, I have tried to play the Duncan Hines and show you where you could find "A Lodging for the Night" or "Adventures in Good Eating," then my only excuse is that I meant well.

And now to pave a few more streets in hell:

+ + +
+ + +

There is a much-discussed point of etiquette in fandom, which has never been completely settled. When you give a manuscript to a fanzine editor for publication, and when he later folds his zine, what should he do with the manuscript?

I hold that it should be returned to the author, unless he has specifically authorized the editor to make some other disposition. One of the reasons why I so seldom contribute, now, to fanzines other than those edited by long-standing and trustworthy friends, is this custom which fans have when they fold a fanzine--that of turning over all "manuscripts on hand" to some neofan or friend who is about to start a new fanzine. Twice in the fairly recent past, this has caused me serious embarrassment.

Tom Reamy asked me for a manuscript, and I sent him one. Tom Reamy folded his fanzine--and passed on all his manuscripts, mine included, to a young Dallas neofan. Said young Dallas neofan published a fanzine redolent with four-letter words and various obscenities, which alighted in my mailbox just about the time I was embroiled in a hassle with the Postal Authorities anyhow. And there I was with my piccolo, as the old story has it...even though my manuscript could have been printed, without alteration, in any high

school newspaper in the United States.

Fortunately, and just by sheer luck, this particular fanzine was the only one in that whole six-month period which somehow didn't get pulled apart and read by postal inspectors before I read it. If they had, my protests that I didn't even know the young fan, and had never seen him or sent him a manuscript, would have been in vain. I dashed off a scorching letter to the neofan, only to discover that his parents had taken a view of the fanzine which was just as dim as mine. Not, in general, that I approve of parental censorship. But in this case, where this boy of sixteen could have wound up in a Federal house of detention (not to mention causing me some very serious embarrassment) if that particular fanzine had been opened--well, frankly, I was grateful that the kid's parents had stomped on the zine before too many copies went through the U.S. mails.

Now, when I submit a manuscript to anyone, I try to find out what sort of thing they are going to be printing in the articles which come before and after mine. Postal inspectors tend to ask you, "Well, if you're not a pig, what's your nose doing in the trough there?"

Somehow it reminds me of the old story of the little boy who thought he'd get into the circus for free by crawling under the wall of the tent. When he finally got in, he found he was right in the middle of a Revival meeting.

Less traumatic (and less dangerous) was the time when I sent Billy Joe Plott, at his request, one of my old rejected manuscripts. However, when Bill folded his fanzine, I took it for granted that he would no longer be needing the manuscript in question, and since Phil Harrell had asked for a contribution to Ventura, I sent the carbon to Phil. Shortly before Ventura appeared, after Phil had practically built an issue around the story, I got a justifiably fire-breathing letter from him. The story, "Fit For Salvage," had appeared in a fanzine of Bob Jennings', called Fadaway, and all Phil's efforts had gone for nothing. Phil was provoked with me, and I don't blame him. I know how I would feel if I built a fanzine around a special story or article and then it appeared in the pages of a competitor. But I assured him in amazed startlement that I'd never heard of Fadaway and had never sent Bob Jennings (whoever he was) any manuscript of any sort whatsoever. I wrote Bob demanding an explanation--which he gave--and an apology (which he refused). I still think he owes one to Phil, if not to me.

I feel, strongly, that when an editor does not pay for the material he uses, what he gets from the author are only "publication rights". If he cannot publish the material, he does not own it. He has no right to pass it on to someone else, without the author's permission; certainly he has no right to pass it on to a publisher unknown to the author.

If the young Dallas neofan had requested material from me, I would have replied, as I always reply to neofans and first-issue publishers, "I'd like to see an issue first; then I can judge more accurately what you'd like me to contribute." This has two advantages. It allows me to decide whether I want to write anything for that fanzine at all (and protects me against appearing in an unknown-quantity which may be illegal or unmailable) and it allows me to write something which will fit into the context of the fanzine in question; saves me from sending sercon material to a humorzine, or sociological think-pieces to a fannish or stefnish one...or fannish pieces to a fanzine based on serious analyses

of science fiction.

I contribute to first issues only when I know, and trust, the editors.

If Bob Jennings had requested material from me (or even if he had done me the courtesy to write and say the equivalent of "Hey, Bill Plott sent me your story--do you mind if I print it in Fadaway?"), I would either have given him permission and sent Phil another one, or else I would have said, "No, I've made other disposition of that story, but I'll write you another." In either case, I would have been saved embarrassment, Phil would have been saved stencils, and Jennings would have been saved from my anger. All for the cost of a postage stamp!

Obviously there is no legal recourse for this constantly recurring fanzine problem. However, I think fandom might well do some thinking about it, and about a related problem. Namely, what happens when you send material to a fanzine publisher and, after four, five, or seven years, he still hasn't printed it? Yet, if you decide he isn't going to use it, and dispose of it elsewhere--or print it in your FAPA-zine--that is the very month in which he shows signs of life, and your long-forgotten piece pops into print again.

There ought to be some sort of "unwritten law" in fandom about manuscripts. Fandom does not pay for material, and has no publisher's contracts. But I suggest:

1) Manuscripts, when fanzines fold, should be returned to the author, not passed on at random to new fanzines.

2) Fans submitting manuscripts to fanzines should observe the elementary courtesy of enclosing a stamp and saying the equivalent of "If you can't use this, please--" return, send to Joe Fann, or drop into the wastebasket.

3) There should be some "statute of limitations" on manuscripts. For instance, it should be understood that if your accepted manuscript is not published in, say, three years, you have a perfect right to re-write it or retype it and send it to some livelier fanzine. Of course, if the editor can't publish it in three years and is still working off an enormous backlog, that's something else. But if an editor has gafiated for three years and showed no signs of life, you should be able to send that dead manuscript elsewhere, and be sure it isn't going to pop up six weeks later.

+
+

+
+

+
+

During the months while this column's predecessor was in a state of hibernation, undergoing metamorphosis, a foot-high stack of fanzines piled up on the desk. In the next installment, I'll give you the highlights (and lowlights) of the collection, together with some commentary on what appears to be a New Trend.

In general, this column has taken off its high heels and corsets. Every fanzine I receive for review, in the future, will receive some discussion and commentary; but there will be no formal reviews and if I feel like devoting the majority of the column to one zine, or comparing the development of two growing fanzines, I'll do it.

In short, this will not be a column of "fanzine reviews," but a column about fanzines. Or am I repeating myself?

--Marion Z. Bradley

A SONG OF SIXPENCE...

CONTINUED

aware if he wished. Subliminal advertising cannot be consciously perceived, which puts it outside the pale--means of dressing up a product and methods used in straightforward advertising are legitimate, because the person who encounters them knows that a product is being advertised. I can't think of a good borderline case--if you can, I may admit that it's a thin, fine line.

The main thing I want to say in this whole letter, though, is in regard to your review of the de Seversky book. I haven't read this book in its entirety, but the Nashville Tennessean carried it serialized and I read a number of installments--enough to know that the doctrine he advocates is possibly the most dangerous to human survival possible. Unfortunately, page 30 in my copy of Kipple, which contained the conclusion of your review, was blank, so I don't know exactly what you had to say as an overall estimate of the book, and I may merely repeat something you've already pointed out. (The review in question was complete on page 29; the last line on page 29 began another review.) However, I feel that the de Seversky viewpoint is so dangerous that it must be attacked wherever it appears (I wrote a letter to the editor of the Tennessean about it, too--which got printed and incidentally earned me a dollar for the best letter of the day). (Your letter to Kipple has been printed, but I'm afraid I can't send you a dollar...)

De Seversky is an Air Force chauvinist, which is bad enough in itself, but he is also a singularly simple-minded one. It is, in fact, most unlikely that the Air Force will ever be involved in another war in any role except that of transport and occasional close-in ground support, unless the war is a general Atomigeddon which neither side can hope to win. It is almost beyond the realm of possibility that the Soviets or the U.S. would knowingly start such a war, since the leaders on both sides are reasonably intelligent men and know there is nothing to be gained. It is naturally to be hoped that there will be no more wars at all involving the U.S.--but if there are, the 99% probability will be that it will be a Korea-type limited war, fought in a limited area with limited weapons for limited objectives. This is the only kind of war which can possibly make any sense, even to the Kremlin. If de Seversky's attitude were to become general, and the Army were reduced to virtually nothing so that the Air Force could have more money, it wouldn't take the Russians a month to start something in Korea, or Iran, or Viet Nam, or some such place, secure in the knowledge that we could do nothing about it without atom-bombing Russia and China themselves, and that we wouldn't dare to do this for fear of retaliation. The only hope of peace (barring disarmament, which is better but which de Seversky doesn't even consider) is to have such strong conventional forces that the Russians know they can't gain anything by starting a war, whether limited or general. The Air Force serves a useful purpose as a deterrent to a general war--alone, it is no deterrent to a limited war, any more than the Army alone is a deterrent to a general war. It requires both services acting as a unit to deter all forms of war--and until some plan of universal disarmament is worked out, it is better that war be deterred in all its forms. (One of de Seversky's points, however, was that our existing Air Force will not for long be capable of deterring such a general war. This may not be true now, but it obviously will eventually come to be true if the Russians continue to improve Air Force and missile units, while we spend millions on a

large, well-equipped infantry. The recent military build-up of the U.S. caused by the Berlin situation struck me as slightly fantastic. If either side is stupid enough to start a war over Berlin, it will certainly be a general one at the outset or become a general one whenever one side begins to lose ground. An additional 90,000 infantry troops are about as valuable in this situation as 500 Springfield rifles. I disagree with much of what de Seversky said, but in this one matter I concur completely: the Air Force, our "general war" deterrent, must be given priority in appropriations. Our continued survival is based on its ability to match the Russian/Chinese offensive potential with its own defensive or retaliatory potential.))

JINX McCOMBS
652 POPLAR AVE.
WASCO, CALIF.

I have one comment to make to Mike Deckinger on his letter in #25. He complains of the crusaders who are constantly trying to convert everyone to their own personal brand of religion. Certainly these people are very annoying, but there is one thing he should try to remember. Most of them sincerely believe that they have found the Answer to the problems of the universe, and they are very earnest in trying to convince the rest of us. They really believe that we're "to burn in Hades unless (we) offer (our) soul to Jesus..." They look on it as a discovery, not just an idea. Mike, if you suddenly discovered that some sort of radiation was killing everybody, and the only way they could protect themselves was to eat boiled cantaloup three times a day--wouldn't you try to convince people that they ought to do it, even though they would consider you crazy? Most of these religious fanaticists are sincerely trying to save us from what they consider a very real danger, and it is at least partial proof of their humanity that they are willing to try. (But I still wish they'd leave me alone...)

Another comment on #25--to Larry McCombs. He says, "The harder you push the segregationists with laws and restrictions, the more vicious they become in finding ways to express their hatred within the laws." This is one of the biggest problems in setting up a system of laws--it is almost impossible to legislate thoroughly enough to cover all the possible crimes. Without laws, most people will take responsibility for their actions, and will regulate their own activities--they will refuse to rob, kill, or blackmail their neighbors, simply because they can see that it is not feasible to do so. But there are always a few individuals who refuse to rule themselves, and these few are such a nuisance that it becomes necessary to make laws to restrain them. But these laws have a strange effect on citizens who were formerly manageable. The laws relieve them of responsibility, and they stop worrying about what they do--as long as it's within the law, it's okay. The laws cannot be abandoned, because some citizens will not obey unless they are forced to do so. On the other hand, while the laws are in effect many citizens refuse to do more than just to obey the letter of the law. (I think that laws have an even more far-reaching effect than you mentioned: in certain cases, the illegality of an act may inspire us to commit it, although we would not do so if it were not prohibited. In an early issue of Kipple, I mentioned an interesting reaction to regulation in a school I once attended. When I first began attending, there was no rule governing smoking by students either on the front steps or in the waiting room. At this time, only a very few students smoked on school premises. However, a rule was shortly introduced prohibiting smoking by students on school property--whereupon the number of students who did so increased many-fold. The dubious thrill of doing so without being caught was evidently

a powerful incentive.))

I'd like to ask Kevin Langdon what his answer to the morality of button-pushing would be in the situation as you, Ted, understood it--if the bomb was still attached to the button. Does he push the button, or not?

AL HaLEVY
1855 WOODLAND AVE.
PALO ALTO, CALIF.

I agree with Bob Lichtman that "Joe's article in Vorpai Glass is accurate, so far as it goes, but it doesn't go very far." However, Lichtman's comments are also accurate, so far as they go, but they also don't go very far. For if "Bill and Danny have a perfect right to invite anyone over they please, and to play any sort of music they want to play," why don't the Little Men have a right to be "rather boring"? And if Joe is perfectly free to ignore Donaho's friends, why can't he ignore the Little Men?

The truth of the matter is that Joe cannot ignore Donaho, his friends, the Little Men, or Bay Area fandom, for to do so would be to ignore certain issues which Joe feels are tied up with fandom. In effect, Joe is saying: "There are certain things which I see around me which I dislike. Some of them exist in fandom. I will therefore criticize these things in fandom." By doing this, Joe ignores the fact that these same things also exist in other places than fandom, and that fandom merely acts as a mirror.

That fandom acts as a mirror by reflecting what exists outside fandom is a point which few fans have ever considered. But no group of fans can exist in isolation in any area of this country from the rest of the culture. Bay Area fandom certainly doesn't do so. The Bay Area is, in many ways, a unique type of culture (or sub-culture) in the U.S. In the first place, it is a very scientifically-oriented area, with two excellent universities; the fact that this area can boast of some twenty or so Nobel Prize winners in science is indicative of this. Secondly, the Bay Area (and Berkeley in particular) is very politically-minded. It is an area in which students first demonstrated that they could be concerned with greater issues than grades or panty-raids. Students in this area were the first to actively demonstrate against HUAC, capital punishment, some of the insanities of the American Legion, etc. The number of political organizations on the campus of the University of California are too numerous to mention; many of them appear to be quite radical. And not only are the students involved in these activities--there exist many organizations here which are composed of adults, some of professional people (I know, I belong to one) and others of religious people, who are concerned with some of the most vital issues of our day: H-bomb tests, disarmament, prevention of war, segregation, etc. And finally this is an area of the U.S. which is concerned with culture. Example: There are some 2-3 dozen little theatres in the Bay Area, presenting an infinite wealth of material, some old and much new. There are also literally hundreds of bookshops specializing in paperbacks (ten percent of all paperbacks sold in this country are sold in the Bay Area).

Now, I'm not suggesting that fans in this area necessarily participate in all these activities. But they cannot help to be strongly influenced by them. For fans are not only fans; they are also people who live and work in this area.

It seems to me more than a coincidence that the Little Men, a science fiction club which is probably the largest in the U.S., is located in an area of the U.S. which is unique. For the Little Men are a unique club.

They are (as Lichtman says) "rather stodgy and science-oriented"; located as they are in a rather stodgy and science-oriented community, they mirror it.

If we examine Joe's recent pronouncements on Bay Area fandom, we find he objects to the Little Men ("I'd probably get more out of some weirdo group's Flying Saucer club!"), people who can't discuss anything else but politics, etc. The interesting fact is that Joe objects to everything in the Bay Area which makes it different from other areas in the U.S. And Lichtman says just this in his letter: "He (Joe) said he was just trying to make fans sit up and take notice of certain trends he had noticed himself." "Trends" found not only in fandom, but in fact all over the Bay Area.

The trouble with Joe is that he just woke up, and now he wants to make other people listen to his great discovery. And Joe has gotten into difficulty recently since he is-- pardon me for using a "rather stodgy and science-oriented" term--stimulus-bound, that is, the things he saw wrong he first saw wrong in fandom, and he cannot generalize this group of people who most interest him; he cannot see that what he most detests in fandom is that which is common to the culture. He sees everything in terms of fandom, and thus criticizes it; the issues which he dislikes he sees as being synonymous with fandom. Since he cannot separate the two, he cannot ignore Donaho, Donaho's friends, the Little Men, etc., for to do so would be to ignore the issues themselves. And the issues mean too much to him.

I am glad that they do mean something to him. Not that I agree with him, but I'd like to see a good deal more discussion of these things in fandom. But it also pains me to see a man who obviously is not isolated from his community (the fact that Joe brought these questions up in the first place indicates this) misperceive a situation so terribly. Lichtman also misperceived the situation, but this is understandable--though Bob mixed with fans while living in the Bay Area, he never tried to understand more than just a few people, he never tried to grasp the feelings and emotions of Berkeley, and he never caught on that fandom is part of a more general culture. He was (and apparently still is) too imbued with fandom as such, in isolation from the culture and the community. This is understandable, as I say, because it takes a certain amount of maturity to see that fandom is only a part of life, possibly even a small part, and that there may be more important issues than fan activities.

Joe said in his article in Vorpai Glass that "I honestly wish I could be more than vaguely known to these meetings" (of the Little Men). If Joe really meant that, then there's only one way to solve his wish, by attending and participating in Little Men meetings. And he also said "...none of 'em say anything that I'd feel the least urge to quote in a fanzine." Whose fault is that?

LENNY KAYE
418 HOBART ROAD
NORTH BRUNSWICK, N.J.

"From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" is one of the finest ideals this world has ever seen. Unfortunately, it is so idealistic that it could never possibly work. It's against human nature, for one thing. Consider two cases: Joe is an extremely hard worker. He sweats at the salt mine for ten hours a day, comes home, eats, goes to bed, and is up the next morning at six. Fine, he is a good worker, and should be paid accordingly. But he has no wife or children, he's healthy, and lives in a substantial shack that his father built. Where's the need? He receives a pittance for his

work. Frank, on the other hand, is lazy. He fakes his work when the foreman comes around and his ability ratio is inversely proportional to his work. But, he has a sickly wife, ten growing children, lives in a tumbledown ruin, and needs an operation. So for his work, he receives a large sum. Like I said, it's a great deal. ({Under our system, Frank's children are placed in a (State) orphanage, he is supported by (State) welfare funds, and has his operation in a (State) charity hospital. So where's the improvement?})

TOM ARMISTEAD
QUARTERS 3202
CARSWELL AFB
FT. WORTH, TEXAS

Seth Johnson mentioned the teaching of sex in schools and you remarked that the use of "dirty words" was not the problem, but rather the use of words which the students think of as dirty. That is true. However, I think it would be quite easy to talk of sex to students if you segregate them, boys from girls. I have noticed in my own classes that it is the girls who will invariably start giggling and thus start the class on a road away from the subject. Also, it might be embarrassing to some of either sex to talk of such a shrouded subject (at least to me) in the presence of the opposite sex. ({The belief that sex should be a "shrouded" subject is precisely what it is imperative to prevent, and this can be done by teaching it in open, mixed classes. It is true that the girls will giggle at times, but if they can learn to control it at that point, perhaps they won't find a need to giggle at the subject at age 27...})

This method did quite well in our school when a speaker came in to talk on sex. He talked to both the boys and girls for an hour, then, later in the day, he spoke to the boys and girls separately for another hour. From usually reliable sources, I found that the talk was along the same lines for both the boys and girls. It was quite a good talk, by the way, and no one left the auditorium that day without a general knowledge of sex, presented in a very religious way. ({What else was wrong with the talk?}) The speaker used the method of telling the young men what to tell to their children when they grow up, thereby getting across to the boys what the boys' parents had not and assuring the boys' telling their own children some general sex knowledge some day. Anyway, it's not the biology that is not known, it is the moral aspects of sex.

I personally advocate a system whereby a chapter on sex, both the biological and moral aspects of the subject, would be placed in the school's science books. There is nothing so impersonal as a book when it comes to sex education, but I am sure most of the students would be so intrigued by the mention of "sex" that they would read the chapter without it even being assigned. At least, they would get out of school with some ideas on sex, VD, and other things of import, ideas not gleaned from the gutter. I got most of my sex education from books, as my parents either do not plan to, or have not yet, given me much information on sex, except the basic knowledge of the "this is a penis" type. I strongly doubt that they will before I go away to college a few years from now. Books are good for the medical aspects, at least, of sexual diseases, etc.

I think you put too much faith in the Packard book, "The Hidden Persuaders," especially in the realm of supermarket packaging. Although I can't say that I've measured "blink rate" (and I'm not too sure that this really tells that the person is being influenced subconsciously), I have seen women shop at supermarkets many times. I've yet to see a woman unable to pay for her goods, unless she simply forgot her money. I also have never ob-

served a woman walking up and down the aisle indiscriminately throwing packages in her cart just because they were "pretty". They all seemed to me to have all their senses, and to be making a critical survey of the market's wares, even though their choices of goods to buy weren't always the best, to my thinking.

I have read Packard's book, and, while finding it thought provoking in some places, think that it does not wholly agree with what I have found on many occasions to be true. For example (to take the supermarket that everyone seems to be stuck on), I have entered a supermarket, have been hit by a blast of purified clean air, the din of ringing, clanking cash registers, thumping carts, and crackly loudspeakers paging someone, and have come upon nicely stacked rows of goods, mostly in cans. Most of the cans have color pictures of their contents, such as a dish of corn on a can of that same product, and a title which reads in large, easy-to-read letters, CORN. Not womb symbols, or other sex symbols, or a reminder of a come-hither look--but CORN. You might say that corn looks like some sort of sex symbol, but I doubt if that is the image transmitted to the average housewife.

Perhaps the most MR-slanted products, in advertising, are cigarettes and new cars. Usually in new car ads there are pictures of wind-blown girls. This implies that the girl will be yours--if you buy the car. Tobacco ads are even better, for amusement. Sometimes they show a boy and girl in some far off--but well-gardened--place, getting away from it all. Of course, the suggestion this time is that they've been rolling around in the grass just a few minutes before, and are taking a few minutes off for a rest break with their favorite cancer stick before getting back to their social conversation. Even deeper, this implies virility for the man if he smokes Stinko brand cigarettes. Or perhaps the ad will feature a very virile looking man with an interesting job, far from the everyday hum-drum existence. Or a tattooed hand, again hinting at virility. This is a thing that is to be disliked, and rightfully so, as it hints at things which aren't there.

Thanks Also To: Dave Locke, Mike Deckinger, Loftus Becker (new address: 6 Colfax Road, Havertown, Pa.), Mark Owings, Naomi Davis, Steve Schultheis, Frederick Butterworth Galvin, Rosemary Hickey, Fred Arnold, Marion Bradley, and Ron Wilson.

FROM:

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

SEND TO:

Len J. Moffatt
10202 Belcher
Downy, California

printed matter only

may be opened for inspection

return requested