

QUOTES & NOTES

BY TED PAULS

There was a great deal of heated discussion seven or eight months ago regarding the relative value of two catch-phrases, "Better Dead Than Red" and "Better Red Than Dead". I entered this discussion in an extremely small way when, in Kipple #20 (December, 1961), I commented briefly on the "Better Dead Than Red" attitude. It would perhaps have been interesting then to discuss the matter at length, but I decided to wait a few months until the rabid emotionalism inspired by this question on both sides had abated. More pressing matters occupied my time, however, and it was not until recently, when John Boardman based one of the questions in his poll on the relative merits of these attitudes, that I remembered my intention. Assuming that the subject is not now thoroughly out of date, I should like to resume the discussion at this time.

I don't know at this writing what the results of John's poll will show, although I strongly suspect a predominantly liberal response. (This is not a tremendously impressive prediction; anyone acquainted with The Pointing Vector, John's magazine, would immediately realize that his readership would tend to be liberal.) For my part, I cast my vote without hesitation for "Better Red Than Dead". If this revelation shocks the conservative element of my readership, I can only hope that they will give their attention to my reasoning before forming an opinion. It should be noted, in beginning, that these phrases are rarely used in a personal, individual context. When one steadfastly contends "Better Red Than Dead!" or its opposite, one is in all likelihood referring either to the country or the entire free world, not merely to oneself as an individual. There is a difference. If you believe that you, as an individual, would be better off dead than a communist (red), that is your right, but I am rather less tolerant when you presume to speak for the entire country. The danger in this attitude is that it may come to be possessed by the government, and while they have a right to hold this (or any other) opinion, they are unfortunately in a position to force their preference on those who might not otherwise choose it. At the present time, most of those who are extreme in their opinion that we would be better off dead than red are not in a position of power, and fortunately cannot do anything as a result of their belief. They nevertheless presume to speak for the country, and so it is that these statements are rarely encountered in an individual context.

Actually, it might be of interest to question the adherents of both of these proposals in an effort to discover whether or not they apply their preference only to the country as a whole or to themselves as individuals as well. A variety of an-

swers might result: a person might personally prefer to die before becoming a "red" but not suggest that the entire country would be better off destroyed, or, conversely, an individual might be willing to become a communist while boggling at the proposition of the entire country falling into their hands. In my case, I would choose life under communism for the country, but as an individual I would be more likely to choose the alternative. "Choose" is really a very poor term, and the entire concept sounds more ostentatious than even my normal dissertations. In addition, it appears to be an extremely cowardly statement. There would be no choice, as such. I could no more become a communist than a fascist; there is no room in my philosophy for such dogmatic doctrines, and in addition I refuse to unquestioningly obey orders. So, if I were offered the choice of becoming a docile comrade or being shot, it would be impossible for me to choose the former. As for the cowardly aspect, this is not what it appears. I seem to be advocating a fate for the country which I myself lack the courage to face, but I hope to show that this fate would be only temporary.

Personally, then, I prefer "Better Dead Than Red" as an acceptable attitude, but the situation changes somewhat if an entire country is considered. First, as I have previously implied, one person (or a group of persons) has not the right to make such a decision for the entire country. But if that decision were mine to make, I would without hesitation choose "Better Red Than Dead". What this means, to me, is that immediate surrender is preferable to a nuclear war which would, in all likelihood, exterminate both sides.

This sounds, on the face of it, treasonous, and I don't doubt that even some of the more liberal readers of this magazine are somewhat shocked by the words "immediate surrender". But let me attempt to explain by outlining a hypothetical situation. The world situation has become even more tense than it has occasionally been in the past, and Russia has delivered an ultimatum: surrender or face a nuclear holocaust. Surrender is currently considered unthinkable, but remember that this is purely a hypothetical situation. Officials of our government immediately return the message, formally surrendering. Paradoxically enough, this alternative offers the most likely method by which to preserve both our lives and our freedom.

Death is final, but a conquest can always be offset by an insurrection, a revolution. (The premise that death is final depends, of course, upon my belief that there is no afterlife. This can be debated, but I think we would all agree that life is at least preferable to death.) If we engage in a nuclear war, a large percentage of the population will certainly die. We should also be able to do a rather thorough job of depopulating Russia, of course, but that is not relevant. But what are the consequences of surrender, not only for the United States but for the other "Western" countries, all of whom will presumably follow our lead? Well, the first objective in handling an enemy which has surrendered is to disarm its military units, and the second step is to occupy the territory and hold in check the civilian population. The first step is easily enough taken, assuming the military surrenders entirely along with the civilian government. At this point, it looks as if all is lost for our American way of life. But behold: now must come the occupation. Forgetting for a moment the many allied countries spread all over the world and concentrating merely on the United States, how does Russia go about occupying it? How are 185,000,000 hostile inhabitants held in check?

After considerable thought, I have come to the conclusion that the task is an impossible one. In simple language, we may say that hav-

ing conquered this country, Russia doesn't know what the hell to do with it. There aren't enough troops in all of Russia to safely control a population the size of ours, not to mention the many millions in allied countries. The communists are accustomed to taking control in countries where dictatorships or semi-dictatorships previously existed, where the people are accustomed to such rule. But the United States (and Great Britain, and a few other countries) poses quite another problem. I should think that in this country alone there would be a hundred million or so healthy civilians prepared to carry out guerilla and underground operations, spread out over an immense territory. (The larger cities would be evacuated when the war threat first became known, of course.) I cannot even begin to estimate the number of troops necessary to control this mass of people; at any rate, I'm quite certain that Russia hasn't nearly enough. No Russian soldier would be safe on the streets, lest he turn up in a back alley with his throat slit; no precautions would prevent the poisoning of at least a portion of the food necessary to sustain such an occupation force; assassinations of the puppet officials set up by the communists would be the order of the day; sabotage would run rampant; and, not the least important, the psychological effect on the troops of being surrounded by millions of hostile inhabitants would be considerable.

Of course, there is a fly in the ointment: having discovered their inability to cope with the population, the Russians might then decide to use their nuclear weapons--as a "lesson". But the chances of this occurring are extremely slim: to do so would be to destroy much-needed agricultural resources, industrial facilities, and manpower, all of which was technically under the control of the Russians to begin with. It would also be very poor propaganda. (Even if the political and military power of the West has been destroyed, propaganda must still be a potent consideration in major Russian action, since the 90% of their own people who are not communists must always be given a favorable impression of Mother Russia's actions.) But even if the worst occurs, the losses would be somewhat less than they otherwise might be, since the cities would be partially deserted and there would be no significant concentration of people in any one spot. So, even at worst, we would be better off.

Therefore: "Better Red Than Dead". I would rather have five--or fifty--generations of Americans live under communist rule until an eventual successful revolution than not to have those generations live at all. People cannot forever be enslaved, and dictators must eventually topple; but death is final and irrevocable.

+
+

+
+

+
+

Apparently, the mysterious hex bestowed upon me by Richard Bergeron which prevented me from writing about stupidity in the newspapers for two issues has now fully dissipated. If this disappoints Sir Richard, he should be further disappointed (not to mention stupified) by the fact that at least half of the letter writers of recent months pointed out that they were saddened by my omission. Now I shall return in grand style to the old tradition. In the mass of material which has accumulated since last I delved into my fabled Files, there must be at least a half-dozen items about which I can become properly incensed.

The single most important subject of the past few weeks is so widely discussed that material devoted to it occupies a file-folder of its very own, facetiously headed "The Invasion of Mississippi". Ordin-

arily, in beginning such a subject, I would briefly summarize the events concerned for the benefit of those readers who hadn't already acquired the information. In this case, however, the matter is so important that I cannot seriously consider the possibility of anyone being unaware of it; if you do not know what I'm talking about, I suggest you notify your next of kin that you shuffled off this mortal coil some weeks ago and have since been waiting for someone to discover the fact.

Since the historical resume is unnecessary, I shall proceed immediately to the opinionating. There are several basic positions taken against the actions of the federal government in Mississippi. First, of course, there are those people who oppose integration in any form, the white supremacists. (There is also a certain body of opinion which advocates the immediate lynching of all Negroes and Jews, but I doubt that I need to dwell upon this particular form of idiocy.) Fortunately, the segregationists are being defeated (albeit gradually in some cases) by sanity, and I gather from some of their comments that Mississippi and its state university were considered one of the Last Stands of their particular attitude. More common are those who ostensibly support integration (and who prove this by mouthing variations of "Some of my best friends are Negroes"), but who cannot bring themselves to support federal intervention in such a case. Their battle cry is "State Sovereignty!"

The first position need not be considered at any great length; I have been discussing integration in one form or another since the third issue of this magazine, and anyone who remains unmoved is not likely to be converted by another similar attempt.

The second position is slightly more worthy of comment. Whenever I see someone stoutly proclaiming (be it in print or in person) the case for the sovereignty of the states, I begin to wonder if I didn't overlook something quite significant in my admittedly sketchy study of this country and its history. I was under the apparently mistaken impression that the United States of America, despite its name, was a country, but these pillars of States' Rights have an entirely different picture: in their eyes, the United States is a loose federation of fifty individual areas which will remain together just so long as such union is mutually advantageous, but where each individual area has the power to disregard the will of the duly authorized central government whenever it wishes. This seems a strikingly foolish concept of a "country", but it is precisely what is suggested by the sovereignty of the states so repetitively advocated by those Southern officials who wish a free hand to treat a percentage of their people as slaves.

The individual state, as far as I am concerned, has no sovereignty as such, other than in such insignificant areas as the creation of speed laws, marriage laws, etc. The individual state cannot secede from this country simply because its officials do not wish to abide by the federal laws.

In defense of states' rights, the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution is often cited: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." The pompous, overbearing advocates of State Sovereignty, completely oblivious to logic or facts, read this amendment faithfully whenever challenged. I am not yet annoyed enough to observe that it may be the only section of the Constitution with which they are familiar, but I feel that someone should point out to them that if they read the Constitution in its entirety, they would find the rights of the states curtailed sharply when they interfere, as in the case of segregation, with the rights of the peo-

ple. The first paragraph of Section 2, Article IV of the Constitution proper states: "The Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of Citizens in the several States." To me, this means that when a Federal Court rules that segregation is unconstitutional--thus delineating the rights of a certain group of people in the country ("the several States")--this ruling applies to the people of Mississippi (or Georgia, or Alabama), despite the fact that the government and laws of the state disagree with the ruling. In this specific case, it means that when the Supreme Court rules that the Negroes of this country are entitled to attend the school of their choice, this "Privilege...of Citizens in the several States" applies as well to the citizens of any one state.

But does this justify federal intervention? The use of troops? I will freely agree that the use of troops and federal marshals in this situation was unfortunate, but I think it obvious that such action was necessary and easily justified. When the fifth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals directed that James Meredith, being intellectually and physically qualified, be admitted to the University of Mississippi, the proper body to carry out this order would have been the Mississippi State Police, acting under orders of the governor, Ross Barnett. However, the governor, other state officials, and the state police not only refused this task, but placed themselves on the other side of the fence; the state police were ordered to prevent the admission of Meredith to the University of Mississippi.

Those who are so intensely concerned with the injustice of federal intervention into state matters would presumably have dropped the matter at this point. This would have set an interesting precedent: it would have shown that state officials need not obey any federal law or court order they didn't happen to like, and could back up their defiance with the armed might of their own police. Fortunately, saner minds were directing the federal actions, and this dangerous situation was not allowed to long delay the implementing of federal law. As of September 15, newspapers reported that the Justice Department was "considering the use of federal marshals if the state defies a federal court order to admit James Meredith." Despite the emotional rabble-rousing of Ross Barnett, the United States did not then rush the Army into the situation, strewing violence in its path. On three separate occasions, a contingent of unarmed U.S. marshals attempted to take Meredith onto the campus of Ole Miss; on each occasion, they were "politely refused" by unarmed police officers acting under Barnett's orders, and not so politely heckled by the demonstrating citizenry. Finally, on the evening of September 30, after two weeks of peaceful and futile negotiation, a large number of marshals, armed with billyclubs and teargas bombs, entered the campus with Meredith. Rioting erupted, and at the height of this rioting 43 carloads of state police left the scene, leaving the marshals to the care of several thousand rioters, both students and outsiders. Finally, as a last resort, the Army was called in to restore order.

This was, as I admitted, unfortunate, but there was plainly no other workable solution. A federal court had given an order, the order was blatantly disregarded, and the police officers who should have carried out that order refused to do so. Moreover, they refused to assist when duly authorized officials of the United States government were attacked by a mob and left the scene to further increase the ferocity of the rioting, during which two persons were murdered.

I submit that there is no issue here of states' rights or the injustice of federal intervention with troops; certain segments of the

6

state of Mississippi staged a revolution, no less real than those which periodically shatter the calm of various South and Central American countries, and such an insurrection must be put down by whatever means possible. President Kennedy neatly summarized this point during a brilliant television address being delivered at the height of the riots:

"If this country should ever reach the point where any man or group of men by force or threat of force could long defy the commands of our courts and our Constitution, then no law would stand free from doubt, no judge would be sure of his writ, and no citizen would be safe from his neighbors."

It is traditional in these articles to end with some of the less intelligent reactions culled from letters to the editor of the local newspapers, and the conservative side of my personality cowers at the thought of disregarding tradition. Hence:

"We are seeing very much of a demonstration of what some legal scholars have long said; namely, that some so-called constitutional law is not law at all, but politics."

"Governor Barnett is not being emotional. He is simply trying to preserve the way of life which his ancestors and mine (but not President Kennedy's--they weren't here) created in this country. He is resisting the attempts of federal newcomers, such as the Kennedys, to destroy it. Pride should prevent Negroes from trying to destroy our social structure by forcing their way into white schools and into white neighborhoods, until they are ready for acceptance. Such an attempt can only be prompted by an overweening inferiority complex."

"And so, in Mississippi, another nail is being driven into the coffin of American democracy."

"Kennedy has made much of the 'lawful right' he has to force a state to its knees...to do his bidding, no matter how odious it may be."

We have taken another step in the right direction; unfortunately, the greatest actual effect of this historic situation will probably be to gain 50,000 new adherents for the various neo-Fascist organizations across the country. Despite precedent, I imagine that a second Negro applicant would have nearly as much difficulty gaining admittance to the University of Mississippi.

+
+

+
+

+
+

"In the whole business of education, there is nothing like to be less hearkened to, or harder to be well observed, than what I am now going to say; and that is, that children should, from their first beginning to talk, have some discreet, sober, nay, wise person about them, whose care it should be to fashion them aright, and keep them from all ill, especially the infection of bad company. I think this

province requires great sobriety, temperance, tenderness, diligence, and discretion; qualities hardly to be found united in persons that are to be had for ordinary salaries, nor easily to be found anywhere. As to the charge of it, I think it will be the money best laid out that can be, about our children; and therefore, though it may be expensive more than is ordinary, yet it cannot be thought dear. He that at any rate procurs his child a good mind, well-principled, tempered to virtue and usefulness, and adorned with civility and good breeding, makes a better purchase for him than if he laid out the money for an addition of more earth to his former acres. Spare it in toys and play-games, in silk and ribbons, laces, and other useless expenses, as much as you please; but be not sparing in so necessary a part as this. 'Tis not good husbandry to make his fortune rich, and his mind poor. I have often with great admiration seen people lavish it profusely in tricking up their children in fine clothes, lodging, and feeding them sumptuously, allowing them more than enough of useless servants, and yet at the same time starve their minds, and not take sufficient care to cover that which is the most shameful nakedness, viz., their natural wrong inclinations and ignorance. This I can look on as no other than a sacrificing to their own vanity, it showing more their pride than true care of the good of their children; whatsoever you employ to the advantage of your son's mind, will show your true kindness, though it be to the lessening of his estate. A wise and good man can hardly want either the opinion or reality of being great and happy; but he that is foolish or vicious can be neither great nor happy, what estate soever you leave him: and I ask you whether there be not men in the world, whom you had rather have your son be with five hundred pounds per annum, than some other you know with five thousand pounds." --John Locke, in "Some Thoughts Concerning Education"

+
+

+
+

+
+

"Goddamn n-----!" Rube spat. He looked contemptuously at the house at the other end of the block, past a dozen ancient row-houses in various states of disrepair.

His friend muttered in reply, shifting his weight on the warped, cracked steps in front of the house. He wiped the dusty sweat from his forehead with a large, hairy forearm.

Rube propped his foot on the garbage can, identical to the battered can in front of every house on Jefferson Street. "Ain't that I don't like 'em," he continued, hitching up the leg of his dungarees and slowly tying his shoe. "Down at the plant, they got n-----s. None in my section yet. Ain't nothin' wrong with 'em, only they don't work unless you get behind 'em with a stick. Never had so goddamn much trouble gettin' guys to work. And when production's off, the super gets on our asses."

Will nodded in sympathy, absently picking flakes of paint off the wooden steps. "Work with 'em all the time," he grumbled. "That ain't too bad, what the hell. Long as we ain't gotta be friendly with 'em or anything. But the boss says we oughta treat 'em like everybody else. Hell with that. Next you know, one o' the bastards be wantin' to go with me and sleep with my wife!"

Rube had finished tying his shoe and was staring intently at the dust and scuff marks on it. He spit into his cupped hand and began to rub the worn shoe. The dust was removed. The scuff marks remained.

"Only trouble-makers anyway," Will continued. "Look at what they

done down South. Got the fuggin' Army fightin' good, God-fearin' people, f'Chrissake!"

Rube's eyes slowly travelled up the front of his house, coming to rest on the shattered window which marked the latest exploits of the children across the street. He gestured toward the window with his head, and Will glanced upward. "Meant to fix that," Rube mumbled. "Guess there ain't no point, now."

"Yeah. With them goddamn n-----s in the block, house ain't worth a damn." Will's tone changed. "You met 'em?"

"What you think?" Rube answered. "They was goin' 'round the block last week, interducin' themselves to everybody pretty as you please. 'Fore I left for work, told Wilma I'd knock her goddamn teeth down her throat if I hear she talks to 'em. She--" he stressed the word, making it sound like a curse "--wanted to be nice to 'em, f'Chrissake. Said they might be nice folks. Hah! Ain't no 'nice folks', jus' n-----s."

Will propped his legs up on the steps, and began methodically spitting into the various cracks and pockmarks which scarred the pavement. "Gonna move?"

"No money," Rube replied curtly. Running a stubby, calloused hand through his sandy hair, he elaborated. "Goddamn real estate people sell a good house to a n-----, prob'ly never worked a day in his life. Bastards won't help me an' Wilma move outa this neighborhood. Won't give us anything for this place. It's a damn shame," he said slowly. "Take a nice place like this, move in some n-----s, pretty soon you got a slums."

"If God hadda wanted them to live with us," Will philosophized, cracking his knuckles, "He'd of made 'em white, like everybody else."

"Yeah." Rube walked heavily up the steps and into the house, waving to Will. "Goddamn n-----s. Goddamn n-----s!"

+ + +
+ + +

Now that my brief career in creative writing has come to an inglorious end, it is perhaps wise at this point to return to a faithful source of commentary: the pages of the metropolitan newspapers. Here may be found a number of both amusing and idiotic--or occasionally infuriating--incidents which have occurred since last I devoted space in this column to such matters. The first clipping culled from my Files, dated October 4, concerns that arch-enemy of thinking men the world over, the House Un-American Activities Committee. In past installments of this column, the many and varied (and not always entirely legal) activities of this body have been chronicled at some length. Its recent exploits, when compared to some of the classic cases, may seem unimportant. However, here is the opening of the story:

"Two young Americans who attended the Communist-inspired World Youth Festival at Helsinki last summer said today its theme could be summed up in two words: 'Hate America.'

"Don Quinlan, 20, of Milwaukee, a Fordham University student, and Ann Eccles, 25, of Brooklyn, said they had volunteered before they went to Helsinki to tell their stories to the House Committee on Un-American Activities

"Miss Eccles testified everything about the festival was rigged in favor of a pro-Soviet line, even puppet shows.

"Quinlan estimated that one fifth of the American delegation was anti-Communist, two fifths Pacifist and two fifths definitely pro-Communist."

Passing for a moment over the question of whether a branch of the legislative body of the government is empowered to enlist the aid of spies on foreign soil, I should like to specifically question the validity of this report. In doing so, I assume a dangerous position, since I know relatively little of the affair other than what I have read; and of this, the only really favorable report has been that of Midge West (see Kipple #29, letter column), a delegate from England. My refusal to accept the report of these HUAC witnesses stems from a more general concept, and one which at least superficially resembles guilt-by-association. To state it as concisely as possible, I do not consider objectively valid the testimony of anyone who, with full cognizance of its aims and tactics, would freely consent to testify before HUAC.

This view is dependent upon a simple premise. HUAC is supported by two groups of people: those who are unaware of its inner workings, and those who favor them. The former group is roughly composed of those average Americans who know nothing of HUAC except that it opposes communism. If HUAC did only this, then I too would support it. But what the average American does not realize is that HUAC proposes the unconstitutional premise that all "defendants" before it are guilty until proven innocent, that one who has a communist for a friend becomes a communist, and that anyone who supports an idea (say, disarmament) also supported by the Communist Party is, per se, a communist. Added to these basic principles are the working tactics: distortion, half-truth, guilt-by-association, et al. We now see that HUAC becomes rather more than a body which opposes communism; it is also a body which opposes, ferociously, any disagreement with its own principles. Of such stuff freedom is not made. But our average American does not realize this, and upon seeing HUAC identified as "anti-communist" is willing to drop the matter at that point, trusting implicitly in HUAC's non-existent Rightness.

The second group consists of those individuals who are intelligent enough to realize the existence of these evils, but who, in fanatical hatred of anything "liberal" or "left", are able to accept them. Since delegates to the Youth Festival could hardly be considered as members of the first group, I can only conclude that they belong to the second.

In short, then, I feel that anyone who would volunteer to testify before HUAC, knowing fully what it stands for, must necessarily be prejudiced against liberalism to begin with, and would therefore not be an objective, impartial observer.

The most important matter to be found in newspapers at this writing is one which makes the first section of this "Quotes & Notes" ironically appropriate: the Cuban situation, so-called. Little else has been discussed, in or out of the newspapers, since President Kennedy addressed the nation two days ago at this writing, announcing that a blockade of Cuba would be undertaken. My opinions on this matter are not yet fully formed, and are of course subject to change in the light of future developments. Basically, I feel that the clandestine metamorphosis of Cuba into an offensive military site once and for all proves

that the Soviet Union has no intention of striving for peace, except when it suits their purposes to do so. I think it obvious that the United States reaction was entirely justified from the viewpoint of this government. However, I cannot in all conscience support this move, since it endangers as never before the lives of each one of us, and the continuance of civilization itself. The blockade is ostensibly a tactical move; however, it appears painfully clear to me that a large part of the motivation concerns not a strategic necessity, but rather the urge to display the vaunted American courage. Twenty years ago, the presence of air bases of a potential enemy within ninety miles of one's shores would have been a matter of the highest urgency, but in these days of submarine-launched missiles and ICBM's, the existence of Russian missiles in Cuba is not of great tactical import. Missiles launched from Siberia can accomplish the same objectives in slightly more time.

Furthermore, despite Adlai Stevenson's attempts to convince the United Nations Security Council otherwise, I doubt that the Russian bases in Cuba are any more threatening to us than are those of the United States in Turkey and elsewhere in the Mediterranean area to the Russians. True, our bases were not installed under cover of secrecy, and they are intended for defense and retaliation, not attack. But this does not mean that they could not just as easily be used for attack, if we were to wish it. Would the United States be likely to look openly-mindedly on a "quarantine" of Turkey or Greece (or England, for that matter) by the Russians?

The only sane comments I have heard on this situation have been those of the indefatigable Lord Bertrand Russell, who, in telegrams to President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev, pleaded "End this madness" and called the actions of the United States "unjustified". "Civilized man condemns it," he said. "We will not have man murdered. Ultimatums mean war. I do not speak for power but plead for civilized man." This is not a particularly popular opinion at this time, but the fact remains that the current actions of the United States are stubborn displays of deadly courage over "safety" and "rights" more apparent than real.

To turn to matters of less urgency, Harry Warner forwarded a copy of the Hagerstown Morning Herald containing a story on the trial of the two school teachers who brutally beat and caused to be hospitalized one of their students. (See Kipple #28, pages 9-10.) Both female teachers were found guilty of assault on eight-year-old Allen Ruck, and sentencing was deferred. Judge D. Kenneth McLaughlin pointed out, in an understatement of impressive proportions, that "Most educators would say you aren't qualified to teach this type of child." Allen is mentally retarded.

The most notable element of the testimony as recorded by the Herald was the infuriatingly pious attitude of the teachers. Part of the testimony of one of them, Sara E. Hose, was reported as follows:

"I told him I loved him, and I do love him," Miss Hose said. "He had understanding of why he was paddled."

"We don't paddle hard or fast at the school. The Lord helped me. I prayed with Allen. It was my responsibility to help Allen and to see that he must obey. I wasn't angry."

"The teacher said that the boy was told to lie across a chair for the paddling. When he jumped and kicked, she instructed Miss Gregory to hold his feet still. She said that they did not hold him down.

"When the punishment had been administered, Allen and I prayed," she continued. "Allen was a happy little boy. He did not cry. Allen hugged me before we left the supply room."

I could forgive a person or persons who had assaulted an eight-year-old child in a moment of anger, and later regretted the action. But there is no compassion in my heart for someone who commits such an atrocity and firmly believes herself to have done an admirable deed. "The Lord helped me." It is my firm opinion that these women are completely unfit to have even nominal control of any children whatever, and even more unfit to have placed in their charge a mentally retarded child. If this society of ours were "civilized", as some people continually insist, they would probably be incarcerated in a mental institution; however, in view of the normal degree of lunacy in our society, the best that can be hoped for is that they will never again be placed in a position where they may exert their will over any child. Even this may be asking too much.

The remaining clippings on the stack this month are of such a nature as to appear quite absurd without any lengthy comments from this quarter being necessary. For example, a clipping from the Baltimore Sun notes that during a fracas at a lunch counter in Augusta, Georgia, Willie Didley, a Negro, was stabbed by Dillen Newsome. The presiding judge at the hearing was kind enough to dismiss the charges against both men, commenting that by being stabbed by the white man, Didley had been punished sufficiently. The judge apparently felt that Newsome had been punished sufficiently simply by appearing in court, since the case against him was promptly dismissed...

John Boardman forwards a clipping from an unidentified newspaper concerning the recent suspending of a student at Cornell whose "off-campus living accommodations," to quote the clipping, "included a pretty coed." The morality of this situation can be argued at another time; the point I wish to make at this time is that the university has absolutely no right to interfere in the off-campus activities of its students, or to exact retribution in any form for actions not directly relating to the university itself.

And I suppose I should at least mention the "frustration room" devised (and patented) by Harry Linsky, in which "the jangle-nerved gentry can heave dishes, lamps, light-bulbs, small furniture pieces with bang-up abandon." The News-Post notes that "Linsky has a stock of slightly damaged crockery to supply frustration rooms."

--Ted Pauls

"There's nothing worse than a sarcastic dog." --Frieda, in "Peanuts"

3/ If a number appears to the left of this paragraph, it is the number of your last issue; "T" indicates that we trade; "C" means you have a contribution herein; "S" refers to this being a sample copy; and "P" indicates your place on my permanent mailing list.

A SONG OF SIXPENCE

LETTERS

BILL PLOTT :: P.O. BOX 5598 :: UNIVERSITY, ALABAMA

Re your comments on abortion and euthanasia, the Finkbine case was indeed convenient for discussion, since the various media of the press managed to keep the public in a state of constant awareness on all developments of the thalidomide issue and its side effects (i.e., Mrs. Finkbine). There was also a certain uniqueness about her particular case. If I remember correctly, her physician (or a staff of physicians) had determined beyond reasonable doubt that her baby--if allowed to continue its growth--would indeed have been malformed.

Yet the issue that you proposed was actually concerned with abortion and euthanasia, per se, rather than with that particular case. I tend to brush aside morality and religious arguments here because of the Catholic Church's stand on birth control. The Church admonishes the more common methods of avoiding conception such as the various contraceptives which can be purchased in any drug store. Yet it advocates the rhythm method of birth control. Frankly, I can't see that the means justifies the end. Birth control is birth control regardless of how it is practiced. (Frankly, I can't see that the stupidity of the Catholic Church's position on birth control justifies brushing aside all moral and religious arguments against abortion or euthanasia.)

That is a slightly abstract parallel to the abortion issue, but I tend to feel that life begins at birth with a consciousness of environment, no matter how slight or undeveloped that awareness may be. I think our abortion laws are in desperate need of review and revision. There have been a number of cases where a physician warned a housewife that she was not physically capable of giving birth to another child. Should she become pregnant she not only has her own life in jeopardy, but also that of the coming child. This leaves her with two alternatives: 1) A risky miscarriage attempt, or 2) abortion.

In the event of the latter, she is again limited to two plans of action. She can seek a physician who is willing to disobey the law and perform the operation, or she can turn to the black market, find some quack and probably die or become seriously infected by the unsanitary surroundings and procedures. Yes, our abortion laws in this country are under fire, but apparently not enough fire to cause any action as of yet.

Abortions can be justified for other reasons besides that of the malformed child and the mother's health. What about pregnancies resulting from sexual assaults? Legally, an abortion cannot be obtained even for that purpose. But fortunately there have been doctors who realized the truly deplorable situation that husband and wife were in and came to their aid despite the possible consequences of the courts.

Euthanasia is something that I find hard to discuss. You have a good point when you say that it omits the death of an individual who

might not be malformed even when snuffed out by an abortion. But this raises an even greater question of morality. On the one hand a possible babbling idiot is removed from society. But on the other hand, that malformed child might turn out to be another Helen Keller if allowed to live. I should like to conclude by quoting your concluding sentence: "My most coherent thought at this moment is to be wildly relieved that this decision is not mine to make."

C.R. BORSELLA :: PO BOX 443 :: TOWSON STATE COLLEGE :: TOWSON, MD.

I share in Joe Pilati's rejoicing over the fact that the Regents Prayer is finally out of the New York schools. People tell me that it is disrespectful to walk out of the room when the Bible is being read but I think the real disrespect lies in the reading of the book in the schools in the first place.

Re the morality of abortion and the "Where do we draw the line?" there seems to be only one place where the line can possibly be drawn. The uniting of the sperm and the egg produces a speck of protoplasm. The odds against any particular sperm uniting with any particular egg are astronomical. I believe in only one miracle in life, and that is the mathematical and genetical miracle (odds 150 trillion to one, not counting crossing over) which makes it possible for every person to be a completely unique organism (discounting monozygotic twins), different from any other organism that will ever live. At the instant of conception, the genes are placed. Already, we have a creature who has a certain color of hair and eyes, certain physical characteristics, certain intelligence. Already, we have an organism whose future behavior patterns are partially established by the traits that he has inherited from his parents. I feel that no mother nor no doctor has the right to exterminate the development of this organism which is unique from any other living form. Contraception, yes. Contraception injures no unique organism. Abortion, no. This is just as wrongful as a mother's murdering a 4- or 5-year-old kid while he sleeps, because the mother just doesn't want the kid anymore.

I think I can partially answer John Boardman's query about whether or not it is possible for an atheist to get married in the state of Maryland. The fact is, that in this state one cannot be married by a Justice of the Peace. A broad-minded minister might condescend to perform the service--but the atheist might not be able to tolerate this. A leader of the Ethical Culture Society (this is a group of assorted freethinkers and religious liberals, not unlike the Humanists) is qualified to perform marriage ceremonies in Maryland.

KEVIN LANGDON :: C/O BREEN :: 2402 GROVE ST. :: BERKELEY 4, CALIFORNIA

Sorry for phrasing my remarks so clumsily. I was really objecting to the indefinite "one is said to have a 'conscience'." Said by whom? If this means anything, it means said by the common man, which leads into the difficulty I mentioned. (Let us say, then, that one is said to have a conscience by Ted Pauls when one reaches the logical conclusion that it is foolish to harm others for personal gain.)

Granted the formulation of an ethical code is a process of the intellect, but you have not proven that the ethical code itself is a product of the intellect. It can't be totally a product of the intellect. The intellect does not give rise to your basic premises, for in order for the intellect to function it must have premises available to reason with. (This is true, of course, but I think it ought to be understood that "formulation" is a broad term in this context. The basic premises for the formulation of an ethical code are not assimilated in

a single lump, but rather drawn piece-meal from many sources over a period of time. The premises with which we begin are those imparted to us by our parents and (later) our teachers. These premises (particularly in the former case) may be entirely wrong and completely illogical, but some people whose minds cease growing at this point are probably blissfully unaware of this. Most of one's ethical premises are obtained by reading, I would say, although a particular attitude can rarely be traced to its source. As information and varying opinions are collected in this fashion, one eventually begins to weigh one's own thoughts and attitudes against this mass of material. An individual takes portions from many different sources in order to form his own attitude, these portions being fused and tempered by logic and compassion. Of course, I can speak only of my own case with authority. The only instance where I am able to trace the origins of one of my own attitudes (and even here not to a single specific source) is in the matter of race relations, a field in which my eventual enlightenment is directly attributable to science fiction. (You must understand that during the early years of my life my attitude was a carbon-copy of my parents' attitude; when they stated unequivocally that the Negro and Jew were inherently inferior to me, I believed them. This is not stated as an excuse, for no excuse is sufficient, but rather as an apology to the people I must have hurt in my childish certainty that I was inherently superior to them.) I cannot trace the origins of my current attitudes on, say, religion and honesty. I was a depressingly normal child, particularly in these fields. I attended Sunday school for several years, and when at last I refused to continue it was in no way attributable to a logical dislike of the doctrine being preached; I was simply too lazy to arise as early on Sunday as I was forced to arise on weekdays. In the field of honesty (intellectual and otherwise) I was regrettably abnormal in entirely the wrong direction. I probably told as many lies as most children of my age, but in addition I was apprehended (though not arrested) for shoplifting at the age of ten. This again I can in no way excuse: I stole minor items which I could have purchased ten times over, perhaps because it made me feel important among the crowd of toughs inhabiting the industrial-cum-residential neighborhood in which I lived. I could say much more about my stupidity and lack of ethics at an early age (and, to relieve the boredom and my ego, I could say a few words about the meagre intellectual heights I achieved), but I think this is sufficient. It ought to give Harry Warner something to think about, if he still believes that one is either born with or without ethics and morals.))

No fair, Ted Pauls! You can't expect to define "just" in terms of "fair" and get away with it. ((Perhaps you'd be interested to know, though, that you are the only writer to comment on this.)) Now define "fair". Defining it in terms of "just" is cheating. ((That which is fair gives to and takes from equally all parties concerned. A just law, then, is a law which respects the rights of all individuals equally, and in addition gives equal power to the right of the individual citizen as against the State; and equal power to the rights of one group as against another, and of one citizen against a group or one group against an individual citizen.))

The important question in your discussion of abortion and euthanasia is whether we should consider what the embryo or newborn infant is (an animal less intelligent than the sheep, cattle, and other animals that we routinely kill for food) or what it may become. I prefer the first point of view and thus I am in favor of abortion in the thalidomide cases. ((You have a right to "prefer" the first point of view, but would you mind explaining to us just why you prefer it?))

Ron Wilson: The only alternative to coexistence is nuclear war, which would probably mean the destruction of all life on this planet. Are you really in favor of this? Elsewhere in your letter, I think that you were probably closer to your father than you realized, in view of your statement (and making it shows a great deal of courage), "I am trying gradually to abolish the deep loathing that I hold for the Negroid peoples that resulted from the murder of my father."

Ted, you say, "Knowledge is valuable because only through knowledge can there be progress." Okay, so why is progress valuable? (Oh, come now. Without progress, a society stagnates and dies. All things being in a state of change, it is obvious that change may occur in two directions: for the better, or for the worst. You are actually asking, in this paragraph, why change-for-the-better is valuable. The question does not warrant an answer.)

HARRY WARNER :: 423 SUMMIT AVE. :: HAGERSTOWN, MARYLAND

My interest in political labels like conservative vs. liberal isn't great enough to produce extensive comments on your broadside at John Boardman. I frankly don't know whether I'm a liberal or conservative, and I don't care very much, because the label seems as pointless as Republican or Democrat: it's meaningful only if the individual is active in public life and must set himself up as one or the other to solace the public, which otherwise might be forced to inquire into his principles and beliefs in order to know if it should approve or disapprove of him. Most people are hopeless mixtures of conservative and liberal inclinations and I'm sure it would take someone wiser than I am to be sure which predominates in most cases and how important one strong liberal trend is in an individual crammed full of mild conservative leanings. (I don't presume to be wiser than you, but perhaps my detachment is an advantage. I would classify you as liberal with regard to human and civil rights, moderate in most other fields, and somewhat conservative in the occasional distrust of science you show.)

I see no reason why I should hesitate to kill someone attacking me, although this involves the wild assumption that I would have enough sense to pull a trigger with the muzzle aimed in the right direction, a most improbable state of affairs for a person who is as nervous around firearms as I am. It is quite impossible for my attacker to know for sure that he isn't going to kill me, even if he means only to slice me up or incapacitate me, and in return I have the right to prevent the uncertain consequences of his attack, even though I may slay him in the process. The law says that it is not necessary for the attacked person to strike the second blow; in fact, a recent court case saw an acquittal for a local man who had sliced open the belly of another man with a broken beer bottle while both were drunk: all the testimony indicated that the plaintiff had charged the defendant, fists ready to strike, in the defendant's home, and the defendant was found not guilty by a jury after only five minutes of deliberation, even though he was the slimiest-acting defendant you could imagine in the court room.

I'm disappointed at your failure to find more convincing reasons why my theory about instinctive knowledge of right and wrong is baseless. (The last one--that infants are selfish and remain so until taught differently--was rather a good one, and I note that you apparently can't think of a refutation, since you ignore it completely in this letter.) You know enough about heredity to know that your first objection is unsound: an inherited characteristic can skip one or more generations, otherwise every child born of red-haired parents would have red hair. The second objection isn't necessarily valid because you

don't take into consideration the other things that can affect an individual's behavior: punishment that he may get for doing wrong as he is growing up; economic circumstances that may reduce his desire to do wrong when he can have what we want through wealth and social standing; the pressure of a circle of moral friends whom he would lose if he obeyed his amoral instincts; and many others. The third objection ignores the fact that many criminals cannot be rehabilitated, the fact that many individuals who failed to inherit this morality would be put in insane asylums rather than jail, and the matters stated just above. The Russian-type inherited characteristics theory, as I understand it, is that you change a creature and its change will be reproduced in succeeding generations. I made it clear that I thought that this instinct is something that becomes inheritable only when influenced by experiences of many, many generations. How else do instincts begin? We all know that birds are instinctively afraid of people today, yet birds on a desert island normally do not fear a castaway or discoverer of that island. The birds must have acquired the man-fearing instinct as humans spread over the earth; they didn't have it before man evolved from whatever he came from. (I wonder if birds are necessarily instinctively afraid of people? This past summer, several families of sparrows frequented our back yard for a free meal of stale bread. At first, only adult birds came, and they presumably returned to the nest with food for the young. But eventually these young birds were apparently large enough to take part in the normal family feast, and we noticed that a half dozen or so accompanied the mature specimens. On several occasions, I unthinkingly walked out the back door while they were eating, and I noticed an extremely interesting detail: while the young were eating, the full-grown sparrows would perch on the fence, alert for danger. On two occasions when I blundered onto the scene, the parent birds (who were sitting on a section of the fence some distance from the door) did not immediately spot me. In these cases, the young birds simply hopped out of my way on the cement path, making no effort to take flight. But when the full-grown sentries spotted me, they would set up a furious peeping, upon which the entire assemblage fled. Later, I tried an experiment. When the bread was thrown out one morning, I walked outside and casually sat down on the back step. Although I did not make any effort to remain perfectly still, I was careful not to move suddenly. Soon the clan of sparrows arrived, and since the bread was extremely close to the back step, some of the birds had to approach within arm's length. Plainly, they saw me; a bird would stand several feet away looking up at me, then suddenly dash in virtually under my feet, retrieve a piece of bread, and immediately retreat, whereupon the bird would once again stand and look up at me, holding the bread. Yet it was only after I had been seen by the mature sparrows that the entire group took flight. On another occasion, several years previously, a family of kilddeer occupied a vacant lot (where now stands an apartment house) near this house. These are most interesting birds, particularly in the manner in which they lead enemies away from their nest. If any fairly large creature approaches the nest, one of the pair will suddenly extend one of its wings, bent as if it were broken, emit a series of mournful shrieks, and hobble away from the nest, leading the creature away from its eggs or brood. I used to delight in watching the many people (both adults and children) who were fooled by this trick. The supposedly wounded kilddeer would match the speed of the pursuer while leading him or her away from the nest: if a man walked slowly toward the bird, it would hobble slowly away, but if a pursuer increased his speed, so would the kilddeer, always keeping a few feet ahead. Then,

when the nest was safely behind, the kildeer would cease shrieking and vigorously fly away, leaving the pursuer with egg on his face. Since I was aware of this trick, I didn't bother following the adult bird but went instead to the nest. In this case, the kildeer would take off into the air, land close to me, and go through its act again, hoping to draw me away from the nest. Throughout this performance, the young birds were in a state of extreme terror, flapping stubby wings uselessly and running around in circles. However, if I approached the nest while the parent bird was a half-block away, detouring another curious person, the offspring showed no fear. From this (done several times), I concluded that the kildeer offspring were not afraid of man, per se, but are afraid whenever the parent goes into its act within their sight and hearing. As for the mature birds, they certainly weren't afraid of men--their act was extremely dangerous, in that it allowed a man to get close enough to heave a rock with reasonable accuracy. I saw anger in the actions of the kildeer, yes; I saw what from a human would have been extreme courage, yes; but I never saw fear in the mature bird. If I hadn't already digressed for so many lines, I'd tell you a story about what happens to idiot children who climb a tree wherein lies a crow's nest. Suffice it to say that while I know of no crows fearing human beings, I do know two human beings--Ted Pauls and Danny Stein--who have a healthy respect for crows.))

I've never heard of this Maryland law prohibiting an atheist from holding public office or a state job, or that court of appeals ruling. ((The matter is covered, among other places, in an article by Robert Bendiner which appeared last year in the "Speaking Out" section of the Saturday Evening Post.) I'm quite sure that it would be held unconstitutional, under Article Six: "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." Maybe you're thinking of the former Ober act, which required school teachers and other state employes to swear loyalty, and the fuss that followed when some fundamentalist sects refused to swear on religious grounds involving oath-taking, not because they were disloyal. Nor do I know why an atheist couldn't get married here. Possibly Boardman was referring to the inability to get married in most, maybe all, parts of Maryland without the help of a clergyman.

JOHN BOARDMAN :: APT. D-3 :: 166-25 89th AVE. :: JAMAICA 32, NEW YORK

Our differences of opinion seem, as you say, to be differences concerning procedure rather than concerning policy. I think that this difference depends upon the following three different perspectives that we bring to bear upon conservative political and criminal activity:

(1) I am old enough to remember the Second World War served up daily in the headlines, rather than as part of a history course.

(2) I lived for 1½ years in a part of the South where the White Citizens' Council exerted an effective veto over the actions and statements of all public bodies. Friends of mine have been jailed or beaten there.

(3) I read regularly a large number of conservative publications, including National Review, Thunderbolt, American Mercury, Kill, Storm, American Opinion, and Stormtrooper. Rather than reading what other people say about conservatives, I prefer to read what the conservatives themselves say about their beliefs and about what they plan to do. This can be very enlightening, as hypocrisy is not one of their faults. ((A few casual impressions, if I may: (1) newspaper headlines during wartime serve exactly the same purpose as during peacetime: to stir up emotionalism. This was apparently quite successful in your par-

ticular case. Personally, I prefer the detachment of an historical account. I have learned to despise the Nazi ideology and methods in this manner every bit as much as I could learn to despise it through a tearful photograph and lurid story in the Daily News. Furthermore, the "I'm older than you and I know what the hell I'm talking about!" attitude, of which your first numbered paragraph is an offshoot, is a method of argument which has never found favor in intelligent circles. (2) I have lived for all of my life among a family which embraces the doctrine of white supremacy. (3) I could give a list of my reading matter with a conservative "line", but since that is not in the least relevant to this argument, I won't bother. We are arguing here not whether the conservatives would treat us badly if they assumed control, but whether it is morally proper ("appropriate" being conceded) for us to do the same to them. And finally, I disagree with you that "hypocrisy is not one of their faults." By assuming a double standard of action/punishment with regard, on the one hand, to fellow conservatives, and on the other, to liberals, they are guilty of hypocrisy. No doubt you don't consider this to be hypocrisy, since it is what I criticized you for last issue, but in my opinion it qualifies nicely under that term.))

With these considerations, it seems to me that in defending themselves against conservatism, liberals are fighting not merely for their principles, but for their very lives. If the evidence cited in "Satyagraha; Havlaga, Treblinka" in Pointing Vector #10 didn't convince you of this, the Battle of Oxford should. This battle was proclaimed by the rebel field commander, General Edwin Walker, as a "conservative revolt". It should be evident by now that conservatives have both the will and the means to kill their liberal opponents. They are most likely to do so in regions, such as the South, where they control the machinery of local government and can therefore act with relative impunity.

Nor are these murders merely individual scattered acts of frustration or intimidation. Conservative spokesmen have made it amply clear that murder of their opposition is part of their policy. It was no illiterate redneck, but Judge Bromfield of Mississippi, who announced from the state bench that if Mississippi Negroes "follow the advice of outside agitators", and register to vote, they will be "slaughtered like sheep". Among the white southerners who have been carrying this policy into action have been law enforcement officials, and even legislators.

In the South, this violence is a continuation of the Civil War. Conservatives are fighting with the same slogans, under the same flag, and for the same principles as they did a century ago. Then, too, they called themselves "conservatives". I don't know who has a better title to this label.

I wish that, in criticizing my views on this subject as expressed in the Pointing Vector, you wouldn't put words into my mouth. I'd prefer that you criticized my opinions on their own merits, or lack of them, rather than making "logical extensions" of your own construction and then accusing me of the misdeeds you think would result from such "extensions". ((To my knowledge, everything I criticized you for was a logical result of your quoted comments, except the comments about my own ancestry, which I immediately admitted to be silly.))

Northern and western conservatives cannot be separated from their more forthright Southern brethren. Some northerners, both liberals and conservatives, will tell you that the southern rebels and killers are "not true conservatives". Of course they are. Just ask them.

And, in fact, northern conservatives have supported Governor

Barnett's actions. Barry Goldwater, "Mr. Conservative", has announced that Barnett had a perfect right to do what he did. Robert Morris, sometime conservative candidate for U.S. Senator from New Jersey, has placed his legal services at the disposal of General Walker. The Conservative Party of New York urges "returning the control of education to parents and local communities." If these northern conservatives accept the same identification as southern segregationists, and excuse their actions, they must come under the same condemnation.

Do you consider violence used to defend liberals against these attacks morally equivalent to the violence used by the conservatives in making the attacks? I certainly do not. (We agree here, but I do not consider some of your proposals to be defensive in any manner of speaking. In my original article, I stipulated that a person had the right to defend himself when attacked--by a liberal, a conservative, or a grizzly bear. But making "the North unsafe for conservatives" (your own words) can hardly be construed as responding to an attack.)

I think there should be no illusions about what conservatives will deliver should they ever come to federal power. They are on record with numerous statements on their plans. Four prominent conservatives, including William F. Buckley Jr. and Fulton Lewis Jr., have advocated hanging Chief Justice Warren--not impeaching him, as the John Birch Society would do, but hanging him. (See Pointing Vector #7, p. 15; or National Review, 9 September 1961, p. 143; Time, 24 November 1961, p. 34; Newsweek, 4 December 1961, p. 18; New York Times, 17 December 1961.) (See also Kipple #21, p. 5. So you see, John, I am not entirely ignorant of these matters. But regardless of what the conservatives would do if they assumed control, this in no way makes it acceptable for liberals to commit the same acts.) And, in a speech delivered in January 1962, Senator Goldwater said, "I have some definite plans for Prof. Galbraith, Ed Murrow, and Arthur Schlesinger Jr. I can't reveal these plans because if there's a leak they might get out of the country before I'm inaugurated." How many other people would have to flee for life or liberty if conservatism takes over? (I might be one to flee, since I have made some notable enemies among local reactionaries, but I will neither support nor tolerate a "liberal" program to make conservatives "flee for life or liberty". If Senator Goldwater were to attack me, I would attempt to defend myself; but, because Goldwater advocates creating difficulties for liberals, I do not consider that sufficient reason to lower myself to his level by advocating the same ends for conservatives.)

Among conservative groups, I consider the National States Rights Party to be the most dangerous. Unlike many conservative groups, it is not a one-man operation for egoboo, but commands much support over several southern states. It is an appeal to an endemic American racism, rather than an attempt to import and graft Nazism. Those who are further curious about it should write to NSRP, Box 783, Birmingham, Alabama, and ask for the latest issue of their publication, Thunderbolt. Then turn to page 417 of the 1962 World Almanac.

At present I feel that it may be more effective to deal with conservatives violently only in response to their own violence. But, if they continue a state of open warfare against Negroes, Jews, liberals, and (often) innocent bystanders in the South, a counterattack in the North would be no less appropriate than the offensive which Sherman opened in Georgia in 1864 to take the pressure off Grant in Virginia. This is entirely a tactical matter. (You seem to use the word "appropriate" an awful lot, don't you? As I have admitted several times, actions of this sort are quite appropriate--if we use the ethical code of

the neo-Fascists. I, for one, refuse to embrace that code. If you wish to, that is your business, but don't complain when someone identifies it for what it is:))

Nazis, now, are another matter. My reasons for taking this position have been expounded at least twice in the Pointing Vector. In 1941, the German Reich declared against the United States a state of war which is still in effect. Nazi troops which did not honor the surrender agreement of 1945 are still in a state of war with the Allies, and are under law guerillas. This seems to be the legal status of the American Nazi Party. Of course, if some district attorney wanted to press for an indictment against them for conspiracy to commit murder, he'd find ample justification for such an indictment in their own literature and public statements. This also holds for their local offshoot, the American National Party.

I hate to disillusion you, but when I advocated "knocking Nazis on the head and throwing them into the gutter" I did mean killing them. I can recall a time when it was accounted a praiseworthy deed to kill Nazis. A great proportion of the national energies of America was dedicated towards this end. Nazism has not changed since then. I would not like to think that America has changed. ((It was once considered a praiseworthy deed to kill pre-Nazi Germans; before that Spaniards; before that Indians; before that southerners; before that English soldiers; and before that "witches" and other heretics. But, goddamnit man, that does not make it right!))

To follow up "The Heckler", I am happy to report that Stephen L'eandes has been inconspicuous ever since he was pasted on the jaw when he tried to break up a meeting of the American Jewish Congress. I've seen him twice since then, once at a distance at a peace meeting in St. Nicholas Arena, and once when he interviewed me for some rural Mississippi papers while I was on a picket line in front of a conservative rally. Both times he behaved like a little gentleman.

I overstepped the legitimate bounds of criticism in my remarks on Betty Kujawa. Four years of residence in Syracuse, where Polish and Ukrainian emigre groups are vocal, had given me a poor perspective on refugees from those regions. One tends to forget that, for centuries, the overwhelming majority of political and racial refugees who have come to America have become faithful citizens of this country, and have not tried to influence their adopted country to revenge real or fancied wrongs which they have suffered in the "old country". However, these refugees are no where near as vocal as the "professional refugees" who will cheerfully risk sending the world up in smoke if their chances of getting back into power are in any way enhanced, or if they see a chance of revenge upon their supplanters. For example: a little group of professional refugees called "The Assembly of Captive European Nations" pressured Congress three years ago into passing a resolution for the partition of the Soviet Union. I'll repeat that in case you missed its significance. The Congress of the United States of America is now unaimously on record as favoring the partition of the Soviet Union into some two dozen specifically listed entities. We are indeed fortunate that the Soviet Union did not choose to regard this belligerent provocation as an act of war. Can you imagine the furor that would be caused in this country if the Supreme Soviet or the Presidium announced as part of Soviet national policy the partition of the U.S.A.?

Among the divisions into which the USSR would be carved by this grandiose plan are such things as "Idel-Ural", "Cossackia", and "White Ruthenia". "Cossackia" sounds as if it would be a separate country for the Cossacks, which would make about as much sense as a separate coun-

try for the U.S. Marines. And can anyone out there identify "Idel-Ural" and "White Ruthenia"? (No "Black Ruthenia"? Are they a bunch of segregationists?) The ACEN's role in passing this resolution is an insult to the many millions of immigrants from Eastern Europe and their descendants, who have made a new life here rather than worrying about the wrongs done to the feudal dictatorships which held power in most of Eastern Europe before they were replaced first by Nazi and then by Communist dictatorships.

There is some connection between my interpretation of Fred Thompson's statement on his sex life, and the conservatives' statement on their political plans. The pronouncements of some conservatives are treated in the press as if they really didn't mean them; you see such phrases as "so-called Nazis" and "self-styled Nazis". Similarly, you feel that no credence should be placed in Thompson's statement that the only reason he molested girls was because he couldn't attract a woman. I subscribe to a school of psychology that is in eclipse right now, but I think will someday be discovered and hailed as the last birth of time. I believe that people perform the actions that they do for the reasons that they think they have in performing them. This is just as oversimplified as Freudian psychology, but it's a lot easier to understand, and probably no less inaccurate.

BETTY KUJAWA :: 2819 CAROLINE ST. :: SOUTH BEND 14, INDIANA

I was naturally pleased, moved and touched to find an exception to my rule, "Liberals are only liberal to their very own". I thank you for risking the sneers of your peers by defending a Conservative. I hope the skin color, racial origin, and religious beliefs of your family will not be 'used', as was mine and that of my husband, against you.

Thank you, Ted Pauls, for being a liberal in the grand tradition and in the finest sense of the word.

In the past we used the term "McCarthyism" for guilt by association and for this kind of smear tactics. Since the late and very unlamented Senator never did me and mine harm directly I'll prefer from now on to deem this style of in-fighting 'Boardmanism' or 'Boardmanship'.

When all this came to pass I stated formally to my husband and, via tape, to Wrai Ballard and, I believe, Boyd Raeburn, that for each and every fan-friend who came to my defense in the next two issues of Kipple I would give ten dollars in each name to either the NAACP or the United Negro College Fund. I have done so in, alas, only one name--yours. As there are many amid your readers who know of the years, money, and effort I have spent for Negro causes I had hopes of giving far more; but instead, my contention about the liberality of our liberals in fandom was borne home to me in a personal and, frankly, saddening way.

But then perhaps they too have families/spouses whom they didn't care to have dragged in and called names? I feel I should warn all that there is no protection against Boardmanship. In my case, I hadn't known the man at all, nor did he know me or my husband. All I did was mention in G2 that I was a conservative. Now it might be wise for fans to declare that they are bachelors/spinsters and orphans with no knowledge of their racial stock; that might help.

It wasn't that I showed no inclination to defend myself and my non-fan bystander husband, Ted. My husband pointed out to me, and wisely, that I couldn't possibly 'fight' this, or 'win' anything when I had to deal with a person who uses these tactics; nor could I hope to explain or change his opinion.

Foolishly perhaps I chose to still have hope, so I waited until the Chicon where, during the Willis/Lindsay Reception, I attempted to give some facts and truths to Mr. Boardman. Since a goodly amount of time has passed since then I can only surmise that no retraction on me and mine is forthcoming. I am now sorry I didn't heed Gene, and I apologize to John Boardman for bothering him with the actual facts of the case. It was very thoughtless of me.

I therefore return to my husband's way of thinking: that I can't possibly defend myself against John's public statements. I don't and won't play 'dirty' myself. I do hope (if they can bear risking it) that perhaps Walter Breen and others whom I've grotched at in the past will testify that I have always based my gripes on the actual deeds they did and not, repeat not, upon their race, color, and creed, nor that of their families or in-laws. Since I play the game this way I am ill equipped to handle a Boardman. Even George C. Willick attacked me only for my over-gooey letters-of-comment and not because he once knew a Pole somewhere whom he didn't like. Ergo, there is something of the good in all of us. Mayhap in the future I'll find some in John; hope springs eternal from my conservative breast.

To reiterate my work for Negro causes; to state again (for the umpteenth time) how upon my death some 90% of my estate will be put in trust at the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor) to be used in perpetuity as scholarships for Negro men and women (the other 10% goes to medical research on children's diseases); to give a lengthy, exhaustive lecture in basic American history on Indiana, New England, the Union, etc. in the Civil War, pointing out that it was my Republican Party and my direct ancestors who supported, fought, bled, and died for the abolition of slavery (and who helped immeasurably here in town to keep the Underground Railroad in operation, thereby creating a fine and exemplary mainly-Negro village of Cassopolis, Michigan to the North of us); to bore you all telling of my Whitehall family's tradition of the rights of all Americans since we got here in the middle-late 1700's; to tell again of the physical beating my husband endured through Roman Catholic Parochial School for sassing back nuns who flatly taught that Negroes were not only 'inferior' but not to be considered 'human'; to give a lecture in Sociology on the Immigrants of South Bend, Indiana, Polish Division (something I am far, far more qualified to do than Mr. Boardman by any standards); to say that in these devoutly UAW/CIO Democratic-voting homes the Holy Trinity consists of The Father (F.D. Roosevelt), The Son (J.F. Kennedy) and The Holy Ghost (Walter Reuther); well, Ted, all this would only clutter up John's keen all-knowing mind, and by my experiences with his tactics in the past not do me nor Gene any good at all.

Those who know me will give me the benefit of the doubt after reading John's letter--at least I hope they still will. Those who want to believe the worst of Betty Kujawa (and her husband with that odd name) will not be moved or swayed at all by any protests on my part and perhaps will commend John for taking a conservative femme-fan down a peg or two.

I choose to think that when anyone stoops down and scoops up filth and flings in willy-nilly at another (and at the other's uninvolved, unsuspecting kin) instead of basing his or her arguments on past deeds, he will end up with most of the ammunition/filth adhering to his own hands and to his own name. A thought to console the two Kujawas if, God forbid, this becomes a new fannish fashion.

Again we thank you personally for your consideration and your fairness. I will continue to hope secretly that you are not a minority

of one among the liberals in fandom. I like this in-group of ours. I like most fans and violently adore some. Henceforth, I hope to be admired and grotched at for myself and for my actions, not for any accident of birth or for my inherent American rights of belief/philosophy. I will continue to do the same for others.

VIC RYAN :: RM 308, LINDGREN HALL :: 2309 SHERIDAN RD. :: EVANSTON, ILL.

You apparently are looking far too deep into this character Thompson's psyche. Naturally his motives for assaulting the little girl go beyond age and poverty, but not that far beyond. Pedophiliacs are notoriously "inferior" people, at least to themselves. The general philosophy seems to be that a little girl is naive, and easier to seduce; she can't complain on the grounds of her attacker's inadequacy; and she has no frame of reference in which the attacker might be judged inferior. He's afraid of being rejected, so he takes the female too young to actively resist, and too inexperienced to fathom his inabilities, if they do exist. ((In this case, then, the man would be even less likely to search out a prostitute, since it would occur to him that she would have abnormally broad frames of reference in which to gauge his inferiority.))

As long as we're on psychology, we might as well deal with Harry Warner's letter. I hope he isn't laboring under the misconception that a "psychiatrist" is necessarily a practitioner of "psychoanalysis", since this very definitely isn't the case. "Long-distance psychoanalysis" probably isn't behind the disrepute of Freud in this day and age; it's just that a sexually sophisticated people find the Freudian typology rather ridiculous; even assuming that sexual experiences are all-important in personality formation, categorizing people into a mere six categories (the areas in which their individual libidos may become fixated) is rather pointless. (Incidentally, Freud isn't completely immersed in ill-repute; he's still fashionable at cocktail parties, and a few really worthwhile notions, such as ambivalence or the importance of childhood experiences, negate all the cross-cultural disproofs of the Oedipus situation, and so on.)

Of course, I'll have to agree in part with what Joe Pilati says on my medicare comments, but I wish he'd bear in mind something called "satirical license", and the fact that I admitted not knowing which bill was defeated in the Senate--at least, I thought I did, but you may have cut the reference. ((Sorry, but I pass the buck back to you--your comments re medicare in #28 were printed verbatim.))

I'm tempted to answer the "few more months" argument anent "mercy killing" with a snide "It hasn't happened yet," but that's probably too snide an answer for even the stupidest of euphemisms. Simply, knowledge of medical breakthroughs doesn't come overnight; the original, hopeful results in most areas of medical research see print in the medical journals, where competent people can follow their progress. It's obvious why such things aren't widely publicized; it's too large a potential area for the fly-by-night quack. In such a case, if the patient is suffering from a disease in which the physician believes there is some chance for an "immediate" breakthrough, perhaps the prolongation of life in pain is justifiable. Otherwise, it seems less the duty to a vague oath than the reluctance to make a definitive decision, and, perhaps, as Larry McCombs has suggested, for personal financial gain as well.

From curiosity, I'd wonder what Tom Armistead wants in the way of "proof" for the validity of the evolutionary scheme? I suppose it's a matter of being conclusively proven for those who want to believe it,

and being impossible to prove to those who care not to be convinced. If the Bible is interpreted liberally, not literally, Adam and Eve might be conceptualized as the first Homo sapiens that could thoroughly and irrevocably be classified as "human"; but if we're to assume them to be pristine life-forms, the same in configuration as present man (they were created in the image of God; supposedly man still retains this image; ergo, modern man resembles Adam) that just doesn't seem to follow. Remnants of such as the Java Homo sapiens indicate that this particular fellow had some distinctively human institutions and characteristics, yet he looks no more like modern man than does the orang-utan.

Still, I have to admire Tom Armistead's calm and collected letter; some of the views may not be mine, but he certainly evidences a considerable degree of maturity, unlike some others that often enter into the argument.

RON WILSON :: RM 119, GOLDSWORTHY HALL :: PULLMAN, WASHINGTON

It is evident from the letter column in Kipple #29 that my article on cybernetics produced the reaction that I wanted. Since it began as a term paper for a composition class and was printed as nothing more, I do not see where I gave the impression that I was informed to any great degree on the subject.

I tackled the question in the first place because I didn't know all the answers and wanted to view the various current arguments and form a fairly intelligent opinion of my own. Few of those who commented seem to have read my opening statement, "This article is a correlation" etc. I obtained all the facts that I presented from such sources as Science Digest, New York Times Magazine, and even from the fact sections of a few science fiction magazines.

So in effect, the "experts" represented in #29 were not contradicting me, but rather other experts in the field. I can claim only as mine (in the total sense of the word) the last section where I put down my own personal reactions. The fact that the construction may have been a bit clumsy was due exclusively to my own correlation. But now to specifics:

Larry McCombs: The points you raised were very stimulating and, of course, my own conclusions about complexity were based on my own data base. The example on page 14 was an error and I spotted it soon after glancing over the section. Now the way I learned logic, either

When I spoke of Wally Weber, I wasn't referring to the statistics about the man. It would have been better for me to use the example of a controversial writer or artist, because I was attempting to expound the fact that likes or dislikes do not characterize the unprogrammed computer. No one could argue that a computer couldn't relate all its programmed data on a given subject, but could it form an opinion because of like or dislike without processing?

I don't believe that the number of people you know who can't recall memories at a hundredth-of-a-second would be adequate enough to label the statement a falsehood. If you wish to argue with the person responsible for the remark, then I will look him up. I have quoted the piece correctly.

If hundredth-of-a-second access to one-hundred trillion memory cells is slow for machines, then why don't the experts as well as everyone else consider the machines of greater memory potential than the human brain? That is all the human brain is supposed to be capable of.

The arguments about "an immortal soul", ESP, etc. are not my arguments, nor are they those of the author of World of Mathematics from which they are taken. They are simply popular sentiments on the ques-

tion, whether right or wrong.

You think that machines can think abstractly. I understand "abstract" to be things apart from material entities. Could you explain how to convey the symbol "wine" to a machine without material objects of some kind? But if we are to consider electrical impulses as being tangible, then the answer is apparent, for impulses constitute the manner in which the human brain receives such symbols. Do you consider the separation of symbols as "abstract" thinking? I would like to know the depth of your thinking on this point.

As I have stated, these are my personal thoughts. I took the matter to Dr. Theodore A. Van Wormer in the Computing Center here at Washington State University and he pointed out that even the experts find little to rest complete agreement on. The fact that he seemed in varying opinion with most of your opinions concerning subjective time illustrated this. About the only thing that practically all the experts can sanction is the Turing Test, which to a large extent borders on the hypothetical in regards to the significance of its application.

Roy Frank: I don't consider the analysis of observations and consequences that leads to new hypotheses completely nonrational. Often times, new hypotheses seem to come from nowhere. The fact that the human brain cannot list logically the steps from its origin is not necessarily sufficient to say that these hypotheses were born of irrationality.

Kevin Langdon: By thinking, I was not referring to the lethargical intellect, actively engaged in erotic sex fantasies or whatever else constitutes "letting pleasant thoughts drift through our minds." I was using thinking in the sense of ratiocination that Mr. Webster saw fit to define as, "To exercise the powers of judgment, conception, or inference; to reflect for the purpose of reaching a conclusion; reason." You may think of the human brain as a machine, but machine normally (to me, at least) implies the transmission of force and motion.

The article may have been poorly thought out and poorly written, but such criticism carries little weight coming from a person who naively asserts that a sane man must be a man of considerable intelligence (Quantifier #1). If the question of sanity is to be judged on whether or not the individual possesses considerable intelligence or not, then many people will be in an unfortunate position; that is, unless they have a machine for a brain which can "think" without reasoning, as you imply.

Thanks to Mike Deckinger for pointing out the inconsistency of my thoughts. The fact that the comments appeared in two different letters and on two trains of thought may account for the error. I should have referred to the hating of the Negroid peoples that I once possessed. The impressions of a small boy are not generally founded in logic. Since there was (according to human nature) grounds for resentment, such hatred was more or less "the thing to do". This could not last for long, however, because any degree of intelligent thinking would show that it is foolish to show animosity towards an entire race of people simply for one incident. I must admit that any hatred I did have as a child had to have been hollow, as I explained earlier in the letter.

DAVE LOCKE :: P.O. BOX 335 :: INDIAN LAKE, NEW YORK

The Lord's Prayer, or Regents' Prayer, or whatever the hell it is, was never a notable or gala occasion at the high school when I was going there. Few of us paid any attention to this voice, of whatever truly honored student received the task, coming over the loud-speaker. But then, Indian Lake is a damned odd community anyhow. It's almost

solid Republican and conservative, yet there are a hell of a lot of agnostics and atheists in it (all of whom are Republican and conservative, except me).

I've discovered another way in which liberalism is superior to conservatism. As a beautiful transition from the above paragraph to this one, let us take a school and use it for an example in order to let you in on this great discovery. Without naming names (which is a generally bad thing, unless you have money or a brilliant lawyer), the point is simply this: Very conservative schools--that is, schools with a very conservative faculty, politically and religiously--won't stand much for any liberal ideas or practices in the school itself. I know a school, and I'm sure that there are handbaskets full of them, which manages in one way or another to get rid of teachers who voice any such liberal ideas or try to execute any such liberal practices. Liberal schools, however, generally allow a great many conservative practices by conservative teachers (who are hired in not-negligible numbers). In other words, the moral is this: The difference between liberalism and conservatism could seem to be (pardon the qualifiers, but back doors are always nice to have around) a frame of mind; open-mindedness or the general lack of it, and toleration in a certain sense of the word. Not that liberals and conservatives tolerate each other very much through the written word. They don't. The toleration and intolerance I'm thinking of are relative to the kinds shown in the above two examples about schools. Agree or disagree?

F. M. BUSBY :: 2852 14th AVE., WEST :: SEATTLE 99, WASHINGTON

I'm far behind on fanzine reading but I did skim Kipple #30 and I am pleased to see you picking up after Boardman who had left a discernible trail of fugg on several topics, particularly the matter of the political opinions of Betty Kujawa versus some refugee of Boardman's acquaintance: as you point out, this was a fine rare specimen of fuggheadedness the like of which it is hard to match without a lot of effort.

JOE PILATI :: 111 S. HIGHLAND AVE. :: PEARL RIVER, NEW YORK

Congratulations on the first six pages of Quotes & Notes. I, too, find myself on the John Boardman side of 90% of the mundane subjects discussed in fanzines, but I have also been genuinely appalled at some of John's writings such as you quoted. It disturbs me greatly to see such ripe and juicy inconsistency in the liberalism of one I respect highly. In my opinion, the only honest answer John could provide would be, "You're right, Ted Pauls."

Regarding your quotation from the Hardin book, it may interest you to know that actually, the world is 8000 years old. That is the figure given me by a girl of my acquaintance, who transferred from a Lutheran private school to Pearl River High School. At said private school, the statement that the world is 8000 years old is drummed into the pupils' craniums, or so I am led to believe. The girl, incidentally, still believes it implicitly. "Joyce," I say to her now and then (for that be her Christian name), "do you still think the world is 8000 years old?" "Yes," she answers piously. Touching.

Loftus Becker Jr.: The Republic of San Marino elected a Communist government--whether the election was honest or not I have no idea --but the government was overthrown subsequently. Also, I believe a few small towns and cities in Italy have elected municipal Communist governments. I presume these elected Communists campaigned mainly on local issues and presented their organization as mostly a radical reform

group. Well, anyway, there have been "honestly elected" communists, else how could they have at least token representation in legislative bodies of most of the countries of Western Europe? I cannot share Loftus' "disturbance" at the fact that "200,000 people are stupid enough to vote for the States' Rights Party." The key word Loftus used was "stupid". I doubt very much whether a well-financed, well-run campaign by States Rightists or similar political neanderthals would significantly increase their popularity. About all they can count upon is the "stupid" vote, and with that particular minority group happily diminishing, I don't consider the SRP much of a threat. Even Barry Goldwater has to hide behind his conservative "respectability"--I saw a television interview in which Goldwater had to state that James Meredith had a right to attend the U. of Mississippi; Barry merely abhorred the federal troops and the "coercion" of the federal government (but didn't indicate what else could have been done to uphold the 14th Amendment).

Where Ben Orlove says "how can people think without a brain?" he says something basic--of course, Clarence Darrow's agnosticism was based on almost precisely the same foundations. Darrow said that physical death was incompatible with the persistence of memory. His autobiography is one of the main reasons I can't accept organized religion, so there, Jack Chalker.

Goldwater may think that there is a tremendous conservative groundswell, but I would wager that if he is ever elected (God help us) someone like Hubert Humphrey or Eugene McCarthy will almost immediately start bellowing about a liberal groundswell. It's the simple principle of the "outs" being more vigorous than the "ins", although as a liberal I am progressively convincing myself that "we" aren't really in after all, and that Jack is just Ike with more hair and a good-looking wife. Ike himself succeeded so completely in being politically neuter that most political activity outside the great middle-of-the-road was psychologically squelched.

Yes, Derek Nelson, Barry doesn't consider the John Birch Society radical. But he does consider Robert Welch radical. Bill Buckley wants us to believe that this is a great spurt of frankness on Barry's part. I feel awfully sorry for Welch, disgusting as he is, because the New Young Right had to select him to be the scapegoat for their own naivete and idiocy.

BRUCE PELZ :: 738 S. MARIPOSA, APT. 107 :: LOS ANGELES 5, CALIFORNIA

For further commentary on rights of unlikeable individuals, see if you can borrow a file of CULT magazines for the last six months or so--the Rockwell-slugging incident in San Diego has brought up the subject, and commentary is still going on. My opinion: someone preaching the abrogation of the rights of others deserves to have his own cut short. Sort of practicing what they preach. (Ah, what wondrous vicious circles we weave, when first we practice hypocrisy. In stating this, you are preaching the abrogation of others' rights, and thus, by your own splendid reasoning, deserve to have your own "cut short." Lapsus calami?)

BEN ORLOVE :: 825 E. 13th STREET :: BROOKLYN 30, NEW YORK

The situation where one person is attempting to kill the other is a him-or-me situation. Somebody is going to die; in our society, if the attacker kills the other, both will die. This is assuming, of course, that the attacker can't be stopped by a means other than death. (One of your comments suggests an interesting parallel which hadn't previously occurred to me. It was once the custom, when one man killed

another, for the family of the victim to avenge his death by seeking out and executing the murderer. At this point, the family of the second victim would seek to avenge his murder, and thus the feud would continue. This custom was particularly prevalent in the last century in the western and in the south-eastern sections of this country, where it would occasionally develop into a continuing war between two super-families which would end only when one clan was completely exterminated. In an earlier time, this practice was justified under the name of dueling, with rigid rules assigned to the physical process of committing the murders. Primitive peoples also have a self-perpetuating revenge system, but in this case the warring factions are usually tribes instead of families. Your phrases "in our society, if the attacker kills the other, both will die" point out that we, in a high state of civilization (self-proclaimed), are not very far from what are now considered barbarous practices. The only real difference is that our system is not self-perpetuating: the killer, instead of being sought out and executed by the family of the victim, is executed by the state; and since the killer's family cannot murder the state in revenge, the matter ends there instead of being prolonged. But I'm not so sure I'm proud of that vague distinction in systems...))

Tom Armistead: Evolution can't have much direct evidence backing it up; we can't go back in time to watch organisms evolve. There are fossil remains of the horse, for example, from a primitive state to what it is now. There are a few examples of organisms which have been watched evolving. One is the peppered moth, *Biston betularia*, which, very briefly, was white before the Industrial Revolution polluted many forests and is now mostly dark, due to natural selection. (Light moths are more readily seen; birds eat them; they don't produce offspring.) (Since you introduced this subject, Ben, I'll quote a few lines from "Some of My Best Friends Are Lepidoptera," a long article/short book which I've been engaged in writing since last spring: "There is, however, one form of protective coloration which was induced by modern civilization: melanism in industrial areas. Melanics are mutants, a dark-colored member of a light species, which have always existed to some extent. Whenever one or more of these mutated moths (highly prized by collectors) is born, the mutation does not usually survive for long, its descendants (if any) becoming less and less with each generation simply because it is easily spotted by enemies. In the woods, the dark coloration is a selective disadvantage. However, there are strains of melanics which do not die out, but propagate freely, because of the smoke and soot of a coal town or some other heavily industrialized center. In these surroundings, the melanics possess a selective advantage, since they are much more difficult to see than the lighter 'normal' moths."))

Contraception is a much better solution to the population problem than abortion. Under certain circumstances, however, legalized abortion is a workable solution to the problem: witness Japan. Sometimes it is necessary to prevent the coming-into-sentience of human beings for the good of the majority.

MIKE DECKINGER :: 31 CARR PLACE :: FORDS, NEW JERSEY

I'll agree with your stand that legalized prostitution probably would have done little to deter the sort of motivations that compelled Fred J. Thompson to murder Edith Kiecorius, but at the same time I wonder just what sort of good, if any, it would accomplish. Several countries have maintained this profession on a legalized and inspected basis, and it usually consisted of girls reporting to a health clinic

once a month, where they underwent a hurried examination for any traces of v.d. Cards were issued to them certifying whether or not any signs existed and prospective clients usually demanded to see these cards before availing themselves of the girls' services. Mexico, for a long time, has used the more widespread method of having numerous "doctors" living in and around the brothels who would administer dosages of penicillin to the men as soon as they left the girls. Either way, it's a somewhat more efficient system than a quick moment with a sidewalk pick-up.

Prostitutes in New York can still be found, of course, though legalization would permit them to advertise their services in more widespread locations. Most of the ones that I've seen, primarily in the Times Square/42nd Street district, looked pretty dumpy and unattractive to me. Every few years a few more trysting places are located and shut down, and immediately a dozen more will spring up in other locations.

One of the requirements of existing in a basically democratic nation is that we are hindered in using force to emphasize the determination we may hold for or against some subject. Rockwell and his goons are free to use beatings, blackmailing, and burnings to support their beliefs, insane though they may be, yet by the same token you feel that his opponents should restrict their opposition to kid-gloved protests. (Rockwell and Co. are free to use these tactics only insofar as they can do so without being apprehended by the law enforcement agencies.) It's almost as ridiculous as the world situation where the U.S. seems to have lost all effectiveness as a tough nation, and feels its strongest method of retaliation is to bounce a strong protest note to some country. It may as well be understood that the days of the cod-dling, kid-gloves treatments are done with. These jokers are playing for keeps; they will not be affected and they will not be intimidated by a few harsh warnings to the effect that if you don't stop that we may do something drastic. (I'm playing for keeps, too, only I have a set of rules to follow, one of which is that you don't practice "liberalism" by going out and killing a fellow who disagrees with you. I am utterly astounded that I am unable to convince a small minority of Kipple's readers that you don't fight fascists by adopting the rules and tactics of fascists. There are two ways, neither the less certain, for liberals to lose this "battle" (if I may use John Boardman's terminology): we may lose it by physical defeat, or we may lose it by the metamorphosis of our ideals to those of the opposition. Both means of defeat are equally devastating, and the latter is in addition the less honorable.) Drastic measures are required now. And I note that while you seem to feel that Rockwell and his Goon Squad should have permission to preach whatever they feel like in public, this same permission was granted to Rockwell's British counterpart in England; and as soon as he opened his tirade he was bitterly attacked and forced to flee by an angry crowd of incensed observers. (Obviously, then, the "angry crowd of incensed observers" were at fault. Regardless of my personal dislike of Sir Oswald Mosley's opinions, the fact remains that the moment we interfere with his right to practice freedom of speech, we lower ourselves to his own abysmal level, and in doing so divest ourselves of any dignity and honor we, as "liberals", might have possessed.)

It's a difficult thing to say when force should be advocated and when it shouldn't; but there are limits to the endurance of the public to accept hate-mongers and racists when they are given full advantage to exploit their misguided aims. Certainly the majority of the observers won't be stirred to join their ranks, but when disgust and hatred materialized as mob action against such a speaker, then this is an in-

dication of the public expressing their strong disagreement with the subject. The racists and hate-speakers are fully aware of the attitude the crowds will show to them; they are deliberately putting their lives in peril by their preachings, and have no one to blame but themselves if they are injured in a mob clash.

In your reply to Tom Armistead's letter, you stated that the fuggheaded reply you had expected didn't come. Didn't it?

I'd like to know on what the Maryland Court of Appeals bases its claim that the lack of belief in God renders a person incompetent. Aren't they aware that some of the fanatic church-goers are among the most incompetent people in the nation? Here you may have an individual who wastes vast quantities of time which could be put to good use prostrating himself before some unseen being to beg for good health and an end to troubles for him and his family, without doing anything really constructive to meet these ends. It's a case where unquestioning reliance is placed on faith, and what could be more incompetent than that?

BERNIE MORRIS :: 420 MEMORIAL DR. :: CAMBRIDGE 39, MASS.

While it is true that using the tactics of the Ku Klux Klan pulls you down to their level, there is also the other extreme. You say that, "As for L'eandes, he is simply exercising the right of free speech in attempting to out-shout the speakers." This is a self-contradiction: "free speech" does not involve shouting down the recognized speaker any more than "freedom to assemble" means the right to riot. Otherwise I agree with you, especially on the thing about "the Nazi that is knocked on the head today will not command a concentration camp tomorrow." Even if you can forget the dubious morality of "getting him before he can get you" (I cannot), the statement is flatly wrong. If Germany in 1918 wasn't "knocked on the head and pitched into the gutter," then nobody ever was. And look at the results.

It is very interesting to see that there is integrated prayer in public schools. The complete segregation in Southern churches has always seemed to me to be the crowning example of Christian hypocrisy. They can find some obscure passage in the Bible which justifies their going to Wall Street and stepping on all who can't move quickly enough. The doctrine of Predestination has been interpreted as 'God favors the rich, or they wouldn't be rich' by some of the local God Squadrs. (The God Squad, as it's affectionately known, is officially called the United Christian Fellowship. Their chief activity consists of converting the heathen, i.e., all non-God Squadrs. In arguments they're lots of fun.)

Ben Orlove: Your arguments against an after-life on a scientific basis are ridiculous. The basic Christian doctrine is "I believe it because it is absurd." All the "scientific" proof in the world won't change this a bit. It is just as ignorant to say that God (or the after-life) does not exist because I don't believe it, as it is to affirm a "belief without evidence in what is told by one who speaks without knowledge, of things without parallel." (This is Ambrose Bierce's definition of faith.) And let me remind everyone that science doesn't have all the answers, and if one claims it does, he can only be compared with Richard Shaver or John W. Campbell, Jr.

Tom Armistead: I'll tell you why I don't believe in the All-Powerful, Benevolent God of the Christians. The main reason is 4000 years of bloody murder which we are pleased to call history. As for your disregarding the facts on evolution, in "1934" O'Brien, the Inquisitor, says, "But we can change History. History is on records and in the minds of the people; we control both." And then he proceeds to

prove that four equals five. If you aren't going to believe proven facts, I can't do much about it. On your sticking to your guns, good for you. I've faced a whole crowd of God Squaders on occasion and I know it isn't easy to disagree with everyone when you have no support save your wits. (Don't interpret this last as a change in my views, I'm merely admiring your facing up to the Monster of an Evil Atheistic Modern Age, i.e., most intelligent people who haven't been forced into any beliefs from the time they could toddle off to church.)

CARL LAZARUS :: C/O BEN ORLOVE :: 825 EAST 13th ST. :: BROOKLYN 30, N.Y.

In Kipple #30 you professed to have begun an attempt to be less prejudiced toward the liberal side. I use the word "attempt" because you were still not very fair by skipping many important points of John Boardman's attacks on conservatism. (It should be appreciated that the comment in Kipple #30 to which you refer was of a facetious nature. I am not, to my knowledge, prejudiced against conservatives, nor against conservative ideas. I am, indeed, opposed to most conservative thought, but I like to think that this was a conclusion reached only after considerable reflection, not a pre-judgement. But the reason I failed to comment on some of John's proposals was simply the problem of space; Kipple #30 was only a 24-page issue, and my disagreement with John consumed over five pages of that total.) At heart, you seem to agree with the tenet that conservatives are basically "bad"; you merely think that they should be tolerated, while John does not. (That impression, while untrue, is unfortunately the inevitable conclusion to be drawn from my comments, a fact I realized when first I read them in print. John used the term "conservative" rather broadly, encompassing everyone from Barry Goldwater to George Rockwell. I would make distinctions between them, but I failed to do so last issue, instead simply using the term in a similar context to Boardman's and assuming that this would be obvious to the readers. Those whom I dislike but nevertheless tolerate are best described as neo-fascists, the lunatic fringe of the far right. John apparently includes in this category anyone right of center, but I do not. Of course, I strongly disagree with the "conservatives" (such as Goldwater, Buckley, etc.), but I respect their opinions; I hold only contempt for the Rockwell/Walker/Welch faction. When I use the word "conservative" in an argument with Boardman, I am using it in the context introduced by John, that of radical-right fanatic. This does not include the real conservatives previously mentioned, and I apologize for confusing anyone.) Kipple #28 contains the allegation that conservatism "has a strong racist flavor", which is certainly wrong, although you did not comment about it. John's opinions show that he does not recognize the distinction between southern fanatics and genuine conservatives; if he did, his views might change. (Aren't there any northern fanatics, Carl? John will probably reply that indeed there are, and that I referred to them as "real conservatives" above. But in anticipation of such a comment, I should at least partially substantiate the distinction made earlier. William F. Buckley, a conservative, specifically damned Ross Barnett, a fanatic, for bigotry and cowardice recently (National Review, Oct. 23, p.304), a condemnation which should force even John Boardman to admit that a distinction exists.)

I have noticed that most people dislike conservatives, although they know little about them. When asked about Barry Goldwater, most people assert that he is a "nut" or at least is not accustomed to the 20th century. The liberals in politics are very much to blame for this because they have not submitted their political creed for all to see, but have instead indoctrinated the public with meaningless phrases such

as "we must move forward", "you should elect a man who understands the twentieth century", "the Democratic Party is for the common man, not for big business". Unfortunately, liberals have tried to confuse the issue, not to clarify it.

I disagree with Ben Orlove's stand on abortion. If we are to place such wide limits on the definition of human life, we might as well not eat fish or many other animals, because humans resemble them very closely in the fetal stage. Besides, the only thing which raises man above the rest of the animal kingdom is his brain, so the distinguishing characteristics of human life should be thinking capacity and awareness. On this basis, infanticide is wrong, but abortion is not because the fetus is not aware and does not think. (Ben's point--and it was a very perceptive one, despite the fact that I challenged it--was that the fetus will become aware, and thus it is wrong to destroy it. What this has to do with lower animals which "resemble" man in the fetal stage I'm sure I don't know.)

On the school prayer issue, I agree with you, Ben, and probably the vast majority of Kipple's readers. Religion is hypocrisy when it is shoved down someone's throat. Anyone who has faith in his religion should also have faith that others will accept the "truth" without having it forced on them. (My own attitude toward the Regents Prayer was rather casual, until Larry McCombs, Vic Ryan, and a few others recently convinced me that any such prayer in public schools should be opposed. But I doubt that there is sufficient reason to believe that people will accept the "truth" preached by theists without it being pushed down their throats; people never have accepted any other "truth" so easily. Evolution had to be shoved down the throats of the collective masses before it was accepted, and even now it is by no means accepted by all. Nor would people believe that the world was round, until that truth was forced on them. The validity of blood tests in determining non-parent-hood has long been concretely proven, but apparently the masses have not yet totally accepted it. (In one famous case, for example, a young woman named Joan Barry sued Charlie Chaplain for the support of her child, and although blood tests showed that it would have been utterly impossible for Chaplain to have fathered the child, the stupidity of the jury caused him nevertheless to lose the case.))

LOFTUS BECKER JR. :: WINTHROP F-24, HARVARD :: CAMBRIDGE 38, MASS.

I'm afraid Tom Armistead's last letter impresses me even less than his first did. Typewritten shouting is one thing; typewritten self-pity is even worse. I do rather wish that he had given some sort of backing to his "imperfect and unproved by scientific study" statement other than the obvious one that nothing is perfect and nothing in the real world can be completely proven. And Tom didn't even make that argument.

I think there is perhaps more rationale to the grilling of American communists on the Hungarian revolt than there is to grilling northern conservatives for the murders committed by their "fellow-conservatives" in the South. The argument here would go that the American communists are accepting direction from, and arguing for the policies of, the Russian Communist Party; but "conservative" is a far more general term than "communist", and unless a northern conservative is supporting lynch-law policies in the south, or unless he is trying to claim that the idiot down south is indeed a "fellow conservative", he has no more responsibility for lynchings in the south than does any American in the north. What John seems to be doing is just reversing the usual mistake of the far right--they are unable to see any distinctions among the

—by david g. hulan—

"HEDONISM - The doctrine that pleasure is the sole or chief good in life and that moral duty is fulfilled in the gratification of pleasure-seeking instincts and dispositions." (Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, 1959 edition)

One is inclined to think of hedonism as a sort of Sybarite philosophy, of creature comforts and uninhibited licentiousness. For some this would undoubtedly be true, but in a deeper sense hedonism is a philosophy which gives a more accurate picture of the way the world is set up than any other that I have found.

What is the purpose of life? In this essay I am going to adopt an agnostic point of view, because the majority of my readers will be agnostics and arguments from religious premises will not be accepted. This means that when I speak of the purpose of life I speak of it in relation to the being living it, not in relation to a possible super-being who has his own purpose for the living being. So, what is the purpose of your life, to you? Why should you go on living?

Is there any other reasonable answer than to enjoy life, the things that it brings, to the utmost limit? Other answers have been given, but I will attempt to show in this essay that either they are simply ways of stating what brings pleasure to the individual giving the answer, or have fallacies when we compare them to the way that humans in fact react. Let us look, then, at some of these answers.

Ask the average man in the street what his goal in life is, and he will most likely say "To become a success," or something to that general effect. He may state it in strictly materialistic terms, "to make a million", "to become President", or something of that nature. He may put it more abstractly; something to the effect of "to have security in my old age". All of these boil down to the same thing in the long run: he wants pleasure. In the majority of cases the kind of pleasure desired is freedom from worry, the pleasure of sitting back and not having to think or do anything. Whether, if he achieves his goal, he will in fact have this pleasure is not to the point; the fact is that he thinks he will.

Is there any other reason for wanting "success"? What is it, if it is not enjoyed? There is no abstract measure of success; the only valid measure is whether the person who has achieved it is satisfied that he has achieved his goal. If he is not so satisfied, then he has not achieved "success"--if he is (rare bird!), then you will find that he is enjoying it.

A more enlightened person may say that he feels that he has a mission to help humanity, to leave the world a better place than he found it. This sounds laudable indeed, especially when compared to my expressed view that my goal is to enjoy life. But let's look at this thing a bit more closely...

In the first place, how can anyone know whether what he does

MUSINGS OF A
PHILOSOPHICAL HEDONIST

will help or harm humanity in the long run? Oh, there are a few possible examples where one can be reasonably sure that overall harm was done--as when someone kills a large number of people (though even here you never know--perhaps one of those killed might have had a descendant who would have destroyed the human race had he lived). But it is very difficult to be sure that any action is for ultimate good. If, for instance, Hitler had received a wound during World War I, and a doctor had treated him and saved his life--would it have been for the good of humanity as a whole? When atomic energy was discovered--was it for the good of humanity as a whole? I confess, I don't know--but equally, neither does anyone else know. The point I am trying to make is that your opinion is the only thing that determines whether you think an action is for the good of humanity or not. You can't be sure that anyone else will agree with you. You put yourself in the position of the self-righteous--and there is no one more dangerous than a self-righteous person, because no consideration will prevent him from doing what he knows is right--even when it's wrong! (Thank you, JWC Jr.)

However, this argument will not sway everyone--some of you will say, "Yes, but some actions have a great probability of being good, and others a great probability of causing ultimate harm. I want to take the action with the greatest probability of having good results for humanity." Aside from the fact that they are claiming an ability to distinguish something which is seldom so clear-cut as they pretend, is there any other reason to distrust this philosophy?

Here I speak from my personal feelings, less objectively than I try to be elsewhere. What do I owe humanity-as-a-whole? Why should I care what happens to humanity-as-a-whole? I will try to help, as best I can, anyone who asks my help, because it gives me pleasure to do so. I will also help my wife and family, because I have assumed responsibility for them and it gives me pleasure to fulfill my responsibilities. And, in the absence of other more directly responsible persons, I will help children and mental incompetents because it is in my nature to do so--i.e., it gives me pleasure. But I can think of no good reason for telling someone that it should give him pleasure too--that he ought to feel the way I do about these things.

In my teenage days I had an ambition to be a dance-band leader (needless to say, this was back in the early 50's when people still danced to music). However, any time I'd mention that this was what I'd really like to do I was told that I had much too good a mind to go into a field requiring no more intelligence than that; that I owed it to humanity to make something of myself, preferably a scientist or a teacher of some sort. So, I went through four years of college and a year of graduate school, majoring in physics and math, and not caring a curse for either subject, even though I did make good grades. Finally, though, it got to the point where the dislike I had for the subjects I was taking exceeded the pleasure I got from pleasing my relatives and their friends, and I quit school and went to work teaching dancing for Arthur Murray. Nice job, that--I stayed broke all the time, but it was one helluva lot more fun than going to school. I couldn't try a job like that now, though--with a wife and child, you need to have a pretty good idea where the next paycheck is coming from, and some weeks I didn't make \$20 at Murray's, though some I made over \$60. Either doesn't approach what I can make with no problems as a physicist or mathematician, though, so I'll undoubtedly go back to work in one of those fields if the international situation will relax enough to let me out of the Army. It's too late now to go back to school and take what I probably should have in the first place, law.

I go into this personal history to show you just why I have this thing about "duty to humanity". Is it right to tell someone they should do something for the good of humanity and present them with this sort of conflict? I don't think so. Perhaps you disagree; if so, why?

Others, perhaps a majority of fans, will say that the purpose of living is to develop oneself. At least, this is something I have heard often enough in fanzines. Now, what does this mean? Ah, this is trickier ground! In a sense, anything will contribute to self-development, since one's personality is the sum total of one's experiences as interpreted by his hereditary makeup (more or less--I'm not trying to argue nature vs. nurture at this point). However, what is usually meant is development along constructive lines--I doubt if most of these fans would consider military training development of the type they mean (whether I do or not is beside the point). What, then, is "constructive" development? As we begin to analyze this viewpoint, it becomes obvious that some sort of goal is set up abstractly as desirable, and development which leads toward that goal is "constructive". Where does this goal come from? Now there you'll have to ask the editor of this magazine, or some of his fellow-believers (are you listening, Larry, Walter, Kevin, John?). Not holding this view, I find the beliefs of those who hold it puzzling in the extreme. However, I will give my personal reaction to it.

If a particular variety of development gives pleasure--or more, in the circumstances, than any other line--then I agree it should be pursued. No argument there. The motivation may be different, but the result is the same. However, if it isn't enjoyable, I can see no reason for pursuing it. Not for its own sake. There may be reasons for pursuing a line which is not especially enjoyable--usually because all alternatives are even less enjoyable. But I disagree violently with the idea that a person should seek discomfort; I have yet to see it proved that it's done anyone any good. Or for that matter that anyone has ever done it.

Having looked at some other views, I now want to expound on my own view of human motivation and the purpose of life.

First, let it be said that one does what he must. Compulsion, of whatever nature, by definition poses the alternatives of obeying or suffering some sort of extreme discomfort--loss of liberty, loss of life, loss of self-respect--some form of punishment. Now, only a masochist invites punishment (and there are mental and moral as well as physical masochists)--so the only reason for disobeying a compulsion of one kind is the existence of a stronger compulsion of another kind, if one is a balanced person. This question arises regarding laws--some laws are good, some are undeniably bad. In general, a balanced person will obey the law unless it stands in the way of some other strong conviction, a conviction that approaches the level of a compulsion when it is challenged. For instance, I have a strong conviction that segregation laws are bad laws and are wrong. If I happen to be in the company of a Negro friend and we want to do something together (eat, for instance, or sit together on a city bus), I go ahead and break the law--I've done it a few times. But on the other hand I don't go out looking for a fight--bad laws are still bad, but if I have no desire to break a specific one at a specific time, I don't go out and break it just because it's a bad law. As the proverb has it, "It depends on whose ox is gored." As long as a bad law isn't stopping me from doing anything I want to do, I don't worry about it unduly--not to the extent of breaking it for the sake of breaking it.

This is, I think, one cause of a lack of communication between

Walter Breen and myself--I don't feel at all stifled by the military, or by bureaucracy, or the various restrictive laws that I know exist, because I have no desire to do any of the things they forbid anyhow. I'll agree willingly that censorship is a Bad Thing, but since I have no interest in pornography it really doesn't bother me that certain films or books are banned. (I have no interest in Art, either, in case you mention that they aren't pornography, that that's just somebody's dirty mind. Tropic of Cancer didn't repulse me, but it bored me to tears.) Since I simply can't get worked up because I'm not allowed to do what I don't want to do anyhow, but can very easily get aroused at the threat that I'll have to do something I detest, I'm all for the Government...and can't really understand people like Breen on the grokking level, though I realize intellectually what's the matter. But back to the main line of argument...

There are, after all, other forms of compulsion than physical force. When I say that one does what he must, then, I refer to inner compulsions as well as external ones. For a religious person, this might include the commandments of his own particular religious persuasion. For others, it might include the dictates of a particular philosophy, such as pacifism. Or racism. There are all sorts of ingrained compulsions, and when they conflict with external compulsions, or with each other, the definition of the greatest pleasure may well be more nearly the least pain.

Given these compulsions, what can one do about them? Kicking against the goad is nothing but masochism. The only thing to do is to try to make the best of it--enjoy what you can, and try to ignore the rest. This is not quite the same as Pollyannaism, though she was pressing toward the philosophy of hedonism--you don't have to try to think of the reasons you have to be glad you're not ever so much worse off, but there are relatively few situations that can't be enjoyed in some degree. I hated basic training as cordially as anyone I know of, but I got along--I enjoyed picking up certain things faster than most (I am a "fast study"--I had my General Orders down pat while others were still stumbling over the first, for instance), and I concentrated on the pleasure I got from escaping gigs on that basis. And everything I managed to do right I derived pleasure from the accomplishment. And then there was the tremendous, overwhelming pleasure of knowing it was all over!

If you can't enjoy it, you're out of luck. Not specifically Basic, but any compulsion. I don't really believe that anyone can long survive a situation in which he is unable to derive any pleasure at all; however, I could be wrong on this. I'm only drawing a conclusion from my own feelings.

Then there are situations where there is little or no compulsion. Here there is no particular problem; the hedonist does what will give the most pleasure. If he is a foresighted person, it will be that which will give the greatest pleasure in the long run; if he is shortsighted, he is likely to choose short-term enjoyment. The search for immediate pleasure, ignoring the future, is not a characteristic of hedonists; it is a characteristic of shortsighted individuals of whatever philosophy. Hedonism, regardless of its usual connotations, is not the same thing as sensualism.

Is there anyone who is not a hedonist? That is, is there anyone who does not behave in all situations in such a way as to maximize his pleasure and/or minimize his pain? Remember, the more intelligent and thoughtful a person is, the better able he is to see that immediate physical pleasure must sometimes be subordinated to a longer-range view

in order to maximize pleasure over a longer stretch. Example: Let \$1 = 1 "pleasure unit". A person with foresight may see that in a choice between two actions, one stands to pay \$10 immediately, while another will pay \$0.1 a day for a year. Clearly the second action stands to gain more, but a person who cannot see a year into the future (by extrapolation, not precognition) will likely choose the first. This is due to a difference in foresight, not philosophy. Keeping this in mind, can anyone honestly say that he has ever made a decision which he felt would, in the long run, cause him less pleasure than the alternative? If so, I'd like to hear about it. If not, then I consider the case for hedonism well-established.

Failure to recognize this basic motivation has two great failings--it leads to many conflicts which could be avoided if the true motivation were known; and more important, it often leads to persecution where understanding of this principle might lead to sympathetic persuasion.

If everyone realized that the purpose of life is to enjoy it, then they would be willing to live and let live, as long as another's pleasure didn't conflict with their own. This is, I believe, the liberal ideal--so I guess that makes me a liberal? Only trouble is, most of the liberals in fandom don't believe that way...

This has been a relatively brief and sketchy run-through of the sort of attitude of mind I try to take when making decisions. If anyone is interested, I may write further articles going into more detail in certain specific areas. In the further articles, though, I will deal primarily with my own feelings, and not with the philosophy of hedonism. This discussion is primarily designed to get my philosophical background on paper, so that my attitudes on other matters can be more readily understood.

--David G. Hulan, October 31, 1962

LETTERS CONTINUED

groups and individuals to their left; John is evidently unable to distinguish between any of the factions to his political right.

I think Mike Deckinger is giving science a bit too much credit in his maunderings about "spiritual belief clashing with scientific fact". The two don't clash: the facts of the case are simply that the fetus dies when it is severed from the uterus--and I am using "dies" here in the same sense that one might say that a finger dies when it is cut off. The spiritual belief comes in when one claims that the fetus, from the moment of conception, has a life of its own, separate from that of its mother--and science, as far as I know, has established nothing on this score, primarily perhaps because nobody has ever come forth with a satisfactory definition of "life".

Mike's arguments on rapists and such also seem to be bad ones: the Catholic Church has all sorts of answers to similar arguments. (Quickly and badly, that intercourse outside of marriage is a rather major sin; intercourse inside of marriage would ideally be dispensed with--but men being as they are, only a very few people would be able to live a life of chastity, and God will not punish those people who are unable to do so--He insists only that they keep their impulses

within reasonable bounds. Since the primary purpose of intercourse is childbearing, not pleasure, the use of contraceptives is an attempt to go against God's purpose--and since the embryo is infused with a soul soon after conception, abortion is in effect the murder of a being with a soul, and hence worse even than contraception. For more complete and accurate arguments, consult someone in the Catholic Church.) The Catholic position is by and large a logical one once one grants their basic premises, and the only argument against it must be one which shows one or more of the essential premises to be false. Since most of these premises are, like almost all basic premises, unprovable, the whole thing boils down to a matter of belief.

The main problem is, I think, when the foetus ceases to be merely a part of the mother and becomes an individual in its own right. Since abortion is practicable only in the first couple months of pregnancy, the problem in practice is simplified--my own view would be that as long as abortion is possible, the decision should be up to the mother. If the foetus could be kept alive outside the parent, perhaps it should be; since it cannot, that question is irrelevant and the mother, who is going to have to go through the remaining seven or eight months of pregnancy and the praturition, should be allowed to make the decision as to whether or not to have an abortion. (The question of whether or not the foetus should be kept alive outside the parent may be irrelevant now, but it may not always be. After all, there is no theoretical reason why the foetus could not be kept alive outside the parent; we simply lack the practical means to do so. Thus, while the question is probably irrelevant to the main issues at this time, I think it ought to be considered as a side issue, since we may one day acquire the practical means to artificially sustain the life of a two- or three-month foetus. Similarly, the question of whether or not a person was actually dead when the heart ceased to operate was considered irrelevant a few years back, since we had not the means to repair this condition; but there was no theoretical obstacle, simply a practical one. If some enterprising physician should discover, twenty years hence, a process by which a foetus may be kept alive outside the body of the woman, it will gravely affect the major premise by which you justify abortion. My own opinion on abortion/infanticide/euthanasia is just as cloudy as it was two issues ago, so I am currently arguing both sides in an effort to find infallible basis for opinion on one or the other.))

TOM ARMISTEAD :: QUARTERS 3202 :: CARSWELL AFB :: FORT WORTH, TEXAS

Thanks for making your views clear. It makes me have a greater respect for you to find out that you were not ridiculing belief, but method of stating belief. I'll begin writing an article on the Proof of God and ought to have in finished in two months, as I'll have to write it in my spare time. I doubt if you will want to publish it in Kipple, as it will no doubt run some 10-12 pages, and will be comprehensive on things I know a little about (like Radiocarbon Dating) and will not be as informative on phases I am not as familiar with (like evolution). (Nothing is rejected from Kipple on the basis of length (within reason); try me in two months. And since you've whetted my curiosity, will you explain what Proof Of God radiocarbon dating will furnish?))

I am still unsure about the question of prayer in schools, and perhaps you can help me on this. In our school, we have a daily Bible reading, then a silent prayer prefaced by "Each in his own way," whereupon there is a moment of silence, then we leave homeroom. This is done over the speaker system, and is a regular thing right after the announcements. What I want to know is whether this is violating the Su-

preme Court decision. To me it is not, as no certain prayer is required, and the Bible readings may be looked upon as simply "wise proverbs". I must admit myself that I do not pray during the silent prayer period (a duration of about ten seconds), because there is no use to it--one can say little in ten seconds, and it serves no purpose right in the middle of a crowded class to start thoughts better kept until another time. (One can say "Thank you" in ten seconds...)

The night before last I went to a school group called the "Young Citizens Forum" where "Young Citizens" meet to talk over World Affairs. Anyway, I sat there and listened to some inane mouthings about preserving the Declaration of Independence (not that I think the Declaration is inane--but the method of discussing it was), and other crud of the usual flavor, and was about to give up the meeting as a bad deal, until we got into a little discussion with the audience. One boy stood up and said, "I can trust only three adults that I have ever met. The adults of the world have had their chance and they have muffed it. The only hope is in the youth, and nothing around this school has impressed me that the youth will be any different--all I see is the three button collar, khaki-level conformity." I was about to raise my hand and tell a few of my experiences on the subject--such as being thought a "queer guy" because I didn't particularly strive to always wear levis or shirts with buttoncollars. Or neat loafers. However, the reaction was one of "parents are a good enough lot" and one girl went so far as to misunderstand his point entirely and quoted the Ten Commandments "where it says you should honor thy father and mother and I think you should and..." The unfortunate thing about these groups is that through inability to communicate so many people receive distorted pictures of what you do believe that it is almost a waste of time to try to tell your thoughts. My views on many things are so far out for this set that I have almost no common plane to base my speeches on. For example, to explain my views on the HUAC would take about 15 minutes with a thorough going over of Operation Abolition, and the San Francisco demonstrations. There is also my inborn inability to communicate very well with segregationists--my views are on just opposite planes.

Your ideas about self-defense are fine, and I agree with them--from a logical sense. However, from an emotional sense I am illogical (and, I suppose, cowardly) enough to want to blow out the guts of anybody who is coming at me. Take, for example, the man coming down the street with a knife. I strongly feel that I have a right to shoot him dead. (If I may play the part of Kevin Langdon for a moment, suppose your attacker was Bertrand Russell?) In fact, I am a poor enough shot so that if anyone comes at me with murderous intent, I am going to pull the trigger and aim at the heart. I want to continue this period of existence, and I feel that I have a right to eliminate a deadly threat to me. I feel so strongly about offensive moves that I don't think one should attack another person first. Thus I doubt if any of your hypothetical cases would ever be true, as none of the better men of this world would be likely to go around knifing people.

KEVIN LANGDON :: C/O BREEN :: 2402 GROVE ST. :: BERKELEY 4, CALIFORNIA

Boardman is right about legalizing prostitution. You or I would have no trouble finding a prostitute if we were so inclined, but this Thompson character does not sound overly intelligent and he probably has no idea of how to get ahold of one (disclaimer). If prostitutes were able to advertize, though, it would be very simple to find one.

You are quite right about Boardman's fuggheadedness in advocating the beating up of conservatives. One doesn't have to take this much

further before it develops into a regular civil war; liberals against conservatives.

I see that at least part of your examination of killing in self-defense was inspired by my remarks to Jinx McCombs about the relative "value" of Bertrand Russell and a home for the mentally defective. I think then that I should give some explanation of my position on this matter and try to give a workable definition of "value to society". I think that, to make our discussion as general as possible, we should refrain from making a definition until after we have examined certain other matters. I agree with you that it is difficult to set up any definite, objective standards for judging value, but I don't think that such standards are necessary, operationally. In each case, one man will have to make a decision between two individuals. Clearly, the only thing that he can do is to make a decision on the basis of his own opinion about the individuals concerned. This is all that is done in practice and it does no good to speculate about what is "right" in any absolute sense. My personal basis for such judgments is my own appraisal of which person is more likely to increase the total amount of love in the world. Comments on this system are invited.

I was glad to see a letter from Ben Orlove in the pages of Kipple. He is the most promising kid I've run across for some years. As to Ben's remarks on thinking, he is guilty of a serious epistemological error. It is not at all established that the biochemical reactions cause the thinking and not the other way around.

I would certainly choose a few months of pain in preference to immediate death. This world is sweet and for he that loves life there is joy even in pain. And if it's human nature to hate a being who destroys something very close to you, I resign from the human race. (We all at one time or another consider that resignation when confronted by the less admirable deeds and attitudes of our society. But if you can find "joy even in pain," then you ought to be able to find some pleasure in your association with this species, even granting the premise that much of its history has not been admirable. It is, of course, "human nature" to hate someone who destroys something very close to you; this may not be laudable, but it is nevertheless the case. My article in #30 was exclusively concerned with self-defense killing, but had it been equally concerned with other situations under which a murder might occur, I would have presented this hypothetical case: You have been newly married and are deeply in love with your wife. Upon returning home one day you find your wife lying dead, having been raped and then murdered. Her attacker remains standing over the body. What are your actions? It would probably be possible to endlessly argue in an effort to find the proper course of action under these circumstances, but that is not at issue; the question is not what should be done, but what will be done. The only honest answer under these conditions is that you will attempt to kill the man; there is no time to pause for logic, for reasoning, for compassion--the over-riding emotion is hatred. If anyone should answer that question by claiming that they would calmly telephone the police department, I should think that they were either deluding themselves or purposely lying to me. Of course, this is quite obviously the proper action to take, but can any one of us honestly state that we would do so? I think not.))

Larry McCombs, what the hell do you mean, "But we have certain ideas about material progress, proper society, etc., which require the subordination of the individual to the will of the majority"? You don't really believe that these things justify censorship. Why did you say so?

Ted, it isn't fair of you to demand that Armistead prove that God exists and that He has some effect on human affairs. Deckinger assumed the same thing in his comment and Tom was just replying to him. The argument is entirely within the system. Whether there's a God is a different argument. Tom, I'm afraid that Ted is right about the theory of evolution. Why fight it? The most rational position for a theist on the matter is that God created the world complete with evidence for evolution, to test man. I don't believe this, but it's a better position than to deny the overwhelming mass of scientific evidence for evolution. I have various other comments on the Bible, and Christianity in general, but I think this can be better discussed in letters.

+
+

+
+

+
+

AND I ALSO HEARD FROM: Tom McKinnon, Bill Donaho, Arnold Kruger, Bernard Morris, John Boardman, Dick Schultz, Enid Jacobs, Steve Schultheis, Dennis Richards, Len Moffatt, Bob Underwood, Redd Boggs, and Dave Hulan. Thanks to one and all.

+
+

+
+

+
+

READER ON A HOT TIN ROOF DEPT. -- CHANGES OF ADDRESS

Bill Donaho, 1526 Arlington Avenue, El Cerrito, California
Enid Jacobs, Box 257, State Teachers College, Towson 4, Maryland.

John Koning, 318 S. Belle Vista, Youngstown 9, Ohio
Arnold Kruger, General Delivery, Islington, Ontario, Canada
Redd Boggs, 444 S. Burlington, Los Angeles 57, California
Calvin Demmon, 2106 Spaulding Avenue, Berkeley 3, California

FROM:

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

printed matter only
return requested
may be opened for inspection
contents: picked nits



SEND—TO—

Len Moffatt
10202 Belcher
Downy, Calif.