

QUOTES AND NOTES by Ted Pauls.....	1
THE POWER-FREE SOCIETY by Roy Finch.....	8
A SONG OF SIXPENCE -letters-.....	10

Kipple, an amateur magazine of opinion and commentary, is published and edited monthly by Ted Pauls, 1448 Meridene Dr., Baltimore 12, Maryland. Copies are available for letters of comment, exchange (by pre-arrangement) with other publications, contributions, or 15¢ per issue, 2/25¢.

--a WOKLpress Publication

QUOTES AND NOTES

by ted pauls

This column has recently shown a near obsession with killing in one form or another. In issue #29, I penned a section dealing with abortion and euthanasia which started a stampede of letter column opinionating which as yet shows no signs of ceasing. This was followed, in the next issue, by what Buck Coulson perceptively described as a discussion with myself on the matter of self-defense killing, a topic which was also gleefully pursued by various letter writers in the following issue. Now I should like to continue along this morbid trail with comments on not one, but several distinctly different matters dealing with situations in which an individual takes the life of another. This process is laughably referred to as the tying of loose ends. I say "laughably" because previous experience has shown that as a result of my inability to form any clear statement on such a matter, this excursion is more likely to result in the further loosening of ends.

The first matter to be considered is infanticide, a subject which has received more than passing interest in the press recently as a result of a case in Liege, Belgium. Mrs. Suzanne Vandeput, her husband, sister, mother, and family doctor are the defendants in the case, involving the poisoning of Mrs. Vandeput's eight-day-old daughter, who was born armless as a result of the drug thalidomide. Mrs. Vandeput is being charged with voluntary homicide, the others as accomplices; the crime could conceivably result in a death sentence for the mother, and in long prison terms for the accomplices. There are several positions taken on this matter: the legal/religious position (coincidentally parallel in this particular case), the humanitarian position, and the Pauls position. This sounds vaguely reminiscent of an old joke concerning the right way, the wrong way, and the Army way of doing things; and perhaps the parallel is accurate enough. The legal position is the logical one (and, presumably as a result of this, the Right one), the humanitarian position is emotionalistic and illogical (and Wrong, although there will be disagreement on this point), and the Pauls position is the confused one (similar in at least that respect to the Army position on most matters). It is worth noting here that it is obviously

coincidental that the religious position (almost inevitably illogical) happens to coincide with the legal, logical one. This occurrence is noteworthy merely because of its rarity.

The first position is the epitome of simplicity: a baby is a human being, the killing of a human being is homicide, ergo infanticide is homicide. American law (and, apparently, Belgian law) makes no distinction between selfish and unselfish motives. The jury will in all probability make such a distinction, but the law itself does not. The religious position is simply the legal position stated more bluntly.

From humanitarian premises, such a killing, committed out of pity, is excusable, and should not be considered a crime. At least several of the jurors will hold a similar attitude, and thus it is that I consider the conviction of any of the participants highly unlikely.

We are now left with the Pauls position. My position is by far the least clear of those considered, and I cannot in all conscience accept either position previously outlined. To take first the humanitarian position, I think it obvious that infanticide is a crime and is certainly not readily excusable. A life has been snuffed out, and the honorable motives do not affect this one iota. Motive, as far as I am concerned, should be considered not in determining the crime, but rather in rendering the punishment. The crime remains the same in any event: homicide. It is only after the nature of the crime has been ascertained that the question of motive should be introduced, in order to temper the punishment. With this in view, the legal position is obviously absurd: what manner of laws be these that under the same heading judge a man who murdered three guards during a bank robbery, and a woman who out of pity ended the life of her deformed infant?

Yet, as I admitted, the Pauls position is the confused one; there are ramifications and side-issues which cloud the position and which are conveniently ignored in the preceding paragraph. One of the stock justifications for infanticide has always been that the individual concerned would be better off dead. I don't know whether or not this was ever true, but it is certainly not true today in such cases as we are discussing. Our medical technology has outmoded this excuse for euthanasia; I have just recently seen films of children in Europe, fitted with mechanical limbs to replace the arms they never possessed, picking flowers, combing their hair, and performing a variety of acts which would have been impossible with mechanical arms just a few years ago. The armless child will obviously never be able to live a completely normal life, but he will live and, more important, he will be self-sufficient to a great degree.

Is it right then for anyone to deprive a child of this life with impunity? No. But can we rightly condemn the mother who took this course out of no other motive than pity?

The Pauls position, then, is simply the indecisive one. I believe that Mrs. Vandeput committed a crime; but I cannot condemn her for it.

The other situations under which a murder might be committed that I wish to discuss at this time are no less complicated. In the letter section of the preceding issue, I introduced a hypothetical situation in which one enters his home to find his new bride raped and murdered, and her attacker still standing over the body. This was introduced as part of a comment on "human nature" to Kevin Langdon, and I pointed out at the time that it was human nature to want to kill this man. Most of us would do just that, without thinking. However, the printed word can give us the necessary time to consider our actions beforehand (as it did in #30), time we would not possess in an actual situation. A little thought should suffice to show that attempting to

kill the interloper would not be the proper action. The only possible motive is revenge, and there is nothing particularly logical or praiseworthy about revenge. Yet, who among us would not attempt to kill the man, even though reason shows us the stupidity of this action? In the actual situation, the crime would be committed on the spur of the moment; reason and logic would not intrude. The true test is whether we would later regret the act. I cannot state positively that I would regret such a killing; can anyone?

The last situation introduced here is one which hasn't even the dubious excuse of being a crime of passion. Suppose, for a moment, that a tyrant somehow managed to seize power in this country. Whether he is a tyrant of the political right or left is not particularly important, but out of deference to my predominantly liberal readership, this hypothetical situation would make him a tyrant of the far right, a man dedicated to the extermination of all Negroes and Jews (plus, of course, all liberals) in this country. This lunatic obviously should not be given the opportunity to remain in power one day longer than necessary. As it happens, I oppose capital punishment; I believe that a person who kills without justification (defined by law) should be placed in a position where he will not again be able to take a life. Execution fulfills this condition, but is barbarous. Two other methods, one physical and one mental, fulfill the condition equally well: imprisonment or rehabilitation. But let us look at the situation if our murderer also happens to have absolute power over the country: he cannot be imprisoned, and of course this also means that he cannot be rehabilitated, since in such cases the latter must follow the former. Therefore, I would attempt to assassinate him. John Boardman, who apparently believes that because I will not condone an attempt to rob neo-Nazis of the rights which justice demands they possess, I would also be a push-over for them if they assumed power and passed laws abridging my rights, must be surprised at this. I am no pacifist; if any individual under any political ideology attempts to revoke my rights and kill my friends, I will do everything in my power to rid myself of him, including killing him. This may not seem particularly consistent with my views on capital punishment, but remember that there is a distinction between a prisoner being executed and a criminal being killed by the police while resisting arrest with a tommygun. Much the same distinction applies to my hypothetical dictator.

Is there, after all, anyone within range of these words who would not have assassinated Hitler in 1940, given the opportunity?

+ + +
+ + +

When Dave Hulan first mentioned to me the article he was planning to do for Kipple, it occurred to me that I would probably be in virtually complete disagreement with it. This is precisely what happened, as a matter of fact, but because "Musings of a Philosophical Hedonist" did not arrive until November 3rd, there was no opportunity to include my comments and criticisms in the same issue. An exhaustive treatise is unnecessary this issue, since I suspect that the letter writers will thoroughly cover the general aspects of Dave's attitude, but perhaps a few specific comments might be in order.

First, to begin as conspicuously as possible, I should like to note that Dave is not, in any pure sense, a hedonist. This distinction is important, since it affects Dave's eventual thesis that everyone is a hedonist--by which he means that everyone searches for pleasure to

some extent, save the insane. I would agree, in a limited sense, with the second portion of this statement, but not with the first. In beginning his article, Dave defines hedonism thusly: "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." In keeping with this definition, hedonists search for pleasure. I am certain that we all number among our acquaintances an individual or individuals who attack all situations with "the gratification of pleasure-seeking instincts" as their foremost goal. But David Hulan, despite the fact that he considers himself a hedonist, does not follow this formula: "The only thing to do is to try to make the best of it--enjoy what you can, and try to ignore the rest," he says. And: "There are relatively few situations that can't be enjoyed in some degree." I submit that this is not hedonism. This is not a search for the course offering the most pleasure; it is an acceptance of a course already undertaken (for legal, ethical, or other reasons), and then a search for pleasure within those duly imposed limits.

Insofar as this is his meaning, I will agree that virtually everyone acts in this manner, but it is still not hedonism. "Hedonism," quoth David, "regardless of its usual connotations, is not the same thing as sensualism." No doubt this is true, for Dave; but there are individuals to whom the terms are synonymous, and it is they who are truly hedonists.

The second point I wish to cover is this matter of "the purpose of life", tricky ground indeed. Dave believes that the purpose of life is to enjoy life, but he also notes in passing what are allegedly two other "purposes" which have been voiced from time to time: (1) to help humanity, to leave the world a better place than we found it; and (2) to develop oneself, to contribute to the store of knowledge of our society. Now, I say that these are allegedly two purposes because they are actually merely two different ways of stating the same thing. I used the second in my "philosophy" in Kipple #27, but I could just as well have used the first. In this discussion, I will use the first, because it is a clearer concept and thus easier to argue, and because Dave spent more space attempting to invalidate it.

The crux of Dave's arguments against the purpose of life being to help humanity is that it is impossible to be 100% certain that a specific action will in the long run be helpful. You can be reasonably sure that overall harm was done when someone kills a large number of people, admits Dave, but "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." This is a colossal red herring, a barricade of wet noodles which is hardly worth the trouble to topple. This reminds me of an extremely poor vaudeville joke where one participant asks another, "What would you do if you were being chased through the jungle by an angry lion?" "I'd jump in my airplane and escape," replies the second. "But," queries the first, "where would you get an airplane?" "The same place you got a jungle and a lion," comes the reply. So, in answer to this objection of Dave's, I will counter by imagining that one of the other persons whose life was saved will have a descendant who will prevent Dave's protagonist from destroying the human race.

Absurd, isn't it?

We can only be certain within the bounds of human reason that an action will benefit the human race; the fact that this is not a 100%, cast-iron certainty always exists, of course, but there is no point in worrying about it. To let this vague possibility prevent you from car-

rying out any action is to fall victim to a new and virulent form of neurosis, somewhat akin to the hypochondria which prevents a person from getting up out of bed all winter for fear of pneumonia.

Therefore, I do what I am reasonably certain will benefit humanity in the long run. The fact that I have not yet produced any astonishing results is a commentary on my ability, not my motives. My accomplishments have been minor indeed. For example, I have personally convinced two people that segregation and intolerance are inherently wrong. In any conceivable context, this is a fantastically minute achievement, but it is something, perhaps more than is ever done by some people: there are two more people who believe in the equality of the races than there would have been had I not attempted to convince them. A microscopic accomplishment, to be sure, but it is, in my sincere opinion, to the ultimate benefit of humanity. I have changed opinions on other subjects as well; it is perhaps my only real talent that I can argue reasonably well. In all cases, I have acted to promote what I believe to be the ultimate good of humanity, rather than brooding about the possibility that I might be wrong. If this makes me self-righteous, then so be it.

Third and last, I would like to examine Dave's attitude towards the breaking and opposing of various laws. I once stated in this magazine that Dave Hulan evinced a disgustingly self-centered attitude. Nothing in this recent article affects that opinion, although I might regret my previous harsh manner of stating it. "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." The section of this sentence following the double hyphen considerably qualifies it. However, a later statement from Dave's article leads to the conclusion that "worry about it unduly" applies to more than simply breaking a law: "I'll agree willingly that censorship is a Bad Thing, but since I have no interest in pornography it doesn't really bother me that certain films or books are banned." From this it is easy to assume that not only does Dave not break those bad laws which do not prohibit something he wishes to do, he also doesn't allow himself to be "bothered" by them. Perhaps the only way to effectively refute this attitude is to explain my own, opposing one. If a law is unjust ("bad"), it "bothers" me regardless of whether or not it interferes with something I wish to do. The reason is very simple: an unjust law is one which must be harming someone, and if someone is being unjustly harmed by a law, it is the responsibility of society--and by extension, the responsibility of every individual--to rectify this. Whether the law happens to interfere with your personal pleasure is immaterial: if it is wrong, it ought to be opposed. Period. This applies to harmful laws, to merely stupid laws, and to everything in between. The Connecticut birth control statutes are unlikely to personally affect me: I see no situation immanent in which I might take up residence in Connecticut and acquire a wife or mistress. And yet, since the law is obviously harming someone unjustly, it bothers me.

But even from a self-centered attitude it should be possible to create a good case for opposing all "bad" laws simply by bearing in mind that while the law may not affect you now, it may in the future. Dave isn't bothered by censorship, because he doesn't care for the material being censored; but does it occur to him that he may, at some time in the future, wish to read or see this material? And does it also occur to him that as a result of his current apathy (and the apathy of thousands of others), this will be impossible, since in the interim the forces of censorship will have taken firm control? In my experience,

"Soviet Science Fiction," by a variety of writers (Collier Book #AS279V, 95¢): 3

"Science in Our Lives," by Ritchie Calder (Signet Key Book #Ks320, 35¢): 6

"Black Like Me," by John Howard Griffin (Signet Book #D2171, 50¢): 10

"The Great Migrations of Animals," by Georges Blond (Collier Book #AS303X, 95¢): 7

"No Place to Hide: Fallout Shelters--Fact and Fiction," edited by Seymour Melman (Black Cat Book #BC-36, 75¢): 8

And what have you been reading lately?

As a result of the pitfalls of composing directly onto stencil, I neglected to mention that "Up From Liberalism" was a gift from Mark Owings, "Soviet Science Fiction" a loan from the same source, and Marion Bradley's latest book a gift from Marion Bradley. As Steve Allen would say, let's encourage this trend...

+ + +
+ + +

SHORT NOTES ON LONG SUBJECTS:

As a result of Red China's aggression in that area, India has recently been most impolitely laughed at by Baltimore's reactionary element, including the Baltimore News-Post. However, the fact that India continued its campaign to have Red China admitted to the United Nations even while the fighting was continuing convinces me that there is yet honor and dignity in this world. Before he was deposed, V.K. Krishna Menon stated to the press, "It isn't that we're morally superior to everyone else, it's just that we realize that an organization cannot be 'world-wide' and continue to exclude such a large and populous country as China." Actually, I disagree with Mr. Krishna Menon; India's policy with regard to Red China is morally superior, in that in supporting the admission of Red China it has asked "Is this right?" not "Will this be to my advantage?" The News-Post, of course, commented that this policy was "stupid". This was to be expected, since in all the years I've read newspapers I don't recall any Hearst paper advocating a course unless "we" stood to gain something from it.

The television program "Chet Huntley Reports" recently commented on capital punishment, including interviews with Clinton Duffy, former warden of San Quentin, and the Rev. Byron Eschelman, the prison chaplain. I plan to write an article on the subject in the near future, but for now I will confine my comments to a single question: when are we going to stop talking about this and do something about it? The statistics showing that the crime rate in states which have abandoned capital punishment has either remained static or dropped slightly prove beyond doubt that executions are not a deterrent to crime, thus utterly demolishing the final "justification" for this barbarism. Why then the delay in once and for all abolishing this inhumane and useless practice?

Once again this issue there will be esoteric symbols in the address box on the mailing wrapper. If a number appears, it will be the number of your last issue; the letter "C" indicates that you have a contribution herein; "T" means that we exchange magazines; "P" indicates your place on my permanent mailing list; and "S" means that this is a sample copy.

--Ted Pauls

by roy finch

the power - free society

A great many people these days like to speak of the core of democracy as the idea of "equality of opportunity". They do not always say precisely opportunity for what and often they take care to explain that they do not mean "equality of outcome." Democracy, they say, is like a footrace. Everyone should get off to an equal start, but what happens after that will depend upon the contestants.

Such a conception of democracy has a wide appeal because it is the American success story which promises every boy a chance to become President--if not of the United States, why then at least of a corporation or a labor union. Persistence and hard work will bring those who are best qualified to the top where the rewards of superiority await them. There is nothing wrong with the race itself: the only trouble is that we have said it is fair when it really wasn't fair.

Is this really all that is wrong with democracy--that not enough people have an equal chance to get to the top? Or is there something perhaps wrong with the idea of anyone being on the top?

This is certainly treason, some will say. Why even in Russia people get rewards; they get medals and big houses and titles after their names. What would be the incentive if they didn't?

Yet the true notion of democracy is that no one shall be on top, no one shall have power over others. The root of the idea that some people are destined to have power and rewards and others destined to lag behind is the belief that some people are by nature superior to others. These are Thomas Jefferson's "natural aristocrats", who will rise if the race is fair (and, some have said, even if it isn't fair).

To this we must oppose the idea that everyone is a natural aristocrat. The idea is not far-fetched. One of our leading psychologists, C. E. Spearman, who has spent his life studying the human mind and human personality, says:

"Every normal man, woman or child is a genius at something as well as an idiot at something. It remains to discover at what--at any rate in respect of the genius."

Every man is a genius--this comes closer to the democratic idea. And what people are geniuses at they will like to do. They will not have to be told or rewarded or bribed to do it. Some of our scientists and artists are the best proof of this.

What then becomes of politics? To this there can only be one answer. Politics in the sense of the wielding of power and the struggle for power must be abolished. Administration and coordination are the only legitimate functions of politics. And some people undoubtedly have superior ability at this. But the genius of administration and coordination is to find ways of expressing and harmonizing the abilities and wishes of others--not to deny them or to dictate to them. The true administrator does not need or want to have his own way--he wants as many others as possible to have their ways. The better administrator he is the less he will need power.

The fact that there are those who desire power and delight in controlling others must be regarded as a symptom of abnormality and disease. It is by no means inevitable or necessary in human nature. The desire for power like the aggressive urge betrays basic weakness, inferiority and fear. Philosophies based on the assumption that men are essentially motivated by a will to power always result in support for tyranny.

It is sometimes said that the machine age must lead to concentrations of power and that even planning must resort to restricting the individual freedom. But if we can use intelligence to coordinate vast enterprises, we can also use it to make work more interesting and responsible. It is much more important that a job be interesting than that it be lucrative or efficient. We could get on with one tenth of the trivia that is being produced today if people enjoyed their work more. The workers who produce shaving lotion or cheap magazines are dulled to want such things. Their life work fits them only for needing the inferior things they are forced to produce.

The world that we live in gives us only an "impoverished reality". We have all the "goods" and they aren't really what we want. Our culture which is supposed to be a source of joy and well-being is as much a source of menace and oppression. Outside there is a great shell of vast machines, giant libraries and universities, complex structures of government and finance. Inside there is confusion, uncertainty, fear and worst of all, emptiness. Only a genuine community of control can reestablish confidence and give the substance as well as the appearance of participation.

Those who themselves wield power will try to keep alive the idea that power is necessary--which is fundamentally the idea that most people can't be trusted. They will continue to stimulate the worst motives, urging people to go on acquiring and struggling for power--and so compete with each other for what belongs to all. In doing this, however, they conspire to keep men in ignorance of their true nature--which is to be able to work with each other without desiring to dominate or come out at some end point "on top". A truly radical political movement must renounce all desire for power for itself or for any other group or interest and work to abolish power or to keep it where it belongs--with everybody

--Roy Finch

"...one could spend years studying buttons..." --Elinor Busby, Cry #163

A SONG OF SIXPENCE

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

I imagine the riots at Oxford will be good for a number of comments in the next couple of issues and with that in mind I thought that you and the other readers might be interested in the situation as it stands here at the University of Alabama. I am a staff member of the Crimson-White, the weekly student newspaper here, and early in October when Meredith was making his initial bid, we ran an editorial advocating his admittance. The following Sunday night the riots and violence broke out in Oxford and on the Ole Miss campus. As a result of the two totally unrelated incidents petitions began to circulate the next day. Most of these petitions were directed toward suppressing freedom of speech and press.

There were also a number of attempts to stage sympathy rallies for the students at Ole Miss. Fortunately the Dean of Men's staff was aware of every attempt and stifled them before the crowd could even begin to gather. I was personally responsible for tipping them off to a rumor of an attempted rally one night. (Presumably it was assumed that violence would result if such a rally were held. But since you appear so concerned with attempts to suppress freedom of speech and press, perhaps you could explain your apparent lack of concern with an abridgement of freedom of assembly.)

We received a number of letters pro and con to our editorial. There were also numerous phonecalls, most of them obscene and threatening. The Ku Klux Klan burned a cross on the lawn of the editor's fraternity house. Consequently he has had two bodyguards since then. This information hit the wire services within the past few days.

A second editorial a couple of weeks later admonishing governor-elect George C. Wallace for his campaign statement that he would "stand in the doorway" of any school where federal troops attempted to enforce integration was rather adversely received also. Many of the letters we received were quite intelligently written, but there were also many assinine and obscene epistles in which the sender didn't have guts enough to sign his name.

The University Administration has of late been hampering the editorial freedom of the paper. Well, actually they've been trying to censor the paper, but they have only succeeded on one occasion when it was too late for the editor and the staff to counter the move. If it comes to a showdown of a free paper or no paper at all, I feel that the Administration will back down because that would actually amount to a more disastrous scandal than a riot would. You see, if the editor of the Crimson-White is

provoked into resigning, I feel that at least 50% of the staff will follow him. And I will be in that half that resigns.

As you know, a Negro has filed for application to Alabama for the spring semester. As of this writing, that individual, whose name has not been disclosed, has not completed the protocol for admission. There has been a lot of talk around campus, but no other steps toward action since the attempts for sympathy demonstrations were stifled in the embryo stage.

A great majority of the students on this campus are diehard racists and they will undoubtedly oppose a Negro's admission. However, I don't believe we will have the trouble that was had at Ole Miss. The University officials, as well as interested parties throughout the city and state, are taking great precautions to prevent that sort of embarrassment. Furthermore, there is a substantial body of students who either favor integration or else have resigned themselves to the fact that it's coming.

These in the latter category tend to feel that it would be far better to go ahead and admit a Negro now and "get it over with" rather than prolong the situation and thus further endanger the reputation of the school and the state, and also endanger lives in the event of possible violence. The only real danger of violence on this campus, I feel, lies in the hands of outsiders such as the KKK, the WCC, and what have you.

At the Crimson-White office we began to receive trade copies of student papers from all parts of the country after our first editorial hit the wire services. There were also letters from faculty members who requested that their names be withheld for obvious reasons. Since the news of our editor's bodyguards has been released, we have received phone calls from at least six states including Florida, New York, and California asking Mel (Melvin Meyer, editor of the C-W) for comments. At this writing I don't know any further information along those lines.

As for my own personal steps in alleviating tension, well, I've mentioned my tip to the Dean of Men regarding a riot rumor. Fortunately, that turned out to be merely a rumor, but I feel some inner satisfaction for having at least acted in that instant. Also when people start talking about censoring the C-W, I start quoting verbatim from the United States Constitution and especially the Bill of Rights.

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

I'm glad that you brought up the point about a person speaking for his country in the "Better dead than red" issue, since it's one that hadn't occurred to me before. It appears as though we both hold a certain fatalism in our thoughts of a Communist regime: to your avowal that you could never be a good comrade and accept orders unquestioningly, I'd add the fact that I'd likely be eliminated quite quickly for not informing on my buddies, or embracing the old capitalistic leanings with a religious fervor. Finally, add the old catch-alls of freedom of speech and this and that, self-respect, and so on. It's a pretty oppressive load.

No doubt someone like Boardman will find my fears of "informing" and "liquidation" amusing, but even if such things don't really exist--and the regular disappearance of notable sovietis gives us every reason to suspect that they do indeed--they would almost certainly be essential features of a government holding millions of people in check.

Your pragmatic doubts about an enslavement of the U.S. are interesting, but it has its faults as a stopcock to communist advance. For one thing, not everyone would be hostile to the invaders; just as

in the Revolutionary War, I suspect there'd be a large core of disinterested or fearful Americans, and about equal numbers of revolutionaries and "tories". Add to that the fact that individually owned weapons would be rare, meetings for planning difficult, and almost everything lined up as in Hungary, and what do you have? (You have a distorted picture of the situation, for one thing. During the Revolution, remember, large numbers of the population were British by birth or descent, a problem which would not be experienced in the hypothetical situation I presented. Remember too that Hungary was weakened by its close proximity to Russia, and also that its people were not accustomed to freedom. Weapons and planning? The OAS in Algeria had little difficulty with either, despite not only a hostile gendarmerie but a largely hostile population. Moreover, the original article referred to the slitting of throats, a phrase which obviously refers to knives, individually owned weapons which are certainly not rare. In general, I believe that the situation in this country would make occupation for any long period impossible.) A pretty damned dismal picture, at best. Perhaps the Russians don't have sufficient personnel to man such a huge prison camp, but don't you suspect that the red Chinese would be willing to send several hundred thousand or even several million "soldiers" to this country as guards, in return for only their lodging in America's rather attractive resources.

Just where did you find evidence to support your position that people cannot forever be enslaved. History may seem to indicate this, but the world has never known the frightening techniques of weaponry and social engineering that exist today. In addition, there's no reason to assume that a revolution leads to improvement; it's almost always accompanied by economic straits, which would be doubly dangerous in a far over-populated world, and the new government--or lack of same--isn't by definition a better one.

Your comments about university paternalism struck particularly close to home, of course. I suspect Northwestern is just a bit more paternalistic than most schools, perhaps with good reason, since Evanston's carry-over from prohibition days invites its own modicum of difficulties. Here, undergraduate women must live on campus, in housing where their hours will be supervised and their guests monitored. For the men, the residence halls are checked--though not always carefully--and finding a woman in a man's room would be grounds for immediate expulsion. (Jennifer Jones was dismissed for entertaining "unauthorized visitors", but it wasn't explained how she was entertaining them.) Men may live off-campus, of course, but one of the cardinal rules for housing receiving university approval is that the entrance to student rooms be easily visible from the landlord's doorway.

Needless to say, the whole system is pretty damned inefficient, and there's a certain thrill to flaunting it all, but that ever-present threat of being kicked out is a sharp sword overhead, and no amount of protest seems to be able to move the mountains of inertia. About the only justification for it is that most parents wouldn't send their girls to Northwestern if the girls didn't have the paternalistic plan, and, even though the girls for the most part couldn't care less, that's where the ultimate embarrassment must lie.

Shall we go into the usual psychological dissertation? I'm not sure what antiquated biologist has been passing psychological truths to Borsella, but it appears he's no less than sixty years behind the times. While it's true that biology to an extent determines intelligence--it sets the limits, and an interaction between genetics and environment determines where the individual will eventually lie--it cer-

tainly isn't the only factor, and perhaps not even the dominant one. And what's this crap about "future development...established by (inherited) traits"? If you consider it worth the while, I'll dig up six or seven dozen cases that add to the logical disproof of this inanity, but I lack the energy now to pass the comment off with anything other than a slight chuckle.

I was certainly glad to see John Boardman's admission of overstepping his ethical bounds in the "Kujawa discussion." I know the matter bothered Betty considerably, and for good reason.

Although Boardman may already realize it, his psychological theory isn't a completely new one. It's the old "self-concept" school, a sort of sub-branch of phenomenology. A person learns to perceive himself, and as he does so, he develops certain ideas of what he is and what he should do. He then tends to act on the basis of what "his kind of person" would do under certain circumstances. Unfortunately, the theory has its difficulties; it leads to a "little man" concept that's never been very popular in either popular or scientific study, and, for that matter, if you're going to accept the predisposition, why bother with the immediate concept of "self" at all? It may be that rather than learning a self-concept and acting accordingly, a person simply learns, then acts. It's no more overly-simplified.

Your observations about the pedophile searching out a prostitute are probably true, Ted; not only is it a rare prostitute that fulfills the child image such a person thinks he wants, but there is this abnormally broad frame of reference that frightens even some normal men (if such things exist).

It's never quite possible to say what the Supreme Court will say on any particular matter, even where the precedent is quite clear. The Court's decisions apply only to certain, specific legislative or executive decrees, and can't be generalized; in fact, they are sometimes at a loss for simple enforcement, as in the Brown vs. Board of Education decision of "separate but equal" facilities. The case Tom Armistead cites probably wouldn't be unconstitutional on the grounds chosen for Engel vs. Vitale, and I couldn't guess what they'd have to say about it, but as long as there's considerable disagreement over whether the Bible has 66 or 72 books, and as long as such things as the Koran exist, I can't justify Bible reading in public schools. The Court agreed 6-1 on the last case, so I suspect they might win a plurality--though not as striking--in the "Armistead case". (One such case--Doremus vs. Board of Education--has been brought before the Supreme Court, but by the time the case reached the Supreme Court, the child of the petitioner had graduated, and on this basis the Court refused to rule.)

DEREK NELSON :: 18 GRANARD BLVD. :: SCARBORO, ONTARIO :: CANADA

In the statement (Kipple #30) "Whether or not the WYF is a communist front organization doesn't really matter since it is a matter of record that an anti-American line by the stated disagreements with American policies," I should have added "and agreement with communist policies." And while I'm on the Helsinki Festival I'll give you the opinions of a Canadian right-wing Socialist: i.e., anti-nuclear, anti-nationalization, pro-economic planning, pro-anti-nuclear NATO, and pro-Cuba (I'm generalizing, of course). She was an attendee, and says, among other things, that though no one quite knew for sure who sponsored the Festival, the organizers of the Canadian group were all communists. You didn't need earphones for translations at seminars "because it was a pretty strong bet that applause would come after a statement decrying the fascist-imperialist-capitalists who were forever engaged in their

favorite game of warmongering. If (the speaker) was an African delegate, we knew it was time for neo-colonialism to be exposed." The Ceylonese delegation left two days before the Festival ended claiming it was nothing but a propaganda show. She attended a Hitler-type rally with the other Canadians at Schwerin as guests of the "German Free Youth" in which Red songs, frenzied chanting and handclapping slowly built up, to an emotional climax that ended in "an orgy of embraces and tears and slogans". By the way, the reason Boardman's British friend didn't get into Berlin itself may be because of the reaction the Wall produced on the Canadian delegation, especially when their communist approved interpreter confessed she would like to go to the West. Then there was the evening entitled "Demonstration of Solidarity with young people in colonial and newly independent countries." I think you will perhaps agree that the Festival was certainly not neutral in its outlook or attitude.

On "Congress legally acting to enforce desegregation," I should have said "legally and without causing the strife, misery and loss of face forced desegregation requires." You were of course quite correct in your refutation of my statement. However, if you mean by morally right that it is a "bad thing" to subjugate the Negro I am in full agreement (at least so far as the U.S.A. goes). ({In what area is it not a bad thing to subjugate the Negro?}) I'd rather see the economic boycott, the political ballot and education change the lot of the Negro people. It would be slower, but more complete and without causing deep hatreds to break into open violence as school desegregation usually does.

By the way, when I said HUAC was constitutionally illegal, I was of course wrong since it has never been tested in the courts to my knowledge. However, for once I agree with Eisenhower when he feels internal security is the prerogative of the executive. Besides, HUAC costs too much and does nothing except Red-bait.

I somehow feel we are thinking on two different planes when you say I proved your point that Goldwater's judgement is in error. Though you, and in this case I also, consider the John Birch Society radical, this does not mean that Goldwater is wrong when he feels it is not. I have Socialist friends who consider any form of capitalism radical. To us they are just as wrong, but not to themselves. They have made no error in judgement; instead we have failed to "see the light". For example, I find the Peace candidate Hughes a radical, but I'm sure John Boardman, and perhaps yourself, would disagree with me. I've drawn my conclusions; I'm prepared to discuss them, but until someone can prove to me that Hughes is not advocating a radical, pro-Red (unwittingly?) line, I will continue to hold to my opinions. Goldwater has the same right. ({The right to be in error is, of course, inherent in our society. Since my attempt to explain by a gentle chide failed, I'll outline my working premise in full: radicalism is an extreme deviation from the norm, and the norm is determined (at least in this country) by the majority choice of the people in electing officials. Thus, our current norm consists of Kennedy Democrats and liberal Republicans, with a scattering of Southern Democrats. The John Birch Society, which deviates rather extremely from this national norm, is defined as radical; this is not a value judgement, but rather a statement of fact. By the same token, Senator Goldwater, William F. Buckley, Norman Thomas, John Boardman and I are radicals. The fact that some of the noted names may not consider themselves radical isn't particularly important; by any conceivable objective scale, they are indeed radicals.})

Thank you very much for demolishing the "liberalism" of John

Boardman. Perhaps you are a true liberal, one of a rare, nearly extinct species.

You've convinced me that killing in self-defense is morally acceptable, so don't feel too bad. Actually, I didn't need much convincing, since I maintain exactly what you said, that an attacker, bent on destruction, himself forfeits the right to exist. This, as far as I'm concerned, also extends to the group and national level. Since I'm a soldier in the Reserve Army, I've been taught to kill another soldier who is out to kill me--and, of course, he feels that I am out to kill him. (This is all very hypothetical, of course. I might "freeze" if actually confronted with such a situation.) But to my mind, I would have no qualms about doing away with my enemy before he does away with me. This takes the right of self-defense down to a basic level of "kill or be killed". The same situation applies no matter what the worth of the individual to society, since self-preservation always comes before the preservation of society in Man.

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

I will have to agree with most of what you say on the "Better Red Than Dead" or vice versa question, but I wonder about the likelihood of the hypothetical situation you set up. Can you be absolutely certain that "a conquest can always be offset by an insurrection, a revolution..."? How many generations later? Do you have much historical precedent? (Virtually nothing is "absolutely sure", but it is possible to say with reasonable certainty that the course of history bears out the proposition that oppression is not permanent. The question of how many generations would live under the totalitarian rule is impossible to answer, of course; history provides us with many examples of both lengthy and brief occupation. Rather than list my historical precedent, I'll ask you to think about this: what is currently the oldest government, i.e., the one which has existed without change for the longest period? Or, to phrase it differently, in what system has there not been a revolution, either physical or social, in the last couple of hundred years?))

More on the Prayer Decision: Here in Rockland County we have a new pressure group called P.R.A.Y.E.R. (People of Rockland to Affirm Your Essential Rights--a rather paradoxical name, don't you think?) Their overriding objective is to have the June decision overturned by one of the holed-up-in-committee bills introduced by various conservative congressmen. Actually, P.R.A.Y.E.R. knows the score, and has small hope of such action (I should say reaction), although they're agitating like mad anyway. On a more pragmatic level (although no more rational), they are in the midst of a gigantic propoganda campaign to have every public school child in the country inscribe a religious motto on book covers, notebooks, rulers and other school supplies. I can't recall the suggested slogan, but it boils down to a simple "I Like God". Sort of arrogant, if you ask me. (Your disrespectful comments to P.R.A.Y.E.R. were totally uncalled for. Is nothing sacred? I suppose someone will now malign such prominent organizations as B.A.P.T.I.S.T. (Baltimore Association of Parents and Teachers Interested in Spiritual Terminology), H.I.N.D.U. (Hollywood Integrated Nonviolent Dockworkers Union), or C.A.T.H.O.L.I.C. (California Association of Teachers and Hairdressers Opposing Licentious, Illicit Conduct). It certainly is a terrible thing....))

I will have to disagree strongly with your use of the adjective "brilliant" in describing Kennedy's Mississippi speech. Frankly, this speech angered me. I hope I will not be accused of slipping into momen-

tary Boardmanism when I say that this speech was entirely too mild and placating. While people were being injured and killed on the Mississippi campus by brainless racists, our great Democratic leader was sitting there reciting a list of "good" Mississippians. He had to dig back 75 to 100 years for some of those obscure names--apparently his underlings were coughing all day amid the dust in the Library of Congress! The whole tone of the speech seemed to be, "Well, look, fellas, I say it's okay to be a bigot, but let's not throw rocks and Coke bottles, fer-chrissake!" The President had a golden opportunity to denounce racial and religious prejudice before a "semi-captive" audience, but he flubbed it. Harken back to 1960 and Kennedy's speech before the Fundamentalist clergy of Texas--one of the reasons I crushed my 14-year-old apathy and worked like hell for Kennedy. Perhaps Kennedy can only make a good speech of this sort when his own neck is at stake.

The New York Post located a quote deserving of wider circulation; it might impel a few of those people who "sit on the fence" regarding HUAC to get off. It goes as follows: "Arguing for the Un-Americans the other day, Rep. Gordon Sherer countered Chief Justice Warren's restatement of the democratic tradition the accused before HUAC are often at the mercy of 'perjurers or persons motivated by malice, vindictiveness, intolerance, prejudice or jealousy' with a proposition which Stalin would have appreciated: that the government can act against a man 'for no other reason than it doesn't like the way he parts his hair.'" (Post editorial, 8/8/62)

You know, if someone doesn't get to work and have these Maryland laws C.R. Borsella mentioned declared unconstitutional, I mourn the state of your state. Why hasn't anything been done thus far? (As I understand it, Madalyn Murray's case refers only to the pre-school reading from religious texts, correct?) (Yes.)

John Boardman's seemingly half-hearted attempts to refute your October editorial made me respect him even less. "I read Pravda, Izvestia, Red Star, Trud, Peking Digest and the London Daily Worker. So nyah to you, because this gives me the right to say that all Communists should be kicked in the face before they establish concentration camps in America!" How's that?

Betty Kujawa asserts that "it was my Republican Party and my direct ancestors who supported, fought, bled and died for the abolition of slavery." She is correct, and she correctly underlines the verb in the past tense. Aside from Betty's appalling blind loyalty to the GOP which she has proclaimed in many magazines, I wonder if she would try to defend the "new", ascendant Republicans in the South? One such is William Workman Jr., who garnered a surprising vote (over 40%) against Senator Olin Johnston, the Democrat from South Carolina who is moderate-to-liberal except when the talk turns to civil rights. Workman has a new book out entitled "The Case for the South", and I urge Betty to locate a copy and see for herself how low her party can sink; lower even than the Democrats of the Faubus and Barnett ilk. One or two sentences from "The Case for the South":

"Is the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People so determined to compel race-mixing that it cares not for the regeneration of bitter race hatred, which had been diminished steadily for years, but which is now being planted in the hearts and minds of white youngsters and which will be a scourge to the NAACP and to the Negro for years to come, not only in the South, but everywhere?

"Are the Negroes of the land so devoid of self-respect and pride that they stand ready to admit that their children cannot develop and improve except in the presence of the white race?"

This is the party of Lincoln?

But I might say that Betty Kujawa's letter in Kipple #31 was a dozen times more impressive than that of my fellow liberal (although sometimes I wonder), John Boardman.

As an occasional reader of National Review, I was interested to see your mild defense of William F. Buckley Jr. within Carl Lazarus' letter. You say that Buckley "specifically damned Ross Barnett...for bigotry and cowardice", and cite page 304 of the October 23rd National Review. Well, I dug up that issue and searched page 304 in vain for "specific damnation" of Ross Barnett. I perceived a tone of "tut-tut-tut", the inevitable reaction of this "respectable" right-wing publication whenever radical rightists overstep the bounds of decency, rather than a specific, booming "Damn You, Damn You, Damn You!" Don't you think you were a little too easy on Buckley, Ted? He may have questioned Barnett's motives, for the sake of journalistic respectability, but he also stated that "whatever provides the passion [of white southerners against the Supreme Court decision], the political cause is admirable. It is the cause of home rule and it is the essence of the American system..." ((Buckley also accused Barnett of cowardice is no uncertain terms: "If you tell the world you will go to jail rather than comply with a court order because you consider it a matter of principle, why then go to jail, dammit, or incur the contempt of those you asked to believe you when you said you were willing to fight to the end.")) Buckley's misuse of the concept of "states' rights" is precisely the arrogance you damned on page 5 of Kipple #31. ((Certainly I disagree with Buckley, and I consider him wrong. My point was that even conservatives, as exemplified by William F. Buckley Jr., could not stomach Ross Barnett's actions. I was simply attempting to invalidate John Boardman's evident practice of tarring with the same brush everyone to the right of President Kennedy.))

I would like to paraphrase Carl Lazarus thusly: "I have noticed that many people dislike liberals, although they know little about them. When asked about Wayne Morse, many people assert that he is a 'nut' or at least is not accustomed to the 18th century. The conservatives 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 return to the traditional American values,' 'the free enterprise system is imperiled,' 'the Republican Party is for individual initiative, not creeping Socialism.' Unfortunately, conservatives have tried to confuse the issue, not to clarify it."

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

I was quite interested in John Boardman's review of his recent reading. I, too, have been doing some reading of the opposition publications; in my case, great liberal newspapers and periodicals such as the London Daily Worker, Pravda, Izvestia, USSR, China Today, and others. These papers, by John's criterion (seemingly his only one), are certainly "liberal" papers: they say so themselves. The liberals so represented are certainly a peaceful bunch. Among other things, they have championed the unrestricted, wholesale murder of the middle class; the torture ("hanging is too good for them") of anyone remotely connected with the American government; the--but I don't think I need to continue. Since Kipple's readership is predominantly liberal, they will all of course be conversant with these policies--these are liberal policies, and thus must be the policies of any people who profess liberalism. Or so one might argue after reading John's letter.

I'm not surprised that John took Goldwater's statement ("I have some definite plans for...") seriously, but I am surprised at you, Ted. Goldwater has a sense of humor, and is about as willing to poke fun at himself as anyone. If John had read the text of Goldwater's speech with even a perception of a deafened bat, he would have realized that Goldwater was joking. Acute political Glaucoma, however, seems to be about all we can expect from John: nearsightedness getting worse.

You hit two points that most people tend to overlook in your comments on "Better Red Than Dead": namely that the phrase can be interpreted either personally or in terms of an entire country; and that living under communist rule is not at all the same thing as being a Communist.

When it comes, however, to saying that our government should surrender if the Soviets give us a clear choice between surrender and all-out war, all sorts of troubles arise. On the one hand, the obvious consequences of our government's saying unconditionally that, if faced with such a choice, we would surrender are that the Russians would immediately offer us such a choice. (Assuming obviously that they were convinced we were serious.) The only deterrent to nuclear weapons, unfortunately, is the threat of nuclear retaliation.

On the other hand, of course, are the arguments you present. I don't think the arguments on either side can be held conclusive: about the only thing any statesman worth his salt can do is refuse to commit himself beforehand--or declare his firm intention to reply, if attacked, with nuclear weapons--and then make his final decision only when necessary, basing it on his estimate of the probable results of his decision--e.g., how good are our defenses? how good are the enemy's? will they really launch an all-out nuclear war, or are they bluffing? and so on.

As to whether the Soviets could keep America, once conquered... well, I too rather doubt they could--but I seriously doubt that resistance would be as simple as you seem to envision it. In the first place, the Soviets have shown time and again, and the Chinese have demonstrated even more strikingly, their disregard for human life: Stalin let millions (literally) of peasants starve when they disobeyed his instructions, and in the short period of the purge trials in 1936-38, he killed probably upwards of a hundred thousand government officials--"at least two-thirds of the governing class of Russia" is George Kennan's phrase. In the second place, the argument that the Russians would in effect give up the use of America's agricultural and industrial might rather than destroy it--bomb them to teach the world a "lesson"--sounds rather specious. The Red Army was happy to burn its own land, and let its own people starve, rather than let food and supplies fall into the hands of the invading Germans; why then should they be reluctant to destroy America rather than allow it ever again to become a threat to Russia. The claim that they could not do such a thing "for propaganda purposes" falls almost of its own weight: with no effective opposition to their power in the world (except for perhaps Red China, which would hardly be the country to protest against the wholesale war which they have so long advocated) the Russians would not need to worry seriously about world opinion; and people behind the iron curtain have always heard pretty much what the party line tells them. It would not be terribly hard to concoct, for example, a story about a secret American underground which was threatening Russia with nuclear weapons. (In general, that article on "Better Red Than Dead" was one of the least intelligent I have ever written, and I amaze even myself in having published it: three days after deadline I wondered how I could possibly

have written some of the sentiments expressed in that article. I still believe that no tyranny can be permanent, but I am less enthused with the idea of a massive resistance movement. There would be guerillas, to be sure, but the "revolution" would probably be a largely gradual one, slowly accomplished within the limits of the government (in other words by evolution, not revolution), just as current-day Russia is moving, however gradually, toward more individual freedom. Oh well, into every editorial a little stupidity must fall--but I have the sneaking suspicion that in one swell poop, I ran through six months' quota...))

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

If the Russians will take over America, they will probably do it by infiltration. That would involve less risk for them. Imagine what a more powerful, Communist-led, Birch-type society could do. A revolution against Communism would be more likely to succeed if there were non-Communist nations in existence (although that doesn't guarantee success; look at Hungary).

Anyone who favors retaliation if the Russians attacked, or even the President's action against Cuba should favor "Better Dead Than Red". If acts of war are favored, then the people who favor them should be willing to die in battle with the Reds, just as someone who eats meat should be willing to butcher the animals.

To clarify my equating abortion to infanticide: A fetus is part of the four-dimensional entity that is a human being (if a person existed for just an instant, he couldn't be perceived). During part of its existence, this entity is sentient. Simply because it is not sentient at a given time does not necessarily justify its being killed. A person who is asleep is also not sentient, yet killing him would be murder, considered a worse crime than the murder of a conscious person.

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

I don't see how my direct memories of WWII imply, as you seem to believe, any superiority to greater age. It's just that, through the fortuity of birthdate, I have a different perspective from you. Your inference that I'm throwing greater age into the scales is scarcely justified, though it's in accord with your general standard of editorial comment.

My comments which you quoted in Kipple #30 on Betty Kujawa are an unjustifiable attempt on my part to infer from statistical to particular cases, much like the inapplicability of "psychohistory" to individuals. It is a safe generalization, which can be justified by a detailed examination of election returns if you wish, that persons of Anglo-Saxon, German, and Slavic ancestry are more likely to be conservatively inclined, while Jews and Negroes are among the more liberal groups. The sort of inference that I made from these statistical generalizations was wholly unjustified. As another example, let me cite the case of the eloquent Negro conservative journalist, George Schuyler...though I doubt that his eloquent conservatism will ever get him a dinner invitation from his fellow member of the Committee to Aid the Katanga Freedom Fighters, Senator Eastland.

I hope I'm not correct in interpreting your comment on page 21 to mean that it was wrong to fight the Nazis in WWII, and that you feel we ought now to come to realize this wrongness! Just what do you mean here? (Obviously, it wasn't wrong to fight the war (except insofar as any war is wrong), but it is certainly wrong--and rather sickening, I think--to strut around twenty years later bragging about the number of men we killed. I believe that the war was necessary--but I don't be-

lieve it was ever properly "a praiseworthy deed", as you said, to "kill Nazis". Killing may be justifiable, forgivable, even acceptable; but it should never be praiseworthy, although our society has made it such on many occasions. This is a difficult question you have posed, and I realize that in practice everything may not be as clear-cut as in theory, but I believe that our race will never be completely "civilized" so long as it is considered praiseworthy to kill another human being.))

Kevin Langdon is a little behind the times when he accused me of advocating a war between liberals and conservatives. Such a "cold civil war" has been in progress for several years, and it is the conservatives who have been instigating it. Consider the following murders, all traceable to conservative political ideology: Herbert Lee, Stephen Thomas, Roman Duckworth, Emmet Till, Clinton Melton, William Remington, George Lee, Walter Harris. With the exception of the Remington case, no man has served a day in jail for any of these murders. (John Farmer, Thomas' murderer, was found legally incompetent, though my information on the subsequent disposal of this case is incomplete.)

There seems to be some disagreement over the definition of a conservative. As far as I'm concerned, anyone who calls himself a conservative is a conservative--who should know better than himself? Such semantics as "pseudo-conservatives", "self-styled conservatives", "so-called conservatives", "crypto-conservatives", or Murray Kempton's "Birchsymps" are nit-picking.

There is a difference in organization between Communists and conservatives, though not the one made by Loftus Becker. The organization of Communism resembles the nervous system of an octopus--or rather, of several octopodes. There are major centers in Moscow and Peking, minor centers in Beograd and Tirana. Instructions and doctrine radiate outward from the center to the component members of the parties in this polycentral structure. American conservatism, on the other hand, can be compared to a fishnet. There is a linkage among the centers, but no center of command, and any two points in the network can have a strong, or a weak, linkage between them.

If the more decentralized structure of conservatism can be said to have a working motto, it is "Ka me, ka thee." National Review opposes the desegregation decision of the Supreme Court, and boosts Goldwater for the presidency. Goldwater supports Barnett, opposes "forced" integration, and proposes to drive liberals into exile. Morris, whom National Review supported for the Senate, is Walker's counsel. Walker was scheduled to speak before a National Review rally last March, and failed to speak there not because of his extremist opinions, but only because he was then a candidate for public office and therefore an inappropriate speaker for a non-partisan rally. Walker belongs to the John Birch Society, as do Frederick Reinicke of the New York Conservative Party and Gordon Sherer (Rep., Ohio, 1) of the Un-American Committee. National Review supported the New York Conservative Party, as did the John Birch Society and New York opponents of anti-discrimination laws. Walker opposes the "anti-Christ" Supreme Court, which is also attacked for its decision against school prayer by the National States Rights Party and the American Nazi Party. Walker is boosted for the presidency by the NSRP. The New York Conservative Party and National Review also attacked the school prayer decision. Former FBI agent Jack Levine reports that an FBI supervisor at the Subversive Organizations Desk says the FBI does not consider the American Nazi Party to be a subversive organization, saying, "All that they are against is Jews, and I don't see anything subversive about that." And so it goes, on and on and on. (Whew! You'll forgive me of course (or perhaps you won't)

for noting that if you aren't careful, you might be hired to write indictments for HUAC. Seriously, I suppose all of this is true (though, since I am not entirely sure what you said, I can't be certain of its truth), but it is not at issue. I agree that National Review and Barry Goldwater espouse policies at which you and I might look askance; I agree that the more extreme elements of the right advocate murder and even genocide to implement policies which do not even deserve to be termed "ideologies"; but I do not agree that the best way to fight this is to adopt the tactics of murder and terrorism.))

I cited the length of time I've lived in the South because it explains why emotions as well as reason enter into my condemnation of conservatism. I was expelled from Florida State University at the instigation of the local White Citizens' Council because of my opposition to segregation, and this campaign of vindictiveness was carried northward to prevent my admission to Stevens Tech. Close friends, including a sometime fiancée, have suffered imprisonment and beating for their stand against segregation. Even here in New York, CORE members have been beaten up in the streets. These are the realities of conservatism, the Streichers and Berias who do the dirty work while the Rosenbergs and Gorkis extoll the glories of their ideologies on a high intellectual plane. With this in my personal background and circle of acquaintance, I hope I can be forgiven for attacking conservatism's respectable apologists as well as the thugs who carry the principles of conservatism into bloody reality.

In the last analysis, our difference of opinion seems to be that I claim liberals ought to defend themselves against conservative violence, while you claim that they are sacrificing their principles in doing so. (I agree, as I have constantly stated, that liberals should defend themselves against conservative violence; but what you propose is not defense, but retaliation, and in adopting the eye-for-an-eye theory of retaliation, we are indeed sacrificing our principles.) This leads into the ancient philosophical argument of principle vs. life. Socrates made the point in his "Apology" that his death would do more than his life to spread his ideals, and we can safely assume that Jesus made the same decision rather than escape through the widespread anti-Roman underground. For myself, I choose life and let this do what damage it may to my principles. There are conservatives in the South who have told me they desire my death. I desire theirs with equal fervor. And I find difficulty feeling respect for copperheads in the North who excuse segregationist violence.

But this brings the whole discussion into an emotional realm, which, while it exists and has much importance, is no fit subject for a long intellectual analysis. No conservative argument, however brilliantly constructed, is going to change the facts in the past which lead me to believe that violence is the last (and, quite often, the first) tactic of conservatism. And no one is forcing northerners who call themselves conservatives to take this label to themselves. But, to avoid confusion, they should have a little care in selecting a label which is also proudly borne by the apostles of racism, revolt, and murder.

BUCK COULSON :: ROUTE 3 :: WABASH, INDIANA

You're wasting time arguing ideals with John Boardman. Haven't you noticed that every time you disagree with him he brings out a personal experience (either of himself or of his friends) to bolster his point? He isn't working from an ideal; he's motivated by personal revenge. Conservatives beat up his friends; therefore he retaliates by

beating up conservatives. Whether they're the same conservatives or not has no bearing; the doctrine of an eye for an eye has been satisfied. You're arguing idealism against the code of Southern chivalry, Western heroes, and Northern kid gangs.

I'll probably comment more on the Cuban affair in Yandro. Mainly, I think it's about time we did show a little of our "vaunted American courage". You don't back down before a bully; it only encourages him. (An elementary fact which--along with several others--seems to have slipped Lord Bertrand Russell's mind.) Not to mention that a bully isn't going to start a fight that he can't win, and the realities of a nuclear war are just as plain to the Russians as they are to us. (If by "us" you mean you and I, I should say you're being hopeful; if by "us" you mean the Civil Defense Organization, I should say you're being pessimistic. A glance at virtually any government CD pamphlet should dissuade you of the notion that "we" are cognizant of the danger.) They aren't going to help Cuba any more than we helped Hungary a few years back, and for the exact same reason. We were afraid to do anything then; they're afraid to provoke us now. Bertrand Russell and his friends may be quite content to be pushed off the sidewalk; pacifism is fine if you don't mind walking in the gutter.

I still don't think we should invade Cuba; the situation doesn't warrant any such extreme act. But I'm all in favor of the blockade and surveillance.

I dunno; I figured Betty Kujawa didn't need any assistance from me, so I don't think I even commented on that issue. That she might want my help even if she didn't need it didn't occur to me.

As for your comment to Armistead about the man with the knife, I suppose that I could say that I don't think much of Bertrand Russell, but there's a better argument. Can you seriously imagine Bertrand Russell coming at Armistead or anyone else with a knife? Seriously, the whole point is that people who come at you with knives are not great thinkers and the world isn't going to lose anything if they're summarily dispatched, which leaves you flat on your hypothesis. (Well, I didn't expect to be taken seriously as regards that comment; it was a parody of the sort of comment Kevin Langdon injects into such discussions.) My own opinion is that an aggressor forfeits all claim to fair treatment. Sure, there are exceptions, but the chance of you running into one is less than that of having your assailant destroyed by a flash of lightning, thereby solving your dilemma.)

DEREK NELSON :: 18 GRANARD BLVD. :: SCARBORO, ONTARIO :: CANADA

I would, in the general and accepted meaning of the remarks, be "better off dead than red". This is of course qualified when one comes down to particulars. For example, if someone put a gun to the back of my neck, "You have your chance to be either dead or Red," I would, without a moment's hesitation, choose to be Red in order to continue to survive. But, fortunately, the choice is not that clear-cut. Being at present a follower of Herman Kahn (and will remain so in the future until someone can prove to me that both his premises and conclusions are false), and refusing to accede to the wails of the Left that we will all die in a nuclear war, I am willing to see such a war rather than surrender our civilization to the barbarism of Communism. (If the "Better Red Than Dead" article had no other effect, it at least re-awakened interest in the problem of nuclear war. In all likelihood, #33 will contain my eight-page article on civil defense. Thus, I will not at this time argue the subject.) Living in Toronto (which my appeasement friends assure me is Target #9 in North America), the possi-

bility of my dying in a nuclear war is rather high. But I'll take my chances rather than see the destruction of most everything I believe in. The choice is not really Red or dead since existence under communism is just about the same as being dead anyway. (You have a right to your opinion, but nuclear war is likely to kill not only those to whom life under communism is intolerable (such as you and I), but also those who probably wouldn't notice the difference if the communists seized power tomorrow. I would rather die than live under a totalitarian government, as I stated in the original article, but I refuse to support a course of action which would cause the death of those who didn't happen to believe in this way.) This would seem to conflict with my earlier statement of abject surrender; however, the cases are not parallel. My previous answer is pure cowardice and nothing else, but give me a weapon and a chance to fight back--be it an A-bomb or a derringer--and I would live or die trying. In support of my belief that being a communist (in North America, at any rate) or under communism is equivalent to death, let me quasi-quote a sentence from the Marxist Review, one of the official organs of North American Reds: "Once power is attained, one-third of the population must be eradicated since they are hopelessly bourgeois." The first people to go would be the vocal anti-communists, then the idealist, appeasement left, and then anyone else who got in their road. I disagree with your contention that American cities would not be made examples of. (So do I, damnit...) Russia made an example of Budapest and China of Tibet without too much reaction behind the Iron Curtain. More important, the "liberation" of America is too important to let a minor detail like killing millions get in the way. Communists are utterly ruthless in the attainment of their aims, and the sooner this is realized the better off the West will be. The communists conquered Russia starting with only a few thousand followers, over-throwing the democratically-elected Socialists of Kerensky and then exterminating them, along with the other powerful opposition groups such as the Royalists and anarchists, till today their control of Russia is near-absolute. (I agree that communists are ruthless in attaining their goals, but you appear to have made an error in stating that Kerensky's government was "democratically elected". In February of 1917, when the tsar abdicated, the duma--a sort of parliament made up of elected representatives, but without the true power of the British Parliament or American Congress--appointed (not unanimously) a provisional government, under Kerensky. This may be the Russian equivalent of "democratically elected", but Kerensky's government was in no sense elected by the Russian people, nor did they support it.) They could do the same with America, especially when they'll control the schools and military might of the nation. No. Better we fight for what we believe in as was done in the past than crawl before the Reds.

Concerning your comments on Cuba, I agree with only the first few lines. What many people fail to realize about any military action is that the production of weapons for this action is relatively easy (witness the large stocks of A-weapons on either side); however, the means of delivery for these weapons is another thing entirely. The Soviets have all the H-bombs they need, but they must get them to their targets before they are any good. Ergo, due to the overwhelming missile (250-100) and bomber (2700-500) superiority the U.S. enjoys, the Soviets know they must lose any war they start. But, with these missiles in Cuba they can destroy America's home SAC bases in 3 instead of 20 minutes, and the bases are only on 15-minute alert. They are strategically important, these bases, for, although "missiles launched from Siberia can accomplish the same objectives," the Russians

don't have the missiles. They would have them in Cuba, but thanks to JFK they don't. (Unfortunately, thanks also to JFK's no invasion pledge the island will still remain a communist base in this hemisphere.)

The bases in Turkey are NATO bases and not American, and can only be removed with the agreement of the NATO council. Turkey has stated she will refuse to withdraw them until they are no longer needed, a couple of years hence. And on your next point--how the hell is Russia going to quarantine Turkey, Italy, or England? It's impossible without full-scale war. Might makes right from the strictly realistic point of view that it works where appeasement fails. The lesson of history in this case is so obvious. ({Might works (sometimes), but might never makes right in the sense in which that phrase is normally considered--that the strongest party is as a result of this right. And I didn't say that Russia could or would quarantine Turkey or England; I just wondered what would be our reaction to such a move.})

As for Bertrand Russell (WWI anti-war; WWII pro-war; 1948 "anything is better than submission to communism"; 1962 anti-USA), I regard his opinions as those of a scared and childish old man. A philosopher is supposed to think with the help of logic, yet Russell condemns the USA for creating the Cuban crisis when it was Russia who moved the missiles in, considers the United States the world's greatest threat to peace after China (and that Russia really wants Western-defined peace), and although a pacifist is willing to condone riots if it will mean a quick British surrender to communism. Russell deserves nothing more than contempt for his attempts to reduce Britain to impotence and blame all cold war troubles on America. ({Lord Russell is often wrong, but I don't believe that the proper response to this is to call him names and hold a verbal lynching. Obviously not "all" cold war troubles are the fault of the United States, and equally obviously Russia is not particularly interested in the Western conception of a lasting peace, save when such a peace is to the advantage of Russia and communism. (That is to say, a peace of the sort which exists between the countries of Western Europe. Russia is apparently interested in the narrower conception of peace such as has existed since the end of World War II, since both sides stand to lose too much in the event of a general war.) But if Bertrand Russell is in error in blaming all of the cold war troubles on the United States, certain right-wing factions are likewise in error by blaming us for none of them--or by implying that all the troubles of our world are to be laid at the doorstep of those leftist Democrats who run the government. Both sides, in short, paint a black-and-white picture of a grey situation; and each side can easily see the faults in the other, but not in itself.})

You have a very interesting interpretation of the American Constitution, and one with which I can see no fault, not being a constitutional lawyer. However, the division among conservatives on civil rights and desegregation rests, as far as I can see, on two points: one is their desire for the advancement of the Negro peoples, and the other is their opposition to Big Government, and the continued intervention of the federal authorities in what are, actually, state matters--in this case, education. ({You neglected the third category: conservative bigots. Surely you'll admit that there are some of this breed?}) The implication in the latter point being that the bigger the government, the more impersonal and authoritarian it gets. Whichever weighs more heavily on the conscience is the one position a conservative will uphold. I personally have difficulty coming out wholly for one point of view or the other. Even so, I can see no good coming from the forced integration of one man into a university with the aid of federal

troops. It hurts the American image abroad (which isn't really much of an argument), badly splits the country and opens old wounds that are not quickly healed. Of equal importance, it has already cost the lives of two innocent bystanders. I still feel that there are easier ways in which to bring about desegregation, the chief of which is the use of the franchise. I don't feel that any true conservative could disagree with this. Only time will tell whether Ole Miss reverts to old ways when Meredith leaves or not; if it does, the whole action will have been a tragic waste, with nothing accomplished for civil rights.

A much more effective ruling was Kennedy's decree outlawing discrimination in federal housing.

On school prayers: what's all the fuss? So what if you're an atheist or agnostic (such as myself) who doesn't accept them? Unless you're going to be as intolerant as Fundamentalist Christians, I see no logical justification to such heated opposition to them. You are denying the majority of the population what they want, and never mind the premise that they might be wrong. This is part of the basis of democracy, particularly inasmuch as it causes no positive harm to anyone. If you fear prayers will corrupt you, then you are not very strong in your non-faith. I'd really like to know what causes the majority of opposition to prayer in the schools (and here I'm talking about such as the Lord's Prayer, and not government-introduced prayers which I do oppose). (The opposition is largely because such prayers are compulsory, either legally in a strict sense, or socially in a non-technical sense. Vic Ryan, among others, made this point in Kipple #29; prior to that, I overlooked the fact that such a ritual may be legally optional, but still for all practical purposes compulsory.)

Boardman fits well into the Nazi category himself. His thinking is right along their totalitarian ("North unsafe for conservatives"), racist (the Kujawa name), anti-democratic (first quote), black-vs.-white (left "good"; right "bad") and guilt-by-association (Nazi=segregationist=radical right=conservative) lines.

And a question to Boardman: where did Goldwater give this speech in January, 1962, to whom, and where can I get a transcript of it? To put it bluntly, I don't believe it.

DOROTHY BRAUNSTEIN :: C/O BEN ORLOVE :: ADDRESS ABOVE

I think "Better Dead than Red" is preferable. I wouldn't want to live under communism and I think most people agree with me. That would be no sort of life. Nor do I think there would be a revolution against the Russians. They seem to keep communist countries communist. Revolutions, like the one in Hungary several years ago, were put down with arms. If they controlled the entire world, as they probably would if they could take over the United States, they could put down any fights against them. They wouldn't last forever, of course, but they could do a lot of harm, like the Catholic Church did in the Middle Ages. (The entire point of the "Better Dead Than Red" faction is that they prefer a nuclear war to any sort of surrender. If you are willing to admit that the Russians "wouldn't last forever," I can hardly understand how you can nevertheless proclaim "Better Dead Than Red". A nuclear war would destroy not only the larger portion of the planet's population, but also, of course, future generations. If you would rather be dead than live under a communist regime, you can with little difficulty get yourself shot for resisting arrest in the event of a communist takeover. That would be admirable. But to support a policy which insures that your grandchildren--and the hypothetical grandchildren of most Americans--will never see the light of day--that is foolish. We cannot

condemn to death future generations because we do not wish to tolerate a temporary subjugation to totalitarianism.))

I think we were wrong in quarantining Cuba. We have bases near the Soviet Union, too. The blockade was an act of war, and we're very lucky they didn't fight back.

Abortion is wrong, but it isn't as wrong as killing a new baby. A baby is alive, but the fetus is a growth in the mother. It is less intelligent, as Kevin says, than sheep. It couldn't live without the mother, it is totally dependent on the mother, it is part of the mother, so it's the mother's decision to say if it should be killed.

John Boardman sounds sort of stupid. Saying its surprising that a Japanese is a conservative when he didn't know whether or not Betty was Japanese is silly. One of my grandfathers was born in Poland. Does that affect me?

BUCK COULSON :: ROUTE 3 :: WABASH, INDIANA

While reviewing Kipple I read your "Better Red Than Dead" comments more carefully and discovered a big fat flaw in them. Mainly: you are saying that a formal surrender could be followed by guerilla action. But what about reprisals? You are doing the whole thing to save lives--would you engage in guerilla action if you knew that for every Russian killed, the Russians would kill ten (or 20, or 100) Americans? The Nazis used reprisals as a part of their plan and the theory became quite well known, and the communists have done the same. The reprisals didn't achieve the desired results, of course, but then, they were not used against people who had already surrendered to save their lives. You don't seem to feel that nuclear war would wipe out all life; why is causing the death of 10,000,000 people more reprehensible than causing the death of 10,000--or one? ((The alternative in which the least number of lives will be lost is the lesser of two evils, and thus the preferable alternative. I realize that in certain philosophies this premise is not recognized, but mine does not happen to be one of them. I would consider surrender not so much to save the lives of our current population (although certainly many would be saved), but for the benefit of future generations. No, I don't believe that all life would be extinguished in the event of a nuclear war--merely most of it. I doubt that the remaining inhabitants would long continue to exist, as human beings, or what we laughingly term "civilized men". In other words, while "life" would probably continue to exist, all that we call "civilization" would be destroyed. I am not prepared to pay that price to prevent us from living under communism for a few hundred years. As for whether or not I would engage in guerilla action if I knew that a number of Americans would die for every Russian I killed, I would be inclined to say no, I wouldn't. However, this does not affect the fact that there will be guerillas in such a situation--I found long ago that my feelings and opinions are not shared by a majority.))

CARL LAZARUS :: C/O BEN ORLOVE :: ADDRESS ABOVE

I don't want to take part in an anti-Boardman crusade, but John makes it very difficult to do otherwise. As usual, his letter in Kipple #31 smacks of fuggheaded thinking.

John Boardman states that he reads a number of "conservative" publications, and he gives Kill, Storm, and Stormtrooper as some examples of his reading. If these are conservative publications, then I am justified in calling the Daily Worker a representative liberal magazine. John's examples of conservatives and conservative quotes (in general) show his myopia when it comes to distinguishing the factions to

his right. General Walker is just as disgusting to many conservatives, including myself, as he is to John Boardman.

John is just as guilty as any of the rightest radicals whom he talks about. He would happily take away their rights and even murder them (as he himself has said) because of his ingrained prejudice against all non-liberals. He is not very liberal (using the original meaning of the word and not its present political meaning) to anyone who is not of his political shading, and is thus being very hypocritical when he talks about the importance of defending political liberalism (you don't defend a principle by subverting it).

I agree with the action taken in Mississippi by the federal government; a nation cannot endure if it allows its laws to be flaunted. In this case, the government was doing what was necessary to defend the rights of the people. I've heard the argument that these Southern whites should have the right to associate with the people of their choice, but the students attending the University of Mississippi can leave the school at any time if they don't wish to associate with certain students, while they do not have the right to make the other students leave. Freedom of association should not mean abridging the rights of others.

I could write several pages about your "Better Red Than Dead" argument, but I'll try to keep it short. Firstly, the whole argument is based upon a hypothetical situation in which we would have to choose between surrender and destruction. This would probably never occur because the communists are reasonable to the extent that they would not start a nuclear war unless they thought that they could win with little loss of life and property on their side, or because they thought that we would surrender. The first situation is not likely to occur unless we disarm unilaterally, or at least stop development on new missiles and weapons. The latter situation will only occur if we keep on giving in to the Soviet Union and if we convince them that we would rather be Red than take any chance on being dead. That's why I think that our action in the Cuban situation was the best step we have taken in several years. Notice that the U.S.S.R. quickly backed down when we took a strong stance. (In retrospect it is possible to admire this government's actions in the Cuban crisis, but I hope none of us will lose sight of the fact that it was no more than a gamble which--with luck and diplomatic genius--we won. The situation, if I may introduce a rather poor analogy, is somewhat akin to the gambler who bets his entire bankroll on a single toss of the dice: if he wins, we admire his singular courage; if he loses, we decry his stupidity.) If this new trend continues, I think it will help to avoid war by showing the Russians that we are determined and will not give in easily. Thus, if we are ever threatened with nuclear war, the best course would be to stand firm--it would probably result in a Soviet desire to "negotiate" rather than fight.

Besides this, there are other holes in your reasoning, Ted. If you personally would rather be dead than Red, why would you force something which you yourself find repugnant on other people (using your own reasoning now) who also have a right to decide if they would rather be Red or dead. (The key phrase here, of course, is "right to decide". I consider nuclear war to be suicide, and with that in mind, I will explain my reasoning in this manner. If this country were to surrender, those who would prefer death can attend to it themselves (as I pointed out to Dorothy Braunstein, above); if a nuclear war comes, however, the bombs will not be selective--they will not kill only those who would rather be dead than Red. In other words, for the country as a whole to

choose to be Red rather than dead does not rule out the possibility of individuals choosing death; but for the country as a whole to choose death is to rob the individual of this choice.})

You also take for granted that the loss of life resulting from surrender, possible "lessons", and a revolution would be small; this can be disputed. As bloody as the suppression of the Hungarian revolution was, it was probably nothing compared to what the Soviets might have done if they did not have to worry about the fury of the free nations (the fall of the U.S. would probably mean the fall of freedom everywhere). Don't forget that the United States' population is concentrated in urban areas where it is easy to watch the people and apply "lessons". Surrender would mean turning over all our arms, making a future revolution very difficult. Even if a revolution is successful, wouldn't that leave us in the same position we started in? (Perhaps, but only if you assume that Russia itself is the same in a few hundred years. Since they are constantly (although slowly) moving towards more individual freedom in their own right, it is not unreasonable to assume that merely by the process of evolution the U.S.S.R. will have become in several hundred years simply a Socialist country.})

I think that freedom is worth fighting for, should fighting be necessary. Also, if people would be willing to risk their lives fighting for freedom in a revolution, shouldn't they be willing to risk their lives fighting for freedom in a war? (The answer to that question has already been given in my reply to Buck Coulson.})

JEFFREY LYNN :: 124 CRESCENT ST. :: ALLENTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA

Your magazine was very interesting, although I find that I disagree with most of your opinions, especially on religion. For example, a lot of people in your letter column are talking about abortion and infanticide, but the only things they consider are the biological facets of the idea. The only really important thing to consider is that even if a fetus isn't "alive" by the strict scientific definition of that word, it is certainly "alive" in the eyes of God. This talk about whether it's conscious or not isn't important; if it's there, God meant it to be born, and anybody who tries to prevent it from being born is committing a sin.

And there's this comment about whether an atheist should hold public office or a state job. Of course, atheists and agnostics don't believe in anything, so nobody can ever be sure they won't lie or cheat. Sometimes this isn't too important, but nobody like that should be allowed to be a judge or senator or any job where somebody honest is needed. (I'm not saying that everybody who is an atheist or agnostic is dishonest, but enough of them are so that there's no point in trusting one unless you can't help it.)

Even though I don't think they're right, most of your readers are people with sensible things to say. But people like this Mike Deckinger are the ones who really ruin this world. I am really disgusted by his comments on people who are smart enough to believe in God. Stuff like he says doesn't belong in print anywhere; it doesn't even belong in a garbage can. (Mike, you are going to hell on a ~~garbage can~~ roller coaster...})

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

I've always regarded "Better Red Than Dead" as an annoyingly ambiguous statement which could easily give rise to several disconnected interpretations. Your explanation of why you prefer it is valid, but digging more deeply, to what extent does the "red" part signify? Merely

communist-controlled government and/or a secret police operating from the government, or an actual state in which everyone lives communistically and thinks communist? If the latter case is what is considered whenever the phrase is voiced with disgust by some of the more fanatical anti-communists, then I think it's ridiculous. Surely these opponents of communism don't ever expect their ideals to be so altered that they will mentally embrace the very philosophy they oppose. In this instance, they could never be Red unless they wanted to, and thus it's assumed that they would foster any resistance to it.

There still are reasons why the Russians might devastate the US completely if they felt the need, even though the reasons why they might not are more sensible (and more reassuring). For instance, if they discovered their supply of non-nuclear weapons was smaller than they'd anticipated, and it also was becoming increasingly apparent that there would always be resistance to their conquests as long as one American remained alive, it might be wiser to simply plant a few well-spaced nuclear weapons throughout the U.S. and let nature take its course when it came to radiation and fallout. This would, of course, place the Russians in jeopardy themselves, with the danger of fallout reaching them, but they might tend to overlook that point if it ever reached a critical stage.

All the furor is slowly dying down over the Mississippi incident and it seems likely that the brunt of the riots has passed, and all that's left is for the sons of the Ole South to crawl into their burrows and lick their wounds. However, of all the bloodiness and violence I think that the most enlightening and saddening spectacle was that of former Major General Walker leading a troop of southerners with gallant cries of "Charge!" against the invasion of the "black horde". If ever a tragicomic figure was revealed to the public eye, it was he.

You applaud Lord Russell's telegrams. On the contrary, I think they add a note of hilarity which is as refreshing as a sunbeam in winter, over the grim seriousness of the Cuban situation. While I agree fully with the good Lord's sympathies in desiring to save civilized man from destruction, it seems to me that blaming the United States for the situation is about as senseless as most of these idiot ban-the-bombers can get. At least he sticks to the official ban-the-bomb policy by placing full reliance on Russia to be levelheaded and sensible in the light of growing world affairs, while the U.S. is regarded with distrust and fear. As long as his message was aimed at saving humanity, why not direct it to them: the Russians who built the bases, the Germans who helped with the missiles, the Cubans who maintain them, etc.

The way I heard it, the case where the Cornell student was under fire for keeping a young coed with him received added impetus because the girl was a close relation to the dean. And as long as you feel that faculty moral-setting is wrong, what about the recent event where the Dean of Vassar publicly admonished her girls to more or less keep away from nasty men who like to paw girls and keep your legs together, too. Not only was she advising them on their moral code, she was seeking to have them all adopt her own views. Morality can't be drummed into an individual verbally with kind words and stern admonitions. It must be experienced to some degree, with the individual having the right to decide just how he feels in relation to some situation. Of the girls that received the lecture, those who followed the woman's views probably were in no danger of shifting to the "wrong" side, and those who didn't would need more than a few naive motherly words to cause them to walk the straight and narrow. In either case, the lecture was useless.

To clarify my points in reference to prostitution, I feel I

should point out that not only do I advocate legalizing prostitution, I think it should be made compulsory for everyone under twenty-one. ({If nothing else, I boggle at the idea of making something else compulsory. Perhaps you had better elucidate...?})

AND I ALSO HEARD FROM

Edmond Meskys renews his subscription, notes that Ted Pauls is "a pompous nut", and that he (Meskys) subscribes to Kipple "largely for laughs." I suppose if I were a pompous "nut" I would have returned Edmond's money along with an impolite note, but being greedy in addition to all my other faults, I decided to take his money and write this impolite note on the back of Kipple. On the reverse side of the coin, Gordon Eklund notes that in view of the taste exhibited by Dick Lupoff in his reviews, Kipple, which he criticizes, "certainly must be worthwhile." Chay Borsella notes that while his mailing address remains the same, he has for all practical purposes moved into the library at Towson State College. School works prohibits a letter of comment, so he joins the legion of the sticky quarter. Harry Warner was at long last able to kick the habit of writing to Kipple every month, aided, I understand, by a business trip to South Bend, Indiana, and by his ever-loving mistress, Bubbles Latour. Len Moffatt notes that neither he nor Anna wrote a letter of comment. John Boardman writes a couple more times, Arnold Kruger sends me a notice of a political rally, and Ed Bryant subscribes.

FROM:

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

printed matter only
return requested
may be opened for inspection

BALTIMORE SEND (3)



35

TO:
Len Moffatt
10202 Belcher
Downy, California

Congratulations! You have just received your first 30-page Christmas card.

PEACE ON EARTH—GOOD WILL TO MEN